



# BULLETIN DE L'INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

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

9782724710069	<i>Gebel el-Zeit III</i>	Georges Castel
9782724709926	<i>Ouadi el-Jarf I</i>	Pierre Tallet, Grégory Marouard, Damien Laisney
9782724710427	<i>Ermant III</i>	Christophe Thiers
9782724710144	<i>Documentary Papyri from the Fouad Collection at the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (P.Fouad II 90-100)</i>	Mohamed Gaber Elmaghrabi
9782724710007	<i>Représentations et symbolique de la guerre et de la paix dans le monde arabe</i>	Sylvie Denoix (éd.), Salam Diab-Duranton (éd.)
9782724710038	<i>Les textes de la pyramide de la reine Ânkhessenpépy II</i>	Bernard Mathieu
9782724709889	<i>Proceedings of the 14th International Conference for Nubian Studies</i>	Marie Millet (éd.), Vincent Rondot (éd.), Frédéric Payraudeau (éd.), Pierre Tallet (éd.)
9782724710182	<i>Bulletin de liaison de la céramique égyptienne 32</i>	Sylvie Marchand (éd.)

## 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:

ⲕⲩⲱ ⲕⲩⲧⲁⲗⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲓ ⲛⲉⲁⲥⲁⲃⲉⲕ | ⲕⲉⲛⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧⲟ (Cherix 1993)<sup>1</sup>

*Et Il fut remis à Sasabek et Berōth.* (Schenke 1985)<sup>2</sup>

Prior to Schenke, who proposes this reading in a review of Cherix's study of *Great Pow.*,<sup>3</sup> the interpretation of this passage was determined by the analysis of ⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧ as a variant of *BFSLA* ⲃⲁⲣⲱⲧ / ⲃⲁⲣⲟⲧ (var. ⲥⲃⲗⲱⲧ), “brass, bronze”,<sup>4</sup> based on the analogy established by the first editor<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> P. CHERIX, *Concordance des textes de Nag Hammadi. Le codex VI, BCNH*, section “Concordances” 2, Sainte-Foy/Leuven–Paris, 1993, p. 439, 441.

<sup>2</sup> H.-M. SCHENKE, Review of P. Cherix, *Le Concept de notre grande puissance (CGVI, 4): texte, remarques philologiques, traduction et notes*, OBO 47, 1982, in *Enchoria* 13, 1985, p. 237–238.

<sup>3</sup> The reference by Schenke to the “sieben Bronzemünzen” of Krause’s

translation—who renders “neun”—is a typographical error.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. W.E. CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford, 1939, p. 43b–44a; R. KASSER, *Compléments au dictionnaire copte de Crum*, BEC 7, 1964, p. 9a.

<sup>5</sup> M. KRAUSE, P. LABIB, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI, ADAIK, Koptische Reihe* 2, Glückstadt, 1971, p. 157b.

- Krause–Labib 1971 (*editio princeps*)

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲗⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲓ ⲛⲉⲁⲥⲁⲃⲉⲕ | ⲁⲩⲉⲛⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧⲓ ⲛ̅  
*Und sie | lieferten ihn aus an Sasabek | für neun Bronzemünzen.*<sup>6</sup>

- Wisse–Williams 1979

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲗⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲓ ⲛⲉⲁⲥⲁⲃⲉⲕ | ⲁⲩⲉⲛⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧⲓ ⲛ̅  
*And they handed | him over to Sasabek | for nine bronze coins.*<sup>7</sup>

- Cherix 1982

*Et Il fut remis à Sasabek pour 9 pièces de bronze.*<sup>8</sup>

- Wisse 1996

*And they handed | him over to Sasabek | for nine bronze coins.*<sup>9</sup>

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.*,<sup>10</sup> this reading raises several problems, as Schenke has demonstrated:

1. the word ⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧⲓ 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 ⲁ̅ does not have the meaning “for.”

These considerations invalidate *per se* the reading ⲁ̅ⲩⲉⲛⲃⲉⲣⲱⲧⲓ ⲛ̅ and the translation “for nine bronze coins.” Nevertheless, they were not immediately taken into account:<sup>11</sup> even if French-speaking scholars embraced them (Cherix 1993<sup>12</sup> and Roberge 2007<sup>13</sup>), the editions

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Fr. WISSE, Fr.E. WILLIAMS, “The Concept of Our Great Power. VI,4: 36,1–48,15”, in D.M. Parrott (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2–5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*, NHS II, Leiden, 1979, p. 308–309.

<sup>8</sup> P. CHERIX, *Le Concept de notre grande puissance (CGVI, 4): texte, remarques philologiques, traduction et notes*, OBO 47, 1982, p. 16.

<sup>9</sup> Fr.E. WILLIAMS, Fr. WISSE, D.M. PARROTT, “The Concept of Our Great Power (VI,4)”, in J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 4th ed., Leiden–New York–Köln, 1996, p. 314.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> The reading of Krause–Labib 1971 was adopted by several studies of which I will list here only three: J.-M. SEVRIN, *Le dossier baptismal séthien: étude sur la sacramentaire gnostique*, BCNH, Section “Études” 2, Québec-City, 1986, p. 156, n. 29; C.A. EVANS, R.L. WEBB, R.A. WIEBE (eds.), *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible. A Synopsis and Index*, *New Testament Tools and Studies* 18, Leiden–New York–Köln, 1993, p. 277; A. PIÑERO, J. MONTSERRAT TORRENTS, Fr. GARCIA

BAZÁN, F. BERMEJO, M.L. MANGADO, A. QUEVEDO, *Textos gnósticos. Biblioteca de Nag Hammadi*, vol. 3 (*Apocalipsis y otros escritos*), *Colección Paradigmas: Biblioteca de Ciencias de las Religiones* 27, Madrid, 2000, p. 125.

<sup>12</sup> See *supra*.

<sup>13</sup> M. ROBERGE, “L’entendement de notre Grande Puissance. Traduction,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier (eds.), *Écrits gnostiques. La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi, BiPleïade* 538, Paris, 2007, p. 915: “Puis il fut remis à Sasabek et à Berotth”; M. DESJARDINS, M. ROBERGE, “L’entendement de notre Grande Puissance. Notes,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier (eds.), *Écrits... op. cit.*, p. 915.

which resulted from the work of the Institute of Antiquity and Christianity of Claremont did not adopt them until 2007.<sup>14</sup>

The only grammatically acceptable interpretation of the passage is that suggested by Schenke, who reads  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  as a variant of the preposition  $L\ \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$ , “and,” itself an alternative form of  $L\ \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{N}$ : “Et Il fut remis à Sasabek et Berōth.”<sup>15</sup> However, this reading requires some comments, which have already been expressed by W.-P. Funk. Whether it is a “vocalisation” de la variante  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$ – or a “sahidisation” superficielle de la variante  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{N}$ –,<sup>16</sup> the form  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  poses a dialectal problem in a text which—to an as-yet undetermined extent—can be defined as Sahidic. Indeed,  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{N}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$  are attested solely in the dialect  $L_4$ , where the former is much better represented.<sup>17</sup> The presence of  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  in *Great Pow.* is to be explained, according to Funk—and this analysis was not called into question—, by an  $L_4$  background of the text (qualified by Funk with a word that suggests a certain history of the text transmission: “traces”). The occurrence in the *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* (NH VI,1) of a preposition  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$ , variant of the  $S\ \mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$ , could lend support to the first of the two solutions proposed by Funk for the  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  of *Great Pow.*, i.e. that of the re-vocalisation of  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$ . If elsewhere in the text of *AcPer12Ap* the preposition  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$  maintains its classic form, in 6,23 it appears as  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  (6,23b–24a:  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}|\overline{\Theta}\ \overline{\mathfrak{N}}\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{O}$ ), whereby  $\mathfrak{E}$  notes an anaptyxis of /ε/ rather than a Northern written form of the *Murmelvokal*.<sup>18</sup> However, Funk opts in this case for the former explanation, that of a Northern vocalisation, and draws a parallel between  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  and the form interpreted by him as “bohārisante” of the following numeral ( $\overline{\Theta}$  for  $\mathfrak{V}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{C}$  in 6,24a). This Bohairic or Bohairic-like dialectal “nest” of *AcPer12Ap* is, for Funk, an argument for an initial stage of the transmission of this text related to a “dialecte nord-égyptien (près du bohārique).”<sup>19</sup> The fact remains that variants of this preposition comprising an epsilon, equally adventitious, so to speak, as that occurring in *AcPer12Ap*, are attested in Sahidic texts which do not exhibit other Northern features.<sup>20</sup>

These remarks are essential for the following discussions.

<sup>14</sup> M. MEYER, “The Concept of Our Great Power. Translation,” in *id.* (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Scriptures. The International Edition*, New York, 2007, p. 398: “They gave him over to Sasabek and Berōth.”

<sup>15</sup> See *supra*.

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 25, n. 104.






<sup>18</sup> In *F* it can be spelled  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  (in complementary distribution with  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{N}$ ,  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{N}$ ,  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}$  and  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{H}$ ) and in *B* it is always written  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$ ; cf. W.E. CRUM, *A Coptic...*, *op. cit.*, p. 683a.

<sup>19</sup> W.-P. FUNK, “L’orthographe...,” *op. cit.*, p. 24–25.

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. S. GIVERSEN, “Acrostical St. Menas-Hymn in Sahidic,” *AcOr* (C) 23, 1959, p. 21; G.P. SOBHY, “Two Leaves in the Coptic Dialect of Middle Egypt (S F<sup>1</sup>),” in *Mélanges Maspero*, vol. 2 (*Orient grec, romain et byzantin*), MIFAO 67, 1935, p. 246; W.C. TILL,

“Ein sahidisches Baruch-Fragment,” *Le Muséon* 46, 1933, p. 36 (II), 37 (13<sup>33</sup>, 22), 38 (26). The preposition  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{N}$  appears also in a graffito of the Dayr Muṣṭafā Kāšif monastery in Kharga Oasis. The graffito, still unpublished, begins with the invocation  $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{N}\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{E}$ , 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 graffites coptes et copto-grecs*, forthcoming at the Institut français d’archéologie orientale.

Prior attempts to explain this name relate it either to the Egyptian god Sobek<sup>21</sup> or to “l’arbre de Sabek’ (LXX Gn 22,13), symbole de la croix”.<sup>22</sup> 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.”<sup>23</sup> 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,”<sup>24</sup> 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.”<sup>25</sup> 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.”<sup>26</sup> 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*.<sup>27</sup>

Sasabek is simply an Egyptian male name, one among many others in a long series of filionyms involving ⲥ-. Transmitted in various spellings (, , , ),<sup>dem.</sup><sup>28</sup>), it is amply attested especially from the Middle Kingdom onwards<sup>29</sup> and

<sup>29</sup> For references, cf. H. RANKE, PN, *loc. cit.* To these occurrences may be added the following: N.K. REICH, "Eine ägyptische Urkunde über den Kauf eines bebauten Grundstückes. Eine Philologisch-Historische Urkunde,"

becomes frequent in Ptolemaic times under the form *sj-sbk*.<sup>30</sup> It is also part of three composed anthroponyms —*sj-sbk šrj* (𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣), *sj-sbk ḥnb(.w)* (𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣), *sj-sbk wḥ(.w)* (𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣)—<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup>

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 *ṣ* 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.”<sup>33</sup>

## BEROth

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<sup>34</sup> to those of Nimrod (𐩢𐩣𐩣𐩠) of Gn 10:8–9, rendered by LXX as Νεβρώδ. It is well established that the LXX, which translates 𐩢𐩣𐩣𐩠 𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠 𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠 (Gn 10:9) by γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον Κυρίου —probably under the influence of the Greek tradition about the giants’ revolt against the Olympian gods<sup>35</sup>—, opens the way for the negative image that the hero of the post-diluvian times takes on up to Dante<sup>36</sup> and beyond.<sup>37</sup> This is the main reason why, prior to Williams, F. Cumont<sup>38</sup>

*Rec Trav* 33, 1911, p. 120, 153–154; A.C. MACE, “A Group of Hitherto Unpublished Scarabs in the Metropolitan Museum, New York,” *JEA* 7, 1921, p. 36 (no. 12); D. DEVAUCHELLE, J.-Cl. GRENIER, “Remarques sur le nome hermonthite à la lumière de quelques inscriptions de Tôd,” *BIFAO* 82, 1982, p. 159.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. E. LÜDDECKENS, H.J. THISEN, W. BRUNSCH, G. VITTMANN, K.-Th. ZAUZICH, *Demotisches Namenbuch*, vol. I.12 (*htp-hr-sn-snw*), Wiesbaden, 1993, p. 904–905.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. H. RANKE, PN, *loc. cit.*

<sup>32</sup> The Coptic person names 𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠 / 𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣 and 𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣 / 𐩱𐩣𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣𐩠𐩢𐩣 (cf. M. HASITZKA, *Namen in koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*,

p. 56a, 87b [[http://www.onb.ac.at/sammlungen/papyrus/publ/kopt\\_namen.pdf](http://www.onb.ac.at/sammlungen/papyrus/publ/kopt_namen.pdf), 22.01.2007]; R.-G. COQUIN, M.-H. RUTSCHOWSKAYA, “Les stèles coptes du Département des antiquités égyptiennes du Louvre,” *BIFAO* 94, 1994, p. 121) are most likely not connected with *sbk*. W. Till (*Datierung und Prosopographie der koptischen Urkunden aus Theben*, *SAWW* 240/1, 1962, p. 81) considers them to be diminutives of Elisabeth.

<sup>33</sup> *Vita Isidori*, ap. PHOTIUM, *Bibliotheca* codd. 181; 242; frag. 99, l. 1, trans. R. ASMUS, *Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos*, *Der philosophischen Bibliothek* 125, Leipzig, 1911, p. 62.

<sup>34</sup> Fr.E. WILLIAMS, *Mental...*, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. C. UEHLINGER, “Nimrod,” in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden–New York–Köln, 1995, p. 1185.

<sup>36</sup> *Divina Commedia Inf.* xxxi, Pg. xii, Pd. xxvi.

<sup>37</sup> 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.

<sup>38</sup> *Recherches sur le manichéisme*, vol. 1 (*La cosmogonie manichéenne d’après Théodore Bar Khôni*), Bruxelles, 1908, p. 74.



and more recently A. Böhlig, Fr. Wisse, P. Labib,<sup>39</sup> and G.A.G. Stroumsa<sup>40</sup> already identified this biblical character with Namrael (mentioned in Theodor bar Koni's *Liber Scholiorum*<sup>41</sup>) and Nebrüel<sup>42</sup> (known through Michael the Syrian,<sup>43</sup> Priscillian of Avila,<sup>44</sup> and the *Gospel of the Egyptians* – NH III,57,18; 22<sup>45</sup>), the consort, in one of the Manichaean anthropogonic myths, of Ašaqḷūn (correlate of the Gnostic demiurge Saklas<sup>46</sup>) and mother of Adam and Eve. Following a well-represented tradition of scholarship,<sup>47</sup> Williams goes further and finds another avatar of the re-mythicised Nimrod / Nebrod in the Mandaean demonness Namrus (Rūhā), who, together with her sons —the seven planets—, embodies the evil forces of the creation.<sup>48</sup> Yet it is just as true that the phonetic mutations implied by the identification of  $\beta\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\theta$  with  $\text{Ne}\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\delta$  remain unexplained.

Beroth is actually an ancient god of the Phoenician theogony, if we are to believe Philo of Byblos. According to his *Phoenician History*, Bērouth (Βηρούθ)<sup>49</sup> —that is the Greek rendering of the name— is the spouse of Elioun (Ἐλιοῦν), “called the Most High, (...) who settled the area around Byblos”.<sup>50</sup> This primeval divine couple gives birth to Epigeius, or Autochton —later called Ouranos (Heaven)—, and Gē (Earth),<sup>51</sup> and lies at the origin of the Phoenician pantheon, populated by the descendants of the incestuous union between Ouranos and his sister Gē. Philo of Byblos (*PE* I.10.15) and Nonnus of Panopolis (*Dionysiaca* XLI.364–367)<sup>52</sup> describe Bērouth (called by Nonnus Βερόη, the name by which Beirut is known in the 5th century)<sup>53</sup> as

<sup>39</sup> *The Nag Hammadi Codices III,2 and IV,2. The Gospel of the Egyptians (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit)*, NHS 4, Leiden, 1975, p. 183.

<sup>40</sup> *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, NHS 24, Leiden, 1984, p. 160, n. 79.

<sup>41</sup> *Theodorus Bar Koni. Liber Scholiorum* II, ed. A. Scher, CSCO 69, *Scriptores Syri* 26, Paris, 1912, p. 317; Fr. CUMONT, *Recherches...*, *op. cit.*, p. 42; H.H. SCHAEFER, R. REITZENSTEIN, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*, *Studien der Bibliothek Warburg* 7, Leipzig–Berlin, 1926, p. 346; A.V.W. JACKSON, *Researches in Manichaeism*, New York, 1932, p. 248–249; G.A.G. STROUMSA, *Another Seed...*, *op. cit.*, p. 159; J.C. REEVES, *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*, *Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies* 41, Leiden–New York–Köln, 1996, p. 79.

<sup>42</sup> Cumont (*Recherches...*, *op. cit.*, p. 42, n. 3, and 74) considers Namrael and Nebrüel a one and the same

Babylonian demon who, once the Babylonian Manichaeism 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 Koni's text which mentions the name under different spellings:  $\text{ܢܡܪܘܬ}$ ,  $\text{ܢܡܪܘܬܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܢܡܪܘܬܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܢܡܪܘܬܐ}$ .

<sup>43</sup> *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche*, ed. J.-B. Chabot, vol. 4, reprinted, Brussels, 1963, p. 118.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. H. CHADWICK, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*, Oxford, 1975, p. 94.

<sup>45</sup> The first half of the name is lost in a lacuna; the first edition to restore it is that of A. BÖHLIG, Fr. WISSE, P. LABIB, *The Nag Hammadi...*, *op. cit.*: p. 122.

<sup>46</sup> For this identification, see Fr. CUMONT, *Recherches...*, *op. cit.*, p. 73–74.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. J.C. REEVES, *Heralds...*, *op. cit.*, p. 98, n. 73.

<sup>48</sup> In this connection, cf. G. FURLANI, “Nimusa, Nimrus e Namrus negli scritti dei Mandeï,” *RAL* ser. 8, 6, 1951, p. 519–531.

<sup>49</sup> EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Preparatio evangelica* I.10.15, ed. H.W. Attridge, R.A. Oden, Jr., *Philo of Byblos, The Phoenician History*, CBQ-Monogr. 9, Washington, 1981, p. 46.

<sup>50</sup> EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Preparatio evangelica* I.10.15, *ed. cit.*, p. 46–47.

<sup>51</sup> For a recent evaluation of the long-debated relation between Philo's work and Hesiod's *Theogony*, see A.I. BAUMGARTEN, “Philo of Byblos,” in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5, New York, 1992, p. 342–343.

<sup>52</sup> Ed. F. Graefe, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1826, p. 380.

<sup>53</sup> On the relation between the two Greek names of the city, see G.F. HILL, “Some Graeco-Phoenician Shrines,” *JHS* 31, 1911, p. 58, n. 9.





Gr. Βήρυ(τ)ός and Βήρυθος, Lat. *Beritus* and *Birito*, Syr. ܒܝܪܝܬ and ܒܝܪܝܬ, and Ar. بيروت, all stem from the Ug. *B'urt*, “wells.”<sup>63</sup> The same toponym, ܒܝܪܝܬ, designating however another town of the Canaanite-speaking region, is mentioned in Jo 9:17, 18:25, and 2 Sm 4:2.<sup>64</sup> To return to the Can. *bērōt* of the derivational chain of Beirut, it implies the meaning “wells” for the hieronym Bērōuth 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 Beroë 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.<sup>65</sup>

Two other hypotheses have been advanced concerning the meaning of the theonym Bērōuth, mentioned in the *Phoenician History*. For Ernest Renan, both Elioun and Bērōuth are definitely Semitic names: in the former he recognises —quite rightly—<sup>66</sup> עֶלְיֹון, “the Most High” of Gn 14:19, translated by Philo Ὑψιστος (*PE* 1.10.15), and in the latter בַּעַל בְּרִית, a deity worshiped by the inhabitants of Sichem, according to Jgs 8:33, 9:4. Renan explains the mutation בְּרִית > Βηρούθ thus: “Le deuxième mot de cette appellation (*i.e.* בְּרִית), étant féminin, a donné lieu de croire qu’elle s’appliquait à une femme.”<sup>67</sup> This explanation was not accepted,<sup>68</sup> and it is in effect weakened by the fact that the plural remains unexplained.

As for L.B. Paton, he considers Βηρούθ as an abbreviation of Ba‘alat Bērūth, “mistress of Beirut” or “mistress of the cypress” —hieronym unattested—, in view of the fact that in Aramaic *Bārōth* would mean “cypress.”<sup>69</sup> For precision’s sake, one should note that the Aramaic actually transmits two lexemes that correspond to this meaning, the spellings of which are ܒܪܝܬܐ and ܒܪܝܬܐ respectively. The Aramaic etymology this proposal invites is worthy of attention.

it is *Bi-’ru-tu* [𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕], another toponym of Thutmose III’s Topographical List [no. 109], that stems from ܒܝܪܝܬ). This identification was disputed by G. Maspero who locates *Bi-’a-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 ܒܝܪܝܬ designated by Josephus (*Ant.* 5,1,18) as location of the battle run by Joshua against the Canaanites, and identifies it with present ‘Aytarūn, in South Lebanon (*Études...*, *op. cit.*, p. 125-126). H. Gauthier supports this identification and associates ‘Aytarūn with the ܒܪܝܬ of Ez 47:16 (*Dictionnaire...*, *op. cit.*, p. 2). A. Jirku considers that either *Bi-’a-ru-tu* or *Bi-’ru-tu* are to be related to the ܒܝܪܝܬ of Jos 9:17, 18:25, and 2 Sm 4:2 (*Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen in Umschrift und mit historisch-archäologischem*

*Kommentar*, Leipzig, 1937, p. 8). W.F. Albright equals *Bi-’a-ru-tu* with the Περύωθ (var. Περύθα) of the LXX version of Jos 19:19 (“The Topography of the Tribe of Issachar,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44, 1926, p. 229). R. Hannig (*Großes Handwörterbuch...*, *op. cit.*, p. 1137) distinguishes between 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕, which he identifies with al-Bira, a locality in Syria-Palestine, and 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕, which he tentatively identifies with Berut, north of al-Ṣanamayn in Bashan.

<sup>63</sup> 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕; cf. Ch. VIROLLEAUD, *Le palais royal d’Ugarit*, vol. 2 (*Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales*), *MRasShamra* 7, 1957, p. 18. See also N. JIDEJIAN, E. LIPÍŃSKI, “Beyrouth,” in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique*, [Turnhout], 1992, p. 71. The Ugaritic toponym underlies as well the personal name Birtn / Bīrutanu; see

Fr. GRÖNDAHL, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, Rome, 1967, p. 27, 114.

<sup>64</sup> In this regard, see P. DHORME, “Amarna (Lettres d’el-Amarna),” *SDB* 1, 1928, col. 212; M.E. MOULTON, “Beeroth,” in D.N. Freedman, A.C. Myers, A.B. Beck (eds.), *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, Grand Rapids (Mich.), 2000, p. 160-161.

<sup>65</sup> Ed. E. Henri, W. Hill, London, 1688, p. 168 (911).

<sup>66</sup> Cf., *i.a.*, W.F. ALBRIGHT, *loc. cit.*

<sup>67</sup> E. RENAN, *Mémoire sur l’origine et le caractère véritable de l’Histoire phénicienne qui porte le nom de Sanchoniathon*, *MAIBL* 23, 1858, p. 269.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, *Præparatio evangelica*, *ed. cit.*, p. 86.

<sup>69</sup> L.B. PATON, “Sanchuniathon,” in J. Hastings, J.A. