BIFAO 110 (2010), p. 91-101

Victor Ghica

Sasabek and Beroth (NHVI,41,28–30): A Theonymic Mixed Marriage

Conditions d’utilisation

L’utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l’éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l’éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

9782724707342 Recherches sur la statuaire royale de la XIXe dynastie Hourig Sourouzian
9782724707700 La chapelle-reposoir de barque de Philippe Arrhidée Christophe Thiers, Charlie Labarta, Anaïs Tillier
9782724707618 The Island City of Tinnis Alain L. Gascoigne
9782724707991 BAEFE
9782724707830 BIFAO 120
9782724707724 French Archaeology in Egypt Laurent Coulon (éd.), Mélanie Cressent (éd.)
9782724707731 Ports and Fortifications Stéphane Pradines (éd.)

© Institut français d’archéologie orientale - Le Caire
Sasabek and Beroth (NH VI, 41, 28–30)
A Theonymic Mixed Marriage

Victor Ghica

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 perspective of 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:

\[
\text{Ἀγὸς Ἰησοῦς Ἡσακαβὲ καὶ Ἀρθὼν Ἡρότω (Cherix 1993)^1}
\]

*Et Il fut remis à Sasabek et Berōth. (Schenke 1985)^2*

Prior to Schenke, who proposes this reading in a review of Cherix’s study of *Great Pow.*,^3^ the interpretation of this passage was determined by the analysis of Ἁρότω as a variant of *BFSLA* Ἁρότω / Ἁρότω (var. Ἁρότω), “brass, bronze”,^4^ based on the analogy established by the first editor^5^ with Mt 26:15; 27:3:

This article is based on a paper presented at the Fifth Seminar of the Nordic Nag Hammadi and Gnosticism Network (NNGN), held in Helsinki, August 10–17, 2008. I am indebted to my colleague Professor Boyo Okinga who read the proofs of this article and made several useful suggestions.

---

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)

\( \text{ΑΥΔ ΑΥΤΑΛΜ ΕΤΟΟΤΡ ἩΣΑΚΑΒΕΚ ό} \)

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

Wisse–Williams 1979

\( \text{ΑΥΔ ΑΥΤΑΛΜ ΕΤΟΟΤΡ ἩΣΑΚΑΒΕΚ ό} \)

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

Cherix 1982

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

Wisse 1996

And they handed \( \text{him over to Sasabek} \) 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 \( \text{ΒΑΡΙΩΤΟΟ} \) 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 \( \text{Αφ} \) does not have the meaning “for.”

These considerations invalidate \textit{per se} the reading \( \text{ΑΦΗΝ ΒΑΡΙΩΤΟΟ} ό \) and the translation “for nine bronze coins.” Nevertheless, they were not immediately taken into account: even if French-speaking scholars embraced them (Cherix 1993\(^12\) and Roberge 2007\(^13\)), the editions

---

\(^6\) Ibid.


\(^8\) P. Cherix, \textit{Le Concept de notre grande puissance} (CGVI, 4): texte, remarques 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 A2EH\* as a variant of the preposition L A2H\*; “and,” itself an alternative form of L A2H\*: “Et il fut remis à Sasabek et Beroth.”\footnote{15 See supra.} However, this reading requires some comments, which have already been expressed by W.-P. Funk. Whether it is a “vocalisation’ de la variante A2H\* – or a “sahidisation’ superficielle de la variante A2AH\*,”\footnote{16 See BIFAO en ligne} the form A2EH\* poses a dialectal problem in a text which —to an as-yet undetermined extent— can be defined as Sahidic. Indeed, A2AH\* and A2H\* are attested solely in the dialect L4, where the former is much better represented.\footnote{17 Cf. ibid., p. 25, n. 104.}

The presence of A2EH\* in \textit{Great Pow.} is to be explained, according to Funk —and this analysis was not called into question—, by an L4 background of the text (qualified by Funk with a word that suggests a certain history of the text transmission: “traces”). The occurrence in the \textit{Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles} (NH VI.1) of a preposition 2EH\*, variant of the S 2H*, could lend support to the first of the two solutions proposed by Funk for the A2EH\* of \textit{Great Pow.}, i.e. that of the re-vocalisation of 2H*. If elsewhere in the text of AcPe12Ap the preposition 2H* maintains its classic form, in 6,23 it appears as 2EH* (6,23b–24a: 2EH* ᾅPO), whereby ε notes an anaptyxis of ἄεί rather than a Northern written form of the Murmelvokal.\footnote{18 In \textit{F} it can be spelled 2EH* (in complementary distribution with ἃεί, ἄης, ἄης and ἄης) and in \textit{B} it is always written ἄης; cf. W.E. Crum, \textit{A Coptic Vocabulary}, p. 683a.}

