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Sasabek and Béroth (NHVI, 41, 28–30): A Theonymic Mixed Marriage
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The purpose of this paper is twofold: to discuss the names of two Gnostic archons, specifically their meaning and origin; to evaluate the results of this semasiological analysis from the historical origins of *The Concept of Our Great Power* (*Great Pow.*), the Nag Hammadi treatise in which these hieronyms are attested.

The passage concerned is *Great Pow.* 41,28b–30a, the Coptic text and the translation of which are presented here according to the latest reading of the text:

\[\text{Άγων Ἄγα\kappaον \textit{Et Il fut remis à Sasabek et Berōth.}} \text{(Schenke 1985)}\]

Prior to Schenke, who proposes this reading in a review of Cherix’s study of *Great Pow.*, the interpretation of this passage was determined by the analysis of \(\text{베푶} \) as a variant of \(\text{BFSLA 뫼} \) / \(\text{ מסוחת} \) (var. \(\text{S 보} \)), “brass, bronze”, based on the analogy established by the first editor with Mt 26:15; 27:3:

3. The reference by Schenke to the “sieben Bronzemünzen” of Krause’s translation—who renders “neun”—is a typographical error.
Krause–Labib 1971 (editio princeps)

\[ \text{Αὐτάς ἐς οὔτῃ ἡσακαβὲκ ἐς ἐρωτὶ ὁ.} \]

Und sie lieferen ihn aus an Sasabek für neun Bronzemünzen.\(^6\)

Wisse–Williams 1979

\[ \text{Αὐτάς ἐς οὔτῃ ἡσακαβὲκ ἐς ἐρωτὶ ὁ.} \]

And they handed him over to Sasabek for nine bronze coins.\(^7\)

Cherix 1982

Et Il fut remis à Sasabek pour 9 pièces de bronze.\(^8\)

Wisse 1996

And they handed him over to Sasabek for nine bronze coins.\(^9\)

Beyond the fact that the New Testament reference put forward by Krause is not a parallel and therefore cannot determine the interpretation of the passage of Great Pow.,\(^10\) this reading raises several problems, as Schenke has demonstrated:

1. the word ἐρωτὶ is—in its entirety—surmounted by the hieronymic supralinear stroke;
2. the numeral is never preceded by the indefinite article, even in indefinite utterances;
3. the numeral modifier precedes the modified noun;
4. the preposition \( λ\) does not have the meaning “for.”

These considerations invalidate per se the reading \( λ ἐρωτὶ \) and the translation “for nine bronze coins.” Nevertheless, they were not immediately taken into account;\(^11\) even if French-speaking scholars embraced them (Cherix 1993\(^12\) and Roberge 2007\(^13\)), the editions

---

\(^6\) Ibid.


\(^8\) P. Cherix, Le Concept de notre grande puissance (CGVI, 4): texte, remarcques philologiques, traduction et notes, OBO 47, 1982, p. 16.


\(^10\) The edition of Krause and Labib shows a wide comprehension of the notion of parallel. In this particular case, no pertinent relation could be established between the thirty silver coins of Matthew—the price of a slave (Exo 21:32)—and the nine bronze coins of Great Pow., which allusion—supposing that there is one—remains obscure.


\(^12\) See supra.


The only grammatically acceptable interpretation of the passage is that suggested by Schenke, who reads \(\text{ε}2\text{θ}1\text{Η}\) as a variant of the preposition \(\text{Λ}2\text{H}\), “and,” itself an alternative form of \(\text{L}2\text{H}\): “Et Il fut remis à Sasabek et Berôth.”\footnote{15 See supra.} However, this reading requires some comments, which have already been expressed by W.-P. Funk. Whether it is a “vocalisation” or a “sahidisation” superfluous de la variante \(\text{L}2\text{H}\), “and,” itself an alternative form of \(\text{L}2\text{H}\) of a preposition \(\text{L}2\text{H}\), variant of the \(\text{S}2\text{H}\), could lend support to the first of the two solutions proposed by Funk for the \(\text{L}2\text{H}\) of Great Pow., i.e. that of the re-vocalisation of \(\text{S}2\text{H}\). If elsewhere in the text of \(\text{AcPe12Ap}\) the preposition \(\text{L}2\text{H}\) maintains its classic form, in 6,23 it appears as \(\text{S}2\text{H}\) (6,23b–24a: \(\text{S}2\text{H} \text{πο}\)), whereby \(\epsilon\) notes an anaptyxis of \(\text{ι}\) rather than a Northern written form of the Murmelvokal.\footnote{16 W.-P. Funk, “L’orthographe du manuscrit,” in P.-H. Poirier, W.-P. Funk, Le tonnerre, intellect parfait (NH VI,2), BCNH, section “Textes” 22, Sainte-Foy/Leuven–Paris, 1995, p. 25.} However, Funk opts in this case for the former explanation, that of a Northern vocalisation, and draws a parallel between the form \(\text{S}2\text{H}\) and the form interpreted by him as “bohârisante” of the following numeral (\(\overline{\text{o}}\) for \(\gamma1\text{c}\) in 6,24a). This Bohairic or Bohairic-like dialectal “nest” of \(\text{AcPe12Ap}\) is, for Funk, an argument for an initial stage of the transmission of this text related to a “dialecte nord-égyptien (près du bohâriqique).”\footnote{17 Cf. ibid., p. 25, n. 104.} The fact remains that variants of this preposition comprising an epsilon, equally adventitious, so to speak, as that occurring in \(\text{AcPe12Ap}\), are attested in Sahidic texts which do not exhibit other Northern features.\footnote{18 In \(F\) it can be spelled \(\text{S}2\text{H}\) (in complementary distribution with \(\text{S}2\text{H}\), \(\text{S}2\text{H}\) and \(\text{S}1\text{H}\) and in \(B\) it is always written \(\text{S}\) instead of \(\text{S}2\text{H}\); cf. W.E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary…, op. cit., p. 683a.} The preposition \(\text{S}2\text{H}\) appears also in a graffiti of the Dayr Muṣṭafā Kāšif monastery in Kharga Oasis. The graffiti, still unpublished, begins with the invocation \(\text{S}2\text{H} \text{H}\text{H}\text{H}\text{P}\text{H}\) which is all but Bohairic. The issue of the vernacular Coptic dialect of Kharga Oasis will be dealt with in G. Roquet, V. Ghica, Bagawat. Inscriptions et gravures, forthcoming at the Institut français d’archéologie orientale.

These remarks are essential for the following discussions.
Prior attempts to explain this name relate it either to the Egyptian god Sobek or to “l’arbre de Sabek” (LXX Gn 22,13), symbole de la croix. An ad hoc Middle Persian etymology was also proposed, which interprets this name — pretending to stem from an unattested sās-ābīg— as “aqueous bug,” “a Gnostic Charon flowing in the waters of hell-river.” Even if vaguely formulated, the first hypothesis is not utterly unfounded. However, its lack of accuracy misleads research into the name’s origin and the possible role of this archon in Great Pow’s economy. The case of Fr.E. Williams is telling in this regard. Williams considers that the Egyptian deity, that he characterises as being a “monster,” personifies “the worm that does not die” of Mt 9:48, as described by the Martyrdom of St. Macarius of Antioch. When attributing to the “snake which never slept” a crocodile head, this Coptic text calls, in effect, upon a symbolic bestiary well-known in Egyptian ascetic literature, whose inspiration is not drawn from the reptile class alone. There is no need to dwell on the numerous examples one can cite in this connection. It should simply be underlined that nothing in the Christian demonic imagery supports Williams’ assertion that “The crocodile-headed monster would (…) seem to be a combination of the worm that never dies and the crocodile Sebk.” It comes as no surprise that the monstrous Sobek depicted by Williams becomes in the latest French translation of Great Pow. “le dieu infernal égyptien Sebk.” Of course, the crocodile-god is in no way definable as an infernal deity, and his outwardly frightful aspect denotes only his power, identical to the strength of the animal which is his ba.

Sasabek is simply an Egyptian male name, one among many others in a long series of filionyms involving ω-. Transmitted in various spellings (**) it is amply attested especially from the Middle Kingdom onwards and are too badly known to demonstrate the borrowing MP *sā-ābīg > CACABEK. Nevertheless, several Persian etymons prove that /g/ becomes in Sahidic Coptic /c/ (e) (S setDefault) and var., “crystal, glass” < NP setDefault; S setDefault, “tin” < ba + NP (market) and var., B setDefault, “cart” < NP (market); cf. J. Černý, Coptic Etymological Dictionary, Cambridge–London–New York–Melbourne, 1976, p. 3, 27, 67, 163; W. Westendorf, Koptisches Handwörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1977, p. 2, 73, 196, 495; W. Vycichl, Dictionnaire érymologique de la langue copte, Leuven, 1983, p. 32, 91a, 197a, 343b. It should also be noted that Albrile gives an erroneous reading of the passage 41,28–30 (“L’entendement…,” op. cit., p. 339). He actually retains the old ungrammatical reading of Krause-Labib because of “questioni mitografiche” (“Oltre…,” op. cit., p. 339) that I will not discuss here.


E. Albrile, “Oltre le soglie di Ade. Un excrusus mitografico,” Laurentianum 47, 2006, p. 346. The same interpretation is given in: id., “Coptica iranica,” Kervan 4–5, 2006–2007, p. 14. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the methodological relevance of the comparative mythology applied in these two articles. However, two points ought to be made: 1. MP *sā-ābīg [v] “fyk” is not attested as such; 2. the phonetic rules that govern the transformations undergone by the few Middle Persian, Avestan or New Persian words adopted in Coptic...
becomes frequent in Ptolemaic times under the form *sj-šbk.* It is also part of three composed anthroponyms — *sj-šbk ṣrj* (_script_ 3), *š2-šbk ṅh(.w)* (_script_ 3), *š2-šbk wȝḥ (w)* (_script_ 3) — and, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods when it is largely documented, it is rendered by Σισοῦχος, “the son of (the god) Suchos,” Σοῦχος being the Greek name of Sobek.

As a rather frequently attested personal name, it is impossible to connect Sasabek to any memorable figure who could possibly throw light on the association which may be the basis of the archontic theonym of Great Pow. However, the vocalisation with keleton points to an archaic hieroglyphic source, which opens new perspectives for the study of the background of the text’s reductor or of one of its redactors. One should recall in this connection that Sobek haunts the memories long after his cult had fallen into abeyance. Indeed the name of Σοῦχος and several of his attributes are still known in the 6th century by Damascius, “the last of the Neoplatonists.”

**Σοῦχος**

Before questioning the inspiration behind this hieronym, we ought to draw attention to the expletive character of the tau. It is obviously a mere graphematic anomaly, a sort of “phonetic complement” which is not without parallels in Coptic.

The name and function of Beroth were related by Fr.E. Williams to those of Nimrod (נִמְרֹד) of Gn 10:8–9, rendered by LXX as Νεβρώδ. It is well established that the LXX, which translates הַנִּמְרוֹד (Gn 10:9) by γῆς κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον Κυρίου —probably under the influence of the Greek tradition about the giants’ revolt against the Olympian gods—, opens the way for the negative image that the hero of the post-diluvian times takes up to Dante and beyond. This is the main reason why, prior to Williams, F. Cumont

---

31 Cf. H. Ranke, PN, loc. cit.
34 Fr.E. Williams, *Mental...*, op. cit., p. 120.
36 *Divina Commedia Inf.* xxxi, Pg. xii, Pd. xxvi.
37 For a recent and well documented survey of the literature concerning Nimrod, see K. van der Toorn, P.W. van der Horst, “Nimrod Before and After the Bible,” *HTR* 83, 1990, p. 1-29.
38 *Recherches sur le manichéisme*, vol. 1 (*La cosmogonie manichéenne d’après Théodore Bars Khôni*), Bruxelles, 1908, p. 74.
and more recently A. Böhlig, Fr. Wiese, P. Labib, and G.A.G. Stroumsa already identified this biblical character with Namrael (mentioned in Theodor bar Konai’s Liber Scholiorum and Nebrūēl (known through Michael the Syrian, Priscillian of Avila, and the Gospel of the Egyptians – NH III,57,18; 2245), the consort, in one of the Manichaean anthropogenic myths, of Ašaqūn (correlate of the Gnostic demiurge Saklas and mother of Adam and Eve. Following a well-represented tradition of scholarship, Williams goes further and finds another avatar of the re-mythicised Nimrod / Nebrod in the Mandean demoness Namrus (Rūḥā), who, together with her sons —the seven planets—, embodies the evil forces of the creation. Yet it is just as true that the phonetic mutations implied by the identification of Βεροῦθ with Νεβρῶδ remain unexplained.

Berouth is actually an ancient god of the Phoenician theogony, if we are to believe Philo of Byblos. According to his Phoenician History, Bêrouth (Βηροῦθ) —that is the Greek rendering of the name— is the spouse of Elioun (Ἐλιοῦν), “called the Most High, (…) who settled the area around Byblos”50. This primeval divine couple gives birth to Epigeius, or Autochthon —later called Ouranos (Heaven)—, and Gê (Earth), and lies at the origin of the Phoenician pantheon, populated by the descendants of the incestuous union between Ouranos and his sister Gê. Philo of Byblos (PE 1.10.15) and Nonnus of Panopolis (Dionysiaca XLI,364–367)52 describe Bêrouth (called by Nonnus Βερόν, the name by which Beirut is known in the 5th century)53 as

42 Cumont (Recherches…, op. cit., p. 42, n. 3, and 74) considers Namrael and Nebrūēl a one and the same Babylonian demon who, once the Babylonian Manicheism penetrated the Roman world, was assimilated to the already demonised Nimrod. The latter assumption was criticised by G.A.G. Stroumsa, Another Seed…, op. cit., p. 160, n. 79. The identity of the two characters is supported by Theodor bar Konai’s text which mentions the name under different spellings: Ἐλιοῦν, Ἐλιοῦν, Ἐλιοῦν.
45 The first half of the name is lost in a lacuna; the first edition to restore it is that of A. Böhlig, Fr. Wiese, P. Labib, The Nag Hammadi… op. cit.: p. 122.
46 For this identification, see Fr. Cumont, Recherches…, op. cit., p. 73–74.
47 Cf. J.C. Reeves, Heralds…, op. cit., p. 98, n. 73.
50 Eusebius of Caesarea, Praeparatio Evangelica 1.10.15, ed. cit., p. 46–47.
the tutelary deity and the personification of the city of Beirut. The connection between the city and its patron goddess is reflected in the coins struck by the former under Elagabalus, on which Beroē is portrayed together with Poseidon, her paredros in Berytus’ mythology. The same scene is attested almost four centuries earlier, in the xenon belonging to the temple of the establishment of Poseidonists in Delos. It is the episode of Poseidon’s seduction of Beroē, a nymph daughter of Kythereia (Aphrodite) and Assyrian Adonis (Dionysiaca XLI.155), given by Zeus as bride to the Earth-shaker (Dionysiaca XLIII.372). The mosaic of Lillebonne apparently displays the same motif. In any case, Philo’s and Nonnus’ assertions suggest a common origin for the toponym and the theonym. Now, the etymology of Beirut is well established: Ake. URU. Be-ru-ta, KUR. bi-ru-tu, and KUR. bi-ru-ul-tu, as well as Can. Bērōt (MT Bi-ˀr bēr [ < *bi’r, MT Bi-ˀa-ru-û]), Eg. Bi-ru-ta (in syllabic writing 𓊻 𓊺 𓊹 𓊷 𓊴 𓊶), P. Anast. I 20,8),

57 Cf. ibid., p. 227.
Gr. Βηρυτος and Βηρυθος, Lat. Beritus and Birito, Syr. بِرُوُتُ and Ar. بيروت, all stem from the Ug. Bʾurṭ, “wells.”63 The same toponym, Bi-ˀa-ru-tu, designating however another town of the Canaanite-speaking region, is mentioned in Jo 9:17, 18:25, and 2 Sm 4:2.64 To return to the Can. bērōt of the derivational chain of Beirut, it implies the meaning “wells” for the hieronym Bērouth and so the name transfer from the city to the goddess. Indeed it is not only the name of the nymph that is related to the water; among other details offered by the myth related by Nonnus, the iconography of Berōc systematically represents her bearing a pitcher. It is certainly not without reason that, in his Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes, Eustathius of Thessalonica connects the name of the city to the sea.65

Two other hypotheses have been advanced concerning the meaning of the toponym Bērouth, mentioned in the Phoenician History. For Ernest Renan, both Elioun and Bērouth are definitely Semitic names: in the former he recognises — quite rightly —66 Βηρυθ, “the Most High” of Gn 14:19, translated by Philo “Yahweh” (PE 110.15), and in the latter Bi-ˀa-ru-tu, a deity worshiped by the inhabitants of Sichem, according to Jgs 8:33, 9:4. Renan explains the mutation Bi-ˀa-ru-tu > Bηροθ thus: “Le deuxième mot de cette appellation (i.e. Βηρυθ), étant féminin, a donné lieu de croire qu’elle s’appliquait à une femme.”67 This explanation was not accepted,68 and it is in effect weakened by the fact that the plural remains unexplained.

As for L.B. Paton, he considers Βηροθ as an abbreviation of Baˁalat Berūth, “mistress of Beirut” — hieronym unattested —, in view of the fact that in Aramaic Bvرو would mean “cypress.”69 For precision’s sake, one should note that the Aramaic actually transmits two lexemes that correspond to this meaning, the spellings of which are Sw=wryb and Sw=wryb respectively. The Aramaic etymology this proposal invites is worthy of attention.

it is Bi-ˀa-ru-tu [Sw=wryb twOr]tfrfb@; another toponym of Thutmose III’s Topographical List [no. 109], that stems from Bi-ˀa-ru-tu. This identification was disputed by G. Maspero who locates Bi-ˀa-ru-tu “dans la région que traverse le Jourdain à sa sortie du lac de Tibériade” (Études…, op. cit., p. 33). He recognises in this toponym the Bi-ˀa-ru-tu designated by Josephus (Ant. 5,1,18) as location of the battle run by Joshua against the Canaanites, and identifies it with present ‘Ayardūn, in South Lebanon (Études…, op. cit., p. 125-126).
H. Gauthier supports this identification and associates ‘Ayardūn with the Bi-ˀa-ru-tu of Ez 47:16 (Dictionnaire…, op. cit., p. 2). A. Jirku considers that either Bi-ˀa-ru-tu or Bi-ˀ-ra-tu are to be related to the Bi-ˀa-ru-tu of Jos 9:17, 18:25, and 2 Sm 4:2 (Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und tyrischer Ortsnamen in Umschrift und mit historisch-archäologischem Kommentar, Leipzig, 1937, p. 8).
66 Cf., i.e., “W.F. Albright, loc. cit.”
68 Cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, Præparatio evangelica, ed. cit., p. 86.
One has to observe that the etymon of the two aforementioned lexemes, the Akk. *bu-ra-šú* ([GIŠ.LI], [LI.GIŠ], *–*–[E]![E]!), is outstandingly productive in the Semitic field, wherein it leaves lexical traces up to Ge'ez and Gurage. It even found its way into Coptic as the foreignism *يلة* > Βηρουθ would certainly have the phonetic advantage of accounting for the dental fricative /θ/ (whose presence in the hieronym—though not problematic—is not explained by the hypothesis of the etymon Can. *Bērōt*) and the semantic one of a theonymy related to one of the most notorious natural attributes of ancient Beirut’s region, “where—according to Nonnus—grow the big trees; the ivy, in the airs, marries the cypress” (*Dionysiaca* XLI.8–9). This etymology assumes however that between the goddess Bērouth and the city of Beirut there is no semantic connection, given that the meaning of the toponym is assured by its Akkadian forms written in the Amarna Tablets with the sumerogram PÚ meaning “wells” (-[E]! [E]![E]! [E]!, -[E]! [E]! [E]!, -[E]! [E]! [E]!, -[E]! | [E]! | –-[E]! | -[E]! | [E]! | -[E]! | ![E]! ! ![E]! ! ![E]!). In this case, to which no formal objection can be raised, the identification made, on the basis of the above mentioned passage of Philo, between the city of Beirut and the place where the goddess Bērouth would have established herself together with her paredros Elioun, would be erroneous.

The first etymology, that which relates the city of Beirut to the Phoenician deity Bērouth and lends to their respective names the same etymon, Can. *Bērōt*, “wells”, is the most persuasive one from a semasiologic point of view.

Last but not least, a short comment should be made about the sequence ΒΑΡΩΘ within a palindromic *vox magica* in the Apollonian invocation of *PGM* I.262–347: ΑΕΜΙΝΝΑΕΒΑΡΩΘΕΡΡΕΘΩΒΑΒΕΑΝΙΜΕΑ. Prima facie, one could be tempted to consider this a case of glossolalic abracadabra. This category and the ideologically founded preconception which fuelled its career from Epiphanius onwards—he is the first to charge the Gnostics with intentional βαρβαρωνυμία— are seriously called into question by several recent studies dealing with the *voces magicae* and *nomina barbara*. Regardless of the partisan approaches which either refuse any possible signification to these two categories or attach to them meanings at all costs, it is undeniable that these constructions may—and quite a few of them demonstrably do—contain meaningful elements. This is perhaps the case for this *vox magica*, in which the vocalic oscillation €/ʎ does not stand in the way of the identification of Bērōth’s name.

Central to the argument of this paper is rather the Semitic, Eastern-Mediterranean origin of this hieronym, which is assured. \textit{Bēlāmu} is, of course, not the only \textit{nomen barbarum} of Semitic origin.\footnote{This is also the case for Abalphe, Daveithe, Eleleth, Harmozel, Oroiael, Saklas, Samael, Sambathus, Yadlaboth, etc.; cf. M. Roberge, “Paraphrase de Sem. Notes,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier (eds.), Écrits..., op. cit., p. 1100, note at 44,6-45,8; S. Giversen, \textit{Apocryphon Johannis, Acta Theologica Danica} 5, Copenhagen, 1963, p. 185-185; M. Black, “An Aramaic Etymology for Jaldaboth?”, in A.H.B. Logan, A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), \textit{The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert Mc. Wilson}, Edinburgh, 1983, p. 71-72; B. Barc, “L’Hypostase des archontes. Traité gnostique sur l’origine de l’homme, du monde et des archontes (NH II, 4),” in B. Barc, M. Roberge, \textit{L’Hypostase des archontes (NH II, 4). Norea (NH IX, 27,11-29,3). BCNH, section “Textes” 5}, Québec-City/Leuven, 1980, p. 113-114. For Yaldaboth, we must retain Black’s solution; following a suggestion of G. Scholm (\textit{Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition}, 2nd ed., New York, 1965, p. 71-72, n. 23), he interprets this name as “the son of the shame” (\textit{Nānīb bā ḫûrās}). In a subsequent contribution (“Jaldaboth Reconsidered,” in \textit{Mélanges d’histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech}, Paris, 1974, p. 405-421), Scholm proposes a less convincing etymology: \textit{yald-(s)abaoth}. Concerning these names of Semitic aspect, we should however reread this affirmation of E.C. Burkitt: “… the nomenclature does not suggest any real acquaintance with Semitic languages or Semitic alphabets, but only a superstitious veneration for Hebrew names found in the Greek versions of the Old Testament, eked out by scraps of ill-digested bits of Hebrew supplied (no doubt) by Jews” (“Pistis Sophia,” \textit{JTS} 23, 1922, p. 279). H.M. Jackson reinforces the same idea: “In the specific case of the Semitic-looking names their motive may rather, or additionally, have been the desire to endow the possessors of the names with the flavour of authenticity lent by the Hebrew / Aramaic look of the names, which the Sethians used, after all, to designate divine beings with similar functions and origins as those to whom the names are given in the magic papyri” (“The Origin in Ancient Incanτary \textit{Voces Magicae} of Some Names in the Sethian Gnostic System,” \textit{ArOr} 10, 1938, p. 77-78).}

75 Thus \textit{kālīnkōnōx / kālīnkōnōx} (\textit{Pistis Sophia} 137; 147), explained by Th. Hopfnner as “Seele der Finsternis” (\textit{bē ḫûrās}) (“Orientalisch-religionsgeschichtliches aus dem griechischen Zauberpapyri Ägyptens,” \textit{ArOr} 3, 1931, p. 329; id., “Ein neues Θημοκάτσιον. Über die sonstigen Θημοκάτσιον, Κάτσιον, Παπστικά und φιμωτικά der griechischen Zauberpapyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Fluchtafeln,” \textit{ArOr} 10, 1938, p. 134).
role in the Gnostic history of salvation. With “the ruler of Hades,” they are those to whom Jesus is delivered after his condemnation to death by Pilate and those over whom he triumphs (41,28–42,9). Sasabek and Beroth are the kingpins of the Darkness (37,30). Both names hint at water, the former relating to the Egyptian crocodile-god associated particularly with the Fayyum, the latter that of a Phoenician deity described by Nonnus as a nymph. And yet, as in ParaShem I,36–2,1, the “immeasurable (and) incomprehensible” water (37,7–8) is in Great Pow. the symbol and the materialisation of the primordial chaos.

This hellish pair gets its symbolic significance probably not only from the original functions of the divinities to which the two names refer but also from their cultural and religious origins. Celsus leads us to believe that Phoenician cults, or at least Phoenician prophetism, were not the most esteemed religious traditions amongst the educated milieux during the second half of the 2nd century in Alexandria, where Ἀληθὴς Ὄργος but also Great Pow. were written. On the other hand, among Alexandrian Jews the contempt for Egyptian idolatry is at least as old as the Wisdom of Solomon. Writings such as 3 Maccabees, the Letter of Aristeas, the Sibylline Oracles, as well as Philo express it openly. Another Nag Hammadi text, of Jewish or Judaising origin, The Thunder: Perfect Mind (16,6–7), mirrors the same rebuke of Egyptian idolatry. These two treatises, transmitted in the same codex, Great Pow. and Thund., inherit in a direct line the pre-Christian Jewish polemic over idolatry.

---

79 Origen, Contra Celsum VII,9, ed., trans. and notes M. Borret, SourcChr 150, p. 34-35.
80 Fr.E. Williams (Mental..., op. cit., p. lxii) places the origin of one of the sources of Great Pow. — the “Christian Instruction” — in Egypt. Albeit the distinction made by Williams between the sources of the Christian and Non-Christian material in Great Pow. remains to be proved conclusively (see the criticism expressed by J.-P. Mahé, M. Desjardins, M. Roberge, “L’entendement de notre Grande Puissance. Notice,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier [eds.], Écrits..., op. cit., p. 902, n. 1), his argument for the Egyptian provenance of the treatise or of part of it (the etymology of Sasabek) is credible, yet inadequately handled, as I hope to have shown.