On two questions which may be of some importance in their bearing on the subject of the formation of the Leonine sacramentary, the question whether the system which prevails in the endings of the prayers and prefaces is traceable through their whole structure, and the question whether exceptions to its rules are specially frequent in particular sections of the collection, I hope to say something in a future note.

H. A. WILSON.

THE POEMANDRES OF HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

AMONG the writings which pass under the name of the Egyptian Hermes the chief place is taken by the *Poemandres*. It consists of fourteen short treatises or chapters which are connected by their reference to a common subject. They deal with the creation of the world and of the soul; the nature of God; the deification of mankind. The character of the book was recognized by Casaubon who devotes to it the greater part of a section in his *Exercitationes Baronianae de Rebus Sacris*. No one, however, seems to have followed up the clue which he gives. And Zeller, while recognizing the Gnostic character of the first and thirteenth chapters, treats the rest of the book as an expression of paganism in its decline. It seems worth while, therefore, to reconsider the *Poemandres* in the light of some of the knowledge which has been added since the time of Casaubon. We shall have little difficulty in shewing as against Zeller that the book is in the main homogeneous and of a Christian origin. Not only so, our discussion will bring us into contact with the later Greek culture as it developed amid Egyptian surroundings, and will raise several problems of considerable importance. Among other things we shall have to trace the way in which Hermes passes over into Christian tradition, and how the Greek representations of Hermes furnished Christian art with one of its earliest motives. We shall further find in it a bridge by which we may pass over from Greek philosophy and science to modes of thought which are properly Christian. And yet the writer still retains so much of the antique spirit that, as we have seen, he can actually be mistaken for an apologist of paganism. But if, on the one hand, we are enabled by recent discoveries to understand the *Poemandres* better than Casaubon was in a position to do, on the other hand the *Poemandres* throws fresh and unsuspected light upon these very discoveries.

I.

In preparing his edition of the *Poemandres* Parthey employed two MSS, one of the fourteenth century in the Laurentian library at Florence, plut. lxxi 33, and one of the latter part of the thirteenth century, Paris 1220. Stobaeus, in the *Eclogae Physicae*, furnishes an independent tradition for a large part of the second, fourth, and tenth chapters. Stobaeus gives a much better tradition than Parthey's MSS, and deserves to play a large part in constituting the ultimate text of these three chapters. The differences between Stobaeus and the MSS of the *Poemandres*, however, are so great that it seems impossible to explain them merely by the corruption of the MSS. Not only is there very great divergence in the order of the words, but constructions are replaced by different but equivalent constructions, and particles are omitted or inserted in the most varied manner. Parthey, in his variant readings, includes some, but by no means all, the important instances from Stobaeus, and the result of comparing his edition with the text of Stobaeus is to inspire a feeling of distrust towards his work as an editor.

Even before Stobaeus we find the *Poemandres* quoted: for example, by Lactantius (*Epitome Div. Inst.* 14): 'Trismegistus paucos admodum fuisse cum diceret perfectae doctrinae viros, in iis cognatos suos enumeravit Uranum, Saturnium, Mercurium,' cf. *Poem.* x 5[1]. Also the same writer's ἡ γὰρ εὐσέβεια γνῶσίς ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ (*Div. Inst.* ii 16) may fairly be referred to *Poem.* ix 4 εὐσέβεια δέ ἐστι θεοῦ γνῶσις. The slight variation is exactly of the same kind as the variations which we find in Stobaeus. The writer of the *Cohort. in Gentiles* 38 quotes from Hermes the saying θεὸν νοῆσαι μέν ἐστι χαλεπόν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον ᾧ καὶ νοῆσαι δυνατόν. Lactantius translates the words into Latin, and says that they begin a book which is addressed by Hermes to his son (*Epitome Div. Inst.* 4). They are not found in the *Poemandres*, and cannot therefore furnish any evidence about its date. Parthey, therefore, makes a mistake in his preface, which he fathers upon Casaubon. Casaubon did not argue from the reference in the *Cohort. in Gent.* to the date of the *Poemandres*.

Of the earlier editors Vergicius supposes the author, Thoth, to be an Egyptian king who lived before the time of Moses, a view repeated by de Foix and Patricius (see Parthey's ed. Pref.). Casaubon introduces a more scientific standpoint. He is surprised that such writings should be quoted by the fathers as if the most ancient Mercury were their author[2]. He devotes a whole section to the *Poemandres* (*De Rebus*

[1] References to the *Poemandres* are given by chapter and paragraph from Parthey.

[2] See *De Rebus Sacris* 56 'Librum integrum esse ψευδεπίγραφον, utpote qui sit

Sacris 52 ff), and one wonders how he could have been misunderstood or overlooked by the more recent editors and historians, Parthey, Ménard, Zeller, and Erdmann. The Christian origin of some of the Hermetic writings did not escape Gibbon, who classes Hermes with Orpheus and the Sibyls as a cloak for Christian forgery (vol. ii p. 69, Bury's ed.).

Ménard's *Hermès Trismégiste* has probably been the means by which most students have approached these writings. He describes his translation as complete, but this is a misnomer. In addition to those works which Ménard translates, Ideler *Physici et Medici Graeci* prints a medical tract, and other similar writings are enumerated (Christ *Griech. Lit.*[2] p. 697). Moreover any list of the Hermetic books must take account of Ostanes, about whom something shall be said later on. Not only is Ménard's translation incomplete, but it gives a most misleading impression by presenting its varied contents in four books as though together they formed a system; the *Poemandres* coming first, the *Asclepius* second, and various fragments as the third and fourth books. But it is impossible to understand the Hermetic collection so long as we fail to distinguish the Christian origin of the *Poemandres*. Ménard makes the incorrect remark (pref. ii) that Casaubon attributes the books which bear the name of Hermes Trismegistus to a Jew or a Christian. Ménard cannot have seen Casaubon's *De Rebus Sacris*, or he would have been saved from such mistakes.

Ménard seems to have misled even Zeller. The historian of Greek philosophy, whom it seems almost ungrateful to criticize, has overlooked the unity of intention, which may be traced throughout the *Poemandres*, and, like Ménard, treats it as homogeneous with the *Asclepius*. He distinguishes indeed between the authorship of various parts of the Hermetic collection, and, in particular, the Gnostic elements in the first and thirteenth chapters of the *Poemandres*, but he overlooks the indubitable traces of Christian teaching, which Casaubon pointed out, in the other chapters.

Erdmann confines his main exposition to the *Poemandres* (*Hist. Phil. tr.* i 113, 2), and attributes the constituent treatises to different authors and times. Curiously enough the thirteenth chapter, in which Zeller sees Gnostic elements, appears to Erdmann of Neopythagorean tendency, because of the references to the ogdoad, decad, and dodecad, in which undoubtedly we are dealing with Gnostic ideas. At the same time

Christiani alicuius vel, ut dicam melius, semichristiani merum figmentum. Neque vero dubitamus id egisse auctorem ut multa pietatis Christianae dogmata quae ceu nova et prius inaudita reiciebantur, probaret ab ultima antiquitate sapientibus fuisse nota et ab illo ipso Mercurio in literas fuisse relata, quem non solum Aegyptii sed etiam Graeci propter vetustatem et doctrinae opinionem magnopere suspiciebant' (*De Rebus Sacris* 55).

Erdmann comes nearest to what is probably the truth when he says, in passing, 'these writings . . . contain also points of correspondence with gnostic, neoplatonic, patristic, and cabalistic ideas' (*op. cit.* 216).

It appears worth while, therefore, to reconsider the authorship and composition of the *Poemandres* in order, if possible, to clear up some of the confusion, which, as we have seen, prevails throughout nearly all that has been written about it.

II.

A considerable part of this confusion is due to the fact that the reigning convention of Egyptian literature is overlooked. What does it mean when a treatise or a saying is ascribed to Hermes? In answering this question it will be necessary to recapitulate facts which are now perfectly familiar even to the tyro in Egyptian studies, but were unknown to or overlooked by most of the writers whom we have mentioned.

The Egyptians lumped all their literature together under the name of Thoth. In the main he personified the profession of a scribe. Plato (*Philebus* 18 b) speaks of him as a god or divine person quite in the Egyptian way. The Egyptian priest and historian Manetho regards him as the remote ancestor by whom all sacred records were written (*Syncellus* I 73, Bonn). Clement of Alexandria groups him with Asclepius—'Αλλὰ καὶ τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἀνθρώπων ποτὲ γενομένων δὲ ἀνθρωπίνῃ δόξῃ θεῶν, Ἑρμῆς τε ὁ Θηβαῖος καὶ Ἀσκληπιὸς ὁ Μεμφίτης (*Strom.* I xxi 134). The convention by which all literature was attributed to him was recognized as such at any rate by some people. To use the phrase of the Pseudo-Iamblichus (*De Mysteriis* viii 1), the Hermetic books are 'the writings of the ancient scribes'. Hence there is no necessary exaggeration when Manetho speaks of the 36,000 books of Hermes, or Seleucus of 20,000 (*ib.*). Clement gives an interesting account of a collection of forty-two Hermetic books, which were used by certain Egyptian priests (*Strom.* VI iv 35 ff). Now there is very little doubt that the books of which Clement and Seleucus and Manetho speak were written in the Egyptian language. Hence the presumption about writings referred to Hermes, is that they belong to the national Egyptian literature, and are written in the native tongue. Of course many Egyptians were bilingual, and it is probable that the greater part of the extant Hermetic collection was composed in Greek by such persons, or by Greek-speaking foreigners. But in face of the facts there is nothing farfetched in supposing that a work like the *Poemandres* may also have been current in a Coptic version.

But Hermes or Thoth is not the only legendary Egyptian author. Maspéro, following Goodwin, has shewn that Ostanes is the name of

a deity who belongs to the cycle of Thoth (*Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* xx 142). His name Ysdnw was derived by the Egyptians themselves from a verb meaning 'to distinguish', and he was a patron of intellectual perception. As time went on, he gained in importance. Under the Ptolemies he was often represented upon the temple walls (*l. c.*). In Pliny he appears as an early writer upon medicine (*Nat. Hist.* xxviii 6). Some of the prescriptions quoted as from him are quite in the Egyptian style (*ib.* 256, 261). Philo Byblius, on whom to be sure not much reliance can be placed, mentions a work of Ostanes—the *Octateuch* (Eus. *Praep. Ev.* I 10, 52). It is tempting to identify this with some such collection as the six medical books which occupy the last place in Clement's list (*Strom.* VI iv 37). Now Pliny, as appears from his list of authorities, does not quote Ostanes directly. If we note that Democritus is mentioned by Pliny in the same context, and that Ostanes is the legendary teacher of Democritus upon his visit to Egypt, we shall consider it at least probable that Pliny depends upon Democritus for his mention of Ostanes. The philosopher, whose visit to Egypt may be regarded as a historical fact, would in that case be dealing with a medical collection which passes under the name of Ostanes. Asclepius, who appears in the *Poemandres*, will be the Greek equivalent of Ostanes. Thus the collocation of Hermes and Asclepius is analogous to the kinship of the Egyptian deities Thoth and Ysdnw.

We shall next try to shew that the *Poemandres* is not without precedent in the later Egyptian literature. Plutarch had access to good sources for the narratives which he gives *De Iside et Osiride* (Maspéro *Dawn of Civilization*, *tr.* 173). In the legend of Osiris (cc. xii–xix) Typhon charges Horus with being a bastard; but, with the advocacy of Hermes, Horus is adjudged by the gods to be legitimate. This is the Greek form of a legend which was very widely spread in Egypt. In the Egyptian versions, however, Thoth appears as the judge or arbitrator rather than the advocate (Maspéro, *op. cit.* 177). After Plutarch has given the popular form of the legend, he proceeds to make a fresh beginning, and to enumerate the interpretations which were given by those who seemed φιλοσοφικώτερόν τι λέγειν (c. xxxii). First, he deals with those opinions which identify the Egyptian gods with natural objects, Osiris with the Nile, Isis with the land, and so on. Then he considers the interpretations of those who identify the gods with the sun and moon, &c. (c. xli). These speculations summarize for us, at first or second hand, some of the Hermetic books which were current in Plutarch's time, and enable us to trace the passage from the tentative explanations which already occur in the *Book of the Dead* to the free speculation of Roman times. Now Plutarch gives an explanation of the lawsuit between Typhon and Horus in the following terms: Horus

ὃν ἡ Ἶσις εἰκόνα τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου αἰσθητὸν ὄντα γεννᾷ. Διὸ καὶ δίκην φεύγειν λέγεται νοθείας ὑπὸ Τυφῶνος, ὡς οὐκ ὢν καθαρὸς οὐδὲ εἰλικρινής, οἷος ὁ πατὴρ λόγος αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀμιγὴς καὶ ἀπαθής, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένος τῇ ὕλῃ διὰ τὸ σωματικόν (c. liv). Horus wins the suit. For Hermes, that is ὁ λόγος, bears witness ὅτι πρὸς τὸ νοητὸν ἡ φύσις μετασχηματιζομένη τὸν κόσμον ἀποδίδωσιν (*ib.*). Such expressions as these are of the same philosophical tendencies as the extant fragments of the Hermetic literature, and render Plutarch an important source of information for the very period in which we are interested.

Now let us turn to the title of the book. It is usually derived from ποιμήν, after Casaubon (*op. cit.* 57), who compares the phrase in the Fourth Gospel (x 14). Yet it is difficult to admit that such a compound as ποιμάνδρης could arise in this way. From ποιμήν we find the form ποιμάνωρ (Aesch. *Pers.* 241), and by a similar syncopation we might have the form ποίμανδρος, of which Poemander would be the proper Latin equivalent. Λέανδρος furnishes a parallel case of syncopation. But we have not yet the form required. I speak subject to correction, but I cannot find a derivative from ἀνήρ which ends in -ανδρης. There is one passage which seems to support this derivation : λόγον γὰρ τὸν σὸν ποιμαίνει ὁ νοῦς (xiii 19). But this expression is far from being equivalent to the meaning required for Ποιμάνδρης, if it is derived from ποιμήν and ἀνήρ. While, however, the name Poemandres does not answer to any Greek original, it is a close transliteration of a Coptic phrase. In the dialect of upper Egypt ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲣⲧⲣⲉ means 'the witness'. That the Coptic article should be treated as part of the name itself is not unusual; compare the name Pior (Palladius *Hist. Laus.* 89). Such a title corresponds very closely in style with the titles of other works of the same period, for example the *True Word* of Celsus, or the *Perfect Word*, which is an alternative title of the *Asclepius*. The term Poemandres, therefore, on this supposition contains an allusion to the widely spread legend of Hermes as the witness, a legend which is verified for us from several sources. But the writer has adapted the details to his purpose. Hermes is not himself the witness, but the herald of the witness. There is probably an allusion to the legend in xiii 13 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, ὦ τέκνον, τὸ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ τριχῇ διαστατόν, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον τὸν περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, εἰς ὃν ὑπεμνηματισάμην, ἵνα μὴ ὦμεν διάβολοι τοῦ παντὸς εἰς τοὺς πολλούς, εἰς οὓς αὐτὸς οὐ θέλει θεός. That is to say, the new birth consists, in one of its aspects, in recognizing the spiritual affinities of the visible world. And those who deny these affinities are compared to slanderers, to the part played by Typhon in the legend. This passage is important for the writer's attitude to Gnosticism. As we shall see, he recognizes the goodness of the creator of this world and appeals to the books of the

Old Testament. In other words he separates himself from the sects both Christian and non-Christian who treated the visible world as evil. Man was created εἰς ἔργων θείων γνῶσιν καὶ φύσεως ἐνεργοῦσαν μαρτυρίαν, καὶ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων εἰς πάντων τῶν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν δεσποτείαν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπίγνωσιν (iii 3). Thus the explanation of the title which I venture to suggest is entirely consonant with the purpose of the book.

If this is so, we are compelled to consider the possibility that the *Poemandres* is a translation from a Coptic original. In that case we shall also be able to explain the striking variations which we find in the excerpts of Stobaeus and the manuscripts. At the same time we must remember that the Coptic writers took over bodily from the Greek the full vocabulary of religious and philosophical terms. And the translator of the presumed Coptic original would find half of his work already done[1]. The Coptic of the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Books of Ieû* borrows nearly all unusual terms from the Greek.

I am surprised at the confidence with which Schmidt declares the *Pistis Sophia* and other Gnostic works to be translations from Greek originals[2]. There seems no adequate reason why such works may not have been composed in Coptic. The Egyptian Gnostic writings of the third century exhibit the same qualities of style as the Coptic biographies and apocalypses of the fourth and following centuries. And so I am prepared to believe that the *Poemandres* may have been first composed in Coptic. Or shall we say that the work was current from the first in both languages? We must not forget that over against the intellectual life of Alexandria, there

[1] There is a curious variant in Stobaeus which furnishes an incidental proof of the existence of a Coptic version, or shall we put the argument at the lowest and say that the variant seems to have originated in a Coptic scribe? In the *Poemandres* we read ἡ δὴ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτὴ θεία τις οὖσα καθάπερ περιβολῇ τῷ πνεύματι χρῆται, x 16. Here Parthey's manuscript B seems to have preserved the correct reading. Stobaeus, however, gives the striking variant καθάπερ ὑπηρέτις τῷ πνεύματι χρῆται, a reading which Patricius corrected to ὑπηρέτῃ. ὑπηρέτις can only have been due to a Christian scribe to whom πνεῦμα suggested the Pauline distinction of πνευματικός and ψυχικός. Hence he would stumble at the phrase which seems to make the Spirit the servant of the soul, and by a change of termination ὑπηρέτις for ὑπηρέτῃ, arrives at the quite orthodox sentiment καθάπερ ὑπηρέτις τῷ πνεύματι χρῆται. But since in the *Poemandres* the term πνεῦμα regularly bears the physiological meaning, the alteration to ὑπηρέτις makes nonsense, and this Patricius saw. But we have still to explain the passage from περιβολῇ to ὑπηρέτῃ. I am afraid the explanation which I am about to suggest will not be entirely convincing, but it must stand in default of a better one. ϧβολϧ is perhaps near enough to the Coptic ϣλον, the servant, to explain how to a Coptic scribe the words might be interchanged. The almost incredible mistakes which were made in transcribing Greek phrases into Coptic are illustrated by Junker and Schubart in their article 'Ein griechisch-koptisches Kirchengebet' (*Zeits. für Aeg.* vol. xl 1 ff).

[2] *Gnostische Schriften in Koptischer Sprache* 11.

stood in contrast the native Egyptian thought of the upper Nile. Hermopolis (Ashmunen) and Panopolis (Akhmim) were the centres of religious and other influences which reacted even upon Alexandria. Plutarch gained part of his information from Hermopolis, *de Is. et Os.* cc. iii, l. And the legends about Thoth were most likely to be current near the seat of his chief shrine. In fact Alexandria was regarded as being on the confines of Egypt rather than as an Egyptian city. Thus Macarius of Alexandria is distinguished from Macarius the Egyptian. So also the title of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* points us away from Alexandria for its origin. And it is remarkable that the *Poemandres*, which as we shall see is one of the most important sources of our knowledge of that Gospel, stands in close relation with native Egyptian life.

III.

Let us now proceed to the analysis of the *Poemandres*. But in order to avoid the confusion into which Ménard and Zeller have fallen, we will note the real character of the other chief Hermetic book, the *Asclepius*, in order that we may leave it entirely on one side. The *Asclepius* or, to give it its Greek title, ὁ τέλειος λόγος, *The Perfect Word*, was written as an apology for the moribund religion of Egypt at a time when there were signs of the approaching victory of Christian ideas. It has come down in a Latin translation wrongly attributed to Apuleius. The author casts his indignation and fear into the form of a prophecy. 'A time was coming', he laments, 'when the national religion would have passed away into a legend no longer believed, mere records upon stone' (c. 9). And, in a passage quoted from the Greek by Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* vii 18), he proceeds after the manner of a Jewish or Christian apocalypse to threaten the apostate world with a deluge or a destruction by fire. He interprets the national religion in the usual Neopythagorean manner. Polytheism and the worship of images are justified; they are approximations, symbols of the truth (c. 13). Thus the temper and method of *The Perfect Word* present very close resemblances to *The True Word* of Celsus. Celsus was far from being an Epicurean who attacked the popular religion generally; he was rather a champion of the national religions and especially of the Egyptian religion against Christian cosmopolitanism. And both these writers seem to have been dealing with Christian opponents of the Gnostic type. In the eyes of the author of *The Perfect Word*, the Christians were men who, in their weariness of soul, disdained the glorious universe and preferred darkness to light, death rather than life. This criticism made from the side of pagan religion was repeated by Plotinus from the side of Greek philosophy

(*Ennead* II ix 13 &c.). As we have already seen, it was one of the objects of the *Poemandres* to meet this attack by vindicating for Christian thought the spiritual affinities of the visible world.

Let us now consider the words in which the author declares his purpose: *μαθεῖν θέλω τὰ ὄντα καὶ νοῆσαι τὴν τούτων φύσιν καὶ γνῶναι τὸν θεόν* (i 3). Here we have three leading topics indicated: the understanding of nature, the Divine attributes, the process by which man attains *γνῶσις*.

The hierarchy of being may be arranged thus:—The supreme God is *ὁ νοῦς*. He *ἀρρενόθηλυς ὤν, ζωὴ καὶ φῶς ὑπάρχων, ἀπεκύησε λόγῳ ἕτερον νοῦν δημιουργόν, ὃς θεὸς τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ πνεύματος ὢν ἐδημιούργησε διοικητάς τινας ἑπτά, ἐν κύκλοις περιέχοντας τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον καὶ ἡ διοίκησις αὐτῶν εἱμαρμένη καλεῖται* (i 9). Hence we may mark off: (*a*) Divine beings, *ὁ νοῦς, ὁ δημιουργός, οἱ ἑπτὰ διοικηταί*; (*b*) *ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος*: the author, like Philo, describes a creation before the material creation, *βουληθεὶς τὸν ὁρατὸν κόσμον τουτονὶ δημιουργῆσαι προεξετύπου τὸν νοητόν* (Philo *Opif. Mund.* 4); (*c*) *ὁ αἰσθητὸς κόσμος*.

The seven *διοικηταί* or planetary spirits who embrace and control the sensible world in i 10, answer to the *αἰών* in xi 3 *τοῦ κόσμου ὑπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐμπεριεχομένου*. Just as the *διοίκησις* of the planetary spirits is called fate i 9, so xi 5 *συνέχει δὲ τοῦτον* (sc. *τὸν κόσμον*) *ὁ αἰών, εἴτε δι' ἀνάγκην εἴτε διὰ πρόνοιαν εἴτε διὰ φύσιν*. Thus the aeon is treated as equivalent to the seven planetary spirits, a fact which throws light upon the number of the aeons in other systems.

If now we turn to the third chapter of the *Poemandres*, we shall find that this cosmogony, for all its Platonic origin, is presented, quite in the style of Philo, as a commentary upon *Genesis* i–iii. The planetary spirits act as intermediaries in the work of creation; *ἀνῆκε δὲ ἕκαστος θεὸς διὰ τῆς ἰδίας δυνάμεως τὸ προσταχθὲν αὐτῷ*, and created beasts and creeping things and birds and herbs and lastly mankind. There is also an obvious allusion to *Gen.* i 4 ff in *Poem.* i 11. Hence the phrase *αὐξάνεσθε ἐν αὐξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πλήθει* (*Poem.* iii 3), which has generally been recognized as an allusion to *Gen.* i 28, is but one instance out of many which prove the writer's familiarity with the Old Testament.

Let us pass now to the second of our main topics, the Divine attributes. If the writer sets forth his cosmogony as a commentary upon *Genesis*, he has *Isaiah* xl in view when he portrays the nature of God. He adopts from the Jewish prophet the rhetorical question: 'Who is it that set the boundaries to the sea? Who is it that established the earth?' But it is especially instructive to compare *Isaiah* xl 19–22 with the following passage: *καὶ ἀνδριάντα μὲν ἢ εἰκόνα χωρὶς ἀνδριαντοποιοῦ ἢ ζωγράφου οὐδείς φησι γεγονέναι, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ*

δημιούργημα χωρὶς δημιουργοῦ γέγονεν; where the Egyptian writer seems to have understood the prophet to be arguing from the work to the workman, instead of attacking the use of plastic representations of God (*Poem.* c. v).

Since the writer thus starts with the Jewish conception of God as the creator, it is not surprising that he should devote one chapter, the second, to refuting the Aristotelian view (*a*) that God is νοῦς ἑαυτὸν νοῶν, (*b*) that God is the prime mover. Νοητὸς γὰρ πρῶτος ὁ θεός ἐστιν ἡμῖν οὐχ ἑαυτῷ (*Poem.* ii 5) and ἡ οὖν κίνησις τοῦ κόσμου καὶ παντὸς ζώου ὑλικοῦ οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν κατεκτὸς τοῦ κόσμου συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι (*ib.* 8). From ii 9 the soul seems to be regarded as the source of motion.

God's nature is most fully revealed in creation: ὁ θεὸς ὁρᾶται ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν (xi 22; cf. v 9 κυεῖν καὶ ποιεῖν). In another place He is said to be pure will, ἡ γὰρ τούτου ἐνέργεια ἡ θέλησίς ἐστι (x 2).

God is not only the creator, He is also the father. But the fatherhood of God is to be understood in a special sense; and here we are brought to the theory of γνῶσις and παλιγγενεσία. Man is naturally a child of this aeon, or of the planetary spirits. It is only so far as he receives νοῦς and thus becomes capable of the knowledge of God, that he can be called 'perfect', or 'the son of God'.

By γνῶσις man rises from the purely 'sensible' view of the world to the 'rational' one. He 'bears witness', lest he should be 'a slanderer' of the Divine purpose. But this knowledge is only possible by the gift of God: γνῶσις δέ ἐστιν ἐπιστήμης τὸ τέλος, ἐπιστήμη δὲ δῶρον τοῦ θεοῦ (x 9). And this gift is pictorially represented as a laver, κρατήρ, of reason, νοῦς (iv 4): ὅσοι μὲν οὖν συνῆκαν τοῦ κηρύγματος καὶ ἐβαπτίσαντο τοῦ νοός, οὗτοι μετέσχον τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τέλειοι ἐγένοντο ἄνθρωποι τὸν νοῦν δεξάμενοι (*ib.*). It follows that belief is identified with the activity of reason: τὸ γὰρ νοῆσαί ἐστι τὸ πιστεῦσαι, τὸ ἀπιστῆσαι δὲ τὸ μὴ νοῆσαι (ix 10). So, τοῦτο μόνον σωτήριον ἀνθρώπῳ ἐστιν ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ (x 15). The whole idea of the laver of regeneration in the *Poemandres* is obviously related to the teaching about baptism addressed to Nicodemus.

This process, which on the intellectual side is represented as a change from a 'sensible' to a 'rational' view of the world, is, on the moral side, a change from the immediate impulses of the senses, to the control of such impulses: ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ κρείττονος αἵρεσις οὐ μόνον τῷ ἑλομένῳ καλλίστη τυγχάνει, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποθεῶσαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν εὐσέβειαν ἐπιδείκνυσιν. The moral change which the new birth involves is analysed in detail: ἔγνωκας, ὦ τέκνον, τῆς παλιγγενεσίας τὸν τρόπον, τῆς δεκάδος παραγινομένης συνετέθη νοερὰ γένεσις (xiii 10). The decad consists of the ten virtues: γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ, γνῶσις χαρᾶς, ἐγκράτεια, καρτερία, δικαιοσύνη, κοινωνία, ἀλήθεια, ἀγαθόν, ζωή, φῶς

(xiii 8 ff). This list presents some suggestive resemblances to the corresponding list in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, S. ix 15: *πίστις, ἐγκράτεια, δύναμις, μακροθυμία, ἁπλότης, ἀκακία, ἁγνεία, ἱλαρότης, ἀλήθεια, σύνεσις, ὁμόνοια, ἀγάπη.* And yet in order that we may not identify this change with a purely moral process, it is referred to a personal agency; regeneration is brought about by *ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς, ἄνθρωπος εἷς, θελήματι θεοῦ* (xiii 4), a statement to be compared with *St. John* i 13.

The figure used by the writer for the moral change varies between the new birth and the sowing of seed (iii 3, xiv 10). He is still at that early stage in the developement of doctrine, when metaphors, such as that of the new birth and the sower, are still fluid, and have not yet crystallized into rigid and impassive forms of thought. By one of those curious accidents which may be traced in the history of ideas, a third kind of metaphor which found great favour with the Christian writers of the second and third centuries has passed away into oblivion. This same moral change is represented as an ascent to the highest spheres, and as a kind of deification. Although this metaphor, which is found frequently in Stoic writers, failed to obtain recognition, it had considerable influence upon Christian dogma so far as it involved the idea of apotheosis. In one place (i 24) the soul is said to rise through the planetary circles, laying its vices down in order until at the eighth stage it 'chants the father in company with *τὰ ὄντα*'. Now just as the new birth is a metaphor, just as the farmer sowing seed is a metaphor, so is this rising through the planetary circles a metaphor: and the real meaning which underlies it is found in a moral change, in the discarding of vices and the acquisition of the virtues. That is to say, the writer does not treat the Gnostic ogdoad, or decad, or dodecad, as fixed schemes of thought, but as pictorial statements thrown out at certain moral facts. Hence we have to face this possibility, that the orthodox criticism of Gnosticism is largely based upon a misapprehension, which insisted upon taking metaphor for doctrine.

