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Approximately sixteen texts in the Nag Hammadi codices can be classified as apocalypses. The principal concern of this study is to determine whether the genre of a selection of these Gnostic apocalypses was based on the traditional apocalypses (Jewish and Christian).

In the first two chapters a new definition of the apocalypse is proposed and developed in relation to the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. This definition states that an apocalypse is essentially a literary work structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation.

Chapters three to five are devoted to a study of those Gnostic texts that recount revelations which the risen Christ is supposed to have given his disciples. After a study of the literature itself (chapter 3), there is a critique of Rudolph's hypothesis that the genre was based on Graeco-Roman dialogue genres (chapter 4). The fifth chapter sets forth and examines the two most probable ways to account for the genre of this literature: 1. the genre could have been based on the traditional apocalypse; 2. it is possible that the genre was created on the basis of post-passion traditions and was not directly modelled on any antecedent genre.

In chapters six and seven it is argued that there is sufficient evidence to establish that the authors of The Apocalypse of Peter (VII,3) and The Apocalypse of Paul (V,2) based their genres on the traditional apocalypse.

The final chapter is devoted to a study of The Apocalypse of Adam (V,5). This text contains elements characteristic of two traditional genres—the testament and the apocalypse. However in its present form ApocAd must be classified as a testament rather than an apocalypse. The last part of this chapter sets forth new evidence which establishes that ApocAd originated in Gnostic circles which had been influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions.
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INTRODUCTION

There are approximately twenty-two texts in the Nag Hammadi codices which have a revelatory character in that they purport to have originated in a revelation from a heavenly figure/1/. From early on in the discussion of the Nag Hammadi texts the question has been asked about the relationship of this literature to the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. Could any of the Gnostic revelatory texts be classified as apocalypses and, if so, was the genre based on the traditional apocalypse (Jewish and early Christian)? Delays in the publication of the Nag Hammadi codices meant that it was for some time impossible to give firm answers to these questions. However on the basis of information available there were many who suggested in a general way—without reference to specific texts—that Gnostic authors adopted the traditional apocalypse as a literary medium for their theological speculations/2/.

1. This number could be increased if one chose to include any of the following texts: The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth (VI,6), Asclepius 21-29 (VI,8), The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (VI,1).

However there was one scholar, P. Vielhauer, who was not sure that this was the case/3/. In the two instances in which he commented on this question he noted that it was impossible to form a final judgment since most of the texts had not been published/3a/. However on the basis of the available material he made several observations: 1. texts which were described as apocalypses by their titles dealt with cosmological and soteriological themes rather than eschatological ones while 'apocalyptic elements' were present in texts bearing other titles; 2. the description of a text as an 'apocalypse' was based on the fact that it contained a revelation and thus should not necessarily be taken as a guide to determining which of these revelatory texts were apocalypses; 3. the revelatory writings in the Nag Hammadi codices belonged to a variety of literary genres/4/. Initially Vielhauer withheld judgment as to a) whether Gnostic revelatory texts could be classified as apocalypses and, if so, then b) the relationship of these Gnostic apocalypses to the Jewish and early Christian apocalypse. However in his Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur he seems to have had growing doubts that Gnostic authors based their revelatory literature on the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. Furthermore he reached a firm conclusion with 3. Vielhauer, HNTA-II, 599 (these initial observations were based on Doresse's The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics); Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (Berlin: 1975), 526f (his comments at this point were based primarily on The First Apocalypse of James, The Second Apocalypse of James, The Apocalypse of Paul and The Apocalypse of Adam—the four texts published by Böhlig and Labib in 1963); 690f (this discussion referred specifically to those texts that recount revelations which the risen Christ is supposed to have given his disciples).

3a. The first complete translation of the Nag Hammadi texts was published two years after Vielhauer's Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: J. Robinson, ed., The Nag Hammadi Library in English (NNLE--Leiden: 1977).
respect to one group of texts—those that recount revelations which the risen Christ gave his disciples. He argued that the genre of these texts was not based on the traditional apocalypse/5/.

The publication of the facsimile edition of the Nag Hammadi codices (1972-1978), an increasing number of critical editions, and a complete English translation (NHLE, 1977) have greatly facilitated the study of this issue. This is reflected in the fact that in recent years there have been a number of scholars who have sought to identify the apocalypses in the Nag Hammadi codices/6/.

4. On the whole the subsequent publication of the Nag Hammadi material has supported these observations. It is particularly important to stress that the term 'apocalypse' in a title is not a reliable guide to identifying apocalypses. Vielhauer, HNTA-II, 582, and Morton Smith, "On the History of ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκάλυπτομενον," AMNNE, 9-19, esp. 14, 18f, have pointed out that: 1. Jewish apocalypses were not originally described as apocalypses; 2. the combination of the term 'apocalypse' with the name of the recipient of the revelation to form a title was a development that occurred within early Christian literature. However even in early Christian and Gnostic usage the title 'Apocalypse of ......' is not necessarily a reliable guide to identifying apocalypses. On the one hand there are apocalypses which do not employ this terminology in their titles (e.g. The Shepherd of Hermas, The Ascension of Isaiah, most Nag Hammadi apocalypses). On the other hand this title is used for texts which have a revelatory character but which are clearly not apocalypses (The Apocalypse of Elijah, The Second Apocalypse of James, The Apocalypse of Adam). The only point at which one could criticize Vielhauer's preliminary comments is with respect to the assumption underlying the first point—viz. that revelatory texts which do not deal with eschatological themes should not be classified as apocalypses. This issue will be dealt with on several occasions in the study of Jewish, early Christian, and Gnostic apocalypses.

5. Vielhauer, Urchristliche Literatur, 690f.

In the study of the relationship of Gnostic revelatory literature to the traditional apocalypse it is advisable to distinguish several aspects of the investigation: 1. to start with, one needs to decide which Gnostic revelatory texts can properly be classified as apocalypses; 2. once the apocalypses have been identified then the question is whether the genre was based on the traditional apocalypse; 3. finally, one needs to take into account the character of each apocalypse with respect to its structural features, content and function. The first two points relating to the questions of classification and derivation require further comment.

NAG HAMMADI APOCALYSES: CLASSIFICATION

The main difficulty with determining which Gnostic revelatory texts can be classified as apocalypses is that in twentieth century scholarship the apocalypse as a literary genre has not been clearly defined. As will be pointed out in the next chapter there has been a widespread tendency to define the apocalypse on the basis of one or more of the following characteristics: 1. eschatological content; 2. the revelatory character of the text; 3. stylistic elements like pseudonymity, historical reviews culminating in an eschatological prophecy, symbolic visions, and esotericism. One problem with this approach is that there is no agreement as to which elements must be present in a given combination in order to classify a text as an apocalypse. As a result scholars make decisions on individual texts on the basis of what they regard as the minimal
requirements for the classification of a text as an apocalypse/7/. In the next chapter it will be argued that an accurate definition of the apocalypse as a literary genre must recognize the distinction between the fundamental structural characteristics which define the essential character of the genre and the variety of stylistic elements and motifs which, while they are extremely important features of some apocalypses, are of secondary importance to defining the genre/8/. The definition that will be proposed is as follows:

An apocalypse is a literary work structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation. The two basic structural elements within this account are: 1. the narrative setting or frame story; 2. the account of the revelatory event itself.

If one examines the Nag Hammadi revelatory texts in light of this definition then sixteen texts or parts of texts can be classified as apocalypses (the first group in the following list are those that relate revelations of the risen Christ while the remaining apocalypses have been listed in the second group):

The Apocryphon of James (I.2)
The Apocryphon of John (II.1; III.1; IV.1; BG 8502.2)
The Book of Thomas the Contender (II.7)

7. Thus, for example, Krause, Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi, 622f., adopts Vielhauer's method of defining an apocalypse on the basis of a cluster of characteristic features. He singles out pseudonymity, accounts of visions, reviews of history, and a combination of literary forms as the basis for defining the genre. He then identifies five apocalypses in the Nag Hammadi codices (623-635): The Apocalypse of Adam, The Apocalypse of Paul, The Apocalypse of Peter, The Concert of Our Great Power, and, tentatively, The Paraphrase of Shem. He also classifies sections of three other texts as apocalypses—primarily on the basis of the historical and eschatological prophecies they contain: Asclepius (VI.8) 70.3-74.17; On the Origin of the World (II.5) 126.32-127.17; Trimorphic Protennoia (XIII.1) 43.4-44.29.

8. J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," Semeia 14 (1979) 1ff, adopts this approach to defining the apocalypse (his definition will be discussed in chapter one). Since Fallon's classification is based on Collins' definition, his list of Nag Hammadi apocalypses is very accurate (Gnostic Apocalypses, 123ff).
The Sophia of Jesus Christ (III.4; BG 8502.3)
The Dialogue of the Saviour (III.5)
The First Apocalypse of James (V.3)
[The Second Apocalypse of James 50.5-57.19 (V.4)]/9/
The Epistle of Peter to Philip (VIII.2)

[The Nature of the Archons 92.32-97.21 (II.4)]/10/
The Apocalypse of Paul (V.2)
The Paraphrase of Shem (VII.1)
The Apocalypse of Peter (VII.3)
Zostrianos (VIII.1)
Melchizedek (IX.1)
Marsanes (X.1)
Allogenes (XI.3)

[The Apocalypse of Adam (V.5)]

The Apocalypse of Adam has been set apart and bracketed because while it contains a number of elements which point to the influence of the traditional apocalypse, it is in fact a testament and not an apocalypse. It has been included in this study because when the thesis was started I adopted the above mentioned method of defining the apocalypse on the basis of a cluster of characteristic features. This approach enabled one both to recognize the testament features of the text and to describe it as an apocalypse/11/.

There are another five revelatory texts which cannot be

9. This text has been bracketed because the account of Christ's revelation to James is only one part of the text. The work as a whole is not an apocalypse.

10. In this case only the last half of the text could be classified as an apocalypse. It is possible that this section was an independent text at one time: cf. F.T. Fallon, The Enthronement of Sabaoth (Leiden: 1978), 4, for a summary of earlier attempts to identify the sources underlying the present text (Bullard, Schenke, Kasser, Krause).

11. E.g. MacRae, IDR Supplement, 616; Krause, Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi, 624f; B. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, Ed. Stone (Assen: 1984), 470, states that "Formally, this document is both an apocalypse and a testament."
regarded as apocalypses. Four of them are simply discourses given by a heavenly figure:

The Thunder, Perfect Mind (VI, 2)
The Concept of Our Great Power (VI, 4)/12/
The Second Treatise of the Great Seth (VII, 2)
Trimorphic Protennoia (XIII, 1)

The fifth text, The Gospel of the Egyptians (III, 2; IV. 2) can be viewed as revelatory in the sense that the heavenly Seth is supposed to have written it in antiquity (cf. III.2, 68.1ff). While these texts purport to be revelations given by a heavenly figure, the fact that they are not structured around a human recipient's account of a revelatory event means that they cannot be classified as apocalypses/13/.

Thus of the approximately twenty-two revelatory texts in the Nag Hammadi codices, sixteen can be classified as apocalypses. The question that follows from this conclusion is whether the authors of these Gnostic apocalypses derived their genre from the traditional apocalypse/14/.

12. This text has been described as an apocalypse because the discourse contains an extensive historical review. Cf. Krause, Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi, 624f; Janssens, Apocalypses de Nag Hammadi, 74; F. E. Williams, NHLE, 284.

13. While these texts are not apocalypses, several of them contain elements which may have been shaped by the traditional apocalypse (esp. GrPower, GosEgypt, and TriProt).

14. It is noteworthy that Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 124, also distinguishes the questions of classification and derivation.
It may be useful to start by asking what are the possible ways to account for the use of the genre 'apocalypse' by Gnostic authors. The assumption underlying this study is that there are three basic possibilities: 1. the genre of a given text (or group of texts) may have originated as an independent creation of a literary genre which is structurally similar to the traditional apocalypse; 2. the genre of a given Gnostic apocalypse may have been based on the traditional apocalypse (Jewish and Christian); 3. an author may have derived his genre from earlier Gnostic apocalypses (whose genre could be explained by either of the above explanations). This list of possibilities suggests that the origins of the use of the genre 'apocalypse' in Gnostic literature must ultimately be explained either as an adaptation of the traditional apocalypse or as the de novo creation of a literary genre which was structurally equivalent to the traditional apocalypse. The third possibility simply suggests that in specific cases an author may have derived his genre from earlier Gnostic apocalypses (in which case the question of the origins of the genre is simply pushed back to those texts).

It might be asked whether an investigation into the origins of the Gnostic apocalypses should also take into account Graeco-Roman revelatory literature. It is clear that there is a diverse body of Greek and Latin revelation literature and that there are formal parallels between some of these texts and aspects of Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic apocalypses, e.g. the use of revelatory devices, pseudonymity, and historical reviews with a combination of ex eventu and genuine prophecies/15/.
However this revelatory literature is cast in a variety of genres and there is very little evidence for the existence of a Graeco-Roman revelatory genre which is structurally equivalent to the Jewish apocalypse. This is recognized by Attridge in his survey of the literature/16/. However he does suggest two cases where it might be appropriate to classify Graeco-Roman revelatory texts as apocalypses. One is the group of texts which describe journeys to the other world. The genre is represented by, for example, Plato's Republic 614B-624B, Cicero's Somnium Scipionis (in De Republica), and Plutarch's De genio Socratidis 21-22 and De sera numinis vindicta 22-31/17/. It is questionable whether these accounts should be classified as apocalypses/18/. However whether or not one chooses to classify these accounts as apocalypses makes little difference to the present study since it is highly unlikely that Gnostic authors based their apocalypses on this type of literature. The reason is that there is no evidence of the influence of these accounts in the Gnostic


16. Attridge, Ibid., 159, writes that "The other genres of Greek and Latin revelatory texts listed here often share certain revelatory devices or elements of content with Jewish, Christian and Gnostic texts, although they cannot be considered as apocalypses."

17. Cf. Attridge, Ibid., 161-167, for a survey of the principal texts and references to relevant literature in the bibliography.

18. While there may be some justification for this classification, there are two considerations which count against it: 1. these accounts are frequently narrated in the third rather than the first person; 2. the accounts are often incorporated in other literary texts (normally philosophical), i.e. they are not the basis for an independent literary work.
apocalypses/18a/.

The other exception to the observation that most Graeco-Roman revelatory literature cannot be classified as apocalypses is a single Greek text—Poimandres/19/. The work is the account of an unnamed seer in which he describes the epiphany of a heavenly revealer, Poimandres, who gives him a revelation by means of vision-interpretation sequences and direct speech in the form of discourse and dialogue. This text must undoubtedly be classified as an apocalypse. However the distinctive feature about the genre of Poimandres is that it has no parallels in Graeco-Roman revelatory literature. The fact that it stands alone raises the question of how to account for its genre. Is it the sole surviving example of a genre which was more widely employed in Graeco-Roman literature? Does it represent a unique and independent creation of a revelatory genre which is structurally similar to the traditional apocalypse? Or is it possible that the author derived his genre from the Jewish apocalypse? This last possibility has been proposed by Birger Pearson/20/. He notes that Poimandres has all the 'earmarks' of a Jewish apocalypse. Most of these are of a formal or structural

18a. This assertion can be confidently made with respect to the texts included in this study. It might be possible to argue that these Graeco-Roman accounts influenced those Gnostic texts in which revelation is mediated in the context of a heavenly journey (Zostrianos, The Paraphrase of Shem, Marsanes, and Allogenes). However I have not discovered any specific evidence which would point to the influence of this literature.


nature (my list): 1. the text is organized around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation; 2. a seer (anonymous) receives the revelation from a heavenly revealer by means of vision-interpretation sequences and direct discourse; 3. a frame story brackets the revelation. In addition to these formal parallels Pearson argues that there are three elements which may be stylized in a recognizably traditional fashion (in particular with reference to II Enoch): 1. the anonymous seer receives his revelation while he is sleeping; 2. Poimandres appears as a gigantic figure who calls him by name; 3. after receiving the revelation the seer is sent to preach. Pearson acknowledges that these similarities are not close enough to amount to conclusive evidence that the author was indebted to the Jewish apocalypse (II Enoch in particular) for his genre. However when one also takes into account the evidence from the content of Poimandres which indicates that the author was familiar with Jewish traditions, then it is very likely that the author derived his genre from the Jewish apocalypse/21/. In view of this it would be unwise to take Poimandres as evidence for the existence of a Graeco-Roman revelatory genre which was structurally identical to the Jewish apocalypse.

In view of these considerations it is unlikely that there was an equivalent genre to the Jewish apocalypse in Graeco-Roman revelation literature. It is thus arguable that the use of the genre 'apocalypse' in Gnostic literature must be explained in one

21. Evidence that the author was acquainted with Jewish traditions has been gathered in the two articles by Pearson just cited (note 20) and earlier by C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: 1934), 99-248. E. Haenchen, "Aufbau und Theologie des 'Poimandres'," ZThK 53 (1956) 149-191, regarded the influence of Jewish traditions as much less pervasive than Dodd (cf. 150, 188ff).
of two ways: 1. Jewish and early Christian apocalypses may have provided the literary models on which the Gnostic apocalypses were based (either directly or indirectly—in the latter case the genre would have been mediated by earlier Gnostic apocalypses); 2. the genre may represent the independent creation of a literary genre which was structurally similar to the traditional apocalypse. This latter possibility is well within the realm of possibility. This is because the apocalypse is in fact a simple genre. Given the emphasis in Gnostic thought on revelations from the pleroma, it would be a small step for an author to produce a text in which he represented an important figure in Gnostic salvation history as relating an account of a revelation he had received (i.e. an apocalypse).

Having suggested the most likely ways to account for the use of the genre 'apocalypse' in Gnostic literature, the next question is how one decides between these two alternatives in specific cases. This is by far the most difficult question. It will be argued that the basic problem can be traced to the fact that the apocalypse is a structurally simple genre: a narrative account of a mediated revelation bracketed by frame stories. Within this broad structure there was a great deal of freedom in the construction of the various elements of the genre: e.g. the literary work as a whole, the narrative settings, the revelatory event, and the characterization of the human recipient and heavenly revealer. The 'fluid' nature of the genre can already be seen in the Jewish apocalypses. However since the Jewish texts come from a relatively homogeneous religious and cultural milieu, there are many elements stylized in a similar way in the various apocalypses. But when the genre is adapted by non-Jewish
authors then the possibility exists that the genre will be used for a non-traditional content and that the various structural elements of the genre will be shaped in light of factors such as the author's religious/cultural background and the requirements of the text and its proposed setting. The result is that there may be few elements which are stylized in an explicitly traditional manner. In the extreme case it is possible that a non-Jewish author, in this context a Gnostic writer, will derive from the Jewish and Christian apocalypses the essential structure of the genre (narrative settings plus account of a mediated revelation) and then shape the elements of the genre in light of his religious tradition without including any elements which are stylized in a recognizably traditional manner. In this case one would have a Gnostic apocalypse whose parallels to the traditional apocalypse would be of a purely formal nature. It would thus be difficult to decide if the genre of the text represented the de novo creation of a literary genre which was structurally similar to the traditional apocalypse or was in fact based on the latter.

The problems posed by the question of derivation vary from text to text. These will be examined in the treatment of individual works. However the basic issues involved will be summed up in the conclusion on the basis of the entire study.
THE STRUCTURE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Frustration was the only result produced by an extended study of the possible relationship of Nag Hammadi apocalypses to the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. The breakthrough came with the realization that the problem lay in the use of the method of defining the apocalypse on the basis of a cluster of stylistic elements like pseudonymity, historical reviews, esotericism, and symbolism. This recognition was the starting point for a search for a more accurate definition of an apocalypse based on the essential structural features of the genre. The resulting definition will be set forth and defended in the first chapter in relation to the Jewish apocalypses. This chapter will also try to explain the significance of the above mentioned stylistic elements which, while they are extremely important features in some apocalypses, are not central to the definition of the genre (e.g. historical reviews, symbolism, esotericism).

Chapter two will be a brief study of early Christian apocalypses. This has been included for several reasons. In the first place the genre of these texts was clearly based on the Jewish apocalypse. This provides an opportunity to test both the fundamental definition of an apocalypse and the interpretation of secondary elements of the genre which were proposed in chapter one. Second, early Christian apocalypses either antedate or are contemporary with the Gnostic apocalypses. Thus it is important to have as complete a picture as possible of the apocalypses which circulated in this period. Finally there are two second century texts which attribute revelations to the risen Christ
(The Apocalypse of Peter and the Epistula Apostolorum). These works are particularly significant for the evaluation of similar Christian Gnostic texts. Because of the importance of this type of literature, mention will also be made of two later works which recount revelations Christ gave the disciples in the post-passion period: The Testament of the Lord and The Questions of Bartholomew.

Chapters three to eight will focus on a study of selected Nag Hammadi apocalypses: the texts which attribute revelations to the risen Christ (8 Nag Hammadi texts plus GosMary and Pistis Sophia), The Apocalypse of Peter, The Apocalypse of Paul, The Apocalypse of Adam/22/. While the literature that attributes revelations to the risen Christ will be examined as a group, the rest of the Nag Hammadi apocalypses cannot be as easily treated in this manner. In fact it seems best to study each text on its own rather than artificially group apocalypses together on the basis of one or more common elements. Furthermore the study of individual works makes it possible to focus on the particular problems posed by a given text. Thus apart from the literature that attributes revelations to the risen Christ, each text will be examined in a separate chapter.

22. The choice of texts was made in the early stages of the planning of the thesis. The decisions were influenced by two factors: 1. the realization that there was disagreement with respect to the generic origins of the texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ (Koester versus Rudolph and Vielhauer); 2. the discussions as to the significance of the term 'apocalypse' in the title (Vielhauer)--this led to the decision to study the texts bearing the title 'apocalypse'. These early decisions meant that a number of important Nag Hammadi apocalypses were not included--esp. Zostrianos, The Paraphrase of Shem, Marsanes, and Allogenes (NatArch 92.32ff and Melchizedek were the other texts left out). However conclusions which emerge from this study would facilitate the extension of the analysis to these texts.
The literature which recounts the revelations which the risen Christ gave his disciples will be the subject of chapters three to five. As far as the question of genre is concerned, the main problem posed by these texts is that of the origins of the genre. Chapter four will examine Kurt Rudolph's hypothesis that Graeco-Roman dialogue genres provided the literary models for this literature. The fifth chapter will examine the two hypotheses which I regard as the most plausible ways to account for the genre embodied in this literature: 1. that it was based on the traditional apocalypse; 2. that it represents a de novo creation and was not directly based on any established genre. The examination of these possibilities will be preceded by a study of the literature itself—its literary character, content and function (chapter 3).

The Apocalypse of Peter (VII,3) will be examined in the sixth chapter. The main interest of this text lies in the fact that while on formal grounds it must be classified as an apocalypse, the similarities to the traditional apocalypse are of a purely formal nature and there is virtually nothing that is stylized in an explicitly traditional fashion. This poses the problem of how one establishes in such cases that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse. Two other interesting features of this apocalypse are the structure of the narrative setting and the distinctive content and function of the work.

In the case of the Apocalypse of Paul (V.2) there can be no doubt that the author based his genre on those traditional apocalypses structured around heavenly ascensions. The main interest of this text lies in the author's characterization of
the lower heavens and in the determination of the function of the apocalypse (chapter 7).

The last chapter will be devoted to an examination of *The Apocalypse of Adam*. As was explained earlier it is now evident that this text cannot be classified as an apocalypse. However, the study of this text has resulted in a clarification of the issues involved in classifying the genre of *ApocAd*—especially since the text contains elements characteristic of both the Jewish testament and the traditional apocalypse. Furthermore, an examination of the historical review in light of the use of this stylistic element in Jewish literature has yielded important evidence relevant to determining whether or not the text comes from a Gnosticism that has been influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions.
Chapter 1

The Jewish Apocalypse

The Jewish apocalypses have been the subject of numerous studies in the last two centuries/1/. In light of this it is surprising that in spite of the extensive investigation of this literature, the apocalypse as a literary genre has not been satisfactorily defined/2/. The result is that there is no consensus as to what an apocalypse is or which texts should be classified as apocalypses. This can be illustrated by two contrasting definitions in a standard reference work: The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible and the recent Supplement.

In the original article M. Rist defines an apocalypse in terms of a characteristic content/3/. He defines 'apocalypticism' as a mode of thought which is dualistic and eschatological and


'apocalypses' as literary works which embody this kind of dualistic and eschatological ideology. The result is that texts which are not normally regarded as apocalypses but which contain an apocalyptic ideology are described as apocalypses: e.g. Didache 16, Thess 2-10, Isa. 24-27, I Cor. 15.20-28, and Lactantius' Divine Institutes Bk. VII. Furthermore he implies that texts like the Shepherd of Hermas and the Christian Apocalypse of Paul are not apocalypses because they lack the requisite apocalyptic content. P. Hanson's definition in the JDB Supplement defines the apocalypse on the basis of a characteristic structure and content. He argues that an apocalypse is a narrative account of a revelation given by divine mediation to a seer (structure) about future events (content)/4/. On the basis of this definition he identifies the following as apocalypses: Daniel 7-12; I Enoch 14-16; IV Ezra 11-12 and II Baruch 53-74/5/. It follows from this that only sections of some texts can be classified as apocalypses (e.g. IV Ezra and II Baruch) and that those texts in which historical eschatology is not a main theme cannot be regarded as apocalypses (e.g. I Enoch 17-36; II Enoch; III Baruch; ApocZeph)/5a/. The approach most commonly used to define the apocalypse has been to formulate lists of typical structural and stylistic


5. It is curious that he has failed to list other texts which on his definition could be classified as apocalypses. This is especially true for I Enoch 85-90, ApocAbraham 25-31, and II Baruch 36-40. It is possible that he did not regard his list of Jewish apocalypses as complete.

5a. However Hanson does suggest that texts structured around a heavenly journey may be apocalypses of a different type (28).
elements. These are then used to determine which texts should be classified as apocalypses/6/. D.S. Russell grouped his analysis under four headings: esotericism, literary revelations, symbolism, and pseudonymity/7/. K. Koch cited the following: discourse cycles, spiritual turmoils, parenetic discourses, pseudonymity, symbolic language, and composite texts/8/. P. Vielhauer noted the following characteristic elements: pseudonymity, surveys of history in future form, combination of literary forms such as prayers and parenetic discourse/9/. In principle this approach could have led to an accurate characterization of the genre. However in practice it has not done so. One difficulty is that every list includes elements which are either of secondary importance/10/, of questionable relevance to defining the genre/11/, or simply inaccurate/12/. However the more important difficulty is that this approach focuses on individual stylistic elements without defining the


9. P. Vielhauer, EMTA-II, 582-587. For a slightly expanded list see P. Vielhauer, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (Berlin, 1975), 487-490.

10. Thus, for example, two of the elements cited in Russell's list, esotericism and symbolism, are not essential elements of the apocalypse.

11. E.g. Vielhauer's reference to the combination of literary forms.

12. E.g. the statement by both Vielhauer and Koch that all apocalypses contain parenetic discourse.
distinctive literary character of the genre as a whole/13/. There has been a failure to identify the essential structural characteristics of an apocalypse. The result is that it is not clear which stylistic elements must be present in a particular combination in order to classify a text as an apocalypse. This has led to a great deal of confusion since stylistic elements regarded as characteristic of an apocalypse are present in other literary genres of the period: e.g. historical reviews and eschatological prophecies (TLevi 16-18; T Moses 2-10; I Enoch 93.1-10 and 92.12-17; Jubilees 23; and Life of Adam and Eve 29.2-10); accounts of revelatory events (TLevi 2-5; 8; I Enoch 14-16; TAbraham 10-15 (Rec A) and 8-12 (Rec B). There is a tendency to regard some of these texts as apocalypses because they contain one or more of the stylistic elements regarded as characteristic of an apocalypse. These problems in the identification of apocalypses would not have arisen if there had been a clearer definition of the genre coupled with a recognition that stylistic elements regarded as characteristic of an apocalypse are also used in other literary genres of the period.

I would suggest that the apocalypse be defined in two related steps/14/. One step is to formulate a summary definition which describes the essential nature of the apocalypse as a

13. D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, 1983), 108, has expressed this well in writing that: "...a mere catalogue of the more distinctive features of apocalyptic literature reveals little about the apocalypse as a literary genre. One literary characteristic of apocalypses is that they incorporate many of the genres found in biblical literature (testaments, hymns, laments, woes, visions, etc.) into patterns which show little consistency when one apocalypse is compared with another. This does not mean that the apocalypse is not a distinctive literary genre. It does mean that the structural features of the genre have not yet been satisfactorily analyzed."
literary genre. This definition is based on structural features which all apocalypses have in common and which together distinguish the apocalypse from other literary genres. The other step is to provide a fuller characterization of the genre with a description of the principal structural and stylistic elements present in the apocalypses.

The first step then is to formulate a summary definition of the genre. I would propose the following definition: an apocalypse is a literary work structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation. In an apocalypse an author represents his material as given by divine revelation and sets it within the framework of an account of the event in which the revelation was mediated to him (though he normally writes under a pseudonym)/15/. The two basic structural elements of the genre are: 1. the narrative setting or frame story; 2. the

---

14. This approach is similar to the one adopted by the editor and contributors to the volume of studies entitled *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, *Semeia* 14 (1979). In the introductory chapter the editor, J. Collins, outlines a paradigm of the characteristic elements of form and content found in the apocalypses (5-8). He then proposes a comprehensive definition of the genre: ""'Apocalypse' is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world." (9)

15. This definition is similar to the one proposed by Collins (see previous note) in that it identifies the essential structural characteristic of an apocalypse as a narrative account of a mediated revelation. There are two additional elements in the present definition: the narrative framework is cast in the first person; the account of the revelatory event provides the framework for a literary composition. The major difference in the definitions is that Collins' states that an apocalypse must have a particular content. This point will be taken up later. It is noteworthy that C. Torrey, "Apocalypse," *Jewish Encyclopedia*—I (1901) 669f, identified the account of the revelation as the essential structural feature of an apocalypse (though this was expressed in different terms).
account of the revelatory event itself. Within this overall structure the author has a great deal of freedom in the stylization of both the literary shape of the apocalypse as a whole and the various elements of the genre. Thus, for example, 1 Enoch 85-90 is structured around an account of a single symbolic vision while Daniel 7-12 consists of four revelatory events which each have a distinctive character. There are also variations in the construction of the narrative settings. These differ in their length, structure and the choice of elements for constructing the frame stories. Furthermore in several apocalypses the narrative framework is expanded to set the revelatory events in the wider context of the author's life (esp. IV Ezra; II Baruch; ApocAbraham). The revelatory events themselves can be stylized in different ways. Thus, for example, while revelation is often mediated in the context of a heavenly journey (seven apocalypses), no two heavenly journeys follow the same pattern. The point is that each apocalypse is distinctive both in its overall structure and in its stylization of the various elements of the genre. However the unifying element which identifies these texts as belonging to a common genre is that in every case a first person narrative framework embraces both an account of a mediated revelation and the narrative setting for the revelation.

This definition also stipulates that the narrative account provides the basis for a literary work. This is an important qualification since in other literary genres there are accounts of revelatory events which are structurally similar to the apocalypses: e.g. TLevi 2-5; 8; I Enoch 14.8-16.4; Life of Adam and Eve 25-28; TAbraham 10-15(A). There has been a tendency to
classify either these pericopes or the larger literary works in which they are found as apocalypses/16/. This is due to a failure to distinguish between the classification of literary works regarded as a whole and the types of literary units which can be found within the whole/17/. Just as apocalypses can incorporate other literary forms like prayers, laments, parenetic discourses and legendary stories, so other literary genres can contain accounts of revelatory events. Each of the above pericopes recounting revelatory events is an integral part of the literary genres in which they are found and serves a function within that setting. With the possible exception of TLevi 2-5 it is unlikely that they were ever independent literary works, i.e. apocalypses. Thus, for example, I Enoch 14.8-16.4 is part of the legendary account of the Watchers which starts at 6.1. In this context the pericope relates Enoch's ascension to the divine throne to receive a message of judgment for the Watchers. TLevi 2-5 and 8.1-19 are part of Levi's autobiographical statement and serve to legitimate the Hasmonean royal priesthood/18/.

If one applies this definition of an apocalypse, a literary work structured around a first person account of a mediated


17. Cf. E.P. Sanders' discussion, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, Ed. by D. Hellholm (Tübingen: 1983), 450-451, of the distinction between the classification of literary works as a whole (uses the term 'genre' to designate this level of classification) and the classification of types of literary units found within this larger framework (described as 'forms'). To avoid confusion the generic classification 'apocalypse' should be reserved for literary works as a whole.

18. Cf. Hanson, Apocalypse, 28. With respect to ApocAbraham J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," ANNE, 542543, argues that the account of Abraham's heavenly journeys is an integral part of the original composition.
revelation, to the corpus of Jewish literature in the period from about 250 B.C. to A.D. 150 then the following texts can be classified as apocalypses:

- Daniel 7-12
- I Enoch 17-36
- I Enoch 37-71
- I Enoch 72-82
- I Enoch 83-90
- IV Ezra
- II Baruch
- III Baruch
- II Enoch
- Apocalypse of Abraham
- Apocalypse of Zephaniah

These eleven texts represent a diverse collection with respect to their content and, in many details, their literary form. However, the unifying element is that they are all literary works cast in the framework of a first person account of a mediated revelation.

There are other texts, or parts of texts, which are frequently regarded as apocalypses in contemporary scholarship. I Enoch 91-105 and TMoses are the two complete texts which, while they are often treated as apocalypses, could not be so classified in light of the present definition. The classification of I Enoch 91-105 as an apocalypse is based on several considerations: the association of this section with the other apocalypses in I Enoch; the historical review culminating in an eschatological prophecy at 93.1-10 and 92.12-17; Enoch's reference to his sources of information as visions, angelic discourses and heavenly tablets (93.2b); and the eschatological perspective of the work as a whole. However, I Enoch 91-105 is not an apocalypse for the simple reason that it is not structured

19. It is possible that one or two of the texts represented by the Qumran fragments were apocalypses. However the texts are too fragmentary to determine their exact literary form. cf. J. Collins, "The Jewish Apocalypses," Semeia 14 (1979) 48-49.
around a narrative account of a mediated revelation. The narrative framework represents the text as Enoch's discourse to his family at the end of his life (a testament setting). While Enoch does appeal to revelations as the formal authority for his discourse, he does not set any of his material in the framework of an account of the revelatory event which mediated the information to him (compare 1 Enoch 83-90). Thus the work has a completely different structure from an apocalypse. The Testament of Moses has been regarded as an apocalypse because of its extended historical review culminating in an eschatological prophecy (3-10). However the work as a whole is a testament as it takes the form of Moses' last statement to Joshua. If the author had wanted to write an apocalypse while retaining a testament setting then he could have followed the example of 1 Enoch 83-90 where the author gives a testament setting to the account of the mediated revelation. However Moses makes no reference to any revelatory motifs. It seems that the author chose to cast his historical review and eschatological prophecy within the framework of a straightforward testament.

There is one text which represents a genuine borderline case—Jubilees. This text is seldom classified as an apocalypse because its content (an embellished account of Biblical history from creation to the exodus) is not typical of the genre/20/. However the structure of Jubilees is very similar to that of the

20. It has been argued by Davies, "Apocalyptic and Historiography," JSOT, 5 (1978) 21f, 27, that Jubilees should be regarded as an apocalypse. This view has been endorsed by C. Rowland, The Open Heaven (London, 1983) 51-52, who concludes that "Thus what at first sight appears to be an unpromising candidate for inclusion in a list of apocalyptic writings is on closer inspection a work of exactly the same type of genre as the other apocalypses." (52)
apocalypses. \textit{Jubilees} is cast as a narrative account of a mediated revelation and the narrative framework embraces both an account of the revelation itself (2.2ff) and the narrative setting for the revelation (1.1–2.1). The frame story sets the revelation in the time that Moses was on Sinai to receive teaching from God (cf. \textit{Exodus} 24.12ff) and the teaching is represented as an angel's discourse. The only point at which \textit{Jubilees} differs from all other Jewish apocalypses is that the narrative setting is in the third person rather than the first person. Moses is not represented as the one who narrates his encounter with God and the angel. Instead the text is composed in the third person by an anonymous author. The difference between a first and third person narrative style may seem slight. However it creates a completely different perspective in the text. This use of a third person narrative framework raises doubts as to whether the author intended to compose an apocalypse since other examples of the genre known to him would have had a first person narrative framework. It also seems likely that the choice of a revelatory framework for \textit{Jubilees} was due more to the influence of the tradition that Moses received direct revelations from God on Sinai than to the influence of the apocalypse (cf. \textit{Exodus} 24.12ff). In view of these considerations \textit{Jubilees} will not be included with the Jewish apocalypses.

This definition of an apocalypse, a literary work structured around a first person account of a mediated revelation, is supported by several considerations. First, and most importantly, it identifies the essential structural characteristics common to all texts which have a claim to be
regarded as apocalypses. The common elements in these texts are not historical surveys, eschatological prophecies, an esoteric motif or most of the other stylistic elements cited in the various lists of 'genre identifiers'. The common element is that each text is structured around a first person account of a revelatory event. Second, this definition is supported by the fact that in literary form the texts frequently regarded as apocalypses but excluded by this definition differ markedly both from the apocalypses and from each other (e.g. Thomas, I Enoch 1-16, I Enoch 91-105, TAbraham, Sibylline Oracles). It is not the case that this definition excludes a homogeneous group of texts which differ from the main group of apocalypses in some minor respect. It is true that problems can arise when accounts of revelatory events are embedded in other literary genres. However the question in these cases is whether the accounts originated as independent literary compositions which were incorporated in or joined to other literary works (e.g. I Enoch 17-36; Daniel 7-12). Third, the definition receives support from the diverse corpus of Christian and Gnostic apocalypses. As will be seen many of these texts differ from the Jewish apocalypses in many details of structure, style and content. Thus, for example, reviews of history, eschatological prophecies and symbolic visions do not feature prominently in most Christian and Gnostic apocalypses. If one defined the apocalypse in terms of these elements then it would be difficult to classify many of these Christian and Gnostic texts as apocalypses. However the essential structural features of an apocalypse are present in these later versions of the genre. Christian and Gnostic apocalypses, like Jewish apocalypses, are literary works structured around a first person account of a mediated
The definition of an apocalypse which has been proposed here is based on the structural elements in common to all apocalypses. It might be asked whether the genre should also be defined with reference to considerations of content and/or function. It is certainly true one must take these considerations into account in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of a particular application of the genre. However the question is whether the essential definition of the genre must include references to elements of content and/or function, i.e. whether a text must have a specific content and/or function if it is to be classified as an apocalypse.

Some definitions of the apocalypse have tried to identify a typical content and function. However it is not always clear whether these aspects of the definition are regarded as essential to the definition or simply observations as to what is true for a group of apocalypses. Thus, for example, while Vielhauer's characterization of the apocalypse is developed in three sections which deal in turn with structural and stylistic elements, typical themes, and social setting and function, these three elements are never brought together in a single definition of an apocalypse/21/.

The difficulty with defining the apocalypse in terms of a typical content and function is that there is no apparent unity.

21. Vielhauer, HNTA——II, 582-587, 587-594, 594-598. Cf. Hanson, Apocalypse, 27-28, where he adds to his original definition the statement that "Most of the apocalypses mentioned above seem to stem from settings of persecution within which they reveal to the faithful a vision of reversal and glorification." (28) However he also leaves open the possibility that apocalypses can serve other functions.
in the subject matter and functions of the extant apocalypses. This is particularly evident with respect to the function of the genre. Generalizations about the social setting and function of the apocalypses are normally based on those texts which respond to an historical crisis with an eschatologically oriented message (e.g. Daniel 7-12, I Enoch 85-89, IV Ezra, II Baruch, ApocAbraham, and I Enoch 37-71)/22/. However there is a large group of Jewish apocalypses which were not written against this background (I Enoch 17-36; 72-82; II Enoch; III Baruch; ApocZeph). With most of these texts it is difficult to determine their original social setting and function/23/. However the diversity of content does not suggest that they served a common function: e.g. astronomical revelations which legitimated a solar calendar (I Enoch 72-82), an embellished account of creation (II Enoch 24-33), and visions of the post-mortem fate of sinners and the righteous (ApocZeph). In the case of Christian and Gnostic apocalypses the diversity of function becomes even greater (compare, for example, Shulermas, AscIsa, GnApocPat, ApocynJn). In view of this obvious diversity it is simply not possible to define the apocalypse in terms of a typical function.

It is more common for scholars to argue that an apocalypse has a typical content. In the extreme case Rist defined the apocalypse as a literary work containing a particular type of

22. D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 110-112, has an excellent treatment of the social setting for this type of apocalypse. It is also noteworthy that he believes that an apocalypse must be defined with reference to considerations of structure, content and function since he criticizes Collins' definition for failing to define the characteristic function of an apocalypse (cf. 109).

23. Collins, *Jewish Apocalypses*, 1-2, cites the difficulty of determining the function of many ancient texts as one reason for not defining the apocalypse in terms of a typical function.
eschatology/24/. However the definitions of Hanson, Vielhauer and Koch also include a reference to a typical content/25/. This is probably because the Jewish apocalypses tend to focus on certain types of themes. The conventional categories of eschatology and heavenly realities are sufficiently broad to embrace much of this material—though these general categories also disguise both the diversity of subject matter within these categories and the unusual themes present in some apocalypses/26/. However it does not follow from this that an apocalypse must deal with particular themes. This is because there is nothing to prevent someone from adopting this revelatory genre to gain religious sanction for a different subject matter. This is not just a hypothetical possibility since there are Christian and Gnostic apocalypses which deal with themes atypical of the Jewish apocalypses. Shērmas provides the best example among the early Christian apocalypses. The main concerns of this work are to set forth the possibility of repentance and to urge moral renewal in light of an extensive body of ethical teaching. Virtually all Gnostic apocalypses deal with non-traditional themes: e.g. OnApocPræ, ApocyrIn, Zostrianos, Natārchons 92.32-97.21. It is true that many of these texts contain a small amount of material which can in some sense be classified as

24. E.P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," AMJNE, 447, notes that "It was once widely—it may be universally—thought that apocalypses are works which include apocalyptic ideas...."

25. Koch, Rediscovery, 28, argued that "A literary type is not only a matter of formal characteristics; typical moods and ideas are equally important."

eschatological. However even if this minimal eschatological material were removed one would still be forced to classify these texts as apocalypses. This is because it is the literary structure of these texts which defines their genre.

It is noteworthy that the definition of an apocalypse recently proposed by Collins and employed by other contributors in that volume defines the genre in terms of a typical structure and content. In view of the potential influence of this definition, their statement that an apocalypse has a typical content deserves attention. Collins' definition stipulates that an apocalypse always treats material which can be classified as relating to either a temporal axis (historical and eschatological themes) and/or a spatial axis (material relating to otherworldly beings and places)/27/. The first category, the temporal axis, is subdivided into six topical categories:

1. Protology (theogony, cosmogony, primordial events)
2. History (explicit recollection of the past, ex eventy prophecies)
3. Soteriology (present salvation through knowledge)
4. Eschatological crisis
5. Eschatological judgment and/or destruction
6. Eschatological salvation

In the subsequent study an effort is made to demonstrate that every apocalypse contains material which can be included in one of these categories.

It is not my intention to discuss the merits of these topical categories. What I would argue is that in reality it was considerations of literary structure rather than content which provided the basis for the classification of ancient texts as

apocalypses. While Collins claims that an apocalypse is defined in terms of structure and content, it is arguable that in fact the apocalypses have been initially identified on the basis of structural features and then a list of topical categories has been drawn up on the basis of these texts. This is evident from the treatment of the Gnostic revelatory texts in the volume of studies edited by Collins. The content of many of these texts differs radically from the Jewish and Christian apocalypses. Consequently if one defined the content of an apocalypse on the basis of Jewish apocalypses then it would be impossible to classify most of these Gnostic texts as apocalypses. This difficulty is circumvented by defining the content of the apocalypse on the basis of both the traditional apocalypse (Jewish and Christian) and the Gnostic apocalypses. Thus the first and third (and in part the second) subdivisions under the topical heading 'temporal axis' have been framed with reference to Gnostic revelatory texts: 1. Protology (theogony, cosmogony, primordial events); 3. Soteriology (present salvation through knowledge). The important point is that these Gnostic revelatory texts have been classified as apocalypses on the basis of the structural characteristics which they have in common with Jewish and Christian apocalypses (the most important structural similarity is that they are narrative accounts of mediated revelations). The topical categories of the apocalyptic genre have then been defined on the basis of texts identified as apocalypses on structural grounds.

Collins' argument that he is defining the genre with reference to considerations of form and content would be more convincing if he provided examples of texts which could be
described as apocalypses because of their literary form, but which must be excluded because they do not have the right content. He implies that there are such texts when he writes that "...dreams and visions which lack the eschatology or otherworldly dimension of the apocalypses are excluded from the genre."/27a/ He does not identify these texts. However one suspects that he is referring to pericopes within other literary genres which describe revelatory events. If this is the case then the real reason why such pericopes cannot be regarded as apocalypses is that they are not the basis for an independent literary composition.

I would thus conclude that the apocalypse must be defined primarily on structural grounds. The chief value of taking into account the content and function of individual apocalypses is that this provides a more complete understanding of how the genre was used in a particular instance. However the evidence of the extant apocalypses does not support the idea that a text must deal with a particular subject matter (or serve a specific function) if it is to be classified as an apocalypse.

The definition which has been proposed is only intended to describe the essential structural characteristics of an apocalypse. The second step is to provide a more comprehensive description of the various elements of the genre. This could be done in a number of ways and with varying degrees of thoroughness. The following discussion will focus on the most important features of the following elements: pseudonymity, the literary structure of the texts, characteristic features of the frame story and narrative framework, the revelatory medium.

employed in the apocalypses, historical surveys and the esoteric motif.

PSEUDONYMITY

One of the most obvious features of the Jewish apocalypses is that they were written under pseudonyms. Important figures in Biblical history were selected as the imagined recipients of revelation/28/. In most cases the authorship of the apocalypse was also attributed to him. The seer or author is often represented as a wise and righteous individual whose piety qualified him for the privilege of receiving a revelation/28a/.

It should be pointed out that pseudonymity is not essential to an apocalypse in the sense that a work must be written under a pseudonym in order to be classified as an apocalypse. In principle an author could put himself forward as the recipient of the revelation and thus write under his own name. In practice this was never the case with Jewish apocalypses. In the case of two early Christian apocalypses, Revelation and The Shepherd of Hermas, the authors did write under their own names. However these two texts must be regarded as exceptional as all other apocalypses, whether Jewish, Christian or Gnostic, were written under pseudonyms.

28. It is possible that the choice of pseudonym can be explained in individual cases. cf. Rowland, Open Heaven, 62-65; Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism—I, 105; Russell, Jewish Apocalyptic, 109-118.

It is clear that pseudonymity was widely practised in the ancient world in connection with numerous kinds of literature and for various reasons/28b/. There have been several attempts to explain the use of pseudonymity in the apocalypses/29/. The most fundamental must have been the need to gain acceptance for a message which was supposed to have been given by direct revelation/30/. This would have been particularly important in light of the emergence of an authoritative canon and the conviction that direct revelations from God were a thing of the past/31/.

LITERARY STRUCTURE

The apocalypses are invariably structured around a narrative account of a revelatory event. The narrative account normally consists of two elements: a frame story which sets the context for the revelatory event, and the account of the revelatory event itself. Thus, for example, in the case of Daniel 7 the frame story is provided by 7.1, 28 while 7.2-27 recounts the revelatory event. This basic structure, frame story plus account of a


29. Dexinger, Nenochs Zehwochenapokalypse, 61-64, discusses eight explanations of the phenomena of pseudonymity.

30. This frequently restated point is well expressed by Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism-I, 105.

31. These points have also been made many times and are well expressed by Rowland, Open Heaven, 66-70.
revelatory event, provides the underlying structure for all apocalypses.

In some apocalypses this basic structure has been expanded by the inclusion of accounts of other events in the author's life at the time the revelation was given to him. This has the effect of providing an autobiographical setting for the revelatory events. In the case of Daniel and I Enoch 1-36 this was achieved through the merging of the apocalypses with other literary works (Daniel 7-12 joined to 1-6; I Enoch 17-36 linked to 1-16)/32/. However in other cases the biographical material is part of the original composition/33/. This is true for II Enoch, I Enoch 72-82, IV Ezra, II Baruch, and ApocAbraham.

IV Ezra contains two blocks of material which fall outside the framework of the account of the revelation: 12.40-50; 14.1-36. In the first case Ezra recounts how the people came to him because they were distressed at his extended absence. Ezra reassures them and then sends them away so that he can prepare for the next revelation. In chapter 14 Ezra recounts God's final instructions to him, a further statement which he made to Israel and then the story of the restoration of the Scriptures and sacred writings lost in the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem.

In II Baruch the basic structure of an apocalypse has been expanded even further. Chapters 1-12 set the stage for the subsequent revelations as they recount Jerusalem's fall and


33. Rowland, Open Heaven, 49-52, attaches a great deal of importance to this legendary material. His account of it differs from my own.
Baruch's response to this event. On three occasions the revelations are interspersed with Baruch's addresses to Israel (or the elders): 31-34; 44-46; 77.1-16. Finally the apocalypse concludes with an account of how Baruch wrote a letter to the 9 1/2 tribes (77.17-25) together with a copy of the letter (78-88).

In the case of The Apocalypse of Abraham the account of the revelatory event is contained in chapters 15-32. Chaps. 1-8 provide an autobiographical setting as Abraham recounts the story of his conversion from idolatry. Chapters 9-14 can be regarded as an extended frame story. Abraham is told to journey to Hebron and offer a sacrifice in preparation for the reception of a revelation (9). The story of the coming of his angelic companion (Jaoel), the journey, and the offering of the sacrifice in spite of the interference of Azazel is told in chapters 10-14.

II Enoch falls naturally into two parts. Enoch's account of his ascension to God's throne and the revelation he received there is contained in chapters 1-37. After receiving the revelation Enoch is told that he is to return to earth for thirty days to transmit the revelations to his posterity and to instruct them in righteousness (36). The second part of II Enoch contains Enoch's account of these discourses to his family (38-66).

It is apparent from this description of the individual texts that there were a number of ways that an author could expand on the basic structure of an apocalypse. It is to an analysis of the elements of this basic structure that we now turn with a consideration of the frame stories which bracket the accounts of the revelatory event.
The narrative settings or frame stories in the apocalypses serve to bracket the revelatory event in that they provide a context with introductory and concluding material. In those cases where revelation is mediated by a combination of vision and interpretation there can also be a transitional frame story between the vision and its interpretation (e.g. Daniel 7.15-16; 8.15-19; IV Ezra 10.27-37; 12.3b-9; 13.14-20). There is a great deal of variety in the construction of these frame stories. However there are a number of recurring elements.

The introductory frame stories normally provide a circumstantial setting for the revelatory event/34/. This frequently includes references to circumstantial details like time, place, and the recipient's activity and/or state of mind. Revelations were received in a wide variety of places. The author's bed is the only location mentioned in several apocalypses. In IV Ezra this provides the setting for Ezra's first, and presumably second and third encounters with the angel (3.1; 5.20ff; 6.35ff). In II Enoch the two angels come to Enoch while he is resting on his couch (1.1). One would expect that the author's bed would provide the context for dream visions. This is the case for Daniel 7.1ff and I Enoch 85.3ff. However dream visions could also be experienced in other places: the temple ruins (II Baruch 35.1); an unspecified place in Hebron (II Baruch 53.1); and a field (IV Ezra 10.58; 12.51).

locations do not fall into any pattern: Mt. Zion (II Baruch 13.1); a cave in the Kedron valley (II Baruch 22.1); an unspecified place in Hebron (II Baruch 47.1); a field (IV Ezra 9.26); by a river (Daniel 10.4; III Baruch 1.1f.).

Reference to the author's state of mind is another recurring element in the frame stories. The recipients are frequently represented as being anxious or disturbed. The source of this distress is often thoughts about Israel's suffering at the hands of the Gentiles/35/. Thus, for example, in the opening vision of IV Ezra the author writes "I was troubled as I lay on my bed, and my thoughts welled up in my heart, because I saw the desolation of Zion and the wealth of those who live in Babylon." (3.2-3)

In three apocalypses there are references to the author's preparation for revelatory events (Daniel, IV Ezra and II Baruch). Prayer/36/, fasting/37/ and special diets/38/ can be part of the seer's preparation.

In those cases where revelation is mediated by a vision the circumstantial frame story leads directly into the vision/39/.

The circumstantial frame story for I Enoch 85-90 is extremely brief and leads quickly into the account of the vision. Enoch is

35. Daniel 9.1-10; IV Ezra 3.4ff; 5.20ff.; 6.36ff.; 9.27; II Baruch 10.6ff.; 21.3ff.; 35.1ff.; 48.1ff.; 52.1ff.; III Baruch 1.1-2. Cf. II Enoch 1.3ff where the cause of Enoch's distress is not given. This motif is absent from I Enoch 17-36; 37-71; 72-82; 83-90; ApocAbraham.


37. E.g. IV Ezra 5.13, 20; 6.31, 35; II Baruch 12.5; 20.5; 21.1; 43.3; 47.2. Cf. ApocAbraham 12.

38. Daniel 10.2-3; IV Ezra 9.23f, 26; 12.51.

39. Daniel 7.2; 8.2; IV Ezra 9.38; 11.1; 13.1; II Baruch 36.1f; 53.1; I Enoch 85.3.
recounting the vision to his son and says: "Before I took your mother Edna I saw a vision in my bed, and behold, a bull came out of the earth...." (85.3) However in those cases where revelation is mediated by a cosmic journey or a direct conversation with a heavenly revealer the frame story frequently brings the heavenly figure on the scene. In several cases the entrance of the heavenly revealer can take a dramatic form with a description of the supernatural appearance of the angelic revealer. The individual responds with fear to this dramatic event and, in turn, is reassured by the angel/40/. These elements are brought together in II Enoch 1.4-8:

"Then two huge men appeared to me, the like of which I had never seen on earth. Their faces were like the shining sun; their eyes were like burning lamps; from their mouths fire was coming forth...their wings were more glistening than gold; their hands were whiter than snow. And they stood at the head of my bed and called me by my name. Then I awoke from my sleep....Then I bowed down to them; and I was terrified; and the appearance of my face was changed because of fear. Then those men said to me, "Be brave, Enoch! In truth, do not fear! The eternal God has sent us to you."

However the entrance of the heavenly revealer is not normally described in such dramatic terms. In most cases it is related in a matter of fact manner/41/. In II Baruch 55 the author introduces the angel who will interpret the vision by saying

"...behold, Ramael, the angel who is set over true visions, was

---

40. Daniel 8.15-18; 10.5-6, 8-10, 15-19; (cf. 8.15-18); ApocAbraham 10-11; II Enoch 1.4-8. The seer can also respond with fear to the revelation itself and be reassured by the heavenly revealer: III Baruch 7.5f; II Enoch 20.1f; 21.2-24.4; I Enoch 60.2-4; ApocZeph 3-4 (Sahidic Fragment).

41. Daniel 9.21; IV Ezra 4.1; 5.31; 7.1; 10.69; III Baruch 1.3; II Baruch 13.1f; 22.1f. There are several instances in which the heavenly revealer speaks to the individual without making an entrance of any kind: II Baruch 35.6; 48.26; IV Ezra 12.10ff; 13.20ff.
sent to me and said to me...." (55.3) The author of III Baruch is equally casual: "And behold, while I was weeping and saying such things, I saw an angel of the Lord coming and saying to me...."
(1.3)

When he comes on the scene the angelic revealer often makes an introductory statement/42/. These introductory statements can include reassurance of the individual and a statement of the objective of the angel's mission with a reference to what will be revealed/42a/. These points are brought together in the angel Ramael's statement to Baruch (III Baruch 55.4-56.2): "Why does your heart trouble you, Baruch.... But now, since you have asked the Most High to reveal to you the explanation of the vision which you have seen, I have been sent to say to you that the Mighty One has let you know the course of times...."

In summary the most common elements which can be used in the construction of frame stories are: a circumstantial setting with references to details like time, place, preparations for receiving a revelation, and the individual's activity and/or state of mind; the introduction of the heavenly revealer; an introductory statement from the heavenly revealer.

The introductory frame stories are normally complemented with a concluding frame story/43/. These can contain one or more of the following elements: a concluding statement from the heavenly revealer, a reference to the individual's response to

42. Daniel 8.19; 9.22-33; 10.11-14; 10.19-11.1; II Enoch 1.8-9; III Baruch 1.3-6; IV Ezra 5.32; 7.2; 10.33, 38-39; 13.21; II Baruch 55.4-56.2; ApocAbraham 10-11.

42a. Daniel 8.19; 9.22; 10.12, 14, 19, 21; IV Ezra 5.32; 10.33, 38; 13.21; II Baruch 55.4ff; III Baruch 1.3; II Enoch 1.8; ApocAbraham 10-11 (in this case the angel also describes his function in the heavenly world).
the revelation, and an account of the seer's subsequent activity. It is noteworthy that in the cases where the introductory frame story narrates the coming of a heavenly revealer, the concluding frame story virtually never describes his departure. In most instances the seer's encounter with the heavenly figure ends abruptly with either the conclusion of the revelation or a final statement of some kind (e.g. Daniel 8.26; 9.27; 12.13; IV Ezra 5.13; 6.34; 9.25; 10.59; II Baruch 76.5; III Baruch 17.2). IV Ezra 12.8 is the only instance in which the departure of the angel is described: "Then he left me."

In his concluding statement the heavenly revealer can tell the individual what he is to do with the revelation/44/. He can also speak about the seer's death. This can be coupled with a statement about the individual's participation in the eschatological era and/or instructions as to what the seer is to do in the time before he dies/45/. Both motifs are present in IV Ezra 14.8ff, 13:

"Lay up in your heart the signs that I have shown you, the dreams that you have seen, and the interpretations that you have heard; for you shall be taken up from among men, and henceforth you shall live with my Son and with those who are like you, until the times are ended. Now therefore, set your house in order, and reprove your people; comfort the lowly among them, and instruct those who are wise."

Another element in the concluding frame story is the


44. Daniel 8.26; 12.4; IV Ezra 12.37-38; 14.45-47; I Enoch 81.5-6; II Enoch 36.1.

author's account of his reaction to the revelatory event/45a/. In several cases the seers are troubled by the revelations—sometimes to the point of being physically weakened (Daniel 7.28; 8.27; I Enoch 90.40-42; IV Ezra 5.14-15). In other cases they give glory to God for what has been revealed to them (I Enoch 36.4; 90.40; IV Ezra 13.57-58; III Baruch 17.2-4). I Enoch 90.40-41 combines both of these responses: "This is the vision which I saw while I was sleeping. Then I woke up and blessed the Lord of righteousness and gave him glory. And I wept with a great weeping, and my tears could not stop... on account of what I had seen...."

Finally there can be references in the concluding frame story to what the individual does in the time after receiving the revelation/46/. The only recurring element is some form of address which the individual gives to his people (IV Ezra; II Baruch; II Enoch).

The object of these frame stories is clearly to set the revelation within the context of the events in which they were given. The most important elements of the introductory frame stories are the circumstantial setting and the account of the heavenly revealer's coming with the associated introductory statement. The concluding frame stories frequently consist of a concluding statement from the heavenly revealer and an account of the individual's response to the revelation and his subsequent activity. There was obviously a great deal of freedom in the shaping of the various elements.

45a. Daniel 7.28; 8.27; III Baruch 17.3-4 I Enoch 90.40-42; cf. 36.4; IV Ezra 5.14-15; 13.57-58.

46. Daniel 8.27; IV Ezra 12.40-50; 14.27ff; 14.37ff; II Baruch 31.1-32.7; 44.1-47.1; 77.1ff; II Enoch 39.1-66.1.
Revelatory Medium

In the Jewish apocalypses revelation is mediated in three ways: a heavenly journey, visions (normally symbolic dream visions), and direct discourse with a heavenly revealer that is not related to the interpretation of visionary phenomena/47/. Each of these revelatory media can involve a heavenly revealer (either God or an angel) in that the revealer interprets scenes in the heavenly world, explains visions or engages the individual in direct conversation. In addition to these three revelatory media there are also references in the literature attributed to Enoch to the seer’s access to heavenly tablets. In I Enoch 81.1 Enoch is told to read them (cf. 93.1ff) and in II Enoch 22.1-23.1 Enoch records how he wrote 360 books as an angel dictated from heavenly books. However these heavenly tablets play a purely formal role as the text of these apocalypses is not represented as a transcription from the heavenly books or the product of the angel’s dictation.

It is frequently assumed that visions constituted the most characteristic revelatory medium. Direct discourse on the other hand is seldom given prominence as an independent revelatory medium/48/. In reality, however, the three revelatory media are fairly evenly distributed in the extant apocalypses. The

---

47. Some scholars use the term auditions to describe direct discourse between the revealer and the individual.

48. Thus, for example, Vielhauer, HNTA-II, 583, writes that "The Apocalyptist receives his revelations mostly in visions, whereas they were granted to the prophets mostly through auditions. But just as the prophets had visions as well, so the apocalyptists also occasionally have auditions, but the visions predominate so strongly that the Apocalypses are generally presented in the form of an account of a vision."
The heavenly journey occurs in seven of the eleven apocalypses: I Enoch 17-36; I Enoch 36-72; I Enoch 72-82; II Enoch; III Baruch; ApocAbraham; and ApocZeph. The remaining four apocalypses employ visions and/or direct discourse: Daniel 7-12; IV Ezra; II Baruch; I Enoch 83-90. The first three texts contain a series of accounts of revelatory events and use a mix of symbolic visions and direct discourse: Daniel (2/2); IV Ezra (3/3); II Baruch (2/3)/49/. I Enoch 83-90 employs a symbolic vision and is the only apocalypse attributed to Enoch which does not use a heavenly journey. ApocAbraham is unusual in that it employs all three revelatory media. The heavenly journey is primarily a means to bring Abraham into God's presence (15-18) where he is then given revelations by means of interpreted visions and direct discourse (21-31). There is only one short block of material in chapter 19 in which Abraham describes scenes in the 7th, 6th and 5th heavens. The most significant point which emerges from this survey of the use of revelatory media is that in four of the five apocalypses that use symbolic visions there is a relatively even distribution between direct discourse and interpreted visions (Daniel, IV Ezra, II Baruch, and ApocAbraham).

In the seven apocalypses employing the heavenly journey as a revelatory medium the journey itself could take a variety of forms. The only recurring pattern is that of an ascent through a series of heavens in which the seer sees something of the content of each heaven (III Baruch, II Enoch). The other accounts of heavenly journeys do not follow a common pattern. In I Enoch

49. Symbolic Visions: Daniel 7; 8; IV Ezra 9.26-10.59; 11-12; 13; II Baruch 35-46; 53-76. Direct Discourse: Daniel 9; 10-12; IV Ezra 3.1-5.20; 5.20-6.34; 6.35-9.25; II Baruch 13-20; 21-34; 47-52.
17-36 The seer's journeys take him to various locations in the terrestrial and heavenly world. Enoch visits the sources of astronomical phenomena in I Enoch 72-82. In the Similitudes, Enoch describes a number of scenes around God's throne which are often the basis for interpretive discourses/50/. Enoch also views scenes in other parts of the heavenly world. However the geography is not specific/51/. In the case of ApocZeph the author views a variety of scenes which are loosely related geographically.

In the context of a heavenly journey revelation could be mediated in several ways. In some instances the individual simply describes what he sees/52/. However in most cases an angel who accompanies the seer interprets the significance of the various phenomena in the heavenly world/53/. Revelation can also be mediated by a direct conversation with a heavenly figure/54/.

It is likely that the choice of this medium was determined to a large extent by the author's subject matter. The heavenly journey was an obvious choice when the author wished to say something about realities which were thought to be a part of the

50. Scenes in the heavenly court with discourses: (1.) 46.1; 46.3-47.2; (2.) 47.3-48.3; 48.4-51.5; (3.) 61.6-8a; 61.8b-63.12/69.26-29.

51. E.g. 41.3-9; 43-44; 52.2-57.3 (five scenes); 59.1-3; 61.1-5.

52. E.g. I Enoch 17.1-18.11; 28.1-32.2; 34.1-36.3.

53. E.g. I Enoch 21.2-27.5 (six sequences of description plus interpretation), III Baruch 2, 3; ApocZeph 2, 3, 4, 10-12. An unusual feature of the Similitudes is that on two occasions Enoch himself interprets the significance of a scene at the divine throne—these interpretations in turn develop into extended eschatological prophecies: (1.) 47.3-48.3; 48.4-51.5; (2.) 61.6-8a; 61.8a-63.12/69.26-29.

54. E.g. II Enoch 24-35; I Enoch 80.2-8; III Baruch 4.8-17; ApocAbraham 23b-24a; 26; 29; 30-31.
heavenly world: e.g. astronomical phenomena, places of reward and punishment, the divine court, and the activities of the angelic world. It is these subjects which constitute the principal subjects of apocalypses employing the heavenly journey. It would appear from the extant apocalypses that this medium was seldom employed when the author's principal concern was historical eschatology. There are no significant eschatological scenarios in 1 Enoch 17-36, I Enoch 72-82, II Enoch, III Baruch and ApocZeph. I Enoch 37-71 and ApocAbraham are exceptional in that they are the only two cases where historical eschatology is a significant theme in an apocalypse structured around a heavenly journey.  

Symbolic visions constituted a second medium of revelation. There are nine instances in which revelation is mediated by symbolic visions. Seven of these can be grouped together in that they were experienced in a dream and were used to disclose historical and eschatological events: Daniel 7, 8; I Enoch 85-90; IV Ezra 11-12, 13; II Baruch 35-46, 53-76/55/. 

The visions in IV Ezra 9.26-10.59 and ApocAbraham 21-29 have a different character. The vision in IV Ezra 9.26ff is experienced in a normal state of consciousness and the main function of the vision is not to set forth an historical or eschatological scenario. The frame story opens with Ezra in a field reflecting on Israel's fate (9.26-37). Suddenly he sees a woman who is grieving at the loss of her son (9.38-10.4). After Ezra tries in vain to comfort her (10.5-24) she is suddenly

54a. Cf. I Enoch 46.3-47.2; 48.1-51.5; 61.8-63.12 and 69.26-29; ApocAbraham 25-31.

55. The dream context for Daniel 8 is not explicit.
transformed into a magnificent city (10.25-27). The symbolic element of this pericope is restricted to the woman and the city. Ezra's conversation with the woman is the main element of the vision. An angel subsequently interprets the woman as the heavenly Zion and her son as the historical Jerusalem (10.40ff). The angel's interpretation is not completely clear. However the main point of this whole revelation would seem to be that just as Ezra tried to console the woman with the promise of eschatological restoration (10.15-16), so Ezra is to take comfort from the promise of the eschatological manifestation of the heavenly Jerusalem (10.50ff)/56/.

In the case of ApocAbraham the author is represented as standing at God's side and looking down at the 'firmament' where he sees a vast picture with representations of various elements of the created world and human history—e.g. the earth and the abyss, the Garden of Eden and early events like the fall and Abel's murder, the division of the world into Israelites and Gentiles, and the destruction of the second Temple (the vision interspersed with interpretation is in chapters 21-29)/57/. It is noteworthy that the representation of these events is not symbolic in the sense that symbols from the natural world are used to represent historical realities.

Direct discourse that is not related to the interpretation of visionary phenomena is a third revelatory medium employed in the Jewish apocalypses. There are eight instances in which direct discourse stands alone as a revelatory medium: Daniel 9, 56. Cf. Meyers, IV Ezra, 278-280.

57. There are also blocks of dialogue material on the question of why God allowed these events to take place (cf. 23.12-14; 26; 27.6ff).
10-12; **IV Ezra** 3.1-5.20; 5.20-6.34; 6.35-9.25; **II Baruch** 13-20; 21-34; 47-52/58/. The two discourses in **Daniel** are cast in the form of a continuous discourse from the angel to Daniel (9.24-27; 11.2-12.4). These two discourses cover similar material to the first two symbolic dream visions in that they predict historical events from the sixth century down to the author's time and beyond. The second discourse contains the most detailed eschatological scenario to be found in **Daniel** (11.40-12.3). The direct discourse material in both **IV Ezra** and **II Baruch** deals with the theodicy question and a variety of eschatological issues. The theodicy question is given more attention in **IV Ezra** while **II Baruch** focuses on eschatological issues. There are eschatological scenarios in the direct discourse material of both texts. However these eschatological prophecies take the form of a generalized description of eschatological signs and events, i.e. they do not link an eschatological scenario to identifiable events in the author's time/59/.

As has been noted the apocalypses which do not employ a heavenly journey use either visions and/or direct discourse to mediate the revelation. Visions were used almost exclusively as a medium for predicting historical and eschatological events (**IV Ezra** 9-10 is the only exception). Direct discourse was also used as a medium for such predictions. Thus the content of the discourses in **Daniel** 9 and 10-12 is formally equivalent to the symbolic visions in **Daniel** 7 and 8 (and other visions in that

58. Cf. also **II Baruch** 41-42 where the question and answer exchange is not thematically related to the interpreted vision that preceded and **AposAbraham** 30-31 (as well as some material within 21-29) where the direct discourse material is not strictly related to the interpretation of the vision.

However direct discourse was used for a wider range of subjects than historical and eschatological scenarios. There are blocks of direct discourse material within the heavenly journeys that touch on a wide range of subjects: e.g. creation (II Enoch 24-33); the vine as the forbidden fruit leading to Adam's sin (III Baruch 4.8-17); theodicy (ApocAbraham 23.12-13; 26; 27.6f). The theodicy question is the dominant theme of the first three dialogues in IV Ezra and the first dialogue in II Baruch. The authors of IV Ezra and II Baruch also make extensive use of the dialogue medium to elicit revelation on a wide range of eschatological questions: e.g. the interim state of the soul between death and the final judgment (IV Ezra 7.75-101); the possibility of interceding for sinners at the final judgment (IV Ezra 7.102-115); the nature of the resurrection and the respective destinies of the righteous and sinners (II Baruch 49-51); and the basis of judgment for apostates and proselytes (II Baruch 41-42). Thus while symbolic visions were used primarily as a medium for predicting historical and eschatological events, direct discourse was used for a wider range of subject matter.

The explanation for the use of direct discourse for a broader range of subject matter is probably to be found in the inherent simplicity of direct discourse. It is easier to communicate a given body of information in a simple discourse than to cast it in a symbolic vision which communicates all the essential ideas. The difficulty with conveying the full range of meanings in a vision's symbolism is reflected in the fact that most symbolic visions require an interpretation to convey their full meaning. In the extreme case of II Baruch 53-76 the author
did not even try to convey the substance of his material in the symbolic vision (53). In this case the symbolic vision provides little more than the framework for the angel's discourse with its long historical review and eschatological prophecy (56-76). Symbolic visions also suffer from the limitation that they are not well adapted to abstract subjects. It is easier to cast relatively concrete realities like historical events in the form of a symbolic vision than, for example, the more abstract subject of the problem of theodicy. In principle one could use the symbolic vision for an abstract subject provided one had recourse to an interpretative discourse. This is evident from the relatively few uses of symbolic visions in non-Jewish apocalypses: ShHermas; Poimandres; and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Peter. In each case, however, the symbolic vision is not maintained throughout the entire apocalypse.

HISTORICAL SURVEYS

Four of the extant apocalypses contain historical reviews which survey a period of history normally extending from the time of the presumed author to the time of writing (ex eventu prophecies) and then beyond to the eschatological events themselves/60/. These four apocalypses contain eight historical reviews: Daniel 7, 8, 9, 11-12; I Enoch 85-90; IV Ezra 11-12; II Baruch 36-40; 53-74. Most of the reviews cover the period from the time of the presumed author to the actual time of writing (Daniel 7, 8, 9, 11-12; II Baruch 36-40). In two cases the survey embraces a series of events from Adam to the
eschatological era (I Enoch 85-90 and II Baruch 53-74). The review in IV Ezra 11-12 is the only one which covers an historical period just before the end. The 'Eagle Vision' sets its eschatological prophecy in the context of Roman political history extending from Caesar to Domitian. The review does not refer to events between Ezra's time and the emergence of the Roman empire. There is also a difference of emphasis between the reviews in the second century B.C. apocalypses (Daniel 7-12 and I Enoch 85-90) and those in IV Ezra and II Baruch. The historical reviews in Daniel 7-12 and I Enoch 85-90 focus on the national crisis which Israel experienced in the time of Antiochus and its anticipated resolution. By contrast the historical reviews in IV Ezra and II Baruch make no reference to the national crisis precipitated by the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. IV Ezra 11-12 simply sets the eschatological prophecy in the context of Roman political history. The first review in II Baruch (36-40) starts in a manner reminiscent of Daniel 7-12 with a cursory survey of the dominant political powers from the sixth century B.C. to the first century A.D. (39.3-4). The author identifies Rome as the final world empire whose power and wickedness exceeds all others (39.5-6). He then launches directly into the eschatological prophecy which describes the advent and mission of the Messiah (39.7-40.3). It is noteworthy that the author does not make any reference to Israel's suffering.

60. Collins, Jewish Apocalypses, 36f, classifies ApocAbraham 21-29 as an historical review. While it is true that this section presents a selection of historical events, the material is not organized as a continuous historical review designed to set the stage for the eschatological prophecy. Each of the disclosures of historical events stands on its own as an explanation of some aspect of the created world and history (e.g. the separation of the world into Jews and Gentiles-22; the Fall-23; Abel's murder and the sinfulness of humanity-24; the desecration of the first temple-25).
at the hands of the Romans. However the most distinctive feature of this review is that it neither refers to any specific first century events nor seeks to establish a temporal relationship between known history and the eschatological era. The author does not go beyond setting the eschatological prophecy in the general context of the Roman period. The second review in II Baruch suggests that this was not coincidental. The extensive review in chapters 53-74 surveys history from creation to the eschatological era. One of the unusual features of this survey is that most of it deals with events prior to Baruch's time (56.3-67.8). The *ex eventu* prophecies are limited to one short chapter (68.1-8) and refer to three events: a reference to the story of Esther (68.2-4); the building of the second temple (68.5-6); and a general reference to the 'fall of many nations' (68.7). The author then launches directly into his extensive eschatological prophecy (69; 70-74). This review provides even less of an historical setting for the eschatological prophecy than the first one—though it is probable that the author expected the reader to transfer the setting provided in the first review to this eschatological prophecy (period of Roman rule). In neither review has the author established a temporal relationship between current events and the eschatological era. Thus while the reader might conclude from these historical reviews that the eschaton lay in the foreseeable future, he could not know if it would be the near or distant future. The most probable explanation for this phenomenon in II Baruch is that the author was reluctant to raise hopes that the eschatological era was imminent. This is borne out not only by the historical reviews themselves, but also by the absence in the rest of II Baruch of any suggestion that the eschaton was imminent/61/.
There is no doubt that the historical review was an important stylistic device for communicating historical and eschatological prophecies. However there has been a tendency to regard such reviews as an essential structural element of an apocalypse. This is particularly evident when historical reviews embodied in other literary genres are described as apocalypses (Moses 2-10; I Enoch 93.1-10; 91.11-17; Jubilees 23; TLevi 16-18). The classification of these pericopes as apocalypses reflects an underlying assumption that historical reviews are virtually the *sine qua non* of apocalypses. It should be clear that this is not the case. On the one hand there is a large group of apocalypses which do not employ an historical review. Furthermore even in those that do there are large blocks of material—including extensive eschatological prophecies—which are not cast in the form of historical reviews (esp. IV Ezra and II Baruch). Seen in proper perspective the historical review was a stylistic device for presenting historical and eschatological prophecies which could be used in a variety of literary genres.

It is frequently assumed that the impetus for the use of the historical review came from its ability to reinforce eschatological prophecies. The imminence of the eschaton could be demonstrated both by identifying the present as the penultimate era and by establishing a temporal link between identifiable historical events and the eschaton. Furthermore the apparent accuracy of the *ex eventu* prophecies and the inexorable way that history had unfolded as predicted to the ancient seer

61. Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 141f, also concludes that the author of II Baruch played down the hope of an imminent eschatological consummation of history. However his conclusion is based on a quite different interpretation of the historical review.
would bolster confidence in the genuine historical and eschatological prophecies/62/. There is no doubt that historical reviews could reinforce eschatological prophecies in this way. It is questionable, however, whether the use of the historical review is to be explained solely, it might even be argued primarily, in terms of its ability to reinforce eschatological prophecies.

The impetus for the use of the historical review must also have come from the fact that the authors were attributing their message of the resolution of a present historical crisis to persons in the distant past/63/. In view of this the historical review served several functions: it bridged the historical period between the past and the present; it represented contemporary history to the ancient seer who could not otherwise have known anything about the present; and for the benefit of the author's audience it identified the present as the object of these 'ancient' revelations. If the authors had been writing for their contemporaries under their own names then there would have been no need for these historical reviews since the author could


63. Vielhauer, HNTA—I, recognizes that the historical review is related to pseudonymity. The present argument is that it was the attribution of these revelations to persons in the distant past which created the need for the historical review. Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews, 332f, suggests the opposite. He argues that one reason the authors opted for attributing revelations to persons in the past was that it created the possibility for ex eventu prophecies which would reinforce the historical and eschatological predictions. This does not seem likely. In assessing the origins of this stylistic device one must also keep in mind the use of the historical review in other literature of the time. Cf. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism—I, 181ff.
write on the basis of a shared knowledge of present history. This is borne out by the canonical Revelation where, with the partial exception of 17.9-11, the author has not used historical reviews. The historical review should thus be seen as a consequence of the attribution of these revelations to persons in the distant past. There is no doubt that the reviews also reinforced the eschatological prophecies. However it is unlikely that it was this which provided the initial impetus for the use of this stylistic device/64/.

Esotericism

The alleged esotericism of the Jewish apocalypses should be mentioned since an esoteric motif is frequently regarded as a characteristic element of the apocalypses/65/. Judging by the actual distribution of esoteric motifs in the extant apocalypses this element has been greatly overrated. In reality most apocalypses do not incorporate an esoteric motif: I Enoch 17-36, I Enoch 37-71, I Enoch 72-82, I Enoch 83-90, II Baruch, III Baruch, II Enoch and ApocZenon. It is noteworthy that II Enoch is explicitly non-esoteric. At one point, for example, Enoch says to his family: "The books which I have given to you, do not hide them. To all who wish, recite them, so that they may

---

64. It has also been argued that the historical review could serve as a didactic device for making certain theological points. Cf. Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews 337f; Rowland, Open Heaven, 136-146; and G.I. Davies, Apocalyptic and Historiography, 15ff.

65. E.g. Russell, Method and Message, 107ff; P. Grelot, "Apocalyptic", Sacramentum Mundi, I, 50; Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews, 330 ("apocalypses are often regarded as secret books"), 330f.
know about the extremely marvellous works of the Lord."/66/

The only two apocalypses which employ an esoteric motif are Daniel 7-12 and IV Ezra/67/. In both texts the seer is told not to circulate an account of the revelations he has received in his time. Daniel is told that the revelations concern events in the distant future (8.17, 19) and that the book he writes is not to be circulated until the time in which the predicted events begin to take place (12.4; cf. 8.26). Ezra is told that he is to give his account of the revelations he has received to the 'wise' (12.37f. cf. 14.5, 48f). However in contrast to Daniel nothing is said about the future circulation of his book.

There is a consensus of opinion that this esoteric motif should not be taken to mean that the apocalypses were restricted to a small circle of readers/68/. The esoteric motif in Daniel

66. 54.1. Cf. II Enoch 33.9f; 35.2f; 47.2; 48.6-8.

67. IV Ezra 14.46-47 distinguishes between sacred literature which is in general circulation and sacred texts which are only in circulation among the 'wise'. It is clear that IV Ezra belongs to this latter category. It may well be that this distinction represents an understanding of the transmission of apocalypses which was widely held at the time. However it is still the case that an explicit esoteric motif is not present in the vast majority of apocalypses.

68. Cf. Grelot, Apocalyptic, 50; Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews, 340f. D. Aune, Prophecy in Early Christianity, 110f, argues from the use of pseudonymous authorship that the apocalypses could not have been an esoteric literature restricted to a small circle. He points out that "pseudonymity is functional only if readers accept the false attribution. Within the framework of a relatively small...group, such acceptance would not be possible." (110) However he does argue that the apocalyptists were addressing those sympathetic with their eschatological orientation rather than Israel as a whole (111). A very different view of esotericism is taken by I. Gruenwald, "The Jewish Esoteric Literature in the Time of the Mishnah and Talmud," Immanuel, IV (1974), 37-43, who argues that the esoteric quality of the apocalypses consists in the claim to expand and supplement Scripture on the authority of angelic revelations.
and *IV Ezra* is rather an attempt to explain why the apocalypse was not in circulation between the presumed and actual time of writing. According to *Daniel* the revelation was only to be disclosed at the time when the events described began to take place while *IV Ezra* claims that the text had been in circulation among the learned class of society. This interpretation is borne out by *Revelation* where the seer is told to publish the revelation now because 'the time is near', viz. the revelation concerns events in the near rather than the distant future (*Revelation* 22.10).

**CONCLUSION**

D. Aune has correctly pointed out that when the apocalypses are compared with each other there is very little consistency in the structure of the texts. It is clearly the case that the genre was a fluid one in the sense that there was a great deal of latitude for shaping the various elements of the genre: e.g. the structure of the texts as a whole, the use of revelatory media, the construction of narrative settings, and the use of stylistic elements like historical reviews and esoteric motifs. It has been argued, however, that there is a common structure underlying all apocalypses. Every apocalypse is structured around a narrative account of a mediated revelation. The narrative account in turn embraces a frame story or narrative setting and the account of the revelatory event itself. This basic structure can be expanded with narrative material that sets
the revelation in the wider context of the individual's life. There are several other points which should be kept in mind. First, symbolic visions were used primarily for a specific subject matter—the representation of historical and eschatological events. Second, direct discourse that is unrelated to the interpretation of visionary phenomena was an important revelatory medium in its own right. It was obviously the most versatile revelatory medium since any subject matter could be cast in discourse form. Third, historical reviews should not be seen as an essential structural feature of an apocalypse. Instead the historical review was a stylistic device, which could be used in a variety of literary genres, for casting historical and eschatological prophecies. It is likely that the fundamental impetus for the use of historical reviews came from the attribution of these revelations to persons in the distant past. Finally it is evident that most apocalypses do not employ an explicit esoteric motif. These points will have a bearing on the investigation of the possibility that the Jewish apocalypse played a formative role in the creation of the revelatory literature of Gnosticism.
The first task in the study of this literature is to identify the Christian apocalypses composed before about A.D. 200. A. Y. Collins' study of early Christian apocalypses suggests that there were a large number of apocalypses written in the first three centuries. She sets out to identify apocalypses written before A.D. 300 and the result is a list of 24 texts/1/. There is little doubt that this is a wildly inflated list. In the first place it is questionable whether at least ten of the 24 texts (or parts of texts) can be classified as apocalypses—irrespective of the question of date: The Book of Enoch; 5 Ezra 2.42-48; Test Isaac 2-3a; Test Isaac 5-6; Test Jacob 1-3a; Test Jacob 5; The Story of Zosimus; Jacob's Ladder; The Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle 8b-14a and 17b-19b (the two sections of this text are treated as distinct apocalypses). The other problem lies in the method of including texts with the 'early Christian apocalypses'. In the first place apocalypses which were clearly written after A.D. 300 are included if there is a

reasonable possibility that an earlier form of the text existed prior to 300, e.g. *The Apocalypse of Paul*. This is a valid point though it does not account for the inclusion of many texts. Second, apocalypses are also included if there is no 'clear indication' of a date after A.D. 300. The question is what constitutes 'clear evidence' for a date after A.D. 300. The only criterion which Collins cites is whether or not there are references within the texts to historical events after A.D. 300/3/. The difficulty with this criterion is that it is based on the practice in a certain type of Jewish apocalypse to combine *ex eventu* and genuine prophecies in an historical review. However since these late Christian apocalypses are not interested in establishing a temporal relationship between their own time and an eschatological scenario which is about to unfold there was no need to refer to events contemporary with the author. The topical concerns of these texts are such that one would not expect the authors to refer to contemporary history. Thus this criterion is virtually useless as a means to identify 'early Christian apocalypses'. There is no doubt that many of the late Christian apocalypses (written between about A.D. 400 to 800) are extremely difficult to date. This is true, for example, of the following texts which Collins includes with the early Christian apocalypses: *The Apocalypse of St. John the Theologian; The Apocalypse of Esdras; The Apocalypse of the Virgin Mary; The Apocalypse of the Holy Mother of God Concerning Punishments; The Apocalypse of James, the Brother of the Lord; The Mysteries of St. John the Apostle and Holy Virgin*. However it takes something more than an appeal to the difficulties of dating and the lack of


reference to historical events after A.D. 300 to include them with early Christian apocalypses. It is unlikely that Collins believes that all the texts in her list were in fact written prior to A.D. 300. However to draw up a list on the basis of this criterion creates the mistaken impression that a large number of Christian apocalypses were written in the first three centuries.

In reality the corpus of early Christian apocalypses was much more modest. There are only four or five extant Christian apocalypses written before A.D. 200:

- Revelation
- The Shepherd of Hermes
- The Ascension of Isaiah 6-11
- The Apocalypse of Peter
  (Epistula Apostolorum)

These texts represent a remarkably heterogeneous collection of apocalypses which have little in common so far as their structural characteristics, content and function are concerned. As a result the texts will be described individually rather than as a group. The aim of the present study is not to provide a complete analysis of the genre of each text. The more modest aim is to describe the most important characteristics of each text as well as identify their distinctive features.
Revelation is the only apocalypse included in the New Testament canon/4/. It was written by a Christian prophet named John (1.1, 4, 9; 22.8) who was known to the churches (1.4, 9). It is impossible to identify the author with any other John known from the first century/5/. According to John he received his visions on the island of Patmos and subsequently sent his account of the revelation to seven churches in the province of Asia (1.4, 9-11). The majority view is that the apocalypse was written towards the end of Domitian's reign (A.D. 81-96)/6/. However the nineteenth century 'majority view' that Revelation was written shortly after the reign of Nero has been forcefully restated in recent years/7/.

Revelation is a particularly interesting apocalypse in that in content and structure it stands closer to the Jewish apocalypses than other early Christian apocalypses. The most

4. Eschatological themes and motifs can be found throughout the New Testament. There has been a tendency to describe the extended eschatological prophecies in Mark 13 (and parallels) and II Thessalonians 12.1-12 as 'apocalypses'. However as a literary designation this is clearly inaccurate. For eschatological themes in the N.T. cf. the useful discussion in James Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977), 309-340. One flaw in this analysis is that Dunn has adopted the widespread practice of defining an apocalypse in terms of a list of distinctive characteristics (310-312--based on Vielhauer). Cf. as well Rowland, Open Heaven, 349-386.


important similarities lie in the use of symbolic visions to represent historical and eschatological events. However there are also a great many distinctive features in this apocalypse.

Like the Jewish apocalypses, Revelation is structured around a narrative account of a mediated revelation. 1.9-20 and 4.1-2 provide the introductory narrative setting for the revelatory event while the concluding narrative material is found at 20.6-17. The revelation itself is recounted in 2.1-3.22 (the letters to the churches of Asia) and 4.2-22.5 (the disclosure of eschatological events). To this basic structure (the account of a mediated revelation) has been added a prologue (1.1-3) and an epistolary framework (1.4-8; 22.18-21).

There are a number of points which can be made about the structure of Revelation. In the first place the author's means of circulating the apocalypse, by sending it to a group of churches within the framework of a letter, is unique. Two second century texts which attribute revelations to the risen Christ, Epistula Apostolorum and The Apocryphon of James, are circulated in an epistolary setting. However in contrast to Revelation the use of an epistolary framework in these two texts is a fictional device. The letters which the risen Christ dictates to each of

7. E.g. John Robinson, Redating the New Testament (London: 1976), 221-253; A.A. Bell, "The Date of John's Apocalypse: The Evidence of Some Roman Historians Reconsidered," NTS 25 (1978) 93-102. Rowland, Open Heaven, 403-413, also argued for this date. I have found my position shifting towards the early date. In my judgment it is impossible to establish either date on the basis of an interpretation of the seven kings in 17.9-11 since the list of seven can be interpreted either literally (early date) or more loosely (later date). However it seems to me that the material in 11.1-13 presupposes that Jerusalem and the Temple are still standing. Attempts to account for this pericope while maintaining a late date, by treating this material as having been derived from an earlier source or interpreting it symbolically, are not convincing.
the churches are another distinctive feature of this apocalypse.

As has been noted the introductory narrative material is divided between 1.9-20 and 4.1-2: 1.9-20 sets the stage for both the revelation as a whole and the letters to the churches while 4.1f provides a new starting point for the eschatological revelations. The introductory frame story at 1.9-20 contains a number of traditional structural elements (though there are distinctive features in the way that each element is shaped): a circumstantial setting (1.9-10), the coming of the heavenly revealer (1.10ff), the account of the revealer's dramatic appearance (1.13-16), a fear-reassurance motif (1.17-18), and an introductory statement (1.17-18, 19-20). The concluding narrative material is unusual in that it is made up of a series of loosely connected statements and exhortations (22.6, 7, 10-11, 12-17). The account of John's response to the revelatory event (22.8-9) is one structural element which frequently occurs in the concluding narrative settings of the apocalypses. However the response itself, an attempt to worship at the feet of the angel, is unprecedented.

In this apocalypse revelation is mediated primarily by means of symbolic visions/8/. These visions are symbolic in the sense that John sees a pictorial representation of events rather than the events themselves. Furthermore these pictorial

8. The term ἱάγος is used to describe that which John sees and hears at 9.17. One of the distinctive features of the symbolic visions in Revelation is that they are experienced in an 'ecstatic' state. On four occasions John describes himself as being 'in the spirit'—ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (1.10.; 4.2; 17.3; 21.10) In the Jewish apocalypses symbolic visions depicting historical and eschatological events are normally experienced in a dream context (Daniel 8 is the only instance in which the dream context is not explicit—though it is probably implied).
representations employ a great deal of symbolic imagery. It is frequently noted that in contrast to most of the symbolic visions in the Jewish apocalypses, the majority of the visions in Revelation are not interpreted. Rowland's explanation for this lack of interpretation was that that author could count on his readers' acquaintance with the stock of apocalyptic imagery that he employed. It seems more likely that the explanation is to be found in the blend of symbolic and realistic images in the construction of the visions. In most instances the author does not employ thoroughly allegorical images in which most or all aspects of the reality to be conveyed are represented allegorically. Instead the representation of eschatological events frequently blends symbolic and realistic images. Thus, for example, the account of the two beasts and their activity in chapter 13 describe the beasts themselves in thoroughly allegorical terms (13.1-3, 11). However the description of the beasts' activity is set forth in realistic terms: e.g. blasphemy, persecution of the saints, demand for worship from the

9. Revelation 17.3-18 (the vision of the Woman on the Beast) is the only instance in which an allegorical vision is interpreted. The significance of the multitude in white robes is explained to John (7.9-17). However this is not an allegorical vision and the primary function of the interpretation is to emphasize the significance of this vision.


11. There are two other factors which may contribute to the explanation. First, the visions of eschatological events are extensive in themselves. If interpretations had been added the apocalypse would have been a much longer work. Second, since the author is writing for his own generation he could assume that the symbolic elements referring to contemporary realities would be correctly interpreted. In the case of IV Ezra 11-12 and II Baruch 35-40, by contrast, the interpretation served in part to make it clear that the symbolism referred to first century political history.

12. This is the case with the visions in IV Ezra 11-12 and II Baruch 36 and 53.
world, the performance of miracles (4-8, 12-17). In this case the identification of the first and second beast in terms of a future Roman ruler and a representative of the imperial cult would have been obvious while the account of their activities required no interpretation. This blend of symbolic and realistic elements is characteristic of most of the visions of eschatological events.

There are two other points which can be made about the way revelation is mediated in this apocalypse. First, from the statements at 1.1 and 22.6, 8 one might expect that the angel would play a major role in the mediation of the revelation (e.g. by interpreting the visions). In reality angelic mediation only occurs at two points in the apocalypse: in chapter 17 the angel interprets the significance of the vision of the woman on the beast; in chapter 21-22 the angel shows John the new Jerusalem (though even here the angel's role is a formal one in that he does not speak—John himself describes the city and explains the significance of its various aspects). Second, it is also worth noting that in the accounts of the visions John occasionally breaks off his description of the vision and completes the picture with his own statement of what will transpire/13/. Thus, for example, at 9.1-11 John describes his vision of the manifestation and activity of the locusts which wreck havoc on mankind. However verse 6 is not narrated as part of the vision. Instead it is John's statement as to the response of the living to this judgment.

13. In the following pericopes the bracketed verses indicate material that falls outside the account of the vision and represent John's own statement: 9.1-11 (6); 9.13-21 (20-21); 11.4-13 (4-10); 13.1-8 (8); 14.1-5 (4-5); 19.11-21 (cf. 11b, 15b, 20b); 20.1-6 (3c, 6); 20.7-10 (7-8, 10c); 21.9-22.5 (21.22-27; 22.2b-5).
In the previous chapter it was noted that each Jewish apocalypse structures the revelatory event in a different way. It is thus not surprising that the revelatory event in Revelation has a distinctive structure. The main feature of this structure is the long series of visions which depict various aspects of the eschatological era (esp. chapters 6-22)/14/. This series of symbolic visions within the framework of a single revelatory event is unparalleled in the Jewish or early Christian apocalypses. The structure of the material in chapters 4-5 and 19.11-22.5 is in the main clear: 4-5 sets the stage for the unfolding of the eschatological drama; 19.11-22.5 provides a sequential account of events from the Parousia to the coming of the new Jerusalem. However the structure of the material in chapters 6.1-19.10 is more problematic. This section of visions is not structured around a sequential presentation of an eschatological scenario depicting events from the onset of the judgments to the Parousia. While there are chronological elements within this material, chapters 6-19 are not cast in the form of a continuous eschatological prophecy/15/.

14. Another distinctive characteristic of Revelation is that the eschatological prophecy is exceptionally long and comprehensive. None of the Jewish apocalypses contain anything close to such an extended portrayal of eschatological events. Thus, for example, in the case of Daniel 11-12 the eschatological prophecy is set forth in a mere nine verses (11.40-12.3). The genuine eschatological prophecy in I Enoch 85-90 is restricted to 90.14-38. The eschatological prophecy in II Baruch 53-76 is extensive by the standards of the Jewish apocalypses (70.1-74.4).

Thus far no mention has been made of what are commonly regarded as the most distinctive characteristics of Revelation: the lack of pseudonymity, historical reviews and esotericism. The absence of these features has created problems for those who define the apocalypse in terms of a cluster of structural and stylistic characteristics. The difficulty is particularly acute since three frequently cited characteristics of an apocalypse are absent from Revelation/16/. However if the apocalypse is correctly defined and the function of these three stylistic elements is properly understood then the absence of these features in Revelation should not occasion any surprise.

With respect to pseudonymity it was argued in the previous chapter that while all Jewish apocalypses were written under pseudonyms, pseudonymity was not an essential characteristic of an apocalypse since in principle it was possible for an author to put himself forward as the recipient of the revelation. This has happened in the case of Revelation. It is likely that John was free to dispense with pseudonymity because early Christian communities were open to the possibility that direct revelations could be given to Christian prophets and because the authority of the risen Christ was sufficient to establish the acceptance of the revelation/17/. With respect to the first point it is significant that John is described by the angel as a prophet.


17. These two points were made by Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews, 331-332. The authority of the work would also have been enhanced by the fact that John was known to the churches as a Christian prophet (1.9; 22.9).
It is arguable that the absence of historical reviews and an esoteric motif in Revelation can be seen as a consequence of the fact that the author wrote under his own name. With respect to the historical review there is in fact a hint of this stylistic device at Revelation 17.1-11. The angel interprets the seven heads of the beast as seven rulers: five have fallen, the sixth is reigning at the time the revelation is given to John, the seventh will only reign for a short time, he will be followed by the appearance of an eighth king who, in turn, is one of the first five kings who will return as the eschatological manifestation of evil (17.9-11). From a structural point of view this brief pericope differs markedly from the historical reviews in the Jewish apocalypses. In the first place it does not employ the customary combination of ex eventu and genuine prophecy. John does not claim to have received the revelation at an earlier period and then recast known history in a prophetic manner. The

18. For a discussion of early Christian prophets cf. D. Aune, Prophecy in Early Christianity, 189-245 ('The Character of Early Christian Prophecy'), 274-288 (an examination of the prophetic elements in Revelation). Cf. as well the discussion and bibliography in: E.S. Fiorenza, "Apokalypsis and Propheteia: The Book of Revelation in the Context of Early Christian Prophecy," L'Apocalypse johannique, 105-128. John's status as a Christian prophet and the description of the revelation as a prophecy have led some to question whether Revelation is a true apocalypse. The problem stems from the lack of clarity in the definition of the apocalypse as as a literary genre and the way prophetic and apocalyptic 'ideologies' are frequently contrasted. In fact there is no reason why a Christian prophet could not employ a contemporary literary genre, the apocalypse, as a medium for a subject matter which in turn was regarded as having a prophetic character.
reigns of the first five kings are represented as past history and John clearly states that he is writing in the time of the sixth king. A second difference between this review and those in the Jewish apocalypses has to do with the relative place which the review has in the apocalypse as a whole. When historical reviews occur in the Jewish apocalypses they are a much more dominant feature of the text in that the central eschatological prophecy is set in the context of a much more extensive ex eventu prophecy/19/. In the case of Revelation, by contrast, the historical review plays a minor role as the vast majority of the eschatological prophecies are not cast in the framework of a survey of past and present history. There is, however, a similarity of function between this short review in Revelation and the much more extensive ones in the Jewish apocalypses. In both cases the reviews serve to provide an historical setting for the eschatological prophecy and establish a temporal relationship between the time in which the apocalypse was written and the eschatological future.

Collins argued that the principal reason John did not make more extensive use of the historical review was that the expectation of an imminent eschaton was an integral element of early Christian belief and did not need to be reinforced with the aid of an historical review/20/. This interpretation assumes that the fundamental impetus for the use of the historical review

19. E.g. I Enoch 85-90; Daniel 7, 8, 9, 11-12; IV Ezra 11-12; II Baruch 36-40, 53-74.

20. Collins, Pseudonymity/Historical Reviews, 333-340. One difficulty with Collins' explanation is that the short review in Revelation serves in part to underscore the imminence of the eschaton—a point which Collins recognizes. However this would suggest that the explanation for the lack of more extended historical reviews lies elsewhere.
came from the need to establish the imminence of the eschaton (a view which Collins argues). It seems more likely, however, that the relative neglect of the historical review as a medium for presenting eschatological prophecies is to be explained by the fact that John did not employ the device of pseudonymity. Since he wrote for his contemporaries under his own name he would have had no opportunity to recast known history to create *ex eventu* prophecies. Furthermore there would have been no need to bridge the gap between the distant past when the presumed author received the revelation and the present/21/. This evidence from Revelation supports the view argued in the previous chapter that the primary impetus for the use of the historical review came from the attribution of the revelations to persons in the past/22/.

Scholars commenting on the genre of Revelation normally identify the lack of pseudonymity, historical reviews and

21. This latter point has been well stated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, 18: "Unlike other apocalyptists, John writes in his own name, not under a pseudonym. Consonant with this his book has no history under the guise of a prophecy. The latter was a by-product of a writer assuming the name of a saint of ancient times, for if the venerable 'prophet' was to issue a prophecy concerning events contemporary with the writer, it was necessary to bridge the period from the time of the saint to his own day. John had no need of such a device."

22. It is also clear from Revelation that both the imminence of the end and the authority of the eschatological prophecy could be established without recourse to historical surveys. The imminence of the eschatological era is the subject of a number of statements by John, the angel and Christ (1.1, 3; 3.11; 22.6, 7, 10, 12, 20). Furthermore there are a number of statements which indicate that the authority of the message is established by its divine origin (cf. 1.1-2; 22.6). While there is no doubt that the historical review in the Jewish apocalypses reinforced the eschatological prophecies, the evidence of Revelation supports the view that the fundamental impetus for the use of this stylistic device came from the attribution of the revelations to ancient worthies.
esotericism as the most distinctive features of this apocalypse. In reality there are many other distinctive elements in Revelation: the circulation of the apocalypse in the form of a letter, the seven letters to the churches of Asia (2-3), the non-sequential structure of the eschatological revelations (6-19), the ecstatic state in which the visions are experienced (in contrast to a dream context), the lack of interpretation for most of the visions, the atypical concluding narrative material, and the length and comprehensiveness of the eschatological prophecy. In light of these features it is not surprising that Revelation stands out as a distinctive apocalypse.

THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

In its present form Shepherd of Hermas consists of three sections which are normally described as Visions (I-V), Mandates (I-XII) and Similitudes (I-X). The text is thought to have been composed over a period of time in the first half of the second century by a Roman Christian named Hermas. It is a long and repetitious text containing a great deal of material. However two concerns underlie most of the work. One is to set forth the possibility

and need for repentance and spiritual renewal. The spiritual and moral failings of the church are initially described in Vision I.3.1-2 (cf. Vis II.2.1). The possibility of repentance is introduced at Vis II.2.2-8 and underlies much of the material that follows/24/. However the author did not stop at presenting a doctrine of repentance. He also wanted to provide guidance for the renewal of the repentant Christian. Consequently ShHermas is replete with moral instruction and exhortation—the main themes of the Mandates and Similitudes in particular. Thus the author is concerned both to set forth the possibility of repentance and to provide moral teaching which the repentant Christian is to obey. These two concerns are brought together in the angel's statement in the introduction to Parable VI:

"These commandments are helpful to those who are going to repent, for if they do not walk in them their repentance is in vain. Do you, therefore, who repent, put away the wickedness of this world which leads you astray, but if you put on all the virtue of righteousness, you shall be able to keep these commandments, and no longer add to your sins. Therefore walk in these commandments of mine, and you shall live to God." (Sim VI.1.3-4)

There is an eschatological dimension to Hermas' teaching. The offer of repentance and the ethical instruction and exhortation are given an eschatological significance in that it is only the righteous and genuinely repentant who will experience eschatological blessing. Unrepentant Christians will suffer the same fate as unbelievers/25/. With respect to historical eschatology Hermas states that the end is near (Vis III.5.5, 8.9) and urges Christians to prepare for the eschatological tribulation (Vis IV.1.4-3.6; cf. Vis II.2.7-8; 3.4)/26/. However

24. Snyder, The Shepherd of Hermas, 69-72, combines an excellent survey of various interpretations of Hermas' doctrine of repentance with a proposal of his own (which has considerable merit).
there are no eschatological scenarios in which the author predicts a series of eschatological events. An exchange between Hermas and the Ancient Lady shows that while the author believes that the eschaton lies in the foreseeable future, his real interest is not in setting forth eschatological predictions:

"And I began to ask her about the times, if the end were yet. But she cried out with a loud voice saying, 'Foolish man, do you not see the tower still being built? Whenever therefore the building of the tower has been finished, the end comes. But it will quickly be built up; ask me nothing more. This reminder and the renewal of your spirits is sufficient for you and for the saints.'" (Vis III.8.9).

Hermas' real interest lies in the moral renewal of the Christian community. Eschatological concerns enter in only insofar as they provide the framework or horizon for the author's exhortations to repentance and renewal.

There is no doubt that the author of ShHermas composed his work as an apocalypse/26a/. The work contains all the essential elements of an apocalypse in that the author has cast his material within the framework of an account of the revelatory event in which it was supposed to have been revealed to him.

Furthermore the author has followed the example of earlier

25. The contrast between the two responses to this revelation and its bearing on one's eternal destiny is brought out in Sim IV, Sim VIII.7.2-6; 11.3-4; Sim IX.14.2. The allegorical visions in Vis III and Sim VI, VIII and IX characterize various types of Christians. For the eschatological blessings of the righteous cf. esp. Vis. I.3.2, 4; Vis II.2.6-7; 3.2-3; Vis IV.3.5.


26a. Vielhauer, HNTA-II, 638, described ShHermas as a 'pseudo-apocalypse' because of its non-traditional content. However he recognized that the author intended to compose an apocalypse (635). For a complex analysis of the genre of Visiona I-IV cf. D. Hellholm, Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse, Volume 1 (Lund: 1980).
apocalypses in providing narrative settings for the revelatory events. In the case of Vis I-IV each of the four revelatory events is given its own introductory and concluding narrative setting/27/. Vision V provides the narrative setting for the Mandates and Similitudes. There are additional narrative settings within the Similitudes which introduce special locations required for the revelations/28/. These narrative settings in turn contain many traditional elements: circumstantial settings/29/, prayer and fasting as a preparation for receiving revelations/30/, accounts of the coming of the heavenly revealer (and in some case descriptions of his or her appearance)/31/, introductory and concluding dialogues and discourses/32/, and references to the individual's response to the revelation/33/.

ShHermas employs revelatory media similar to earlier apocalypses. Two heavenly figures play a role in most of the revelations: the Ancient Lady (Visions I-IV) and an angel described as the Shepherd (Vis V and the Mandates and Similitudes)/34/. Most of the revelations are communicated by either interpreted visions or direct discourse. The most

27. Vis I.1.1-2.4; 4.1-3; Vis II.1.1-2.1; 4.1-3; Vis III.1.1-7; 10.1-2; Vis IV.1.1-4; 3.7.
28. Sim II.1; Sim V.1.1-3; Sim VI.1.1-5; Sim VII.1; Sim IX.1.1-4. There are also several narrative connections within Sim IX: 2.5-7; 5.2-7; 7.6-7; 10.5-11.9.
29. E.g. Vis I.1.1-2.1; Vis II.1.1-3; Vis III.1.2; Vis IV.1.2-3; Sim II.1; Sim V.1.1-2; Sim VII.1; Sim IX.1.4; Sim X.1.1.
30. Vis II.2.1; Vis III.1.2; 10.6-7; Vis V.1 (prayer); Sim V.1.1.
31. Vis I.2.2; Vis III.1.6; Vis IV.2.1; Vis V.1.4.
32. E.g. Vis I.2.2-4; Vis V.5; Mandate III.3.2-6.5; Sim VI.1.2-4; Sim VIII.11.1-4; Sim X.
33. Sim VI.1.1; 3.1; Sim IX.2.2, 5; 10.1; 14.3 (this last one is a classic example).
important visions are in *Vis* III.2.4-8.8 (The Tower), *Vis* IV.1.4-3.5 (The Beast), and *Similitudes* VI-IX. There are several distinctive features about these visions: 1. they are strongly allegorical and as a result require extensive interpretations in order to make them intelligible; 2. they are experienced in a normal state of consciousness rather than in a dream or ecstatic state; 3. they are used as a medium for the author's message on repentance and moral renewal rather than as a means to represent historical and eschatological events. Direct discourse that is not related to the interpretation of visions is the most frequently used revelatory medium. This is used in *Vis* I.3.1-2, *Vis* III.9.1-10, all the *Mandates*, and *Similitudes* I, II, III, IV, V and VII. This direct discourse involves a blend of discourse and dialogue elements. A third revelatory medium which is without precedent in earlier apocalypses is a book containing a message for the church. In *Vis* I.3.3-4 the Lady reads from the book while in *Vis* II.1.3-3.4 Hermas copies a message from the book which he is then enabled to read.

As has been noted, *SheHermas* was not written under a pseudonym. Perhaps as a result of writing under his own name Hermas has not followed the custom of Jewish apocalypses and represented himself as a righteous person whose piety qualified

34. A heavenly figure described as a young man features at *Vis* II.4.1 and *Vis* III.10.7-13.4. cf. Vielhauer, *ENTA*-II, 634-635, for an analysis of the figures of the Ancient Lady and the Shepherd and references to earlier studies of these figures.

35. Danielou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 37, observes that the visions in *SheHermas* are similar to those in *IV Ezra*. This is particularly true if they are compared to the vision of the 'Mourning Woman' in *IV Ezra* 10. This vision is experienced in a normal state of consciousness, is strongly allegorical, and is not used as a medium for an eschatological scenario.
him to receive a revelation. Instead Hermas has represented himself as being repeatedly censured: for lustful desires (Vis I.1.4-8; 2.3-4; Sim VII.1-7), for laxity in the fulfillment of his responsibilities to the church (Vis II.3.1-2; Vis III.3.1), for his persistence in seeking further revelations (Vis III.3.2; Sim V.4.2-5.1) and even for his failure to understand the symbolism of the visions (Vis III.6.5; 10.7-9; Sim VI.4.3). At one point Hermas does suggest that the Lady judged him worthy to receive the revelations (Vis III.3.4; cf. Vis II.1.2). However as the interpretation of the Tower Vision proceeds the Lady suddenly breaks off the interpretation to tell Hermas that it was not his worthiness which qualified him to receive the revelation:

"It is not because you are more worthy than all the others that a revelation was given to you, for there were others before you and better than you, to whom these visions ought to have been revealed. But in order that 'the name of God might be glorified' they have been...revealed to you...." (Vis III.4.3)

While Shērmas is an apocalypse with many formal similarities to the traditional apocalypse, most readers are more likely to be impressed by the distinctive character of this text. On first reading Shērmas has a radically different character from the whole of Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. This is in part due to the way the author has stylized the various elements of the genre in light of his cultural and religious milieu: e.g. the narrative settings in rural Italy, the characterizations of the Lady and the Shepherd, and the symbolism of the allegorical visions/36/. However the distinctive

36. Snyder, The Shepherd of Hermas, 17, notes that "The author lived in a segment of society that was deeply immersed in Roman culture and he utilizes this environment as a means of communicating his message of repentance." Cf. J. Reiling, Hermas and Christian Prophecy (Leiden: 1973) 25-26; Bauckham, Great Tribulation, 27 (note 7).
character of Shêrûnas is in the main due to the fact that the
author has used the literary medium of an apocalypse for a wholly
non-traditional subject matter. This is particularly true for
the Mandates and Similitudes. The long discourses and dialogue
exchanges on moral and religious issues and the extensive
allegories relevant to repentance and the church give this
apocalypse a completely unique character.

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

The Ascension of Isaiah is a composite text of considerable
complexity. Most scholars argue that two or three literary
sources can be discerned in the final redaction: an account of
Isaiah's martyrdom (1-5); a fragment of a Testament of Hezekiah
(3.13-4.18); Isaiah's account of a revelation he received
(6-11)/37/. Suggested dates for the source texts range from the
late first to end of the second century while the final redaction
is normally dated sometime between about A.D. 175-300/38/.

HNTA-II, 642-643, argued for two basic sources (Martyrdom of
Isaiah and Vision of Isaiah) plus a great deal of
interpolated material. R.H. Charles, The Ascension of
Isaiah (London: 1900), xxxvi-xlvi, argued for a third
source, The Testament of Hezekiah. For an extensive study
of this proposed Hezekiah cf. E. von Nordheim, Die Lehre
der Alten (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 208-219, F.C. Burkitt,
Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (London: 1914) 45-46,
held out for the unity of the work—with the exception of
11.2-22 which he regarded as a later interpolation.
A.K. Helmbold, "Ascension of Isaiah," Zondervan Pictorial
Encyclopedia of the Bible I (1976) 348-350, has an
excellent discussion of the text and critical issues (348f
for the discussion of sources and dates). Cf. as well
The only section which can be classified as an apocalypse is chapters 6-11. This section is often described as The Vision of Isaiah (a designation which will be used to distinguish this material from the text as a whole). VisIsaiah can be classified as an apocalypse since it is likely that it originated as an independent literary composition: either as a wholly independent text or as an addition to earlier material in the AsaIsa (this is analogous to the case of Daniel 7-12).

VisIsaiah is structured around the traditional ingredients of a narrative setting (6.1-7.9; 11.36-43) and an account of the revelatory event (7.9-11.35). A distinctive feature in the narrative framework is the combination of a third and first person narrative style. The text as a whole is cast in a third person narrative framework (6.1-7.1; 11.39-43). However within this framework the author places Isaiah's first person account of the revelation he received (7.2-11.37). In the introductory narrative framework (3rd person) the author tells how Isaiah was speaking 'words of faith and righteousness' in Hezekiah's court (6.1-9). Suddenly an angel comes and takes Isaiah's spirit from his body in order to impart a revelation to him (6.10-15). When this happens Hezekiah dismisses those unworthy to witness such an event (6.17) and when Isaiah returns he relates the revelation to those who are worthy to hear it. The transition to Isaiah's account occurs at 7.1-2:

"Now the vision which he had seen Isaiah narrated to Hezekiah, his son Jasub, Micaiah and the rest of the prophets saying, "In that moment when I was prophesying according to things heard by you, I saw a sublime angel...he possessed great glory and honour, ...

38. In addition to the literature cited in the previous note of R. Meyer, "Himmelfahrt und Martyrium des Jesaja," RGG Vol 3, Col 337, who suggests a third or possibly fourth century date for the final redaction.
so that I cannot describe the glory of this angel."

This introductory third person narrative framework is matched by a concluding one (11.36-41). This use of a third person narrative framework in an apocalypse is unprecedented since the recipient of the revelation is normally represented as the author of the entire apocalypse. The explanation for this feature of VisIsaiah is not apparent—though it may lie in the literary history of the texts describing elements of Isaiah's career/39/.

In addition to the narrative setting mentioned above, Isaiah also provides a narrative setting for the revelation he received (7.2-8; 11.34-35). There are several traditional elements in this frame story: the angel has a supernatural appearance (7.2—cf. above quote); in the introductory dialogue the angel identifies himself and defines his mission (7.3-8); the angel's concluding statement (11.35-36) includes a reference to Isaiah's future (he will return to the seventh heaven at death). The only other noteworthy element in the narrative setting is the implicit esotericism in the concluding narrative material. According to the author Isaiah instructs the king not to disclose the revelation to the people of Israel (11.39). This is the only early Christian apocalypse which employs an esoteric motif. As was the case with the Jewish apocalypses the purpose of this motif was to account for the fact that the text had not been in widespread circulation from ancient times.

There are several interesting points which can be made about the structure of the revelatory event in VisIsaiah. While there

39. If, for example, VisIsaiah was written as an addition to the section of material extending from chapters 1-5 then the author may have chosen to continue the third person narrative style of the original text.
is no formal break in the structure of the material, the revelatory event can be divided into two parts. In the first half Isaiah ascends through the stratified heavens until he arrives in the seventh heaven (7.9-9.26). The angel who accompanies Isaiah acts as his guide and explains the significance of celestial phenomena as well as answering Isaiah's questions. The ascension only involves Isaiah's spirit (cf. 6.10-12) and in the course of the ascent he is transformed until he becomes like an angel/40/. The focus of the revelation shifts in the second half. Isaiah encounters Christ and the Holy Spirit (who are both represented as angels-9.27-36) and then witnesses the 'glory' of God himself (9.37-10.6)/41/. This leads to God's commissioning Christ to undertake a redemptive work in the created world (10.7-15). Isaiah then describes Christ's descent through the heavens, his historical ministry and his ascent to the seventh heaven (10.17-11.33). A final point is that scattered throughout the revelatory event are references to Isaiah's response to the revelation/42/.

In the case of the Jewish apocalypses it was apparent that those texts employing a heavenly journey as a revelatory medium dealt with a wide range of distinctive themes. This is also the case for VisIsaiah. The revelation covers a variety of topics and it is difficult to identify an underlying purpose in the choice of subject matter. The author has an interest in the

40. VisIsaiah 7.25; 9.30. According to 'II Enoch' 22.8ff the seer is transformed to the point that he becomes like the angels.

41. Cf. Daniélon, Theology of Jewish Christianity, 12f and chaps 4 and 5, for the doctrine of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit implied in this section.

42. Cf. 7.23, 37; 8.13, 22; (11.36).
structure of the heavenly world as he describes scenes in the firmament (the abode of Satan and his forces) and the seven heavens (7.9-9.26). It may be that the author wanted to familiarize his readers with the structure of the heavenly world since at death all believers would make this journey in the 'company of the angel of the Holy Spirit' (7.23). The author's interest in personal soteriology finds further expression in the frequent references to the 'robes', 'crowns' and 'thrones' which will be given to the righteous on their arrival in the seventh heaven/43/. Thus, for example, at 9.24-26 the angel says:

"And I saw there many garments stored up, and many thrones and many crowns, and I said to the angel who conducted me, 'To whom do these garments and thrones and crowns belong?' And he said to me, 'These garments shall many from that world receive, if they believe on the words of that one who, as I have told thee, shall be named, and observe them and believe therein, and believe in his cross. For them are these laid up."

The author also gives answers to the questions of the destiny of the righteous who died before Christ's coming (9.7-13a, 17f) and how events on earth are known in the seventh heaven (9.19-23). The second part of the revelation focuses on a vision of Christ's descent/ascent (10.17-31; 11.23-32) and his work in history (11.2-22; cf. 9.13-18)/44/. This material is preceded by an unusual account of Isaiah's encounter with Christ, the Holy


44. 11.2-22 is normally regarded as a late interpolation because this section is not found in several versions (cf. Flemming and Duensing, JTNTA—II, 643). The difficulty with this view is that if this section is removed then one is left with an extremely awkward transition between 11.1 and 11.23. Helmbold, Ascension Isaiah, 348f, argues that the versions which lack 11.2-22 represent an inferior text family. If this is the case then 11.2-22 would be original to VisIsaiah (in which case there would be an element of irony in the fact that Burkitt, who held out for the unity of AscIsa, conceded only that 11.2-22 was a subsequent interpolation).
Spirit and 'the glory of God' (9.27-10.6)/45/.

**Revelations Attributed to the Risen Christ**

There are four (or five depending on how one counts them) texts written before about A.D. 400 that recount revelations which Christ gave the disciples in the post-passion period:

- **The Apocalypse of Peter**
- **Epistula Apostolorum**
- **Testament of the Lord**
  - *(T*Lord I.2-14a)*
- **The Questions of Bartholomew**

The first two texts were written in the second century. The others were written between about 250 and 400. *T*Lord and *T*Lord I.2-14a will be included because this type of text is useful for comparative purposes in an assessment of Gnostic texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ/46/.

---

45. There are a great many unusual motifs in this text. The questions of the ideological origins and ecclesiastical setting for this theology do not lie within the scope of this study. A.K. Helmbold, "Gnostic Elements in the 'Ascension of Isaiah'," NTS 18 (1972) 222-227, noted the gnostic character of some of the material (cf. his article in ZPEB as well). Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 12-14, treats the text as a document of Jewish Christianity.

46. The *Questions of Bartholomew* will not be included in the analysis because it would take a great deal of space to outline the complex structure of the material and assess the various elements of the genre which could be taken as evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. It is hard to justify this since the results would make little difference to the present argument. However I might note that in my judgment there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the author intended to compose an apocalypse. For an introduction to the text and English translation cf. F. Scheidweiler, "The Questions of Bartholomew," HNTA-I, 486-503.
On formal grounds all these texts can be classified as apocalypses since they narrate accounts of mediated revelations. The question, however, is whether the genre of these texts was actually based on or derived from the traditional apocalypse. The reason this is in doubt is that it is quite possible that this type of literature was created exclusively on the basis of traditions that Christ gave special teaching to the disciples in the post-passion period (Acts 1.3). The possibility that a literary genre which was structurally similar to the apocalypse could have been created on the basis of this tradition will be explored in chapter five.

The main interest of the subsequent discussion will be to identify elements of the genre which have been stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner. The identification of this kind of evidence is the only way to establish that the genre was in fact based on the traditional apocalypse. As will become clear there is very little of this type of evidence in these texts. There are several reasons for this situation. First, the narrative settings of each text have been shaped in light of canonical traditions about the post-passion period. This could account for the fact that there are virtually no elements in the narrative settings stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner. Second, the vast majority of Jesus' teaching is cast in the form of discourse and dialogue. As a revelatory medium direct discourse is less distinctive than visions or heavenly journeys. As a result it is more difficult to take the use of discourse and dialogue as a medium for Christ's revelations as positive evidence that the genre of these texts was based on the traditional apocalypse. Finally, several of the texts deal with
atypical themes and this in turn gives them a different character. However as will become clear from T.2-14a a consistently eschatological content is not a sure indication of the influence of the apocalypse. As a result of this combination of factors there is very little firm evidence that the genre of these texts was based on the traditional apocalypse. In fact this can only be established with a high degree of probability for The Apocalypse of Peter. While it is possible that the genre of the other texts was derived from the traditional apocalypse, there is insufficient evidence to establish that this is in fact the case.

APOCALYPSE OF PETER

The Apocalypse of Peter recounts a revelation which Christ gave to all the disciples on the eve of his ascension. The text is attributed to Peter since he is the principal interlocutor and the one who narrates the event/47/. In order to distinguish this Christian Apocalypse of Peter from the Gnostic Apocalypse of Peter the two texts will be abbreviated ChrApocPet and GnApocPet. Two quite different versions of ChrApocPet have survived: a Greek fragment and a complete Ethiopic translation. It is virtually certain that the Ethiopic text is much closer to the original than the Greek fragment/48/. The work is normally dated between about A.D. 135 and 150/49/, with a suggested provenance

47. This is the first apocalypse in which the revelation is given to a group. A distinctive feature of the narrative style is that the author vacillates between a first person singular and plural style (I/we: e.g. chpts 1, 2, 3, 15-17).
in either Egypt or Syria/50/.

While the revelation is set in the post-passion period, this is indicated for the first time in the concluding narrative setting (17). The introductory narrative setting is based on Mark 13.1ff (and parallels): Christ is seated on the Mount of Olives and his disciples come to ask about the signs of the Parousia:

"Make known unto us what are the signs of thy Parousia and the end of the world, that we may perceive and mark the time of thy Parousia and instruct those who come after us, to whom we preach the word of thy Gospel and whom we install in thy Church, in order that they, when they hear it, may take heed to themselves that they mark the time of thy coming."

This statement leads directly into the revelation which can be broken down into two parts. The first part (Chpt 1–14a) is a relatively coherent but loosely organized eschatological prophecy which focuses on penultimate events (1, 2, 5), the Parousia (1, 6), the separation of sinners and the righteous at the judgment (4, 6) and the respective destinies of sinners (major theme: 4, 5, 6, 7–12) and the righteous (minor theme: 13–14a). QrApQcEQt is best known for its correlation of specific sins with appropriate punishments (7–12). However this section is only a component part of a more comprehensive eschatological prophecy (1–14a). It is particularly noteworthy that the eschatological prophecy refers to a second century event as a sign that the

------------------------------------------------------------------------


49. Cf. Ch. Maurer, HNTA=II, 664; Vielhauer, Urchristliche Literatur, 508.

50. Maurer, HNTA=II, 664, and Vielhauer, Urchristliche Literatur, 508, favour an Egyptian provenance while Danielou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, 26, suggests a Syrian one.
eschatological era is imminent. Christ's interpretation of the flourishing of the fig tree is interpreted as a time when Israel will prosper as a nation and a leader will emerge who claims to be the Messiah and persecutes Christians (Chpt 2). It is likely that this is a reference to Bar Cochba/51/. The implication of this is that from the author's point of view the eschaton lies in the near future. However the imminence motif only occurs at this point in QarApocPat and on the whole it is a weak element.

It would appear from 14B that the revelation is coming to a close as Christ makes what seems to be a final statement to Peter in which Christ commissions him to undertake a missionary enterprise. However chapters 15-17 contain further revelations of a different character. This section has been closely modelled on the Transfiguration narratives. Elijah and Moses appear to the disciples (15) who then ask about the abode of the patriarchs and other 'righteous fathers'. They are then shown Paradise and it is implied that those persecuted for the sake of Christ will join the 'righteous fathers' in Paradise (16). The concluding narrative setting is provided by chapter 17 which describes Christ's ascension—an account influenced by both the Transfiguration narratives and Acts 1.9.

It is virtually certain that the genre of QarApocPat was based on the traditional apocalypse. However it is seldom appreciated that few elements of the text have been stylized in a strongly apocalyptic manner. The narrative settings in particular have been shaped in light of canonical traditions and contain no evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. The conclusion that the author was indebted to the traditional

51. Maurer, HNTA—II, 664.
apocalypse for his genre is based on three characteristics of the text: 1. the first person narrative style, 2. the use of visions as a revelatory medium in chapters 3 and 16, 3. the consistently eschatological content of the work. Taken individually these points could be interpreted in other terms and do not constitute strong evidence that the author based his genre on the apocalypse. However the combination of these elements provides sufficient evidence to conclude that ChráPọṣẹ̀ was composed as an apocalypse.

**Epistula Apostolorum**

The *Epistula Apostolorum* is an account of a revelation Christ gave the disciples in the context of his first encounter with them after his resurrection (Chpts 10-11)/52/. The text was written in the context of the conflict with Christian Gnosticism/53/. This is evident in the references to Simon and Cerinthus (Chpts 1, 7) and in the more general references to

---


53. M. Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum* (Berlin: 1965), 7, writes that "Der Zweck der Epistula ist, kurz gesagt, die Abwehr des Einbruchs der doketischen und antiapokalypischen Gnosis." He points out that the polemic is indirect in that it is accomplished through teaching orthodox doctrine: "Die *EpAp* ist eine Widerlegung der Gnostiker zur Befestigung der 'Katholiken'."
false teaching (29a, 45-50). The polemical setting can also be seen in the doctrinal expositions which are frequently formulated in response to Gnostic motifs. The text is thought to have been written in either Egypt or Asia Minor and to have been composed in the mid second century A.D/54/.

The account of Christ's revelation is cast within an epistolary setting. The disciples are represented as writing to the churches scattered throughout the world to warn them about the deceptions of Simon and Cerinthus and provide Christians with a reliable account of Christ's teaching (1-2). The epistolary introduction is followed by the disciples' doctrinal confession that focuses on an account of Christ's person and work (3-8). From chapter 9 this merges into an account of the post-passion encounter in which the main revelation is given (9-11: these chapters make extensive use of canonical Easter traditions). The setting is Christ's first encounter with the disciples after the passion (identified with events described in John 29.19-20).

After an introductory statement (12) Christ teaches the disciples in a combination of discourse and dialogue (13-50). The extensive body of teaching is loosely organized and frequently repetitious. However Christology, eschatology and ecclesiology represent the dominant concerns of the author/55/. The

54. Hornschuh, Epistula Apostolorum, has an extensive discussion of the text's provenance (99-115) and date (116-119). He favours an Egyptian provenance (though he recognizes that there is a strong case for a provenance in Asia Minor) and a date before 150. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, 361-402, argues for a provenance in Asia Minor and a date between 160 and 170.

concluding narrative setting includes a final statement and an account of Christ's departure which is identified with his ascension (51).

EpAp is frequently described as an apocalypse and it is clear that some scholars believe that the genre was based on the traditional apocalypse/56/. There is no doubt that EpAp can be classified as an apocalypse since the text is structured around a first person (plural) narrative account of a mediated revelation. However, it is not clear that the genre of this text was actually derived from the traditional apocalypse. There are two reasons for this uncertainty. In the first place it is possible that the genre of the text was shaped by Gnostic texts which recounted revelations of the risen Christ. This links the question of the genre of EpAp to that of the origins of the genre of these Gnostic texts/57/. Thus Vielhauer argues that since the genre of these Gnostic texts was not based on the traditional apocalypse, the same must be true of EpAp (see previous note). This is not necessarily the case since the author could have assimilated the genre to the traditional apocalypse. However there is another reason for questioning whether the apocalypse exercised a formative influence on this text. This is that there is virtually nothing in EpAp which is stylized in an explicitly "apocalyptic" manner. The narrative settings in particular have


57. Hornschuh, Epistula Apostolorum, 6-7, writes that "Der Verfasser unseres Apokryphons hat sich die von den Gnostiker geschaffene Form zu eigen gemacht...." Cf. Vielhauer, Urochristliche Literatur, 680-692; H. Koester, History and Literature, 237.
been heavily influenced by canonical Easter traditions. The only possible evidence of the influence of the apocalypse is Christ's introductory statement:

"Stand up and I will reveal to you what is on earth, and what is above heaven, and your resurrection that is in the kingdom of heaven, concerning which my Father has sent me, that I may take up you and those who believe in me."

The summary of the content of what is to be disclosed has formal parallels in the introductory statements of the traditional apocalypses. Hornschuh has noted that the references to things 'on earth' and in 'heaven' correspond to the content of Jewish apocalypses which focus on the disclosure of heavenly realities/58/. However the parallels are of a formal nature. They are not sufficiently specific to establish that the author intended to base his genre on the apocalypse.

THE TESTAMENT OF THE LORD

In its present form The Testament of the Lord recounts a revelation Christ gave to his disciples on two quite different themes: eschatology (I.3-14a) and 'church order' (I.19-II.24). The revelation is bracketed by frame stories which set the revelation in the post-passion period on the eve of Christ's ascension (Prologue; I.1-2; I.14b-18; II.25-27)/59/. The text is normally dated sometime in the fourth century with a suggested provenance in Asia Minor or Syria/60/.


The eschatological prophecy in chapters I.3-14a is attested independently of TLord as a whole. When this consideration is taken with the radical contrast between the content of the two parts of the text it seems very likely that this prophecy was once an independent literary work. This has been argued by J. Cooper who identified the original text as corresponding to I.2-14a/61/. In its present form this section has a limited introductory narrative setting (I.2) and no concluding frame story. It is likely, however, that the original narrative settings were replaced by the author of TLord with his own frame stories/62/. Cooper dates I.2-14 to the third century/63/. He argues that the present text was created with the addition of the 'church order' (I.19-II.24) and expanded narrative settings (Prologue; I.1; I.14b-18; II.25-27). This interpretation of the literary history of TLord has a great deal to commend it. The significance of this conclusion for the present study is that TLord provides two texts which recount revelations of the risen Christ: TLord I.2-14a (third century) and TLord I.1-II.27 (fourth century).

Taking the earlier text first, there is no firm evidence in TLord I.2-14a that this text was composed as an apocalypse. The revelation is given in a discourse medium and the narrative settings have been shaped in light of canonical traditions. It could be argued that the eschatological content points to the

60. Cooper, Ibid., 28-42 (date), 42-45 (provenance—favours Asia Minor).

61. Cooper, Ibid., 141-144.

62. Cooper, Ibid., 143, suggests that the narrative settings in other versions of I.2-14a may be the original narrative settings.

63. Cooper, Ibid., 144.
influence of the apocalypse. However this is not necessarily the case since the Gospels provide a precedent for Christ's setting forth extended eschatological prophecies (Mark 13 and par). It is possible that in the case of TLord I.2-14a the impetus for attributing extended eschatological prophecies to Christ came from these Gospel traditions. This possibility is supported by the similarities in structure and content between Mark 13 and TLord I.2-14a.

Evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the fourth century text, TLord, is also lacking. Many would not consider TLord as an apocalypse because of the atypical content of the material which the author has added to the eschatological prophecy (the 'church order')/64/. However in itself this is not a good reason since in principle an author could use the apocalypse as a literary medium for this kind of material. The real reason for withholding judgment as to whether the genre of TLord was based on the traditional apocalypse is that there is nothing in this text which has been stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner/65/.

64. Thus, for example, A.Y. Collins, Early Christian Apocalypses; 77f, classifies I.1-14 as an apocalypse but not the text as a whole. The reason is the non-eschatological content of the new material.

65. It could be argued that the author's description of Christ's revelation as a 'testament' (I.17, 18; II.26) suggests that the author did not intend to compose an apocalypse. However it must be kept in mind that designations of this sort are seldom a reliable guide to the genre of a text. In the case of TLord the designation 'testament' must be broadly understood since there is no other evidence that the author has based his genre on established testament genres.
Early Christian Apocalypses: Conclusion

The dominant impression which one gets from the early Christian apocalypses is the enormous diversity in form, content and function exhibited by these texts. This makes it difficult to identify trends in the way the apocalypse was taken over and used by early Christian writers. However this extreme diversity supports the definition of an apocalypse proposed in the previous chapter. It is evident from these early Christian apocalypses that one cannot define the apocalypse in terms of features like historical reviews, pseudonymity, symbolic visions, esotericism, eschatological content or a particular function. While all these elements are important features in at least some apocalypses, they do not represent the essential structural characteristics of the genre. The essential structural elements of the apocalypse are 1. the account of a mediated revelation and, 2. the narrative settings for that event. As was argued in the previous chapter an apocalypse is a literary work structured around a first person account of a mediated revelation.

While the early Christian apocalypses do not represent a homogeneous collection of texts, it is possible to make several observations about the use of this genre by early Christian writers. It is apparent that apart from Revelation the genre was not used as a medium for setting forth eschatological scenarios that were on the point of realization. There was also a decline in the use of symbolic visions and historical reviews as a medium for representing historical and eschatological events. It is evident that in both early and later Christian apocalypses direct discourse and heavenly journeys become the dominant revelatory
media. With respect to the content of early Christian apocalypses, *ShHermas* provides an example of how the apocalypse could be used for a thoroughly non-traditional content (to a lesser extent this is also true for *VisIsaiah*). However, the direction that Christian apocalypses would subsequently take is best illustrated by *ChrApocPet*. This text foreshadows the way that the genre would be used in later Christian apocalypses as a medium for: 1. generalized eschatological prophecies (i.e. not related to contemporary history) with a focus on 'signs', an interest in the 'Antichrist', and descriptions of the Parousia; 2. describing post-mortem punishments and rewards.

This study of early Christian apocalypses has also raised the problem posed by those texts in which revelations are attributed to the risen Christ. Christ's status as a heavenly revealer means that on formal grounds these texts can be described as apocalypses. The question, however, is whether the genre of the texts was in fact based on the traditional apocalypse. This problem will be given a thorough treatment in chapter five. It is instructive to note, however, that this is a problem for both orthodox and Gnostic texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ.
Collins' Typology of Apocalypses: An Evaluation

In a potentially influential study John Collins has argued that it is possible to identify six types of apocalypses /66/. This six-fold classification is applied not only to Jewish and Christian apocalypses, but also to Graeco-Roman, Gnostic and Iranian texts. The proposed typology can be given an initial test in light of the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses introduced thus far (though some mention will be made of Gnostic apocalypses).

Collins' typology is based on six combinations of three variables: the revelatory media, the type of eschatology and the use of an historical survey. The first division is between those apocalypses which employ a heavenly journey and those which use other revelatory media (I and II). The type of eschatology and the manner of its presentation are the basis for three identical sub-divisions within each section (A, B, C). The first group of texts (A) are described as 'historical apocalypses'. This means that they employ an historical review as a medium for casting historical and eschatological prophecies. The second group (B) are described as apocalypses with cosmic and/or political eschatology. The only apparent difference between these two categories is that in class B texts the eschatological prophecies are not set in the context of an historical review. The third group are those texts which contain only personal eschatology.

The six types can be outlined as follows:

**I. Revelatory Media: other than a heavenly journey**
A. Historical apocalypse, viz. one with an historical review
B. Apocalypse with cosmic and/or political eschatology but without historical review
C. Apocalypse with only personal eschatology

**II. Revelatory Medium: heavenly journey**
A. Historical apocalypse, viz. one with an historical review
B. Apocalypse with cosmic and/or political eschatology but without historical review
C. Apocalypse with only personal eschatology

While this is a neat classification of ancient apocalypses, it is doubtful that it has produced a meaningful grouping of texts in such a way that there is a genuine phenomenological similarity between the texts in each category. There are several reasons for this. One difficulty is that this approach assumes that since eschatology is such an important thematic element in every apocalypse, texts can be meaningfully classified according to the type of eschatology they contain (historical or personal) and the manner of its presentation (with or without an historical review). In reality eschatology is not the central theme of many of the texts classified as apocalypses in this volume of studies. This is particularly evident in the case of Gnostic apocalypses (e.g. GnApocPet; ApocAdam; NatArchons 92-32-97.21; ApocryJn; Zostrianos; ParShem). However there are also a cluster of Jewish and early Christian apocalypses in which eschatology is not the dominant theme of the revelation (I Enoch 72-82, III Baruch, II Enoch, ShHermas, AscIsa 6-11). Since Collins' topical categories for classifying apocalypses cannot take into account the dominant themes of these texts, they must be classified on the basis of the minimal eschatological material found in them. Another difficulty is that it is doubtful that four types of
apocalypses can be identified on the basis of whether or not eschatological prophecies are set in the context of an historical review/67/. However it may be that the most serious objection to this classification is that there is far too much variety in the form, content and function of ancient apocalypses to permit a meaningful classification on the basis of, in effect, two variables: the medium of revelation and the type of eschatology (the third variable is based on the way the eschatological prophecy is stylized—with or without an historical review).

In light of these problems with the proposed classification it does not come as a surprise that the application of this typology has produced extremely unsatisfactory results/68/. In virtually every category texts which are fundamentally dissimilar in terms of their structure, content and function have been grouped together on the basis of two or three formal elements/70/. Thus, for example, category 1B (historical eschatology without an historical review) contains such widely divergent texts as Revelation, ShHermas, ChrApocPet, The Gospel of ‘Mary’ and The Second Apocalypse of James/70/. Category IIB (heavenly journeys with historical eschatology but w/o historical

67. It is noteworthy that there are no clear examples of the IIA type. Collins, Morphology, 14–15, can only cite two examples: ApocAbraham and III Enoch. It was argued in the previous chapter that ApocAbraham 22–31 is not cast in the form of an historical review (cf. 53, note 60). With respect to III Enoch it is questionable whether this text should be classified as an apocalypse.

68. It is noteworthy that Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 126–139, and Attridge, Greek and Latin Apocalypses, 161–168, found it difficult to apply Collins’ typology and blended it with a typology of their own.

69. This can be easily seen on pp. 14–15 where the principal texts are grouped into the six categories. Two examples are given in the text.

70. Collins, Morphology of a Genre, 14.
review) contains texts like I Enoch 37-71, I Enoch 72-82, AscIsa 6-11, The Apocalypse of Paul (Christian), and The Paraphrase of Shem (Gnostic)/71/. While the examples could be multiplied, it should be apparent from these examples that Collins' typology has resulted in a grouping of extremely dissimilar texts. Furthermore there is at least one instance in which texts which have a great deal in common have been put in different categories. The Gnostic texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ are located in two categories: IB (2ApocJas, Pistis Sophia I-III, and GosMary) and IC (ApocryJn, SJc, and the rest).

It may be that it is possible to identify types of apocalypses (though this task does not lie within the scope of this study). However Collins' typology is much too mechanical in that it is based on fixed variables. It is likely that a successful classification of apocalypses would be one in which texts were grouped on the basis of characteristic elements which identify a group of apocalypses as belonging to a common type. These distinctive characteristics, in turn, would undoubtedly vary from one case to another. Thus, for example, it may be that some late Christian apocalypses could be grouped together because they deal with common themes (general eschatological predictions, descriptions of the Antichrist and a focus on post-mortem punishments and rewards). The attribution of revelations to the risen Christ could provide the basis for another grouping of Gnostic and perhaps some early Christian texts. It is arguable that there are a group of Jewish apocalypses which are related by elements of style, content and function (Daniel 7-12, I Enoch 85-90, IV Ezra, II Baruch). One consequence of this approach is

71. Collins, Ibid., 15.
that there will be individual texts which are so distinctive that they cannot be successfully included with a particular type of apocalypse. Among the early Christian apocalypses ShHermas would appear to be one such case. ShHermas is a unique apocalypse that is not closely related in form, content or function to other known apocalypses. While this flexible approach to the identification of types of apocalypses may not produce the well defined categories of Collins' typology, it is more likely to produce satisfactory results in that there will be a genuine similarity among texts within a particular group.
Chapter 3
The Revelations of the Risen Christ

As was pointed out in the introduction a significant number of Gnostic revelatory texts recount revelations which the risen Christ is supposed to have given one or more of his disciples. Two major hypotheses have been proposed to account for the present form of this literary genre. One is that the traditional apocalypse provided the literary models on which the genre was based. The other is that the genre was created under the influence of Greek and Latin dialogue genres. These two proposals and an additional hypothesis will be set forth and examined in the next two chapters. The present chapter will be devoted to an examination of the constituent elements of the genre itself.

At the outset it is necessary to settle on a designation for the genre and to determine which texts should be regarded as belonging to it. These two questions will be examined in turn.

In contemporary scholarship the texts have been characterized in a number of ways/1/. They have frequently been described as 'Gnostic Gospels'/2/. The rationale for this seems to be that they are functionally equivalent to the canonical
Gospels in that they represent Gnostic versions of Christ's teaching. The difficulty with this designation is that the use of the term 'Gospel' to designate both the canonical Gospels and these Gnostic revelations can mistakenly suggest that the two groups of texts belong to the same genre. A related problem is that this designation does not distinguish between this genre of apocryphal literature and those apocryphal Gospels whose form is more closely related to the canonical Gospels.

The texts have also been described as 'Gnostic Dialogues'. This is a more appropriate designation since it comes closer to describing the genre of the texts. However, one

1. The texts themselves do not employ a common nomenclature in either their titles or in descriptive terms within the text. In their present form seven of the nine texts have titles (the exceptions are ApocryJas and PetPhil). These titles use a variety of key words: δικαιοπληκτής (1ApocJas 24.10; 44.9f; 2ApocJas 44.11f); εγκαταστάσεως (GosMary 19.3f); Πράξις (The Book--ThCont 144.17); ἀποκρυφόν (ApocryJn 32.7-9); Αἵλορος (DialSav 120.1; 147.23); and ζωή (SJC 90.14; 119.18). A variety of descriptive terms are used within the material. 1ApocJas and 2ApocJas frequently use the word group δωμήτιον and ὑποτεκτίον (to reveal, disclose—cf. Crum, 812, 486f) to characterize Jesus' teaching as revelatory (e.g. 1ApocJas 25.6; 26.8; 29.12, 20; 30.2-3; 2ApocJas 46.7; 56.17, 21; cf. ApocryJn 16.3f, 24). ApocryJas uses the word ἀπόκρυφον to describe this type of text (1.10, 30f). This text also describes Jesus' teaching as a discourse (μισθωτικόν—1.28) and a revelation (κοπέλων ὑποστήριξις—16.4). The word group κόσμος (to teach) occurs in three texts: DialSav 129.24; 122.2; ApocryJn II.1, 1.1, 3; GosMary 17.14). ThCont describes Jesus' teaching as 'secret words' (Ῥωµικός ἐν Θνήτη 138.1; cf. GosThomas 32.10). It is evident from this diversity of terminology that there was not an established nomenclature for this literature.


difficulty with it is that the authors do not consistently employ a dialogue style. They frequently employ a pure discourse style and it is thus misleading to describe the texts simply as 'dialogues'. Another difficulty is that this designation does not take into account the basic character of the texts as revelations of the risen Christ to his disciples. While this is not a fatal objection, it does mean that the designation does not distinguish this genre from other Gnostic works employing a dialogue style (e.g. *NatArch* and *Zostrianos*)/5/. The best designation for the genre is one used in German literature: Gespräche Jesu (or--der Auferstandenen) mit seinen Jüngern/6/. This brings out the essential nature of the genre as Christ's revelations to his disciples and the word 'Gespräche' can encompass both dialogue and discourse styles. The problem with using this designation is that it is not easily translated as there is not a good English equivalent to 'Gespräche'.

For the purposes of this study the texts belonging to this genre will be designated 'Revelations of the Risen Christ'. This is a neutral expression which describes the essential character of the genre. However it is a cumbersome designation and thus the abbreviation RRC will be used in lieu of the full 'Revelations of the Risen Christ'.

A second introductory question is which texts should be regarded as belonging to this genre. One difficulty with answering this question is that there are distinctive features in

5. Perkins, *Gnostic Dialogue*, 19ff, treats the revelations of the risen Christ with other dialogue works like those mentioned in the text.

many individual texts. These distinctive characteristics could be taken as evidence that some of the texts were not composed on the basis of an acquaintance with mainstream examples of the genre. While this is a real possibility, there is insufficient evidence to determine the extent of a given author's acquaintance with previous examples of the genre. It thus seems best to classify texts on the basis of broad criteria and then identify the distinctive characteristics of individual texts. In the present study texts will be classified as RRC if they meet the following criteria: 1. they recount revelations which the risen Christ gave one or more of his disciples; 2. a narrative setting is provided for the revelation. On the basis of these criteria the following texts can be regarded as belonging to the genre:

- The Apocryphon of James I.2
- The Apocryphon of John II.1; III.1; IV.1;
  BG 8502.2
- Thomas the Contender II.7
- [The Dialogue of the Saviour III.5]
- The First Apocalypse of James V.3
- The Second Apocalypse of James V.4, 50.5-57.19
- The Epistle of Peter to Philip VIII,2
- The Gospel of Mary BG 8502.1
- Pistis Sophia I-III
- Pistis Sophia IV
  (The Books of Jeu)

Pistis Sophia IV and I-III and the Books of Jeu will not be a part of the main study as they are later examples of an established genre/7/. It will be noted that only part of 2ApocJas has been cited. This is because the text as a whole is not structured around an account of Christ's revelation to James. The work narrates a speech which James gave to a Jewish audience (46.6-60.23) and then describes his martyrdom (61.1-63.22).

7. Pistis Sophia I-III and IV will be mentioned at times for comparative purposes. The Books of Jeu do not stand in the mainstream of the genre as they lack a narrative setting—cf. Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 141f.
James' account of the revelation Christ gave him is part of his address to the Jews (50.5-57.19). This block of material has been included since it is structurally similar to the BEC. It could be argued that DialSay should not be included since it lacks the characteristic narrative setting—the text opens with Christ's introductory statement to the disciples (120.2-122.1). This lack of a conventional frame story sets the work apart from the other BEC. However DialSay will be included because the dialogue/discourse framework is similar to other examples of the genre.

In the studies of Rudolph, Koester and Perkins a number of other texts have been grouped with the BEC/8: GnApocPaul (Rudolph); The Second Treatise of the Great Seth (Koester); The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles (Perkins and Koester); and GnApocPet (Perkins and Koester). It is unlikely, however, that any of these texts should be included with the BEC. GnApocPaul stands within the literary tradition of the apocalypses structured around an ascension through the heavens/9/. While GrSeth is a revelation of the risen Christ, it lacks a narrative setting of any kind and it is not stated that the audience consisted of the historical disciples. ActPet12 is more closely related to the genre of the apocryphal Acts/10/. It might be argued that the disciples' second encounter with Christ (8.11-12.19) provides grounds for including either the entire

---


9. M. Krause, "Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi", AWWLE, 627, also disputes the inclusion of GnApocPaul with the BEC.

text or this pericope with the RRC. However this is unlikely in view of the stylistic dissimilarities between this account and the RRC. The case for including GnApocPet with the RRC is considerably stronger as the text recounts a special revelation which Christ is supposed to have given Peter. However there are two considerations which suggest that the author did not intend to write in the style of this Gnostic genre. One is that the revelation is not set in the post-passion period. If the author had wished to base his literary work on the RRC then it is likely that he would have chosen a post-passion setting and stylized the narrative framework accordingly. A second reason for not grouping GnApocPet with the RRC is the evidence that the author was more directly dependent on the traditional apocalypse for his literary genre. This evidence will be examined in the chapter devoted to this text. However the conclusion rests primarily on the use of both a first person narrative framework and interpreted visions as a revelatory medium. The present study will thus be based on the following texts:

ApocryJas
ApocryJn (references will be to II,1)
ThCont
SJC (references will be to III,4)
DialSay (references will be to III,5)
1ApocJas
2ApocJas 50.5-57.19
PetPhil
GosMary

The critical questions relevant to the date, religious and geographical provenance, literary history, social setting and function of these texts are not of direct relevance to this study/11/. In any case it is difficult to reach firm conclusions

11. A full bibliography on individual texts can be found in D. Scholer, Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1969 (Leiden: 1971) and the annual supplements in Novum Testamentum.
on many of these issues. However several general observations can be made. First, these texts are normally dated sometime between about A.D. 150-250. Second, with respect to most of the texts there is a consensus of opinion that they were written by Christian Gnostics. The Gnostic character of *ApocryJas* and *ThCont* has been questioned since these texts lack an explicit treatment of several typically Gnostic themes/12/. However this probably reflects the interests of the texts. There are certainly a significant number of Gnostic motifs in both texts/13/. Third, it is frequently claimed that literary sources were used in the composition of individual texts. The use of source material has been claimed for *ApocryJas*/14/, *ApocryJn*/*ThCont*/16/, *Sic/17/, *DialSay*/18/, *1ApocJas*/19/, *PetPhil*/20/, and


The use of literary sources is more likely in some cases than others. However this question has no bearing on the question of the origins of the genre.

The primary motivation for the composition of this literature was undoubtedly to provide dominical and apostolic authority for Gnostic doctrine. Rudolph has argued that these texts were used for instructional purposes within Christian...

17. This is the only case in which the source text has also survived—Eugnostos (III.4 and V.1). M. Krause's study provided the basis for the majority view that SJC is dependent on Eugnostos: "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi," JbAC, Ergänzungsband I., Ed. by A. Stuiber and A. Herman (Münster: 1964) 215-223. For a summary of earlier views cf. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, 111-114.


22. It is probable, though, that the use of literary sources can account for the artificial dialogue style found in several texts—esp. SJC.

23. Vielhauer, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur, 680, writes that the authors were endeavouring "...einerseits ihre 'Gnosis' als alte und echte Tradition auf Christus selbst zurückzuführen und andererseits zu erklären, warum sie anderen Christen unbekannt geblieben war." Apocryj Jas and ThCont have a more polemical character and it is likely that they had a more specific function within the communities for which they were written. cf. Turner, Thomas the Contender, 217-220, for one analysis of the function of this text within a proposed setting.
Gnostic communities/24/. This is a real possibility in view of the centrality of doctrinal exposition in most of the texts. However there is insufficient evidence to establish how this literature was actually used within Gnostic communities.

In her study of this literature Perkins has argued that the genre had a much more polemical function. She states that these texts were written and used in the context of the conflict between Christian Gnostics and the orthodox church/25/. She identifies three ways that the genre could be used for polemical or propagandistic purposes. First, the genre could be written as evangelistic tracts with a view to converting either orthodox Christians or pagan or Jewish Gnostics to Christian Gnosticism: Apocrypan is viewed as an evangelistic tract for orthodox Christians while it is suggested that Sim may have been written for pagan or Jewish Gnostics/26/. Second, the genre could be used to attack the non-ascetic ethic of orthodox Christians (ThCont and DialSay)/27/. Finally, the genre could have polemical and apologetical value insofar as it reassured Christian Gnostics that there was dominical authority for their doctrinal systems in spite of orthodox assertions to the contrary: Apocryphas, 1ApocJas, CosMary, PetPhil/28/.


25. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 25, 60, 67f, 80-82, and 157-162 for summaries of this view. The following is a representative statement: "...we conclude that the authority and popularity of the genre are dependent upon its use as a basic tool of Christian Gnostic propaganda." (162)


The starting point for this interpretation of the function of the RRC is the observation that the genre contains formulations of traditional Gnostic doctrine. It is inferred from this that the genre was not used either as a medium for speculative explorations in Gnostic theology or for elementary expositions of Gnostic doctrine. The key to the real function of the genre is then found in the appeal to dominical and apostolic authority. This is taken as evidence that the actual function of the genre was to reassure Christian Gnostics that, contrary to the assertions of the orthodox, there was dominical authority for Gnostic doctrine/29/. However the genre did not simply serve this apologetical function. These texts could also be used as evangelistic tracts (ApocryPh and SJC) and as a medium for a direct attack on orthodox traditions. ThCont and DialSav are singled out as the most polemical texts in that they attack the non-ascetic ethic of the orthodox. However there is an attempt to identify polemical elements in the other texts as well/30/.

In most of these texts there is very little that is explicitly polemical. However this is not regarded as a real difficulty since the choice of subject matter is given a polemical significance. It is argued that the authors choose the material which they would invest with dominical authority on the basis of the most important issues dividing them from the orthodox/31/.


29. The juxtaposition of this negative and positive argument can be found on pp. 36, 37, 59f, 73.

30. For polemical elements in other texts cf. *Gnostic Dialogue*, 93f (ApocryPh), 97f (SJC), 122ff (PetPhil) 141 and 144 (1ApocJas), 133ff (GosMary), 145ff (ApocryPh). Many of the features which Perkins identifies are at best elements which could be given a polemical significance—they are not explicitly polemical.
The argument that the RRC had apologetical value for Christian Gnostics is undoubtedly correct. However, with the exception of ThCont and ApocryJas, it is doubtful that they were as strongly shaped by polemical considerations as is argued/32/. If this literature was regarded as having a polemical function then it is reasonable to expect that the material would have a more pronounced polemical tone. In those RRC and other Christian Gnostic documents which have a clear polemical character the texts contain either direct attacks on the opposition or formulations of doctrine in reaction to orthodox theology (ThCont, GnApocPet, The Testimony of Truth, ApocryJas, cf. EnAp)/33/. Apart from ThCont and ApocryJas this kind of direct polemical attack is totally lacking in the RRC. It is doubtful that the relatively few elements in the narrative setting or teaching which could be given a polemical significance justify the characterization of the genre as a whole as a polemical literature. It thus seems probable that this interpretation of the function of the genre has greatly exaggerated the polemical character of the literature/34/.

---

31. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 60: "What the contents of these revelations do show us are the doctrines which Gnostics felt to be at issue between themselves and their opponents. They indicate those teachings that it was necessary to invest with all the authority of the guardians of the tradition."

32. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 90 and 103, noted that the genre did not have a polemical character.


34. The credibility of the hypothesis also suffers from the way the polemical and apologetical functions of several texts are interpreted. It is hard to see, for example, that there is any evidence to support the view that ApocryJn and SLG are evangelistic tracts designed to convert others to Christian Gnosticism. It is also unlikely that DialSaw can be seen as a critique of orthodox ethics and the promotion of an ascetic ethic.
GENRE ANALYSIS

The rest of this chapter will be devoted to a study of the various elements of this genre. This will be done by examining the structure of the narrative settings, the use of discourse and dialogue, and the esoteric elements which are found in several texts.

It is important to stress at the outset that the structure of the RRC is extremely simple\(^{35}\). An introductory and concluding frame story or narrative setting set the context for Christ's teaching in either a discourse or dialogue medium (or both)\(^{36}\). Generalizations as to the characteristic features of the narrative settings are often based on those texts which have a dramatic and often extensive narrative setting. In this respect ApocryJn and SJC are the favourite texts\(^{37}\). The problem is that some of the generalizations are only true for a minority of the texts. In the following analysis an attempt will be made to assess the importance of the different elements in light of their distribution in the extant literature. It is quite possible, of course, that if a different set of texts had

---


36. The similarities and differences between the literary structure and narrative settings of the RRC and the traditional apocalypses will be spelled out in chapter 5. The main interest of this chapter is to examine the RRC on its own terms.

37. Cf. Puech, Gnostic Gospels, 320f, 246, 253, and Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 26-32, 37-58, for examples of generalizations based to a large extent on these two texts. Koester, One Jesus, 194, refers to the features of the narrative setting of ApocryJn as 'typical elements'.
survived then one would reach different conclusions about the importance of individual elements.

**GENRE ANALYSIS: NARRATIVE SETTINGS**

The account of Christ's encounter with the disciples is set within a narrative framework which embraces both the frame story and the account of Christ's teaching. This narrative framework is cast in either a first or third person style (or both). In most cases a third person style is employed, i.e. the text is not written from the perspective of one of the participants: *SJC, ThCont, DialSav, 1ApocJas, PetPhil, GosMary/38*. Apart from *ThCont* and *1ApocJas* the third person style is not explained by an account of who wrote the text. According to *ThCont* 138.1ff Matthaias (Matthew) was the one who recorded the conversation that took place between Jesus and Thomas. In the case of *1ApocJas* the third person style is explained by the account of the transmission of the material and its ultimate publication. At 36.13-38.8 Jesus instructs James that he is to disclose the revelations to someone named Addai. Addai is then to write them down and transmit the text to a person named Levi, whose younger son will ultimately give the text a wider circulation. Thus the

38. There are three statements in the first person in *1ApocJas* (24.11; 25.12; 27.18). There is no apparent explanation for this use of the first person in a text which is dominated by a third person style. *GosMary* 10.10-17.7 is cast in the first person as Mary relates to the other disciples a revelation which Christ had given her at an earlier time. However this first person style is subordinate to the third person narrative framework of the text as a whole. The use of a first person narrative style contrasts with the first person narrative style of the Jewish apocalypses. Cf. the discussion of this difference in chapter 5, 181ff.
third person narrative framework is explained by the claim that Addai composed the text on the basis of what James told him.

Three texts employ a predominantly first person narrative style: ApocryJaD, ApocryJaN, 2ApocJa5 50.5-57.19. The pericope in 2ApocJa5 represents a special case in that the first person style can be attributed to the setting of this account in James' address to a Jewish audience. The first person narrative style of ApocryJaD is due to the epistolary setting of the text (1.1-35; 16.12-30). James is represented as responding to a request from an individual for an account of Christ's special revelation (1.8-35). Within this epistolary setting James recounts a revelation which Christ gave to Peter and himself.

In the case of ApocryJaN most of the text uses a first person narrative style—though part of the frame story is cast in the third person. In the long version most of the introductory frame story (II.1, 1.17b-2.26a) and the entire account of Christ's teaching (II.1, 2.26b-31.31) are cast in a first person narrative framework. This makes sense in light of Christ's instruction that John is to write an account of what he has been taught and circulate it in the Gnostic community (31.28-31). However part of the introductory frame story (1.1-17a) and the entire concluding frame story (31.32-32.5) are cast in the third person. It is likely that this use of a third person style is due to a subsequent redaction of the original narrative setting. This has obviously happened with the concluding frame story of the long version. The narrative setting of the short version has not only been expanded, but material which was cast in the first person in the short version has become part of the third person narrative framework in the long version—Jesus' curse on those who peddle
accounts of the revelation for material gain is part of the first
person narrative framework in the short version (BG 76.9-15)
while it is cast in the third person in the long version (II.1;
31.34-37). Since the short version is the earliest extant one it
is difficult to prove that there was an even earlier expansion of
the narrative framework/39/. However the use of both a first and
third person narrative style in the concluding frame story might
suggest that there was an expansion of an earlier version of the
narrative setting (BG 76.5-15a; 76.15b-77.5). The break between
the first and third person narrative styles in the introductory
frame story does not at first sight suggest that it was due to a
subsequent redaction. The section starting with a first person
narrative style (20.4ff) appears to be integrally related to the
earlier part of the frame story (19.6-20.3): John's troubled
state of mind (20.4ff) is attributed to a Pharisee's accusation
that John's faith is ill-founded (19.10-20.3). However it is
possible that the Pharisee's challenge was not part of the
original frame story. It may be that the original introductory
frame story began with John posing a series of questions (20.7ff)
and that these questions were subsequently given a more specific
setting with the story of John's encounter with the Pharisee.
The incongruity between John's questions (20.7ff) and the
challenged posed by the Pharisee (19.13ff) could be interpreted
in this way. On this interpretation the original version of
ApocryphJn would have been composed in the first person
(corresponding to about BG 20.5-76.15a). The third person
narrative framework in the introductory and concluding frame
story would be the work of a subsequent redactor (19.6-20.3;

39. It should be pointed out that there is a minority view that
the long version of ApocryphJn is the earliest: S. Giversen,
While it is impossible to substantiate this reconstruction, it is at least a plausible explanation of this combination of a first and third person narrative framework in ApocryJn.

In summary, a third person narrative framework is employed in most of the RRC. ApocryJas and ApocryJn employ a first person narrative style. While 2ApocJas also uses a first person style, this is due to the setting of this pericope in James's address.

As has been pointed out the accounts of Christ's teaching are normally bracketed with an introductory and concluding frame story. Six of the nine texts have a complete introductory and concluding narrative setting (ApocryJas, ApocryJn, SJC, PetPhil, 1ApocJas, 2ApocJas)/40/.

Most of the introductory frame stories have a common structure: they create a context for Christ's encounter with the disciples, bring Christ on the scene and then provide a transition to the teaching itself. ThCont and DialSay do not follow this pattern since they open with Christ and the disciples together/41/.

A context for the revelatory event can be built up with references to details as to the time, occasion and location for

40. GosMary would probably be included with this group if the first half of this text had survived because the concluding frame story is so similar to the main group of texts. ThCont has an atypical introduction and no concluding narrative setting. The brief statement describing the work contains a minimal circumstantial setting (138.1-4). This is followed by an introductory dialogue (138.4-36). DialSay lacks any frame story though Christ does make an introductory statement (120.2-122.1)

41. This is also true for the first part of 1ApocJas (24.11). Cf. Pistis Sophia I.1.
Christ's encounter with the disciples. In most texts the revelations are set in the post-passion period. A pre-passion setting is employed for the first part of 1ApocJas (24.11-30.12) and possibly for Mary's account in the second part of GosMary (10.10-17.7). The post-passion setting is only implicit in the cases of ThCont and DialSay/42/. The temporal setting within the post-passion period varies from text to text. In the case of SIC, 1ApocJas and perhaps ApocryIn Christ's encounter with the disciples is regarded as the first since the passion. The author of ApocryJas represents the event he describes as taking place 550 days after the passion and on the eve of Christ's ascension (2.19-20; 15.5ff)/43/. The reference to other accounts of Christ's esoteric teaching in ApocryJas suggests that the author believed that Christ had taught his disciples on more than one occasion during this 550 day period (1.28ff; 2.7ff)/44/. The commission elements in Christ's concluding statements in SIC, PatPhil, GosMary and ApocryIn suggest that these events were regarded as Christ's final encounter with the disciples/45/. However with the exception of ApocryJas, none of these texts employs an explicit ascension theology. Christ's departure is described with a simple 'he disappeared' or 'he departed'. In the case of ThCont, 2ApocJas and DialSay the timing of the event in the post-passion period is not specified.

42. Cf. ThCont 138.21-23; DialSay 121.5-9.

43. The forty days of Acts 1.3 has been extended to 550 days in ApocryJas (close to the 18 months cited in AdvHaer I.3.2 and I.30.14 and the 545 days of AscJas 9.16) and eleven years in Pistis Sophia I.1.

44. This is also the assumption of Pistis Sophia I.1.

45. SIC (III,4) 119.1-8; GosMary 8.12-9.4; PatPhil 137.17-138.3; ApocryIn (II,1) 31.25ff.
The occasion and setting for Christ's encounter with the disciples varies from text to text. In *ApocryJas* the disciples are writing accounts of Christ's public and esoteric teaching (2.7-21). According to *SJC* the disciples and women go to a mountain in Galilee where they raise a number of metaphysical questions (90.14-91.9). In *ApocryJn* John withdraws to a desert after a Pharisee tells him that he has been deceived by Christ (II.1; 1.5-29). In the second part of *1ApocJas* James has been with his disciples grieving over what has happened to Christ (30.13-32.12). The author of *2ApocJas* has James sitting at home reflecting on some unspecified subjects (50.5ff). According to *PetPhil* Peter gathers the disciples and takes them to the Mount of Olives where they pray for power to face their persecutors (132.12-134.9). It is apparent that there is a great deal of variety in the selection of settings for the revelatory event. The one motif that recurs in many of these texts is a reference to the disciples' anxiety or perplexity. In *1ApocJas* it is Christ's sufferings which trouble James and his disciples (30.13ff). The cause of James' reflections in *2ApocJas* is not specified (50.5ff). In most cases unanswered questions are the cause of the disciples' distress (*SJC* 91.3ff; *ApocryJn* 1.12-29, *ThCont* 138.4ff; *PetPhil* 133.17ff; cf. *GosMary* 8.6ff)/46/. *ApocryJn* provides the most dramatic example of this motif. After being challenged by a Pharisee, John goes into the desert and raises a number of questions:

"When I John heard these things, I turned away from the temple to a desert place, and I became greatly grieved and said in my heart, 'How then was the savior chosen and why was he sent into the world by his Father, and who is his Father who sent him, and of what sort is that aeon to which we shall go? For what did he mean when he said to us, 'This aeon to

46. This motif is not present in *ApocryJas* and *DialSay*. 
which you will go is a type of the imperishable aeon,' but he did not teach us concerning that one of what sort it is." (II.1, 1.17-29)

In four texts the place where Christ meets the disciples is specified. In 2ApooLaas Christ meets James in his home (50.5ff). In the other three texts a mountain is the locus of the revelatory event. In the short version of ApocryfIn (BG 20.5ff) and PetPhil (133.13-17) Christ meets them on the Mount of Olives/47/. In SIC the disciples go to a mountain in Galilee called 'Place of Harvest-Time and Joy' (90.19ff)/48/. The location of the mountain in 1ApooLaas is not mentioned (called 'Gaugelan'--30.20).

Having built up a context for the revelatory event, Christ is then brought on the scene. The descriptions of Christ's entry can be either simple statements of fact or highly dramatic accounts. ApocryfJas, 1ApooLaas and 2ApooLaas describe Christ's coming in matter of fact terms/49/. Christ's entry in ApocryfJas is typical of this undramatic entrance:

"Now when the twelve disciples were all sitting together and recalling what the Savior had said to each one of them...lo, the Savior appeared, after he had departed from us, and we had waited for him. And after five hundred and fifty days since he had risen from the dead, we said to him, 'Have you departed and removed yourself from us?'" (2.7-22)

In three texts Christ's entry has a more dramatic character:

ApocryfIn, SIC and PetPhil/50/. In the account in ApocryfIn Christ's entry is accompanied by cosmic disturbances and he

47. This is probably a reflection of the tradition that Christ taught the disciples on the Mount of Olives cf. Mark 13.2 and parallels. The long versions of ApocryfIn drop the reference to the mountain and just mention a desert (II.1, 1.19).

48. Cf. Mk 16.7; Mt 28.7, 16ff.

49. ApocryfJas 2.17-19; 1ApooLaas 31.20; 2ApooLaas 50.5ff.
appears in the light as a polymorphous being:

"Straightway, while I was contemplating these things, behold the heavens opened and the whole creation which is under heaven shone and the world was shaken. And I was afraid and behold I saw in the light a youth who stood by me. While I looked at him he became like an old man. And he changed his form again becoming like a servant. There was not a plurality before me, but there was a likeness with multiple forms in the light, and the forms appeared through each other and the likeness had three forms." (II.1, 1.30-2.9)

The author of SJC does not present such a dramatic account, but he does emphasize Christ's luminous appearance:

"The Savior appeared not in his first form, but in the invisible spirit. And his form was like a great angel of light. And his likeness I must not describe. No mortal flesh can endure it, but only pure and perfect flesh..." (91.10-17)

In the case of PetPhil Christ speaks to the disciples from a great light which appears on the mountain (134.9-18; 138.3-7)/51/.

The disciples' response to Christ's entry is another recurring feature in these frame stories. In ApocryJn (2.1, 10f) and SJC (91.23f) the disciples experience fear when confronted with Christ's supernatural appearance. In 2ApocJas (50.11-16) the apparent cause of James' fear is that Christ addresses him as his brother. James responds with joy to Christ's coming in

50. Puech, Gnostic Gospels, 321, writing in relation to ApocryJn suggests that these dramatic accounts are standard features of the genre. Evans, Jesus in Gnostic Literature, 408, also states that a 'luminous apparition' is a 'typical' element. This is clearly not the case as this element only occurs in three texts. In related literature dramatic accounts of Christ's entry are absent from ChrApocPet, EpAp, TLord and Pistis Sophia IV. Christ's appearance is described in supernatural terms in Pistis Sophia I.2-6. However in this text the motif is not part of Christ's initial encounter with the disciples.

51. This would appear to be based on the Transfiguration narratives in Mark 9.2ff and parallels. In addition to the accounts mentioned in the text of the more extensive account of Christ's coming in light in Pistis Sophia I.4-6.
1ApocJas (31.4ff). Christ's coming is met with a question in ApocryJas (2.22). PetPhil is the only text in which the disciples do not respond in some way to Christ's coming.

The final ingredient in the introductory frame story is the transition to the teaching. In a few texts the disciples take the initiative with a statement or question. This provides the starting point for Christ's response and the transition to the main revelation: ApocryJas 2.21ff, 1ApocJas 31.5ff, and GosMary 10.12ff. In the rest of the texts the initiative lies with Christ. This is especially evident in those texts which attribute an introductory discourse to Christ and have the disciples say little or nothing in response: ApocryJn 2.9-26, DialSay 120.2ff, 2ApocJas 51.2-19. In another group of texts Christ takes the initiative with either a short discourse or question that elicits a response from the disciples. The result is an introductory discourse/dialogue: SJC 91.20-93.24, ThCont 138.4-39, PetPhil 134.13-135.8/52/.

The introductory frame stories are normally complemented with a concluding frame story. These are normally short and contain one or more of the following elements: (1) Christ's final statement; (2) a reference to Christ's departure; (3) an

52. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 52-55, argues that in this literature there was a standard or ideal introductory discourse attributed to the heavenly revealer which consisted of three parts: (1) a rebuke of the individual; (2) 'I Am' statements identifying the heavenly revealer; (3) a statement of purpose. This 'model' address is in fact based on the introductory statement in ApocryJn (II.1, 2.9-25). The content, order and stylization of these elements are not found in Christ's introductory statements in the other RNC. Compare the statement in ApocryJn with the following: ApocryJas 2.23-39, ThCont 138.4-20, SJC 91.20-93.24, DialSay 120.2-121.2, 1ApocJas 24.11-25.9 and 31.14-32.23, 2ApocJas 51.2-19, PetPhil 134.15-135.8, GosMary 10.10ff.
account of the disciples' response and subsequent activity.

In most of the texts Christ makes a final statement to the disciples/53/. The only recurring pattern is that in several instances the disciples are commissioned to undertake missionary activity: SJC 119.1-8; PetPhil 137.20-138.3; GosMary 8.21-9.4. Jesus speaks about James' future mission in 1ApocJas 40.9ff but there does not appear to be an explicit missionary commission in this statement/54/. The rest of the material in these concluding statements does not fall into a pattern. In ApocryJas Jesus announces his impending ascension and pronounces a blessing on future believers (14.20-15.5). Jesus also states that he is about to depart in ApocryJn but in this case also tells John that he is to transmit these revelations to fellow Gnostics (31.25-31). In addition to the missionary commission in SJC, Jesus also summarizes the purpose of his earthly mission (118.3-25).

Having made his final statement Christ can then be taken from the disciples. In most cases this involves nothing more than a simple statement of fact such as 'he disappeared' or 'he departed' (ApocryJn 32.3; SJC 119.10; GosMary 9.5; cf. PetPhil 138.6). ApocryJas is the only text which has an extended account of Christ's departure. This is identified with his ascension and

53. Cf. ApocryJas 14.19-15.5; ApocryJn 31.25-31; DialSay 146.18-147.22 (fragmentary); 1ApocJas 40.9-41.18 (fragmentary); PetPhil 137.17-138.3; SJC 118.3-119.8; GosMary 8.14-9.5.

54. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 57, overstates the case when she asserts that "Commissioning of the recipients is a constant feature of the final narrative." In spite of a broad definition of commissioning to include instructions to disclose the revelation to others or to undertake a pastoral role, there are still no formal commissions in the concluding statements of ApocryJas, 2ApocJas, DialSay, Pistis Sophia IV and I-III.
Peter and James are enabled to accompany Christ through several levels of the heavenly world before they are returned to the disciples (15.6-28)/55/.

A final element which can be incorporated in the concluding frame stories is an account of the disciples' response to the revelation and their subsequent activity/56/. Four texts refer to the disciples' psychological response: SIC (joy--119.10ff); 2ApocJas (understanding, fear and joy--57.17ff); PatPhil (thanksgiving and joy--138.7ff; 139.4f); GosMary (grief and anxiety--9.5ff). In three texts the disciples disperse to preach (PatPhil 139.6ff; GosMary 18.21ff; SIC 119.14ff). In two instances the disciples relate what Christ has told them to their fellow disciples (ApocJas 15.28ff; ApocJn 32.4f).

It is apparent from this examination of the constituent elements of the narrative settings that while a common structure underlies most of them, there are numerous variations in the shaping of individual elements. These revelations are firmly set in the post-passion period and, as a result, the influence of canonical resurrection traditions can be seen in the shaping of the narrative settings—a point which will be taken up in chapter five.

55. Christ's departure is also described as an ascension in ChrApocPet and EpAP.

56. Cf. ApocJas 15.29-16.11; ApocJn 32.4-5; 1ApocJas 42.21ff (fragmentary); 2ApocJas 57.17-19; PatPhil 138.7ff; GosMary 9.5ff.
As has been pointed out the narrative settings bracket Christ's teaching. This teaching in turn is cast in the form of discourse and/or dialogue/57/. It is important to examine the distribution and stylization of this material since the hypothesis that Graeco-Roman dialogue genres provided the literary models for the ERG rests to a large extent on the alleged similarities in dialogue styles.

