



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Statement by Referee of Master's Thesis

The M.H.L. dissertation entitled:

"The Rabbinic Parallels to the 'Peter-Simon Magus Stories' of the Pseudo-Clementines,"

written by Solomon Kahn Kaplan
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication ()
cannot be considered for publication (✓)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library ()
may not be loaned by the Library (✓)

Samuel S. Cohon
(signature of referee)

Samuel S. Cohon (coreferee)
(referee)

5-25-49
(date)

rec. 10/78

"The Rabbinic Parallels To The 'Peter - Simon Magus
Stories' of the Pseudo-Clementines: A Contribution
To The Problem Of Jewish and Judeo-Christian Gnosis"

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
master of Hebrew Letters.

Submitted by Solomon Kaplan

Dr. Samuel S. Cohon, and
Dr. Eric Werner, Referees

Table of Contents

Part I. The Christian Gnosis and Its Development	1
Part II. Gnosticism and Judaism.....	21
Part III. The Pseudo Clementines: The Connecting Link	
A. The Historical Significance.....	30
B. The Jewish Elements.....	32
C. The Petrine Gnosis.....	39
D. The Minim.....	52
E. From Ophites, thru Paul, To Marcion.....	64
Conclusion.....	81
Notes	
Bibliography.	

Summary Of Thesis

Part I of the thesis is an exposition of the Christian Gnostic Schools of Basilides, Valentine, and Marcion and their evolution to the end of the second century. Emphasis is placed upon the problems of theodicy and evil as well as the development of a metaphysics among the early Gnostics. This is necessarily a lengthy section as it serves to define what is generally meant by "Gnosticism".

Part II discusses the parallel doctrines which are to be found in the Jewish sources, and suggests that a large part of the Christian Gnosis was borrowed from that of Judaism.

Part III is divided into five parts and is designed to present the thesis that in the Pseudo-Clementine writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers can be found direct evidence of the link between Jewish and Christian Gnosticism. First there is a discussion of the historical significance of the Clementines where they are shown to record several disputations by two different types of Gnostic teachers. Next a summary of the elements in the writings which definitely class them as a Judeo-Christian work. Indeed almost wholly Jewish except for references by the author to Jesus as the true prophet. The protagonist of this doctrine is the Apostle Peter; his teachings are shown to be a mixture of Orthodox Judaism with a mild Jewish Gnosis and the admission of Jesus into his scheme as the teacher of this doctrine. This "Petrine Gnosis" is a link between the Gnosticism of the Rabbis and the Biblical Gnosis of Basilides and Valentine. At this point the identification of the Minim is discussed. These are found to be of various

schools (against those scholars who would group them together.)

In the discussion of the antagonist to Peter, Simon Magus, it is urged that Simon's doctrine is too similar to that of the anti-Biblical Jewish Minim who were known as the Ophites to be accidental. And the hypothesis is presented that the "Pauline Gnosis" of Simon is a link between the radical Jewish Gnosis of the Ophites and the corresponding anti-nomianism of Marcion. Thus the main types of Christian Gnosis, both the Biblical and anti-Biblical are shown to have had their foundations in Judaism.

If, as has been suggested, Christian Gnosticism is responsible for the introduction of such dogmas as the emanation doctrine of the Trinity, the mediatorship of Jesus, etc. these, too, can be considered an indirect contribution by Jewish sources to Christianity.

Part I - The Christian Gnosis and Its Development

Gnosticism has been termed "the great heresy" of the Christian Church. The writings of the Church fathers are replete with denunciations of this strange doctrine which seems to be widespread during the first three centuries of the common era. To learn from such conscientious defenders of the faith as Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Irenaeus one would think that the gnostic heresy sprang full grown from the mind of one Simon of Gitta who is mentioned in the book of Acts as a sorcerer who practiced witchcraft and was considered a god by the Samaritans before he was finally converted by Philip.¹ And the term "gnostic" according to Hippolytus² was first used by the Ophite sect to designate their doctrine. For the purposes of our paper the definition of Gnosticism of the Church writers must be used - for it was they who first gave the doctrine its name. However, on careful reading of the heresiologues one finds that there is not Gnosticism but gnosticisms for the various sects branded as Gnostic differ widely in their esoteric doctrines - so much so that at first one is inclined to agree with Ernst Renan who claimed the Gnostic teachings were a memorable example of the³ aberrations of which the human spirit in delirium is capable. But on examining the works of the great Gnostics - Basilides, Valentine, Marcion and of the several important sects - one finds that in reality there is a common method to them all. Various scholars, despite the traditional legend that Simon founded the sect, have tried

to trace the Gnostic doctrines back to early pre-Christian sources. Anz has shown that a large part of the Gnostic Mythology is directly traceable to Babylonian sources⁴. Bousset finds that Persian Religion rather is responsible for many of the ideas expressed by the heretics,⁵ while Amélineau finds⁶ much Egyptian mythology firmly imbedded in Gnostic teaching. Others trace the movement back to Phrygia and the Adonis cults. But be this as it may, for our purposes the general statement of Dr. Leo Baeck that Gnosticism came about as a syncretizing of the Eastern astrological science-religions with Greek Philosophical movements during that great period of the intermingling of ideas in the four centuries before the common era will serve our purpose and its truth will be brought out obiter dictum in the course of this essay.

Thus, Gnosticism in its earliest form may be said to be a movement which tended to interpret philosophically the various ancient religions. Though we know it by definition in the early Church heresies and in practice among the Jewish sources, it may be assumed that it appeared in the Orient earlier since both Jewish and Christian sources present the Gnostic methods as full blown and since, also, these Gnostic elements seem rather foreign to basic Jewish thought one must assume that Gnosticism, per se coexisted with the Judaism of the early Talmudic period and preceded Christianity entirely. With this idea, then, we must define our terms **more sharply**. Since the term, "Gnosticism", has been appropriated almost completely

to define the appearance of these theosophizing elements in early Christian sects, we shall use this term to signify technically the Christian Gnostics. However, as we show the same ideas to appear in Jewish thought and writings we shall use the term "gnosis" or Jewish gnosis as opposed to Pagan gnosis.

First, then, it is best to show the main ideas of Gnosticism as systematized by the early Church fathers. What are the basic problems which the Gnostics try to solve in their system and exactly how did these strange ideas come into such great prominence in the second century of the present era? To start with, it must be realized that the evidence which the Church writers give of Gnosticism, the various Gnostic sects and their leaders, are all strongly biased and that the writings are all certainly propagandistic; also, very often, while the founders of the various Gnostic schools may have used the teachings very conservatively, the schools which they founded enlarged greatly upon the early ideas. Indeed, we find that such men as Epiphanius, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus who lived at the end of the second century and later, present such Gnostics as Basilides (116-181) and Valentine (c.140) only in the light of their developed schools at the end of the second century. If we should compare the teachings of Epiphanius concerning Basilides, the first Gnostic about whom we have much evidence, with those of Clement of Alexandria about the same man, we would find that the earlier Clement

by no means attributes a developed Gnostic system to Basilides⁷ but only mentions certain of his teachings. Epiphanius, however, presents a thorough doctrine and ascribes it to Basilides. Epiphanius seems to give the doctrines as described in the now lost *Εὐκτακτὸν* of Hyppolytus - and this particular doctrine is rather that of the Basilidean school at the time of Epiphanius and is first mentioned by Hyppolytus (d.236). Else,⁸ surely Clement would have mentioned the fact that Basilides had a well developed theory of Gnostic Metaphysics in his polemics against the founder of the first gnostic school. And indeed, when we read Hyppolytus' account of the doctrine of Basilides in the Philosophoumena, we find that the doctrine of Basilides seems to include not only that of his own school but also that of several of the Gnostic sects which came after his own. Thus, in our presentation we shall strive to present the truly early Gnostics and their theses as defined by such early writers as Clement, Tertullian, and Origen, and consider the later writers - Hyppolytus, Epiphanius, and Irenaeus, - as presenting the various schools in their fully developed stages.

As presented by Clement, the Gnostic doctrine of Basilides seems to have been bound up with the problem of theodicy. If God is perfect, why do men sin? Is there a penalty for such sin, and if so, how can man overcome the sin in the world so as not to be evil? Man, says Basilides, is not essentially evil. The evil comes from certain accidents of the soul certain *παθῆ* which attach themselves to the soul dur-

ing weak moments. These "passions" may also take the form of *φύσεις* or animal natures - such as those of wolf, monkey, etc.- all of these hinder the soul, turn the soul to their own end, even against one's will. If one has faith and is not weak, then the passions will not enter the soul and one will not sin. However, faith itself is only given to the chosen few who perceive it through intuition 9. Faith is otherworldly and yet everyone can achieve to it. That everyone can have faith and that faith is allowed only to the chosen few would seem paradoxical if it were not for Basilides' theory of reincarnation (*μετεμψυχισμός*). One develops his faith as far as he is able in one life and then continues to be reembodyed until eventually he is chosen for the great intuition which alone can save him. However, if one is not completely good, then one suffers; and since the passions only enter man's body through sin (i.e. man receives his just due) which is almost impossible for man to avoid, it is only through such suffering and the subduing of it through education in the faith that man can be saved. The combination of these two can be interpreted to mean that man should be educated in order that he may learn to suffer most nobly. From this Basilides concludes that martyrdom, suffering for a great cause, is the most noble way to die. The martyr must indeed have sinned because he suffered - but he has the greatest faith because he suffered for the divine cause. Hence Jesus, since he suffered, must have sinned because God only punishes those who sinned. Jesus then was a man who suffered

for his sins. But he was the highest type of man because he suffered nobly. Indeed, martyrdom, itself, the highest type of suffering, is allowed only to those chosen few who have developed their potentialities in warding off other types of suffering to their utmost. Clement accuses Basilides of heresy on two grounds. First, the evil "passions" are outside of man - they force him to sin. This smacks of dualism (θεύλομαι τὸν δῖ' ἄβυσσόν) since it exalts evil to a first power . Secondly, Basilides rejects the divinity of Jesus on the grounds that he suffered and must be a man. ¹⁰

Isidore, Basilides' son, continued his father's work and we can see the development of the school in Isidore's refinement of the doctrine of the evil passions. Clement had argued that since the passions could not be avoided there was a dualism in the system. Against this, Isidore states that the passions do not really force a man. That man's reason can overcome them. "We must show ourselves by reason superior to ¹¹ our inferior nature." All of us, even children, have the capacity to sin, we must not give reign to this faculty. That we suffer proves that we sin - Jesus, himself was no exception to the rule. And here, Isidore reiterates the re-incarnation theory of his father but uses it in an attempt to lessen the accusation that Jesus was a sinner. It was not necessary that Jesus himself had sinned that he was punished, it could have been that his avatar had sinned. 2

Basilides had proven reincarnation by alluding to the text: "God visits the iniquity of the Fathers upon the sons to the third and fourth generations"¹² and Isidore explains that it could have been one of Jesus' previous embodiments that had been a sinful one and therefore the suffering. Again, Martyrdom¹⁵ is the final suffering, the great trial, which expiated all of Jesus' sins as well as those of his previous reincarnations.

Clement makes no mention of Basilides' metaphysics. This will be treated later when we discuss the intermingling of ideas among the schools of the founders. However, when Clement discusses the next prominent Gnostic, Valentine (C.140), we get some hint as to the source of the Gnostic metaphysics. Valentine seems to have been a Platonist or a Neo-Platonist. According to him this world is a copy of what he calls the invisible world. This world is to heaven as a portrait is to the model. And even as an artist place his signature on a portrait, so God's signature can be seen in the world by the chosen few.¹³

With Valentine, as with Basilides, the evil spirits attach themselves to man, they are like "unwelcome guests in a hotel, who despoil it".¹⁴ The soul must be kept free of such passions and this can only be done through divine intervention. Of course, Valentine draws the same accusation of dualism as Basilides from Clement. Valentine also maintains that not

Jesus, alone, but all men can be saved - not through faith alone but through a certain esoteric knowledge can man escape the endless series of incarnations. Clement quotes Valentine's instructions to the initiates into the secret doctrines: "You have been immortal from the beginning. You are the children of eternal life and you would participate in death only in order to dispense with it...and death dies in you and because of you. For while you are separated from yourselves, you are the masters over creation and over entire corruption"¹⁵

Of course, Clement disagrees with this theory because it makes the "chosen ones" equal in life eternal to Jesus, himself. According to Valentine, as with Basilides, Jesus is one of those who have attained salvation. Through suffering and knowledge according to Basilides; through the correct knowledge, gnosis, alone according to Valentine. For Valentine asserts that Jesus could not have suffered since he had already conquered over death in previous reincarnations. He had only a semblance of body in his appearance on earth-didn't even digest or evacuate food. Jesus' main purpose in returning to earth from "eternal light" was to guide the elite to similar salvation.¹⁶ He presented the secret doctrines through which the faithful chosen few could attain to heaven. Not everyone could enter the kingdom of God according to Valentine. And it is with this Gnostic, or perhaps his school, that we first find mention of the Gnostics' threefold nature of

mankind. Men on earth are divided into three categories. These are: the spiritual (πνευματικοί), the psychic (ψυχικοί), and the earthly (ὕλικοι¹⁷). The spirituals, through their innate nature alone are especially chosen for salvation - they need only the secret knowledge, i.e. the gnosis, and the mysterious words (that is, the knowledge which Jesus is supposed to have submitted orally to the cognoscenti, and the words which are taught them in the initiation rites) for complete salvation. Here it may be mentioned that the only authentic Gnostic document which has come down to us, the Pistis Sophia, also places Jesus as a revealer of knowledge and a leader who has the secrets which save and the formulas which give access to the highest heaven to the initiates.¹⁸

The Psychics are in-betweeners - they have the potentialities which can make them "spiritual" but they must strive through good acts, faith, etc. to reach the upper level. The earthly ones cannot be saved - they are so deeply sunk into the evil matter of the world that there is no hope at all for them. The world is essentially evil; that is why the spirituals require the gnosis - it is an inoculation which immunizes the pneumatic spiritual from the evils of the world. It must be reiterated that the early Gnostics seem to be preoccupied with salvation and theodicy. Indeed, Valentine's metaphysics seem to be designed primarily to guide man to salvation; this process is an involved one.

There is, says Valentine, one God, ineffable and un-

approachable an from him emerges the "Logos" who in turn inspires the demiurge to build the world. Here, in these early fragments of Valentine's doctrine as given by Clement we find the first mention of the "pleroma" or fulness of the divine hierarchy from the ineffable, non-creator, who is not created, down to the demiurge who created the world. How this pleroma was expounded upon we shall show later when we speak of the metaphysics of the Valentinian school. For neither Valentine, or Ptolemy and Heracleon, his pupils, mentions the famous syzygies, or pairs of divinities in the pleroma (as recorded by Clement). The Logos in the pleroma is the ruler over the spiritual people on earth - through this Logos and especially the materialized Logos in the person of Jesus are the pneumatics saved. The demiurge is responsible for the teaching of the psychics and when he created them he gave them the divine spark which, through the teachings of pneumatics who have already advanced in the gnosis, can be kindled into the spiritual flame which the spirituals already possess. The "earthly ones" are under the Jurisdiction of the Devil and there is no hope for them. The devil in this case seems to be sinful matter.

Note the similarity between this and the Platonic doctrine. Previously, Valentine had said that this world was patterned after the invisible world. And now, just as the

invisible world is peopled with a spiritual Logos and a lower demiurge, so the visible world has its pneumatics and psychics. How evil came into the world is not explained in the fragments but in the later schools of Valentine evil was first formed in the *pleroma* when one of the female elements of the syzygies, *Sophia*, or wisdom sinned by destroying the heavenly harmony. This brought about a corresponding change in the visible world and thus sin becomes feminine and the sinful elements of the world are the works of a woman, "Eve, ²⁹ who caused man's fall".

Ptolemy, one of Valentine's successors, tries to answer a question which eventually was responsible for one of the greatest gnostic sects. Of what use is the Bible and what its authority? It could not be written by the perfect God as is the claim of the Jews because it there are many apparent inaccuracies in it. But again, it could not be the work of the Devil because there are many references in it to Justice and surely the Devil would not ask for justice in the world. By whom, then, were the laws written? Ptolemy divides the Torah into three sections. The true parts- these Jesus comes to fulfill in his disciples by explaining their full meanings. The untrue sections - these tell of such unjust precepts as the lex talionis and the embodied Logos has abrogated them. The third part of the Torah is that dealing with the ceremonies and these the true gnosis allegorizes into spiritual

ideals. These last laws are not of the logos but of the demiurge - the intermediary between God and man who is not absolutely good as is the ineffable God but is, at any rate, just. The demiurge becomes, then, the just God of the Torah who devised his particular laws for his charges, the psychics, in order that through them they might attain to the rank of spirituals. This doctrine of the two Godheads was elaborated upon by the next Gnostic school.

Marcion (c.160) carries the above doctrine much farther. He goes along with the doctrine of the two Gods and agrees that the invisible world was created by the ineffable God. But Marcion's great teaching was that this world, since it is sinful could never have been created by the unknown "sweet, peaceful, uniquely good God" and concludes that it must have been the sole work of the demiurge, the God of the Torah - the harsh, merciless Yahweh. Hence the old testament since it is the work of the inferior but just God is denied by him to be valid at all; and Moses, its author, is the false God's prophet. Marcion has been accused of dualism because of this doctrine but in reality he maintains the unity of the Great God, and the OT God is an inferior deity. The Torah God, the creator of the world is not exactly evil to Marcion who holds that since he is a cruelly just God, he is evil in that he does not have the merciful characteristics of the

ineffable, true God. With such an attitude of rejection toward the old testament, obviously Marcion wishes to do away with it and along with it the Christological proofs which it is supposed to contain. He contends that the Jewish messiah as prophesied in the Old Testament cannot be the true saviour. Indeed, since the Old Testament is a fallacious work done by the prophet of the God who created a sinful world, even the prophecy concerning the virgin birth is a fraud; for how could the saviour take on a body which is sinful²² Jesus was indeed the Messiah but he was the son of the great God not the son of the God of the Old Testament. That is why Jesus rebukes Peter when the apostle acknowledges him as the messiah. Peter has the wrong conception of the messiah. Indeed, in Luke 5:12f. when Jesus touches the leper, he does so to show utter contempt²³ for the God of the Old Testament who had forbidden such contact. Marcion also suggests that good Christians should tend to do the opposite of all Biblical commandments, since the evil God has given them in contradistinction to the true God. For example when the old testament says that man should be fruitful and multiply, good Christians should do the opposite for by multiplying humanity they were multiplying sin, Appelles, Marcion's disciple continued the polemic against the Old Testament. He indulged in some minor critical attacks against the Bible to prove the Scriptures false. He went into the description of Noah's ark and showed that with its measurements it

could scarcely hold four elephants much less all the other
²³
 animals; According to Epiphanius, Appelles also recognized
 Marcion's Godhead who was supreme and unknown, and who has
 not created this world and does not govern it. This God created
 the superior, invisible world of which this world is a poor
 copy, and also the angels. Among these angels was the demi-
 urge who created the earth. The supreme God is "Elohim" who
 created "Yahweh" who built this world with the help of
 the Logos. When "Yahweh" saw that the world he had created was
 not a faithful copy of the invisible world, he begged the
 great Elohim to send his son to better the world. Thus Jesus
 has been sent. He was indeed incarnated but his body is of
 a finer substance. He was sent to rearrange the laws of Yahweh
 in better accord with the invisible world. Evil in the world
 is due to the angelus igneus, the fiery God of the Old Testament.
 This unworthy God was responsible for man's fall, and Jesus'
 teachings are designed to emancipate man from this God so
 as to free his soul.

In this brief sampling of the early Gnostic teachings
 we find the raison d'être for Gnosticism. The New Testament
 is a simple writing. It told of the coming of Jesus and his
 trials and resurrection and of the early attempts of Paul to
 establish a Church based on the doctrine of a risen saviour.
 But in it there is no systematic theology, no patent answers,
 indeed, to such problems raised by the philosophic schools

as divine justice, the existence of sin, and man's place in the cosmos.

The early Gnostic philosophers, realizing the inadequacies of the New Testament set to work to fill in the blank spaces. They may be called the first systematic Christian theologians. Their doctrine of evil, albeit a dualistic one, at least recognized the problem. Their salvation doctrine showed the process by which a man could be saved. Their doctrine of God gives evidence that they were aware of the various paradoxes which existed in the belief that God was perfect and yet had created an imperfect world. But greatest by far was their attempt to establish a metaphysics by which to explain the place of man in the world and Jesus' part in the world scheme of sin and redemption in order thus to systematize the various doctrines into a complete whole. That they may have plagiarized from other religions is not to their discredit for they were living in fast changing times when the various cultures of the world were brought closely together. The very right to syncretize was given them by the authors of the New Testament, themselves. Many of their answers had been hinted at by Paul himself. For instance, the Valentinian pleroma seems to have had its inception from a verse on Collosians: "ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα". Here Paul mentions a divine hierarchy of the Godhead and it might have served the systematizing purpose of the Valentinians to base its

24

metaphysics on this verse. But since Paul does not mention what the contents of the "fulness" might be, the Gnostics take the liberty of describing it themselves. And here it is well that we describe in detail the later Gnostic metaphysics.

Toward the end of the second century there seems to be a great intermingling of Gnostic ideas. At this time we find that the Basilidean and Valentinian schools have quite similar schemes of metaphysics. There is no space to describe these in full detail, nor those of the various Marcionite schools which seem to have copied the others but have rejected the use of Biblical terms and dependence on the Old Testament. Here is a brief account of the later Valentinian system²⁵ which epitomizes the others. First of all, there is the primary being, $\beta\epsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$, or depth, who has as his female consort, $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$, silence; from the union of these two sprang $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$. From the latter two came $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\zeta\acute{\omega}\eta$; and these in turn beget $\alpha\upsilon\theta\omicron\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma$. This was the Ogdoad, the chief divine constellation of the pleroma containing four male and four female elements. There seems to be an allegorical interpretation for the Ogdoad: from the deep ineffable arises intellectualized truth which creates the living manifest word from whence is derived the perfect, chosen man. From this Ogdoad there comes a lesser decad and from this a dodecad forming in all thirty aeons or degrees in the pleroma. The thirtieth aeon, sophia, was indirectly responsible for the creation of the material world. Being a lesser deity, sophia was possessed by a desire to know $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, God's intellect.

This was forbidden her and as punishment, her desire, ^{ἐπιθυμία}, was separated from her and exiled from the pleroma into emptiness. Here the desire became personalized as Achamos (hebr. ^{חִינּוּחַ}) and gave birth to the demiurge who created the world - first the seven heavens (thus forming a lower Ogdoad) and then mankind with the threefold division of pneumatics, psychics, and Hylics mentioned previously. Thus the verse in Proverbs ^{חֵן בָּנוּהָהוּסֵן} ^{חִינּוּחַ}, "Wisdom hath built her house" is carried out. But the desire of Achamos to know "God" is still in the world and "Christ" the demiurge's son comes into the world to give the knowledge of the heavenly pleroma by which the pneumatics can be saved.

This metaphysical doctrine runs through all of the gnostic sects and one can see here, in early form, such official Church doctrines as the mystery of the trinity (the ineffable Supreme God, the demiurge and his son, the saviour later become the Holy Spirit, the Father, and the Son), the doctrine of supralapsarian original sin (sophia's sin brought evil to the world), and also the doctrine of salvation through belief-in that the true gnostic needed only true belief to be saved. Perhaps, in gnosticism we are given some insight into the manner in which Church doctrine came to be refined from more primitive systems. These early Gnostic systems give evidence of being the mill through which official doctrines were ground. That they are denounced by later writers as heresies may only be in line with a studied attempt of the Church writers to deny their parenthood and erase the evidences for their former lowly state. This statement

is borne out by Dr. Carlyon who, in describing the results of the fight between the Gnostics and the official Church, says " And yet the Gnostics won, in part. The simple monotheism of Judaism gave way to a learned doctrine of a three-person deity, of which the second and third persons in their relationship to the first were markedly similar to what the Gnostics had called emanations. The son and the spirit ~~were~~ to many Christians were subordinates and in some way derivatives from the father God. The mediatorship of Christ and the comforting presence of the Holy spirit were likewise concessions to the heretical polytheism of opponents of orthodox theology. The developed doctrines of the Logos, the highest teaching of the incarnation, these are precious possessions of Christianity for which theologians have been most grateful to their inspirers, whoever they may have been. The Gnostics take their place with others in this significant development."

Before leaving Christian Gnosticism a word must be said concerning the anti-biblical doctrine of Marcion in an effort to arrive at its source. Apelles, it will be remembered, had stated that Jesus' purpose was to help the people combat the evil God of the Old Testament who was essentially evil; and Marcion had suggested that the Bible was a snare which called the good, evil and the evil, good. Irenaeus mentions several gnostic schools grouped under the name Ophites or Naasenes. These are called by Hyppolitus the first gnostics. They took as their symbol the snake of the garden of Eden, who, they

claimed, far from misleading Adam and Eve, really helped them by making them eat of the tree of knowledge against the will of the evil demiurge who had forbidden it. Another such anti-biblical sect were the Kainites who believed that since the God of the Old Testament had chastised Cain, this man was to be revered as being the first to challenge the evil, inferior creator of this sinful world. That Hyppolytus²⁷ claims great antiquity for this sect may hint that Marcion derived his anti-biblical doctrine from it. This will later be discussed in much greater detail. A similar sect was the Judasite sect that claimed that Judas did not really betray Jesus. Judas knew that Jesus might hesitate in giving his life, so he hastened Jesus' death to save the world thereby.

The most far-fetched result of the anti-biblical teaching was the development of the so-called libertine Gnostics. Since this world is an inferior one, they say, one must rise up against its laws and violate them. Indeed until one has tried every vice he cannot be saved and they borrowed Basilides' theory of reincarnation to give each man time enough to participate in each vice. Another group of Libertines suggested that pneumatics could not be harmed by earthly sins, since the chosen ones would enter heaven anyway and they proceeded to indulge.

Hence, we have two types of Gnostic.⁵ Those who based their beliefs on the Bible and those who rejected the Bible entirely. Here again, we might not be dealing with splinter groups from the Church as the heresiologues would have it, but the

struggle between the Biblical and anti-Biblical Gnostics may very well have been an important factor in the choice of the Church to retain the Jewish Scripture in its sacred doctrine. It must be reiterated that the fact that the Church Fathers spend so much time denouncing the Gnostics and the fact that Gnosticism seems to have been prevalent at the time when the early Church was formulating its policies points to the conclusion that far from being a minor heresy, the Gnostics were a great power and swayed the minds of the masses. It can only be suggested here that more work should be done toward reevaluating this early heresy to show that the Church, either by outright adoption or by compromise owes much to these rejected and despised sects.

Part II - Gnosticism and Judaism

Scholars in evaluating the Christian Gnostics, have traced its beginnings to Persian, Indian, and Egyptian belief. But little attention has been payed to the possibility that the Gnostic beliefs, in large part, could have entered Christianity through Judaism. Having demonstrated the salient characteristics of Gnosticism, it would be well to see if this doctrine, too, could have its roots in the Mother religion. When one examines the Valentinian metaphysics carefully one is struck by its similarity with the mystical books of Judaism. Note for instance the similarity Valentine's system with that of the Zohar. On analysis one sees that the theory of the ten *הינדס* going forth from the *אין אין* is also an attempt to describe all existence as a series of emanations. When one realizes that the *הינדס* are divided into three pairs with combining forms, etc. and that these pairs are male and female, one can only be reminded of Valentines *Βύθος*, from which emanates the syzygies of aeons, male and female. And the fact that the whole Decad of the Zohar is called *אין אין* is surely related to the last syzygy of the Ogdoad which is *Αυθροτης* and *Εκκλησιαι*. Just as the archetypical man is illustrated in Kabbala - do the emanations in Valentine also produce the perfect man. In Valentine the spiritual world affects the material world and thus also the material world evolves from the two spiritual worlds of the Kabbalah. Man's purpose for the Gnostic heretic is to win his way back through knowledge to the pleroma and Kabbala

likewise proposes a reincarnation theory to give man time to perfect himself and become the perfect man. The fact also that the Valentinian school uses the Hebrew term *שנח*, to denote the worldly creative factor also points to a Jewish background and may be evidence for the correlation of the word *שנח* with its Greek equivalent *σύνεσις* in a technical sense. The main argument against Kabbalistic influence, however is that the authorities disagree on the exact dating of the Kabbalah, specifically the Zohar which is said to have been written by Moses de Leon on 1305 but most likely was a compilation by him of much earlier material. Franck traces the doctrine back to the Persian period and finds there the remote prigin of the Kabbala from Zoroastrianism.²⁸ He correlates the Amshaspands with the Sephiros. Strikingly enough, Hilgenfeld has claimed that these same Amshaspands are traceable in the Valentinian Ogdoad.²⁹ Indeed, the similarities between the Gnostic system and the Kabbalistic one are too parallel as to be accidental and Valentine's use of Hebrew expressions almost decidedly proves his debt to the Zohar for his metaphysics. While the doctrine may be essentially Persian, the facts seem to point that it came into Christianity through Judaism. Again the Gnostic distinction between the ineffable first principle and the creator of the world, or demiurge, can be found in another Jewish source. Philo himself tries to distinguish between the supreme God and the

Logos. The Logos seems to be endowed with the character of the Biblical Yahweh while God, Himself, seems to be the absolute first principle. We find this distinction between the creative power and God, Himself, when Philo says: "Bezalel means then, 'in the shadow of God'; but God's shadow is His word (Logos) which he made use of as an instrument and so made the world. But this shadow and what we may describe as the representation is the archetype for further creation.³⁰"

Also Philo's use of the *dynameis*, or powers, while they may mean merely attributes of God can also be interpreted to represent ranks of inferior angels corresponding to the aeons. Also, the Alexandrian often mentions "the perfect man" or the contemplative man as he who can attain to knowledge of divine things and this can be correlated with the Gnostic³¹ pneumatic. Here again, there is the question as to whether these ideas were derived directly from Plato or came into Christianity through Philo or some other Jewish source. We can only point to the fact that Philo was the first to abstract these ideas from Plato's *Timaeus* and used them in much the same way as the Gnostics did to amplify religious doctrine. It would seem that the early Christians of Alexandria would have found his doctrine "ready-made" for their own purposes. The fact that they use Philo's identical method justifies the statement that they borrowed from him.

Another fact that intimates that Gnosticism came into Christianity through Judaism is the continuous reference to Gnostic ideas in both Talmud and Midrash. Rabbinic Gnosis found its outlet in the doctrines of ^{השקפה} ^{העליונה}, speculations about creation, and ^{השקפה} ^{העליונה}, speculations on the divinity and forms of the creator. Even as the Christian gnosis was kept as secret doctrine, so the Jewish speculation was secret and so we have very little evidence of exact Jewish Gnostic teachings and the penchant for monobiblicism also contributes to our lack of knowledge. ³² Indeed, we read that "sexual relations" may not be discussed before three people, the story of the creation before two, or the mysteries of the chariot ³³ before one. ^{העליונה}, or illegal sexual relations may refer in this case to the doctrine of the syzygies which it will be remembered were male and female. ³⁴ Origen refers to "the chariot" as a secret science. Thus we are quite in the dark concerning the doctrines of those Rabbis who had Gnostic tendencies specifically Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai and his school which consisted of Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, Akiba, and Ishmael; Joshua ben Chananyah, Rabbi Jose, ³⁵ and others whom the Zohar mentions as forming a later school.

At first it seems there was no direct opposition to gnostic thought and there is mention that the Merchavah ³⁶ mystery was expounded orally by Eliezer ben Arak to Johanan. Also, we have the statement that "Many expounded the Merchavah ³⁷ but never beheld it." We know, too, that the ancients of

Pumpeditha were accustomed to study the story of creation
 together. ³⁸ The "Mystery of Creation" must have had reference
 in it to the doctrine of syzygies both male and female and
 the Jerusalem Talmud makes strange reference to it: "Rabbi
 Levi says that the upper waters are male and the lower, female.
 God says, 'Let the earth open and bring forth salvation.' ³⁹ In
 Baba Basra is made the statement that God created all male and
 female. ⁴⁰ We also have reference in Hagigah to the three
 types of man corresponding to the pneumatists, psychics and
 hylics of the ⁴¹ Gnostics.

Even as the Christian Gnostics had special formulae in
 their mysteries, we find that Rav in B'rachos refers to the
 combination of letters by which the world was created. ⁴²

Dr. Baeck has noted that "between Johanan and the Mish-
 nah there is a historical interval during which theosophical
 mysticism was rejected in realization of the dangers of
 mysticism." ⁴³ What these dangers are he does not say but from
 our exposition thus far, it might be suggested that the early
 Christians at this time were beginning to adapt the Jewish
 gnostic speculations to their own concept of the messiah and
 the problem of the Minim - so called heretics who seem to ques-
 tion the authority of the God of the old testament and who
 regale the Rabbis with their doubts - shall be discussed
 later. These heretics seem definitely to be gnostics by
 the questions they ask. Still in the Jewish fold they give
 evidence of belonging to an early cult within Judaism which
 was entertaining the possibility that Jesus was the messiah

and might have been fitting gnostic elements into their scheme. And to combat such harmful doctrine, we find the Talmud stating "whoever regards four things would better not have been born. The things below, the things that were before, and the things that shall be. Whoever has no regard for the honor of his God would better not have been born."⁴⁴

Also in the Palestinian Hagigah we find the famous reference to the four who entered "paradise" (the garden of metaphysical speculation) of whom only one, Rabbi Akiba, emerged unscathed.⁴⁵ Among the others was the notorious Elisha ben Abuyah, or Aher, whose description in Peshhim would lead one to believe that he was among the first of the libertine gnostics and was the pattern for the later Christian sect.

While the Talmud may have gone to pains to exclude references to gnosticism, we find that the Midrashim are more explicit in their presentation of the doctrine. Of course, the main source would be B'reshis Rabah where we can find hints concerning "the works of Creation". Here we find that Valentine's theory of the two worlds, supposedly of Platonic origin, is anticipated. The Midrash tells us that the Torah existed two thousand years before creation and the Torah exclaims "I was the instrument by which God created the world."⁴⁶ Here there is not an invisible world after which this one was patterned but that God had a divine blueprint by which He created the world. Also God in Genesis is said to conceal

matters which the "wise" can understand. Genesis Rabah also gives hints that there was in "creation" speculation a doctrine of syzygies when it mentions that the sun and the moon occupy the second sphere of the seven heavens.⁴⁷ The contemplative nature of Ben Zoma is alluded to and he is described as "always beside himself".⁴⁸ In the Midrash to the Song of Songs, Rabbi Berachyah interprets the phrase "He brought me into his chambers" as meaning "God taught me the secrets of creation" and the chariot.⁴⁹ Here also we find evidence that gnosticism was getting out of hand and that the people were beginning to question the God of their fathers. There was the interpretation of *בראשית ברא אלהים* as meaning, "In the beginning, God created with the heavens and with the earth" implying thereby that God did not create the world by himself but with someone, i.e. the demiurge.⁵⁰ Likewise, there was the interpretation that Bereshis created God, hinting that someone else created Elohim and giving aid to the gnostic doctrine of the supreme God who created the inferior old testament divinity.

These arguments had to be met and also such statements as the one in Genesis where God said "Let us make man in our image" were interpreted to mean that there was a plurality of Gods by the sceptics. Thus, in Genesis Rabah we find that God meant to say "I create man" and the plural is that of majesty.

All of this shows that there must have been a great

deal of gnostic speculation in Jewish circles. Not only was there a positive Jewish gnosis but also corresponding heresiologues to combat it. That this gnosis was not ephemeral is shown by its amplification in the *Abbalah* and the statement of Hai Gaon (c.1000) bears this out. He says:

"Many scholars were of the opinion that there are ways to achieve this for a man who, thanks to certain qualities is able to strive after the *Merchavah* and to cast a glance into the porticos of the heavenly beings. He should fast on certain days, put his head between his knees and whisper into the earth many songs and hymns exactly as they were written. Thereupon he beholds the insides and the porticos ,,, as though he were seeing them with his own eyes and stepped from one to the other and saw everything that was in them." ⁵¹ Mention must also be made of the so-called "Hechalot" literature - mystical works of the twelfth century which may have much earlier traditions. Here the *Merchavah* throne-world is pictured as the *pleroma*. The throne exemplifies all forms of creation. There are the greater and lesser Hechalot or halls leading to the divine throne. They speak of chambers and palaces which must be passed before one can contemplate God's "glory". This was a secret gnosis yet many attempts were made to keep it within Halachic Judaism. Great attention was given ⁵² to Physiognomy and Chiromancy.

Hence, we see that Judaism has a long gnostic tradition and that many of the Jewish phases repeat themselves in

Christian Gnosticism. If we class the linim as indeed misbelieving Jews we find that even the antinomian gnosis was known to Judaism. Actually, we shall see later that the term Min covers a multitude of meanings.

It is rather difficult to show, however, that the Christian gnosis came into Christian thought through the earlier Jewish gnosis rather than directly from the Eastern doctrines from which both Judaism and Christianity could have drawn. We have shown so far only that it is possible that Christian gnosis was derived from similar Jewish doctrine. There is however, direct evidence which might show that there was a definite Judeo-Christian Gnosticism which had in it all the elements of Jewish Gnosis and which indeed fought against the so-called anti-nomian gnosticism of the Ophites and Marcion. If this is so then we can provide the missing link between the gnosis of Judaism and the Christian Gnosticism and show more conclusively that Judaism also had a hand in developing that later Christian heresy which indirectly contributed so much to orthodox Christianity.

Part III - The Pseudo-Clementines: The Connecting Link

A. The Historical Significance

Buried in the works of the Ante-Nicene Church fathers, there is a group of writings which go by the name of the "Clementine". They consist of two separate works the Recognitions of Clement and the Homilies of Clement with a third minor work "The Epitome" which contains extracts from the Homilies and some small additions. The Clementines for the large part describe the conversion of one Clement of Rome by Peter and record a series of disputations between Peter and Simon Magus as witnessed by the aforesaid Clement who later is said to have become a Pope. Of course the works were not actually written by Clement and their very nature makes it obvious that the writer was not intending a forgery but was authoring what has been termed "Pendenz-Romance" or an interpolation of the early Christian story in line with a certain personal interest. The date of the Pseudo-Clementines is hard to fix. Some writers go as far as to claim the fifth century since they find a reference to archbishops who were not appointed until that time. The material of the work has much earlier origin, however. It contains obvious references to Marcion and possibly even an earlier Ophite sect so that there is one strata of the writings which can be traced to the Marcionite period and if the Ophite hypothesis which will be presented later is correct, then the earliest strata may go back as far as the first pre-Christian century because of the similarity of its doctrines with certain schools mentioned by

by Philo. The Catholic Encyclopaedia, in its article on the Clementines claims the books to be merely a defense of the Faith by Peter against ancient magical doctrine. However, recent scholars, following the lead of the Tübingen school under Baur have found the work to be of definite Ebionite or Judeo-Christian authorship and as we shall suggest later, there are also traces of Essene doctrine in the work. Hilgenfeld traces the core of the books to an earlier Ebionite work, now non-extant, called the "Kerugma of Peter"⁵³ and it is now generally conceded that the works are "Judaistic, even when mixed with Gnostic speculation of heathen origin"⁵⁴, the Judaistic phase being represented by Peter, the protagonist of Ebionite doctrine, and the heathen Gnostic element supposedly represented in the person of Simon Magus, who seems to represent a curious collection of various gnostic ideas, mainly anti-Biblical, but also anti-Christian and to a lesser extent, anti-Jewish.

Peter, of course, is praised in the work and at first sight it might appear that the work is a protest by an orthodox Christian against Gnosticism in the person of Simon. However, we shall try to show that, in reality, is a polemic of an Ebionite, and hence Judeo-Christian, gnosis against several other more radical gnostic schools and that the gnosis of the Ebionite school was far from heathen in origin and derives itself almost completely from the orthodox

Jewish gnosis which prevailed at the time and earlier. Also Simon's own presentation of his doctrine has its Jewish counterparts in a rather unorthodox gnosticism prevalent among certain Jewish heretic groups. Indeed, the Clementines can be called a record of the struggle to keep the orthodox Jewish gnostic ideas within the early Church against its more radical opponents. It is here that we can find the process through which the Jewish gnosis in both its orthodox, pro-Jewish leanings and its unorthodox, paganized, anti-nomian and dualistic forms.

B. The Jewish Elements

That the doctrines defended by Peter in his disputations are definitely Jewish ones has been suggested by Judah Berg-
 55
 mann and indeed a perusal of the Pseudo-Clementines will soon show that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Jewish Lore, and citations to this effect must be taken into consideration in an attempt to show exactly what type of sect authored the Clementines. Peter, before he combats Simon delivers to his disciples several Homilies which purport to represent the doctrine of his sect. It is from these "Homilies" that we draw the following analogies with Judaism. First, Peter is represented as still retaining many Jewish characteristics and it is specifically stated that he recited the

"Birchas Hamazon" the blessing after meals (Hebraeorum ritu⁵⁶ gratias agens deo). He knows well the rite of Circumcision⁵⁷ and also the keeping of the Sabbath. And hence seems to be a fairly observant Jew.

Peter gives a brief resume of the Biblical story to his followers and in doing so he gives many of the same teleological explanations for names as do the Rabbis. The Homilies explain the name "Nimrod" as "choosing like a giant to devise things against God"⁵⁸. Likewise, the Talmud asks " And why was he called Nimrod? Because in his reign he caused all the world to revolt against God."⁵⁹ Peter, too, derives the name "Cain" from both of its Hebrew derivatives קַיִן , meaning to possess, and קַנָּא , to envy. and the Jewish tradition likewise gives both of these derivations.

In explaining why the perfect God would allow sacrifice, Peter explains that "Moses...allowed them to sacrifice... but only to God...that he might cut off one-half the evil;⁶⁰ i.e. idolatry. And Leviticus Rabah takes the same tack: "God said let them sacrifice continually before me in the tent of Assembly and they shall thus be kept free from idol worship."⁶¹ Thus we find Peter always defending the Jewish position. When asked by Simon why the true God does not destroy all of the false Gods, Peter explains that God cannot destroy all of the false Gods because: "If according to you , everything that was

to be worshipped ought to be destroyed, there would have been almost nothing in this world. For what is there that you have left without worshipping it? The sun, moon, and stars, the water, etc....there is none of these that you have not worshipped."⁶² And Graetz in one of his few references to the Clementines points out the amazing similarity between these words and those of the Talmud where "The philosophers asked the righteous ones in Rome 'If God did not like idol worshippers then why didn't he destroy it?' They answered them: 'If these things were not needed in the world, then God would have destroyed them. But behold people worship the sun and the moon, the stars and the planets. Should God destroy his world because of fools?'"⁶³

When Peter explains the process of conversion to his followers, he mentions three steps by which his followers can achieve true religion and tells them "Be this therefore the first grade for you of three - this one of thirty commandments,⁶⁴ the second sixty, and the third, one hundred." That the first step contains thirty precepts is similar to a statement in Avodah Zara: "These are the thirty commands which the Noachites will practice in the future"⁶⁵ and this is all the more similar since the "sons of Noah" were really in the first grade also among Jewish proselytes. Concerning the second grade of sixty commandments we find that the Pesikta divides the Mosaic laws into three divisions of sixty commands,

each: "Moses wrote for us three chapters in the Torah each of which contains sixty commandments. These are those on Passover sacrifices, on damages, and on Holiness." Since Peter is obviously referring to the spiritual enlightenment of the heathen, it may very well be that he is referring here to the section K'dashim. As for the highest group of one hundred commandments - we find these mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud where "It was taught in the name of Rabbi Meir: there is no man in Israel who does not perform one hundred commandments every day, the saying of the Sh'ma, etc."⁶⁷ So Peter would bring the proselyte into his religion in three steps. First, the basic elements, then the holiness instruction and finally as a full fledged Israelite he would perform each day the one hundred Mitsvoth. That Peter abided by other Talmudic injunctions we discover in a strange passage which reads "and the things which pollute the soul and the body are these: to partake of the table of demons..."⁶⁸ And the corresponding law is found in Avodah Zara which says that "Just as a corpse is a source of impurity so are idolatrous offerings." And Peter's "partaking of the table of demons" can be interpreted to mean partaking of food offered to idols.

Even more direct evidence that the sect we are dealing with in the Pseudo-Clementines is a Jewish one is the similarity of its explanation of theodicy to the Jewish one. In the Homilies it is stated "For as the wicked here enjoy luxury to the loss of eternal blessings, so

punishments are sent upon the Jews who transgress for a settlement of accounts, that, expiating their transgressions here, they may there be set free from eternal punishment.⁶⁹ Genesis Rabah explains the problem in much the same way: " God is zealous for the righteous and extracts payment from them for their evil deeds while they are still in this world in order to give them their good reward in the world to come. He grants peace to the wicked and gives them a reward in this world for whatever simple, good deeds they may have done in order to punish them in the world to come."⁷⁰

Thus, Peter seems to have a wonderful knowledge of the current literature and gives evidence of following its injunctions religiously. If we are dealing with an Ebionite, Jewish-Christian sect, it seems to be much more Jewish than Christian. Indeed the only reference to Christian doctrine is that which refers to the person of Jesus as teacher; but even here we do not have Jesus represented as God, but as a prophet who has come to teach concerning the proper way for the good life . This Jesus becomes a saviour not because of his propitiatory death but because he had knowledge of the way to God that no other man of his time possessed. So if the sect of the Pseudo-Clementines is to be called Christian, it certainly must not be considered as such in the orthodox sense but rather a Gnostic one. For we have no saviour dying to take upon himself the sins of the world and thus save but merely the "true prophet", who has the

the knowledge of truth and brings salvation through it to the righteous. This idea, also, is not foreign to Judaism for we find that in the apocryphal book of Enoch, likewise, the hero through special indoctrination, and special divine choice becomes transformed into Metatron, the chief of the angels sitting at the right hand of God (perhaps the derivation of ^{MATA PROPH} Metatron, beside the throne?).⁷¹ Midrash Rabah to Numbers states "...this is the (heavenly) sanctuary of the boy who is called Metatron and to it he brings the souls of the pious as offerings, as an atonement for Israel in the days of their exile."⁷² And in Sanhedrin we find Metatron in the capacity of Guide to Moses and the passage interprets the speaker in the verse "And he said to Moses, Go up to the Lord" as Metatron."⁷³ It appears that at a later time the idea of Metatron as a teacher was frowned upon most likely because of the dangerous inroads of Gnostic learning; for in the same passage, Metatron's capacity as prophet is rejected: " 'and he said unto Moses, Go up to the Lord'. He (i.e. God) ought to have said, 'Go up unto me'. Rav Idi said 'This is Metatron (speaking) whose name is as the name of his master. For it is written, For thy name is in him.' 'If this is so, (says a kien who seems to be a gnostic) worship him.' Rab Idi said 'It is written: Provoke him not' (Do not mistake him for me). ...Rav Idi said to him 'Be sure of this that even as a

guide, we would not receive him." In this one passage we see Metatron considered as a guide by some, but others merely state that he is merely God's servant, perhaps His heavenly High priest, offering the souls of the righteous to God.

Enoch's transformation into the heavenly spheres seems to be closely bound up with the idea prevalent among Jewish gnostics that thru special knowledge, the truly righteous could reach into the Godly realms, and become as one of the angels, and an exceedingly righteous person might even attain to the throne of God if he was well versed in the lore of "the chariot". Such a person was Enoch and the book has been said to be the locus classicus for the "Maaseh Merhavah"⁷⁴. But how did one obtain the Jewish gnosis? Through esoteric learning which was passed on from teacher to pupil one could get hints, but in reality it was only the individual who, by diligent study of the Chapters of Genesis and Ezekiel, and by perhaps the peculiar exercises which we have seen described by Chai Gaon, could perhaps attain to the true insight. That the gnosis was evasive we have already seen in the statement that "many have expounded the Chariot, but few have beheld it." The true Jewish gnosis then was hard to obtain for it required diligent and saintly preparation, coupled with much deep learning. It is the difficulty of possession of this Jewish Gnosis with which the Clementines

Hai

take issue and the person of Jesus is used in the capacity of the teacher of a type of Jewish gnostic thinking; indeed, the gnosis as represented by Peter in the Clementines is a mild one, embodying, for the most part, ideas which were current in Jewish gnostic circles.

C. The Petrine Gnosis

The Gnostic teachings as represented by Peter, then, present new glad tidings to Israel and the Gentiles. No longer need the Jew go through rigorous training to be initiated into the mysteries of the "Cheriot" and of Genesis; for the 'true prophet', having already learned these, has also revealed them to his disciples. Jewish gnostics heretofore were forced to discover the secrets for themselves, now, we shall teach them to you through Jesus: "The man who is the helper, I call the true prophet. He alone is able to enlighten the sould of man so that ...we may see the way of eternal salvation. But otherwise, it is impossible." The earth it seems is full of the smoke of iniquity and someone must open the earth's door - true lovers of truth must call for him. "For the many and diverse blessings" cannot be had "without first knowing things as they are; and this knowledge cannot be had without first

becoming acquainted with the prophet of truth". This pro-
 phet knows all things, the past, present, and future. He
 is the repository of the true gnosis and here and there,
 we get glimpses of what this gnosis is; as may be expected
 from a sect which is so markedly Jewish, we find that all
 other elements, excepting of course the addition of Jesus
 as the only teacher, are borrowed from previous Jewish
 Gnostics. As a matter of fact, the revealed gnosis in
 the Petrine sect is nothing else but sound Jewish practice
 of the time, although Peter is careful to point out that the
 really hidden truths he cannot reveal in public, "For Jesus
 had explained to his disciples privately the mysteries of
 the kingdom of heaven".⁷⁸ Nevertheless, we find the doctrine
 of the threefold nature of mankind even as it is set forth
 in Hagigah when Peter says that "The good person (the spirit-
 ual) desires all to be healed by repentance but saves only
 those who know God (the psychics). But those who know Him
 not (the hylics) he does not heal; not that he does not wish
 to do so but because it is not lawful to afford to those,
 who through want of judgment are like to irrational ani-
 mals, the good things which have been prepared for the chil-
 dren of the kingdom. Hence, the gnostic teaching which we
 found in the Talmud and Valentine that only certain ones
 can be saved through gnosis. Here we see the transitional

edgewise

stage which may have brought an idea already assimilated by Judaism into the Christian Gnosis by means of such a Judeo-Christian assimilation.

The metaphysical doctrine of the syzygies is referred to in the unexplained statement that "men are deceived 79 because they do not understand the doctrine of conjunction." This doctrine of conjunction may be parallel to that of "sexual relations" which we have already seen in the Talmud and is also referred to in explaining the problem of Free Will: "Hence, therefore, God being just has distinguished all principles into pairs and opposites - himself being sole God and one from the beginning - having made heaven and earth, day and night, light and fire, sun and moon, life and death has also given man freedom to be righteous 80 or unrighteous." It will be recalled that Rabbi Levi of the Talmud Jerushalmi made a statement to the effect that the upperwaters were male and the lower female - perhaps, the gnostic Peter gives some hint to the meaning of Levi's words when he maintains that the present world is female 81 and the world to come is male. This world is temporary, the world to come is permanent. There are also two types of prophecy according to Peter- one male and one female. The male prophecy is true; the female is false. This attributing of falseness to the female element is reminiscent

of the statement in the "Sayings of the Fathers" to the effect that talking with women has as its result the multiplication⁸² of lies. It also can be connected with that strange Christian Gnostic metaphysics which attributes evil to the thirtieth aeon, sophia, the female element which erred. Although Peter does mention that in his Public Lectures he does not reveal the "hidden things", nevertheless in his talks to his disciples he does mention certain elements of the gnosis which⁸³ Jesus is supposed to have handed down as mysteries to his disciples. "For if anyone knows anything he has received it from him, or from his disciples: that there is one God whose work the world is; who being altogether righteous shall certainly at some time render to everyone according to his deeds". This⁸³ is of course plain Mosaic doctrine. Why then have Jesus teach it? Here is another peculiarity of the Pseudo-Clementines.

While in some sections it is stated that only Jesus can teach the doctrine, in others it states that it also can be learned from Moses and that it makes no difference at all from whom it is taken. The implication seems to be that Moses is the teacher for the Jews and Jesus for the gentiles as the following citation hints: "Since, therefore, both to the Hebrews and to those who are called from the Gentiles, believing in the teachers of truth is of God, while excellent actions are left to everyone to do by his own judgment, the

reward is righteously bestowed upon those who do well. For there would have been no need of Moses or of the coming of Jesus, if of themselves they would have understood what is reasonable. Neither is there salvation in believing in teachers and calling them Lords. For on this account, Jesus is concealed from the Jews who have taken Moses as their teacher, and Moses is hidden from those who have believed in Jesus. For, there being one teaching by both,⁸⁴ God accepts him who has believed either of these." As for the statement that there was one teaching by Moses and Jesus, this is explained by the Clementines in a way that would imply the use of the theories of reincarnation which we have found in Kabbalah under the name ~~שם~~ life and seen used by Basilides, the early Christian gnostic. Peter says that the spirit of the true prophet appeared at the creation of the⁸⁵ world and this is in line with the Rabbinic statement that the Messiah was one of the seven things which God created⁸⁶ before the world. This spirit of the true prophet appeared first in Adam when he "fittingly gave names to each animal" and then he "who has changed his forms and his names from the beginning of the world...reappeared again and again in the world, until coming upon his own times and being anointed with mercy for the works of God, he shall enjoy rest forever".⁸⁷ The phrase "in his own times" is rather cryptic but it may refer to the statement that "the messiah shall not

come until all the souls which are destined to be created⁸⁸ are created". Further proof that this was what Peter has in mind occurs in the Recognitions when he says "And on this account the world required long periods until the number of the souls which were predestined to fill it should be completed and then that visible heaven shall be folded up like a scroll and that which is higher should appear and the souls of the blessed being restored to their bodies should be ushered into light.

In our discussion of Christian Gnosticism we have noticed a preoccupation with the problem of evil in Basilides and Valentine both of whom seem to think that there is a sort of dualism in the world and that the evil demons enter the body at weak moments in the forms of passions and animal natures. It will be remembered that Isidore tried to explain away the dualism by insisting that man could overcome the evil passions. In the Clementines there is a like preoccupation with the origin of evil and its effects. The discussion of the problem takes place when Peter is asked by Simon Magus, his adversary, how it is possible that his good God should create evil. Peter's answers take several forms for he must be careful: he recognizes that he must not admit that God created evil and on the other hand he cannot say that evil exists externally of God for then he would be convicted

of dualism. In one of his answers, Peter anticipates by many years the negative theology of later religious philosophers:

"Evil, then, does not exist always, yea, it cannot exist at all substantially; for pain and death belong to the class of accidents, neither of which can exist with abiding strength. For what is pain but the interruption of harmony? and what is death but the separation of soul from body? Therefore there is no pain when there is harmony. For death does not even at all belong to those things which substantially exist."⁸⁹

And when further pressed by Simon, Peter takes another viewpoint and asserts that evil is only ignorance in man of the divine laws and says that the man who really "knows" feels no evil. "Yet in the beginning of the world men lived long and had no diseases. But when through carelessness, sons in succession cohabiting through ignorance at times when they ought not, placed their children under innumerable afflictions. And in truth such afflictions arise because of ignorance; as for instance, by not knowing when one ought to cohabit with his wife, as if she be pure from her discharge... However, give me the man who sins not; and you will find that he, himself, does not suffer but that he is able to heal others."⁹⁰ Thus, Peter, good Jew that he is, solves the problem of evil by explaining that it arises because mankind does not observe the laws regarding the nidah, or menstruous

woman. However, even here, Gnosis lends it aid and there is another explanation of evil which is similar to that of Basilides. Here also we have a hint at Gnostic metaphysics. At first it would seem that man's sin came from ignorance, but later he was helped in his sinning by certain fallen angels. These are the B'nai Elohim, the sons of God of Genesis. Among the heavenly spheres these angels inhabited the lowest region. Looking down upon mankind sinning they asked permission of God to descend to earth and chastise man for his sins. Permission was granted them and they came down to earth. Here they had intercourse with the daughters of man and through this became their slaves,"and being involved with them and sunk in defilement and altogether emptied of their first power, were unable to turn back to the first purity of their proper nature, for they themselves, being fettered with their bonds of flesh, turned away from their original fiery substance... and have no more been able to ascend into the heavens." ⁹¹ These demons also gave to women the knowledge of where to get gold and Jewels and all things which are for the adornment and delight of women and which the author implies are sources of sin. From the intercourse with women, strange creatures, the giants, sprang and these taught men to eat animal flesh, since they longed after the taste of blood. But mankind soon ran out of edible animals and even turned to cannibalism. Thus

"by the shedding of blood, the pure air became defiled with impure vapours and sickening those who breathed it, rendered them liable to disease so that thenceforth men died prematurely." ⁹² The earth became so defiled that the poison - darting and deadly creatures sprang from it. It was because of the evil sown by these brutal demons that God sent the flood to wipe them out. It is interesting to note that a similar explanation for the evil of the world is also given by the "Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer" which states that "From the B'nai Elohim were born Giants who stretched out their hands ⁹³ to shedding blood." In the same book we find "Rabbi Joshua said the angels were flaming fir but when they fell away ⁹⁴ their strength and stature became like sons of man." (The date of this book has not been fully ascertained but it is said to go back at least to the fourth century and even earlier. It should be mentioned here that there are many seeming gnostic elements in the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer such as these and it would be well to make a separate study of them.)

After the flood not all of the demons were done away with and their progeny still survive, enticing men to eat at their tables and chastising those who do partake of their meals. We have mentioned earlier that this cause of sinning might be alluded to in the Rabbinic statement that partaking of the offerings to idols causes a man to be impure. And

evil as the evil passions of the Christian Gnostics enter the body at weak moments, so the demons of the Pseudo-Clementines enter the body by means of improper food and thus become blended with the souls of mankind. These demons who first gave bodily pleasures to man delight in entering the souls and causing men to overindulge; lurking in men's bodies, they are the source of all diseases. They can only be driven out through abstinence, suffering and fasting which they hate. Here we find an ascetic gnosis far removed from those libertines described earlier. The demons can also be washed out of the body through submersion in a flowing river and we find baptism one of the rites of the Petrine Gnosis.

That the shedding of blood and eating of meat is looked upon as evil might lead to the belief that our sect is a vegetarian one. This together with the ascetic doctrines and baptism could very well be evidence that our sect might be an offshoot from the Essene group which is described both by Josephus and Philo and which likewise possessed books of mysteries and knew secrets which they never disclosed relating to the tetragrammaton and other divine names, certainly reminiscent of gnostic doctrine.

The problem of evil according to the Pseudo-Clementines is solved by having the demons enter the body. Evil could only be conquered by knowing the proper methods of living and the proper exorcisms to drive the demons out. These demons

along with the "evil passions" of the later Biblical Gnostics are related of course to the Yezer Tob and the Yezer Hara of Jewish lore. The evil inclination enters into man early in life and he must conquer it. The Rabbis interpret the the word _____, in Gen.2:4, by explaining the two yods as meaning the good and evil desires which god created in man. Indeed the Basilidean term "pathe" could very well be translated as "Yezer Hara" and very often the evil inclination is personalized as The Christians do in calling the "passions", animal natures. An interesting Rabbinic parallel in the Clementine regarding the so-called evil desire occurs when Peter says "wherefore God is not evil who has placed lust in man that there may be a continuance of life, but they are most impious who have used the good of lust badly." and the Rabbis make a similar statement when they thank God for the evil inclination because without it the trees would not grow nor would mankind reproduce himself.

Such is the combination of Jewish gnosis with Judaism plus the "teacher" role of Jesus which lends the Clementines their mystery. Peter has learned from Jesus the truths which were foreordained by God and he sums up the Petrine Gnostic requirements for God's service. "And this is the service he has appointed. To worship Him only and to trust only in the prophet of truth, and to be baptized for the remission of sins

and abstain from the table of demons, that is from food offered to idols, from dead carcasses, from animals which have been suffocated or caught by wild beasts, and from blood; not to live any longer impurely; that the women on their part should keep the law of purification; that all should be sober minded, given to good works, looking to eternal life from the all-powerful God, and asking with prayer and continual supplication that they win it." Such¹⁰¹ were the requirements of the Essene-Ebionite cult of the Pseudo-Clementines. It's very terms of reference are definitely Jewish and there's little doubt that it's writer considers himself a Jew. The evidences of gnosis which the sect presents are directly traceable to original Jewish Gnostic sources; the only addition seems to be the substitution of Jesus for Metatron and the assumption that Jesus, too, has been given the power of the "true prophet" to present the gnosis in a simplified form to any who have not received it from Moses. This doctrine is merely orthodox Jewish teaching with borrowings from the Jewish Gnostics.

There is yet an element which we have not yet mentioned and which seems to be a characteristic of all types of Gnosis. That is the element of Biblical criticism. Peter, here again anticipates modern thought when he maintains that the whole Torah is not necessarily true, that there are many chapters which are false and incomplete: "The prophet Moses, having

by order of God delivered the law...to certain chosen men, seventy in number (cf. Pirke Abot, chap.i) in order that they might instruct whomever they chose, after a little the written law had added to it certain falsehoods contrary¹⁰² to the law of God." These falsehoods were implanted by the demon to confuse the world. The gnosis of the Clementine sect entertains to tell which of these chapters are false. But this knowledge must be kept secret " for we do not want to say in public that these chapters are added to the Bible, since we should thereby perplex the unlearned multitudes... for they, not yet having the power of discerning would flee¹⁰³ from us as impious." However, in public disputations when such a challenger as Simon Magus questions these false chapters " we are under the necessity of assenting to these false chapters and putting questions in return to him concerning them, to draw him into a strait and to give in private an explanation of the chapters which are spoken against¹⁰⁴ God, that is, to the well disposed after a trial of faith." These well disposed thus "learning the mystery of the Scriptures and gaining the means of not sinning against God will incomparably rejoice, " This doctrine too removes our sect from normative Judaism for to the Rabbis nothing could be added or subtracted from the Torah and the Talmud time and again remonstrates against this practice; for while Peter

may have thought his criticism of the Bible "would bring incomparable rejoicing", to the Rabbis, such tampering was blasphemy. If such a doctored text of the Torah was found, "The glosses (thus we translate *בגין*) and books of the Minim they do not save but these are burnt in their place for while the idolaters do not acknowledge him and speak falsely concerning him, these (the Minim) do acknowledge him and speak falsely concerning him... Rabbi Ishmael said 'Whereas in order to make peace between a man and his wife, God says, Let my name which is written in holiness be blotted out in water,' how much the more the books of the Minim which portend enmity and jealousy and strife between Israel and their Father in heaven should be blotted out."¹⁰⁵

It would seem that in view of their false concept of the Torah, our sect might be classified with the mysterious Minim who are continually mentioned in the Talmud and not only greatly troubled the ancient Rabbis but are a source of contention among eminent scholars today. In order for us better to understand the true nature of the arguments between the Petrine Gnostics of the Clementines and their adversary Simon Magus, more must be known about these "heretics" who are called Minim in the Talmud.

D. The Minim

The Minim have been classed as Jewish Christians by some scholars while others contend that they are simply Jewish

Gnostics of especially radical leanings. Recently, there have been several attempts to classify these Minim and to place them into one group or another. F.C. Frank has¹⁰⁶ claimed that they are Jewish Gnostics and in this he is in accord with M. Friedlaender who traces the references to Minut to the Ophite anti-biblical sect which we have¹⁰⁷ seen mentioned by Hippolytus. But Travers Herford's arguments that there are marked references to Judeo-Christians as Minim must not be overlooked and his claims¹⁰⁸ are well substantiated in his monumental work. Dr. Harris Hirschberg goes so far as to claim that the Minim are solely "Pauline Gnostics", who far from maintaining any relationship to Judaism expand Paul's antinomianism into a developed¹⁰⁹ gnosis. The truth of the matter seems to be that the Minim of the Talmud have such diverse characteristics that they may be put into many classifications, some of them mutually exclusive, ranging from such simple cults as that of the Petrine Gnostics of the Clementines which vary from the established Judaism only in small details to the very drastic Pauline Gnosis which would abolish all references to Jewish doctrine.

That the Minim are varied in their doctrines can be shown by a reference to the Talmud on the subject. Rabbi Johanan hints that there are many types of Minuth when he says that " Israel did not go into exile until they had been made twenty-four sects of Minim."¹¹⁰ Whether the Rabbi himself knew of twenty-four sects is conjecturable. Herford claims

that there may be some grounds for the Palestine Gamara's statement that this number was arrived at by doubling the number of tribes but this seems rather artificial and it would seem that the sage is rather speaking from experience. It is true that elsewhere the Minim are spoken of as a single group as in Siphri, p.331 where in the verse " And I will recompense them that hate me" it is stated that "These are the Minim". But that the various heresies of the Minim greatly differed can be shown by the various manners by which Minuth was detected. In some cases, there were blatant transgressions. For instance, in Hullin it is definitely said that a hole to catch the blood of slaughtered animals is not to be made ¹¹¹ in the street "that one may not imitate the Minim". This may be a reference to certain heretics who were participating in the sacred blood rites of the Mithras cult. And again, " He that makes his Tephillin round, it is a danger and there is no Mitzvah in it. If he places it on his forehead or on the palm of his hand, behold, this is the way of Minuth." ¹¹² And then there was a type of Min who could not be so easily detected. For him there was a special prayer to be said at the close of the Amidah prayer: "Our Rabbis teach: Shim'on HaPekoli ordered the Amidah in the presence of Rabban Gamaliel according to its order in Jabneh. Rabban Gamaliel said to the wise ones, 'Is there anyone who knows how to compose a benediction of the Minim?' Shemuel HaKaton stood up and composed it... Rab said, "If a man makes a mistake in all the other benedictions

they do not question him but in the benediction of the Minim they question him because they suspect that he is a Min,¹¹³" This statement shows that the class of Min who was discussed was so close to the orthodox Judaism that it had to be recognized only by such painstaking methods as the latter. If a Min could circulate among the Jews, even attend religious services, wherein lies the Minuth? It must follow that there could only have been certain secret doctrine, undiscernable in public. And indeed this smacks of Gnosticism.

Since we have already mentioned that certain gnostic doctrines were practiced openly as Akiba and Eliezer, what types of Gnosticism had to be legislated against which self-evident Jews were practicing in secret? If we now go back to our Pseudo-Clementines, we shall see that the doctrines therein preached could fit this description of Minuth exactly. First the Petrine Gnostics, since they were not antinomian as their Pauline brethren, could not be distinguished from their fellow Jews; true they did believe in the teaching of Jesus, but this may have been used only in conversations with Gentiles and the so-called teaching of Jesus were only a mixture of the normative Judaism with a Jewish Gnosis in which even the famous Rabbis indulged. Their Torah doctrine was a secret one and there were no outward signs that they differed in any way.

It was such gnostics as these then whose deviations from Judaism had to be carefully watched for our Petrine Gnostics must surely even observed the rite of circumcision and we find Rabbi Berachyah stating " that the wicked and the Minim of Israel may not say 'We are circumcised, we shall not go down to Gehinnom' what does the Holy one, Blessed be He do? He sends an angel and effaces their circumcision and they go down to Gehinnom." ¹¹⁴ All of this argues against Dr. Hirschberg's theory that the Minim are exclusively Pauline Gnostics there is a great deal of doubt as to whether they would attend the regular orthodox services and as Dr. Werner states, uncircumcised as the Paulinians must have been there is little chance of their being allowed to enter the synagogues at all.

All that we have said in proof that some of the Minim could have been Petrine Gnostics can also be used to show that they were Jewish Gnostics whose doctrines were objectionable. This Friedlaender has done in his "Vorchristliche judische Gnosticismus" in which he traces Minuth-to the Ophite sect described by Hyppolytus. These Ophites were the first to promulgate the doctrine of the two Gods which we have already seen in Basilides, Valentine and Marcion. It was mentioned that this theory could have been derived from the Philonic conception of the Logos and the supreme Lord and how the idea was later perverted by Marcion who rejected entirely what he called the inferior God of the Old Testament.

But it seems that Philo, himself, knew of such anti-biblical schools among the Jewish Gnastics who likewise perverted his doctrine into an anti-biblical, two-powered one and his description fits perfectly that sect of the Ophite group which was called the Cainites and whom we have previously discussed. Indeed, Philo makes the identification a complete one when he himself gives the name "sons of Cain" to the group he mentions. These "separate themselves from the right believing mass of men, they form parties of their own and are concerned only to investigate the naked truth as it is in itself but reject ceremonial law after they have dissected it allegorically. They show disrespect for the Sabbath, Feastsdays, Circumcision, and other religious observances".
115
Indeed, the similarity to the Hyppolytan Cainites is very striking. Friedlaender points out this likeness of the anti-nomists mentioned by Philo and the Ophite sects which Hyppolytus claims to be the first Gnostic sect even preceding Simon Magus.

These Ophites, or Naasenes (from the Hebrew *naah*, the serpent) says Hyppolitus derive their heresies from the Greek philosophers assuming the name Gnostics and claiming to know the deep truths. Proceeding on the assumption that the creator of the world is to be regarded as an evil power acting in hostility to the supreme God they took the symbol of the serpent as intellect "par excellence" by whose means the

first humans were raised to the knowledge of the existence of higher beings than their creator. Of course some of the Ophite schools came to the ultimate conclusion that all of the torah must be inverted and that the good was evil and the evil good - even as did the later Marcionite schools. However other such sects were hesitant in going so far as to invest the evil spirit with deity. What all the Ophites did have in common however was the representation of all things as a Spiritual man similar to the Adam Kadmon of Kabbalah. Along with this Spiritual Man is Ennoia, a second Spiritual Man, and a third feminine principle known as "Spirit", according to Irenaeus. The Union of these three principles of the pleroma begat the messiah and also a feminine principle Sophia. Sophia, sinking to material chaos gave birth to a son called Ialdebaoth who in his turn created six successive generations of angels, himself being the seventh and forming in conjunction with Sophia, an Ogdoad. The serpent becomes the offspring of Ialdebaoth, the demiurge; this is the doctrine of the major schools. In some schools the serpent becomes the Logos, the intermediary between God and Matter.

The boldest and most consistent of the Ophite sects in the development of their theory to its logical conclusions were the Cainites who carried out to the smallest detail

the theory that the God of the old testament, being an evil creation, all that is condemned in the Torah was to be regarded as good and all that is approved there is evil. Friedlaender's great contribution to Gnostic studies was his correlation of this Eainite sect mentioned by Hippolytus with that of the Eainite group which Philo mentions, thus suggesting that the anti-Biblical Christian Gnostics had as ancestors an earlier Jewish-Pagan pattern. That the fundamental principle of Ophite theory is of Jewish origin we could learn from internal evidence even if we did not have the word of Philo to prove it. The names of their Mythology are clearly hebrew. Ialdebaoth, for instance has been derived from the Hebrew words אלהים, child of chaos, or as another interpretation would have it אלהים, Lord, God of Fathers.¹¹⁶

The serpent from whence they derive their name is the serpent of the Book of Genesis, showing strong Jewish influence; and in the teachings of their innumerable sects we find a constant perversion of the Torah. But upon this Jewish substratum was placed no end of ideas taken from pagan philosophy. Baur¹¹⁷ finds in Ophism signs of the Phrygian orgies of Cybele, the Egyptian rites of Osiris and Isis, the secret doctrines of Eleusis, the Persian dualism, the fables of Greek mythology, the cosmogony of Plato's Timaeus. It is difficult to tell when these pagan accretions were made but it seems plausible from Philo's account that most were made during the first Christian century, or allowing the sect some time for

development, the first pre-Christian era. The theological conception of the Ogdoad has been related by Irenaeus to the Pythagorean *τετράκτυς*, or their metaphysical theory which consists of four elemental pairs. Dr. Eric Werner finds an extremely early reference to the Ogdoad in "Christ's Hymn to His Disciples" from the Apocryphal Acts of St. John,¹¹⁸ which he dates at the close of the second century. (In his speculations concerning the Ogdoad, Dr. Werner uses the later Valentinian system as quoted by Irenaeus which seems to have been borrowed from the earlier Ophite cult. This leads him to the conclusion that "At about the same time, i.e. as the Acts of St. John, end of the second century, we receive the first information about the Ogdoad." Actually, Valentine got his theory of the seven heavens and the demiurge second hand from the Ophites and thus we find a much earlier mention of the Ogdoad.)

Not only do we have the authority of Hyppolitus and Philo for the early origin of these Judeo-Pagan Gnostics but also in the Talmud. Time and again, certain Minim are mentioned whose philosophy can be duly traced to such anti-nomian speculation. The evidence for this is found often where the Minim are accused of holding the doctrine of the "two powers" and in other places where various heretics approach the Rabbis with the intention of belittling the God of the Old Testament. The doctrine of the two powers we have seen in our Ophites who posited the supreme, spiri-

ual Man of the pleroma, and Ialdebaoth, his son many times removed who was the creator of the seven heavens surrounding this world and subsequently of the world itself. That the Naasene-Ophite cult which placed emphasis on the serpent of the garden of Eden is mentioned directly in Rabbinic literature might be argued from the fact that in Bereshis 119 Raba we find the statement that the serpent was a Min. That the doctrines were known is shown by various allusions to them as Minuth. For instance "A certain Min said to Rabbi Ishmael the son of Rabbi Jose, 'It is written, And the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord. 120 It ought to have been from Himself.'" Thus the mention of "the Lord" twice here seems to hint at two "Lords", one subordinate to the other. Another Min said to Rabbi "He who formed the mountains did not create the wind. And he who created the wind did not form the mountains. For it is written: 'For, Lo, he that formeth the mountains and (he) that 121 created the wind.'" It is not necessary to give the Rabbinic answers to these Minim. Needless to say that the unity of God is stoutly defended.

Another method for the proof for more than one God is that which emphasizes the fact that "Elohim" is a plural form and that God often uses the plural in speaking. The Minim always refuse to allow that this usage is the plural of majesty: "Rabbi Johanan said in every place where the Minim misinterpret, the context refutes them. 'Let us make man in our image.' (Which implies a divine plurality is refuted by the

verse) 'And God created (sing.) man in his Image! and again the verse 'Come now let us go down and there confound their Language' is refuted by 'And the Lord went down to see the city and the tower.'¹²² Several other similar attacks by Minim are mentioned here and similarly refuted by bringing in contradictory verses. When they discuss the reasons why only one man was created in the beginning, an answer that is given is "In order that Minim might not say that there are several powers in heaven"¹²³. This answer is rather obscure but at least we can learn from it that there might here be reference to our dualistic Jewish Ophites.

Another charming little anecdote is that "When Moses was writing the Torah, he wrote the deeds of each day(of creation). When he came to this verse as it is written 'And God said let us make man in our image according to our likeness", he said, 'Lord of the world, how Thou art giving a chance to the Minim! I am astonished!' God said to him: ' Write, and he who would err, let him err."

It will be remembered that Marcion, in his whole hearted support of the Pauline anti-nomistic teaching also uses the doctrine of the two powers in such a way as our Minim. The appearance of this multi-power theory among the Minim has led some scholars to claim that the Minim are Pauline Gnostics similar to Marcion. Harris Hirschberg states: "The speculation about the two powers speaks for the assumption of a Christian

rather than a Jewish Gnosticism. Marcion, though himself no Gnostic (sic!) became the spiritual father of the movement by propagating the doctrine of the 'two powers' which in his opinion was the logical deduction from Paul's true teaching.¹²⁴ Now, it is evident that Hirschberg has not even considered the fact that the Ophites - at one time a Jewish sect- also maintained the doctrine of the two powers and what is more from the text we have quoted there is no evidence at all that the Minim there were Paulinian. The very fact that they are able to be refuted by allusions to Biblical texts, or indeed that they make use of the Torah text at all to prove their own theories that they are neither Marcionite or Paulinian in that they are willing to use accepted Rabbinic methods in their arguments!

Dr. Friedlaender, however, in asserting that because of the Minim's use of the two-power doctrine all Minims must be ascribed to the Jewish Gnostics also errs in that he has not taken into consideration the fact that there are other types of Gnosis other than an anti-Biblical, multi-powered one such as we have already shown in discussing the Petrine Gnostics of the Pseudo-Clementines who also fit into the category of Minim.

We mentioned earlier that a natural result of the anti-Biblical gnosis was the development of the so-called libertine

sects and in Rabbinic literature we find also references to the fact that some of the Minim were becoming licentious. In Siphri, we find the verse "And ye shall walk after your heart" interpreted "this is Minuth according as it is said "And I find a thing more bitter than death, even the woman whose heart is snares and nets and whose hands are bands". Thus, 'going after one's heart' is interpreted to mean a preoccupation with the feminine sex which is alluded to as a characteristic of Minuth. In Koheles Rabbah we find the rather daring story telling how one of the disciples of Rabbi Jonathan ran away to the Minim. Jonathan went to investigate and the Minim said to him "Rabbi come and show kindness to a girl". He went and found them with a girl. "He said 'Is it thus that Jews act?' They said to him 'Thou shalt cast in thy lot with us -One purse shalt there be for us all (Pr.1:14)."

125

Here we see how the anti-norrian Jewish libertines in their interpretation of scriptures made use of the phrase "One purse (Hebrew אֶחָד) shalt there be for us all".

F. From the Ophites, Through Paul, To Marcion

The fact that the more radical Jewish gnostic sects had so much in common with the later anti-Biblical Christian groups can hardly be accidental and it is highly probable that Paul, when in his travels he came into contact with them readily compatible with his antinomianism. Certainly,

the Apostle to the Gentiles with his utter contempt for ceremonial Judaism, his insistence that lack of circumcision need be no deterrent to conversion, and his concept of an unknowable God (cf. Romans 11:33 prhps. after Is.40:13): "Oh, the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out." And again in Corinthians Paul hints that this indiscernible quality of God can be reached through Christ. In other words, the supreme God can be known. And we find Paul speaking to his followers in much the same way that Peter spoke to the Jewish Gnostics of the Clementines, presenting Jesus as the "True Teacher": "The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. Now, we have received not the spirit of the world but the spirit which is God; that we might no the things that are given to us freely of God... For who hath known the mind of the Lord that he might instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ."

127

Whether Paul himself was influenced by the Jewish gnosis is a matter for lengthy discussion. We do find him in certain epistles using Gnostic terms but here, in his passion for conversion he may only be suggesting to the Gnostics a means by which Jesus may be fitted into their system. Speaking to the Gnostics in their own language in an attempt to persuade even them. In Ephesians, for instance, Paul stresses the love of God which surpasses knowledge "τῇ

ὑπερβαλλομένης γνώσεως" and when he adds "ὡς καὶ πληρὴ ὁ θεὸς τὸ πλῆρωμα

128 ^{θεῶν}

τὸ πλῆρωμα τοῦ α", we find him using two gnostic terms in one sentence. The use of πλῆρωμα and ἁπλοῖς in this context implies that Paul is speaking to a group that understands the pleroma and he seems to be persuading them that love for Jesus can be even more important than their gnosis. Too, he speaks of the Church as the body of Christ 'the fulness (πλῆρωμα) of him who fills all in all' and the Christian is spoken of as coming "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the fulness of Christ" and here the pleroma is connected with the perfect man. If we keep in mind the doctrine of the Ophites, whose supreme deity is called the "Spiritual Man" and notice that the last passage quoted is followed by the words "that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of man and crafty cunningness whereby they lie in wait to deceive" it seems quite apparent that Paul here is talking to people who are 'tossed to and fro' on the waves of the gnostic doctrine which elsewhere Paul inveighs against with less guarded words as in Cor.8:1 where he solemnly states "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth (ἡ ἁπλοῖς φύσις, ἡ δὲ ἀκατὰ ἐκδόσεις) and if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. Here Paul's true intent seems to be brought out. He means to substitute love for knowledge, ἀκατὰ for ἁπλοῖς. In Ephesians he is using caution and trying to convert actual gnostics to his

doctrine by suggesting that the love for Christ can fit even into their unorthodox doctrine.

That Paul was successful with the gnostics in his arguments can be seen not only by the fact that Marcion accepts only the writings of Paul as authentic and then only some of them but also that the Naasenes, formerly Jewish gnostics, as quoted by Irenaeus refer in the the larger part only to Pauline works. Thus we have the following three steps. First we have the Ophites with their Jewish-Pagan doctrine, who then being converted by Paul, dethrone the demiurge from their pleroma and place the Love of Jesus, the agape, the Christ-mind, in its stead to become what might be loosely termed "Pauline Gnostics". Then at last, Marcion's school carries the parallel doctrines to their logical conclusion, and develops them into a thoroughly anti-Biblical doctrine, with Jesus, the son of the supreme God as the purveyor of knowledge and the true saviour meanwhile separating Jesus from the God of the Old Testament entirely.

Earlier we have suggested how the orthodox Jewish gnosis might have been used by Judeo-Christians to form the simple, ascetic Petrine Gnosticism which is represented by the Peter episodes in the Pseudo-Clementines. In the Simon Magus doctrine of the Clementines it is possible to see the radical Jewish gnostic theory of the Naasenes and its development through all three stages into the rockbound antinomianism

of the Christian Gnostic school of Marcion.

The person of Simon Magus with whom Peter has his disputations in the Clementines is indeed a mysterious one. Whether he ever really existed or not, no one knows. We find the first reference to him in the Book of Acts: "But there was a certain man called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery and bewitched people of Samaria, giving out that he was some great one, to whom they all gave heed from the least to the greatest saying 'this man is the great power of God'¹²⁹". The first reference to him among Church writers is made by Hegesippus who speaks of him merely as one of the heretics proceeding from the Jewish sects among whom he reckons the Samaritans.¹³⁰ But later, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, and Tertullian all give definite accounts of his metaphysics - definitely gnostic, definitely anti-nomistic, certainly fantastic. Indeed, Simon for the Church fathers seems to become the arch-Gnostic and the elements of all antinomian, dualistic gnosticisms are found attributed to him.

The Pseudo-Clementines present Simon at his worst. Naturally, the Petrine Gnostic authors with their insistence upon the legitimacy of at least parts of the Old Testament, with their doctrine of the unity of God, their asceticism and essential Jewishness would greatly resent the presence of such blasphemous ideas as Simon is made to represent. Thus in the Clementines we find that the person of Simon Magus,

the ancient magician, who asserted that he himself was the "great power" and that his consort Helena was ennoia, the second great power, is made to be the representative of all the elements which went into the development of the hated Marcionite gnosis. At first reading of the Simonite doctrine in the Clementines one is tempted to consider it a worthless hodge-podge. At some times, Simon seems to echo to the least detail the Gnostic doctrine in its original Judeo-Pagan form, at others he seems to be the Apostle Paul in disguise, and very often he exemplifies exactly the violent antinomianism of Marcion. Actually, however, as we shall attempt to demonstrate, he is all three in one. Or, better, one might divide the Simonite doctrine of the Clementines into three separate strata corresponding to the stages in the development of the doctrine of Marcion which we have already discussed.

In the Pseudo-Clementines the actual metaphysical theory of Simon is merely sketched. It is lost in a maze of philosophical discussion and we can obtain it in most cases only indirectly. Simon claims "I am the first power, who am always and without beginning... I have moved from place to place upheld by angels' hands." And he tells Peter, "I am the Son of God enduring to eternity...but you cannot do any real works as I have mentioned that I can do...as he also who sent you is a magician who yet could not deliver himself from the suffering of the cross." And since Simon is

the son of God, he claims Godhood also along with the others of his rank for he says "that there are many Gods; but there is one incomprehensible and unknown to all, and that he is the God of all these Gods." ¹³² Here we see that Simon's heaven must contain a pleroma. And again we find a suggestion of a hierarchy of Gods when the Clementines speak of Simon's consort, Helena or Luna and with her "he goes about asserting that he himself is a certain power which is above God the creator (i.e. the Torah God) while Luna, who is with him, has been brought down from the highest heavens and that she is wisdom (Sophia), the Mother of all things." ¹³³ Note here the similarity of Simon's doctrine of the pleroma and that of our Ophites. Simon would have it that he is the incarnated "Spirit" of the Ophite pleroma, redeeming the fallen Sophia, who fell from the heavens and became the Mother of the world just as she does in Ophite theory.

That he is connected with the Jewish gnosis is evidenced by the fact that in this doctrine at least there is no positive reference to Jesus and also he attempts to prove the multi-God theory by reference to the Torah just as the Ophites of the Minim did and in many cases uses the same texts. If one compares the quotations from the Talmus already given with the following sayings of Simon, he will find the parallels quite interesting; for instance "Then Simon said, I shall make

use of assertions from the law of the Jews only. For it is manifest to all who take interest in religion that this law is of universal authority (Could Paul or Marcion be saying this?), yet that everyone receives the understanding of this law according to his own judgment... Whence whether anyone wishes to bring forward truth, or anyone to bring forward falsehood, no assertion will be received without this law. Inasmuch, therefore, as my knowledge is most fully in accordance with this law, I rightly declare that there are many gods of whom one is more eminent than the rest ...even he who is the God of gods. But that there are many gods, the law itself informs me. For in the first place, where one in the form of a serpent speaks to Eve "on the day that ye eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, ye shall be as gods", that is as those who made man; and after they have tasted of the tree, God himself testifies...'Behold Adam has become as one of us'; thus therefore it is manifest that there were many gods engaged in the making of man. Also whereas at the first God said to the other gods 'Let us make man after our image and likeness'; also His saying 'Let us drive him out' and again 'Come let us go down and confound their language... There are also many other testimonies which might be adduced from the law, not only obscure, but plain by which it is taught that there are many gods.¹³⁴" These passages have been quoted in extenso because they show that at least in this section of the Clementines, Simon can in no way be equated either with Paul or with Marcion. Not with Paul

because no mention of Jesus is made nor did the Apostle ever maintain a multitude of Gods. Some scholars have said that Simon's representation of himself as the son of God is a subtle reference to Paul's attempt to deify Jesus, for "the son of God must also be God" but when we recall that the Ophite metaphysic which Simon seems to represent fits in very fairly with his statement that he is the son of God and therefore a god, to look for another explanation would be violating every law of parsimony; that Simon is not Marcion here can be shown when one realizes that Marcion never mentions the doctrine of the pleroma, nor does he ever confess that the Torah is the true authority-quite the contrary. Rather should one place Simon among the Minims since his arguments are directly parallel to those mentioned before as radical Minuth.

Simon shows a certain antibiblical tendency however later on when he claims in a lengthy argument with Peter that the Torah God is evil in that he created evil.¹³⁵ This may be connected with Simon as Marcion as we shall show later. On the other hand it may merely be connecting him with the Jewish libertines Ophites as demonstrated in the Talmud. Simon could well be accused of this type of Minuth. Firstly because he openly consorted with the prostitute, Helena, and also there is a unique passage in the Homilies in which Appion, a follower of Simon explains to the young Clement the best

techniques by which to ensnare women and also proves to him that adultery, far from being a sin is rather a good principle, using Egyptian and Greek mythology to make his point.
136

Simon's relationship to the Naasenes is hinted several times. Simon, in his proofs for the existence of gods used first the verse which quoted the serpent as referring to gods and Peter warns him of "with what penalty the serpent was visited, which had first named Gods. For it is condemned to feed upon the dust...But if you wish also to introduce many gods, see that you partake not the serpent's doom."
137
Here Simon is positively identified with the serpent and perhaps the exact text from which the Naasenes derived their name and their multi-god theory is described here. Elsewhere, Peter says "And now also, when the Gentiles are about to be ransomed from the superstition with respect to idols, wickedness which reigns over them has set forth her ally like another serpent, even this Simon whom you see, who works wonders to astonish and deceive not signs of healing to convert and save."
138

Such monstrous accusations could not have been made of Paul who did heal to convert but surely apply to the anti-biblical Jewish serpent worshippers. The mention also of the Gentiles seems to suggest that the wickedness of Simon is coming forth from the Jewish group. We have noted before

that it was to such Jewish gnostics to whom Paul is speaking in the Ephesians as he tries to insert Jesus into their pleroma since their doctrine was sympathetic to his. Now, the Pauline antinomianism was not so radical as that of the Jewish gnostics and that eventually the two became combined is suggested in the homilies when Peter rails against Simon "and not only he, but if any other shall recount to those among the gentiles any vain, dreamlike, richly set out story against God, he will be believed." ¹³⁹ Now here there may be evidence of Paul entering the scene. But it is highly improbable that the Apostle is actually meant here. Paul never denies the God of the old testament but Marcion, who follows Paul's teachings exclusively does use them to fight against God. If there is a polemic against Paul here, it is not so much the man himself, but his doctrine as it manifests itself through Marcion that is really the target. For Marcion was the final combiner of the Pauline teachings with the anti-biblical gnosis. In his rejection of the entire Old Testament, and indeed the denial of the large part of the New Testament, we find Marcion in a very radical way speaking against God. Among the Pauline epistles themselves, Marcion accepted only ten. He rejects all appeals to the Torah for Christological prophecies. Marcion's heretical opinions of the old testament seem to have begun in a carefully worked out Biblical criticism through which he found the numerous self contradictions and anthropomorphic conceptions of the deity which he considered unworthy. Here are a few examples.

The God whom these writings reveal, says Marcion, cannot have been a God of wisdom and goodness and power; for after having created man in his own image he permitted him to fall, being either ignorant that he would fall or unwilling to prevent him from falling.¹⁴⁰ God is represented as calling to Adam in the Garden, "Adam, where art thou" showing that he was ignorant as to where Adam really was.¹⁴¹ And we find Simon in his representation as Marcion using similar arguments: "For this God as I have said, according to what the writing of the law teaches is shown to be weak in many things. In the first place because the man whom hw formed was unable to remain such as he had intended him to be."¹⁴² And again, Simon in true Marcionis style proclaims the Torah God to be lacking: "Therefore, Adam being made at first after his likeness...is said not to have knowledge of good or evil, and is found a transgressor... In like manner also, he who made him, because he sees not in all places says with reference to the overthrow of Sodom, 'Come let us go down and see whether they do according to their cry' and thus he shows himself ignorant. And whereas it is written that God repented¹⁴³ that he made man this implies both repentance and ignorance."

In the above one can see a transition from the arguments of the Minim, the anti-biblical Jewish gnostics, to the antinomianism of Paul as represented in its ultimate phase by Marcion. Simon is made to quote almost verbatim first the arguments of the Minim and then those of Marcion.

Thus Simon who originally may have been an Ophite Gnostic, becomes Marcion; both doctrines thus far are strikingly similar.

In other parts of the Clementines, Simon can more readily be identified with Marcion. For Marcion, it will be remembered had denied entirely the humanity of Jesus. That is why he rejected the New Testament hypothesis of the virgin birth. And also, he refused the old testament proofs, separating entirely the messiah of the prophets from the "true Christ". It is in the various disputations of Simon with Peter on the personality of Jesus that the magician is shown not to be just an Ophite heretic, but worse, a Marcionite. In these arguments of course Peter maintains that Jesus was a man who through having mastered the gnosis became the great teacher. In the following passage "Then said Simon I understand that you speak of your Jesus as him who was prophesied by Scrip-¹⁴⁴ture." it is perhaps possible to say that Simon himself had a different conception of Jesus - one which ruled out the possibility of any Scripture reference. In numerous places, the departure which Marcion made from the early Jewish Gnosis can be plainly shown. Marcion used the anti-biblical method of the Minim but more than this he applied it to the New Testament as well. And Simon does the same thing: "Then said Simon, 'I am astonished at your folly. For you so propound the words of your master as if it were certain that he is a prophet; while I can very easily prove that he often contra-

dicted himself. For you say that he said that every kingdom divided in itself shall not stand; and elsewhere you say that he said that he would send the sword that he might separate those who are in one house... If then everything that is divided falls, he who makes divisions furnishes causes of falling; and if he is such, assuredly he is wicked. Answer this if you
145
can,"

Another one of the Marcionite theories as we have explained before was the extreme division of the Godhead into two: the just God of the Torah, and the supreme God of the heavens. Against Peter, Simon argues "he who framed the world is not the highest God, but that the highest God is another who alone is good, and who has remained unknown up to this time. At once then state to me whether you maintain that the framer of the world is the lawgiver or not? If then, he is the lawgiver, he is just; but if he is just then he is not good (since he would not be forgiving or merciful). But if he is not good, then it is another that Jesus proclaimed when he said 'Do not call me good; for one is good, the father that is in the heavens.' Now a lawgiver cannot be both just and good for these
146
qualities do not harmonize." Therefore the assumption is that there are two Gods and Simon here makes the sharp dichotomy.

It should be noticed here that Simon quotes Jesus as though he assents to this part of his doctrine and what is more he uses the book of Matthew which Marcion had rejected. A hint to the context in which Jesus is quoted is found when Simon uses the statement "No one knows the Father but the Son"

which is also found in the book of Matthew. Simon uses it and alleges it to be true and since only Jesus seems to have known the true Father, then Adam, Abraham, Moses, etc. only knew a False God, inferior to the true Father. Simon hastens to add here that he is not quoting Jesus because he believes in him but " I maintain that there is some unrevealed power , unknown to all as Jesus himself has also maintained, though he did not know what he said. For when one talks a great deal, he sometimes hits the truth not knowing what he is saying. I am referring to the statement which he uttered 'Noone knows the Father...' I do not profess to believe his doctrine but I am discussing points in which he was by accident right."¹⁴⁷

Thus far, we have attempted to demonstrate two strata of the personality of Simon. First, the Ophite Jewish origins and then the Marcionite gnostic forms in which Simon is also pictured. In the Clementines, direct reference to Paul is difficult to find. Mostly, objectionable Pauline doctrine is fought through its appearance in Marcion's doctrine. Here and there, however, an overt reference to Paul, himself, is made. The best example of this appears in the Homilies, where Simon says: "You professed that you well understood the doctrines and deeds of your teacher because you saw them before you with your own eyes and that it is not possible for any other to have anything similar by vision or apparition. But I shall show that this is false. He who hears anything

with his ears is not fully assured of the truth of what is said. But apparition...inseires him with confidence who sees
 148
 it, for it comes from God." Here apparent reference is made to the fact that Peter was an actual Apostle of Jesus and learned the doctrine from Jesus' own mouth, whereas Paul was not converted until he saw the vision of the risen Christ on the road to Damascus. The Tübingen school uses this section in its attempt to identify Simon with Paul. However, when one reads this particular section, one is struck by the fact that nowhere else does Simon even mention seeing an apparition, in fact in other places, Simon is definitely anti-Paulinic, especially where he states that Jesus is not to be believed except where he is accidentally correct.

Now if one were not familiar with the doctrines of Marcion, there might be grounds for claiming Simon as Paul because of the distinct anti-nomistic attitude of the Marcionite doctrine, especially the anti-New Testament statements. Paul's attempts in the Ephesians and Colossians to make Jesus a part of the Godhead, the saviour God, might also lead one to believe that the conservative Petrine gnostics invented this Simon as the incarnated God, and son of God, in a parody of Paul's doctrine were it not for the fact that we have already seen that such a doctrine was common among the Judeo-Pagan sects perhaps even before Paul; indeed there are signs that the apostle tried to fit the saviour Jesus into such a pattern. Therefore, we suggest, that because of their incongruity

in the general Ophite-Marcionite scheme into which Simon is placed, that these sections which are used so often to claim Simon as Paul are a third strata, perhaps added by a later hand. That Paul was a needed link between the radical Jewish gnosis and Marcion cannot be denied but that he is Simon magus is a tenuous theory indeed.

Conclusion

This study is meant to be an introduction to the interrelation of Jewish and Christian Gnosticism. Heretofore scholars have considered the two as separate although it is generally conceded that they draw upon the same sources. The evidence, however, which the Pseudo-Clementine writings give, seems to point to another conclusion. It is that the Christian Gnosis is highly dependent upon Jewish gnosticism for many of its theories if not all. ^{of them} Both the Petrine Gnosis of the Ebionite-Essene sect, and the Pauline Gnosis which Simon Magus, the adversary, represents have their roots in Jewish thought and the Clementines seem to show the transition which the Jewish gnosis took before it entered the avowed Christian schools. The more orthodox Jewish Gnosis becomes transformed into that of Basilides and Valentine. The radical Jewish Gnosis of the Ophites ultimately manifests itself in the school of Marcion.

There yet remain several questions for further work. Was Paul actually influenced by Ophitism or did he influence it? Is Peter accurately represented as to his true thinking in the Clementines or is he a mouthpiece for ideas alien to his own? These are subjects much too lengthy for this short study. But from the closeness of the two doctrines it does seem possible that Judaism also had a large part in developing even the official Christological dogmas of the Church. And in the background of the Peter - Simon Magus stories can be seen the struggles of the various factions in the early Church

Conclusion (cont.)

to develop a fixed doctrine. Perhaps, had there been no Petrine Gnostics to counterbalance the radical Pauline ideas which Marcion entertained, the Trinity would not have been held down to only three persons but today might consist of an adaptation of all thirty of Valentine's aeons of the pleroma. Perhaps, too, if there had not been a strong influence from orthodox Jewish Gnosis in the early Church, the old testament would not today be considered Holy Scripture by the Christians but Marcion might have triumphed (and with him the pagan-Jewish Ophites) in his anti-Biblical polemics. There yet remains the task of examining the many similar works of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to add more weight to the theory that Jewish Gnosticism has been of more influence upon the Church than normative Judaism itself.

42

Bibliography

1. Migne, Patrologia Graeca, Paris, 1886. The original writings of the Church Fathers.
2. The Antenicene Fathers, ed. Riddle, et al. This is a fairly good translation of the above but rather biased.
3. Bouillion, L., L'eglise Apostoliques et Les Juifs Philosophes, Orthez, 1914
4. DeFaye, E., Gnostiques et Gnosticisme, Paris, P. Guenther, 1925
5. Hilgenfeld, Die Ketzer Geschichte des Urchristenthums, Leipsig, 1884.
6. Harnack, A. von, Dogmengeschichte, Freiburg, 1893
7. Anz, W., Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus, Leipsig, 1927.
8. Baur, F.C., Die Christliche Gnosis, Tübingen, 1835
9. Lewis, A.H., Paganism Surviving in Christianity, New York, 1892
10. Graetz, Heinrich, Gnosticismus und Judenthum, Krotoschin, 1840
11. Friedlaender, M., Der Vorchristliche judische Gnosticismus, Gottingen, 1898
12. Mead, G.R.S., Pistis Sophia, London 1896
13. Abelson, J., Jewish Mysticism, London, 1913
14. Mueller, E., A History of Jewish Mysticism, Oxford, 1940
15. Scholem, G., Major Trends of Jewish Mysticism, Schocken, 1941
16. Baeck, Leo, The Pharisees, Schocken, 1943
17. Franck, A., La Kabbale, Paris 1849
18. Hort, F.J.A.H., Judaistic Christianity, Chicago, 1894
19. Carlyon, J.T., The Impact of Gnosticism on Early Christianity, Chicago, 1939
20. Cullman, O., Le Probleme Litteraire et Historique du Roman Pseudo- Clementin, Paris, 1933.

Bibliography (cont.)

21. Strack, H. and Billerbeck P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munchen, 1922-'28
22. Hastings, Encycyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, New York 1908
23. Jewish Encyclopaedia, Funk and Wagnalls, 1901

Notes

1. cf. especially Hippolytus, Philosophoumena, Bk. IV
2. Hippolytus, Ref. Haer., Bk.V, 6
3. E. Renan, L'eglise chretienne, Chs,IX, and X
4. Anz, W. Zur Frage nach dem ursprung dem Gnostizismus
5. Boudset, M.W. Hauptprobleme der Gnosis
6. Amelineau, M. Essai sur le gnosticisme Egyptien, 1882, p. 249ff
7. Clem. Alex. Stromata, Bk.IV, Ch.xii, 81-83
8. Hippolytus, Philos. Bk.VI. 31-37
9. Clem. Alex., V Stromata, I,3; II, III,10
10. Clem. Alex., Excerpta Theodoti, Ch. 28
11. ibid. Chs.29, 30; also Stromata, Bk.V, ,ch. 1,1-3
12. Stromata, XII: 82 of Bk. IV
13. Ibid. XII.
- 14.II Stromata, XX: 89,90
15. IV Stromata, XIV,29
16. Origen, In Johanno VI, 56,57
17. Epiphanius, Con. haer., XXXIII, 3 - 7
18. This book has been dated at the middle of the third century.
A Coptic Ms. is in the British Museum.
19. IV Stromata, IX, 71
20. ibid.
21. Note that here we do not have an evil Torah deity. But God of O.T. is subordinate creature.
22. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, I:6
- 23.Origen, In Genesim Hommilia, II,2
24. Coloss. 11:9
25. cf. the lengthy accout in Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I ff.
26. Carlyon, J.T. "Impact of Gnosticism on Earl Christ.", p 123

Notes (cont)

27. Hippolytus, Philos. IV,ff.
28. Cf. Franck, A. La Kabbale, p.350ff.
29. In his Ketzergeschichte, p.219
30. Allegorical Interpretations, III,96
31. ibid. III,73
32. This is an interpretation of Dr. Leo Baeck in Ausdreijahr-
tausenden
33. Succah, 28b P. 2
34. Contra Celsum, VI, 18
35. Mueller, E., A Hist. of Jew. Myst., p44
36. Hagigah, 14b, the locus classicus for Talmudic Gnosis.
Also Pal. Tal. Hagigah 77a
37. Tos. Megillah, 4:28
38. cf. note 33
39. Pal. Tal. Berachoth, 14 a ✓
40. 74b
41. 14b
42. 58a
43. In essay "Jewish Mysticism" in The Prophets, Schocken, 1945 ✓
44. Hagigah 14a
45. ibid 14b
46. VIII,2 of Gen. R.
47. ibid VI,5
48. ibid. II,17
49. Canticles Rabah, I,4
50. Gen.R., I:1
51. in "Teshuvot HaGeonim", p.31
52. Mueller, E., op. cit. p.52
53. cf. Prof. Riddles introductory notice to the Clementina
in Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 8

Notes (cont.)

54. Ante Nicene Fathers, vol.VII, p.69
55. Art.: "Les éléments Juives dans Les Pseudo-Clementines" in REJ, 1903
56. Recognitions, V:36
57. ibid. IX:28
58. Homilies, IX:4
59. Eruvin, 43b
60. Rec. I:36
61. Leviticus Rabah, ch.XXII
62. Hom.IX:6 and Rec. V:24
63. Graetz, Gnosticismus und Judenthum, p.23, n.19
64. Rec. IV:36
65. Pal. Tal. Avodah Zara, 40b
66. Pesikta, ed. Buber, 51b-52a
67. Pal. Tal., Berachoth, 14d
68. Rec. IV:36
69. Avodah Zara, 32b
70. Hom. XI:16
71. Other derivations: From Latin metator, measurer; or matrona, mistress: acc. to Levi ben Gershom a Kabbalistic name
72. Numbers Rabah, XII
73. Sanhedrin, 38b
74. of. Odeberg, The Book of Enoch
75. Homilies, I:19
76. ibid. II:5
77. ibid. II:6
78. Homilies, XIX:20
79. ibid. III:16
80. ibid. II:15

Notes (cont.)

81. cf. note 35, supra
82. "Sayings of the Fathers", Ch. 2 *Refrence made*
83. Homilies, II:12
84. *ibid.* VIII:5-7
85. *ibid.* III:20
86. Genesis Rabah, ch I.
87. Homilies III:1ff.
88. Genesis Rabah 74; cp. Rec. III:26
89. Homilies, XIX:20
90. *ibid.* 19:22
91. *ibid.* VII:13
92. "
93. p.26a ff.
94. p.26aff.
95. Homilies, IX:19
96. Genesis "abab I
97. Hom. IX:12
98. Josephus, "Jewish Wars", II:8, paragraphs 12.13
Philo, "On The Contemplative Life"
99. Hom. XIX:4
100. Evil inclination then is a bad translation; better "passion"
as in Basilides.
101. Hom. VII:8
102. *ibid.* II:38
103. Hom. II:39
104. *ibid.* II:40
105. Mishnah Shabbas 13:5
106. JBL, LXII (1944) p.315

Notes (cont.)

107. Friedlaender, M., Der Vorchristliche Judische Gnosticismus, pp. 43ff.
108. Herford, T., Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, p.340
109. JBL, LXII,(1943) p.85f.
110. Pal. Tal. Sanhedrin, 29c
111. Hullin 41a
112. Mishnah Megillah 4:8,9
113. Berachos, 28b-20a
114. Exodus Rabah, XIX:4
115. Philo, De Migratione, I:450
116. The first interpretation is that given by the Herzog Encyclopaedia, art. Ophiten, the second is Harvey's (Irenaeus I. p.230)
117. Baur, Die Christliche Gnosis, p.196
118. Werner, E., "The Origin Of The Eight Modes Of Music", in HUCA XXI (1948), pp. 222ff.
119. Genesis Rabah XIX:1
120. Hullin 87a
121. *ibid.*
122. Sanhedrin, 38b
123. Mishnah Sanhedrin,4:5
124. JBL, LXVII (1948),p.305
125. Siphri, CXV.
126. Eccles. Rabah, I:8
127. 1 Corinthians 2:16
128. Ephes.3:19
129. Acts 8:5,9,10
130. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiae,IV:22
131. Rec. III:47

Notes (cont.)

- 132. Rec. II:38
- 133. ibid. II:12
- 134. ibid. II:39
- 135. Homily XIX
- 136. Homilies, V, ff.
- 137. Rec. II:44
- 138. Homilies, II:33
- 139. ibid. III:4
- 140. Tertullian, Adv. Marc. II:5
- 141. ibid. II:5
- 142. Rec. II:53
- 143. Homilies, III, 39.
- 144. ibid. III:49
- 145. Rec. II:32
- 146. Homilies, XVIII
- 147. ibid. XVIII: 11
- 148 ibid. XVII: 15 ad finem.