The writer of the *Poemandres* lets it be seen clearly that he is consciously using figurative modes of speech, as when (x 15) he says that the knowledge of God is the ascent to Olympus. The seventh chapter contains traces of an interesting attempt to incorporate this notion of an ascent into Christian belief: *μὴ συγκατενεχθῆτε τοιγαροῦν τῷ πολλῷ ῥεύματι, ἀναρροίᾳ δὲ χρησάμενοι οἱ δυνάμενοι λαβέσθαι τοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας λιμένος, ἐνορμισάμενοι τούτῳ ζητήσατε χειραγωγὸν τὸν ὁδηγήσαντα ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς τῆς γνώσεως θύρας ὅπου ἐστὶ τὸ λαμπρὸν φῶς, τὸ καθαρὸν σκότους, ὅπου οὐδὲ εἷς μεθύει, ἀλλὰ πάντες νήφουσιν, ἀφορῶντες τῇ καρδίᾳ εἰς τὸν ὁραθῆναι θέλοντα.* Now this whole passage receives a most suggestive commentary in the exposition which Hippolytus quotes from a heretical writer of the sect of the Naassenes (*Refut.* v 7 f). The spiritual

birth is, according to the Naassenes, ὁ μέγας Ἰορδάνης, ὃν πάτῳ ῥέοντα καὶ καλύοντα ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου . . . ἀνέστειλεν Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐτοίησεν ἄνω ῥέειν. The same writer proceeds to explain the meaning of the door: λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη ἡ ἀληθινή. In the third place the body is put off in a spiritual resurrection. It is a fair inference from these resemblances that the writer of the *Poemandres* and the Naassene writer are occupied with the same context—an inference which will lead us to some important further consequences.

IV.

The traditional estimate of Gnosticism, then, requires to be reconsidered, in the light of the *Poemandres*. It belongs to a time when religious definitions were still in the making; a time therefore when the limits of free discussion were not yet straitly drawn. Hence the varied presentations of religious belief which we find in Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, would not be admitted by their exponents to be in conflict with the Christian faith, but would rather be regarded as exhibiting new and fruitful applications of principles common to all. Ecclesiastical opinion ultimately settled down in one direction rather than another. But until this process was complete, each living system of belief might count upon a possible victory, and so, among others, the system which may be traced in the *Poemandres*[1]. And the *Poemandres* is so far from being a merely heretical production, that its relation to orthodox belief may fairly be indicated by saying that it answers to the earlier intellectual position of Clement of Alexandria.

And perhaps this is as suitable place as any to mark the date and origin of the *Poemandres*. It will be found that the relations which we have traced between the book and other early Christian literature, agree very well with a time towards the end of the second century. Nor does this date preclude us from finding occasional traces of even earlier material. The author may very well have combined, with material of his own, expositions from other sources with which he found himself in agreement. It is perhaps in this way that we may explain the occasional variations in detail which chequer the fairly uniform character of the work. It is a production which stands halfway between the Gnosticism of the Valentinian type, and that Gnosticism of Clement and Origen which ultimately became the official theology of the Church. The *Poemandres*, in fact, carries us back to that common standpoint

[1] The ordinary use of the term 'Gnostic' tends to obscure the claim of the Gnostic sects not only to be part of the true Church, but the most perfect part of it; though the historians of Doctrine, of course, recognize this claim as characteristic.

from which both the Valentinians and, later, Origen, took their start. The thinkers to whom Hippolytus gives the name Naassenes, styled themselves Gnostics pure and simple. And their system is identical in all main respects with the system of the *Poemandres*. In both cases we find the free use of Greek mythology to embody Christian ideas. And the Hermes of the *Poemandres* is simply the Hermes of the Naassene Gnostics transplanted to Egyptian soil. More than this, we find the common use of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, and by comparing the *Poemandres* with the exposition given in Hippolytus's *Refutations*, we are enabled to add considerably to our knowledge of that Gospel.

V.

The functions of Hermes in Greek religion, and of Thoth in Egyptian religion, offered a sufficiently close analogy to the mission of Jesus, and Christian writers hastened to make use of this analogy. 'Just as the Greek philosophers had found their philosophy in Homer, so Christian writers found in him Christian theology.'[1] Taking Homer *Odyssey* xxiv 1 ff as a text, the Gnostics traced the resemblances which held between Christ and the Greek Hermes. Hermes charms the eyes of the dead, and again he wakes those that are asleep: *περὶ τούτων, φησίν, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει· Ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἐξεγέρθητι, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ ἐν πᾶσι, φησί, τοῖς γενητοῖς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου κεχαρακτηρισμένος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀχαρακτηρίστου λόγου* (Hipp. *Refut.* v 7). Now since the *Poemandres* belongs to the same school of thought, we need not be surprised to find that Jesus is represented under the figure of the Egyptian Hermes. Poemandres, who is *ὁ τῆς αὐθεντίας νοῦς*, instructs Hermes, and after the instruction he asks: *λοιπὸν τί μέλλεις; οὐχ ὡς πάντα παραλαβὼν καθοδηγὸς γίνῃ τοῖς ἀξίοις, ὅπως τὸ γένος τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος διὰ σοῦ ὑπὸ θεοῦ σωθῇ;* (i 26)[2]. Hermes then proceeds with what is in all probability a paraphrase of the third *Logion Iesu*: *ἤργμαι κηρύσσειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ τὸ τῆς γνώσεως κάλλος. ὦ λαοί, ἄνδρες γηγενεῖς, οἱ μέθῃ καὶ ὕπνῳ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες καὶ τῇ ἀγνωσίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, νήψατε, παύσασθε κραιπαλῶντες, θελγόμενοι ὕπνῳ ἀλόγῳ* (i 27). And some gave themselves up to 'the

[1] Hatch *Hibbert Lect.* p. 69.

[2] This turn of phrase may be compared with 1 *Clem.* 61 *σοὶ ἐξομολογούμεθα δι' τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and the *Didache* 10 *ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.* That is to say, the position which is assigned to Jesus in the *Poemandres*, answers to the early view which finds its most characteristic expression in what Harnack styles the adoptionism of the Shepherd (*Sim.* v and ix 1, 12; Harnack *Hist. Dogm.* tr. i 190).

way of death'[1]: οἱ δὲ παρεκάλουν διδαχθῆναι, ἑαυτοὺς πρὸ τοδῶν μου βίψαντες. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀναστήσας αὐτοὺς καθοδηγὸς ἐγενόμην τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου, τοὺς λόγους διδάσκων, πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ σωθήσονται. καὶ ἔσπειρα αὐτοῖς τοὺς τῆς σοφίας λόγους καὶ ἐτράφησαν (*Patr.* ἐτρόφησα) ἐκ τοῦ ἀμβροσίου ὕδατος. ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου αὐγῆς ἀρχομένης δύεσθαι ὅλης ἐκέλευσα αὐτοὺς εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ (i 29). It would be interesting, but superfluous for our present purpose, to trace all the connexions between this passage and the evangelical narrative. We may, however, note the conclusion εὐλογητὸς εἶ πάτερ· ὁ σὸς ἄνθρωπος, συναγιάζειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν (i 32) with its reference to *St. John* xvii 2.

Since then, the identification of Jesus with Hermes took place in circles which formed part of the Christian community, we shall not be surprised to find that one of the leading types of Christian art, the Good Shepherd, was immediately adapted from a current representation of the Greek Hermes (see Sittl *Klassische Kunstarchäologie* 777, 809, 819). As we see from Hippolytus (*Refut.* v 7), the Gnostics were especially interested in Hermes as Hermes Logius, a type which was increasingly frequent in later Greek art. And this epithet was connected by them with the conception of Jesus as the Logos. Now another type of Hermes, the Kriophoros, served to bring together Jesus as the Logos, and Jesus as the Good Shepherd. These representations of Jesus begin in the second century; and so they correspond in order of time with the appearance of the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, and of these Gnostic compositions which largely depend upon it.

Another fact leads us to think that the figure of the Good Shepherd had its roots in a previous tradition. 'It is probable that there were no statues before the age of Constantine, except the Good Shepherd.'[2] We must therefore add Hermes to the list of pagan types which were taken over for its own purposes by the rising Christian art.

Moreover, we are enabled to advance one step further the long-standing controversy as to the portraits of Jesus. Since the figure of the Good Shepherd is borrowed from Greek sculpture, it cannot be used as evidence for the earliest conceptions about the appearance of Jesus. And so the arguments of Farrar and others fall to the ground in so far as they take the presence of this type to shew that there was no genuine tradition of Christ's appearance.

We are now in a position to throw a little further light upon the famous inscription of Abercius. The inscription speaks of a shepherd—

[1] Cf. *Didache* 5.

[2] Lowrie *Christian Art and Archaeology* p. 290. This is one of the few omissions that may be noted in Mr. Lowrie's valuable book.

ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσιν πεδίοις τε
ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει μεγάλους πάντη καθορῶντας
οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε . . . γράμματα πιστά[1].

The shepherd whose great eyes look in every direction, is no other than Hermes treated as a symbol of Christ. And so some of the arguments which may be directed against the Christian character of this inscription, and to which Harnack (cf. *Class. Rev.* ix 297) attaches an exaggerated weight, are turned aside. It is very likely that the figure upon the tomb of another Abercius[2] is also adapted from the figure of Hermes.

VI.

We now approach what is perhaps the most important contribution which the *Poemandres* makes to our knowledge: namely the light which it throws upon the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* and the *Logia Jesu*.

The *Gospel according to the Egyptians* was much better known than might be gathered from the current accounts of it. Clement of Alexandria quotes several passages from it (see *Strom.* iii 6 45; 9 63, 64, 66; 13 92). It was used by the Valentinians (*Fragm. Theodot.* 67), and probably by the author of the Homily ascribed to Clement of Rome (§ xii). In tendency it was Sabellian, and it was used by persons of that way of thinking in the third century (see Epiph. *Haer.* 62 2, who quotes the saying τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱόν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον πνεῦμα). But we are fortunate in having an explicit indication of the contents of this Gospel, an indication which deserves

[1] The *Poemandres* would suggest that the lacuna contained some such phrase as νοεῖν or νοῦν:

οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε νοεῖν καὶ γράμματα πιστά.

Among the works which from time to time are attributed to Hermes, there occurs the name τὰ ἀλμενιχιακά. Casaubon, in one of his less happy moments, suggests that it is derived from Salamis Σαλαμινιακά (*De Rebus Sacris* 55). If, however, we turn to Hippolytus (*Refut.* v 7), we find that the Gnostic writer is occupied with the question who was the first man, and quotes a poem which has been attributed to Pindar. This poem begins—

εἴτε Βοιωτοῖσιν Ἀλαλκομενεὺς λίμνας ὑπὲρ Καφισίδος
πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων ἀνέσχεν κ.τ.λ.

Ἀλαλκομένιος was the name of the first month in the Boeotian year. On the sixteenth a festival was held to commemorate the battle of Plataea, and at this festival the Plataean priest prayed to Zeus and Hermes Chthonios. The name itself seems to have been derived from a cult-name of Athena, *Iliad* iv 8. I would suggest then that a Hermetic writing was current under the name τὰ Ἀλαλκομενιακά. A considerable discussion is devoted by the Gnostic writer in Hippolytus *Refut.* v 7 to the nature of the first man, a topic which of course filled the mind of St Paul. And the name Ἀλαλκομενιακά would suit such a subject-matter very well.

[2] See Ramsay *Church in the Roman Empire* 441.

more attention than it has received. Εἶναι δὲ φασὶ τὴν ψυχὴν δυσεύρετον πάνυ καὶ δυσκατανόητον· οὐ γὰρ μένει ἐπὶ σχήματος οὐδὲ μορφῆς τῆς αὐτῆς πάντοτε οὐδὲ πάθους ἑνός, ἵνα τις αὐτὴν ἢ τύπῳ εἴπῃ ἢ οὐσίᾳ καταλήψηται. τὰς δὲ ἐξαλλαγὰς ταύτας τὰς ποικίλας ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγελίῳ κειμένας ἔχουσιν (Hipp. *Refut.* v 7).

Let me now recall the attention of the reader to the close parallel which we traced between the seventh chapter of the *Poemandres*, and a considerable portion of Hipp. *Refut.* v. It is impossible to believe that such resemblances could be fortuitous. The explanation which, I think, will commend itself upon a careful survey of the facts, is that both writers had before them the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. The description of that Gospel which we have just quoted, occurs early in the description of the Gnostic (or so-called Naassene) system; and it may be said of the Gnostic system, as of the Gospel, that it is concerned with the changes of the soul.

But the author of the *Poemandres* also belongs to the same school with the writer of the Gospel (compare xiii 21 θεέ, σὺ πάτερ, σὺ ὁ κύριος, σὺ ὁ νοῦς with the Sabellian tenet already quoted from Epiphanius). Not only so, he twice (i 27, vii 1) paraphrases the third *Logion Iesu*[1], and there is considerable reason for believing that the *Logia Iesu* are extracts from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. For in the *Classical Review* (xii 35) I shewed that the second Logion was to be referred to a context from which Clement quotes (*Strom.* iii 15 99), and that this context is probably the Gospel in question. Hence we reach this important conclusion that the *Poemandres*, the Naassene writings summarized by Hippolytus, and the *Logia Iesu* are all based upon the heretical Gospel.

VII.

Not only so; by combining the scattered hints which we may glean from these several connected sources we are enabled to enter more fully into the Alexandrine life of the first and second Christian centuries. And in so doing we find ourselves better placed for understanding the composition and origin of the Fourth Gospel.

Let us begin with the title of the thirteenth chapter of the *Poemandres*, ἐν ὄρει λόγος. 'The sermon on the mountain' would suggest to the Gnostic reader, not the beginning of the teaching of Jesus, but one of His discourses delivered after the resurrection. Ménard's remarks (*op. cit.* lxiii) lose their point because they ignore the characteristic distinction between the public discourses of Jesus, and the mystical discourses delivered to the disciples alone upon the Mount of Olives.

[1] In the *Classical Review* xvii 251, I have suggested an emendation in the third Logion with the help of these paraphrases, νήψαντα for διψῶντα.

If we compare Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii 13 92 πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, with the quotation in '2 Clem.' xii introduced by the words ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπό τινος πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, we are led to think of the passage in the *Acts of the Apostles* i 6 οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; (cf. i 4 λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ). It was on these two passages that the early Christian imagination erected an enormous structure of apocryphal literature, all professing to set forth the revelations of the risen Lord to His disciples. Thus the Mount of Olives is the scene of the conversations recorded in the *Pistis Sophia*. It is remarkable that Salome herself appears in the *Pistis Sophia* as one of the women who accompanied the Apostles on these occasions (*tr.* Schwartze, p. 213). Now in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* Salome puts questions to Jesus, and receives answers very similar to the conversations which make up the staple of the *Pistis Sophia* (see Clem. *Strom.* iii 9 63 f). It is thus very probable that the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* consisted in conversations which took place after the resurrection upon the Mount of Olives, and that the title of the thirteenth chapter of the *Poemandres* conveyed an allusion to the same locality.

Now it is instructive to note that Salome, who plays so prominent a part in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, is the mother of St John, and that the same Gnostic circles in which this Gospel was current, were also those in which we hear for the first time of the Fourth Gospel. That is to say, the Fourth Gospel comes to us from the hands of the Alexandrine Gnostics. The system of Valentinus is really a somewhat fanciful commentary upon the opening chapters of *St John's Gospel*. Heracleon, the first great commentator upon St John, was both a Gnostic and at the same time was really the master of Origen, and through him helped to determine the developement of the orthodox theology. Now the key to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel is to be found in the Gnostic ideas which underlie the *Poemandres*, ideas to which Heracleon furnishes a clue. But the commentators have refused the help which the Gnostics could give, and the Fourth Gospel has been consistently misunderstood owing to the exaggerated stress which has been laid upon the doctrine of the λόγος. A few considerations upon this point shall bring this paper to a close.

In the *Poemandres* the term πνεῦμα is still used in the traditional medical sense x 13 τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα . . κινεῖ τὸ ζῷον. Along with air πνεῦμα fills vacua (ii 11). The soul uses the πνεῦμα as a vestment. For the πνεῦμα pervades the living creature. The whole theory of the πνεῦμα is not very clearly expressed, but it seems to be borrowed from Galen (Sieb. *Geschichte der Psychologie* I ii 145). If this is the case, we reach

an upward limit for the date of the *Poemandres*, which cannot in this case be earlier than the end of the second century. The interesting enumeration of the parts of the body (v 6), shews that the writer, if not himself a physician, was at any rate in touch with the medicine of his time. The spirit of Greek science has not yet been submerged entirely under the rising flood of mysticism.

Now it is interesting to notice that the connexion of the N. T. idea of πνεῦμα with Greek ideas, 'is most perceptible in the Johannine Gospel (which stands near Alexandrine culture) with its analogies of Divine spirit and moved air of breath' (Sieb. *op. cit.* I ii 157). Cf. *Joh.* xx 22 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Here undoubtedly πνεῦμα is used in a partly material sense, and the term is ambiguous. Hence we need not be surprised to find in the *Poemandres* that πνεῦμα is confined to the material sense and is replaced by another term, namely νοῦς, in order to denote the highest or spiritual nature. The author thus removes the ambiguity which attaches to the Johannine conception of πνεῦμα by analysing it into the material πνεῦμα, and the immaterial νοῦς. Hence throughout the *Poemandres* νοῦς replaces πνεῦμα in the sense of spirit. Thus God is addressed as Father, Lord, and νοῦς (xiii 21). The laver of regeneration is filled with νοῦς (iv 3).

The λόγος is subordinated to the νοῦς. All men have λόγος, not all men have νοῦς. τὸν μὲν οὖν λόγον ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐμέρισε, τὸν δὲ νοῦν οὐκέτι (iv 3). The presence of the λόγος in man is explained as τὸ ἐν σοὶ βλέπον καὶ ἀκοῦον (i 6). Now a careful reading of the opening chapters of *St John's Gospel* will shew that the writer introduces the λόγος in the prologue, as a transition from a subject in which he is only partially interested, to his proper subject, the new birth which is brought about by the imparting of the spirit by Jesus. Hence the phrase 'incarnation of the λόγος' does not render to us the leading purpose of the writer, and the theology which is based upon that phrase is an inadequate criticism of his thoughts. Both in *St John* and the *Poemandres*, man is imperfect until he receives the Divine Gnosis.

VIII.

The *Poemandres*, then, is a very striking exponent of the religious and philosophical ideas amid which Alexandrine theology arose. On the one hand it is in touch with Greek mythology and science; on the other with Jewish and Christian literature. The author is more sober than most of his Gnostic contemporaries; he is a more consistent reasoner than Clement. I have but indicated a few of the problems which the *Poemandres* raises and helps to solve, and should like to think that this paper may lead other students to the same field.

FRANK GRANGER.