In view of the frequent description of the ERG as 'dialogues', it is surprising to discover that the authors often make use of a pure discourse style. Most of Christ's teaching is cast in discourse form in 2ApooJas, ApornyIn and Aponylas. All of Christ's teaching is cast in discourse form in 2ApooJas. In the case of ApornyIn the author has presented the theogony, cosmogony and account of the origins and early history of mankind in a continuous discourse (II.1, 2.26-25.16; 27.33-30.11). It could be argued that the discourse is given in response to 1. the questions John asks in his troubled state of mind before Christ appeared (1.12-29) and, 2. to John's request for instruction on the points Christ says he will teach John (2.25f; cf. 2.16-25). However the list of questions is simply part of the frame story and they do not set the thematic agenda for the discourse. John's request (2.25f) is cast in indirect speech as an account of his response to Christ's introductory statement. Thus neither

57. Puech, Gnostic Gospels, 320, suggests that there were two types of 'Gnostic Gospels'—one employing a discourse and the other a dialogue style. However it is impossible to classify these texts on this basis since a significant number employ a combination of discourse and dialogue styles (ApornyIn, ApornyIn, ThCont, DialSy, and 1ApooJas).
of these elements provides a genuine dialogue setting for the discourse. However the author has introduced a limited amount of dialogue material into the discourse. In the account of the origins and early history of mankind he has inserted a series of three parenthetical questions and answers (13.17-26; 22.9-15; 22.21-28). In each case the questions and answers interrupt the flow of the discourse and do not set the thematic agenda for the exposition which follows up to the next question. John asks a question about an aspect of something that Christ has just said (13.17f; 22.9-11; 22.21f), Christ answers the question (13.18-26; 22.12-15; 22.22-28) and then resumes his discourse. This parenthetical use of questions and answers suggests that the author has added new material to his original source with the use of dialogue/58/. At 26.16 the discourse is interrupted by a series of six questions and answers on a somewhat different theme (25.16-27.13). However it would appear that the author returned to his source material at 27.33 (27.33-30.11). There are two reasons for viewing 27.33-30.11 as a continuation of the earlier discourse. In the first place this section picks up the story of the early history of mankind where it left off at 25.16. Furthermore this section is introduced with a question (27.31f) which is loosely related thematically to the material that follows. It seems that after interrupting the flow of the discourse with a series of questions and answers on the fate of the soul, the author returns to his source material with the help of a contrived transitional question. It would thus appear that the author has cast the majority of his source material in the form of a continuous discourse (2.26-25.16; 27.33-30.11). He has introduced a dialogue element with a series of three

parenthetical questions (13.17ff; 22.9ff; 22.21ff) and with a transitional question which enables him to return to his source material after a dialogue section on the fate of the soul (27.31ff). The short versions of ApocryPh break off at the end of the account of the early history of mankind (BG 75.10). However in the long versions an additional statement is attributed to Christ in which he describes his redemptive activity throughout history in the form of a first person discourse (II.1, 30.11-31.25).

ApocryPh also makes extensive use of a discourse style. This is particularly evident in the largest block of material extending from 7.10-13.25. This discourse covers a wide range of topics but is neither introduced nor interrupted with questions. It is only broken up at two points with narrative accounts of the disciples' emotional responses to Christ's discourse (joy--11.6-10; distress--12.18). While these narrative references mark transitions in the discourse, they cannot be seen as introducing a genuine dialogue element. The beginning of Christ's teaching also starts with a discourse style (2.40ff). However the section from 2.40-6.20 is interspersed with three statements in which Peter or James comment on what Christ has been saying (3.38ff; 4.23ff; 5.35ff). The second and third statements effect a shift in the theme of the discourse. However these statements are loosely related to Christ's response so that the section extending from 2.40-6.20 has more of a discourse than a dialogue character. The only two pericopes in ApocryPh which are cast in a true dialogue framework are 6.21-7.10 and 13.25-14.19 (Peter's concluding question).
There are also significant blocks of discourse material in ThCont, DialSav and 1Apostas. In the case of ThCont the second half of the text is cast in discourse form (143.8-145.16). This discourse consists of a series of woes and blessings and is unusual in that it is addressed directly to the intended recipients—a plural 'you' is used throughout/59/. The central revelation in the second part of 1Apostas is also cast in discourse form. In 32.28-36.13 Christ explains how the soul can successfully ascend through the heavenly world—the discourse concludes with instructions as to the transmission of the revelation (36.13-38.11). James had asked for this teaching during his encounter with Christ before the passion (27.13-17; 28.29-29.3). However in its immediate context this section is not introduced with fresh questions from James. Finally, in DialSav there is a block of discourse material at the beginning of the text in which Christ explains how the soul can successfully ascend through the heavenly world after death (122.1-124.22).

It is apparent that these texts make extensive use of a pure discourse style. The material in Apostas, Apostas and 2Apostas is cast primarily in discourse form. There are also significant blocks of discourse material in ThCont and 1Apostas.

59. One of the distinctive features in the narrative style of ThCont is the use of plural pronouns (we/you—plural). As has been noted the woes and blessings employ a plural 'you'. In the dialogue section the author vacillates between using singular and plural pronouns (I/we; you/you-pl.). In two blocks of material Thomas speaks in the first person singular while Christ addresses him in the second person singular (I/you: 138.4-20; 142.3-18). However in the rest of the dialogue first and second person plural forms are used (we/you-pl.—cf. 138.24-36; 138.36-139.12; 139.12-31; 140.5-18; 141.2-6; 141.19-26; 142.18-32). In two instances I and we are used in the same statement (139.12ff; 140.5ff), and on one occasion Thomas uses the singular 'I' while Christ responds with a plural 'you' (138.24ff).
Even DialSay has a lengthy discourse. SJC and PetPhil are the only texts which do not employ a discourse medium/59a/.

The RRC are better known for their use of dialogue. While the authors of these texts make extensive use of a dialogue medium, it is remarkable how different the dialogue styles are in the various texts. The small block of dialogue material in ApocryJn (II.1, 25.16-27.31) can be taken as a starting point in that it is the type of dialogue which one might expect would be typical of the genre as a whole. This block of material consists of six question-answer exchanges on the fate of the soul at death. There are several characteristic features of this style: 1. the questions guide the exposition of the material in that they set the agenda for Christ's responses; 2. the answers respond directly to the question and do not develop into a wide ranging exposition of related subjects; 3. the subject in question is systematically presented. The first two points are particularly important. In this dialogue style the initiative in developing the theme lies with the questioner who poses a series of questions which, in turn, are given a direct answer. The result is a thematic unity between question and answer. This style is employed in the dialogue exchanges of several other texts/60/. However most of the texts employ a somewhat different dialogue style.

In the case of ThCont the first section is cast in a series of nine exchanges between Christ and Thomas (138.36-143.8).

59a. On SJC see subsequent discussion.

60. E.g. ApocryJas 6.21-7.21; GosMary BG 7.10-20; PetPhil 137.13-25; cf. DialSay where the questions normally define the issue to which the answers respond. However the subject matter is not systematically organized in this text.
However in contrast to the dialogue style in *Apocryphal Thomas*, questions seldom pose well defined problems to which Christ gives a direct answer. In most cases there is a loose thematic relationship between Thomas' statement or question and Christ's response. This can be illustrated by the first and last exchanges. After the introductory dialogue Thomas makes a general request for teaching which does not clearly identify the issue to which Christ will speak: "Tell us about these things that you say are not visible, but hidden from us." (138.36-39) Christ then makes an extended statement on the nature of man (138.39-139.12). In the case of the last question Thomas asks how they can preach Christ's message in a world which views these ideas with contempt (142.18-26). Instead of answering the actual question, Christ describes the eschatological punishments to be experienced by those who respond contemptuously to his message (142.26-143.8). In another four cases there is a slightly closer thematic relationship between the question and answer. However in each case Christ responds briefly to the question and then discourses on some other aspect of the subject or introduces a new theme. Thus, for example, at 141.2ff Thomas asks if it is good for Gnostics to 'rest among our own?' Christ answers that it is (141.4-6) and then describes the destiny of those who have indulged their bodily desires and abandoned their faith (141.6-18). This pattern is present in the following exchanges: 139.22-140.5; 140.5-37; 141.19-142.2. There are only three instances in which Thomas' question poses a reasonably well defined problem to which Christ gives a direct answer (140.12-31; 142.37-141.2; 142.3-18). One consequence of this dialogue style is that Thomas does not appear to have the initiative in guiding the exposition of the material with his questions. Christ
introduces most of the teaching without reference to a question which defines the issue to which he will speak.

1Apocz contains two blocks of dialogue material: 24.12-30.13 and 38.12-41.18. The second section will be set aside as it is exceptionally fragmentary. The distinctive characteristic of the exchanges in the first section is that Christ guides the exposition of the theme and James simply responds to ideas which Christ has introduced. After making an introductory statement (24.12-19) Christ begins the main exposition without reference to a question from James (24.19-25.9). There then follows a series of six exchanges (25.10-30.6). In each case James' statement or question is based on what Christ has just said. Christ responds to what James says and then introduces new ideas which in turn provide the basis for another statement from James/61/. The result is that James' statements respond to Christ's teaching rather than set the agenda for it. While this is similar to ThCont, in 1Apocz there is a closer thematic relationship between question and answer.

The author of PetPhil has not used a series of alternating questions and answers to present his material. Instead the disciples ask a series of six questions (134.20-135.2) and the

61. The first question, 25.10-12, is based on the statement that the archons will seize Christ (25.7-9). The second and third questions, 26.2-5 and 26.13-15, are based on the teaching on the archons (25.21-26.1; 26.10-13). The fourth question, 27.13-17, is based on statements about James' redemption (27.1-12). The fifth exchange is structured around a cluster of questions (28.5-29.3) which are based on the statement that the hostility of the archons is in the main directed against Christ (27.18-28.4). The final question, 29.13-19, refers back to the statement that James will be given a revelation after Christ has fulfilled his 'destiny' or passion (29.9-13).
answers are contained in a continuous discourse (135.3-137.13). The discourse gives the impression that it is treating each question in turn (135.8f; 136.16; 137.4, 10). In reality Christ responds directly to the first, second and sixth questions and in his answer changes the meaning of the second question. The first question has two parts and is answered in two distinct paragraphs: Christ responds to the first part of the question by describing the nature of the archontic powers (Q-134.20-22; A-135.8-136.15), and to the second part with an account of his redemptive work (Q-134.22; A-136.16-137.4)/62/. In responding to the second question Christ changes the meaning of the question. The disciples ask 'How are we held in this place?' (134.23-24) The answer changes the 'how' to 'why' and explains why they are in the world (137.4-9). No answer is given to the third, fourth and fifth questions. The sixth question (135.2) is given a straightforward answer (137.10-13). This discourse is followed by a single question-answer exchange (137.13-17; 137.17-25) and then Christ says his final word to the disciples (137.25-138.3).

DialSav is another text with a unique dialogue style. Most of the work consists of a series of short question-answer exchanges in which the disciples set the theme and Christ responds/63/. However these exchanges are not used to present a systematic exposition of a particular subject. Instead the

62. Wisse, NHLE, 395, translates 134.22f in such a way that the disciples ask about 'their Pleroma', i.e. the archons (ΠΕΥΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ). This is certainly wrong. Ménard, La lettre de Pierre à Philippe, 16f, has 'your Pleroma' (ΠΕΥΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ). This is correct as the K of the possessive adjective is quite clear in the facsimile edition of the text, Facsimile of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Codex VIII (Leiden: 1976), 140.

63. The following material falls outside this pattern and may be due to the use of other source material: 133.3-134.24; 134.24-137.2; cf. Christ's response at 129.20-131.15.
dialogue covers a wide range of themes. The stylization of this material is similar to that in a Gnostic sayings collection like GosThomas—except that DialSay employs a consistent dialogue framework/64/.

It has been noted with respect to SJC that the author has taken a literary treatise (Eugnostos) and recast it with modifications as a revelation which the risen Christ gave his disciples. He has set both the source material and his additions within a dialogue framework consisting of twelve exchanges between Christ and the disciples. However the dialogue framework which the author created is extremely artificial. One reason for this is that the statements can be extremely vague with little thematic relationship to the material that follows. In many instances the disciples do not pose questions which identify the essential issues to which Christ speaks in the subsequent answer. Thus, for example, the first statement from a disciple introduces

64. Koester and Pagels, Report, 67f, argue that the author/redactor of DialSay took his dialogue material from an earlier source. They argue that the explanation for the distinctive dialogue style lies in the fact that it was devised in the process of interpreting traditional sayings. The dialogue framework would be created as the disciples gave Christ the opportunity to reinterpret a traditional saying by asking questions based on these sayings. There may be an element of truth in this view. However it is clear from the Gospel of Thomas that the reinterpretation of traditional sayings could take place without the use of a dialogue framework. It is also questionable how many of the questions are based on traditional sayings. It is evident, however, that whatever the origins of this dialogue style may have been, the arrangement and stylization of these dialogue pericopes suggests some contact with 'Sayings Collections'. For this view of how sayings collections could develop into dialogues cf. James Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," Trajectories through Early Christianity, ed. J. Robinson and H. Koester (Philadelphia: 1971) 82-85; Turner, Thomas the Contender, 220-225. Cf. as well H. Koester, Dialog und Spruchüberlieferung, 532ff; "Gnostic Writings as Witnesses for the Development of the Sayings Tradition," Yale—J, 238-256 (256ff for the seminar discussion); Koester and Pagels, DialSay—NHS 26, 2-8.
the exposition of the doctrine of God (94.4ff) and is simply a
confessional statement coupled with a request for teaching:
"Lord, no one can find the truth except through you. Therefore
teach us the truth." (93.24-94.4). The last question, which
introduces special material not found in Eugnostos, provides
another example of a weak question. Mariamme asks: "Holy Lord,
your disciples, whence came they, and where do they go and (what)
should they do here?" (114.9-12) The answer deals with the fall
of Sophia, the origin of mankind and Christ's redemptive work
(III.4, 114.13-25; BG 118.13-122.8; III.4, 117.1-118.2)/65/.
There are instances in which there is a closer thematic
relationship between the question and its answer. However in
many cases the second problem with the author's dialogue
framework becomes apparent. This is that the question is related
to only a limited amount of the material that lies between the
present question and the next one. It is apparent that the
author has inserted questions into his source material without
attempting to formulate the questions in such a way that they set
the agenda for all that Christ would say before another question
was introduced. This is particularly evident in the following
pericopes:

Q. 96.14-17 A. 96.18-97.19
Other Material: 97.19-98.9
Q. 98.9-10 A. 98.11-22
Other Material: 98.22-100.16
Q. 106.9-14 A. 106.14-107.11
Other Material: 107.11-108.16

In principle the dialogue style of SJC is similar to that in
APORYJDn in that the disciples' questions are meant to guide the
exposition of the material. However the dialogue framework is
65. Other examples of weak questions: III.4, 108.16-19; BG
107.12-16.
badly flawed by questions which are weak and which do not set the thematic agenda for all the material that lies between two questions. The result is an exceptionally artificial dialogue framework/66/.

It is apparent from this examination of the use of dialogue in the RRC that the authors did not use a uniform style. In some cases the disciples have the initiative in guiding the exposition of the material with their questions. The best examples of this style are to be found in the six exchanges in ApocryJn (25.16-27.30). In other cases Christ has the initiative in guiding the exposition of the theme and the disciples respond with questions to ideas that he has introduced (esp. 1ApocJas, ThCont, ApocryJas). Finally, the dialogue styles of several of these texts can appear artificial and contrived due to the use of weak questions and a loose thematic relationship between question and answer.

GENRE ANALYSIS: ESOTERICISM

In one respect all the RRC can be regarded as esoteric in that Christ's teaching is given to the disciples in private. Furthermore in several instances Christ states that the revelation is given for the benefit of the believing

66. Fallon's characterization of the dialogue style of SJG, Gnostic Apocalypses, 129, brings out the fact that the dialogue framework is so weak that Jesus' teaching is in effect given in a discourse: "The twelve disciples and seven women interrupt the discourse of the Savior with their questions, to which the answers of the discourse are loosely attached."
In Apocryphon this point is made in both the introductory and concluding statements:

"Now, then, lift up your face that you may receive the things which I shall tell you today, and that you may tell them to your fellow spirits who are from the unwavering race of the perfect Man." (2.20-25)

"And I have said everything to you that you might write them down and give them secretly to your fellow spirits, for this is the mystery of the immovable race." (31.28-31)

Several texts incorporate more explicit esoteric motifs. In Apocryphon Jesus tells John to write an account of the teaching he has received and give it 'secretly' to his 'fellow spirits' (31.28-31). Jesus also says that the revelation is to be kept 'secure' (31.32-34) and pronounces a curse on those who market or sell accounts of his revelation (31.35-37). In the case of Apocryphal James is told that the revelation is not to be given a wider circulation in his time. Instead the revelation is to be secretly transmitted until the time comes for its disclosure (36.13-38.11). There is no suggestion, however, that after this time the text would be subject to a restricted circulation. In fact Christ's statement at 29.19-29 that the revelation would have the effect of leading unbelievers to faith suggests that the author did not intend to imply that the circulation of the text was to be permanently restricted. Finally in the epistolary framework of Apocryphal the author instructs the imaginary recipient that he is not to disclose the contents of the text to one and all: "...since you are a minister of the salvation of the saints...take care not to rehearse this text to many..." (1.18-22) Apocryphal also describes an account of Christ's teaching as a 'secret book' (1.10, 30f)/68/.

67. Cf. SIC 93.16-24; Apocryphon 2.20-25; 31.28-31; ThCont 140.10.
These three texts, *ApocryJn*, *ApocryJas* and *1ApocJas*, are the only ones which employ explicit esoteric motifs. It is unlikely that these esoteric elements should be taken to mean that the texts were subject to a limited circulation, e.g. to Christian Gnostic communities. While it would be possible to place this interpretation on the evidence, it is difficult to see how it would serve a useful purpose to restrict the circulation of the texts. In fact the opposite is true since it would seem that the interests of Christian Gnostic communities would be best served by being able to lay claim to a literature in which Christ taught Gnostic doctrine. Thus it is more likely that the esoteric motif was a way to account for the fact that these texts had not been in general circulation from apostolic times.

**THE DISCIPLES AS RECIPIENTS OF REVELATION**

As a final point a few observations should be made about the choice of disciples as the recipients of Christ's revelations. In four of the texts the revelation is given to the disciples as a group: *PetPhil*, *SJC*, *DialSay*, *GosMary*. The last of these texts includes one or more of the women associated with Christ in the pre-passion period. Mary (probably Magdalene) plays a prominent role in *SJC*, *DialSay*, *GosMary* and *Pistis Sophia*. *SJC* states that seven women accompanied the disciples to Galilee but only names Mary (90.17ff)/69/. In three of these four texts in which the revelation is given to the disciples the concluding

68. Cf. ThCont 138.1 and GosThomas 32.1--'secret words' (Nýαχε ἀθνη).
narrative setting represents the disciples as dispersing to preach the Gnostic gospel. DialSav lacks this motif—which is not surprising since this does not have the customary narrative settings. In the case of ApocryJn the revelation is only given to John. However he immediately relates it to the rest of the disciples (32.4f). Thomas and James are the only other individuals who are given revelations (ThCont, 1ApocJas, 2ApocJas, ApocryJas). In the case of ApocryJas Christ comes to the disciples as a group but then takes James and Peter aside to give them a revelation—though they subsequently relate at least a part of the revelation to the other disciples (15.30ff).

The only noteworthy feature in the choice of disciples is the evidence which suggests that there is a depreciation of the Twelve in two of the texts attributed to James—ApocryJas and 1ApocJas. As has been noted Christ only gives the revelation to Peter and James in ApocryJas. This does not necessarily have a polemical significance since the Twelve are represented as writing accounts of Christ's public and esoteric teaching (2.7ff). The implication of this is that the Twelve had access to other accounts of Christ's esoteric revelations. It is often assumed that the author adopts a critical attitude towards Peter in this text/70/. Thus, for example, Perkins argues this on the basis of the character of Peter's questions which show that he has failed to understand Christ's teaching (3.38ff; 13.25ff)/71/. However this is not a good reason since a similar lack of understanding underlies both James' questions and statements

69. Cf. 1ApocJas 38.15ff for another reference to a group of women associated with Christ.
70. Cf. 141f for Peter in GosMary, GosThomas and Pistis Sophia.
(4.22ff; 5.35ff; 6.21ff; 6.33ff) and the responses attributed to both of them (11.6ff; 12.18ff). However there are two points which suggest that the author did not regard the Twelve as missionaries of a Gnostic Gospel. In the first place they are represented as responding negatively to the revelation and then being dispersed by James who returns alone to Jerusalem (16.2ff). Second, there are a number of statements which suggest that the Gnostic community was not established in the apostolic generation (cf. 14.41-15.5; 15.37-16.2; 16.2-6, 9-11, 12-30). These statements speak about a future community of believers. There are two reasons for thinking that the author did not envision that this community would be established by the disciples. James disperses the disciples without any reference to a missionary enterprise they are to undertake (16.5ff). More importantly in the epistolary conclusion James writes as though the recipient is to play the principal role in the founding of the believing community: "And I pray that the beginning may come from you...." (16.12; cf. 16.12-30). This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that in 1Apoc there is further evidence which suggests that a Gnostic community was not founded by the disciples. Christ tells James that the revelation he has received is not to be disclosed in the apostolic period. Instead it is to be disclosed in the future by an unnamed person (37.24-38.11). The text is badly preserved at this point but it does appear that the individual who publishes the revelation given to James plays an important role in the establishing of a Gnostic community. James' rebuke of the Twelve in the concluding narrative setting (42.20-24) is also suggestive of a negative view of Jesus' disciples. While it is difficult to be certain about the precise significance of these statements in texts
attributed to James, they do at least suggest a depreciation of
the Twelve in the circles for which these texts were written/72/.

It has been argued by Perkins that GosMary adopts a critical
attitude towards Peter (and possibly other of the disciples)/73/.
She argues that according to the author Peter (as well as Andrew
and perhaps other disciples) has 'rejected the clear teaching of
Jesus' and consequently accepted and given expression to the
'orthodox objections to gnosticism'. The argument is based on Andrew
and Peter's objections to Mary's account of the revelation she
had received from Christ. Andrew doubts that the Saviour taught
such unusual ideas (17.10-15) while Peter is offended that Christ
would give a revelation to Mary and not to the disciples as a
group (17.16-22). It is unlikely that one could conclude from
this that Peter and Andrew did not embrace a Gnostic
theology--Peter's objection in particular does not object to the
content of Mary's revelation. It must be remembered that Peter
is represented as eliciting revelations from Christ in the first
part of the text and, more importantly, all the disciples
disperse to preach a Gnostic Gospel in the end (18.21ff). It
seems more likely that these objections serve to support Mary's
claim to have received a revelation in that Peter and Andrew
raise the objections the author knows would be in the minds of

72. It is worth pointing out that James could play a prominent
role in Gnostic interpretations of the apostolic period
without deprecating the rest of the disciples. According
to GosThomas 12 Christ states that James is to be the leader
of the Twelve.

73. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 133-137. There are also
statements which represent Peter in conflict with Mary in
GosThomas (51.18-26) and Pistis Sophia (Chpts. 36, 146). However
these statements do not go so far as to imply that
Peter is "...the irascible opponent of gnosticism who represents
orthodox, anti-Gnostic polemic." (Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue,
141).
the orthodox (perhaps even Christian Gnostics) in order to show that the disciples took these considerations into account but still accepted Mary's revelation.

CONCLUSION

The ERC represent a structurally simple genre in that Christ's teaching in discourse and dialogue is normally bracketed by narrative settings. It is apparent that within this structure there was a great deal of latitude in the construction of narrative settings and in the use of dialogue and discourse. However these texts have enough in common to be treated as examples of a coherent genre.

The next two chapters will take up the question of how to account for the present form of the genre. In this century two explanations have been proposed. In each case it has been argued that the creators of the ERC based their literature on established literary genres. One hypothesis is that Graeco-Roman dialogue genres provided the literary models for the ERC. The other is that the genre was based on the traditional apocalypse. In the subsequent study I will propose a third hypothesis which argues that the genre may represent a de novo creation and was not directly based on any established genre. These three hypotheses will be designated as 'the dialogue hypothesis', 'the apocalypse hypothesis' and 'the de novo creation hypothesis'. Chapter four will be devoted to an examination of the 'dialogue hypothesis' while the fifth chapter will treat the other two
hypotheses together.
Chapter 4

The RRC and Graeco-Roman Dialogue Genres

In an article published in 1968 Kurt Rudolph argued that the Gnostic creators of the RRC based their genre on elements derived from two Graeco-Roman dialogue genres: the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature. This view has subsequently been cited by a number of scholars without apparent criticism. It is particularly significant that Vielhauer adopted the whole of Rudolph's hypothesis. An important element of Vielhauer's discussion is that he compared the cases for the two hypotheses that the RRC were based either on the traditional apocalypse (Koester) or Graeco-Roman dialogue genres (Rudolph). He came down firmly in favour of the dialogue hypothesis.

As Rudolph's proposal has never been subject to critical scrutiny, I propose to evaluate the strength of his case in this chapter. This will be done by first setting out his hypothesis.

---------------------------------------------


and then examining the strength of his supporting arguments. This will be followed by a brief study of the dialogue style employed in the Hermetic dialogues. There are two reasons for including this analysis. On the one hand both Dörrie and Rudolph have treated the Corpus Hermeticum as a second century example of the Erotapokriseis genre. It will be argued that this is a highly improbable classification. Furthermore it has been suggested that there may be an historical relationship between the Hermetic dialogues and the RRC. This examination of the Hermetic dialogues will provide the opportunity to assess the probability of this proposal.

**Dialogue Hypothesis: 1. Dialogue and Erotapokriseis Genres**

Before identifying the contribution which Rudolph believes these two dialogue genres made to the formation of the RRC it is worth noting the main points that Rudolph makes about the genres themselves. The 'Dialogue' genre refers to the dialogue form as it was developed by Plato and Aristotle/4/. The best examples of this genre from the Roman period are the dialogues of Cicero, Plutarch and Lucian/5/. In order to distinguish these dialogues from other dialogue genres this type will be described as the

---


5. Hirzel, *Dialog*, has a comprehensive treatment of each of these authors' dialogues: Cicero (I—457–552); Plutarch (II—124–237); Lucian (II—269–334).
'classical dialogue'. There are numerous variations in the structure of the classical dialogues. However the common element which runs through all of them is that they are cast as informal discussions among a group of individuals in which a particular theme is explored. Rudolph draws attention to the distinction which has been made by many between the dialogues which reproduce the process of dialectical or philosophical argument employed in the enquiry after truth (often described as dynamic or dramatic dialogues) and those in which the conversation is simply a medium for setting forth the author's established views—normally in relation to other views on the subject (static dialogues)/6/. While the classical dialogue is a well known literary genre, 'Erotapokriseis' (Question-Answer) literature is seldom recognized as an established Graeco-Roman literary genre. Rudolph's characterization of the genre is based on Heinrich Dörrie's article in RAC/7/. Rudolph defines Erotapokriseis as a genre in which a subject is set forth in a series of questions and answers. He states that it was used as a medium for introducing subjects to novices and as a framework for solving problems such as the interpretation of ancient texts. The only examples of this genre that Rudolph cites are the Hermetic dialogues which he regards as a second century A.D. version of Erotapokriseis/8/. A more complete picture of the genre with


8. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 87-88 and 104-105, for his description of Erotapokriseis as a genre and discussion of the Hermetic texts.
representative texts can be found in Dörrie's article/9/. He argues that the Erotapokriseis genre was used primarily for scientific subjects—though in the case of the Hermetic texts the form was used in a revelatory genre. He distinguishes two forms of this genre on the basis of whether the genre was used for a systematic or unsystematic treatment of a particular subject. Dörrie identifies three uses for the unsystematic form. The first, and the one for which there are the greatest number of examples, is the use of a question-answer framework for the investigation of exegetical problems in ancient texts/10/. Plutarch's ΠΛΑΤΩΝΙΚΑ ΗΡΩΤΗΜΑΤΑ provides a good example of this type of literature/11/. A second application of the genre was for the treatment of a more diverse range of topics (Sachverklaüfung). The symposium literature is mentioned with a reference to Plutarch's ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΝΙΚΑ ΗΡΩΤΗΜΑΤΑ /12/. Thirdly, Dörrie suggests that Erotapokriseis was on the whole not used as a medium for philosophical themes. In his judgment the


11. Cf. "Platonicae Quaestiones," Plutarch's Moralia XIII/1 LCL (1976). For other literature cf. references in previous note. It is noteworthy that Dörrie includes Philo's Questions on Genesis with this literature (though he did not mention "Questions on Exodus"). Cf. R. Marcus (trans), "Questions and Answers on Genesis," "Questions and Answers on Exodus," 2 volumes, LCL (1953). Dörrie argues that Philo's text is the only instance in which the genre was used to systematically interpret an ancient text (viz. as a commentary).

12. Dörrie, Ibid., 344. It would seem that this would be the place to include three other of Plutarch's works: "The Roman Questions" and "The Greek Questions"—cf. F.C. Babbitt, Plutarch's Moralia, Vol IV, LCL (1936). "Quaestiones Naturales," Plutarch's Moralia, Volume XI, LCL (1955) 133-299. None of these texts are mentioned in Dörrie's discussion.
only firm example of the application of the genre to philosophical issues is Porphyry's συμμετρητική ζωή κτέσι /13/.

The second major application of the genre was for the systematic presentation of a particular subject. The primary function of this type of literature was to introduce a novice to the subject in question /14/. The most accessible example of this use of the genre is Cicero's de partitio oratoria /15/. This dialogue is cast in a continuous series of questions and answers in which Cicero's son poses questions which give Cicero the opportunity to set forth the theory and practice of oratory.

Finally Dörrie argues that this genre could be used in revelatory literature. The Hermetic texts are the only example cited of this usage /16/.

It is clear that Dörrie has identified a type of dialogue literature that has a different character from the classical dialogues. The question, however, is whether this diverse collection of texts should be regarded as a unified and historically related genre. Is there an historical line of development in the these texts analogous to that found in the classical dialogues from Plato to Lucian? This seems unlikely. It is hard to see, for example, that Cicero's de partitio oratoria, Philo's Questions on Genesis and Plutarch's


14. Dörrie, EAC-6, 345-346. He states that his list of examples is not complete and that a comprehensive list can be found in E. Norden, "Die Composition und Literaturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisones," Hermes 40 (1905) 517ff.


It is likely that within this collection of texts several types of dialogue genres can be differentiated: e.g. dialogues devoted to the interpretation of ancient texts (e.g. Plutarch’s *Platonic Questions*), the symposium literature, and perhaps a group of dialogues designed to provide a systematic introduction to a particular subject.

It is worth noting that both Rudolph and Hermann Dörries (as distinct from Heinrich Dörrie) suggest that there is a difficulty in distinguishing Erotapokriseis from the classical dialogue. According to Rudolph the problem in distinguishing these genres is that important characteristics of each can be found in the other: Erotapokriseis can take a conversational form while the classical dialogue can become simply a convention for the dogmatic exposition of the author’s views in which a question-answer style is employed. Dörries argued that the distinction lies in the assumption about the nature of the material. In the classical dialogue the conversation is a means to seek out the truth by means of a multilateral enquiry while in Erotapokriseis the dialogue form is simply a literary medium.


18. There are a number of statements in Dörrie’s article which suggest that he does not regard all the texts cited as belonging to a homogeneous genre. Thus he states that the ‘unsystematic’ form of the genre can only be designated as Erotapokriseis in the broad sense. His view seems to be that in a strict sense Erotapokriseis literature consists of those texts which systematically present a subject in a question-answer framework in order to introduce a novice to a subject (Col. 345).

communicating information which is assumed to be true/21/. However as Rudolph has pointed out this is not a successful distinction since many classical dialogues lack the element of a multilateral enquiry after truth/22/. In the end Rudolph does not attempt to draw a sharp distinction between the two genres. This is surprising since there are characteristics of the texts classified as Erotapokriseis which clearly distinguish them from the classical dialogues. One is the lack of a narrative setting for the dialogue. The dialogue exchanges also have a distinctive character in the Erotapokriseis literature. The main elements of this dialogue style are: 1. a continuous series of questions and answers; 2. the use of the question to guide the exposition of the material by setting the thematic agenda for each answer; 3. a thematic unity between question and answer. As has been pointed out there are question-answer exchanges in the classical dialogues. However in this literature they occur within a wider conversational setting and are not cast in the continuous, systematic manner characteristic of the Erotapokriseis literature. It is thus arguable that the lack of a narrative setting and the distinctive question-answer dialogue style (esp. the latter) provide criteria for distinguishing a group of

20. Rudolph, *Gnostische Dialog*, 88. It would have been helpful if Rudolph had provided examples of this mixing of dialogue styles. The examples of Erotapokriseis literature cited by Dörrie do not employ a conversational style—except for the symposium literature and the Hermetic dialogues (the classification of both types of dialogues as Erotapokriseis is questionable). The question-answer exchanges in the classical dialogues have a different character in that: 1. they are set in the wider context of a discussion among peers; 2. they are not structured around a continuous series of questions and answers in which the question guides the exposition of the theme.


Graeco-Roman dialogues from the classical dialogue. It is questionable, however, whether all these texts should be regarded as belonging to a common, historically related genre that can be designated as Erotapokriseis. In any case a comprehensive description and typology of Graeco-Roman dialogues that do not belong to the classical type does not lie within the scope of this study and is not required in order to evaluate the dialogue hypothesis. As will become clear it is sufficient to note that there were Graeco-Roman dialogues structured around a continuous series of question-answer exchanges/23/.

23. Instead of referring to a single Erotapokriseis genre I will use the expressions Erotapokriseis genres or Erotapokriseis literature to refer to this type of dialogue literature. It may also be worth pointing out a difference between Rudolph and Dörrie as to the extent of the use of this type of dialogue literature. Rudolph, *Gnostische Dialog*, 87, states that the genre was frequently used ("Sie ist im Bereich der antiken Wissenschaft eine häufig verwendete Art der Behandlung eines Gegenstandes....") Dörrie notes at two points that in pre-Christian Graeco-Roman literature the genre was infrequently used (Col 345 and 347). In the latter instance he writes that "Im Ganzen sind die vor- und ausserchristlichen Ansätze zur E. spärlich. Sie war eine Lehr- und Mitteilungsform unter vielen anderen. Das antike Schulwesen legte anscheinend kein besonderes Gewicht auf die E., so sehr man von ihrer Eignung wusste, das Elementare zu lehren. Die nicht systematische Anwendung, die vielerlei Variationen erlaubte..., stand viel mehr in Geltung als die strenge Form...die zum Drill tendierte." Judging by the diverse and relatively small group of texts that Dörrie cites as examples of this genre the latter assessment is the more likely.
Rudolph's Hypothesis: 2. Dialogue Genres and the RRC

Rudolph has not argued that the RRC were closely modelled on any one of these dialogue genres/24/. In his view the RRC represent a somewhat original creation that was broadly based on structural and stylistic elements derived from the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature. His view is neatly summed up in the following statement: "Es ist eine eigenständige Literaturform durch Fortbildung älterer Stilformen entstanden."/25/ To start with, Rudolph argues that the structural model for the genre was derived from the classical dialogue rather than the Erotapokriseis literature. This is because the classical dialogue included both a narrative setting and the dialogue itself while Erotapokriseis literature lacked a narrative setting/26/. Thus the classical dialogue provided the basic structural framework for the RRC: narrative setting plus dialogue.

Rudolph does not argue that the narrative settings of the RRC were based on the classical dialogues. However he does argue that both dialogue genres have influenced the discourse/dialogue styles of the RRC. Scattered throughout his article one can identify four related characteristics of the discourse/dialogue styles of the RRC.

24. For this reason it is unnecessary to undertake a detailed analysis of the varieties of dialogue styles and literary structures in the classical dialogues and Erotapokriseis literature. Thus, for example, it would not contribute anything to the evaluation of Rudolph's hypothesis to trace the development of the classical dialogue from Plutarch to Lucian.

25. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 89.

The style of the RRC which Rudolph believes have parallels in the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature. The first is the use of the dialogue as a literary medium for communicating the author's established views (in contrast to an investigation of some issue). Rudolph points out that this was true for both the 'static' type of classical dialogue and for the Erotapokriseis literature/27/. Second, Rudolph argues that the relationship between Christ and the disciples in the RRC has a close parallel in the Erotapokriseis literature. In both cases the relationship is that of a teacher/expert to a student/novice. Within this relationship there is a unilateral communication of information from the 'expert' to the 'novice'./28/.

The third and fourth parallels have to do with the structure of the discourse and dialogue material. Rudolph finds a parallel to Christ's discourses in the RRC in those classical dialogues in which a speaker sets his theme and expounds it without reference to the other participants/29/. The use of a question-answer style in the RRC is attributed primarily to the influence of the Erotapokriseis literature/30/.

In Rudolph's view the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature provided the authors of the RRC with both the structural framework for a literary genre (dialogue bracketed by narrative settings) and a dialogue style whose fundamental characteristic was the unilateral communication of information from the 'expert' to the 'novice'. The main contribution of the

27. Rudolph, Ibid., 86-88.
28. Rudolph, Ibid., 89.
29. Rudolph, Ibid., 86.
30. Rudolph, Ibid., cf. esp. 89, 103.
classical dialogue was the structural framework for the genre. While both genres influenced the dialogue style of the BED, Rudolph seems to give priority to the Erotapokriseis literature with its use of a continuous series of questions and answers. His view of the relative contributions of the two genres is summed up in the following statement/31/: 

"Der formale Charakter des Dialogs wird beibehalten, aber von einem neuen Inhalt gefüllt, wobei dessen Stilisierung von der Erotapokriseis-Literatur beeinflusst erscheint."

It must be kept in mind, however, that in Rudolph's view the Gnostic creators of this genre did not closely imitate either dialogue genre. Instead these two genres provided the building blocks (Stilformen) for the creation of a relatively new genre/32/. The characteristics of the genre which can be attributed to the creative work of the Gnostic authors are not clearly defined. However the most obvious elements are: 1. the structure and content of the narrative settings, 2. the shaping of the discourse/dialogue styles in individual texts.

31. Rudolph, Ibid., 89. Cf. 103.
32. Rudolph, Ibid., 89.
Dialogue Hypothesis: Evaluation

It is important to stress that the dialogue hypothesis argues more than that the authors of the RRC were influenced by the discourse/dialogue styles of Graeco-Roman dialogue genres. The argument is that the genre as a whole was based on and shaped by elements derived from the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature. Thus the evaluation of this hypothesis must ask whether there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the RRC as a complete literary genre was based on these Graeco-Roman dialogue genres.

It must be said at the outset that it is possible that Rudolph's hypothesis is correct since there are formal similarities between the RRC and Graeco-Roman dialogue genres. The question, however, is whether these formal parallels are either sufficiently close or distinctive to establish the dialogue hypothesis with a high degree of probability. It will be argued that it is unlikely that this is the case. The fundamental problem is that the similarities to Graeco-Roman dialogue genres are of a formal nature and can easily be accounted for in other terms. This is true for both the structural similarities between the two genres and the basic character of the discourse/dialogue styles.

This is particularly evident in the case of the structural similarity between the RRC and the classical dialogue. The similarity is limited to the fact that in both genres the dialogue is bracketed by narrative settings, viz. it does not extend to the structure and content of the narrative settings themselves. This purely formal parallel does not constitute strong evidence
that the classical dialogue provided the structural model on which the RRC was based. Furthermore this basic structure can easily be accounted for in other ways. It could be argued that this structure followed naturally from the decision to attribute revelations to the risen Christ. Since these accounts relate events not recorded in canonical traditions, it would be a natural step to set Christ's teaching within an account of the event in which it was given to the disciples/33/. This basic structure could also be accounted for by the hypothesis that the traditional apocalypse provided the literary models for the RRC. As has been pointed out the two basic structural elements of the apocalypse are the narrative setting and the account of the revelatory event/34/. In short there is nothing sufficiently distinctive about the structural similarities between the RRC and the classical dialogue to warrant attaching a great deal of weight to this evidence.

As has been noted, Rudolph identified a cluster of similarities between the discourse/dialogue style of the RRC and Graeco-Roman dialogue genres: 1. the use of the dialogue as a medium for dogmatic exposition, 2. an 'expert/novice' relationship between participants, 3. the attribution of discourses to the principal speaker, 4. the use of a continuous series of questions and answers. There is no doubt that these represent genuine similarities between the RRC and the discourse/dialogue styles of at least some Graeco-Roman texts. However the difficulty with attaching a great deal of weight to these similarities is that they are of a formal nature. The one

33. Cf. chapter 5, 186f.
34. Cf. chapter 1, 22f and chapter 5, 181ff.
possible exception is the use of a continuous series of questions and answers in which the questions guide the exposition of the theme. The problem for Rudolph's hypothesis is that this distinctive dialogue style is seldom used in the BE.G. It is also clear that these formal similarities can be accounted for in other terms. Thus, for example, each of these characteristic features can be found in the discourse/dialogue material of the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. However one can also account for these elements without an appeal to the influence of an antecedent genre. A significant point about all these similarities is that they relate to the use of the dialogue as a medium for the unilateral communication of information from the 'expert' to the 'novice'. It is entirely possible to interpret all these elements as a consequence of the assumption that in the BE.G the 'expert' is the risen Christ. These points will be expanded on in a consideration of the individual elements.

The first two characteristics, the use of the dialogue as a medium for dogmatic exposition and the 'expert-novice' relationship between participants, can be taken together. It is particularly obvious in this case that the similarities to Graeco-Roman dialogue genres are of a formal nature. In fact this relationship was not characteristic of most of the classical dialogues which were structured around a conversation among peers (though there was often someone who guided the conversation). It is also apparent that these similarities can be accounted for by the Christological assumptions underlying these texts. In view of the representation of Christ as a heavenly figure whose historical mission consisted in the communication of a redemptive revelation, it is only to be expected that the genre would be
used for dogmatic exposition (viz. the revelation) and that the disciples' role would be limited to eliciting teaching from Christ.

The second two characteristics, the attribution of discourses to the principal speaker and the use of a continuous series of questions and answers, can also be taken together since they relate to the discourse/dialogue style of the BRG. The use of a straightforward discourse is clearly not a highly distinctive characteristic. Furthermore the difference in the relationships between the participants in the classical dialogues and the BRG gives these discourses an entirely different character. In the classical dialogue the discourses have a conversational setting in that they are set within a discussion among a group of peers. In the BRG the discourses have a revelational setting in that they are attributed to the risen Christ.

At first glance the claim that the dialogue exchanges in the BRG have been influenced by the Erotapokriseis literature suggests that there might be firm evidence of the influence of this genre. By way of reminder the principal elements of this style are: 1. the material is set within a continuous series of questions and answers; 2. the question guides the exposition of the material by setting the thematic agenda for each answer; 3. the answer responds directly to the question so that there is a thematic unity between question and answer. If the BRG made extensive use of this dialogue style then it is possible that this would be suggestive of the influence of the Erotapokriseis literature on the BRG. In reality this type of question-answer exchange occurs relatively infrequently in the BRG. The best
example is the group of six questions and answers on the fate of the soul in *Apgryjn* (II.1, 25.16-27.30)/35/. This is an excellent example of a question-answer dialogue style in which the question guides the exposition of the theme and the answer responds directly to the issues raised in the question. While this type of exchange occurs sporadically in other texts, it is not consistently used in any of the Nag Hammadi BEC. There are of course instances in which the material is cast in a continuous question-answer framework. This is particularly true for *SNC* and the first parts of *Apopjas* and *ThCont* (*Apopyas* has fewer dialogue exchanges). There is a similarity to the dialogue exchanges in the Erotapokriseis literature in that the function of the question is to elicit teaching from Christ. However the differences are more significant than this one formal similarity. In the dialogue exchanges in the BEC the question seldom guides the exposition of the theme in the way that it does in the Erotapokriseis literature. As was pointed out in the previous chapter the disciples' questions are often weak and loosely related to Christ's answers, frequently respond to ideas which Christ has introduced, and do not set the thematic agenda for the material that lies between two questions/36/. It is thus evident that there is not a close structural similarity between the dialogue exchanges in the BEC and the Erotapokriseis literature.

35. There are also several good examples of this kind of dialogue exchange in *Pistis Sophia*—cf. especially the exchanges in chapters 20-27, 83-90, 97-101, 103-110, 114-115, 127-131, 144-148. However it must be kept in mind that large sections of this text are cast in in the form of a straightforward discourse. *DialSay* does use a consistent question-answer framework. However the similarities between this text and the Gnostic sayings collection embodied in *GosThomas* suggest that the dialogue framework could have been developed on the basis of this type of material. Cf. chapter 3, 134.

This conclusion raises the question of Rudolph's reason for stating that there was a similarity between the dialogue exchanges in the RRC and the Erotapokriseis literature. It seems likely that this argument was based more on the fact that the dialogue exchanges in the RRC involve a unilateral communication of information from Christ to the disciples than on a genuine structural similarity in the form of the dialogue exchanges themselves. It is true that when question-answer exchanges are introduced into the RRC the question serves to elicit teaching from Christ. This relationship between question and answer is also true for the Erotapokriseis literature. However this is a very general relationship. The most distinctive features of the question-answer exchanges in the Erotapokriseis literature do not characterize most of the dialogue exchanges in the RRC.

There are three other points which can be made about the discourse/dialogue styles of the RRC. First, the diversity of discourse/dialogue styles within the texts raises the question as to whether the authors consciously modelled their dialogues on either the classical dialogue or Erotapokriseis literature. If a particular type of Graeco-Roman dialogue literature had exercised a formative influence on the RRC then one would expect a more unified style. As it is there are marked differences in discourse/dialogue styles from text to text (by way of contrast the Hermetic dialogues employed a more uniform dialogue style).

Second, it is worth pointing out that the characteristic features of the discourse/dialogue styles of the RRC have formal parallels in the traditional apocalypses/3T/. In both the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses there are numerous instances in which discourse and dialogue are used as a medium of revelation
Furthermore in each case there is a unilateral communication of information from the heavenly revealer to the seer. The role of the seer is to receive the revelations and, where a dialogue framework is used, to elicit further teaching from the heavenly revealer.

Finally, it is arguable that the choice of a discourse/dialogue medium for Christ's teaching and the basic characteristics of these elements can be accounted for without reference to the influence of an antecedent genre. Once the decision had been made to attribute revelations to the risen Christ then it would be natural to cast his teaching in the form of direct speech—leaving a choice between discourse and dialogue. It would follow from the assumption that Christ was a heavenly figure that either medium would take the form of a unilateral communication of information from Christ to the disciples. These observations are borne out by the non-Gnostic texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ. In every case the majority of Christ's teaching is cast in the form of discourse and dialogue and the disciples' role is limited to eliciting teaching from him (ChrApocPet, EpAp, TLord—both parts, and QuestBarth).

37. Thus the one argument which Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, 206-208, put forward for the view that the genre of EpAp was based on the the traditional apocalypse was the use of discourse and dialogue as a revelatory medium. In particular he compared the dialogue style of EpAp with that found in ShHermas. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 106, raises the possibility that Graeco-Roman dialogue styles were mediated to the creators of the RHC by way of the Jewish apocalypses. However he concludes that this is unlikely.

38. Cf. chapter 1, 45f, 49-52. In the early Christian apocalypses discourse and dialogue feature prominently in ShHermas and ChrApocPet.
It has been argued that both lines of evidence adduced to support the dialogue hypothesis (similarities in literary structure and discourse/dialogue styles) suffer from the same weaknesses. The alleged parallels are of a purely formal nature and can easily be accounted for in other terms. There is nothing sufficiently distinctive about the similarities which Rudolph identifies to establish his argument with a high degree of probability. One could respond to this critique with the observation that Rudolph argued that the RRC were only loosely based on Graeco-Roman dialogue genres. It could be argued that the lack of firm evidence of the influence of the classical dialogue and Erotapokriseis literature on either the narrative settings or the discourse/dialogue styles could be attributed to the refashioning of these elements by the Gnostic creators of this genre. Rudolph does in fact suggest that this is the case. However he is still willing to admit the structural similarities to the classical dialogue (narrative settings bracketing a dialogue) and the common characteristics in the discourse/dialogue styles as positive evidence in support of his hypothesis. I would argue that these similarities cannot be admitted as positive evidence because they are of a purely formal character and can be explained in other terms.

Finally, it might be asked whether there is anything which actually militates against the dialogue hypothesis. While there is no evidence which can actually disprove it, there are two considerations which raise serious doubts about the probability that the hypothesis is correct.
First, it is questionable whether the dialogue style embodied in the Erotapokriseis literature exercised a direct influence on the RRC. If this had been the case then one would expect: 1. a more uniform dialogue style in the RRC, 2. a more extensive use of a question-answer style in which the question guided the exposition of the material by setting the thematic agenda for each answer. As has been noted there is a great deal of variety in the distribution and shaping of the discourse/dialogue material in the RRC. Furthermore the type of question-answer exchange that characterized the Erotapokriseis literature does not feature prominently in the RRC. These facts do not suggest that the Erotapokriseis literature exercised a direct influence on the RRC.

The second consideration has to do with the probability that the creators of the RRC derived the basic structure of the genre from the classical dialogue. The main impression that one gets from comparing a selection of classical dialogues with the RRC is the enormous distance between the two genres. The differences are evident in the nature of the narrative settings, the relationship among participants, the character of the discourse/dialogue styles, the content of the respective texts and the revelational character of the RRC. The cumulative effect of these differences is such that it is difficult to imagine that the creators of the RRC looked to the classical dialogue in order to distill from it two simple structural elements on which to base a literary genre (narrative settings plus dialogue). It is hard to see that the classical dialogue would have commended itself as an appropriate literary medium for attributing revelations to the risen Christ/39/. While this is a subjective
judgment that is impossible to demonstrate, proponents of the
dialogue hypothesis must at least take account of this
consideration.

To sum up it has been argued that while it is possible that
Rudolph's hypothesis is correct, it cannot be accepted with a
high degree of probability. One difficulty is the lack of
positive evidence to support it. The parallels to Graeco-Roman
dialogue genres are of a purely formal character and can easily
be explained in other terms. Furthermore there are two
considerations which raise doubts that the genre was consciously
based on elements derived from the classical dialogue and
Erotapokriseis genres. It is questionable whether the classical
dialogue would have impressed the creators of this genre as a
suitable medium for recounting revelations of the risen Christ.
Furthermore the diversity of discourse/dialogue styles in the RHC
does not suggest that the genre developed under the direct
influence of a particular type of dialogue
literature—Erotapokriseis genres in particular.

39. By way of contrast it is worth pointing out that the
traditional apocalypse would have been a literary genre much
closer to the character and intent of the kind of literature
which these Christian Gnostics wanted to create.
**Corpus Hermeticum and the Erotapokriseis Literature**

In recent years there have been a number of scholars who have classified the Hermetic tractates as Erotapokriseis literature. It would appear that this identification was initially made by H. Dörrie/40/. Rudolph adopted this view and argued that the Hermetic texts were a second century version of this genre. He argued that the Hermetic texts were more closely related to Erotapokriseis genres than the RRC—presumably because they lacked the narrative settings found in the classical dialogues and the RRC/41/. Both Turner and Grese adopted this classification of the Hermetic texts/42/.

The main point of the subsequent study of the dialogue style of the Hermetic texts is to suggest that this classification is in all probability mistaken. However this study is also relevant to the investigation of the RRC. It has been suggested that the RRC might stand in some sort of relationship to the Hermetic literature/43/. The study of the dialogue styles in the Hermetic texts will provide an opportunity for a brief comparison of the two genres.

---

40. Dörrie, RAC—6, 346-347. W. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: 1979), 59, notes that it has been customary to relate the Hermetic dialogues to the classical dialogue (cf. the references in his text).


42. Turner, *Thomas the Contender*, 216, stated that: "While Plato's dialogues are the prime example of the philosophical dialogue, the tractates of the Corpus Hermeticum are prime examples of erotapokriseis, where a disciple, within a dialogue framework, elicits revelation of supernatural knowledge in philosophical dress." W. Grese, *Corpus Hermeticum XIII*, 59-61, devotes several pages to a discussion of this issue. He seems to favour Dörrie and Rudolph's classification.
When reading the Hermetic material in light of Dörrie and Rudolph's classification one is immediately struck by the fact that many of the tractates are cast in a pure discourse style and contain no dialogue elements. Only seven of the sixteen tractates (excluding Poimandres/43a/) contain any sort of dialogue/44/. In the case of the Excerpta it is more difficult to assess the distribution of dialogue and discourse material since those with no dialogue element may have been taken from a tractate containing dialogue exchanges at some other point. In any case only nine of the twenty-nine Excerpta contain at least one or more dialogue exchanges/45/. It would seem that this extensive use of a discourse style should have raised doubts as to whether the authors composed these texts under the direct influence of Erotapokriseis genres/46/. However even if one

43. Attridge, Graeco-Roman Apocalypses, 172, simply suggests that there may be a relationship without specifying the nature of the connection between the two bodies of literature. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 104-105, sees the relationship as lying in the fact that each represents a second century adaption of the Erotapokriseis genre. He suggests that the Hermetic texts provide an important insight into one form that the genre took in the second century—the implication is that the prototypes for the Hermetic literature may have influenced the RRC as well (105). Grese, Corpus Hermeticum XIII, 61, suggests that there are close similarities between the dialogue styles of the RRC and the Hermetic dialogues.

43a. Poimandres has not been included in this discussion because the literary form of the text differs from the rest of the Hermetic tractates. Cf. the brief discussion of Poimandres as an apocalypse in the Introduction, 10f.

44. CH II, IV, X, XI (minimal— one statement from Hermes at the beginning), XII, XIII, XVII.

45. Excerpt IIA/B, IV, VI, VIII, XI (Minimal—in Par 5 Tat says 'what do you mean?'), XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI.

46. Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 103 (note 37), points out that many of the tractates are cast in a pure discourse form. However this does not seem to have raised any questions in his mind about the classification of the Hermetic texts as Erotapokriseis literature.
focuses on those texts that incorporate a dialogue element it is hard to see that the dialogue exchanges have been stylized on the basis of the characteristic question-answer style found in Erotapokriiseis literature.

The most striking characteristic of the dialogue exchanges in many of the Hermetic texts is the way that they are subordinated to the discourse. The dominant medium for presenting the material is the discourse and dialogue exchanges are introduced for purposes of clarification or as a means to encourage the teacher to continue the discourse along similar lines. In these instances the questions seek clarification (e.g. 'what do you mean?'), ask about the implication of the teaching or query the consistency of a particular idea with other motifs/47/. Many of these dialogue exchanges do involve a question-answer structure. However they are not stylized in the manner characteristic of Erotapokriiseis genres. In Erotapokriiseis literature the material as a whole is set in a question-answer framework in which the question guides the exposition of the material by setting the agenda for each answer. When one question has been answered then another one is asked. This is not true for the question-answer exchanges in those Hermetic texts in which the dialogue is subordinate to the discourse. This can be illustrated with a few representative examples. In CH XII Hermes opens with a long discourse on the nature of mind (1-4). Tat interrupts with an objection to and a

47. The relationship between the dialogue exchanges and the discourse is similar to that between a classroom lecture and student's questions. The question interrupts the flow of the lecture in order to seek clarification on some point. This may not be coincidental as Festugière has argued that the Hermetic texts grew out of a schools context: La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, Vol. 2, 28-50.
question about a point Hermes has made (5). Hermes answers the question and then quite deliberately returns to his earlier theme (5-6). Hermes' discourse is subsequently interrupted with a further series of questions which seek to clarify an element of the teaching: Par 7, 13 (2X), 16-17 (2X), 21-22 (2X). In the case of Excerpt XXIII (Kore Kosmu) Isis' long discourse is interrupted with two questions that relate to an element of the previous teaching (Par 22 and 64). In many instances the question is a simple 'what do you mean?' (πίστες τον θρόνον). Thus, for example, in CH X four of Tat's ten questions employ this statement (Par 7, 15, 16, 23). In the case of Excerpt XXVI Isis' long discourse is only interrupted at two points with the 'what do you mean?' type of question (Par 9, 12). While there are various types of questions in these dialogue exchanges, in every case they respond to and interact with Hermes' discourse rather than guide his exposition by posing a series of well-defined questions that set the thematic agenda for each answer (whether long or short). This tendency to subordinate the dialogue exchanges to the discourse is particularly evident in the following texts: CH IV, X, XII, much of Asclepius, Excerpta II A/B, VI, XI, XXIII, XXV and XXVI/48/

There are two tractates in which the dialogue exchanges are not subordinate to a discourse—CH II and XIII. These two tractates contain a much more continuous series of dialogue exchanges. However in most instances the dialogue does not take

48. Cf. the following dialogue exchanges: CH IV (Par 3-4, 6); CH X (Par 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 20, 23); CH XII (Par 5, 7, 9-10, 11, 12-13); Exc IV (Par 7, 17, 21); Exc VI (Par 2, 3, 5, 18-19); Exc XI (Par 5); Exc XXIII (Par 22, 64); Exc XXV (Par xx); Exc XXVI (Par 9, 12, 13). It is also worth pointing out that in this type of text the dialogue exchanges are located sporadically throughout the text. There is no apparent pattern in their distribution.
the form of a series of questions and answers in which Asclepius or Tat guides the exposition of the material. In the case of CH II Hermes retains the initiative in guiding the development of the subject throughout most of the dialogue. Hermes makes his first point by asking Asclepius a series of leading questions (Par 1-4) and his second point in a discourse that is not introduced by a question from Asclepius (Par 4-6). The material extending from Par 6-12 is cast in a lively dialogue style. However in every case Hermes takes the initiative in making a fresh point which then becomes the basis for a short clarifying dialogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermes' statement</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Par 6</td>
<td>Par 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 8</td>
<td>Par 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 9</td>
<td>Par 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 12</td>
<td>Par 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asclepius takes the initiative for the first time in Par 12 and asks a question which poses a fresh problem. Hermes' answer takes the form of a long exposition on the theme which Asclepius introduced (12-17).

CH XIII stands out from the other Hermetic dialogues in the liveliness of its dialogue style which involves a continuous series of exchanges between Hermes and Tat (on the theme of regeneration)/49/. Furthermore the initiative in many of the dialogue exchanges comes from Tat. He initiates the dialogue with a request for teaching on the subject of regeneration (lines 1-15) and subsequently presses Hermes to disclose more (lines 28-31, 154-156, 163). Furthermore there are a number of dialogue exchanges in which Tat poses a clear problem and Hermes gives a

49. Cf. Grese, Corpus Hermeticum XIII, 67ff, for an analysis of the dialogue. I have used the line enumeration in his text and translation (1-33).
These characteristics of the dialogue style do resemble that found in Erotapokriseis literature. However there are several features which distinguish the dialogue exchanges in CH XIII from those found in Erotapokriseis genres. This tractate does not consist of a dogmatic exposition of a particular subject (e.g. regeneration). Instead it represents the process by which Hermes, in conversation with Tat, leads him into the experience of regeneration. This gives the dialogue exchanges a different character since many of them are not structured around a positive question from Tat. Instead there are statements of incomprehension, disbelief and acknowledgement scattered throughout the dialogue/50/. It is also noteworthy that the important teaching in lines 78-120 is not introduced with a question. As a result of these characteristics there is not a close structural relationship between the dialogue exchanges in CH XIII and the Erotapokriseis literature.