However, Funk opts in this case for the former explanation, that of a Northern vocalisation, and draws a parallel between the preposition 2EH* and the form interpreted by him as “bohaïrisante” of the following numeral (Orden for ἄεί in 6,24a). This Bohairic or Bohairic-like dialectal “nest” of AcPe12Ap is, for Funk, an argument for an initial stage of the transmission of this text related to a “dialekte nord-égyptien (près du bohaïrique).”\footnote{19 Cf. supra.} The fact remains that variants of this preposition comprising an epsilon, equally adventitious, so to speak, as that occurring in AcPe12Ap, are attested in Sahidic texts which do not exhibit other Northern features.\footnote{20 See supra.}

These remarks are essential for the following discussions.
Prior attempts to explain this name relate it either to the Egyptian god Sobek\(^\text{21}\) or to “l’arbre de Sabek (LXX Gn 22,13), symbole de la croix”.\(^\text{22}\) An *ad hoc* Middle Persian etymology was also proposed, which interprets this name—pretending to stem from an unattested *sās-ābig*—as “aqueous bug,” “a Gnostic Charon flowing in the waters of hell-river.”\(^\text{23}\) 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,”\(^\text{24}\) personifies “the worm that refuses to 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.”\(^\text{25}\) 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.”\(^\text{26}\) 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.\(^\text{27}\)

Sasabek is simply an Egyptian male name, one among many others in a long series of filionyms involving ω-4. Transmitted in various spellings (ṣās-ābīg, ṣās-ābig, ṣāsābīg, ṣāsābig, ṣˀsˀs ˀp), it is amply attested especially from the Middle Kingdom onwards\(^\text{29}\) and are too badly known to demonstrate the borrowing MP “sās-ābig > *cacabek*”. Nevertheless, several Persian etymons prove that /g/ becomes in Sahidic Coptic /c/ (e.g. *S ṭaḥḥēh* and var., \(\text{BA} \ ṭaḥḥēh\) and var., “crystal, glass” < NP ṭāḥēh\(^\text{6}\); *S ṭa[h]hēh, “tin* < \(\text{BA} + \text{NP} \ ṭāḥēh\) ; \(\text{SC} \ ṭa[h]hēh\) and var., \(\text{BA} \ ṭa[h]hēh\) “hare” < NP ṭāḥēh\(^\text{6}\) and only once /k/ (kī) (SA kāabarā, “earring” < NP kāabarā\(^\text{28}\)) ; 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 é TYPOGRAPHIQUE de la langue copte,* Leuven, 1983, p. 32, 91a, 97a, 343b. It should also be noted that Albrile gives an erroneous reading of the passage 41,28–30 (“Oltre…” *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.

---


\(^\text{22}\) M. Desjardins, M. Roberge, “L’entendement…” *op. cit.*, p. 915.

\(^\text{23}\) M. Desjardins, M. Roberge, “L’entendement…,” *loc. cit.*

\(^\text{24}\) E. Albrile, “Oltre le soglie di Ade. Un *excursus* mitografico,” *Laur 47,* 2006, p. 346. The same interpretation is given in: *id., “Coptic 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 “sās-ābig [‘sib] *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-štḥk.\textsuperscript{30} It is also part of three composed anthroponyms —ṣȝ-štḥk ṣrj (気軽に), ṣȝ-štḥk ṣḥ(.n) (気軽に), ṣȝ-štḥk wȝḥ (.w) (気軽に)\textsuperscript{33} and, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods when it is largely documented, it is rendered by Σἰσοῦχος, “the son of (the god) Suchos,” Σοῦχος being the Greek name of Sobek.\textsuperscript{32}

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 ḫ points to an archaic hieroglyphic source, which opens new perspectives for the study of the background of the text’s redactor 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.”\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{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\textsuperscript{34} to those of Nimrod (\(\text{Namele} \)) of Gn 10:8–9, rendered by LXX as Νεβρώδ. It is well established that the LXX, which translates Νόμιμος (\(\text{Namele} \)) by γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον Κυρίου —probably under the influence of the Greek tradition about the giants’ revolt against the Olympian gods\textsuperscript{35}—, opens the way for the negative image that the hero of the post-diluvian times takes on up to Dante\textsuperscript{16} and beyond.\textsuperscript{37} This is the main reason why, prior to Williams, F. Cumont\textsuperscript{18}
and more recently A. Böhlig, Fr. Wisse, P. Labib, and G.A.G. Stroumsa already identified this biblical character with Namrael (mentioned in Theodor bar Konai’s Liber Scholiorum and Nebrūel (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 anthropogonic myths, of Ašaqlūn (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 Mandeans, of Demen, 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 Bērho with Nebēroth remain unexplained.

Bereth is actually an ancient god of the Phoenician theogony, if we are to believe Philo of Byblos. According to his Phoenician History, Bērōth (Bnρουθ) — that is the Greek rendering of the name — is the spouse of Elioun (Ἐλιοῦν), “the Most High, (…) who settled the area around Byblos”. This primeval divine couple gives birth to Epigeius, or Autochthon — later called Oūranos (Heaven) —, and Gē (Earth), and lies at the origin of the Phoenician pantheon, populated by the descendants of the incestuous union between Oūranos and his sister Gē. Philo of Byblos (PE 1.10.15) and Nonnus of Panopolis (Dionysiaca XLI,364–367) describe Bērōth (called by Nonnus Bepōn, the name by which Beirut is known in the 5th century) as...
the tutelary deity and the personification of the city of Beirut.\textsuperscript{54} 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.\textsuperscript{55} The same scene is attested almost four centuries earlier, in the xenon belonging to the temple of the establishment of Poseidonists in Delos.\textsuperscript{56} It is the episode of Poseidon’s seduction of Beroē, a nymph daughter of Kythereia (Aphrodite) and Assyro-Adonis (\textit{Dionysiaca} XXI,155), given by Zeus as bride to the Earth-shaker (\textit{Dionysiaca} XLIII,372). The mosaic of Lillebonne apparently displays the same motif.\textsuperscript{57} 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: Akk. \textit{URU. be-ru-ta},\textsuperscript{58} KUR.\textit{bi-ru-tu},\textsuperscript{59} and KUR.\textit{bi-ru-ul-tu}\textsuperscript{60}, as well as Can. Bērēt (MT\textsuperscript{60} KUR.bi-ru-ta; sg. bēr [< *biʾr, MT\textsuperscript{60} KUR.bi-ru-tu]),\textsuperscript{56} Eg. Bi-ru-ta (in syllabic writing \textcircled{b}\textcircled{r}\textcircled{a}; P.\textsuperscript{62} Anast. 1,20,8),}\textsuperscript{60} It is the episode of Poseidon’s seduction of Beroē, a nymph daughter of Kythereia (Aphrodite) and Assyro-Adonis (\textit{Dionysiaca} XXI,155), given by Zeus as bride to the Earth-shaker (\textit{Dionysiaca} XLIII,372). The mosaic of Lillebonne apparently displays the same motif.\textsuperscript{57} 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: Akk. \textit{URU. be-ru-ta},\textsuperscript{58} KUR.\textit{bi-ru-tu},\textsuperscript{59} and KUR.\textit{bi-ru-ul-tu}\textsuperscript{60}, as well as Can. Bērēt (MT\textsuperscript{60} KUR.bi-ru-ta; sg. bēr [< *biʾr, MT\textsuperscript{60} KUR.bi-ru-tu]),\textsuperscript{56} Eg. Bi-ru-ta (in syllabic writing \textcircled{b}\textcircled{r}\textcircled{a}; P.\textsuperscript{62} Anast. 1,20,8),\textsuperscript{62} See Fr.J. Chabas, \textit{Voyage d’un Égyptien en Syrie, en Phénicie, en Palestine, etc. au xvi\textsuperscript{e} siècle avant notre ère}, Chalon-sur-Saône, 1866, p. 161-162; M. Burchardt, \textit{Die altkanaanäischen Fremdworte und Eigennamen im aegyptischen}, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1910, no. 366. The designatum of the toponym is well established; cf. W.M. Müller, \textit{Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern}, Leipzig, 1893, p. 184; G. Maspero, \textit{Études de mythologie et d’archéologie égyptiennes}, BiEg 27, vol. 7, 1911, p. 154: E.A.T.W. Budge, \textit{An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary}, vol. 2, London, 1920, p. 978; H. Gauthier, \textit{Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques, vol. 2 (De \textcircled{i} à \textcircled{x})}, Cairo, 1925, p. 25; R. Hanning, \textit{Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch}, Mainz, 2006, p. 1317. The Eg. Bi-ʾa-ru-tu (\textcircled{b}\textcircled{r}\textcircled{a}; K.H. Sethe, \textit{Urkunden der 18. Dynastie}, vol. 3 [Urk. 45], Leipzig, 1907, p. 782) attested by Thutmose III’s Topographical List (no. 19) was also identified with Beirut (A. Mariette, \textit{Les listes géographiques des pylônes de Karnak, comprenant la Palestine, l’Éthiopie, le pays de Somâl}, Leipzig, 1875, p. 19-20; A.Fr. Rainey, “Linguistic Notes on Thutmose III’S Topographical List”, in S. Israelit-Groll [ed.], \textit{Egyptological Studies [Scripta hiero-glyphica] 28}, Jerusalem, 1982, p. 340, 350; for E. Edel \textit{Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III [Bonnener Bibli-}

\textsuperscript{54} On the typology to which this association belongs, cf. P. Gardner, “Countries and Cities in Ancient Art,” \textit{JHS} 9, 1888, p. 55-56.


\textsuperscript{57} Cf. ibid., p. 227.


\textsuperscript{60} RS 17.3.4,14-17 (J. Nougayrol, \textit{Le palais royal d’Ugarit}, vol. 4 [Textes accadiens des archives sud], \textit{MRAiSham 9}, Paris, 1956, p. 162 and pl. 1).

Gr. Βηρυττός and Βήρυθος, Lat. Beritus and Birito, Syr. ܒ阂ܟ and ܒ阂ܡ, and Ar. بِرْوَت, all stem from the Ug. B’urt, “wells.”

The same toponym, ܒ阂ܟ, designating however another town of the Canaanite-speaking region, is mentioned in Jo 9:17, 18:25, and 2 Sm 4:2. To return to the Can. bèrōt of the derivational chain of Beirut, it implies the meaning “wells” for the hieronym Bêrouth 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 Beroē 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.

Two other hypotheses have been advanced concerning the meaning of the theonym Bêrouth, mentioned in the Phoenician History. For Ernest Renan, both Elioun and Bêrouth are definitely Semitic names: in the former he recognises—quite rightly—\(\;\) the Most High” of Gn 14:19, translated by Philo “Ὑψιστος (PE 110.15), and in the latter ܒ阂ܡ, a deity worshiped by the inhabitants of Sichem, according to Jgs 8:33, 9:4. Renan explains the mutation ܒ阂ܢ > ܒ/rs=000; thus: “Le deuxième mot de cette appellation (i.e. ܒ阂ܢ), étant féminin, a donné lieu de croire qu’elle s’appliquait à une femme.”\(\) This explanation was not accepted, and it is in effect weakened by the fact that the plural remains unexplained.

As for L.B. Paton, he considers ܒ/rs=000; as an abbreviation of Baˁalat Bērūth, “mistress of Beirut” or “mistress of the cypress”—hieronym unattested—in view of the fact that in Aramaic Bêrōth would mean “cypress.” For precision’s sake, one should note that the Aramaic actually transmits two lexemes that correspond to this meaning, the spellings of which are ܒ缻 and ܒ缫 respectively. The Aramaic etymology this proposal invites is worthy of attention.
One has to observe that the etymon of the two aforementioned lexemes, the Akk. *bu-ra-shú* ([GIŠ.LI], [LI.GIŠ], [LI.Š], [GIŠ]), 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 ⲛⲓⲧⲗⲓ. The derivation ⲛⲓⲧⲗⲓ > Βηρούθ 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. Βηρώτ) 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 Βηρώθ 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” (\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)\(-\)). 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 Βηρώθ 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 Βηρώθ and lends to their respective names the same etymon, Can. Βηρώτ, “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 ι/λ does not stand in the way of the identification of Βηρώθ’s name.

---

71 Ed. cit., p. 363.
Central to the argument of this paper is rather the Semitic, Eastern-Mediterranean origin of this hieronym, which is assured. ἐρωτόμονος is, of course, not the only nomen barbarum of Semitic origin. Hybrid names, at once Hebrew and Greek or Coptic, are also present, as well as purely Greek or Egyptian names in the vein of θυμοκάτοχοι. What does this Semitic theonymy, so close geographically and culturally to the Jewish-Palestinian world, tell us about Great Pow.? Not necessarily the Jewish origin of the treatise but far more than the diversity of the literature with which the Alexandrian intellectual circles which are the source of Great Pow. were familiar. The hand responsible for these two archon names in Great Pow. knows Philo’s Phoenician History, draws liberally from it a name which is, of course, exotic and barbaric but not meaningless, and marries it with an Egyptian one. The reasons for this marriage, which may appear curious, should be searched for in the personality and origin of the deities to which the names allude.

Indeed, the choice of these two infernal powers’ names in the range of a theonymy associated to Phoenician and Egyptian traditional cults could hardly be considered casual. Great Pow. gives these two archons, the only ones whose names are mentioned in the text, a significant

75 This is also the case for Abalphe, Daveithe, Eleleth, Harmozel, Oroiael, Saklas, Samael, Sambathas, Yaldabaath, 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, Apocryphon Johannis, Acta Theologica Danica 5, Copenhagen, 1963, p. 185-185; M. Black, “An Aramaic Etymology for Jaldabaath?,” in A.H.B. Logan, A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. Wilson (eds.), B. Barc, M. Roberge, L’Hypostase des archontes. Traté gnostique sur l’origine de l’homme, du monde et des archontes (NH II, 4),” in B. Barc, M. Roberge, L’Hypostase des archontes (NH II, 4). Noreaa (NH IX, 27,11-29,5), BCNH, section “Textes” 5, Québec-City/Leuven, 1980, p. 113-114. For Yaldabaath, we must retain Black’s solution; following a suggestion of G. Scholcm (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” (Haθαθαθ, wherein ἀθάνατος < θάνατος). In a subsequent contribution (“Jaldabaath Reconsidered,” in Mélanges d’histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech, Paris, 1974, p. 405-421), Scholcm proposes a less convincing etymology: 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,” 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 endorse 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 papyrus” (“The Name in Ancient Incantatory Voces Magicae of Some Names in the Sethian Gnostic System,” VigChr 43, 1989, p. 77-78).

76 A good example of mixed theonomy is Aberamethô, built of ἀβρα = qr(0)uq, “Thor, mighty of the waters”; cf. M. Tardieu, “Aberamènthô,” in R. van den Broek, M.J. Vermaseren (eds.), Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, EPRO 91, 1981, p. 416. Tardieu’s hypothesis is rejected by Jackson (“The Origin…,” op. cit., p. 78, n. 5) because of its more daring and innovative aspect, i.e. the mixed etonyms. The Egyptian origin proposed by Jackson (cf. ιμωτικά, .ΑΜΗΤΥΣ; ibid., p. 70) does not explain the first part of the name; it remains highly conjectural.

77 Two examples will suffice to illustrate the point: Phorbea and Chloerga (Paraph. Shem 44,16-21); cf. M. Roberge, “Paraphrase…,” op. cit., p. 1100, note at 44,6-45,8.

78 Thus καλός κακός / κακός καλός (Pistis Sophia 137; 147), explained by Th. Hopfner as “Seele der Finsternis” (k2=k kko) (”Orientalisch-religionsgeschichtliches aus dem griechischen Zauberpapyrus Aegyptens,” ArOr 3, 1931, p. 329; id., “Ein neues Óθωμόκατοχον. Über die sonstigen Óθωμόκατοχον, κάτοχον, υποκάτοχον und ϕιοκάτοχον der griechischen Zauberpapyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Fluchtafeln,” 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 Faiyum, the latter that of a Phoenician deity described by Nonnus as a nymph. And yet, as in ParaShem 1,36–2,1, 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,79 where Ἀληθὴς Λόγος but also Great Pow.80 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 Sibyline Oracles, as well as Philo81 express it openly. Another Nag Hammadi text, of Jewish or Judaising origin,82 The Thunder: Perfect Mind (16,6–7),83 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. lxi) 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.