While the dialogue structure in the most of the Hermetic texts differs from that in the Erotapokriseis literature, there are a few instances in which there is a greater similarity in the dialogue exchanges of the two genres. In several texts in which the dialogue is subordinate to the discourse there are blocks of material in which the 'student' suddenly takes the initiative and guides the exposition of the theme with a series of questions: Excerpt IIA. 11-15 to IIB.1-8 (5 questions and answers); Excerpt IV.1-5 (2 exchanges); Excerpt VI.7-10 (2 exchanges); Excerpt VIII.1-7 (1 exchange)/51/. However the best example of this type of question and answer structure is found in Excerpt XXIV. The

text opens with Isis asking Horus if he has any questions about the subject of her previous discourse (Excerpt XXIII). The rest of the text is built around a series of questions and answers. Each question raises a fresh issue which Isis answers in a short or long response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horus' Question</th>
<th>Isis' Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Par 1</td>
<td>Par 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 7</td>
<td>Par 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 8</td>
<td>Par 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 10</td>
<td>Par 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 11</td>
<td>Par 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par 16</td>
<td>Par 16-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a genuine structural similarity between these dialogue exchanges and those in the Erotapokriseis literature. However, this is not a common type of dialogue structure in the Corpus Hermeticum.

In view of the characteristics of the discourse/dialogue styles in the Hermetic texts it is surprising that these works (or at least those with a dialogue element) were classified as Erotapokriseis literature. The fact that so many texts are cast in a pure discourse style should have raised questions as to whether the literature was composed under the direct influence of Erotapokriseis genres. Furthermore it is clear that the vast majority of texts incorporating a dialogue element do not employ the characteristic question and answer style of the Erotapokriseis literature. The most distinctive characteristic of the dialogue exchanges in the Hermetic dialogues is the tendency to subordinate them to the discourse. As has been noted

51. It is noteworthy that Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 104 (note 37), singles out these four Excerpts as having a particularly pronounced 'oracular' character, viz. a question and answer framework in which the question guides the exposition of the material. He does not seem to recognize that this dialogue style is relatively rare in the Hermetic dialogues.
there are only a relatively few instances in which the material is cast within a continuous series of questions and answers with the exposition of the theme directed by the question.

The only other similarities to the Erotapokriseis genres are the lack of a narrative setting (in contrast to the classical dialogues) and the relationship between participants—a teacher/student or expert/novice relationship (in contrast to the conversational setting among peers in the classical dialogue). It is likely that these characteristics provided the real basis for classifying this literature as Erotapokriseis. However the parallels are not sufficient to justify this classification—especially when the characteristic question-answer structure of the Erotapokriseis literature occurs so infrequently in the Hermetic dialogues.

Finally, there are a few observations which can be made about the suggestion that there may be some sort of relationship between the Hermetic dialogues and the RRC. So far as the literary structure of the texts is concerned it is clear that these works have little in common. In contrast to the Hermetic texts the RRC bracket the discourse/dialogue material with narrative settings. The RRC also employ a continuous narrative framework within the dialogue which demarcates the exchanges between Christ and the disciples. This is not true of the Hermetic dialogues.

It is also apparent that the dialogue styles in the RRC and Hermetic texts have a quite different structure. There are a number of formal parallels between these two groups of texts: 1. the use of discourses; 2. the unilateral communication of
information from the 'expert' to the 'novice'; 3. the question serves to elicit teaching from the 'expert'; 4. the initiative in developing the exposition often lies with the 'expert'. However these similarities are not particularly distinctive and can be explained by the 'expert/novice' relationship between participants that characterizes both groups of texts. Apart from these formal parallels there are marked differences in the structure of the dialogue exchanges in the REC and Hermetic dialogues. In particular the characteristic subordination of the dialogue exchanges to the discourse ('lecture with clarifying question') is not a prominent feature of the dialogue material in the REC/52/.

In view of the differences in the literary structure and dialogue styles between the REC and the Hermetic dialogues it is unlikely that there was a close historical relationship between these two genres. While it is possible that there was a more distant relationship, this is impossible to demonstrate.

---

52. There are a few scattered examples of this: the best is found in ApocryJn where Christ's discourse is interrupted with three clarifying questions (II.1, 13.17-18, 22.9-11, 22.21f). There are weaker versions of this style in ApocryJas (cf. 3.38ff; 4.23ff; 5.35ff). Rudolph, Gnostische Dialog, 104-105, argued that one similarity in the discourse/dialogue styles of the two genres was the tendency to pose a question which set the thematic agenda for a long discourse. In reality this is not a common style in either the REC or the Hermetic dialogues. In fact there is not a good example of this structure in the Nag Hammadi REC (PetPhil provides a partial exception in that a series of questions more or less set the agenda for the discourse). In the Corpus Hermeticum there are only a few instances of this structure. The best example is in CH XI where Hermes' statement in Par 1 prefaces the discourse (cf. Exc V.1; VIII.1; XXV.1). While there are many instances in which there is a great deal of discourse material between two questions, a close examination of the question and subsequent exposition reveals that the question has not set the thematic agenda for the material that lies between the two questions (cf. e.g. CH IV, X, XII, Exc XI).
Chapter 5

The RRC: Apocalypse and De Novo Creation Hypotheses

This chapter will set forth and evaluate the two hypotheses which I regard as the most likely explanations for the present form of the RRC. These are that the RRC either were based on the traditional apocalypse ('apocalypse hypothesis') or represent the de novo creation of a literary genre which was not directly based on any antecedent genre ('de novo creation hypothesis'). The reasons for examining these two views together will become apparent in the subsequent argument.

The view that the RRC were based on the traditional apocalypse was first put forward by Carl Schmidt in his edition of the Epistula Apostolorum/1/. He provided very little evidence to support this hypothesis—the only evidence cited is the use of a dialogue style in both the traditional apocalypse (especially ShHermas) and the RRC. This view has subsequently been argued with varying degrees of thoroughness by Koester/2/, Perkins/3/, Evans/4/, and Maurer/5/.

It is evident, however, that there has been a reluctance to

embrace this hypothesis. While this view has seldom been subjected to considered criticism, it has not become a frequently cited consensus view in the secondary literature. The reasons for this reluctance are not clear. Vielhauer's criticism of the hypothesis was that there are important structural differences between the two genres which stem from the fact that revelation is mediated primarily by means of interpreted visions in the apocalypses while in the RHC revelation is mediated by discourse and dialogue/6/. The use of a third person narrative framework and the distinctive content of the RHC may also have contributed to a reluctance to link the RHC with the traditional apocalypses.

In the subsequent study it will be argued that a good case

2. H. Koester, "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," in Trajectories through Early Christianity (Philadelphia, 1971), 193-198. His argument was based virtually entirely on evidence drawn from Apocryph and he did not attempt to argue the hypothesis in light of all the texts. It is noteworthy that in a recent article on this literature he did not restate this view: "Dialog und Spruchüberlieferung in den gnostischen Texten von Nag Hammadi," Evangelische Theologie 29 (1979), 532-566.

3. P. Perkins, Studies in the Origins and Development of the Gnostic Revelation Dialogue, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 1971). This thesis did not come to grips with the central issue of the origins of the genre—a point acknowledged by Perkins in her recent monograph on this literature—Gnostic Dialogue, vii, note 17. This monograph contains several references to this issue in that she identifies a number of similarities between the RHC and the apocalypse (cf. esp. 45, 51, 53f, 57). However she does not actually argue that the genre was based on the apocalypse—cf. the remarks on p. 41.


6. Vielhauer, Urchristliche Literatur, 690f.
can be made for the 'apocalypse hypothesis'. However so far as the genre as a whole is concerned, it will be argued that this hypothesis cannot be established with a high degree of probability. The reason is not, as might be expected, certain differences in content and/or structure between the traditional apocalypse and the RHC. The real difficulty is that the origins of the genre can also be explained by another hypothesis. It is possible that the genre was created independently of the direct influence of any antecedent genre—whether the apocalypse or Graeco-Roman dialogue genres, i.e. the RHC represents the 'de novo' creation of a literary genre. According to this hypothesis the starting point for the creation of the genre would be a combination of three elements: 

1. a Christology which sees Christ as a Redeemer whose work consists primarily in the communication of a redemptive revelation; 
2. the need for dominical authority for Gnostic doctrine; 
3. the tradition that Christ gave special teaching to his disciples in the post-passion period (Acts 1.3). It is arguable that these elements provided the fundamental impetus for attributing revelations to the risen Christ. According to this hypothesis the structure of the genre can also be accounted for without reference to the influence of an antecedent genre. The choice of a post-passion setting and the influence of the resurrection narratives can be seen as the factors which determined both the overall structure of the works (Christ's teaching bracketed by narrative settings) and the structure and constituent elements of the narrative settings themselves.
It will be argued that so far as the genre as a whole is concerned it is virtually impossible to establish either hypothesis with a high degree of probability since both can account for the same structural and stylistic elements. However before taking up the question of the more likely hypothesis, the evidence to support these two views will be set forth. This will be done by examining these two hypotheses with respect to the various elements of this literature: 1. the revelatory character of the genre; 2. the structure of the texts; 3. the structure and constituent elements of the narrative settings; 4. the esoteric motif; 5. the content of the RRC.

REVELATORY CHARACTER

The RRC are a revelatory genre in that they recount revelations which the risen Christ gave his disciples. The revelatory character of the genre creates a cluster of formal similarities between the RRC and the traditional apocalypse. The disciples are formally equivalent to the recipients of revelation in the apocalypses. Christ can be seen as corresponding to the heavenly figures who mediate revelation in the apocalypses—either an angel or God. Finally, when viewed as a revelatory medium, Christ's teaching in discourse and dialogue would be classified as a direct discourse medium—one of the three media of revelation in the apocalypses.
There is no doubt that these formal similarities have contributed a great deal to the impression that the BEJQ were created under the influence of the apocalypse. It is noteworthy, however, that it is at the point of these apparent similarities between the two genres that Vielhauer has challenged the hypothesis that the BEJQ were based on the traditional apocalypse/7/. He has argued that these elements are stylized in a quite different manner in the two genres. The starting point for his argument is the observation that revelation is normally mediated by means of visions in the apocalypses while one encounters discourse and dialogue in the BEJQ. On this basis he contrasts the roles of both the heavenly revealer and the recipients of revelation in the two genres. In the apocalypses the angelic revealer is said to play an intermediate role as the interpreter of visionary phenomena while in the BEJQ Christ is a heavenly revealer who is the immediate source of revelation. He then contrasts the seers of the apocalypses who recount visions they have seen with the disciples who are merely the passive recipients of Christ's teaching. He concludes that these structural or stylistic differences rule out the possibility that the apocalypse provided the literary model for the BEJQ.

The main difficulty with this argument is that it is based on a comparison with those sections of the traditional apocalypses in which visions are employed as a revelatory medium--either symbolic visions or descriptions of phenomena in the heavenly world. However as has been pointed out there are

7. Vielhauer, Uristitische Literatur, 690-691. He does leave open the possibility that the apocalypse may have influenced the shaping of individual elements of the genre. He may have in mind elements of the narrative settings like the dramatic account of Christ's coming in Apocry. In.
large sections of Jewish and early Christian apocalypses which employ direct discourse as a revelatory medium (esp. Daniel 9, 10-12 and considerable parts of IV Ezra, II Baruch, ChrApoFet and Shérmn). As a revelatory medium direct discourse is as important in the Jewish and Christian apocalypses as either symbolic visions or heavenly ascension visions/8/. When the BED are compared to those sections of the traditional apocalypses which employ direct discourse then the stark contrasts which Vielhauer proposes simply dissolve/9/.

Thus these formal similarities constitute a genuine cluster of parallels between the EBG and the traditional apocalypse. However in spite of the apparent impressiveness of these parallels, they do not provide significant support to the hypothesis that the creators of this genre were indebted to the

8. Cf. the discussion of direct discourse as a revelatory medium in chapter 1, 45, 49-52.

9. Vielhauer's argument does not take into account the fact that direct discourse was a more appropriate medium for teaching Gnostic doctrine than symbolic visions. In the Jewish apocalypses symbolic visions were used primarily to represent historical and eschatological events. It is evident from Pqmdmn, GnApoPct and Shérmn that, with the aid of extensive interpretations, symbolic visions could be used for more abstract subjects. However even in these texts direct discourse that is unrelated to the interpretation of visions is the dominant medium of revelation (with the possible exception of Shérmn). In most of the Gnostic apocalypses revelation is mediated by direct discourse: e.g. Natarchons 92.32-97.21, Melchisedek, Zostrianos, The Paraphrase of Shen, Harangos, Allogenes, and most of GnApoPct. GnApoPct is the only Gnostic apocalypse which makes limited use of interpreted visions and GnApoPaul the only text in which revelation is mediated primarily by means of descriptions of scenes in the heavenly world. Allogenes makes limited use of descriptions of scenes in the heavenly world. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 52, argues that Gnostic authors did not use symbolic visions because they rejected the use of symbols drawn from the created world. Apart from the question of what evidence there is for this interpretation, it seems likely that the use of direct discourse is better explained by the simple fact that it was more appropriate to the dogmatic subject matter of the Gnostic apocalypses.
apocalypse for their literary genre. This is because the source of all these parallels lies in a Christology which sees Christ as a heavenly revealer. The entire cluster of parallels follows from this characterization of Christ as a heavenly revealer. This Christology in turn cannot be attributed to the influence of the apocalypse since it was an integral element of the Christology of Christian Gnosticism. Having said this it is certainly true that this Christology meant that the apocalypse would have been a ready made genre for those who wanted to attribute revelations to Christ. However the formal similarities themselves cannot be taken as positive evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the creation of the BRQ.

It is clear from the above discussion that the revelatory character of the genre can easily be accounted for by the hypothesis that the genre was created independently of the influence of an antecedent genre. Given a Christology which interpreted Christ's redemptive work in terms of the

10. If, by contrast, Paul were substituted for Christ as the teacher of Gnostic doctrine then there would not be these parallels to the apocalypse, viz. Paul's teaching in discourse and dialogue could not be regarded as a revelatory medium, those he taught would not be equivalent to the recipients of revelation in the apocalypses and Paul himself would not be a heavenly revealer.

11. In the case of ShBermas, by contrast, it is arguable that it was the traditional apocalypse which provided the catalyst for creating two heavenly figures (The Lady and The Shepherd) who mediate revelations to a human individual. For a survey of the Christology of Christian Gnosticism which takes into account the Nag Hammadi texts cf. Rudolph, Gnosis, 148-171, esp. 151f. The representation of Christ as a heavenly figure whose redemptive work consists in the communication of revelation finds frequent expression in the BRQ. The following are some of the more explicit statements: Apocryfjas 8.35-9.8; Apocryfjn II.1, 2.12-20; ThCont 138.4-7, 7-18; SJ2 III.4, 93.8-12; 96.18-21; 106.5-9; 118.3-25; DialSav III.5, 120.23-121.2; iApocendas 25.2-5; 28.7-20; ZApocendas 54.15-18; 56.17-57.10; PetPhil 136.16-137.9.
communication of a revelation, it would be a natural step to create a literature which recounted Christ's teaching or revelations. The question, however, is whether the genre which embodied these revelations was based on an established literary genre.

Literary Structure: A. Apocalypse

While the revelatory characteristics of the genre do not in themselves provide significant evidence that the genre was based on the traditional apocalypse, stronger support for this hypothesis comes from the fact that these accounts of Christ's revelations are cast within literary works that are structurally similar to the apocalypse. The BEQ, like the apocalypses, relate the revelation within the framework of a narrative account of the event in which it was given. Furthermore in both genres the two basic structural elements of the genre are: 1. the narrative setting (introductory and concluding frame story); 2. the account of the revelation itself.

There is, however, one important difference between the structure of the traditional apocalypses and most of the BEQ. While the apocalypses are always written from a first person perspective, viz. the revelation is recounted by the person who received it, most of the BEQ employ a third person narrative framework—the event is not narrated by one of the disciples. A third person narrative framework is used in six of the nine texts: SIN, PatPhil, DialSay, GosMary, ThCont and most of 1Apoc as (there are three statements in the first person—24.11; 25.12; 27.18)/12/. The only three texts which employ a first
person style are ApocryJas, ApocryJn and 2ApocJas/13/.

The use of a third person narrative style in most of the EB would appear to be a strong argument against linking this genre to the apocalypse—at least in the case of those texts which use a third person style. All Jewish and early Christian apocalypses use a first person narrative style. Thus if the authors of the EB modelled their genre on the traditional apocalypse then one would expect that they would have adopted a first person narrative style. However the force of this argument can be reduced by two considerations. First, it is arguable that the use of a first person narrative style is not absolutely necessary to an apocalypse since the account of the revelatory event could be narrated by someone else. This is not simply a hypothetical possibility since there are a number of late Christian apocalypses which employ a third person narrative framework: The Greek Apocalypse of Ezra, The Vision of Ezra, The Questions of Ezra, Apocalypse of Sedrach/14/.

While these texts employ a third person narrative style, there is no doubt that the authors intended to compose apocalypses. It is thus possible that an apocalypse could be composed in the third person.

A second consideration which should be taken into account is the possibility that an explanation can be found for this use of a third person narrative framework. In the Jewish and most of

12. Pistis Sophia I-III and IV and The Books of Jub are also written from a third person perspective.

13. The use of a first person style in 2ApocJas can be attributed to the setting of this account within James’ speech to a Jewish audience. In the case of ApocJn part of the frame story is in the third person (II.1, 1.5-17 and 31.32-32.5). Cf. chapter three, 115ff.

14. Cf. OTP-I, 561ff; 581ff; 591ff; 605ff.
the early Christian apocalypses the revelation is given to a single person. A first person style followed naturally from this as the author could write from the perspective of the seer. However in many of the BB the revelation is given to the disciples as a group (SIC, PetPhil, CosMary, DialSay, Pistis Sophia I-III and IV, and The Books of Enoch). It may be that the introduction of a group as the recipients of revelation was accompanied by a shift to a third person narrative framework. A possible reason for this may be that a first person plural narrative style which implied collective authorship was judged unnatural. The distribution of a first and third person narrative style does not provide unequivocal support for this interpretation. It is significant that a third person narrative style is employed in every text in which the revelation is given to the disciples and women as a group. However there are two instances in which a third person narrative framework is used where the revelation is given to an individual. While ApocryJas, 2Apostles and ApocryPh employ a first person narrative style, ThCont and 1Apostles use a third person narrative style. The case of ThCont is not particularly significant since this text, with its atypical narrative setting, does not stand in the mainstream of the genre. The use of a third person narrative setting in 1Apostles can be seen as a consequence of the author's account of the transmission of the text. Jesus is represented as instructing James to relate the revelation to Addai who is subsequently to write an account based on what James has told him (36.15). The use of a third person style is due to the fact that Addai is the presumed author. This leaves open the possibility that, were it not for the need to take account of this motif, the author might have employed a first person narrative style/15/.
This is an admittedly tenuous interpretation. However the correctness of the more important hypothesis, that the third person narrative framework is due to the introduction of a group as the recipients of revelation, does not depend on being able to account for the use of a third person narrative framework in ThCont and 1ApocJas. This view could still be correct for those texts in which Christ's teaching is given to the disciples as a group.

It is instructive to note how the narrative framework is stylized in related texts that recount revelations which the risen Christ gave to the disciples as a group: ChrApocPet, EpAp, TLord and QuestBarth. While three texts employ a first person narrative style (QuestBarth is cast in a third person narrative framework), in each case the authors introduce some element to facilitate or explain the style. In the case of ChrApocPet Peter is singled out as the one who narrates the event and initiates most of the exchanges with Christ. The narrative framework alternates between a first person singular and plural style (I/we). The epistolary setting of EpAp facilitates the use of a first person style as the apostles are represented as writing to the churches of their day. In the case of TLord the authorship of the work is explained in the narrative conclusion which states that John, Peter and Matthew composed this account of Jesus' teaching (27).

In contrast to the Gnostic RRC in which the revelation is

15. Although if the author had been determined to use a first person narrative style then he could have done so while preserving the account of the text's transmission--he could simply have had Jesus instruct James to hand on a literary work to Addai rather then relate the revelation by word of mouth.
given to the disciples as a group, these three texts employ a first person narrative style. However they do not use a simple, unexplained first person style. This could suggest that the introduction of a group as the recipients of the revelation created a stylistic difficulty which was circumvented in different ways. It is possible that this is the reason for the use of a third person narrative style in those RRC in which the revelation is given to the disciples as a group.

To return to the main point, the use of a third person narrative style in many of the RRC is the only significant difference between the structure of this genre and the traditional apocalypses. However this difference does not constitute a decisive objection to the hypothesis that the traditional apocalypse provided the literary models for the RRC. It is arguable that a first person narrative style is not essential to the apocalypse and it is possible that an explanation can be found for the use of a third person style in the RRC/16/.

Thus the fact that the RRC narrate revelations within literary works which are structurally similar to the apocalypses means that it is possible that the apocalypse provided the literary models for this genre. However this evidence is by no means decisive since the literary structure of this genre can

16. It will become apparent that the real problem for this hypothesis is not the use of a third person narrative style in the RRC. In reality it would make very little difference to the strength of the case if every text employed a first person narrative framework. While it would remove a possible objection to the hypothesis, it would not substantially strengthen the supporting argument. Thus, for example, the use of a first person narrative style in EnAp and Tlord does not make it any more likely that the authors of these texts intended to base their genre on the apocalypse.
also be accounted for by the alternative hypothesis.

LITERARY STRUCTURE: DE NOVO CREATION HYPOTHESIS

It could be argued that it is improbable that a complete literary genre could emerge that was not based to some extent on an established genre. However it must be remembered that the RRC represent an exceptionally simple genre composed of two structural elements: 1. narrative settings; 2. Christ's teaching set within a narrative framework. It is arguable that this structure can be seen as a consequence of the post-passion settings. If the genre was based on the tradition that Christ taught the disciples in the post-passion period, then it was likely that the accounts of his teaching would include a narrative framework indicating that Christ was teaching the disciples. Thus in addition to the frame stories all the RRC employ a narrative framework demarcating Christ's statements from those of the disciples (with exchanges like 'Peter said', 'The Lord answered'). In the case of DialSav and ThCont the entire text is structured around accounts of Christ's teaching within a minimal narrative framework. However most of the RRC have added introductory and concluding frame stories. The addition of narrative settings may not have been an inevitable step (e.g. DialSav and ThCont). However in view of the claim to narrate events not recorded in the canonical traditions it would be a natural step to place Christ's teaching within the framework of an account of the event in which he gave the revelation to the
disciples. It is likely that this would have enhanced the realism of these texts as well. It is also possible that the circumstantial settings of the resurrection narratives contributed to this development. In any case it is entirely plausible that the simple structure of the RRC, narrative settings bracketing accounts of Christ's teaching, can be accounted for by 'de novo creation hypothesis'.

THE NARRATIVE SETTINGS

The narrative settings are a potentially important source of evidence as to the origins of this genre. In particular, if the genre was based on the traditional apocalypse then it is possible that this would be evident in the structure and stylization of the narrative settings. It will become apparent that there are a significant number of similarities between the narrative settings of the RRC and the apocalypse. This is reflected in the fact that in previous studies which sought to establish the 'apocalypse hypothesis' much of the evidence adduced is drawn from the narrative settings/17/. However as is the case with the elements of the genre which have been discussed thus far most of these similarities can also be accounted for by the 'de novo creation hypothesis'. It will be argued that it is possible to

17. Koester, One Jesus, 193f, notes the importance of the narrative settings for determining the origins of this genre: "But the framework gives some clues for recognizing the sources of the evolution of the 'gnostic gospel'...." Four of the five elements which he cites are drawn from the narrative settings: mountain setting, Jesus's coming as an epiphany, the introductory statement, and the curse formula in the concluding statement.
account for both the structure and constituent elements of the narrative settings by two related factors: the post-passion setting and the influence of the resurrection narratives.

NARRATIVE SETTINGS: APOCALYPSE

One parallel between the narrative settings of the two genres is that both normally provide circumstantial settings for the revelatory event. These settings can include information as to the time, place, activity and mental disposition of the individual. The only point at which there is a close similarity between the corresponding elements in the two genres is that in both cases the individual is frequently represented as in a state of distress. However the distress is traced to different causes in the respective genres. In the Jewish apocalypses it is the historical plight of Israel which is normally the source of the seer's anxiety. In the case of the RRC this motif is broadly linked to the post-passion setting. James' distress in 1ApocJas is a response to Christ's passion while in the case of SJC and ApocryIn the disciples are distressed or anxious because of unresolved metaphysical and

18. For the circumstantial settings in the apocalypses cf. chapter 1, 39ff. For the RRC cf. chapter 3, 115ff.

19. For the Jewish apocalypses cf. chapter 1, 40. For the RRC cf. chapter III, 120f. Maurer, Apocalypticism and Gnosticism, 264, took this motif as evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 41, notes that this element has precedents in the apocalypses. However she also points to the presence of this feature in the resurrection narratives.
Christological questions—the implication is that Christ has left them without teaching them all they need to know.

The most important similarity between the structures of the narrative settings in the two genres is the pattern of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer. In many apocalypses the individual is represented as being in a particular setting and then a heavenly figure comes to mediate a revelation to him/20/. In most instances the departure of the heavenly revealer is not actually narrated in the Jewish apocalypses/21/. However a departure is assumed as the heavenly revealer frequently makes a concluding statement and then the individual is alone once again.

There are a number of stylistic elements which are related to this pattern of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer: 1. an introductory and concluding statement can be attributed to the heavenly revealer; 2. the coming of the heavenly revealer can be described in dramatic terms; 3. the individual can respond with fear and then be reassured by the heavenly figure. The coming/departure pattern and introductory and concluding statements occur in many of the RRC. However dramatic accounts of Christ's coming coupled with a

---

20. Cf. chapter 1, 41f. Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 139, attached such importance to this pattern of the coming of a heavenly figure that he selected it as the criterion for determining which RRC could be classified as apocalypses. Thus he does not classify ThCont, DialSav and The Books of Jeu as apocalypses. He argues that while they contain all the characteristic features of the other texts, they lack an account of the heavenly revealer's arrival and departure: "There is not an account of the appearance or departure of the heavenly revealer and thus no clear presentation of Jesus as a transcendent mediator as in the gnostic apocalypses." (139) It is doubtful that this is a good reason for excluding these texts since in each case the underlying assumption is that Jesus is a transcendent figure who mediates revelation to his disciples.

21. IV Ezra 12.8 is the exception. Cf. ShHermas Vis. I.4.3; III.10.1f; IV.3.7; ChrApocPet 17.
fear-reassurance motif are less frequent.

The RE frequently locate the disciples in a setting and then have Christ come to them. Furthermore the account of Christ's coming is normally complemented with a statement about his departure. This basic structure is present in ApocryJas, ApocryJn, SJC, PetPhil, and 2ApocJas/22/. GosMary states that Christ departed but since the first part of the text is lost it is impossible to say if the narrative setting recounted Christ's coming to the disciples. 1ApocJas follows the pattern of having the risen Christ come to James (31.2ff) but it is unlikely that there was a reference to his departure (though pp. 41 and 42 are extremely fragmentary). The only texts which do not employ any part of this structure are DialSay and ThCont where the text opens with Christ and the disciples together and there is no reference to Christ's departure.

It has been pointed out that in the apocalypses the coming of the heavenly revealer is normally described in matter of fact terms/23/. However there are a few instances in which the angel's coming is depicted as a dramatic event. In each case the drama lies in the supernatural appearance of the angelic figure (Daniel 10.5-6; ApocAbraham 11.2-3; II Enoch 1.4-5; cf. Revelation 1.12-16). As has been pointed out these dramatic accounts of the heavenly revealer's coming are always coupled with a fear-reassurance motif: the heavenly revealer responds to

22. This structure is also present in EpAp and, rather weakly, in TLord and QuestBarth (these last two texts do not refer to Christ's departure). In Pistis Sophia IV and ChrApocPet the disciples go to Jesus (in the latter case he is sitting on the Mount of Olives). OnApocPet and Pistis Sophia I-III open with Christ and the disciples together. Neither Pistis Sophia I-III or IV refers to Christ's departure.

23. Cf. chapter 1, 41f.
the individual's fear with words of reassurance/24/. In the case of the EBC Christ's coming is frequently described in a matter of fact manner (Apocryphas, 1Apoclas, 2Apoclas, cf. EpAb, ILord, QuestEarth). However there are several instances in which Christ's coming has a more dramatic character. In the case of PatPhil the disciples are praying on the Mount of Olives when an intense light appears and Christ speaks out of the light (134.9-18). There are several elements which suggest that this scene was modelled on the Transfiguration narratives: the mountain setting, the disciples at prayer, and a voice speaking from a light (instead of a cloud). The dramatic accounts in ApocryPha and SNC bear a closer resemblance to the corresponding accounts in the apocalypses. In both instances the authors describe Christ's supernatural appearance and incorporate a fear-reassurance motif. In the case of SNC the author sets his account in the context of a contrast between Christ's pre- and post-passion mode of existence:

"The Savior appeared not in his first form, but in the invisible spirit. And his form was like a great angel of light. And his likeness I must not describe." 91.10-14

In ApocryPha several elements contribute to a dramatic entry: the heavens open, the world is shaken and a light envelops creation, Christ appears as a polymorphous being (a youth, an old man, a servant). There are no precedents in the apocalypses for either the association of cosmic disturbances with the coming of the heavenly revealer or for the characterization of the heavenly revealer as a polymorphous being/25/. However the drama of the entire event and the emphasis on Christ's unusual appearance constitute formal parallels to similar accounts in the

24. Cf. Daniel 10.7-12, 15-19; II Enoch 1.4-8; ApocAbraham 10-11; Revelation 1.17f.
apocalypses. The one element for which there is a direct parallel is the opening of the heavens. In II Baruch 22.1 God's speaking to Baruch is preceded by the opening of the heavens/26/. Finally in the case of both ApocryJn and SJC the disciples respond with fear to Christ's dramatic entry and he in turn reassures them (II.1, 2.1, 9-12; III.4, 91.24-92.1). This combination of a dramatic account of Christ's coming and a fear-reassurance motif constitutes the closest similarity between the narrative settings of the RRC and the apocalypse. It must be kept in mind, however, that this combination of elements occurs in only two texts—ApocryJn and SJ/27/.

Introductory and concluding statements are also associated with the motif of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer. In the RRC Christ's coming is always followed by some sort of introductory statement or dialogue and a concluding statement is frequently attributed to him. In most instances these introductory and concluding statements constitute only a formal parallel in that their content is not reminiscent of similar statements in the apocalypses/28/. The exceptions are the introductory and concluding statements in ApocryJn (2.9-25 and 31.25-31). There are several elements to the introductory

25. Cf. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 49f, for suggested explanations of Christ's polymorphous appearance. She also suggests that the theophanies in Old Testament literature may have provided the examples for the association of cosmic disturbances with the coming of the heavenly revealer (49).


27. This combination of motifs is not present in other texts which attribute revelations to Christ: ChrApocPet, GnApocPet, TLord, QuestBarth, EpAp.
statements: 1. Christ reassures John (2.9-12); 2. he identifies himself in a series of 'I am' statements (2.12-15); 3. he states that the purpose of his coming is to give John a revelation and then summarizes what will be revealed (2.16-20); 4. Christ then exhorts John to be attentive to what he says so that John can transmit the revelation to the believing community (2.20-25).

There are parallels to the first three elements in the introductory statements of several apocalypses. It has already been pointed out that a word of reassurance (first element) always follows the dramatic entrance of an angelic revealer. The second part, Christ's self-identification in a series of 'I am' statements, has parallels in ApocAbraham 10.8-12 and Revelation 1.17-18. Finally a statement about the nature of the heavenly revealer's mission (third element) is the most frequent theme of the introductory statements in the Jewish apocalypses/29/.

Furthermore there is a clause within this statement of purpose which is similar to part of Christ's introductory statement in Revelation 1.19. Christ says that he has come to teach John

"...what is and what was and what will come to pass...."

28. For introductory and concluding statements in the Jewish apocalypses cf. chapter 1, 42f. For introductory statements in the RBC cf. ApocJas 2.21ff; ApocJIn 2.9ff; SIC 91.20ff; ThCont 138.4ff; DialSay 120.2ff; 1ApolLas 24.11ff and 31.5ff. There are only a few instances in which these statements take the form of a simple discourse (ApocJIn, 2ApolLas; DialSay). In most cases a dialogue element is introduced which is not typical of introductory statements in the apocalypses (cf. chapter 3, 123). Koester, One Jesus, 196, argued that the curse on those who try to make commercial gain from this text (ApocJIn 31.34ff) was evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. However this motif is lacking in extant Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. The structural similarities between the concluding statements in the RBC and the apocalypses are closer in that these statements take the form of a simple discourse: ApocJas 14.19ff; ApocJIn 31.25ff; DialSay 146.18ff; 1ApolLas 40.19ff; PetPhil 137.17ff; SIC 118.3ff; GosMary 8.14ff.

29. Cf. chapter 1, 42 (note 42a).
Christ's concluding statement in *ApocryJn* also bears a closer resemblance to similar statements in the apocalypses than other concluding statements in the *RRC*. Christ says that he will return to the 'perfect aeon' (31.25-26) and states that he has given the revelation to John so that he could write it down and transmit it to the believing community ('to your fellow spirits', 'the immovable race'--31.26-31). The similarity to concluding statements in the apocalypses lies in the inclusion of instructions as to the transmission of the revelation/31/.

In summary the pattern of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer (most texts) together with the related motifs of the heavenly revealer's dramatic entrance (3x), the response of fear coupled with reassurance (2x) and the use of an introductory and concluding statement (most) constitute an important cluster of similarities to the structure of the narrative settings in Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. In most instances these similarities are of a formal nature. However in individual texts there are elements which bear a closer resemblance to the corresponding element in the apocalypses (esp. *ApocryJn*).

Finally in the concluding frame stories of the *RRC* there is a cluster of elements which have their parallel in the traditional apocalypses. Three elements frequently recur in the concluding narrative settings of both the apocalypse and the *RRC*:


31. Cf. Daniel 12.4; IV Ezra 12.37f; Revelation 22.10.
1. a concluding statement from the heavenly revealer; 2. a reference to the recipient's response to the revelation; and 3. an account of the individual's subsequent activity/32/. In most instances these parallels are of a formal nature. The similarities in the concluding statement in ApocryJn to those in the Jewish apocalypses have already been mentioned. The only other point at which an element is stylized in a reasonably similar manner is that the recipients can respond positively to the revelatory event: SJC—joy (119.10ff); PetPhil—thanksgiving and joy (138.7ff; 139.4f); 2ApocJas—understanding, fear and joy (57.17ff)/33/.

There are thus a significant number of structural similarities between the narrative settings of the apocalypses and those in the RRC. Both genres frequently provide a circumstantial setting for the revelatory event, bracket the revelation with an account of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer (in the Jewish apocalypses the departure of the angel is normally assumed), attribute introductory and concluding statements to the heavenly revealer, and use similar ingredients in the construction of the concluding frame stories (concluding statement, response to the revelation, and account of the recipient's subsequent activity). While most of the similarities are of a structural nature, in individual texts there are elements which bear a closer resemblance to the corresponding element in the traditional apocalypse: dramatic entrance of the heavenly revealer (ApocryJn, SJC, PetPhil); a fear-reassurance

32. For the response to the revelatory event in the apocalypses cf. chapter 1, 43f. For the RRC cf. chapter 3, 122f, 125. Subsequent activity: chapter 1, 44; chapter 3, 125.

33. Cf. I Enoch 36.4; 90.40; IV Ezra 13.57f; III Baruch 17.2ff.
motif (ApocryIn, SJC); similarities in the content of the introductory and concluding statement (ApocryIn); references to the distress of the individual as part of the circumstantial setting (ApocryIn, SJC, 1ApocJas, PetPhil); and the disciples' positive response to the revelatory event (SJC, PetPhil, 2ApocJas).

**NARRATIVE SETTINGS: 'DE NOVO CREATION'**

Koester argued that there were a number of elements in the narrative settings of the RRC which were stylized in an apocalyptic manner and had no direct parallel in the resurrection narratives. This point was made primarily with reference to ApocryIn and so far as this text is concerned the observation is correct/34/. However it is arguable that for most of the RRC both the general structure and constituent elements of the narrative settings can be accounted for by two related factors: 1. the attribution of these revelations to the risen Christ; 2. the influence of the resurrection narratives and other canonical traditions. It is particularly significant that there are precedents in the resurrection narratives and other canonical traditions for virtually every structural element in the narrative settings of the RRC. It will become apparent, however, that many of these parallels are of a formal nature. In most instances the various features of the narrative settings have not been closely modelled on the corresponding element in the

34. Koester, *One Jesus*, 194.
resurrection narratives. However there are instances where individual elements have been clearly shaped by specific canonical traditions.

In the first place the provision of a circumstantial setting for these accounts would be a natural step since the authors were recounting events which were not a part of the Gospel tradition. In view of this one would expect a circumstantial setting with references to elements of time, place and the circumstances surrounding Christ's encounter with the disciples. The authors would also have had the example of the resurrection narratives which frequently provide a circumstantial setting for Christ's appearance to the disciples/35/. In most instances the constituent elements of the narrative setting have not been shaped in light of specific canonical traditions. While there are some formal parallels (references to time, place and the disciples' activity) the authors have normally created their own setting for Christ's encounter with the disciples. However the influence of specific canonical traditions can be seen at several points. The most significant is the circumstantial setting in SJQ which is based on the account in Matthew 28.16ff: the disciples go to a mountain in Galilee for their first encounter with Christ after the passion (90.14ff). Traditions in Acts have influenced the temporal setting in ApocryJas: Christ comes to the disciples 545 days after the resurrection and on the eve of his ascension—which is recounted in the concluding frame story (2.19ff; 15.5ff). However other elements of the circumstantial setting are not based on canonical traditions—cf. the representation of the disciples as gathered together writing

accounts of Christ's public and esoteric teaching (2.7-16). The setting of the revelation on the Mount of Olives in the short version of ApocryJn (BG 20.4ff)/36/ and PetPhil can be attributed to the influence of canonical traditions that Christ taught the disciples there/37/. This evidence of the influence of specific canonical traditions on the shaping of the circumstantial settings only accounts for a relatively small amount of material. In most instances the authors have created their own settings for Christ's encounter with the disciples.

There is one element which recurs in a number of circumstantial settings which has a more direct parallel in the apocalypses than in the resurrection narratives. This is the reference to the disciples' state of mind/38/. In the Gospel narratives there are three instances in which some reference is

36. The mountain is not named in ApocryJn. However the use of the definite article to describe a mountain close to Jerusalem and the Temple area suggests that the author was referring to the Mount of Olives.

37. Koester, One Jesus, 194, argued that the use of a mountain setting could not be attributed to the influence of canonical traditions since the Mount of Olives setting occurred in the pre-passion period in the Gospels. The implication of this argument was that the mountain setting must be due to the influence of the apocalypse. With respect to the first point the assertion is not completely accurate since it is implied in Acts 1.12 that Christ and the disciples were on the Mount of Olives just before his ascension. More importantly, however, there is no reason why an author could not use a setting from the pre-passion period to construct a setting for a post-passion event (this has clearly happened in the case of ChrApocPet). The argument that the use of a mountain location must be due to the influence of the apocalypse flounders on the fact that in the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses mountains are seldom chosen as the setting for a revelatory event. II Baruch 13.1 (Mount Zion) and ChrApocPet (Mount of Olives) are the only instances in which a mountain setting is employed.

38. ApocryJn 1.12ff; SJc 91.3ff; 1ApocJas 30.13ff; 2ApocJas 50.5ff; PetPhil 133.17ff; ThCont 138.4ff; cf. GosMary 8.6ff.
made to the disciples' state of mind: Mary is crying in John 20.11, 13, 15; the two men in Luke 24.17 have downcast faces as they talk to Jesus; and according to John 20.19 the disciples locked the doors for fear of the Jews. However in the Easter accounts this motif is not as central to the circumstantial settings as is the case in the BEQ. In fact it does not occur in those settings which most closely resemble the frame stories in the BEQ (Luke 24.33ff; John 20.26ff; 21.1ff; Matthew 28.16ff; John 20.19ff is a partial exception). It is thus by no means certain that the resurrection narratives provided the impetus for the inclusion of this element in the frame stories of the BEQ. However it is possible to account for this element on other grounds, viz. without reference to the influence of the apocalypse. On the one hand it would be a natural element to include since there would be the expectation that the disciples were distressed in the post-passion period. This could be due to the fact of Christ's suffering (1ApocThes 30.13ff), the fear of being left alone in a hostile world (PetPhil 133.17ff), or the fact that Christ has left them without teaching them on all matters relevant to Gnostic doctrine (Apocryphal, SIC). With respect to Apocryphal and SIC it is likely that an additional motive was the desire to explain the need for these additional revelations: it is implied that in the pre-passion period the disciples were not fully taught so that Christ must come to give them a special revelation/39/. Thus while the references to the disciples' distress do not have a direct parallel in the circumstantial settings of the resurrection narratives, it is

---

39. Although in PetPhil Christ states that he had given them the teaching for which they asked in the pre-passion period and says that they failed to understand because of their unbelief (135.5-8).
easy to see how this element came to be included.

Second, the important pattern of the coming and departure of a heavenly revealer with the associated introductory and concluding statements can also be seen as a consequence of the choice of a post-passion setting and the influence of the resurrection narratives. The Gospels and Acts assume that in the post-passion period Christ was not with the disciples continuously but only came to them on certain occasions. Furthermore several of the resurrection accounts employ the pattern of locating the disciples in a setting and then having Christ come to them (esp. John 20.19-23; 20.26-29; 21.2ff; Luke 24.33-53---this last account is the only one which also narrates Christ's departure). It is arguable that it is these Gospel traditions which lie behind the pattern of Christ's coming and departure in the narrative settings of the BE.

The dramatic accounts of Christ's coming and the associated fear-reassurance motif are the only elements which have no parallel in the resurrection narratives\(^\text{40}\). However as has been pointed out these dramatic accounts do not recur frequently in the BE (Apocryphon, SJC, PatPhil, Pistis Sophia). As has been noted, it is likely that the account in PatPhil has been influenced by a different Gospel tradition---the Transfiguration narratives. It is unlikely that the accounts in Apocryphon and SJC can also be attributed to the influence of these traditions.

However it is possible that these accounts can be attributed to

\(^{40}\) It is worth pointing out that there is a parallel to the fear-reassurance motif in Luke 24.37-39. Christ responds to the disciples' fear and surprise at his sudden appearance (37) with words of reassurance (38-39). However while the source of the disciples' fear in this case is the mere fact of Christ's sudden coming, in the BE it is related to his supernatural appearance.
the conviction that in the post-passion period Christ has put off the flesh and exists in the glory of his true being. This explanation would be particularly appropriate to SJC where the emphasis is on the contrast between his pre- and post-passion modes of existence (91.10ff)/41/. However it would be more difficult to explain all the elements in the account in ApocryJn with this interpretation.

The use of introductory and concluding statements can be seen as a complement to the pattern of Christ's coming and departure. One would expect the authors to attribute an introductory statement or dialogue to Christ when he first appears and a concluding one just before his departure. These statements also have their parallels in the resurrection narratives which can attribute brief statements to Christ/42/. These differ from those in the RRC since in most instances they are not divided into introductory and concluding statements. The exception is the account in Luke 24.33ff where one can distinguish between an introductory (24.38f) and final statement (24.48f). In most instances the content of these statements is not based on the resurrection narratives. However there are a few exceptions/43/. The main point, however, is that the use of

41. Cf. the account of Christ's true being in GnApocPet 83.8-15.

42. Cf. Luke 24.38f; John 20.21; 20.26c

43. In SJC part of the introductory statement is based on John 20.19, 21, 26: "Peace to you! My peace I give to you." (91.21-23) The statement of reassurance in ApocryJn 2.9-12 could well have been influenced by Jesus' words in Luke 24.38f. With respect to the concluding statement there are a significant number of allusions to canonical traditions in the concluding statement in GosMary (8.14-9.4). Finally the influence of canonical commissioning statements can be seen in varying degrees in PatPhil (137.22-138.3; 140.15-23), GosMary (8.14ff), and SJC (119.1-8--though the content and wording do not reflect canonical traditions in this case).
introductory and concluding statements can be attributed to the coming/departure motif and to the influence of the resurrection narratives.

Finally, the principal ingredients of the concluding narrative settings can also be accounted for by the 'de novo creation hypothesis'. It has already been argued that the concluding statement is related to the departure motif. The two elements of the disciples' response to the revelatory event and the account of their subsequent activity can both be seen as a natural rounding off of the narrative setting after Christ's departure. These two elements complement the circumstantial setting of the introductory frame story in that they describe what the disciples did after Christ's departure. Furthermore there is a precedent for both elements in the Gospel tradition. In Luke 24.33-53 the narrative describes both the disciples' response (worship and joy-52) and their subsequent activity (52f)/44/.

To sum up, it has been argued that the post-passion setting and the influence of the resurrection narratives can account for both the general structure and the constituent elements of the narrative settings. There are precedents in the resurrection narratives (and other Gospel traditions) for virtually every element in the narrative settings of the EllCC/45/. The references to the disciples' distress and the dramatic accounts of Christ's coming are the only elements which do not have a direct parallel.

---

44. It is possible that this tradition has influenced the accounts in SJQ and PetPhil. In SJQ the disciples respond with joy (119.10ff). The parallels are even closer in PetPhil where the responses of thanksgiving and joy (138.7ff; 139.4f) are followed by the disciples' return to the Temple in Jerusalem (compare PetPhil 138.7ff; 139.4ff and Luke 24.52f).
However it may even be possible to account for these elements without reference to the influence of the apocalypse.

Narrative Settings: Conclusion

It should be apparent that it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the evidence of the narrative settings. On the one hand there are a great many structural similarities between the narrative settings of the apocalypse and the RRC. On the other hand it is clear that the choice of a post-passion setting and the influence of the resurrection narratives could have led to the creation of narrative settings with many structural similarities to the frame stories in the apocalypses. There are only a few instances in which an element has been stylized in what appears to be an explicitly apocalyptic manner. The significance of this evidence will be examined in the concluding assessment of the two hypotheses.

45. The account in Luke 24.33ff contains the greatest number of formal parallels: a circumstantial setting (33-35), Christ comes to the disciples (36), a fear-reassurance motif (37-39), an introductory statement (36b), a concluding statement (49), an account of Christ's departure (51), and a reference to the disciples' response and their subsequent activity (52-53). Virtually all the structural ingredients for the construction of the narrative settings in the RRC can be found in this one account.
As has been pointed out there are only three BE. Q which incorporate an explicit esoteric motif: Apocryphal, Apocryphal, and 1Apocryphal/46/. While there are obviously no precedents in the Gospel traditions for these esoteric motifs, there are parallels in the Jewish apocalypses. As has been noted only two Jewish apocalypses employ an explicit esoteric motif--Daniel and IV Ezra/47/. The common element in these two Jewish apocalypses and three Gnostic BE. Q is that the circulation of the text is to be restricted in some respect. However this motif takes a different form in each text and there is no specific evidence of the influence of the esoteric motifs in Daniel and IV Ezra on the formulation of this element in either Apocryphal, Apocryphal, or 1Apocryphal/48/. Thus the esoteric elements in these three BE. Q constitute formal similarities to similar features in Daniel and IV Ezra. It could still be argued that the influence of the Jewish apocalypse can be seen in the use of this element. However one must also reckon with the possibility that this

47. Cf. chapter 1, 57-59.
48. In Daniel 12.4 Daniel is told that the revelation is not to be circulated until the time when the predicted events begin to take place. Ezra is simply told to give his account of the revelations he has received to the 'wise' (12.37f). James instructs the person to whom he sent his account that he is not to relate it to 'many' (1.19ff). John is told to give his account 'secretly' to his 'fellow spirits' (31.28ff). It is also said that the revelation is to be kept secure (31.32ff). Finally in 1Apocryphal Christ says that the revelation is to be secretly transmitted until the time comes to disclose it (36.13ff). The reference to the future publication of the revelation is reminiscent of the similar statement in Daniel 12.4f. However it is a formal similarity since the motif of future publication takes a different form in each case.
formal similarity between the two groups of texts is due to the fact that in both cases the authors are responding to a similar problem: the need to account for the fact that the texts had only come into circulation in recent times. This would be particularly important for Christian Gnostics who would need to counter the argument that their accounts of Christ's teaching Gnostic doctrine had not been in widespread circulation from apostolic times. Thus in themselves these esoteric elements do not constitute strong evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the genre. However if it is taken with other evidence then the presence of an esoteric motif might carry more weight. This point will be taken up in a consideration of individual texts.

CONTENT

It might be asked whether the topical concerns of the BNB indicate that the genre was not based on the traditional apocalypse and thus provide indirect support for the 'de novo creation hypothesis'. It is certainly the case that most of the BNB contain straightforward expositions of Gnostic doctrine and that there is not a close parallel between this material and the typical subject matter of the traditional apocalypses/49/. The

49. Vielhauer, Urchristliche Literatur, 690, suggests that there are parallels in both form and content between the two genres: "Tatsächlich zeigen sich manche Verwandtschaften im Formalen und noch mehr im Inhaltlichen (Offenbarungen zukünftiger und jenseitiger, vorzeitliche und kosmologische Geheimnisse)." However these similarities in content can only be identified with the use of broad topical categories. Koester, One Jesus, 193ff, is more realistic and recognizes the differences in content between the BNB and the traditional apocalypses.
references to the ascent of the Gnostic soul at death are frequently described as eschatological material. However in a Gnostic context this kind of material is an aspect of soteriological doctrine and thus cannot be simply equated with the eschatological content of the Jewish apocalypses/50/.

It is thus clear that the RRC do not treat the kind of themes which characterize the mainstream traditional apocalypses. It is doubtful, however, that this can be taken as an argument against the 'apocalypse hypothesis' and in favour of the 'de novo creation hypothesis'. There are several reasons for this/51/.

In the first place one would expect that Gnostic authors would use the apocalypse as a literary medium for their central theological concerns. It is clear that the main themes of the traditional apocalypses (especially the historical eschatology) were not the central concerns of Gnostic thought. This expectation that Gnostic authors would use the apocalypse as a medium for the central elements of their teaching is borne out by other Gnostic apocalypses. Apart from the RRC there are eight texts in the Nag Hammadi codices which can be classified as apocalypses. Only one deals with what could be regarded as in some sense a traditional subject matter (GnApocPaul). The rest treat various elements of Gnostic doctrine: NatArchons 92.32-97.21; GnApocPet; Melchizedek; Zostrianos; The Paraphrase

50. In Pistis Sophia there are accounts of the post-mortem fate of the soul which are more similar to related material in the traditional apocalypses (cf. esp. the series of questions and answers in chapters 141ff.).

51. It is also important to keep in mind that when evaluating the kind of literature that recounts revelations of the risen Christ eschatological content alone is not sufficient to establish that the author intended to base his work on the traditional apocalypse. This is evident in the cases of EpAp and TLord I.1-14. Cf. chapter 2, 87, 90-95.
of Shem; Marsanes; Allogenes. It is also likely that the choice of subject matter for the RRC can be seen as a consequence of the basic motivation underlying this literature. It has been argued that the primary impetus for the creation of this literature was the desire to claim dominical and apostolic authority for Gnostic doctrine. In light of this it is to be expected that Gnostic authors would use the genre as a medium for establishing dominical authority for various elements of Gnostic theology. Thus the fact that the genre is not used for Gnostic versions of eschatological doctrine does not undermine the 'apocalypse hypothesis'.

The final point involves anticipating a conclusion which has yet to be established. It will be argued in the following pages that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that at least one RRC was composed under the direct influence of the traditional apocalypse. There can be little doubt that the author of Apocryjn was acquainted with the traditional apocalypse and intended to write an apocalypse. The significance of this conclusion for the present argument is that in the case of Apocryjn the author's intention to compose an apocalypse has made no difference to the content of the text. Apocryjn is indistinguishable from the other RRC in its emphasis on the exposition of Gnostic doctrine (in fact it is one of the best examples of this use of the genre).

In view of these considerations the fact that there is not a close similarity in content between the RRC and the traditional apocalypse should not be taken as evidence that the genre could not have been based on the apocalypse. In my judgment the content of the RRC cannot be used as an argument either for or
against either hypothesis.

**SUMMARY ASSESSMENT**

The most important point which emerges from the preceding analysis is that both hypotheses can account for the various elements of the ERG. The revelatory character of the genre, the structure of the texts, the structure and constituent elements of the narrative settings and the use of an esoteric motif can in the majority of instances be satisfactorily accounted for by either hypothesis. The objection might be raised with respect to the 'de novo creation hypothesis' that it is too much of a coincidence that the de novo creation of a literary genre should result in a literature with so many similarities to the apocalypse. It is arguable, however, that the structural similarities to the apocalypse are not coincidental. These similarities can be seen as a consequence of a Christology which interprets Christ as a heavenly figure and the choice of a post-passion setting. A Gnostic Christology meant that it would be a revelatory genre. The post-passion setting and the claim to narrate events not recorded in the Gospel traditions can be seen as shaping the structure of the genre: narrative settings bracketing the revelation. Finally the influence of traditions about the post-passion period on the structure of the narrative settings created the possibility for a cluster of parallels to the frame stories of the apocalypses: a circumstantial setting, the pattern of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer,
introductory and concluding statements or dialogues, references to the recipients' response to the revelation and their subsequent activity. Thus if the genre did originate as a de novo creation it is not mere coincidence that the resultant genre was structurally similar to the apocalypse.

The question will inevitably be raised whether it is possible to attach a higher degree of probability to either hypothesis. This might be possible in the case of individual texts. However so far as the genre as a whole is concerned it is difficult to see how a preference for either hypothesis can be based on anything more than a subjective judgment as to which is the more probable interpretation.

It is particularly difficult to attach a higher degree of probability to the 'de novo creation hypothesis'. This could only be done if one could find grounds for virtually excluding the possibility that this literature was modelled on an established genre. However this is simply impossible. There are so many structural similarities between the RRC and the apocalypse that it is hard to see how the 'apocalypse hypothesis' can be excluded/52/. The one argument which might appear to favour the 'de novo creation hypothesis' is that there are so few texts in which elements of the genre have been stylized in an explicitly 'apocalyptic' manner. It could be argued that if the genre had been created and developed under the influence of the apocalypse then one would expect more evidence of this in the

52. To a certain extent this is also true for the 'dialogue hypothesis'. In view of the structural parallels between the RRC and some Graeco-Roman dialogue genres (narrative settings bracketing a dialogue), the possibility must be left open that this literature provided the formal models for the RRC.
stylization of the elements of the genre—especially when a moderately sized group of these texts survive. This is a consideration which might tip the balance in the minds of some. However it is not a particularly strong argument. The influence of the apocalypse is most likely to be seen in the narrative settings. However when one takes into account the freedom in the construction of narrative settings in the traditional apocalypses and the probability that the elements of the narrative setting would be shaped in light of Easter traditions as interpreted by Christian Gnostics, then one cannot attach a great deal of significance to the relative lack of stylistic elements shaped in an explicitly 'apocalyptic' manner. In this respect it is worth repeating the point that in the case of ChrApocPet and GnApocPet, two texts which were clearly written as apocalypses, the elements of the narrative setting have not been stylized in an explicitly 'apocalyptic' manner—in reality there are even fewer structural similarities to the narrative settings of the apocalypses than there are in many of the ECG. Thus while the 'de novo creation hypothesis' can be regarded as a plausible interpretation of the origins of the genre, it is difficult to see how one could either establish it or attach a higher degree of probability to this view.

It should be clear that a good case can be made for the 'apocalypse hypothesis'/53/. However the only way that one could either establish or attach a higher degree of probability to this view would be to identify elements of the genre which are stylized in a more explicitly apocalyptic manner. The relevant evidence may well be different in the case of individual texts. This can be seen by referring once again to the two apocalypses
attributed to Peter: ChrApoPet and GnApoPet. In each case it is a different combination of elements which indicates that the authors were indebted to the apocalypse for their literary genre. In the case of ChrApoPet it is the consistently eschatological content, the first person narrative style and, to a lesser extent, the visionary material in chapter 16 that identify this non-Gnostic EBG as an apocalypse. Dependence on the traditional apocalypse in the case of GnApoPet is indicated by an important cluster of formal parallels (esp. the first person narrative style and the use of interpreted visions) and by the absence of an alternative explanation for the genre. The question is whether this kind of evidence can be found in the Gnostic EBG.

It should be apparent from the previous analysis that so far as the majority of texts are concerned it does not. Most of the parallels to the apocalypse are of a formal nature and can also be accounted for by post-passion traditions. There are only a relatively few instances in which elements of the genre have been stylized in what appears to be a more explicitly apocalyptic manner. However the best evidence of this kind is concentrated in one text--ApoCryJn. It is just possible that such evidence

53. Both the strength of the case and the real difficulty with establishing it can be shown by hypothetically substituting another heavenly figure for Christ as the heavenly revealer (e.g. the Gnostic angel Eleleth who features as the heavenly revealer in NatArchons 93.2ff). There can be little doubt that if Eleleth was represented as transmitting revelations to Jesus' disciples in a literature which was structurally identical to the EBG, it would be widely accepted that the genre was based on the apocalypse. Thus the problem with establishing the 'apocalypse hypothesis' is not the predominantly non-eschatological content of the EBG, the lack of interpreted visions as a revelatory medium, or some distinctive structural feature like the use of a third person narrative style. The real difficulty is that the basis for the creation of a literary genre which is structurally similar to the apocalypse lies in the Christology of Christian Gnosticism and canonical traditions about the post-passion period.
can be found in SJF and 1ApocJas. However in the rest of the texts there is no firm evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the genre (ApocryJas, PatPhil, GosMary, 2ApocJas, ThCont, DialSav). These points are best made by a summary review of the features in individual texts which could be taken as positive evidence of the influence of the apocalypse.

The Apocryphon of John is one text where there is such a concentration of elements stylized in an 'apocalyptic' manner as to make it virtually certain that the author was influenced by the traditional apocalypse. Most of the evidence has already been discussed. However it is useful to bring together this evidence in a single list:

1. The main part of the text is written from a first person perspective (II.1, 1.17-31.31).

2. John's distress is an important element of the circumstantial setting (1.17ff).

3. Christ's entry is described in dramatic terms (1.30-2.9). There is a direct parallel in the apocalypses for the association of the opening of the heavens with the coming of a heavenly revealer. There are also formal parallels for the description of Christ's supernatural appearance.

4. A fear-reassurance motif is associated with the dramatic account of Christ's coming (2.1, 9ff).

5. Three elements of Christ's introductory statement have parallels in similar statements in the apocalypses: the word of reassurance, the self-identification, and the definition of the mission. The summary of what will be revealed with the use of the phrase 'what is and what was and what will come to pass' is particularly significant.

6. The concluding statement speaks of the transmission of the revelation and gives the text an esoteric character.
There is one other consideration which is significant when taken with the above evidence. The influence of the resurrection narratives on the frame stories is not as evident in ApocryJn as it is in other texts. While the author sets the revelation in the post-passion period, Jesus’ coming is not as clearly identified as a resurrection appearance as is the case in texts like SJC, ApocryJas, 1ApocJas, and PetPhil. Instead the author sets up a confrontation between John and a Pharisee from which John withdraws to reflect on unresolved questions which Jesus’ departure has occasioned. When taken with other evidence of the influence of the apocalypse, this unusual circumstantial setting could be a further indication that the author was not writing primarily under the influence of post-passion traditions.

Taken individually some of these points carry more weight than others (the strongest evidence is that cited in points 3, 4 and 5). Furthermore it is theoretically possible to account for several of these individual elements without reference to the influence of the apocalypse. However the cumulative weight of this evidence makes it virtually certain that the author was influenced by the traditional apocalypse and intended to write in that genre/54/.

54. W. C. van Unnik, "A Formula Describing Prophecy," NTS 9 (1962/63), 86, noted that "It seems as though the author wants to stand in a certain apocalyptic tradition, although the contents of the book are toto coelo different from apocalyptic revelations." Koester, One Jesus, 193ff, based his discussion of the relationship of the RRC to the traditional apocalypse almost exclusively on ApocryJn. While I would agree with him that the author of ApocryJn did intend to write an apocalypse, I do not think that it is legitimate to infer from this that the traditional apocalypse exercised a formative influence on the RRC as a whole. It is questionable whether Koester recognized that ApocryJn is distinctive in that there are numerous elements which have been stylized in an explicitly traditional fashion. This is not true for most of the RRC.
The evidence for the influence of the apocalypse on *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* is not as unambiguous as was the case with *Apocryphon*. It is worth pointing out that the narrative settings of SJG are very comprehensive and contain all the structural elements which have been cited as typical of the apocalypse: a circumstantial setting, accounts of the coming and departure of the heavenly revealer, introductory and concluding statements, and references to the individual's response and subsequent activity. However these parallels are in the main of a formal nature. Furthermore the evidence of the influence of specific Gospel traditions on the circumstantial setting and on elements of Christ's introductory and concluding statements means that it is possible that these structural elements could be due to the influence of canonical post-passion traditions. There are two elements which are more suggestive of the influence of the apocalypse. The first is the reference to the disciples' mental state. They are represented as being 'perplexed' by unresolved metaphysical and christological questions (91.3ff). In itself this evidence is by no means decisive since this motif could have been included in order to explain the need for these additional revelations. The second piece of evidence is the dramatic account of Christ's coming with the associated fear-reassurance motif (91.10ff). This could normally be taken as reasonably firm evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. However the fact that this description of Christ's appearance is set within the context of a contrast between his pre- and post-passion modes of existence raises the possibility that this motif can be attributed to the influence of a Gnostic Christology. In this instance the association of a fear-reassurance motif is not a decisive consideration. It is a weak version of this stylistic
element and in any case could be explained as a natural element to include after describing Christ's appearance in dramatic terms. Thus while there are several elements of this text which are suggestive of the influence of the apocalypse, the evidence cannot be regarded as decisive.

Evidence for the influence of the apocalypse on the genre of The First Apocalypse of James is even more tenuous than it was in SJG. In fact there is nothing in the text which is stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner. However there are several characteristics of the text which when taken together contribute to the impression that this text may have been composed as an apocalypse.

In the first place the narrative settings have not been influenced by specific canonical traditions. While Christ's coming is formally equivalent to the resurrection appearances in the Gospels, the entire setting is the author's own creation (30.13ff). It is thus possible that the author did not compose his work primarily on the basis of post-passion traditions. Another factor which gives 1ApocJas more the character of an apocalypse than some other RRC is that the revelation is given to an individual rather than to a group. In light of this one would expect that this text would employ a first person narrative style if the author intended to emulate the traditional apocalypse. While there are three statements in the first person—and there is no apparent explanation for this—most of the narrative framework is in the third person. It has been argued, however, that the author may have allowed his explanation of the transmission and authorship of the text to determine the narrative style: James' recounts the revelation to Addai who
writes the text (36.15ff). Finally the esoteric motif which takes the form of instructions about the transmission and ultimate publication of the revelation (36.15ff) constitutes a close formal parallel to this element in Daniel.

This evidence is by no means decisive and each element can be explained in some other way. Thus, for example, it does not necessarily follow from the lack of specific canonical traditions in the narrative settings that the author did not base his work on canonical traditions. He may simply have chosen to create his own settings without incorporating specific elements from the post-passion traditions. Furthermore the fact that only James is given the revelation could be due to a depreciation of the 'Twelve'/55/. The esoteric motif and instructions about the transmission of the revelation carry a bit more weight as evidence. However even these elements could be due to the need to explain why the text had not been known from apostolic times. Thus while there are several elements of this text which are suggestive of the influence of the apocalypse, the evidence cannot be regarded as decisive.

Firm evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the RRC is lacking in the rest of the texts: ApocJas, 2ApocJas, GosMary, PatPhil, ThCont, DialSav. However it is worth making a few observations with respect to these texts.

There are three elements in The Apocryphon of James which some might regard as evidence of the influence of the apocalypse:

1. the first person narrative style; 2. the esoteric motif

55. In the concluding narrative setting James rebukes 'the Twelve' (42.20-24). A depreciation of the twelve seems to be implied in ApocJas as well (1.22-25; 16.2ff). Cf. chapter 3, 139ff.
(1.19-25); 3. the account of Peter and James' ecstatic ascension into the heavenly world as they accompanied Christ at his ascension. It is unlikely, however, that these features can be taken as positive evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. The first person style is due to the epistolary setting of the account (1.1-35; 16.12-30). The esoteric motif is a weak one and there is nothing in its formulation to suggest that it has been shaped by similar motifs in the apocalypses. Finally even if the account of Peter and James' ascension was modelled on apocalyptic ascension visions, it would not follow that the genre of the work as a whole was based on the apocalypse.\textsuperscript{56}

Another account of a revelation given to James is the pericope within \textit{The Second Apocalypse of James} (50.5-57.19). The narrative setting of this account is somewhat distinctive in that there is nothing which is stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner or with reference to specific canonical traditions. The similarities to both the apocalypse and post-passion traditions are of a formal nature. While the account employs a first person style and the revelation is given to an individual, in this case these considerations do not carry much weight as evidence since these features can be explained by the setting of the account within James' speech to a Jewish audience.

In \textit{The Gospel of Mary} there are two accounts of revelations which Christ gave his disciples: the first part of the text recounts one he gave to the disciples and Mary as a group (ends at 9.5); the second is one which he gave to Mary (10.10-17.7). One difficulty with coming to any conclusions about the first

\textsuperscript{56} Williams, \textit{NHLE}, 29, suggests that the account of their ascension was modelled on apocalyptic ascension visions.
revelation is that the introductory frame story is among the lost material (first six pages). It is noteworthy, however, that the concluding frame story has been heavily influenced by canonical traditions. It has been suggested that Mary experienced her revelation in a visionary state/57/. However this is unlikely. Mary's statement to Christ in which she says 'I saw you today in a vision' (10.12, 13) refers back to a previous vision and provides the starting point for a dialogue on how visions are seen (10.16ff).

The Epistle of Peter to Philip conveys the impression of being the most 'unapocalyptic' of the BRG. This is probably due to two related characteristics of the text: 1. the extended narrative settings; 2. the extensive use of canonical traditions in the construction of the text. In fact if one were to take this text on its own there would be grounds for concluding that it was more likely that the genre was a de novo creation. The dramatic account of Christ's coming (134.9ff) is the only element which could be interpreted as evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. However this is only a formal parallel to the apocalypse since the account has been modelled on the Transfiguration narratives rather than on similar accounts in the apocalypses.

ThCont and DialSay stand apart from the rest of the BRG in that they lack the typical frame stories. One consequence of this is that there is no specific evidence of influence from either the apocalypse or canonical traditions in the narrative framework of either text. Furthermore the lack of narrative settings means

57. Puech, Gnostic Gospels, 342; Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 131.
that there are fewer structural parallels to the traditional apocalypse than there are in the other EEC. However from a formal point of view both texts can still be classified as apocalypses since they set a revelation within the framework of an account of the event in which it was mediated to the human recipients. It is worth pointing out that there is one pericope in which Christ takes Judas, Matthew and Miriam to a place where they can view 'the pit' (134.24-ca. 137.3). It is possible that this one pericope was influenced by apocalyptic traditions. However even if this were the case it would not mean that the genre of the work as a whole was based on the apocalypse.

Thus *The Apocryphon of John* is the only text for which there is firm evidence of the influence of the apocalypse. It is just possible that such evidence can also be found in SJJC and 1ApocJas. However for the rest of the texts there is no firm evidence which would make it possible to attach a higher degree of probability to the 'apocalypse hypothesis'.

It would be possible to infer from the fact that there is evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on at least one text (and possibly two more) that the apocalypse has exercised a formative influence on the genre as a whole. However this would be an unwarranted inference. The reason is that it is impossible to determine where ApocryJn (and SJJC and 1ApocJas) fit in the history of the creation and development of the genre. It is possible that ApocryJn, and for the sake of argument SJJC and 1ApocJas, represent the prototypes of the genre which were deliberately modelled on the apocalypse and which provided the basis for the future development of the genre. However it is also possible that they represent later examples of the genre.
In this case it is possible that the genre was originally created on the basis of post-passion traditions and that subsequent authors assimilated the genre to the apocalypse—a natural step in view of the structural similarities between the RRC and the apocalypse/58/.

CONCLUSION

The position which has been argued in the preceding study is that the present form of the RRC can be accounted for by either of two hypotheses. One the one hand a good case can be made for the view that the Jewish and Christian apocalypse provided the literary models on which this genre was based. On the other hand it is entirely plausible that the genre was created independently of the influence of an antecedent genre. It has been argued that the genre could have been created on the basis of a Gnostic Christology and traditions about the post-passion period. So far as the genre as a whole is concerned it would appear to be impossible either to establish or to attach a higher degree of probability to either hypothesis. The difficulty with establishing the 'de novo creation hypothesis' is that it is impossible to rule out the possibility that the genre was in fact based on an established literary genre (either the apocalypse or

58. In reality the creation and development of the genre could have had a much more complicated history then these two alternatives suggest. Thus, for example, it is possible that there were two or more independent prototypes and that each was created on the basis of different influences. Furthermore subsequent texts based on a given prototype could have developed in different ways.
Graeco-Roman dialogue literature). So far as the 'apocalypse hypothesis' is concerned there is clear evidence of the influence of the apocalypse on the genre of one text—*The Apocryphon of John*. As has been pointed out the evidence is more ambiguous in the cases of *SJC* and *IApocJas*. However in the majority of the texts the elements of the genre have not been stylized in an explicitly apocalyptic manner. In the absence of this kind of evidence it is impossible to say more than that the 'apocalypse hypothesis' is a plausible interpretation of the origins of the genre.

This conclusion may not seem like a completely satisfactory one since it does not come down in favour of either view. However it seems unwise to insist on drawing conclusions which the evidence will not support for the sake of psychologically satisfying conclusions. Furthermore it is hoped that this analysis will have identified the most likely ways to account for the present form of the *RRC* and the actual difficulties with establishing any interpretation.
Chapter 6

The Apocalypses of Peter

The Gnostic Apocalypses of Peter (VII.3; GnApocPet) is structured around Peter's account of a revelation which Christ gave him on the subjects of the passion and 'early Church history'/1/. While the text has been extremely well preserved, in many places the meaning of the Coptic is difficult to determine. This in turn creates problems for both translation and interpretation. It has been suggested that this is due either to a careless copyist or, more likely, to the incompetence of the translator who rendered the Greek text into Coptic/2/. There is very little evidence on which to base an accurate determination of date and provenance. However Koschorke has suggested that the text may have been written in Syria and argues  

that it was composed between about A.D. 200-250/3/.

With respect to questions of genre GnApocPet poses a number of problems: 1. the interpretation of the structure of the narrative setting; 2. the question as to whether there is sufficient evidence to establish that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse; 3. the ecclesiastical setting and function of the text. These issues will be examined in this order after a brief survey of the content of GnApocPet.

The text opens with a brief narrative setting which locates Jesus and Peter in the Jerusalem temple (70.14-20). This leads into Jesus' initial discourse which is built around several themes: the blessedness of the Gnostics (because they have received a revelation which enables them to distinguish truth from error--70.21ff), a description of his own redemptive work (70.25-71.14), and exhortations to Peter in view of his future role as the founder of the Gnostic community who will remain faithful to Jesus' message (71.15-72.4)/4/.

This discourse is interrupted by the approach of a hostile Jewish mob who threaten Jesus and Peter with stones (72.4ff).

2. Cf. Werner, TLZ=22, 575; Krause, Nag Hammadi Apokalypsen, 621f; 627f; Koschorke, Polesnik, 14--esp. note 5 (he also notes that some of the difficulties arise from our ignorance of the historical background for the material); Brashier, Genre Analysis, 8-10, argues that the problems are those that would arise from a poor translation rather than an inaccurate copyist.

3. Koschorke, Polesnik, 16f. Jewish Christian influence has been noted by Werner, TLZ=22, 575, Schenke, "Bemerkungen zur Apokalypse des Petrus," NJS VI (Leiden, 1975) 277, and Koschorke, Polesnik, 16. All commentators note a preference for the Gospel of Matthew. The motif of the laughing Savior is paralleled in Irenaeus' account of Basilides (Advbaer I.24.4) and GrSeth (VII.2) 56.13-19.

When Peter is afraid that they will be killed, Jesus reassures him that there is no need to fear since the mob is 'blind' and 'deaf'. This is demonstrated for Peter by two 'revelations' in which Peter is able to see what is happening at another level of reality: 1. he sees a light descending on Jesus (72.12-28); 2. he hears the mob praising Jesus (72.28-73.17). While the meaning of the latter revelation is unclear, the first vision anticipates the subsequent revelation that Christ's essential being cannot be harmed by the hostile mob. This revelation provides the transition to a long discourse on what will happen after Jesus' departure (73.23-80.23). The author relates this discourse to the immediate context (73.12-22) and the connection appears to be that the blindness and deafness of the Jewish mob (73.13f) will also characterize the opponents of the Gnostic community (76.21f).

The discourse itself is rather loosely structured. The author uses phrases like 'for many', 'for some' and 'but others' as transitions within the discourse (73.23; 74.22; 76.24; [76.27]; 77.22; 78.31; 79.22). However the material between two such phrases does not necessarily deal with a single issue (e.g. 73.23-74.22; 77.22-78.31). It is also evident that the discourse is neither a sequential account of events down to the author's time nor a thematic catalogue describing the various errors of the orthodox. Instead the author blends a characterization of various aspects of the orthodox community with references to particular individuals and events/5/. Furthermore in virtually every pericope the author relates his characterization of the orthodox to the threat they pose to the Gnostic community. Finally at one point in the discourse the
characterization of the coming apostasy is interrupted as Jesus explains the difference between the Gnostics and their opponents on the basis of a Gnostic anthropology: the Gnostics are immortal souls while their opponents are of this age and thus enslaved to the created world (75.7-76.23).

According to the author Jesus' teaching is initially accepted but apostasy sets in early on:

"For many will accept our teaching in the beginning. And they will turn from them again by the will of the Father of their error, because they have done what he wanted." 73.23-28

It is said that the apostates embrace the theology of the cross ('they will cleave to the name of a dead man') and come under the influence of an individual who imposes a 'manifold dogma' (74.13-22). This is almost certainly a reference to the apostle Paul/6/.

There are only two other instances in which the author refers to specific individuals: 1. it is likely that the polemic at 74.22-75.7 is directed against Simon and Simonian Gnostics.

5. Brashler, Genre and Function, 222ff; NHLE, 339, states that the author is describing various groups of orthodox Christians and rival Gnostic communities. It is possible that this is the case in one or two instances (e.g. 74.22ff). However it is unlikely that each of the major pericopes can be interpreted as a polemic against distinct groups. Cf. Perkins' critique of Brashler- Genre Dialogue, 129, note 17. Koschorke, Polémik, 48f, has argued that the individual pericopes describe various aspects of the one orthodox church. While this is a more accurate characterization of the discourse, it must also be recognized that in places the author refers to specific events that took place over a period of time and in at least one instance he may refer to the error of a rival Gnostic community (74.22ff).

6. Werner, TLZ=22, 576; Koschorke, Polémik, 39-42, amasses a great deal of evidence for this identification; Brashler, Genre and Function, 220-222, doubts that there is sufficient evidence to warrant this identification and suggests that this description could be true of any leader in the early church (it is doubtful that this skepticism is justified).
(cf. the description of the key figures as 'a man and a naked woman')/7/; 2. the reference to Hermas at 78.14-19 has been taken as evidence that the author is attacking Hermas' teaching on repentance/8/. Other characterizations tend to be more general: e.g. the orthodox claim to be in exclusive possession of the truth and try to win over novice Gnostics (76.24-77.22)/9/; there are those who believe that martyrdom will perfect the believing community (78.31-79.21--this pericope develops into a broader attack on the orthodox and a prophecy of their punishment); in the last pericope the author attacks the offices of bishop and deacon (79.22-31).

As has been noted the author frequently relates these descriptions of the opposition to the threat posed to the Gnostic community. It would seem that the main danger lay in the absorption of novice Gnostics by the orthodox (73.32-74.9; 76.34-77.21; 78.3-11, 20-22, 26-31; 79.18-21). Furthermore the author's open acknowledgement that Gnostics were falling away and his conviction that orthodox domination would only be brought to an end at the eschaton suggests that they were experiencing considerable success (77.17-21; 78.3-11; 80.8-23).

Peter responds to the discourse with fear as he anticipates

7. Schenkel, Apokalypse des Petrus, 281-283; Koschorke, Polosnik, 41 (esp. note 8) and 49-52, lists a variety of possibilities. He argues that while the reference is to Simon and Helen, Simon is a code word for Paul and the woman may be Thekla. It is likely that this interpretation has been influenced by his view that the entire polemic in GnApocPet is directed against the orthodox leadership (see below).

8. Koschorke, Polosnik, 54-60.

9. Koschorke, Polosnik, 52-57, treats 76.24-27 and 76.27-77.22 as two sections while others treat it as a single pericope. The material extending from 77.4-16 is particularly difficult to interpret.
the future (79.32-80.7). However Christ reassures him that while the orthodox will have the upper hand in this age, the situation will be reversed at his 'Parousia' (80.8-23; cf. 78.3-6 for the term 'Parousia'). This exchange is worth quoting:

But I said, "I am afraid because of what you have told me...that there are multitudes that will mislead other multitudes of living ones, and destroy them among themselves. And when they speak your name they will be believed."

The Savior said, "For a time determined for them in proportion to their error they will rule over the little ones. And after the completion of the error, the never-aging one of the immortal understanding shall become young, and they (the little ones) shall rule over those who are their rulers. The root of their error he shall pluck out, and he shall put it to shame so that it shall be manifest in all the impudence which it has assumed to itself. And such ones shall become unchangeable, O Peter."

This last statement ends the discourse on 'early church history' and the text then takes up the theme of Christ's passion. This takes the form of two revelations relating to the cross and Jesus' subsequent 'glorification'/10/. In the first Peter sees two figures: one is being nailed to the cross while another is standing beside him 'glad and laughing'. Jesus explains that the individual who was crucified is a 'substitute' while the one who is 'glad and laughing' is the 'living Jesus' (81.7-24; cf. 82.1-3, 17-33). In the second revelation Peter sees another figure who resembles the 'living Jesus' and is accompanied by a host of angels (82.4-16). Jesus' initial interpretation returns to the first vision (82.17-83.8) and it is only in the last few lines that the second vision is explained in terms of the coming of Jesus' 'intellectual pleroma' who restores Christ to his full glory (83.8-15)/11/.

10. The nature of these revelations will be examined in the next section.
This interpretation of the passion is followed by a concluding statement in which Jesus tells Peter that the revelation is only to be given to the Gnostic community, contrasts the Gnostics with their opponents, and exhorts Peter to be courageous (83.15-84.11). The text ends with a single narrative statement which refers either to Christ's 'ascension' or to Peter's emergence from an ecstatic state (84.12f--this phrase will be examined in the next section).

**APOCALYPSE OF PETER: NARRATIVE SETTINGS**

An intriguing problem posed by *GnApocPet* is the interpretation of the narrative setting which the author provides for the revelation. The fact that there is a problem was initially noted by Werner who stated that "In Rahmen und Aufbau der ApoPt finden sich besonders viele Unklarheiten."/12/ There are at least two ways of interpreting the structure of the narrative setting/13/. One is that the entire revelation was given in the context of the Temple setting with which the text opens. On this view the revelations which interpret Jesus' passion would have been mediated entirely by visions which look forward to the event/14/. The other possibility is that the revelation was given in two settings: the Temple and the site of


crucifixion. On this view the Temple setting would provide the context for the material extending from 70.14-80.23a. At 80.23b-81.3a there would be a transition to a new setting as Peter describes Jesus' apparent arrest (81.4-6) and then Peter and Jesus are in the vicinity of the Cross. The subsequent visions of the 'living Jesus' laughing by the cross (81.7-14) and the approach of another heavenly figure (82.4-16) would take place within the context of the actual crucifixion instead of being visionary anticipations of these events. Finally the revelation would conclude with Jesus' final exhortation to Peter (83.15-84.11) and his 'ascension' (84.12-14)/15/. This interpretation of the narrative setting is supported by the following evidence.

The first indication that the Temple setting is not maintained for the entire revelation comes at the end of Jesus'

13. Brashler, ApocPet, 130-135, has proposed a third interpretation. He argues that the entire revelation was given in the heavenly Temple (which is a metaphor for the Pleroma) after Jesus' ascension. This view assumes that Peter has experienced an ecstatic rapture into heaven and that the material describing events in the Temple area and at the site of crucifixion represents a 'visionary flashback'. This interpretation is based almost exclusively on an exegesis of the enigmatic narrative setting (70.14-19). One difficulty with this interpretation is that there is no support for it within the text. Thus, for example, the material describing the approach of the Jewish mob and Peter's fear that they will be harmed implies a setting in the historical Jerusalem Temple (72.4ff). Furthermore the transitional statement at 80.23ff does not make sense on this view. Cf. as well Perkins' critique, Gnostic Dialogue, 116 (note 6).

14. This is the way the material is normally interpreted. It has been well expressed by Werner, TLZ-99, 575, who offers this reconstruction of the structure of the text: "Wahrscheinlich in der Karwoche erfährt Petrus im Tempel eine Offenbarung des wahren Wesens Jesu. Petrus sieht Jesus von himmlischem Licht überstrahlt und erhält von ihm in Visionen und Auditionen Aufschlüsse über die nähere und fernere Zukunft. Er schaut dabei Verhaftung, Verleugnung, Prozess und Hinrichtung Jesus. Eingebettet darin ist eine 'kritische Theologiegescichte' der frühen Christenheit."
discourse on the coming apostasy. Jesus' next statement urging Peter to prepare for the passion events (80.23-81.3) plus the first lines of Peter's subsequent narrative (81.3-6) are as follows:

"Come therefore, let us go on with the completion of the will of the incorruptible Father. For behold, those who will bring them judgment are coming, and they will put them to shame. But me they cannot touch. And you, O Peter, shall stand in their midst. Do not be afraid because of your cowardice. Their minds shall be closed for the invisible one has opposed them."

When he had said these things, I saw him seemingly being seized by them.

There are several elements in this material which suggest that a change of setting is introduced at this point. In the first place Jesus' statement contains verbs of movement ('come', 'let us go', 'are coming') and seems to prepare Peter for an impending event ('you shall stand in their midst', 'do not be afraid'). While these elements do not make much sense as an introduction to a vision of future events, they are completely intelligible as an introduction to real events that are about to take place. Second, while the phrase 'I saw him seemingly being seized by them' could be read as the introduction to a vision, it is also possible to take it as a reference to Jesus' actual

15. Koschorke, Polenik, 12-13, seems to interpret the narrative setting in this way. However he has not set forth the detailed evidence which would support this interpretation. It is worth pointing out that in the Acts of John (97-102) John recounts how Christ gave him a revelation concerning the true meaning of the passion in the context of the event itself. John tells how he fled from the site of crucifixion and went to a cave on the Mount of Olives. The 'real Jesus' appeared to him, showed John a vision of a 'Cross of Light', and interpreted the significance of both that vision and the events that were taking place at the historical cross. After giving John the revelation Jesus ascends to the heavenly world. John then returns to the site of crucifixion and laughs at the crowd which does not understand what is happening. Cf. BNTA=II, 232-235.
arrest. Furthermore this phrase can be closely related to the earlier references to the hostile Jewish mob approaching Jesus and Peter (72.9-73.10). On this view 81.3-6 picks up from 72.9-73.10: after Jesus' discourse on the future apostasy (for which the starting point was a typology between the Jewish mob and the Gnostics' opponents) the author returns to the Temple setting and describes Jesus' apparent arrest by the Jews. Finally, there are close structural and verbal parallels between Matthew 26.46, 50 and these lines (esp. 80.23-29; 81.5-6)/15a:

The second statement, 'those who will bring them judgment are coming', is particularly interesting as it appears to be a Gnostic interpretation of Jesus' statement that 'my betrayer is at hand.' Since the attempt to crucify Jesus results in the judgment of the archons rather than Christ's destruction, Jesus' betrayers can be viewed as those who in fact bring ruin upon the lower powers (82.1-3, 21-26). The main point, however, is that the apparent use of material from the Gospel passion narratives which mark transitions in the development of the story supports the other evidence that the author intended to effect a change of setting at this point in GnApocPet.

The second source of evidence for the view that the revelation was given in two settings comes from the first of the two revelations concerning the passion (81.7-82.3). This section

15a. It is apparent that elements from the Gethsemane narratives have been transferred to the Temple setting.
And I said, 'What do I see, O Lord, that it is you yourself whom they take, and that you are grasping me? Or who is this one, glad and laughing on the tree? And is it another one whose feet and hands they are striking?'

The Savior said to me, 'He whom you see on the tree, glad and laughing, this is the living Jesus. But this one into whose feet they drive the nails is his fleshly part, which is the substitute being put to shame, the one who came into being in his likeness. But look at him and me.'

But I, when I had looked, said, 'Lord, no one is looking at you. Let us flee this place.'

But he said to me, 'I have told you, Leave the blind alone! And you, see how they do not know what they are saying. For the son of their glory instead of my servant they have put to shame.'

There are several elements in this account which suggest that the revelation was given in the context of the actual crucifixion.

First, in the interpretation of the visions the author uses present and past tenses instead of future (this is true for the subsequent revelation as well)/16/. The following represent some typical statements:

"He whom you see glad and laughing on the tree...." 81.15-17
"For the son of their glory...they have put to shame...." 82.1-3
"...he whom they crucified...." 82.21
"But what they released was my incorporeal body." 83.6-8

It is possible that the use of present and past tenses was determined by the fact that the interpretation refers back to the vision (though this would not explain every instance). However

16. The only instance in which a future tense is used is 83.5: "So then the one susceptible to suffering shall come, since the body is the substitute." The reason for this usage is not clear. However if the vision referred to future events then one would expect the consistent use of future tenses in the interpretation.
if the vision concerned future events then one would expect that
the interpretation would be developed in terms of what would take
place in the future (i.e. with the use of future tenses).

Another indication that this revelation concerning the
passion took place in the context of the actual events is that
several statements suggest that Jesus refers to events as they
are actually taking place rather than back to the vision. The
first indication of this comes with Jesus' conclusion to the
vision. He tells Peter to compare the figure on the Cross with
himself: "But look at him and at me." (81.24) This statement
implies either that the vision is still unfolding before Peter or
that they are actually watching events as they take place. This
is also the case in the subsequent exchange between Jesus and
Peter. Peter says that as no one is watching them they should
run away (81.25-28). Jesus responds that the crowd is blind,
they do not know what they are saying, and they are crucifying
the wrong person (81.28-82.3). While Peter's statement that they
should flee could be understood as meaning that they should leave
the Temple area, this statement would be even more intelligible
in the context of the actual crucifixion. However Jesus' response
provides firmer evidence for the proposed interpretation. His exhortation to observe that the crowd does
not know what they are saying does not refer back to the vision
since there is no reference to this element in Peter's account.
Furthermore his statements that the crowd is ignorant of what
they are saying because they are not crucifying the 'real' Jesus
implies a reference to real events that are taking place as Peter
and Jesus watch.
A final consideration which provides indirect support for this interpretation is that on this view the relationship between 'vision' and 'historical reality' in this section would be the same as was employed in the first visions given in the Temple setting. In that case Peter described events as they were taking place at the 'natural level' (the hostile mob approaching Jesus) and Christ enabled him to perceive events taking place at a 'higher level' (a light descending on Jesus and the transformation of the crowd's angry shouts to praise). On the interpretation that is being proposed the same structure underlies 81.3-83.15: in the context of the actual crucifixion Peter sees two brief visions which enable him to see beyond empirical reality to what is actually taking place/17/. The significance of both the historical events and the visions is then interpreted by Jesus.

The final source of evidence that the revelation is given in more than one setting is provided by the concluding material (83.15-84.13). Most of this consists of Jesus' concluding statement to Peter (83.15-84.11). This is followed by a brief narrative statement (84.12-13). This latter statement will be examined first. The Coptic is as follows: ΝΑΙ ΝΤΑΥ ΧΟΥ ΑΥΥΨΝΕ ΛΡΑΙ ΝΤΩ ΤΥ. The meaning of the first part of the sentence is clear: "When he (Jesus) had said these things...." The problem lies in the interpretation of the second clause. Who is the subject of ΑΥΥΨΝΕ and what is meant by ΝΤΩ ΤΥ? It has been argued that Peter is the subject and that the verb should be interpreted reflexively ('Peter came to

17. Koschorke, Polemik, 18-27, develops his treatment of the passion material in terms of what, according to the author, is perceptible to the 'spiritual eye' in contrast to the 'fleshly eye'.
himself'). This is then interpreted as a reference to Peter's emergence from an ecstatic state/18/. The main problem with this interpretation is that there is no indication earlier in the text that Peter received the revelation in the context of an ecstatic state. It is clear Peter is in a normal state of consciousness in the first part of the text (he watched a hostile crowd approaching). There is nothing to indicate that Peter went into an ecstatic state either when he saw the light descend on Jesus or to hear the transformation of the crowd's hostility into praise (72.4-73.14). The only other point at which Peter might have gone into an ecstatic state is just before the revelations relating to the passion (80.23ff). However once again there is nothing to indicate that this happened.

This phrase has also been taken as a reference to Jesus' departure or 'ascension'/19/. On this view Jesus would be the subject of both verbs and the 'in him' would refer to the supreme deity or, more likely, to Christ's 'intellectual Pleroma' which Peter had seen approaching Jesus in the last vision (82.4-16; 83.8-15)/20/. Whatever the precise meaning of 'in him', two considerations suggest that this statement refers to Jesus' departure.

First, there is a precedent for this combination of ideas

18. This interpretation was first proposed by Böhlig, "Zur Apokalypse des Petrus," Göttingen Mischelen 8 (1973), 11-13. It was adopted by Brashler, Apostel, 129f, and Bullard, NHLE, 345.


20. Werner, TLZ=29, 582, suggests 'dem Geist' (though it is not clear if he regards this as a reference to Jesus' ascension). Cf. GrSeth 70.5-6 where Jesus says: ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕΙΔΥΠΤΕ ΖΝ ΚΟΥΝΑ ΜΠΙΩΤ ('I have been in the bosom of the Father').
(when Jesus had finished speaking/he departed) in a number of texts that represent Christ in conversation with his disciples just before his departure. The earliest is the statement in Acts 1.7: "And when he had said this...he was lifted up...."

Furthermore there are a number of statements with a similar structure in Gnostic texts that attribute revelations to the risen Christ/21/:

"Having said these words, he departed."

ApocryJas 15.5f

"And these things were presented to him in a mystery, and immediately he disappeared from him."

ApocryJn II.1, 32.1ff

"These are the things the blessed Savior said, and he disappeared from them."

SJC III.4, 119.8f

"When he had said this, he departed."

GosMary 9.5

The other evidence which suggests that this final phrase should be interpreted as a reference to Jesus' departure is that the preceding pericope is Jesus' final word to Peter (83.15-84.11). He tells Peter that the revelation is only to be given to the Gnostic community and contrasts the Gnostics with their opponents. The real indication that this is Jesus' final word is the cluster of exhortations at the end/22/:

"You, therefore, be courageous and do not fear at all. For I shall be with you in order that none of your enemies may prevail over you. Peace be to you. Be strong." 84.6-11

In view of these considerations it is likely that this final


22. For close parallels to elements of this statement cf. Jesus' final words in Matthew 28.20 ('I am with you always'); GosMary 8.14 and PetPhil 140.17 ("Peace be with you", "Peace to you all"); PetPhil 140.20-23 ("And be not afraid. Behold I am with you forever.").
phrase refers to Jesus' departure. While it is theoretically possible that the author envisioned the departure of the 'living Jesus' as having taken place before the passion took place, it seems more likely that the author represented Christ's departure as having taken place after he had explained to Peter the true meaning of the Cross in the context of the event itself/23/.

There are thus a number of indications which suggest that Christ's revelations are given to Peter in two settings—the Temple and the site of crucifixion. The only difficulty with this interpretation is that the transition between the Temple setting and the site of crucifixion is extremely abrupt. Peter sees the Jewish mob apparently seize Jesus (81.4-10) and the next moment he is describing events at the Cross (81.10-14). The only transition between the two settings is Peter's question as to whether it is Jesus himself whom the crowd has seized (81.7-10). It is likely that it is the abruptness of this transition which has led commentators to conclude that the revelations concerning the passion are visionary anticipations of these events. However against this one difficulty must be placed a number of indications drawn from various parts of the text which indicate that the actual site of the crucifixion provides the context for the revelations concerning the passion.

---

23. It is noteworthy that in the Acts of John Christ's ascension takes place while the crucifixion is still in progress (102).
GENRE: BASED ON THE TRADITIONAL APOCALYPSE?

There is no doubt that on formal grounds GnApocPet must be classified as an apocalypse. The text is structured around a narrative account of a mediated revelation, a first person narrative style is used, and the two basic structural elements of the genre are the narrative setting and the account of the revelatory event. It is also likely that the author derived his genre from the traditional apocalypse. However in this respect it is important to realize that there is virtually nothing in this Gnostic apocalypse which has been stylized in an explicitly traditional manner. This can be seen by examining the various elements of the genre which one might expect would provide evidence of the influence of the traditional apocalypse.

So far as the narrative settings are concerned there are a number of formal parallels to the frame stories in the traditional apocalypse: a circumstantial setting, an introductory statement, a concluding statement--including instructions as to the transmission of the revelation, and a statement that the heavenly revealer departed. However these similarities are of a formal nature as none of these elements have been stylized in a traditional fashion. It would appear that the narrative settings represent the author's own creation--though influenced in places by canonical traditions (e.g. the choice of a Temple setting, the transition to the site of crucifixion, elements of the concluding statement).
The use of interpreted visions as a revelatory medium in GnApocPet is a distinctive feature in that this is the only example of this revelatory device in an extant Gnostic apocalypse/24/. This might suggest that the presence of this stylistic device in GnApocPet is due to the influence of the traditional apocalypse/25/. However this inference must be tempered by two considerations. First, the author makes very limited use of interpreted visions. The are only four instances in which visions are used and these accounts are very brief. Second, and more importantly, the visions in GnApocPet have a completely different character from those in the traditional apocalypses/26/. In the traditional apocalypses visions normally take the form of symbolic or allegorical representations of historical and eschatological events. However in GnApocPet the author describes events as they take place at the 'empirical' level and then Christ enables him to see events that are simultaneously transpiring at the 'supernatural' level. The significance of events taking place at both levels of reality is then interpreted by Jesus. There are no parallels in the traditional apocalypses to this type of vision. Thus the use of interpreted visions in GnApocPet constitutes a purely formal similarity to the traditional apocalypse and cannot be taken as decisive evidence that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse.

The use of an esoteric motif is a third element which could

24. The use of interpreted visions in the context of a heavenly journey represents a different phenomenon (e.g. GnApocPaul).

25. Brashler, Genre Analysis, 128f; Krause, Apokalypsen von Nag Hammadi, 628.

26. Krause, Nag Hammadi Apokalypsen, 628, recognizes this fact.
be taken as evidence of the influence of the traditional apocalypse. In his concluding statement Jesus tells Peter that the revelation is only to be circulated within the Gnostic community (83.15-18). However as was the case with ApocryJn, iApocJas, and ApocryJas, the formulation of this motif is not sufficiently distinctive to indicate that it was based on the traditional apocalypse. None of these Gnostic texts employ the more distinctive motif of a restriction of the circulation of the text until the eschatological era/27/.

Both Brashler and Krause treat Jesus' discourse on the future 'apostasy' as analogous to the historical reviews in the traditional apocalypses/28/. It is doubtful, however, that this discourse can be viewed as a form of the traditional historical review. This is because the discourse is not structured around a sequential representation of events from the time of Jesus' departure to his Parousia. While the discourse starts by describing events that will take place shortly after Christ's departure, a chronological structure is not maintained throughout the discourse. As has been noted the discourse is loosely structured around a characterization of various of their opponents' errors and the threat posed to the Gnostic community (with an excursus on the anthropological basis of the opposing groups at 75.7ff). Those who see the influence of the traditional historical review in this discourse might point out that this section culminates in an eschatological prophecy (80.8-23). While this is true, it is important to note that this prophecy is given in response to Peter's reaction to the whole

27. Cf. chapter five, 204f.
discourse. Peter says that he fears that the Gnostics will fall away and be absorbed by their opposition (79.32-80.7). In his response Christ says that while the Gnostics will be dominated by their opposition for a time, this situation will be reversed at the eschaton (80.8-23). The point is that this eschatological prophecy is not related to the earlier discourse in the way that one would expect if the author had modelled this section on the traditional historical review, viz. the prophecy is not the climax of a sequential representation of historical events. Thus apart from the obvious fact that Jesus' discourse consists of ex eventu prophecies, there is nothing in the structure of the material to suggest that the author intended to model this section on the traditional historical review.

In view of the above discussion it should be evident that the similarities between GnADocPet and the traditional apocalypse are of a formal nature. There is nothing in the text which has been stylized in an explicitly traditional fashion.

It could thus be asked if there are sufficient grounds to establish with a reasonable degree of probability that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse. In my judgment there are several considerations which suggest that the traditional apocalypse did provide the author with the genre for his literary composition. First, the text contains all the fundamental structural elements which one would expect in an apocalypse (first person narrative style, frame stories, account of a revelatory event). In addition the author has employed interpreted visions as a revelatory medium and an esoteric motif. As has been argued these represent purely formal similarities. However in conjunction with other evidence a certain amount of
weight can be attached to the use of these two stylistic features. Second, the provenance of the text provides indirect support for this hypothesis. It is clear that the author is a Christian Gnostic who is well acquainted with Christian (and perhaps Jewish Christian) traditions. It follows from this that he would almost certainly have been acquainted with the genre 'apocalypse' through at least some Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. A final consideration which supports the conclusion that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse is that there is not an obvious alternative explanation for the present form of the text. In contrast to the RRC the genre of GnApocPet cannot be seen as the development of a canonical tradition/29/. Thus the genre embodied in the text represents either a completely individual creation or was based on the traditional apocalypse. The latter alternative seems the more likely in view of the substantial formal similarities to the traditional apocalypse and the Christian Gnostic provenance of the text.

29. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 116-122, treats GnApocPet with the RRC and makes no reference to the possibility that the genre of this text may have been based on the traditional apocalypse. While there are formal similarities between GnApocPet and the RRC, the distinctive narrative setting of the text does not suggest that the author intended to write in the tradition of this Gnostic genre.
Brashler has suggested that there are important similarities in social setting, content and function between OnApocPet and the traditional apocalypse/30/. He argues that like the authors of the traditional apocalypses, the writer of OnApocPet was responding to an historical crisis with a message of hope—the encouragement being the implicit promise that just as the true being of Jesus did not suffer, so the Gnostic community would ultimately 'escape the hostile forces that threaten them.' On this view OnApocPet turns out to be a traditional apocalypse.

It is doubtful, however, that the similarities in content and function between OnApocPet and the traditional apocalypse are as close as Brashler suggests. There is no doubt but that the text was written in the context of a crisis created by the threat posed to the Gnostic community by the orthodox. However this crisis setting is due to historical circumstances and cannot in itself be taken as a significant parallel to the crisis setting of some traditional apocalypses. More importantly, however, the

30. Brashler, Genre and Function, 141-144. It is significant that his definition of an apocalypse includes references to elements of structure, content, and function: "An apocalypse is an esoteric written account of a symbolic visual revelation, mediated and/or interpreted by a celestial figure to a pseudonymous authority figure, which discloses a trans-historical basis for a self-understanding that will encourage the recipients in the face of opposition." (p. 95) There are several problems with this definition: 1. it incorrectly suggests that the revelation is normally mediated by means of symbolic visions; 2. the identification of a typical content is so broad as to be meaningless ('a trans-historical basis for a self-understanding'); 3. unless one defines 'crisis' in the broadest possible manner, it is simply not true that apocalypses always—or even normally—were written in response to an historical crisis (a crisis setting is not evident in, for example, I Enoch 17-36, 72-82, II Enoch, ApocZephaniah, III Baruch, ShHermas, AscIsa 6-11, and most Nag Hammadi apocalypses).
The author has not responded to the crisis confronting the Gnostic community in the way one would expect if he were taking his lead from the traditional apocalypses in formulating his response. The Jewish apocalypses which were clearly written in the context of national crisis respond with an eschatologically oriented message (Daniel 7-12, I Enoch 83-90, IV Ezra, II Baruch—though the response in the last two texts also takes the form of a theodicy). In the case of GnApocPet the author has introduced some eschatological material: 1. he states that Gnostics who have succumbed to the pressures of the opposition will be forgiven in the eschatological era (78.7-11); 2. the punishment of the Gnostics' opponents is predicted (78.23-26; 79.16-18); 3. the eschaton will end the period of orthodox domination and result in the vindication of the Gnostic community (80.8-23; 78.3-6)—though this prophecy of eschatological vindication neither sets forth a traditional eschatological scenario nor establishes a temporal relationship between the time of writing and the eschaton. Taken in isolation this eschatological material could be construed as impressive evidence that the author was taking his lead from a certain type of traditional apocalypse in responding to the crisis created by the orthodox persecution of the Gnostic community. In reality the eschatological material constitutes a minor theme in the text. The author's main interest was to expose the true nature of the orthodox and Gnostic communities (and the threat posed to the latter) and, on the Christological issue, to set forth a Gnostic interpretation of Christ and the passion. This is indicated in Jesus' introductory statement in which he blesses the Gnostics who are able to distinguish 'words of unrighteousness and transgression of law from righteousness' on the basis of Jesus'
teaching (70.20-71.5; cf. Hebrews 5.13f). The entire revelation is oriented towards achieving this objective. Thus while there is a small amount of eschatological material in GnApocPet, the major topical concerns of the text do not suggest that the author took his lead from the traditional apocalypses in formulating a response to the crisis in which his community found itself.

The discussion of GnApocPet to this point has assumed that the text was written in a setting in which the orthodox community threatened the Gnostic one. Virtually all commentators have adopted this view of the general setting in which GnApocPet originated. However Koschorke has taken exception to this view and proposed a highly original alternative interpretation/31/. He argues that the text reflects a situation in which a Gnostic party was in competition with the orthodox leadership for the loyalty of lay Christians. He identifies three groups in the text: 1. the orthodox ecclesiastical leadership (die orthodoxen Amtsträger), 2. the Gnostic party, 3. the community of lay Christians subject to the orthodox leadership. According to Koschorke, the author views this third group, the lay Christians, as potential Gnostics whose potential for receiving Gnosis is frustrated by the orthodox leadership. GnApocPet was written to expose this situation and to help lay Christians realize their potential for receiving Gnosis. His view can be summed up in the following statement: "ApocPt ist das Dokument der Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und orthodoxen Christentum und spiegelt das Ringen der Wortführer beider Seiten um den Einfluss auf die Masse der Gemeindechristen wider."/32/

31. Koschorke, Polemik, 80-90 (esp. 80-85).
32. Koschorke, Polemik, 89.
On Koschorke's view *GnApocPet* is a tract of missionary propaganda.

At the heart of this hypothesis is the argument that the references in the text to the 'little ones' and to those who are oppressed refer to lay Christians. It is difficult to outline his supporting evidence for this crucial identification since it is made as much by assertion as by argument. It would appear, however, that the first step in building the case is the argument that the polemic is directed solely against the orthodox leadership and that there are no disparaging references to an orthodox laity. He then argues that the distinction between the leaders and those who are ruled and deceived (74.13-22) as well as to the 'little ones' (79.18-21) suggests that this latter group is to be identified with lay Christians who would otherwise go unmentioned. Koschorke then argues that the author regards these deceived 'lay Christians' as 'living ones' (79.31-80.6) and 'immortal souls' (76.27-77.22), i.e. as Gnostics/33/. He argues that the author regards these 'little ones' as potential Gnostics dominated by the ecclesiastical leadership. Two passages are cited to support this identification. He states that 'lay Christians' are referred to at 74.20-22 as 'those who will be ruled heretically' and identifies them with the 'little ones' of 80.8-11. He also appeals to 79.12, 19 and states that the equation of the 'little ones' with 'their brothers' indicates that the contrast is between church leaders and the laity/34/. On the basis of this evidence he identifies 'little ones' as lay Christians and interprets all the references to threat posed by


the orthodox as relating to an attempt by the leadership to frustrate lay Christians' potential for receiving Gnosis/35/.

In my judgment Koschorke's interpretation of the ecclesiastical setting and function of *GnApocPet* is highly improbable. However it is difficult to clearly disprove his reconstruction as it is in principle possible to place this interpretation on the material. It is questionable, however, whether the text requires his interpretation or whether it is a natural reading of the material. There are several considerations which suggest that this interpretation does not represent a natural interpretation of the text.

In the first place it is true that the author does focus attention on the orthodox leadership. However this is understandable since they would have been held responsible for the doctrinal views of the 'heretical' community. It is doubtful, however, that the opposition is understood solely in terms of the orthodox leadership since there is evidence that the author regarded the opposition as a complete community which included 'leaders' and 'followers'. This is particularly evident

35. The following quotation represents another good summary of his interpretation: "Somit steht folgende Konstellation hinter der Polemik von ApocPt. 'Tot', unrettbar verloren sind die Verführer, die Exponenten der Rechtgläubigkeit, die sich der Machtmittel des kirchlichen Amtes bedienen können. 'Lebende' hingegen sind die Gnostiker, die sich kraft der Offenbarung des Soter an das 'Leben' 'erinnern' und die ihrerseits als die 'Diener des Wortes' anderen durch ihre Verkümmigung zu solchem 'Erinnern' verhelfen und ihnen so 'Kraft' verleihen. Als 'Lebende' gelten aber auch die 'Kleinen', die Masse der Gemeindechristen, die sich freilich gegenwärtig nicht an ihren himmlischen Ursprung 'erinnern' bzw. diesen unter der Einwirkung der kirchlichen Irrlehre 'vergessen' haben. Doch kommt es vor, dass sie sich von den 'schlechten Worten' der kirchlichen Lügenpredigt 'abwenden'. Als fest Pole der Auseinandersetzung haben wir so die Wortführer von Orthodoxie und Gnosis. Das Gemeindechristentum hingegen ist eher als fluktierendes Mittelfeld zu charakterisieren." 85-86
in two pericopes: 73.24-74.22; 79.1-10.

The first pericope describes the initial falling away from Jesus' teaching (73.24-74.22). In principle this material could be interpreted in a number of ways since the subjects of the verbs are not specified ('they', 'those who', etc.). However the probability that the author envisions the creation of an entire apostate community is suggested by the final line which distinguishes between 'leaders' and 'followers': "...they will be ruled heretically." (74.21f) Koschorke recognizes this but argues that the 'they' are lay Christians regarded as 'little ones' or potential Gnostics/36/. However if this was the author's view then one would have expected him to introduce this technical terminology at this point in order to give clear expression to his novel—and apparently unprecedented—understanding of lay Christians (see below).

The other pericope, 79.1-10, provides even clearer evidence that the opposition was regarded as a complete community. After describing the Gnostic community as 'the brotherhood which really exists' (79.1-2), the author says that 'the kindred race of the sisterhood will appear as an imitation' (79.7-10). This latter group is said to oppress 'their brothers' and 'the little ones' (79.11-21). The description of the 'sisterhood' as an alternative community suggests that it was constituted of leaders and followers—it would make little sense to define an alternative community in terms of leaders alone. In fact Koschorke seems to recognize that this is the case since he interprets the phrase 'these are the ones who oppress their

36. Koschorke, Polemik, 81, seems to base this identification on the use of the term 'rule' in relation to the 'little ones' at 80.11.
brothers' as referring to the leadership's oppression of the lay Christians within the community designated as 'the sisterhood'. However this is a highly improbable interpretation. First, the antecedent of 'these are the ones who oppress' is the 'sisterhood' or 'alternative community' -- not the leadership in particular. Second, as the contrast is between two communities with the Gnostic one described as 'the brotherhood' and the relationship between the two is expressed in kinship terms (the 'sisterhood' is the 'kindred race'), it is more likely that 'their brothers' refers to members of 'the brotherhood' or Gnostic community. Thus this pericope provides added support for the view that the opposition is regarded as a complete community (leaders and followers) /37/

Another consideration which undermines Koschorke's reconstruction relates to the fact that the interpretation of lay Christians as 'immortal souls' whose potential for receiving Gnosis is frustrated by the orthodox leadership represents a highly distinctive theology. In fact there are no parallels for this view in other extant Gnostic sources or Patristic accounts of Gnostic doctrine /37a/. In view of the apparently unprecedented nature of this theology, one would expect that the author would express it much more clearly. As it is, the distinction between the two types of Gnostics (lay Christians and

37. This section also provides the most unambiguous evidence for the view that the activities of the opposition are directed against the Gnostic community (the brotherhood) rather than at members of their own community (the sisterhood).

37a. The Valentinian division of humanity into three groups-- pneumatics (Gnostics), psychics (orthodox Christians), and choics (unbelieving humanity) --provides the closest analogy to the anthropology which Koschorke attributes to the author of GnAposPet. However, the similarities are not very close.
those who have realized their potential for salvation) is not clearly drawn.

This lack of clear distinctions is particularly evident in the nomenclature used to describe the Gnostics. The author uses a large number of expressions: 'those above belonging to the Father' (70.21), 'the sons of light' (78.25f), 'those of another race (ἅλλοι γενόμενοι) who are not of this age' (83.17f), 'the brotherhood' (79.1), 'immortal souls' (75.27; 77.3, 17; 78.3), 'little ones' (78.22; 79.19; 80.1, 11), and 'living ones' (80.4)/38/. On Koschorke's view both types of Gnostics are described as 'immortal souls', but the designations 'little ones' and 'living ones' refer to lay Christians—viz. immortal souls in subjection to the orthodox. However if this were the author's view then one would have expected him to introduce this terminology earlier and with clear reference to the laity in the orthodox community. There would have been an opportunity to do so at the beginning of the discourse with the description of the original emergence of the 'imitation' community—especially as the author distinguishes between leaders and followers (73.23-74.22). As it is the designation 'little ones' is first employed towards the end of the discourse (78.22; 79.19) and its association with other terms to describe the Gnostic community does not suggest that this phrase refers to a different group (77.22-79.21: 'immortal souls', 'sons of light', 'the

38. The use of the term 'little ones' is normally traced to Matthean usage (10.42; 18.6,10,14; cf. 25.40, 45). In the Gospel of Truth the Gnostics are described as 'little children' (1.3, 19.28ff). Koschorke, Polémik, 83, note 4, has a comprehensive discussion of this terminology. He argues that in the case of 4 ApocPet the terminology must be interpreted in light of its usage in the text rather than with reference to its use in other texts. However some weight must be attached to the fact that this terminology is consistently used in other literature to describe Gnostics.
brotherhood'). The point is that in view of the distinctive, and probably unprecedented, nature of this theology one would have expected a much clearer identification of the 'little ones' as lay Christians. As the text stands it is difficult to see that lay Christians, the proposed target audience, would have recognized themselves as the 'little ones' of GnApocPet.

Finally, it is arguable that the material which describes the threat posed to the Gnostic community is best interpreted in terms of 1. the political domination of the orthodox community and 2. the attempt to encourage the defection of Gnostics. With respect to the first point there are several instances in which the author implies that the opposition dominates the Gnostic community. This is particularly evident in the eschatological prophecy where Christ says that 'For a time...they will rule over the little ones' (80.8-11; cf. 78.3-6). Furthermore the mere fact that the 'sisterhood' is in a position to 'oppress' their 'brothers' suggests that the former group is working from a position of strength (79.11-21; cf. 78.20-31; 84.1-4). These statements could be interpreted in such a way as to support Koschorke's reconstruction (the leadership's domination of lay Christians). However in view of other evidence it seems more likely that this material indicates that the orthodox community was the dominant one while the Gnostic party was in the minority.

There are other instances in which the threat posed by the orthodox seems to be interpreted in terms of an attempt to encourage defections (73.29-74.9; 76.34-77.21; 78.3-11; 78.20-31; 79.1-21; 80.1-7). In principle it would be possible to place Koschorke's interpretation on some of this material. However there are several instances in which images of falling away are
used and the impression is conveyed that it is established
Gnostics who are under threat (esp. 74.4-9; 77.17-21; 78.7-11;
79.19-21). The pericope of which 77.17-21 is the climax is
extremely difficult to interpret (esp. 76.34-77.16). However the
wording of these final lines suggests a case in which novice
Gnostics are won over by the opposition: "For if the immortal
soul receives power in an intellectual spirit—. But immediately
they join with one of those who misled them."/39/. In the second
pericope the author contrasts the 'brotherhood' with the 'kindred
race of the sisterhood' and says that the latter group oppresses
'their brothers'. It has already been argued that 'their
brothers' refers, not to a group within the 'sisterhood' (lay
Christians), but to members of the 'brotherhood', i.e. Gnostics.
Furthermore the subsequent description of the activity of the
'sisterhood' suggests a situation in which established Gnostics
are won over to the other side: "...the little ones whom they
saw, (and) whom they took prisoner." (79.18-21) Finally, Peter's

39. This is Bullard's translation—NHLE, 342. Koschorke,
Polemik, 74, expands the text so as to give it a somewhat
different meaning: "Denn wenn die unsterbliche Seele von
einem verständigen Geist Πυττμαρυφάνην τοὺς θηρίτευσαν
Kraft erhält, so machen aber sofort sie (die Mächte) /sie/
(die unsterbliche Seele) dem (Menschen) gleich, der zu den (bereits)
Verführten gehört." Even this translation brings out the
sequence believer-apostate. However this is explained with
the help of a highly speculative interpretation. He argues
that the phrase 'immortal souls' designates lay Christians
regarded as potential Gnostics, that the phrase Πυττμαρυφάνην
toũs θηρίτευσαν refers to Gnostic teachers or missionaries
(but cf. 83.12f), and that the pericope describes a
situation in which Gnostic teachers are trying to realize
the potential of lay Christians for receiving Gnosis while
the orthodox try to frustrate this attempt (84-85). Thus he
writes: "Die Gnostiker klären die Gemeindevchristen über das
wahre Heil, über ihren himmlischen Ursprung auf. Doch
gelingt es den Wortführern der Gegenseite, die so geweckte
Erkenntnis wieder abzutöten.——Bleiben nach dieser Stelle
die gnostischen Missionsbemühungen erfolglos...." (85) It
is hard to avoid the impression that he has interpreted this
pericope to fit his reconstruction of the Sitz im Leben for
GnApocPet.
statement of what he fears will happen implies that the opposition wins over believing Gnostics ('living ones'): "I am afraid...that there are multitudes that will mislead other multitudes of living ones, and destroy them among themselves." (79.32-80.6) In each of these statements the language suggests a process of 'falling away' or 'defection'—immortal souls or living ones are misled, taken prisoner and destroyed. Koschorke interprets these as Gnostics in the sense of 'potential Gnostics'. However in the absence of clear supporting evidence this interpretation seems highly improbable.

CONCLUSION

GnApocPet is an excellent example of a case in which an author has derived the essential structure of a literary genre from the traditional apocalypse and then shaped the individual elements of the genre to suit his own requirements. The traditional apocalypse provided the author with a model for a genre in which a literary work was structured around a first person account of a mediated revelation with narrative settings bracketing the account of the revelatory event. However the various elements of the genre have not been shaped in an explicitly traditional fashion but represent the author's own creation (e.g. the narrative settings, the structure of the revelatory event, the representation of Christ as a heavenly revealer and Peter as a recipient of revelation). One can imagine that a number of factors influenced the shaping of these features: the decision to have Jesus give Peter a revelation
within the context of historical events, the interpretation of canonical traditions along Gnostic lines, and the aims underlying the composition of the text as a whole. The important point, however, is that the various elements of the genre represent the author's own creation and have not been shaped in a recognizably traditional fashion.

It is also important to stress that the author has used the apocalypse both as a literary medium for a non-traditional content and for purposes which do not have a direct parallel in Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. While there is some eschatological material in the text, the main themes of the work, a Gnostic interpretation of the passion and church history, cannot be regarded as traditional subject matter for an apocalypse. There is a broad formal parallel between the function of GnApocPat and some traditional apocalypses in that the author is responding to a situation in which his community is under threat. However there is no evidence that in formulating the main thrust of his response the author took his lead from the traditional apocalypses written in the context of an historical crisis.

It is thus evident that there are very few elements in GnApocPat that can be regarded as traditional. The author has derived the basic structure for a literary work from the traditional apocalypse. However the topical concerns of the work and the shaping of the various structural elements of the text do not reflect the direct influence of the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. This relative lack of traditional features raises the question as to whether there are sufficient grounds for establishing that the author derived his genre from
the traditional apocalypse. It has been argued that in the case of GnApocPet the combination of a large cluster of formal similarities to the traditional apocalypse and the Christian Gnostic provenance of the text provides sufficient grounds for concluding that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse.
Chapter I

The Apocalypse of Paul

The Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul (GnApocPaul) is the second text in codex five/1/. While the title of the work is identical to that of the Christian Apocalypse of Paul (ChrApocPaul), the only significant point of contact between the two texts is the judgment scenes, and these parallels are probably due to the use of traditional material rather than to literary dependence in either direction/2/. GnApocPaul should also be distinguished from the 'Ascension of Paul' which Epiphanius states was used by the Gnostics (Panarion 38.2.5)/3/. The latter work relates Paul's experiences in the first three heavens while GnApocPaul focuses on events in the third to the tenth heavens. The attribution of heavenly ascensions to Paul is not surprising in


3. Cf. Murdock and MacRae, Nag Hammadi Codices V, 47.
that Paul's allusion to a heavenly rapture in II Corinthians 12.1-4 provided an inviting starting point for such compositions/4/. One of the striking features of GnApocPaul is the author's use of motifs drawn from a variety of religious traditions. Jewish and Christian traditions provide the closest parallels for much of the material, but Hellenistic motifs have also been employed/5/. However the author has given a thoroughly Gnostic interpretation to these traditions. There is insufficient evidence either to relate the text to a particular Gnostic school or to propose a date for its composition/6/.

GnApocPaul falls naturally into two parts: an introductory frame story (17.20-19.20); and the account of Paul's heavenly ascension (19.20-24.18). It is impossible to form a complete picture of the circumstantial setting since the bottom of page seventeen and the top of page eighteen are lost. However it seems that Paul is on a mountain at Jericho (19.10-14) and on his way to Jerusalem to see the apostles (18.5, 18--cf. Galatians 1.18). He meets a 'Little Child' who engages Paul in conversation (18.3-13). The Child then identifies himself as the 'Spirit' and defines his mission (18.14-19.18)/7/. The Spirit says that Paul is to go to Jerusalem to see his fellow apostles (18.17-19; 19.15-18). The author probably means the heavenly Jerusalem interpreted as an image for the Pleroma. This suggests

---


5. Murdock, *ApocPaul*, 21-74, 75-124, 181-221, has provided the most thorough investigation of the history of religions background for the important motifs in GnApocPaul.

6. Murdock and MacRae, *Nag Hammadi Codices V*, 49, simply note that the high valuation of Paul is at home in second century Valentinianism and that nothing requires a date after A.D. 200.
that the goal of Paul's ascension is an encounter with the apostles in the Pleroma. In reality the apostles accompany Paul on his ascension. While on the earth Paul looks up and sees them greeting him from the heavens (19.18-20). From the fourth heaven Paul sees the apostles at his 'right and left hand' with the Spirit going before (20.1-5). He also states that his 'fellow apostles' accompanied him on his passage to the fifth and sixth heavens as well as the eighth to the tenth (21.28ff; 22.14ff; 23.30ff)/8/.

Paul's heavenly ascension begins with his being taken by the Spirit to the third heaven (19.22-24). However he immediately goes on to the fourth heaven (19.24f). From there the Spirit tells him to look down at those who are on the earth/9/. Paul then witnesses an extensive judgment scene in which angels drive a soul with whips to the 'toll collector' (ΤΕΛΗΒΩΝ) who resides in the fourth heaven/10/. When the toll collector

7. The heavenly revealer is described as 'the (Holy) Spirit' (18.21; 19.21, 26, etc.) and 'the (Little) Child' (18.6, 8, 12). It is likely that the revealer is in fact Christ—cf. Murdock, ApocPaul, 130-134. For the 'Child' figure in Gnosticism cf. G. Stroumsa, Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology (Leiden: 1984) 77-80. While Seth is frequently identified as the 'Child', Stroumsa notes that at least two texts identify the 'Child' with Christ: GrPower (44.32f) and GnApocPaul. Cf. as well ApocryJn (BG 8502) 21.4 and Acts of John 88.

8. The relationship between the historical and heavenly apostles is not clear. Murdock, ApocPaul, 219-225, thinks that they are the heavenly counterparts to the historical figures. It is also possible that the historical apostles as a group experienced a heavenly journey similar to Paul's.

9. Compare TAbraham (B) 12 and ChrApocPaul 13.

10. Murdock, ApocPaul, 75-124, has provided an extensive study of the sources which may have influenced the various elements of the judgment scenes in the fourth and fifth heavens. The closest parallels to the judgment scene in the fourth heaven are similar scenes in TAbraham (B) 10 and ChrApocPaul 17-18.
accuses the soul of committing sins in the world, the latter tries to excuse himself (20.18-23). Three witness are brought forward and establish the soul's guilt (20.25-21.15). The soul is punished with reincarnation in that it is returned to a body (21.18-21)/11/.

Paul and the apostles then ascend to the fifth heaven. Here he sees a 'great angel' with an iron rod and three other angels with whips driving the souls to judgment (22.2-10). As this scene is not developed the identity of the souls and the nature of the judgment is unclear. In the sixth heaven Paul sees a light shining down from the seventh and then orders the 'toll collector' to open the gate to the seventh heaven (22.3-24).

In the seventh heaven Paul encounters the God of the created world, viz. the Demiurge. The author's representation of this figure is based on analogous scenes in Jewish literature: he is an old man; his garment is white; his throne is brighter than the sun (22.25-30)/12/. The Demiurge engages Paul in a conversation about where he is going (23.2-17: this exchange will be examined more closely in the subsequent study). He then asks how Paul will escape his grasp (23.18-22). The Spirit instructs Paul to give him the 'sign' (σήμα) /13/. When Paul does so the Demiurge looks down at the created world and the seventh heaven opens so that Paul and the apostles can enter the Ogdoad (23.22-24.1). From there Paul ascends to the ninth and tenth

12. Compare Daniel 9.13; I Enoch 46.1; 47.3; 74.10; TLevi 5.1.
13. Böhlig, Koptisch—gnostische Apokalypsen, 16, suggested that the sign is that of the Cross. In GosThomas Jesus tells the disciples that when the archons ask 'What is the sign of your Father in you?', they are to say 'It is movement and repose.' (42.4-7)
heavens and greets the occupants of each (described as 'fellow spirits' in the tenth heaven: 24.3-8). The text ends abruptly at this point.

The most interesting question posed by this text is that of the author's purpose in composing this account of Paul's ascension. However before taking up this issue there are several things which can be said about GnApocPaul as an apocalypse.

THE APOCALYPSE OF PAUL: AN APOCALYPSE

There can be no doubt but that GnApocPaul must be classified as an apocalypse and that the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse/14/. With reference to the question of classification the text is structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation with a frame story introducing the revelatory event (there is no concluding narrative setting). The introductory frame story in turn is composed of traditional elements: a circumstantial setting, the appearance of a heavenly revealer, an introductory statement. The only unusual structural feature of the work is the oscillation between a first and third person narrative style. The surviving text opens with a third person narrative account of Paul's encounter with the 'child' (18.2). However the narrative

14. Even Vielhauer, who was reluctant to classify Gnostic revelatory texts as apocalypses, recognized that GnApocPaul was a true apocalypse: Urchristliches Literatur, 527.
link between the first and second introductory discourses is in the first person (19.8-10). After the second discourse the narrative changes back into the third person and continues in this manner until the middle of the account of Paul's experiences in the fourth heaven (19.18-20.5). Suddenly at 20.5b there is a shift back to the first person, and this narrative style is maintained throughout the rest of the work. Kasser argued that this phenomenon is due to the editorial activity of a redactor who abbreviated a longer version of GnApoPaul/15/. This longer version gave equal space to describing events in each of the heavens. Kasser suggested that the redactor deleted a great deal of material and in the process carelessly introduced a third person narrative style. As Murdock has noted, the difficulty with this explanation is that the transitions between the two styles do not correspond to the places where the redactional activity is supposed to have taken place/16/. The first two shifts occur within the introductory narrative setting while the third takes place in the middle of describing scenes in the fourth heaven--the one place where the hypothetical redactor did not drop a large section of material. The most plausible explanation for this shift between a first and third person narrative style is that either the author or translator was careless in maintaining a single style at the beginning of the text. Priority should be given to the first person style as it prevails in most of GnApoPaul and is more appropriate to the genre of the work.

The fact that the author based his genre on the traditional

apocalypse is evident on even the most casual reading. The clearest evidence of this is the way the text is structured around an ascension through a series of stratified heavens in the company of a heavenly figure and with descriptions of scenes in many of the heavens/17/. The structure of this ascension bears a close relationship to similar accounts in Jewish and early Christian apocalypses--esp. III Baruch, II Enoch, AscIsa 6-11 (cf. the long version of TLevi 2-5).

There are several points which can be made by way of comparison with this tradition of heavenly ascensions. First, the structural similarities extend to the point of including transitional statements describing the passage from one heaven to another: 19.20-25; 21.22-22.1; 22.11-16; 22.19-24; 23.30-24.7. Given that this is a short text these transitional links occupy a large amount of space/18/. Second, in GnAposPaul the accompanying heavenly figure provides less in the way of interpretations than is normally the case. Throughout the ascension Paul simply describes the journey and the scenes in the various heavens. Paul neither requests nor is offered any interpretation. The Spirit's role is limited to instructing Paul to do different things at several points in the ascension: in the fourth heaven he instructs Paul to look back on the earth (19.26ff) and then later tells him to proceed to the fifth heaven (21.24ff); in the seventh heaven the Spirit gives him permission

17. The author's use of material associated with the Jewish and early Christian traditions (in many instances associated with apocalypses) is another indication as to the source of the author's literary genre, e.g. the judgment scenes in the fourth and fifth heavens, the seven heaven cosmology for the lower realms, and the characterization of the Demiurge.

18. For similar statements in the traditional apocalypses cf. e.g. III Baruch 2.1; 3.1; 10.1; 11.1; AscIsa 7.13, 18, 24, etc.; II Enoch 3.1; 7.1; 8.1; etc.
to speak with the Demiurge (23.5-7) and then tells Paul to give him the 'sign' that will enable them to pass (23.22-25).

Finally, it is worth pointing out that GnApocPaul does not describe Paul's return to the earth and end the account with a concluding narrative setting. However it will become apparent that the reader would learn from Paul's conversation with the Demiurge that Paul returned to the earth in order to carry out his task as a Gnostic apostle (see below).

Given the fact that apocalypses based on a heavenly journey could be structured in a variety of ways, GnApocPaul is, as far as its structure is concerned, a very traditional apocalypse/19/. The distinctive character of GnApocPaul in relation to the traditional apocalypses relates not to the literary structure of the text but to the author's evaluation of the heavenly world of the Jewish and Christian apocalypses. The first seven heavens are regarded as the realms of the lower deity or creator. As a result the judgment scenes which in the traditional apocalypses were a valid judgment based on a positive moral code are interpreted as the means whereby the Demiurge and his powers keep souls trapped in the material world (see below). This 'demonization' of the seven heaven cosmology of Jewish and Christian tradition represents the most distinctive element of GnApocPaul. The actual genre of the text is on the whole very traditional and closely related to the Jewish and early Christian apocalypses.

19. As has been noted, no two Jewish apocalypses based on a heavenly journey are structured in the same way: cf. chapter 1, 46f.
Two widely different answers have been given as to the question of the author's purpose in writing *GnApocPaul*. Vielhauer argued that the author's primary interest was in the post-mortem ascent of the soul through the heavenly world/20/. Murdock, on the other hand, proposed that *GnApocPaul* was written as a Gnostic version of Paul's call and commission as an apostle of the Gnostic Christ/21/. On this view the author set out to lay claim to Paul as a Gnostic apostle by representing Paul as recounting the event in which he was called to this task. It is likely that there is an element of truth in both views of the function of *GnApocPaul*. However each interpretation needs to be qualified in important respects. This will be done by examining each proposal in turn.

Vielhauer's argument that the author's primary interest lay in the post-mortem ascent of the soul through the heavenly world is supported by the fact that the scenes in the fourth and fifth heavens depict the judgment of souls while in the seventh heaven Paul is shown how to bypass the Demiurge and enter the Ogdoad. The question is what the author was trying to convey in these scenes.

The judgment scenes in the fourth and fifth heaven can be taken together. As has been noted, the meaning of the scene in the fifth heaven is unclear—Paul simply describes a situation in which angels with whips are driving souls to 'the judgment'.

However the judgment scene in the fourth heaven is more developed. Angels bring the soul to the 'toll collector' who accuses it of having sinned. When the soul tries to protest its innocence three witnesses are brought forward to establish its guilt (20.13-26). The important feature about these figures is that they are not simply neutral witnesses to the individual's sins. It is likely that they are represented as angelic beings who played a role in encouraging the soul to sin/22/. This is particularly clear in the case of the third witness. He says to the soul: "Did I not come to you at the twelfth hour of the day when the sun was about to set? I gave you darkness until you should accomplish your sins." (21.11-14) It is likely that the statement of the first witness also indicates that he provoked the soul to sin: "I rose up against you until you fell into anger and rage and envy." (20.30-21.2) This idea is not as evident in the ambiguous statement of the second witness (21.4-9). However it is possible that the function of this witness was meant to be interpreted in light of the other statements. This evidence suggests that the judgment scenes in the fourth heaven (and by inference the fifth heaven as well) serve primarily to show how the creator and his powers kept the souls of non-Gnostics trapped in the material world. The lower powers do this by first enticing souls into sin and then punishing them with 'reincarnation'/23/.

It follows from this analysis that it is unlikely that the

22. Murdock, *ApocPaul*, 107ff, calls them 'tempter-witnesses' and argues that they are Gnostic versions of the fallen angels of Jewish tradition which lead humanity into sin.

23. There are parallels to this idea in *Apocryhn* (II,1) 26.32-27.11 (cf. 29.16-30.11) and * Pistis Sophia* (e.g. 140, 144-148).
judgment scenes were included to show Gnostics how they could successfully ascend through the lower heavens. This is suggested by two considerations. First, it is virtually certain that the soul in the fourth heaven is that of a non-Gnostic and there is nothing to indicate that the souls in the fifth heaven are those of Gnostics. Second, in other accounts which depict the archons' attempt to block the ascent of the Gnostic soul the emphasis is not on a judgment based on their moral character but on the soul's ability to answer questions concerning its 'origin and destiny'. A good example of this line of questioning is to be found in Paul's conversation with the Demiurge in the seventh heaven (23.1-26: see below for the distinctive character of Paul's answers).

It is thus arguable that the author's primary concern in depicting the scenes in the fourth and fifth heaven was to show how the lower powers keep non-Gnostics trapped in the material world. It is unlikely that he implied that Gnostics would be threatened with this kind of treatment by the archons.

At first glance Paul's conversation with the Demiurge in the seventh heaven appears to provide the material which would be relevant for the ascent of the Gnostic soul (23.1-26). However while a Gnostic reader would learn something from this exchange, it is unlikely that it was composed as a model which anyone could adopt in its present form. This is indicated by the distinctive

---

24. Compare 1ApocJas 33.2-34.20; GosThomas 41.31-42.7; GosMary 15.1-17.7; Irenaeus Advhaer I.21.5.

25. However it is possible that the author did intend to make the point that moral purity was evidence of freedom from the influence of the archons. This in turn would ensure that a Gnostic soul would not be subject to this kind of judgment at death.
character of Paul's answers to the first and second questions. The Demiurge initially asks where he is going (23.2). Paul replies: "I am going to the place from which I came." (23.9f) On the basis of related traditions one would naturally interpret this to mean that Paul was going to the place from which his soul ultimately originated, i.e. the Pleroma (cf. e.g. 1ApocJas 34.16-18; GosThomas 41.32-42.1). However the answer to the second question suggests that this is not what is meant in this instance. To the question as to where Paul is from one would expect him to answer that his origin lies in the Pleroma (cf. 1ApocJas 33.15-18). Instead Paul responds by clearly defining the ultimate destination of his journey as a return to the created world in order to lead others to freedom: "I am going down to the world of the dead in order to lead captive the captivity that was led captive in the captivity of Babylon." It is likely that Paul's answer to the first question, the destination of his journey, should be interpreted in light of the answer to the second question/26/. The reason is that the answers to the questions as to the soul's origin and destination normally refer to the same place/27/. This would mean that when Paul says that he is going (destination) to the place from which he came (origin) he means the place from which his ascension started, viz. the earth. This interpretation is supported by the fact that Paul's answer to the question of origin ('where are you from') takes the form of a more precise definition of the ultimate destination and purpose of his journey.

26. This was initially argued by Murdock, ApocPaul, 200-209. The atypical character of Paul's answer to the second question led Böhlig, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen, 15 and 25, to emend the text so that Paul's statement referred to a mission that had already been accomplished: ΚΙΝΑ ΨΗΚ was emended to ΝΕΙΝΑ ΨΗΚ or ΝΕΙΝΑ ΨΗΚ. 
It follows from the distinctive nature of Paul's answer to the first two questions that this material was not composed in order to show how the Gnostic soul could successfully ascend through the lower heavens. These exchanges have been composed with reference to the ultimate purpose of Paul's ascension—a return to the earth to lead others to salvation. This does not mean that Paul's conversation with the Demiurge was of no value to other Gnostics. The reference to the 'sign' which enabled passage to the Ogdoad would have been important (23.23ff). However it is unlikely that the principal reason for composing this scene in the seventh heaven was to provide a model which could be adopted by any Gnostic/28/.

It is clear that, as Vielhauer argued, the author was interested in the post-mortem fate of the soul. This is particularly clear from the judgment scenes in the fourth and fifth heavens. With reference to this material it is important to recognize that it seems to have been included primarily to show how the lower powers kept the souls of non-Gnostics trapped in the material world. There is nothing to suggest that the souls of Gnostics would be subject to this kind of treatment.

27. The identification of the soul's destination and place of origin is made in 1ApocJas 34.16-18, GosThomas 41.27-30, and Irenaeus' account of Gnostic doctrine in Advhaer 1.21-5. Thus in 1ApocJas Jesus says that when the archons ask 'Where will you go?', James is to answer 'To the place from which I have come, there shall I return.' (34.15-18) In GosThomas Jesus says: "Blessed are the solitary and elect, for you will find the Kingdom. For you are from it, and to it you will return." (41.27-30) Irenaeus reports that one statement the Gnostic is supposed to make before the powers is: "I derive my being from him who is pre-existent, and I go again to that which is my own, whence I came forth." (Advhaer 1.21.5) In each case the soul's destination is the place of the individual's origin.

28. This was the point of Jesus' instructions to James in 1ApocJas 32.2ff.
However it is unlikely that depiction of the post-mortem fate of the soul was the author's only, or even primary, reason for producing this text. If it had been then one would have expected Paul's conversation with the Demiurge to have been shaped as a model which any Gnostic could adopt. As it is Paul's answers to the first two questions have been shaped in light of the ultimate purpose of his ascension, viz. a return to the world in order to lead others to salvation.

The other interpretation of the author's primary purpose in writing *GnApocPaul* is that the text was written as an account of Paul's initial call and commission as a Gnostic apostle. This view was initially proposed by W. Murdock who argued that the emphasis in the text is on Paul's call and the commission that resulted from his encounter with Christ and the subsequent heavenly ascension. His argument is based on elements of the narrative setting and Paul's conversation with the Demiurge.

Murdock argues that the introductory narrative setting is based on a conflation of three New Testament pericopes: *II Corinthians* 12.1-4, *Galatians* 1.11-17, and *Galatians* 2.1-2/29/. The author's dependence on the passage in *II Corinthians* is obvious in that he not only attributes an ascension vision to Paul, but also takes his reference to the third heaven (*II Cor.* 12.2) as the starting point for his own account (19.20ff). It is also likely that the author has employed motifs drawn from *Gal.* 2.1ff. There Paul says that he went up to Jerusalem in response to a revelation. It is implied in verse two that he went with the intention of seeing all the

apostles. Paul's journey to the historical Jerusalem in GnApocPaul could be seen as corresponding to the trip mentioned in Gal. 2.1f. However Murdock has gone further and argued that in constructing his frame story the author has allegorized Gal. 2.1f/30/: 1. Paul's ascent to the historical Jerusalem (ἡ νευτικὴ) becomes an ascension to the heavenly Jerusalem; 2. his intention to visit the historical apostles is interpreted as an ascension to the heavenly apostles; 3. the epiphany scene together with the Child's function as an angelus interpres is the formal equivalent to Paul's statement that he went in response to a revelation. Galatians 1.11-17 is the final pericope which Murdock believes influenced the shaping of the narrative setting/31/. In this section Paul gives an account of his apostolic credentials. There is an allusion to Gal. 1.15 at 18.14-17. The Child says: "I know who you are Paul. You are he who was blessed from his mother's womb." (Gal. 1.15: ὁ ἀνθρώπος με ἐκ κοιλίας ημύνος) The author's dependence on this passage is confirmed by the Demiurge's use of this statement in a formulation that is even closer to the original (23.3f).

The author has thus taken motifs from three pericopes in Paul's letters in the construction of his narrative setting. The question which is important for the interpretation of the function of GnApocPaul is how the author understood this event which he described with the aid of New Testament material.


31. Murdock, ApocPaul, 150-159. The treatment of Gal. 1.11-17 in relation to elements of the narrative setting is strained at numerous points in the interests of developing the thesis that GnApocPaul is an account of Paul's initial call as a Gnostic apostle. However there is a clear allusion to Gal. 1.15 (see text).
Murdock argues that the author is conflating three events. On this view Paul's call and commission (Gal. 1.11ff) occurred in the context of the journey to Jerusalem (Gal. 2.1f) and involved an ascension to the heavenly world (1 Cor. 12.1ff). This interpretation is supported by the various allusions to Paul's calling as an apostle and, in particular, by Paul's answers to the Demiurge which indicated that the ultimate objective of his ascension is a return to the earth to lead others to freedom.32/

32. Murdock, ApocPaul, 168-173, also appeals to traditional ascension visions which, he argues, set an initial call to a specific vocation within the context of a heavenly ascension. He cites as examples TLevi 2-5, I Enoch 81.5f, II Enoch and The Paraphrase of Shem. The difficulty with this argument is that heavenly ascensions were normally used, not as a means of calling and commissioning an individual for an historical task, but as a medium for transmitting revelations on a range of subjects (e.g. I Enoch 17-36; I Enoch 37-71; I Enoch 72-82; II Enoch; III Baruch; ApocZephaniah; ApocAbraham; 1Abraham; AscIsa 6-11; ChrApocPaul; Allogenes; Marsanes; The Paraphrase of Shem). When the seer is instructed to return to the earth and carry out some task this frequently relates to the transmission of the revelation (I Enoch 81.5f; II Enoch 36.1ff; Allogenes 68.16-32; cf. ParShem 25.35-26.25; 28.34-29.6). There are only a couple of instances where the ascension vision is closely related to the individual's historical career. One element of TLevi 2-5 is God's promise that Levi and his descendants will constitute Israel's priesthood (5.1f; cf. 8.1ff). However this is only a small element of the ascension vision. In Zostrianos the ascension is more closely related to the seer's role as a preacher of salvation. In the introductory setting the heavenly revealer says that Zostrianos will return to the world in order to: "...preach to a living generation and to save those who are worthy and to strengthen the elect...." (4.15-17) When Zostrianos returns he writes an account of the revelation he had received on three tablets (130.1ff) and then goes on to preach to others with a view to their salvation (130.14-132.5: the substance of the message he preached is recounted at 130.16-132.5). This is the one text which would appear to support Murdock's argument. However even in this case there is no explicit statement of call and commission. It is assumed that Zostrianos is a Gnostic before his ascension (1.10ff) and his role after the revelation is not the result of a specific commission (though the heavenly ascension does equip him for his task). In view of this evidence it is doubtful that Murdock is correct in stating that ascension visions were traditionally associated with the initial call and commissioning of an individual to a specific vocation.
It is very likely that the author did intend to relate Paul's ascension to his status as a Gnostic apostle. This is evident from Paul's answers to the Demiurge's questions. However, it is likely that Murdock has overstated his case in arguing that the work was intended to be an account of Paul's initial apostolic call and commission. To a large extent this hypothesis rests on a specific interpretation of the author's intention in employing elements from Galatians 1.11ff and 2.1f, viz. that in creating the frame story the author conflated Paul's reference to his initial call by Christ (Gal. 1.11-17) and his journey to Jerusalem (Gal. 2.1f). The result is that the author locates Paul's call and commission in the context of the trip to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. 2.1f. However the author's intention is capable of another interpretation. It may be that the author was only bringing together the events described in Gal. 2.1f and II Cor. 12.1ff (journey to Jerusalem plus heavenly ascension) to construct the frame story, and that the allusions to Gal. 1.11-17 were included simply to build up the picture of Paul as one called into the service of the Gnostic Christ. On this view Paul was already a Gnostic apostle when Christ, disguised as a child, met him as he was going to Jerusalem. There are several elements in the text which suggest that this was the case. First, Paul is not explicitly called or commissioned in the introductory discourses. The author has attributed two long introductory discourses to the Child (18.14-19.17; 19.10-18). While there is an acknowledgment that Paul has been called and that he is a Gnostic apostle (18.14-20), there is no explicit statement of call or commission/33/. If the primary function of GnApocPaul was to provide an account of Paul's call to be a Gnostic apostle then one would expect that this would constitute a much more
dominant element in the introductory discourses. Second, there is nothing in the heavenly ascension which is explicitly related to Paul's call and commission. The description of scenes in the fourth to the seventh heavens bears no obvious relationship to Paul's commissioning. His passage from the Ogdoad to the tenth heaven simply establishes that Paul had ascended to the highest level of reality. While this ascension would serve to support the appropriation of Paul by Christian Gnostics, there is nothing that is directly related to Paul's initial call. Finally, there is some evidence that Paul was already regarded as a Gnostic apostle when Christ met him as he was going to Jerusalem. In the introductory discourse Paul is included with the other apostles without any explanation—'your fellow apostles' (18.17ff). In the seventh heaven Paul is able to answer the Demiurge's questions without any help from his guide (23.1-16). Finally, when instructed to give the Demiurge the 'sign', Paul knows exactly what to do (23.22-26). This material does not seem to have been shaped on the assumption that Paul was a novice Gnostic who was undergoing an experience in which he was called and commissioned as a Gnostic apostle.

In summary, it would appear that the author had at least two interests in writing this text. First, he set out to appropriate Paul (and the other apostles) for the Gnostic community. It is likely that in the author's view the heavenly ascension served to equip Paul for his role as a Gnostic apostle. However the evidence does not suggest that one could go further and argue

33. Murdock, ApocPaul, 138ff, 151f, argues that Christ's appearance to Paul and the use of Paul's name ('I know who you are, Paul'—18.14f) constitutes a call. However in the context of two introductory discourses this does not seem to provide substantial evidence that this event recounts Paul's initial call as a Gnostic apostle.
that the author viewed Paul's encounter with Christ and his heavenly ascension as the event in which he was initially called and commissioned as a Gnostic apostle. Second, it would also seem that the author was interested in the structure of the heavenly world and the post-mortem ascent of the soul. However in this respect the emphasis was on showing how the lower powers kept the souls of non-Gnostics trapped in the material world (fourth and fifth heavens)/34/. The author has not developed a complete picture of the ascension of the soul with a demonstration of how the Gnostic could successfully ascend to the Pleroma (though some material is relevant to this question—especially when interpreted in light of other Gnostic traditions).

34. It is arguable that a polemical intent underlies the composition as a whole. Most of the ascension involves a journey through the heavenly world of Jewish and Christian tradition (third to the seventh heavens). This realm has been 'demonized' in that it is regarded as the realm of the lower deity and his powers.
Chapter 8

The Apocalypse of Adam

The Apocalypse of Adam was one Nag Hammadi text which was made available to the academic community relatively early/1/. As a result there has been time to study the text and a significant number of studies have been published on various aspects of this work/2/. The issue which has attracted a great deal of attention is whether the text comes from a Gnosticism which has been influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions. The classification of the text's genre has also received some attention—though it has not been a central issue. While the primary interest of this chapter is the question of genre, several new arguments have emerged from the study of the text's

1. The first edition was that of A. Böhligh and P. Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi (Halle-Wittenberg: 1963) 96-117. M. Krause's translation was also early: "The Apocalypse of Adam," Gnosis—II, 13-23. Cf. Charles Hedrick, The Apocalypse of Adam: A Literary and Source Analysis (Chico: 1982), 9-11 (for a review of translations of ApocAd) and 230ff (for his own text, translation and notes—though this is presented in three sections on the basis of his analysis of the literary history of ApocAd). References in this chapter will be to the Coptic text and English translation prepared by G. W. MacRae: Nag Hammadi Codices, V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4 (Leiden: 1979), 154-195.

2. Cf. Hedrick, Adam, 9-17, for a history of research and survey of the most important literature on ApocAd up to the late 70's.
genre which are relevant to the question of provenance. However before examining these issues it may be useful to summarize the essential elements of the text.

Aproz is structured around Adam's discourse to Seth. The discourse in turn falls into two parts: 1. an autobiographical statement (64.6-67.14); 2. an account of the future history of Seth's posterity (67.14-85.18). This discourse is bracketed with a narrative introduction (64.2-6) and conclusion (85.19-31).

The autobiographical statement starts with Adam describing how he and Eve were initially created as an androgynous being with a status higher than that of the creator and his powers (64.6-19). The creator then divided Adam and Eve into distinct individuals. The result was that they lost the 'glory' and 'knowledge' which they had originally possessed and became subject to the Demiurge (64.20-65.22). Adam then describes how in the midst of this situation of subjection to the Demiurge three men, figures from the 'great aeons', came to him in order to impart a revelation concerning the future history of Seth's posterity (65.24-66.14). Sakla realized that something was amiss and renewed Adam and Eve's subjection by giving them the desire for sexual relations. The result was the loss of knowledge and the shortening of life (66.14-67.14). Adam then says that he will relate to Seth the revelation that was given to him by the three men (67.14-21).

3. The author uses a variety of designations for the creator god: god (64.7, 17; 70.6, 16f; 71.16); god, the ruler of the aeons (64.20-21); god who created us (64.17; 65.17f, 31; 66.14f, 25f; cf. 66.20f); god of the powers (77.4f); god the almighty ( : 69.4-5; 72.25; 73.9-10); Sakla (74.3, 7). The higher deity is described with the following terminology: God (72.14f; 82.21; 83.13, 21);, eternal God (64.13f; 76.22; 85.15); living God (83.9f); God of truth (65.12f; 83.28f); God of the aeons (85.4f).
The revelation is a long review of history extending from Adam's death to the eschaton (67.22-85.18). The review focuses on the preservation of the Gnostic community in the face of the Demiurge's repeated attempts to destroy it. The first event in this drama is the flood. This is represented as the creator's attempt to destroy humanity in general and Seth's posterity in particular (69.2ff). His intention to destroy the Gnostic community is foiled by action from the pleroma as great angels remove them to a safe place (69.19-24). Noah and his family are singled out for preservation so that the Demiurge will have subjects loyal to him and free from the influence of the Gnostic community (70.6-71.8). However after the flood Seth's posterity is returned to the earth and appears before Noah and the lower powers (71.8-15). When the creator accuses Noah of treachery in creating another Gnostic community, the latter pleads innocence and claims that he is not responsible for the re-emergence of this group (71.16-26). After a gap created by several missing lines the narrative resumes with the Sethian community being settled in a land that is to be their own. They will live there for 600 years—undisturbed by the Demiurge and in a state of spiritual perfection (72.1-14)/5/. In the meantime Noah divides the world among his three sons and exhorts them to serve the Demiurge (72.15-25). One of Noah's sons (almost certainly Shem)

4. The realms of the higher deity are described as: the aeon from which we had come forth (64.10-12); the great aeons (65.5; 71.13; 76.21; 82.27; 85.3); the great aeons of imperishability (74.1f). The references to Seth's posterity or the Gnostic community use a variety of non-technical descriptions: the/those men (e.g. 69.12, 22; 71.6, 11, 24; 74.8; 83.25; 83.11f); the great men (75.2); the great men who are in their glory (74.5-7); those men who came forth from the great eternal knowledge (74.5-7). There is a suggestion at 72.6-7 that they described themselves as 'Sethians' in some manner: 'they will be called by that name' (Seth).
responds by committing his posterity to the service of 'god the almighty' (73.1-12).

The next crisis is precipitated by the 'apostasy' of 400,000 from Ham and Japheth's posterity who join the Sethian community (those who are left form twelve kingdoms--73.13-24, 25-29). This leads to a group (probably Shem's posterity--cf. 74.17ff) bringing an accusation before Sakla that the Gnostic community is undermining his authority (73.30-74.26). Sakla responds by sending some of his angelic powers to help Shem's posterity destroy the Gnostic community with 'fire, sulphur and asphalt' (74.26-75.16). However they are rescued by three angels who take them into the great aeons where they become like the angels who

5. This is probably the land of Sodom and Gomorrah. This identification is suggested by the fact that the next attack on the Gnostic community is apparently identified with the burning of these places. A.F.J. Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 94, doubts that the account of the conflagration is an interpretation of the story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. He argues that it may be based on non-Biblical traditions of a periodic destruction of the world by water and fire. However in light of the following considerations it seems likely that the author is interpreting the Biblical account: 1. the references to Seth's posterity dwelling in these cities in GosEgypt (III.2, 60.9-17; cf. ParShem 28.34-29.29); 2. the author's interest in reinterpreting Genesis narratives; 3. in both accounts there is a local destruction and not a universal conflagration; 4. the references to fire and sulphur in both accounts; 5. accusations against the inhabitants precede the destruction in each case (Genesis 18.20ff; ApocAd 74.3-26). G. Stroumsa, Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology (Leiden: 1984) 119-123, argues that this 'promised land' of the Gnostics was located in an otherworldly, mythical location rather than in this world. So far as ApocAd is concerned this seems unlikely. The fact that after the flood the Gnostics return to this place brings them into contact with the Demiurge and Noah's posterity (400,000 of the latter join the Gnostics) suggests a location in this world. It is also hard to see why Shem's posterity would have been so disturbed by this Gnostic community if they were located in an otherworldly place. Finally, the identification of the Demiurge's second attack on the Gnostics with the Sodom and Gomorrah incident implies an historical dwelling place.
rescued them (75.17-76.7).

The next episode in this history is abruptly introduced in that the author does not create a context for the event. The 'Illuminator of Knowledge' comes to create a Gnostic community from 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth' (76.8ff). The Illuminator is a heavenly figure who manifests himself in the world through a docetic union with an historical individual (cf. 77.5-18). Since several lines at the bottom of page 76 and top of page 77 are badly damaged (76.28-77.1) it is difficult to determine the relationship between the Illuminator and Seth (whose named is mentioned at 77.1). However comparisons with related texts have led many to believe that the Illuminator is a manifestation of the heavenly Seth. The Illuminator arouses the hostility of the powers by performing 'signs and wonders'. When the Demiurge sets out to destroy him the Illuminator departs into the Pleroma while the individual through whom he manifested himself is punished by the lower powers (77.1-18). The Demiurge then tries to create misunderstanding about the nature of the Illuminator (77.18-27). This is followed by the most enigmatic section in ApocAd: thirteen false explanations of the origin of the Illuminator are proposed before the correct explanation is provided by the Gnostic community (77.27-83.4). The author then moves directly to the eschatological prophecy. There is a conflict between the Gnostic community and its opponents and once again there is intervention from the pleroma on behalf of the


7. Cf. Hedrick, Adam, 55 (last part of note 77), for a summary of interpretations of this section, 117-119 and 130-154 for his own analysis.
Gnostics (83.4-8). However the eschatological prophecy does not go on to describe the final destruction of the Demiurge, his powers, his human subjects and the created world. Instead the author relates a confession in which 'the peoples' vindicate the Gnostic community, describe their own sins and acknowledge the sentence of death which hangs over them (83.8-84.3)/8/. A voice then comes from the pleroma rebuking this group and contrasting their wickedness (84.4-28) with the integrity of the Gnostic community (85.1-18). Adam's discourse breaks off at this point and the text concludes with what appear to be two narrative conclusions (85.19-22a; 85.22b-32).

There is a great deal of material in ApocAd and a close study of it reveals a large number of textual and interpretive problems. Those that have a bearing on the issues to be investigated in this chapter will be examined in due course. ApocAd also raises the usual critical questions of provenance, date, literary unity, social setting and function. These questions do not have a direct bearing on the main issue of this chapter. However in the course of the present study of the text's genre some new evidence emerged with respect to the provenance of the the ApocAd. There is a consensus of opinion that ApocAd is related to a Gnostic outlook which can in some sense be designated as 'Sethian'/9/. However the important question is whether or not this text represents a 'Sethian' Gnosticism that was influenced by Christianity. After a study of the genre of ApocAd I will propose several new arguments to support the view that ApocAd comes from a Gnosticism which has been influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions.

8. The best parallels in Jewish literature to this statement are in Wisdom 5.1-3 and I Enoch 62.1-63.12.
Mention should perhaps be made of Hedrick's reconstruction of the literary history of ApocAd. He has argued that in ApocAd one can identify two literary sources (A and B) plus the redactional material (R) added by the author/redactor of the present text/10/. The following material is identified as having been a part of source A: 64.6-65.23 and 66.12-67.12 from Adam's autobiographical statement; 67.22-76.7 and 83.7-84.3 from the historical review (this corresponds to the period of history from the flood to the conflagration and part of the eschatological prophecy); 85.19-22a from the concluding narrative (first conclusion)/11/. In Hedrick's view the following material was derived from source B: 65.24-66.12 and 67.12-21 (from Adam's autobiographical statement); 76.8-83.4 (the account of the

9. There is very little agreement, however, on the nature of 'Sethian Gnosticism'. Cf. the following discussions of this question: H.-M. Schenke, "Das saschianische System nach Nag-Hammadi-Handschriften," Studia Coptica, ed. P. Nagel (Berlin: 1974), 165-173; "The Phenomenon and Significance of Gnostic Sethianism," Yale-II, 588-616; F. Wisse, "The Sethians and the Nag Hammadi Library," 1972 SEL Seminar Proceedings, 601-607; "Stalking those Elusive Sethians," Yale-II, 563-576; M. Tardieu, "Les livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Sethiens de l'héresiologie," NHS 8, 204-210; Klijn, Seth, 81-120; K. Rudolph, "Die 'Sethianische' Gnosis—Eine Hääresiologische Fiktion?" Yale-II, 577f. Cf. as well the seminar discussions of the papers given at the Yale conference: Yale-II, 634-642, 671-685. Hedrick, Adam, 210-215, develops Morard's argument that the text came from a group related to the Sethian/Archontic Gnostics described by Epiphanius. It is questionable whether there is sufficient evidence to be this precise. In this context it can be noted that Epiphanius, Panarion 26.8.1, states that Sethian Gnostics used texts called 'Revelations [Apocalypses] of Adam'. There is no way to determine whether the present text is related to the literature cited by Epiphanius. There is an extract from another 'Apocalypse of Adam' in the Cologne Mani Codex (48.16-50). This extract is not related to the present text.

10. Hedrick, Adam, initially sets out the case for his proposal (21-57), examines each section (A: 59-95; B: 97-184; R: 185-226), and then provides text, translation and notes for each type of material (230-298).

11. Hedrick regards the following material as redactional additions to source A: 65.3-9; 69.10-17; 71.4-8; 76.6-7.
Illuminator's coming and subsequent events)/12/. In addition to the redactional material inserted into these two sources Hedrick argues that the following material has been added by the redactor: 83.4-7; 84.4-85.18; 85.22b-31. The argument to support this analysis of the literary history of ApocAd is much too involved to reproduce here. However most of the arguments relate to apparent inconsistencies and abrupt transitions in the story line of Adam's autobiographical statement and the historical review.

There is no doubt that Hedrick has identified a number of inconsistencies and abrupt transitions in the story line of ApocAd/13/. It seems unlikely, however, that these can only be explained by an inept redaction of literary sources. It would take a great deal of space to deal with every aspect of Hedrick's argument. However my reservations are based on the following considerations/14/. First, the general development of this salvation history is coherent and has parallels in other texts. In particular the flood-conflagration-eschatological era scheme is attested in the closely related GosEgypt (III.2, 64.4-64.9). It is arguable that this is a more coherent story line than the one proposed for 'Source A' where Gnostic salvation history ends with the Sethian community being taken into the 'great aeons'.

12. The following material is regarded as redactional additions to source B: 76.11-13; 82.18-19.

13. Schenke, Gnostic Sethianism, 598, agrees with Hedrick that ApocAd does not employ a consistent story line. However he is unsure whether this should be explained in terms of literary sources that once existed as independent texts.

(75.22-76.6) and the judgment of the non-Gnostics left in the world (83.7-84.3). At one point Hedrick states that in this hypothetical document the eschaton took place just after the Sethian community was rescued from the conflagration/15/. It seems highly unlikely that a Gnostic author writing in the first centuries of the Christian era would represent the eschaton as having taken place centuries before. Second, it is questionable whether a great deal of weight can be attached to the apparent inconsistencies and abrupt transitions in the story line as this is a common feature in Gnostic narratives. Finally, in most instances the major 'sources' correspond to different periods of Gnostic salvation history. It is possible that the distinctive character of each section in the historical review is due to the fact that the author is describing distinct periods of Gnostic salvation history on the basis of different traditions: 1. in 67.21-76.7 the author describes events that transpired between the death of Adam and the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah on the basis of Biblical traditions (Source A); 2. in 76.8-83.4 he describes events in the recent past on the basis of his community's interpretation of the Illuminator who founded the Gnostic community to which the author belonged (Source B); in 83.4-85.18 the author looks to the future (according to Hedrick this section is a combination of Source A and redactional material—the distinctive character of 83.7-84.3 could be due to the influence of Jewish traditions like Wisdom 5.1-3 and I Enoch 62.1-63.12). It would obviously require a much more detailed argument to establish the substantial literary unity of ApocAd. However it is likely that a case could be developed along the lines which have been suggested/16/.

15. Hedrick, Adam, 203.
THE APOCALYPSE OF ADAM: GENRE

So far as the genre of ApocAd is concerned the main question has to do with the classification of the text's genre rather than the origins of the genre. The author's dependence on Jewish traditions is evident at many points in the text. It is thus virtually certain that the author wrote under the influence of Jewish literary genres.

It will become evident that ApocAd contains structural and stylistic features characteristic of both the Jewish testament and the traditional apocalypse. In recent years a number of commentators have argued that the work should be classified as a testament/17/. While it is true that in its present form ApocAd should be classified as a testament, this judgment must be tempered by the recognition of two characteristics of the text: 1. the author has not incorporated a number of important elements normally associated with the testament genre; 2. several features normally associated with the traditional apocalypse have been employed in the text. These points will be developed in the following pages.

The evidence that the author intended to compose a testament is concentrated in the first seven lines of ApocAd/18/. The author writes:

"The revelation which Adam taught his son, Seth, in

16. Another type of evidence which may prove to have a bearing on this question is the nomenclature in ApocAd for the two deities, the two heavenly worlds and the Gnostic community. A similar terminology is used in both the proposed sources and the redactional material (cf. notes 3 and 4).

17. E.g. MacRae, IDR-Supplement, 9; Perkins, Genre and Function, 384-386; Nickelsburg, Related Traditions, 533.
the seven hundredth year, saying: "Listen to my words, my son Seth. When God had created me...."
(64.2-7)

This is followed by Adam's extensive autobiographical statement (64.6-67.14). There are a cluster of formal similarities in these lines to the introductions of Jewish testaments. This can be seen by referring to von Nordheim's list of seven elements which recur in the introductory narrative settings of Jewish testaments/19/:

1. a title
2. the name of the person giving the testament
3. the name of the recipient of the testament
4. references to the author's impending death
5. the dating of the event
6. a circumstantial setting for the testament
7. an introductory statement

Five of these elements are found in ApgqAd 64.1-7 (numbers 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7). The only elements that have not been included are a circumstantial setting for the giving of the testament and an explicit reference to Adam's impending death (4 and 6). With respect to the latter point the only indication that this event took place at the end of Adam's life is the dating (700th year).

18. The most comprehensive study of Jewish testaments is E. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten: I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-romischen Zeit (Leiden: 1980). The following texts represent the extant Jewish testaments: The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (T12P: 12 testaments); The Testament of Job (TJob); The Testament of Moses (TMoæes). There are four texts which, while they are described as testaments by their titles, are not true testaments: The Testaments of the Three Patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) and The Testament of Solomon. There is a Testament of Adam which in its present form is a Christian work. It is not clear whether this text was based on a full fledged Jewish testament. Translations for all the above works can be found in Old Testament Apocrypha, volume 1 (ed. Charlesworth). In addition to complete testaments there are also testament scenes in other literature: cf. esp. I Enoch 81.5; 82.1; 83.1; 85.1; 91.1ff; II Enoch 39-67; LAE 33; LAE 30.1ff; 39.1ff.

19. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten, 229.
Both the Hebrew and Septuagint text of *Genesis* 5.3-5 state that Adam lived 930 years. However there is a difference in their dating of Seth's birth. In the Hebrew text Adam is 130 years old when Seth is born and lives for another 800 years. However according to the Septuagint Adam was 230 years old when Seth was born and lived for another 700 years. It is clear that the author has followed the LXX dating and set this event in the year of Adam's death/20/.

In addition to these formal similarities there are also more specific parallels between the introductory material in *ApocAd* and the introductions to the testaments in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In T12P each testament is prefaced with a narrative statement that is frequently very short and which leads directly into the autobiographical reminiscences/21/. Baltzer has formulated a model statement that includes all the elements that could be included (two short versions have been added)/22/:

"A copy of the words (or: testament) of (name of Patriarch), which he recited to his sons before his death in...year of his life. He was healthy (or: sick), assembled his sons, kissed them and said to them, 'Hearken, my children to (name of Patriarch) your father and hear his speech...."

20. This was first recognized in the English translation of Foerster's collection of Gnostic materials: *Gnosis—II*, 15, note 3. The LXX dating is also employed in Josephus' Antiquities I.66-70, 83 and by Pseudo-Philo (LXX I.2).

21. In other cases the testament settings tend to be more extensive: e.g. TMob 1.1-7; TMoses 1.1-18; Life of Adam and Eve 30-31.

22. K. Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary (Oxford: 1971), 143; cf. Perkins, Genre and Function, 385. In the following references the second one is the autobiographical statement: TReuben 1.1-5; 1.6-10; TSimeon 1.1-2.1; 2.2-13; TLevi 1.1-2; 2.1-12.5; TJudah 1.1-2; 1.2-12.12; TJissachar 1.1; 1.2-3.8; TZebulon 1.1; 1.2-4.13; TDan 1.1-2; 1.3-9; TNaphtali 1.1-5; 1.6-12; TOgd 1.1; 1.2-2.5; TAsher 1.1-2; TJoseph 1.1-2; 1.2-16.5; TBenjamin 1.1-2; 1.2-2.5.
"A copy of the testament of Gad, concerning what he said to his sons in the one hundred and twenty-seventh year of his life, saying, 'I was Jacob's ninth son...." (T Gad 1.1f)

"A copy of the words of Dan, which he spoke to his sons at the last of his days, in the one hundred and twenty-fifth year of his life. Assembling his clan, he said, 'Sons of Dan, hear my words...." (T Dan 1.1f)

While ApocAd does not employ every element in this model address, this is also true for many individual testaments. In any case the similarities between the introductory statement in ApocAd and those in T12P are striking: 1. there is a description of the literary work (though in ApocAd the text is described as a 'revelation' instead of a 'testament'); 2. the names of the person giving the testament and the one receiving it are given (Adam, his son Seth); 3. there is an indication of date (700th year); 4. an exhortation to be attentive to what the father will say precedes the testament itself ("Listen to my words"). Furthermore in both ApocAd and T12P the father's autobiographical statement follows on directly from this introduction.

It is also noteworthy that in the Life of Adam and Eve there is a close parallel to the introductory material in ApocAd. The text as a whole is not a testament. However the material extending from 30.1 to 34.2 (of. 40.1ff) has a testament character. Adam realizes that he is about to die and calls his sons together (30.1ff). When his sons come there is a short conversation on the meaning of pain (30.4-31.3). Thus far the testament setting bears little resemblance to ApocAd. However there is a similarity of structure and wording in the subsequent transition to Adam's autobiographical statement (32.1):

Hear me
my sons

Listen to my words,
my son Seth.
When God made us
me and your mother Eve...

When God had created me
out of the earth
along with Eve, your mother...

There are thus close parallels in the first lines of *ApocAd* to the introductions of Jewish testaments. These similarities would appear to indicate that the author intended to compose a testament. However, it is also important to note that there are significant differences between *ApocAd* and Jewish testaments.

The most obvious differences in the narrative settings are:
1. the description of the text as the 'revelation of Adam' instead of the 'testament of Adam';
2. the absence of more explicit references to Adam's impending death in the introductory material;
3. the complete lack of a concluding narrative setting. In Jewish testaments, references to the individual's impending death are normally a major element of the introductory material. Furthermore, the concluding narrative always refers to the individual's death and frequently to his burial. Von Nordheim also notes that a farewell statement and a reference to the family's grief is frequently a part of a testament's conclusion. Thus, there are a number of important elements associated with Jewish testament settings that are not a part of *ApocAd*. One consequence of the absence of these features is that the testament setting for this text is not completely obvious. In fact, the recognition of the work as a testament depends on one's ability to interpret the significance of the first seven lines of the text.

23. Cf. Tlob 1.2; T Moses 1.15; and most of the testaments in T12P. Cf. von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 229.


Another distinctive feature about *ApocAd* as a testament is that the content of Adam's testament is based on a revelation that he received earlier in his life/27/. This is not the case in Jewish testaments where the personal prestige of the 'patriarch' establishes the authority of what he says in his farewell discourse. Thus, for example, in *TMoses* the long review of history culminating in an eschatological prophecy is simply represented as Moses' address to Joshua. Moses does not claim a revelational source for his information about the future. Thus the fact that in his testament discourse Adam relates the content of a revelation he received earlier in his life is a distinctive feature of this testament/28/.

The distinctive features in *ApocAd* do not necessarily mean that the author did not intend to compose a testament. The testament, like the apocalypse, was a fluid genre. Furthermore it is likely that a Gnostic author would drop some elements that were not relevant in a Gnostic context (this could explain the absence of explicit references to Adam's death and burial).

26. This conclusion is supported by the fact that it took some time for contemporary scholarship to recognize the testament characteristics of *ApocAd*.

27. Von Nordheim, *Die Lehre der Alten*, 229f, argues that Jewish testaments normally contain autobiographical reminiscences, moral instruction and exhortation and disclosures about the future history of the individual's posterity. The only formal element lacking in *ApocAd* is the second (though this is one of the central elements in Jewish testaments). While the 'salvation history' of Seth's posterity is more extensive than is normally the case, there is a precedent for this in *TMoses* (which also lacks the extensive autobiographical material and moral exhortations of most testaments).

28. There are a few accounts of revelatory events in Jewish testaments: *Tlevi* 2-5, 8; *TNaphtali* 5-6. However in these cases the account of the revelatory event is only one part of the autobiographical statement. The testament as a whole is not based on a revelation the patriarch had received.
However it is also possible that the distinctive features of ApocAd suggest that the author’s literary genre cannot be explained exclusively in terms of the Jewish testament.

There are several elements in ApocAd which suggest that the author was also influenced by the traditional apocalypse/29/. These are the distinctive terminology, the account of the revelatory event and the fact that Adam’s testament discourse is an account of what the angels told him/30/.

First, the use of the term $\text{τ} \text{π} \text{o} \text{k} \text{a} \text{l} \text{y} \text{γ} \text{i} \text{c}$ to describe the text is not what one would expect in a testament. The title $\text{τ} \text{a} \text{π} \text{o} \text{k} \text{a} \text{l} \text{y} \text{γ} \text{i} \text{c} \ \text{R} \text{α} \text{d} \text{a} \text{d} \text{a}$ occurs at the beginning and end of the text (64.1, 85.32). While it is possible that this title is secondary, the same terminology occurs in the introductory and concluding narrative material (64.2; 85.19). The most significant statement is the introductory one: $\text{T} \text{a} \text{π} \text{o} \text{k} \text{a} \text{l} \text{y} \text{γ} \text{i} \text{c} \ \text{ε} \text{τ} \text{a} \text{d} \text{a} \text{m} \ \text{τ} \text{η} \text{μ} \text{ε} \ \text{π} \text{ε} \text{γ} \text{υ} \text{μ} \text{e} \ \text{ω} \text{θ} \text{e} \ \text{γ} \text{ρ} \text{o} \text{ς}$. Given the

29. Before the recognition of the testament features in ApocAd it was customary to regard the work as an apocalypse in the traditional sense. However this classification has persisted even after the testament character of the work was pointed out. Recently Krause, Nag Hammadi Apokalypsen, 624-625, acknowledged the testament features of ApocAd but still chose to classify the text as an apocalypse. He defines the apocalypse with the use of Vielhauer’s list of characteristic elements and finds all of them in ApocAd (pseudonymity, account of a revelation received in a dream, historical review): "Die Adamapokalypse weist somit alle 3 von Vielhauer gennanten Kriterien auf und kann zur Gattung der Apokalypsen gerechnet werden." (625) Janssens, Apocalypsea de Nag Hammadi, 71, classified ApocAd as an apocalypse. MacRae, TDE—Supplement, 9f, 616, treats ApocAd as an example of a mixed genre (testament and apocalypse). At one point he notes that ApocAd is the best example of an apocalypse among the Nag Hammadi texts—616. It is noteworthy that Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses, 126f, includes ApocAd in his survey of Gnostic apocalypses since he recognizes that the text is a testament. It is likely that he included ApocAd because of the reference to a revelatory event and the long historical review (cf. the following note).
similarly of this statement to corresponding introductions in Στ2P one would expect the terms 'testament' or 'words' (στάθηκη, λόγος—αποκάλυψη) rather than 'revelation'/31/. Thus the frequent use of the term 'apocalypse' is not something one would expect in a text based exclusively on the Jewish testament. Having said this it is also true that this terminology is not characteristic of the Jewish apocalypse/32/. The use of this word group to describe revelatory literature appears to have originated in early Christian literature/33/. Thus if the use of the term 'apocalypse' in ApocAd is indicative of the influence of

30. The fact that the content of ApocAd is cast in the form of an extensive historical review culminating in an eschatological prophecy has undoubtedly been an important factor in the classification of the work as an apocalypse. This is because historical reviews have been regarded as one of the most fundamental characteristics of an apocalypse and, in many cases, simply described as 'apocalypses'. Cf. the references to the historical review in the literature cited in the previous note. Nickelsburg, Related Traditions, 533, recognizes that ApocAd is cast as a testament but then goes on to describe the historical review as an apocalypse. He argues that the title's designation of the text as an apocalypse is justified since the 'apocalypse' (historical review) dominates the work. In the first chapter it was argued that the historical review should not be seen as one of the essential structural features of an apocalypse. While this stylistic device was frequently employed in the Jewish apocalypses, it could be employed in other literary genres—including testaments (cf. ×Rnósa; ÌLevi 16-18; 1 Enoch 93.1-10 and 92.12-17). Thus the presence of an extensive historical review in ApocAd cannot be taken as firm evidence that the author intended to base his genre on the traditional apocalypse.

31. Cf. as well TJob 1.1 (words).

32. Cf. Vielhauer, HNTA—II, 582, and M. Smith, "On the History of ἀποκάλυπται and ἀποκάλυψις," AMWNE, 9-19. Morton Smith noted that this terminology is not present in any Jewish apocalypse (except for secondary titles and introductions added by Christian editors—cf. II Baruch and III Baruch): "I do not know of any...text prior to the New Testament Apocalypse which either describes itself or the proceedings in it as ἀποκάλυπται or even uses the verb ἀποκάλυπται for the whole of the revelation." (14)

33. Smith, Ibid., 18-19. Cf. Revelation 1.1 (and title); ShHermas Vis 2.4.1; 3.1.2; 3.3.2ff; 3.10.2, 6-9; etc.; ChrApocPet (title).
the traditional apocalypse then it is likely that one would have to look to the Christian apocalypse (or perhaps Gnostic revelatory literature which adopted this terminology from Christian usage). With respect to the second possibility it may be significant that the use of the term 'apocalypse' to describe revelations is restricted to works with a clearly Christian Gnostic character. In most instances the word is used in titles (ApocPaul, 1ApocJas, 2ApocJas, ApocPet)/34/. There are two instances in which the term is used within the text to designate the revelation: ApocryJas 16.24 and Melchizedek 27.3. It may not be wise to press this point too forcefully/35/. However even if this terminology cannot be taken as firm evidence that the author was acquainted with its usage in early Christian literature, there is no doubt that the terminology itself is not employed in extant Jewish testaments (or apocalypses).

Two more related elements which are suggestive of the influence of the apocalypse are: 1. Adam's description of a revelation which he had received earlier in his life (65.24-66.22); 2. the account of the content of that revelation (67.22-85.18). The account of the revelatory event is as follows:

"Now I slept in the thought of my heart. And I saw three men before me whose likeness I was unable to recognize, since they were not from the powers of the god who had created us...(damaged lines)...saying to me: "Arise, Adam, from the sleep of death, and hear about the aeon and the seed of that man to whom life has come, who came from you and Eve, your wife." When I had heard these words from the great men who were standing before me, then we sighed, I and Eve, in our

34. Cf. V.2, 17.19; 24.9f; V.3, 24.10; 44.9f; V.4, 44.11; VII.3, 70.13; 84.14.

35. Smith, Ibid, 18f, suggests that this terminology may have been employed in pagan literature. However the earliest examples come from the late third century A.D.
There are a number of traditional elements in this account:
1. a circumstantial setting (which possibly employs the language of dream visions), 2. angelic mediation of revelation/36/, 3. a reference to the indescribable appearance of the angels, 4. an introductory statement, and 5. an account of Adam's response to the revelation. The only element which calls for mention is the way that the revelation is mediated to Adam. It has been argued that Adam's reference to sleep and the angels' call to arise from 'the sleep of death' suggest that the revelation was given to Adam in the context of a dream/37/. This is a possible interpretation of the wording which resembles the introductions to dream visions in Jewish accounts of revelatory events. However if this is the case then it is clear that the language of dream visions has been interpreted in a Gnostic direction (e.g. 'slept in the thought of my heart', 'arise...from the sleep of death')/38/.

Hedrick has suggested that this language should be understood as a metaphorical way of describing Adam's fallen condition or his 'state of being in the world'. His main argument is that this language is similar to Gnostic descriptions of the spiritual state of fallen mankind and the call to awaken/39/. He also notes that Eve apparently heard the

36. Schenke, OLZ, 32, identified the three with the mediators of redemptive knowledge mentioned at 85.30f. The three men who visited Abraham in Genesis 18.2 are frequently cited as a close Biblical parallel (cf. TAbraham 6 as well).

37. E.g. Böhlig, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen, 88; Krause, Nag Hammadi Apokalypsen, 625; Cf. Perkins--following note.

38. Perkins, Genre and Function, 386, notes that the 'gnostic expressions...are simple expansions of a typical dream vision opening....').
revelation which the men gave Adam (66.12ff) and suggests that this would be impossible in a dream context. This is a strong argument and it is reinforced by the fact that a call to awaken is not associated with dream visions in Jewish apocalypses. If a revelation is given in the context of a dream then the dream context is maintained throughout the revelatory event. In view of these considerations it is likely that Hedrick's interpretation is correct.

Thus the author of ApocAd bases the content of Adam's discourse on a revelatory event and describes the event itself. As was noted earlier this is not characteristic of Jewish testaments. It is true that there are a few accounts of revelatory events in Jewish testaments—especially in the autobiographical statements/40/. However there are no instances in which the text as a whole is based on a revelation which the individual had received. As has been noted, in Jewish testaments the patriarch's personal prestige is sufficient to establish the authority of his address.

It would be possible to place a number of interpretations on the evidence which is suggestive of the influence of the traditional apocalypse. Thus, for example, one could argue that the author's primary intention was to compose a testament and that he simply incorporated into his text several elements normally associated with the apocalypse (revelatory terminology, use of mediated revelations, historical review). It could be


40. Cf. TLevi 2-5, 8-7; TNaphtali 5-6; cf. LAE 25-28 (though this account is not placed within a true testament setting).
argued that Adam's subjection to the Demiurge was the reason for basing the testament discourse on a revelatory event (a direct revelation from the 'great aeons' was the only way Adam could come into the possession of this knowledge).

It is also possible that the author intended to blend the two genres by setting an apocalypse within the framework of a testament. There is an example of this structure in I Enoch 83-90. In the present form of the Enoch corpus the testament setting is established at 81.5-6. The angels tell Enoch that he will be returned to the earth for one year so that he can transmit the revelations he has received to his son Methuselah. This provides the setting for the apocalypse contained in I Enoch 83-90. Enoch tells Methuselah that he will reveal the visions that he had received earlier in his life (83.1-2; 85.1-2) and then describes two dream visions (83.3-5; 85.3-90.42). While there is no evidence that the author based his text on this apocalypse, it is possible that he intended to produce a similar structure (account of a mediated revelation within a testament setting).

In reality the author came very close to producing this structure. If the account of what the angels said had been placed between lines 64.8 and 64.9 then ApocAd would be a true apocalypse: 64.24-66.8 would be the introductory narrative setting, the historical review would be cast as the angels' revelation given by means of direct discourse, and 66.9ff would constitute the concluding narrative setting. Alternatively if, when the author had finished the autobiographical statement, he had provided a brief narrative transition with words like "And when the men spoke to me they said ...." then the text could be
regarded as a genuine apocalypse. This may seem excessively hypothetical. The point, however, is to show how small changes in the structure of the material could have made this text into an apocalypse. The fact that the author did not produce this structure could be explained by his failure to grasp that in order to produce an apocalypse it was essential to have the seer relate the content of the revelation within the framework of an account of the event in which it was given. As it is the author has separated the account of the revelatory event from the presentation of the content of the revelation. It is obviously impossible to demonstrate that the author intended to compose an apocalypse with the account of the mediated revelation set within a testament framework. However this is at least a possible interpretation of the evidence which indicates that the author was acquainted with the traditional apocalypse.

In summary, it has been argued that in its present form ApocAd must be classified as a testament. However the testament features are minimal and the 'clues' which identify the work as a testament are concentrated in the first six lines of the text. Furthermore the work lacks important elements normally associated with Jewish testaments: 1. explicit references to Adam's impending death in the introductory material; 2. a circumstantial setting for giving the testament; 3. a concluding narrative setting with elements like Adam's final statement, descriptions of his death and burial and references to Seth's response. It has also been argued that there are a number of elements which suggest that the author was influenced by the traditional apocalypse. This is indicated by the terminology which describes the text ('apocalypse'), the basing of the testament discourse on
a revelatory event which is briefly described, and possibly the use of an historical review. While it may be that the author simply intended to incorporate these elements into a work which he regarded essentially as a testament, it is also possible that he intended to blend the two genres by setting the account of a revelatory event within a testament setting (though he clearly failed). However whatever the author's precise intentions may have been, the work he produced must be classified as a testament and not an apocalypse.

With respect to the testament character of ApocAd it is worth noting that both Perkins and Nickelsburg have argued that the author based his testament on a testament of Adam which is no longer extant/41/. Similarities between ApocAd and extant Adam literature (esp. Life of Adam and Eve) provide the starting point for this interpretation. It is certainly true that there are a number of elements in ApocAd which have parallels in LAE:

1. LAE attributes testaments to both Adam and Eve (30.1ff; 49.1ff)
2. Seth features prominently in the testament settings
3. There are similarities in the transition to the autobiographical statements (as noted above)
4. Eve speaks of judgments by flood and fire (49.3)
5. Accounts of Adam and Eve's life are written on tablets of stone and clay (50.1f)
6. Adam discloses a revelation he has received in a heavenly journey (25.1-29.1)
7. Adam relates to Seth the course of future history—not within a testament setting (29.2-10)

While some of these parallels are more specific than others, it is clear that the author was acquainted with Jewish traditions

41. Perkins, Genre and Function, 385, Nickelsburg, "Some Related Traditions in the Apocalypse of Adam, the Books of Adam and Eve, and I Enoch," Yale--II, 525ff. It is not suggested that the TAdam which Robinson translated in OTP-1, 989ff, is either the text in question or bears any relationship to ApocAd.
relating to Adam and Seth. It is not as obvious, however, that there was a TAdam which provided the author of ApocAd with both his genre and the Adam traditions incorporated in his work. While it is easy to propose that there may have been such a document, it is much harder to establish that this was the case. Nickelsburg has tried to do this by identifying the shape of this text from the common material in LÆ and ApocMoses/42/. His argument is complicated and it is impossible to reproduce it here. However it is possible to make several observations. If, as Nickelsburg argues, substantial sections of the original TAdam were incorporated in LÆ and ApocMoses, then it is clear that any relationship between ApocAd and this hypothetical testament was a rather general one. While there are a number of similarities between ApocAd and the testament material in the two Adam texts, there are also enormous differences in both structure and content. This can be seen from a couple of examples. First, the setting for Adam's testament in LÆ is much more extensive than is the one in ApocAd (cf. LÆ 30-31). The only close similarity between them is the transition to Adam's autobiographical statement (LÆ 32.1; ApocAd 64.5-8). Second, the content of ApocAd does not have a close parallel in LÆ/43/. Nickelsburg suggests that a flood-fire-end time scheme may have been a part of the original TAdam (by combining LÆ 49-50 and 29.2-10)/44/. However even if this were the case this brief

42. Nickelsburg, Related Traditions, 524f.

43. Many of the parallels which Nickelsburg identifies between the historical review in ApocAd and LÆ (1 Enoch 93.1-10; 91.11-17 as well) are not particularly distinctive; Related Traditions, 533-538. Cf. the reservations about Nickelsburg's hypothesis expressed in the seminar discussion--Yale--II, 553-557.

44. Nickelsburg, Related Traditions, 525-533.
scheme is only loosely related to the extensive salvation history of Seth's posterity found in ApocAd. Thus even if there was a TAdam that was a source document for LAR and ApocMoses, it is unlikely that ApocAd was closely modelled on this text.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ADAM: EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE

Since the original publication of ApocAd a great deal of attention has been given to the question as to whether or not ApocAd came from a Gnostic community that was influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions. Böhlig initially argued that there was no evidence of Christian influence in ApocAd and that the text came from a Jewish Gnosticism closely related to Jewish baptismal sects/45/. His view that ApocAd comes from a Gnostic sect which had not been influenced by Christian traditions has been subsequently endorsed by a considerable number of scholars/46/.


However there have also been numerous advocates for the view that Christian influence can be discerned in Ἀποκάθισμα/47/. It is noteworthy that the case for the presence of Christian influence has not been presented as systematically as has the alternative view. As a result it may be useful to summarize the evidence of Christian influence which has already been adduced before presenting some additional evidence.

The characterization of the Illuminator and his work has been regarded as the best evidence for the influence of Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions. According to Ἀποκάθισμα 76.8-77.22 the Illuminator of Knowledge is a heavenly figure (probably Seth) who enters the world by means of a docetic union with an historical figure. The Illuminator creates a Gnostic community who are metaphorically called 'fruit-bearing trees'. He performs

47. The first arguments were contained in reviews of Böhlig and Labib's work: Schenke, OLZ 61 (1966) 31-34; Daniélou, RechSR 54 (1966) 291f; Haardt, WJKW 61 (1967) 153-159. R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, 135-139, tentatively argued for the presence of Christian influence. Klijn, Seth in JEWISH CHRISTIAN AND GNOSTIC LITERATURE (Leiden: 1977) 90-96, thinks that a Christian Gnostic provenance is obvious but does not provide a supporting argument. E. Yamauchi has argued the case for Christian influence on several occasions: cf. esp. PRE-CHRISTIAN Gnosticism (2nd edition—Grand Rapids: 1983), 217ff. W. Beltz, "Bemerkungen zur Adamapokalypse aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex V," STUDIA COPTICA, ed. P. Nagel (Berlin: 1974), 159ff, also regards Ἀποκάθισμα as late and subject to the influence of Christian traditions. For further lists of opinions on both sides cf. the notes in Klijn and in F. T. Fallon, The Enthronement of Sabaoth (Leiden: 1978), 69f, note 146. In the course of this debate there has been a notable retraction. Schenke originally argued the case for a Christian Gnostic provenance (cf. above). However in his paper given at the Yale conference he retracted this view: "The Phenomenon and Significance of Gnostic Sethianism," Yale—II, 607. It is interesting, however, that he leaves open the possibility that Christian traditions may have exercised what might be described as a secondary influence on the text (608f). It is likely that this retraction is related to his conviction that Sethian Gnosticism was essentially a non-Christian form of Gnosticism and that it was impossible to produce a genuinely 'Christian' version of this Gnostic system (607-612).
'signs and wonders' in order to mock the powers. The Demiurge responds by trying to destroy the Illuminator. However the Illuminator withdraws and the powers 'punish the flesh of the man upon whom the holy spirit has come.' The Demiurge and his powers then try to mislead people about the nature of the Illuminator in that they 'use the name in error'. It is argued that the numerous similarities between this account of the Illuminator and Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus should be taken as evidence that the Illuminator is in fact Jesus (or more precisely the heavenly Seth who manifests himself in Jesus). Those who deny Christian influence argue that this profile of the Illuminator or Redeemer myth may have been developed independently of the influence of Christian traditions. The result is an impasse in the debate since it is difficult to establish whether or not there was a pre-Christian Gnostic redeemer myth of this type. I will return to this point in the subsequent discussion with an argument which, in my judgment, breaks the stalemate without having to resolve the vexed question of the shape of non-Christian redeemer myths. In addition to similarities between this characterization of the Illuminator and Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus there are a number of specific elements which have been regarded as possible New Testament allusions: the description of the Gnostic community as 'fruit-bearing trees' (76.14f); the reference to the Illuminator's performance of 'signs and wonders' (77.2); and the statement that the 'holy spirit' descends on 'the man' through whom the Illuminator manifests himself (77.16ff).
In addition to these elements in the Illuminator pericope there are several other features which have been taken as evidence of the influence of Christian traditions. For present purposes these can be summarized in a brief list:

1. The names of the angelic figures at 85.30-31 may have been based on the name of Jesus/48/.
2. It is likely that there is an allusion to Revelation 12.5f at ApocAδ/49/.
3. The baptismal language at 83.5f is reminiscent of Christian usage ('receive his name upon the water' cf. note 73).
4. The description of the material as an 'apocalypse' (my proposal: cf. pages 291f).

Finally Yamauchi has argued that ApocAδ could not have been written before the second century A.D. because the myth of Mithra's rock birth which is alluded to at 80.21-26 was not in circulation in the Roman world before A.D. 100/50/.

It is admitted by those who argue that ApocAδ comes from a Gnostic community which has not been influenced by Christian traditions that the text does in fact contain motifs and expressions which could be interpreted as evidence of Christian influence. However they object to inferring Christian influence from these elements on the grounds that the allusions are not

48. The names are: Yesseus, Nazareus, Yessedekeus (cf. GosEgypt III.2, 64.10f; Zostrianos VIII.1, 47.5f). Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, 138, suggests that the first two names may be corruptions of Iesous Nazareus while the last may be related to Melchizedek. Recently Koenen, "From Baptism to the Gnosis of Manichaeism," Yale-11, 752, argued that all three names are variants on Jesus and represent the practice of hiding the name of the deity behind a multiplicity of names.

49. Böhlig, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen, 93 (though he argues that both references are based on traditional mythology); Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, 138.

sufficiently explicit. MacRae and Böhlig in particular have argued that Gnostic literature is explicitly syncretistic and invariably makes some clear references to the religious traditions employed/51/. The obvious response to this is that the lack of more explicit references is due to the apocalyptic character of the work. In a subsequent article MacRae had to take this counter argument seriously in light of the Nag Hammadi text *The Concept of Our Great Power* (VI, 4). In this text there is a veiled prophecy of a future Redeemer which is an *ex eventu* interpretation of the historical Jesus (40.24-42.21)/52/. MacRae's response is that this text differs from *ApocAd* in that "...the very effectiveness of the revelatory vision depends on its evoking known New Testament circumstances."/53/ However this statement begs the question for if *ApocAd* is a Christian Gnostic text then the apparent allusions to Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions would have had the desired effect on the reader precisely because they evoked these known traditions. In view of this Böhlig and MacRae's attempt to dismiss the apparent evidence of Christian influence is not well-grounded and full weight must be given to this evidence unless other arguments can be adduced to account for the material.

In the subsequent discussion several new arguments will be proposed which, in my judgment, establish beyond reasonable doubt that *ApocAd* comes from a Gnosticism which has been influenced by


52. There is another example of this practice in *NatArch* 96.32-97.19. Rudolph, *Gnosis*, 135, argues that this is an *ex eventu* prophecy of Jesus (or more precisely of the heavenly Seth's incarnation in Christ). This is also the view of Schenke, *OLZ*-61, 32.

53. MacRae, *The Apocalypse of Adam Reconsidered*, 574f.
Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions/54/.

The first argument relates to the question of whether from the standpoint of the author of ApocAd the Illuminator figure had already appeared or was yet to appear. Is the Illuminator pericope an ex eventu prophecy or a genuine prophecy of events that lie in the future? For some inexplicable reason this question has been virtually ignored in the secondary literature/55/. This is surprising since the identification of the transition between ex eventu and genuine prophecies in historical reviews is commonly regarded as an important means to determine the date and provenance of the texts in which they are found. In the case of ApocAd the analysis of the historical review from this perspective provides the most important evidence that this text has been influenced by Christian traditions.

There are only two places in the historical review at which the transition between ex eventu and genuine prophecy could plausibly occur/56/: 1. between the end of the story of the rescue of the Gnostic community from the conflagration and the


55. Hedrick, Adam, 203, implies that the Illuminator pericope is an ex eventu prophecy in that he suggests that the author belongs to the community created by the Illuminator's redemptive work. However he does not realize the significance of this view.

56. In principle there is a third possibility. The transition could occur between 83.6 and 83.7: between the final conflict involving the Gnostics and their opponents and the eschatological vindication of the former. However this is unlikely since there is no other evidence which suggests that the Gnostic community is in the midst of a crisis which is about to be resolved by intervention from the pleroma.
account of the Illuminator's coming (76.7 and 76.8); 2. between the end of the material relating to the Illuminator and the commencement of the final conflict between the Gnostics and their opponents (83.4). The choice between these alternatives revolves around whether the coming of the Illuminator is a future or past event from the perspective of the author. There are two considerations which establish that the Illuminator pericope interprets past history and is thus part of the *ex eventu* prophecy. First, the author's understanding of Gnostic salvation history explicitly rules out the possibility that the author could have written prior to the Illuminator's appearance. From the author's point of view no Gnostic community existed in the world between the conflagration and the Illuminator's manifestation. When the Gnostics were rescued from the conflagration they were taken into the pleroma and became the companions of angels (75.17-76.7). Now after the Gnostics' deliverance from the flood they were returned to the earth (71.8-15). However there is no mention of such a return after the conflagration. One might argue that the author assumed that such a return took place. However the fact that the Illuminator does not come to a flourishing community of Seth's natural posterity renders this assumption highly unlikely. The Illuminator does not come to an established Gnostic community. Instead he comes to create one from the Noah's natural posterity (see below). The impression is conveyed that the original Sethian community remained in the Pleroma and that the world lacked a Gnostic witness until the Illuminator's appearance/57/.

57. Hedrick, Adam, 191, recognizes that the Sethian Gnostics were permanently removed from the world at the conflagration and that the Illuminator comes to create a new Gnostic community from the natural descendants of Noah.
Thus one cannot place the time of writing in a period when, from the author's point of view, there were no Gnostics in the world (between the conflagration and the coming of the Illuminator). Second, the differences between the structure of accounts of the flood and conflagration and the Illuminator pericope point to the conclusion that the latter interprets past history. In the first two crises redemption involves deliverance from physical danger, in the third it means the proclamation of saving Gnosis. In the first two epochs angels rescue a flourishing Gnostic community, in the third the Illuminator creates a community de novo. In the former case it is Seth's natural posterity who are rescued, in the latter the Illuminator creates a community from Noah's natural posterity, viz. "the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth." This last point is especially significant in that it is almost certainly a veiled reference to Jews and Gentiles (see below). The accounts of the flood and conflagration are interpretations of Biblical events according to the same artificial model. To some extent this model is employed in the construction of the genuine eschatological prophecy in 83.4ff. The Illuminator pericope does not fall into this pattern. The best explanation for this series of contrasts is that the author is interpreting the events in the recent past which constitute the basis for his community's existence/58/.

This evidence points to the conclusion that the Illuminator pericope is an ex eventu prophecy and that the transition to the genuine prophecy occurs with the description of the final conflict between the Gnostic community and their opponents (83.4). The significance of this conclusion lies in the author's view of the Illuminator. This Redeemer figure is depicted as a
heavenly figure who manifests himself in the world by means of a
docetic union with an historical individual. This is indicated
by the phrase which describes the Demiurge's attempt to destroy
the Illuminator. Not recognizing that the Illuminator has
departed, the powers "...punish the flesh of the man upon whom
the holy spirit has come." (77.16-18) The fact that the
Illuminator manifests himself as an historical person is also
indicated by the use of the expressions 'this man' and 'that man' (this terminology also links the Illuminator to the figure
punished by the powers):

"Then the god of the powers will be disturbed,
saying: 'What is the power of this man who is higher
than we?' Then he will arouse a great wrath against
that man." (77.4-9)

Thus if the Illuminator pericope is an ex eventu prophecy, it
means that the author is interpreting an historical figure from
the recent past as the individual through whom the Illuminator
manifested himself. The significance of this will be developed
after examining two other elements of the historical review.
However the conclusion that will be argued is that there are two
reasons for identifying this historical figure as Jesus:

58. There are two other considerations which support the view
that the Illuminator pericope is an ex eventu prophecy. First, if the author belonged to a Gnostic community for
whom everything from 76.7ff was the object of future
expectation then it is difficult to answer the question as
to the origins, beliefs and life of this hypothetical
Gnostic sect. It is much easier to answer these questions if
one recognizes that the Illuminator pericope interprets
past history. A final consideration relates to the relative
balance of ex eventu and genuine futuristic prophecies in
historical reviews. In every instance the ex eventu
prophecy constitutes the major part of the historical review
and the genuine prophecy is a relatively short piece at the
end. This pattern would be true for ApocAd if the
transition to genuine prediction took place at 83.4.
However if the transition occurred at the beginning (76.7)
then the text would be way out of balance as a little more
than half of the historical review would consist of a
genuine futuristic prophecy (76.7-85.3).
1. there is no evidence that there was a non-Christian Gnosticism which 'historicised' the Redeemer in this way; 2. the major elements of the Illuminator myth correspond to characteristic Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus. It will thus be argued that the historical Jesus is the only plausible candidate for this ex eventu prophecy as he is the only known historical figure who was interpreted as a Gnostic Redeemer in the way that ApocAd interprets the person and work of the Illuminator.

The identification of those who are the objects of the Illuminator's redemptive activity provides further evidence of the influence of Christian traditions. At 76.12-13 it is said that the Illuminator's redemption embraced 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth'. The following evidence points to the conclusion that the author identified 'the seed of Noah' with Shem's posterity who are the Jews and 'the sons of Ham and Japheth' with the Gentiles. First, it is clear from 74.17-19 that 'the seed of Noah' is distinguished from 'the sons of Ham and Japheth'. These lines occur within the context of an accusation made against the Gnostics before the Demiurge. The accusers state that in contrast to the 400,000 from Ham and Japheth's posterity who have joined the Sethians, 'the seed of Noah' has remained faithful to the creator. They claim that: 

"...the seed of Noah through his son has done all your will (Ἀπεκούστη ἐν Ναοί ἕμν Ναό μετὰ τὴν ἐποχήν έγείρε ἄπεκούσμω τιθήνῃ). The singular form of 'son' means that only one of Noah's sons is in view. The phrase 'the seed of Noah' must refer to Shem's posterity who are distinguished from that of Ham and Japheth. Second, the identification of 'the seed of Noah' or Shem's posterity as the Jews is suggested by their special relationship
with the Demiurge who is the god of the Old Testament. This is reflected in the passage just quoted. It is confirmed by the attribution of the prayer of 73.1b-12 to Shem. The introduction of the prayer is fragmentary, but it is clear that Shem is the speaker/59/. In the prayer Shem commits his posterity to the Demiurge's service and prays that the creator will act to preserve his descendants' faithfulness. There can thus be little doubt that Shem's posterity are identified with the Jews/60/. Finally, the conclusion that 'the sons of Ham and Japheth' refers to the Gentiles is an inference drawn from the identification of Shem's posterity with the Jews, but readily intelligible as a simplistic interpretation of Genesis 10/61/. It is thus likely that the phrase 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth' is a reference to Jews and Gentiles/62/.

This evidence that the author believed that the Illuminator's redemptive work embraced Jew and Gentile is an important clue to the provenance of the work. It is possible that a theology of redemption that embraced Jew and Gentile could have arisen in a Diaspora context. However the combination of this motif in ApocAd with a Redeemer myth that is so similar

59. Schenke, OLZ==61, 32; Klijn, Seth, 94; Hedrick, Adam, 252.

60. Hedrick, Adam, 191f, recognizes that Shem's posterity are identified with the Jews. However he fails to realize that the phrase 'seed of Noah' refers to Shem's descendants. As a result Hedrick develops a long argument to explain what he thought was a failure to include Shem's posterity within the scope of the Illuminator's redemptive work. He concludes that it was due to a negative evaluation of Israel.

61. The identification of Ham and Japheth's posterity as Gentiles has also been suggested by Perkins, "Apocalyptic Schematization in the Apocalypse of Adam and the Gospel of the Egyptians," SBL 1972 Seminar Papers, 597, note 20, and Fallon, Enthronement, 72 (he notes that W. Beltz also made this identification). Neither Perkins nor Fallon seem to have considered the implications of this identification for the provenance of ApocAd.
to Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus suggests that one should see this element as a result of Christian influence. The frequently expressed belief that Christ's redemption embraced Jew and Gentile together with the historical reality of mixed Jewish-Gentile congregations forms the most plausible background to this motif in *ApolAd*.

Further evidence for a Christian Gnostic provenance comes from the first lines of the genuine eschatological prophecy (83.4b-6a). The following is a literal translation of these lines:

Then the seed $Tote \overset{\text{1}_{C.\text{NoPD}}}{\text{}}$

---

62. Schenke and Stroumsa have proposed different interpretations of the *dramatis personae*. Schenke, *OLZ*-61, 31, argues that Seth's posterity are the true Gnostics, Shem's seed represent those who are unconditionally committed to the Demiurge (presumably beyond hope of salvation), and Ham and Japheth's descendants represent natural humanity which is still capable of salvation. This typology breaks down if one recognizes that 'the seed of Noah' refers to Shem's posterity and that the second two groups refer to Jews and Gentiles who are both included within the Illuminator's redemptive work. Stroumsa, *Another Seed*, 83-88, has proposed a highly unusual interpretation. He argues that the Gnostics in the early period were angelic beings or, more precisely, heavenly Sethians (69.11-24; 71.10ff; 72.1-14) who were joined by 400,000 from Ham and Japheth's posterity. Second, he states that Noah and his posterity through Shem, Ham and Japheth were 'sinful Sethites' (except the 400,000). He does recognize that Shem's posterity are identified with the Jews. Finally, he argues that the coming of the Illuminator takes place at 'the final destruction of the earth at the end of time' (87: he seems to say something different on p. 100), and involves the salvation of the Gnostic community. It is questionable whether this reconstruction is correct. The fact that the Gnostic community of the primordial period resided in this world and were in contact with non-Gnostics (after the flood they were settled in the land of Sodom and Gomorrah—cf. note 5) does not suggest that they were 'heavenly Sethians'. It is curious that Stroumsa states that the Illuminator comes to save an existing Gnostic community but does not explain how the phrase 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth' (76.12f) can be regarded as a designation for Gnostics. It seems more likely that the Illuminator comes, not to save a flourishing Gnostic community, but to create one from 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth' (i.e. Jews and Gentiles).
will fight against the power those who will receive his name upon the water (and of them all)

There are a number of difficult textual and interpretive problems in these lines: 1. the identification of the protagonists referred to by the terms 'seed' and 'power'; 2. the identification of the group that practices baptism; 3. the meaning of the last clause (this is immaterial for the present study).

The first question concerns the identification of the groups designated as 'the seed' and 'the power'. The word *seed* is normally used with reference to the Gnostic community/64/. The word for 'power' is most often used with reference to the Demiurge and his associated forces/65/. This

63. This argument was the most poorly developed in my initial article (88-90). I have subsequently changed my mind on the identification of the groups represented by the terms 'seed' and 'power' and have gained a fuller appreciation of the textual and interpretive problems posed by this pericope as well as the related material which suggests a depreciatory view of water baptism. However the basic thrust of the argument remains unchanged.

64. 65.4, 8; 66.4; 69.12; 76.7; 85.22, 29. 71.5 is unusual in that the term refers to Noah's posterity (though it does not occur here in a generic sense). Cf. FarShem (VII,1) 35.12f, 40.27f where non-Gnostics are described as 'the seed of universal darkness'. In these instances the word is *περροδ* and not *πορδ* .

65. There are five uses of this term in ApocAd: 1. to describe the associates of the Demiurge, i.e. 'the powers' (64.18, 22; 65.19, 30; 74.5; 74.19; 75.27; 77.3, 5, 13, 21, 26; 83.5, 19, 25; 84.20); 2. to characterize an attribute of the creator (70.9; 71.20; 73.3; 74.16); 3. as an attribute of the non-Gnostics (70.10); 4. as an attribute of the Gnostic community (73.21; 74.8); 5. as an attribute of the Illuminator (77.6). Finally in the 13 incorrect explanations of the Illuminator's origins there are twelve instances in which the word is used in the expression that the Illuminator received 'power and glory' (e.g. 78.3, 25; 79.16; etc.).
use of terms suggests that 'the seed' refers to the Gnostic community and 'the power' to their opposition.

The second problem is by far the more difficult—-which group is described by the phrase 'those who will receive his name upon the water'66/. There are at least three ways of interpreting this phrase67/. First, the antecedent of this clause could be 'the seed'. If the phrase is taken in apposition to one of these groups then, as Hedrick notes, this is the most likely identification on strictly grammatical grounds. This is because the word ΚΤΩΡ is normally associated with the Gnostic community and can be used in a generic sense to designate the community as a whole68/. The difficulty with this interpretation is that it would mean that this group practiced water baptism. In view of the probability that there is a polemic against water baptism in this text it is unlikely that the Gnostic community would be described as those who receive the name of the Illuminator in a baptismal rite69/. Second, the antecedent of the phrase could be 'the power'. Hedrick has pointed out that the difficulty with this is that one would expect a plural article before ΆοΜ since

66. Hedrick, Adam, 293f, has the most comprehensive discussion of the possible antecedents of the phrase. He notes that several translators have simply followed the word order and left the question of the antecedent unresolved (Bohlig, Krause, Beltz). MacRae and Kasser both take the antecedent to be 'the seed'.

67. Schenke, Χαζε=61, 33, has suggested a radical reconstruction of these lines. However his proposal has not been adopted by subsequent translators.

68. Cf. 65.4, 8; 66.4; 69.12; 76.7; 79.16; 85.22, 29--cf. the generic usage in these last two references. 71.5 is the only instance in which the word is used to describe Noah's descendants.

69. Cf. 84.4ff; 18ff; 85.22ff. The view that there is a polemic against water baptism is widely held--cf. the literature cited in notes 73-75.
the singular form is not used in the text in a generic sense to designate a group of individuals (either angelic figures or historical persons). A third possibility proposed by Hedrick is to emend the text by adding a genitival $V$ to $N$. He suggests that haplography may have occurred with the resultant loss of the $N$. As a result he emends the text to read: $\text{f(oll RMH 6rN4XI hvýp4AI liYm 7TIMPor /70/}. This is a likely interpretation—especially since the result is a clearer identification of the group which the 'seed' opposes. The subsequent lines indicate that the adversaries of the Gnostic community are historical individuals (as opposed to heavenly powers—83.7ff). The problem with designating any group of individuals as 'the power' is that there is no precedent for this in the text/71/. This word is used either to describe the associates of the creator ('the powers') or as an attribute of the creator, the Illuminator, and the Gnostic and non-Gnostic communities (cf. note 65). It is never used in an absolute sense to designate an historical community (or heavenly for that matter). Thus the term 'power' does not make much sense in light of the nomenclature of ApocAd. However the phrase 'the power of those who receive his name upon the water' is slightly more intelligible as a description of a human community. Finally this interpretation is supported by the material which suggests that there is a polemic against those who practice water baptism (cf. notes 73-75)/72/. This would suggest that the phrase 'those

70. Hedrick, Adam, 294 (cf. 284).

71. By contrast there is a precedent for a genitival construction with 'power': 'the power of these men' (74.8); 'the power of this man' (77.6).

72. Hedrick, Adam, 71, also regards this as an important consideration.
who receive his name upon the water' modifies the opposition group.

In view of the above considerations I am inclined to conclude that 'the seed' refers to the Gnostics and 'the power of those who will receive his name upon the water' to their opponents. It follows from this that it is the Gnostics' adversaries who practice a baptismal rite in which they receive 'the name'.

With respect to the question of the provenance of ApocAd the most important point to emerge from 83.4-6 is that the author's community is confronted by a rival group that lays claim to the same Redeemer. This is indicated by the fact that they take the 'name' in baptism. Earlier in the text this designation ('the name') refers to the heavenly Seth (65.7; 72.6f; possibly 77.1) and the Illuminator -- who is probably Seth as well (77.18-22). Thus the Gnostics' opponents practice a baptismal rite in which they take the name of the Illuminator. The significance of this for the present argument is that it follows from this conclusion that the text assumes the existence of two communities which lay claim to the same 'heavenly-historical' figure as their Redeemer. This would be intelligible in a Christian Gnostic context. In this case the baptismal polemic could be directed against either the orthodox/73/ or Christian Gnostics who practice a baptismal rite/74/. However it is much harder to account for this baptismal polemic if the text is interpreted as a document of non-Christian Gnosticism/75/. The problem is that one then has to argue that there were rival communities that interpreted the same historical figure as the Redeemer. However there is absolutely no evidence for the existence of such groups. The
reasons for this assertion will be developed in the subsequent argument.

Thus the principal conclusion of the present argument is that the Gnostics' opponents lay claim to the same historical figure as their Redeemer and practice a baptism in which they take his 'name'/76/. It is arguable that this phenomenon is only

73. This was the position I argued in my earlier article (90f). The view that the baptismal polemic was directed against the orthodox has been argued by Beltz, Adam-Apokalypse, 222. This identification could be supported by the widespread phenomena of Gnostic polemic against orthodox baptismal practice, including works with Sethian features: cf. Koschorke, Die Polemik, 142-148. It is also significant that the phrase 'receive his name upon the water' is an appropriate description of Christian baptism. In a general sense a number of texts witness to the association of the 'Name' with baptism: cf. G. W. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (London: 1951) 184-296. In Schérer's there are phrases which closely parallel this expression in vocabulary and meaning (Similitude IX.12.8; 13.2; 13.7; cf. IX.13.3). Cf. as well The Gospel of Philip (II.3) 64.22-31. It may even be that the phrase is a technical one designating a Jewish Christian rite of marking an 'X' on the baptismal candidate which stood, not for the Cross as in later usage, but for 'Xristos', that is the name of the Illuminator. This interpretation was suggested to me by Einar Thomassen. While it is an attractive one, the tenuous nature of several links in Daniélou's reconstruction of this rite makes it impossible to be sure that it existed and that the author could have had it in view. Cf. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, 329-331, Primitive Christian Symbols (London: 1964) 139-142. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: 1956) 401-403, has some relevant material.


75. Böhlig, Jüdisches und Iranisches, 152, has argued that the polemic is directed against a rival Jewish baptismal sect in the area of Syria/Palestine. Schottroff, "Anmae naturaliter salvandae: Zum Problem der himmlische Herkunft des Gnostikers," Christentum und Gnosis, ed. W. Eltester (Berlin: 1969), 70 (note 16), suggests on the basis of 84.5-8 that the polemic was directed against the baptismal practice of another Gnostic sect (though both sects are regarded as having been free of the influence of Christian traditions).
intelligible in the context of Christian Gnosticism where many groups laid claim to Jesus as a Redeemer figure and where there were a variety of baptismal practices.

Assessment of Evidence

The most important fact to emerge from this study of the historical review is that the Illuminator pericope interprets past history. It follows from this that in the author's view the Illuminator is a heavenly figure (probably Seth) who entered the world in the recent past by means of a docetic union with an historical individual/77/. This conclusion provides the key to breaking the impasse over whether or not the similarities between the characterization of the Illuminator and Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus should be taken as evidence of the influence of Christian traditions. The question as to whether major elements of the Redeemer myth embodied in the Illuminator pericope were present in pre-Christian redeemer myths can be temporarily set aside. This is because there is no evidence for

76. It may be possible to interpret the relevant material in such a way that it is the author's community which practices baptism, e.g. a spiritualized form of this rite. This interpretation would reduce the force of the argument to the extent that there would not be two rival communities laying claim to the same historical figure as their Redeemer. However it would still be significant that a Gnostic community which interpreted an historical figure from the recent past as a docetic incarnation of a heavenly redeemer also took the name of the Redeemer in a baptismal rite.

77. It is noteworthy that the most persistent champion of the case for a non-Christian Gnostic provenance recognizes that the Illuminator is probably a docetic incarnation of Seth: G. MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," SBL 1977 Seminar Papers, 21: "...it is quite probable that the figure in question is meant to be a (docetic) incarnation of Seth." He does not discuss the issue of whether from the author's perspective the Illuminator's coming is a past event or the object of future expectation.
a non-Christian Gnostic system which interpreted an historical person from the recent past as the Gnostic Redeemer. This last point is recognized by Rudolph who argues: 1. that pre-Christian gnostic redeemer figures were invariably mythological heavenly and historical figures from the distant past; 2. that the historicizing of the Redeemer figure, viz. the identification of an historical person from the recent past as the Redeemer, first occurred when Jesus was introduced into Gnostic systems/78/. With respect to the first point he observes that in non-Christian Gnostic systems a great many figures and abstract entities functioned as Redeemers in that they were bearers of redemptive revelation: e.g. Dedekeas (ParShem), Pronoia (Apocryphal II. 1, 30.11ff), Protennoia (TriProt), the heavenly Eve (NatArch 89.11ff), the angel Baruch (The Book of Baruch), Seth (CosEgypt)/79/. He notes that in every case they were mythological figures from the distant past/80/. The question as to whether or not these mythological redeemer figures were part of pre-Christian Gnostic systems need not be answered at this point. The point is that in the Nag Hammadi texts (and Patristic accounts of Gnosticism) Redeemer figures which could plausibly be described as having been a part of a pre-Christian Gnostic system are mythological figures from the distant past. There is no evidence for a non-Christian Gnostic system which interpreted an historical person from the recent past as the Redeemer—especially in the sense of a docetic incarnation of a

78. Rudolph, Gnosis, 149f.

79. Rudolph, Ibid., 130-150, for a survey of these figures. Cf. as well Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser," Gnosis und Neues Testament, ed. Tröger (Gerd Mohn: 1973), 207-217, where the same point is made and examples given.

80. Rudolph, Ibid., 150.
heavenly figure/81/. Thus even if certain elements of the Redeemer myth in the Illuminator pericope existed prior to the influence of Christianity (e.g. applied to mythical figures from the past) there is nothing to indicate that this 'Redeemerology' was applied by Jewish or pagan Gnostics to an historical figure who lived in the first centuries of the Christian era.

Thus the simple fact that the Illuminator pericope interprets past history is a strong argument for the identification of the Illuminator as the manifestation of a heavenly figure (Seth) in Jesus. However the identification rests on more than this. The conclusion that the Illuminator pericope interprets past history clears the way for taking the fundamental similarities between the characterization of the Illuminator and Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus as positive evidence for this identification.

There are a number of elements in the account of the Illuminator and his work which have parallels in both Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus and accounts of the redemptive activity of mythological figures in primordial times: e.g. the coming of a heavenly figure to disclose a redemptive revelation, the threat posed to the powers and their attempt to destroy the Redeemer, the ability of the heavenly figure to elude the lower powers, the return of the Redeemer to the pleroma. In themselves

81. The only possible exceptions are Simon Magus and Menander. However as Rudolph notes the characterization of these individuals as redeemer figures is almost certainly a reaction to Christian traditions (Gnosis, 150; cf. 294-298). It is also important to stress that these individuals were not interpreted as redeemer figures in the way that Christian Gnostics interpreted Jesus and the ApocAd interprets the Illuminator. The major elements of the redeemer myth in ApocAd are not present in the interpretation of these individuals--cf. Foerster, Gnosis—1, 27-33, for relevant material.
these motifs cannot be taken as firm evidence of Christian influence (though the fact that they are part of the interpretation of an historical figure from the recent past as the Redeemer suggests that this is an interpretation of Jesus). However there are three elements which have a more pronounced Christian Gnostic character.

First, the distinction within the figure of the Illuminator between the heavenly Redeemer and the historical individual through whom he manifests himself has parallels in Gnostic Christologies. In fact Rudolph has argued that this 'splitting' of the Redeemer into two (or more) parts is a development that first occurred when Jesus was introduced into Gnostic systems/82/. This seems likely since this element can be seen as a consequence of interpreting an historical figure from the recent past as the manifestation of a heavenly Redeemer. In any case this division within the figure of the Redeemer is widely attested in Gnostic Christologies--but not in Gnostic redeemer myths that could plausibly be described as non-Christian. The closest parallel to the Illuminator myth in ApocAd is in GosEgypt. In the latter text it is explicitly stated that it was the great Seth who 'put on' Jesus in order to accomplish a redemptive work (III.2, 63.4-64.9; esp. 64.1ff). According to Epiphanius the Sethians identified Jesus as Seth/83/. However the account is not sufficiently explicit to establish how this relationship was conceptualized. A final example can be cited

82. Rudolph, Gnosis, 149ff, 150-157. Koschorke, Polemik, 44 (note 15), cites Harnack's judgment that the distinction between the heavenly Christ (Redeemer) and the historical Jesus was the most characteristic element of Christian Gnostic Christologies.

83. Epiphanius, Panarion, 39.1.3; 39.3.5. cf. Klijn, Seth, 82ff; Pearson, Yale--II, 498f.
from the Trimorphic Protennoia where the Protennoia says: "I myself put on Jesus. I bore him from the cursed wood, and established him in the dwelling places of his Father."
(50.12-15)/84/.

A second important similarity lies in the fact that it was the historical individual and not the heavenly Redeemer who suffered at the hands of the lower powers. According to the author the Illuminator's departure is not seen by the powers and as a result their punishment falls on the individual who is left behind. This corresponds to attempts by Christian Gnostics to explain Jesus' passion in light of their conviction that he was a heavenly Redeemer. Rudolph relates this motif to the docetic element in Gnostic Christologies and argues that this was another feature which resulted from the identification of Jesus as the Redeemer/85/. This seems quite probable as there is no evidence for this motif in Gnostic redeemer myths which could plausibly be described as non-Christian.

A final element in the Illuminator pericope which has close parallels in Christian Gnostic texts is the description of the efforts of the powers to create misunderstanding about the nature of the Illuminator after his departure. The author states:

"Then the angels and all the generations of the

84. Rudolph, Die Gnosis, 154, identifies the Protennoia with Seth-Christ.

85. Rudolph, Gnosis, 157-171 (esp. 162ff). Koschorke, Polemik, 44-48, has an extended analysis of Gnostic interpretations of the passion. Koschorke points out that there were a number of ways to account for Christ's passion but that the aim of each was to establish that the Redeemer's essential being did not experience suffering (45). This motif is not a prominent feature in the passage cited above from GosEgypt. However the wording of 64.1-4 does imply that the passion involved Jesus and not the great Seth (cf. as well TriProt 50.12-15).
powers will use the name in error, asking: 'Where did it come from?' or 'Where did the words of deception, which all the powers have failed to discover, come from?" (77.18-27)

The idea that the powers try to nullify the effect of the Redeemer's work by creating misunderstanding about him is attested in Christian Gnostic texts which seek to account for the existence of the orthodox Church. The best examples are found in GnApocPet and GrSeth. According to GrSeth the archons create a community based on a misrepresentation of Christ and his message (60.13-61.14). In GnApocPet the creator is described as being behind the initial falling away from Christ's message (73.25-28) and is subsequently associated with the orthodox church in several ways/86/. In GrPower the veiled prophecy of Christ's coming is followed by accounts of apostasy from his message (59.19ff; 60.13ff.). However in this instance the powers are not directly blamed.

In summary, several additional arguments for the presence of Christian influence in ApocAd have been proposed/86a/. The most important is that the Illuminator pericope interprets past history. It follows from this that the Illuminator must be identified as an interpretation of the historical Jesus as the individual through whom the heavenly Redeemer manifested himself. This identification is supported by two facts: 1. there is no evidence for a non-Christian Gnosticism which 'historicised' the

86. Cf. 73.25ff; 74.16f; 77.4ff. Koschorke, Polemik, 71-80, has an extensive study of the motif that the lower powers are the operative force in the orthodox church.

86a. In addition to the main arguments it has also been proposed that the use of the term 'apocalypse' to describe the content of the text is suggestive of Christian influence. In itself this is not a decisive argument. However it is an important consideration given other evidence of Christian influence.
Redeemer in this way; 2. the major elements of the Illuminator myth correspond to characteristic Christian Gnostic interpretations of Jesus. Second, it has been argued that the statement that the Redeemer's redemption embraced 'the seed of Noah and the sons of Ham and Japheth' is a reference to Jews and Gentiles. Finally, 83.4-6 suggests that the author's community were confronted by a rival group which laid claim to the same historical figure as their Redeemer and practiced a baptism in which they took his 'name'. It was argued that this phenomenon is only intelligible in the context of Christian Gnosticism.

In my judgment the evidence that ApocAd came from a Gnostic community which had been influenced by Christian and Christian Gnostic traditions is overwhelming. It may be theoretically possible to maintain that ApocAd comes from a pre-Christian Gnosticism. However the difficulty with doing so can be seen by considering what must be attributed to this hypothetical community. One must not only argue that they interpreted an historical figure as the Redeemer in the way that Christian Gnostics later interpreted Jesus, but also that they believed that this Redeemer had created a community from Jews and Gentiles, that they were confronted by another group claiming the same Redeemer but also practicing baptism, and that they employed a variety of motifs which found their way into the New Testament and later Christian Gnosticism. Finally one must take into account the complete silence of ancient sources with respect to the existence of both this Gnostic community and the rival group. This seems an extremely improbable position.
One of the interesting features of the secondary literature on *ApocAd* is the range of proposals which have been put forward as to the author's primary interest in composing the text:

1. Schottroff argued that *ApocAd* was written as a polemic against the anthropology of another Gnostic community/87/; Beltz saw the text as an introduction to Sethian Gnosticism which could be used with initiates/88/; 3. Morard viewed the text as a polemic against the baptismal practice of a rival Gnostic community/89/; 4. Perkins argued that *ApocAd* was an exercise in Gnostic irony and that the author's aim was to reinforce the solidarity of his community by satirizing the traditions of a competing religious tradition (Judaism)/90/.

The difficulty with identifying a specific purpose underlying the composition of *ApocAd* is that there is not a distinctive concern which runs through the text as a whole. *ApocAd* is a well balanced presentation of the whole of Gnostic salvation history. Adam's autobiographical statement refers to

87. Schottroff, *Animae*, 63-97, esp. 68-83. This view was based primarily on 75.1-8 and material interpreted in light of this passage. It is hard to see that this is sufficient evidence to conclude that the author's main interest lay in an attack on a rival sect's anthropology (it is noteworthy that this view has not been endorsed by subsequent commentators). Furthermore it is questionable whether Schottroff's interpretation of the author's anthropology is correct. If, as has been argued, the Illuminator's redemption embraces not Seth's natural posterity but the posterity of Noah (Jew and Gentile) then it would not be the case that Gnosis is only given to those who have an undefiled origin.

primordial events--his creation and subsequent subjection to the Demiurge. The review itself follows the story of the preservations of Seth's natural descendants until they are taken into the pleroma. A new beginning is made when the Illuminator comes to create a Gnostic community from the natural posterity of Noah--Jews and Gentiles. The author describes the work of the Illuminator and the Demiurge's attempts to frustrate his efforts. The review then turns to the genuine eschatological prophecy with an account of the final conflict between the Gnostic community

89. Cf. the two articles cited in note 74. This interpretation is based primarily on a reading of 84.4ff which has the heavenly voice rebuke Micheu, Michar and Mnesinous for 'lawlessness' and for 'defiling the water of life'. In other Gnostic literature these figures are related to baptism and given a positive valuation (cf. CosEgypt (III,2) 64.14-20; TriProt (XIII,1) 48.18-21; Bruce Codex 136.18-23; Zostrianos 6.8-17). Thus the apparent criticism of these figures could be taken to mean that the baptismal polemic is directed against a rival Gnostic community. However it is possible to translate these lines in such a way that these figures are not the object of the heavenly rebuke: cf. MacRae, *Nag Hammadi Codices*, 191, who suggests several other ways of rendering these lines, and Stroumsa, *Another Seed*, 102f. The reason Morard attaches so much importance to the few references to baptism in ApocAd is that she adopts Hedrick's source analysis of the text. On this view all the baptismal references occur in the material belonging to the final redaction and are thus taken as the key to interpreting the function of the text. However if this source analysis is regarded as improbable then it is hard to justify attaching so much weight to these baptismal references.

90. Perkins, *Genre and Function*, 382-395, esp. 391ff. It is obvious that there is a massive depreciation of Jewish traditions in ApocAd. It is doubtful, however, that this should be interpreted in the way Perkins proposes. This reservation is based on several considerations: 1. the devaluation of Jewish salvation history is a common feature in Gnostic literature; 2. the material relating to the Illuminator does not fit into this interpretation; 3. most of the ironies mentioned depend on the reader's interpretation of elements of the text in light of a wide range of Jewish traditions--this not only assumes a very sophisticated author and audience but raises doubts that this literary style can properly be described as ironical; 4. contrary to Perkins the summary account of Gnostic salvation history in ApocAd would in its own right provide useful ideological support for the community's faith.
and their opponents and the vindication of the former. Much of the material is presented in a summary fashion and the reader would need to fill in the picture on the basis of a wider knowledge of the community's traditions (e.g. elements of Adam's autobiographical statement, the Illuminator pericope, the eschatological prophecy at 83.4ff). The point, however, is that apart from the presentation of Gnostic salvation history, there is not a single theme or interest which underlies large sections of the material. It is obvious that the text would have provided useful ideological support for a Gnostic community. However it is difficult to identify a more precise motive for the composition of the text and its function within the Gnostic community.

Beltz had noted that the major part of the text is a summary presentation of Gnostic salvation history and has suggested that the work was written as an introduction to Sethian Gnosticism for the benefit of novices (cf. note 88). While this may be true, there is no explicit evidence in the text which would indicate that this was how the text was actually used. However the real difficulty with Beltz' hypothesis is the way that it is developed. He argues that ApocAd served not as a full fledged introduction to Sethian doctrine but as a mere foretaste of a fuller instruction which was to come. The function of ApocAd was to whet the initiate's appetite for a more comprehensive instruction (Beltz suggests that a text like GosEgypt may have provided this fuller instruction). He bases this interpretation on lines 85.3-18: 3-6 is taken as an assertion that Gnosis has not been committed to a literary source (including ApocAd); 7-18 is interpreted as a promise of further instruction in true
Gnosis. In short these lines tell the reader that the text he is reading is not an account of true Gnosis, and promise that fuller instruction is available to him/91/. In addition to being extremely conjectural there are several difficulties with this interpretation. In the first place there is an apparent contradiction within the argument in that Beltz claims that the author rejects written sources for Gnosis but then goes on to suggest that the author may have had a text like GosEgypt in mind for those advanced in the initiatory process. The problem is that GosEgypt is itself a written source. More importantly, however, Beltz has misinterpreted 83.3-18. Since ApocAd is a written source of Gnostic salvation history it is likely that 83.3-6 is in fact a polemic against the written Scriptures of Judaism (and perhaps Christianity)—note the definite article with 'book' (Ἰβύκῳ). Furthermore 83.7-11 should be taken to mean that the text of ApocAd was written on stone and preserved on a mountain until recent times when angels made the text available to the Gnostic community/92/. The purpose of 85.3-18 is to establish the priority and superiority of the traditions embodied in ApocAd in relation to the written Scriptures of Judaism and perhaps Christianity. Thus this pericope provides no support for Beltz' interpretation of the

91. Beltz, Ibid., 160f. The essential elements of his interpretation of 85.3-18 are contained in these two statements: "Inhaltlich wird hier nicht mehr und nicht weniger gesagt, als dass die Worte des Gottes der Äonen die Gnosis sind, die von Menschen nicht erkannt werden kann, sondern ihnen durch Engelartige gebracht werden muss. Es gibt nichts Schriftliches darüber, kein Buch. Die Gnosis ist grundsätzlich unzugänglich und verborgen." (160) "Dann kann es aber doch nur bedeuten, dass der Leser der AA, der kurz vor dem doppelten Schluss der AA diesen erfährt, wissen soll, dass das bisher Vernommene noch nicht die wahre und vollkommene Gnosis ist, sondern dass diese ihm noch gebracht werden kann. Er muss nicht verzweifeln oder verzagen, sondern kann weiter hoffen und weiterlernen." (161)
function of ApocAd. In view of these considerations his hypothesis must be regarded as highly improbable.

While there have been a number of imaginative interpretations of the function of ApocAd, none of them find broad support in the text as a whole. It is difficult to see that one can say more than that the text was written as a salvation history of the Gnostic community and that such a text would have provided important ideological support for the community's life.

92. For the preservation of Sethian and Adamic traditions on tablets of stone and clay cf. LAR 50.1f; Josephus, Antiquities I.70-71; GosEgypt (III,2) 68.1-69.5; Allogenes (XI,3) 68.16-23; according to Zoatrianos 130.1-4 the seer recorded the revelation he had received on three tablets. While this work is not an account of a revelation received by Seth, it is noteworthy that one Nag Hammadi text is entitled The Three Steleq CT. Z2. th (VII,5). Cf. Stroumsa, Another Seed, 107-113, for a discussion of these traditions.
This study was begun with a view to determining whether the genre of the Gnostic apocalypses was based on the earlier Jewish and Christian apocalypses. Initially the intention was to work with the conventional approach to defining the apocalypse as a literary genre, viz. on the basis of a cluster of stylistic elements. The application of this approach to the Nag Hammadi apocalypses produced unsatisfactory results. It became apparent that the problem lay in the traditional approach to defining the genre. This realization led to a search for a more accurate definition of the apocalypse. The new definition which has been proposed is that an apocalypse is a literary work structured around a first person narrative account of a mediated revelation—with the narrative settings and the account of the revelatory event as the basic component parts of the text. Within this fundamental structure there was a great deal of variety (though some patterns as well) in the structure of texts as a whole, the construction of narrative settings, the choice of revelatory media, and the use of stylistic elements like historical reviews and an esoteric motif. This definition has not tried to identify a typical content and function which can be associated with the apocalypse. The reason is that Jewish, early Christian and Gnostic apocalypses dealt with such a wide range of topical issues and were written for such a variety of purposes.
that it is impossible to include a reference to a typical content and/or function in the definition of an apocalypse/1/.

When this definition of an apocalypse is applied to the Nag Hammadi revelatory texts then the result is a list of approximately sixteen apocalypses. This study has focused on a selection of these works with a view to ascertaining whether the traditional apocalypse provided the literary models on which these Gnostic apocalypses were based. The principal difficulty with establishing that Gnostic authors based their genres on the traditional apocalypse is that as the apocalypse was a fluid genre, the process of adaptation could produce a text in which virtually nothing was stylized in an explicitly traditional fashion. Thus, for example, elements like the construction of the narrative setting and the characterization of the heavenly revealer and the recipient of the revelation could be shaped without the use of traditional material. In the Gnostic apocalypses direct discourse is normally used as the revelatory medium (probably because it was suited to a dogmatic subject matter). However it is a much less distinctive revelatory medium than (the) symbolic visions or heavenly ascensions/2/. Furthermore virtually all the Gnostic apocalypses deal with an atypical content (normally the exposition of Gnostic doctrine). The

1. This argument is comparable to J. Collins' argument in his study of Jewish Testaments: JWSTP, 325f. He states that as a literary genre the Jewish testament must be defined on the basis of structural elements—esp. the constituent elements of the narrative settings. He argues that in view of the diversity of content in the Jewish testaments, it is impossible to include a reference to a typical content in the essential definition of the genre. It is unfortunate that he did not recognize that this is also true for the apocalypse. While Collins recognized that one cannot identify a typical function for the apocalypses, he did argue that the apocalypses were used as a literary medium for a typical subject matter (cf. the discussion in chapter 1, 32ff).
result of this process of adaptation is that the similarities between the Gnostic and traditional apocalypses can be of a purely formal nature. This raises the question of how one determines in such cases whether or not the author based his genre on the traditional apocalypse. The present study suggests that this question can only be answered after one has examined a given text from several perspectives. First, it is necessary to determine the nature of the similarities and differences between a Gnostic apocalypse and the traditional apocalypses. A significant cluster of formal similarities or the traditional character of an important element may indicate dependence on the traditional apocalypse. Second, it is important to consider whether there is an alternative explanation for the genre of the text in question. Finally, the provenance of the text can be an important consideration. If there is evidence that the Gnostic author has been influenced by Jewish and Christian traditions then this at least creates the possibility that he could have been acquainted with the traditional apocalypse. In each case the answer to the question of derivation may well be based on a different combination of considerations.

The texts that recount Christ's revelations to the disciples in the post-passion period have an obviously Christian Gnostic provenance. In many instances there are numerous structural similarities between these texts and the apocalypse (though these are normally of a formal nature—ApocryJn is the exception). However the difficulty with attaching a great deal of weight to

2. Even when heavenly journeys are used as a revelatory medium, they do not necessarily take the same form as they do in the traditional apocalypses. GnApocPaul is the only text in which the heavenly ascension is structured in a traditional fashion. This is not true for Zostrianos, The Paraphrase of Shem, Marsanes, and Allogenes.
this evidence is that in the case of the RRC the origins of the genre can be accounted for in other terms. It has been argued that canonical traditions relating to the post-passion period could have provided the basis for the creation of this literature. The examination of the apocalypse and *de novo* creation hypotheses in chapter five produced an inconclusive result since it became apparent that it was impossible to attach a higher degree of probability to either hypothesis.

In the case of *GnApocPet* the structural similarities to the traditional apocalypse are also of a purely formal nature. However it is likely that the author of this text did base his genre on the traditional apocalypse. This conclusion is supported by three considerations: 1. there is a significant cluster of formal similarities to the traditional apocalypse (esp. the first person narrative style, the use of interpreted visions, and the esoteric motif); 2. the text has an obviously Christian Gnostic provenance; 3. in contrast to the RRC there is not an obvious alternative way to account for the genre of the text.

Dependence on the traditional apocalypse was most easily demonstrated in the case of *GnApocPaul*. This is established by the similarities in structure and content between Paul's heavenly ascension and related accounts in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

It was argued with respect to *ApocAd* that the text cannot be classified as an apocalypse. However there is clear evidence that the author was acquainted with and influenced by the traditional apocalypse. This in turn provides a further
indication that the apocalypse was known in at least some Gnostic circles and could thus have played a formative role in the creation of Gnostic apocalypses.
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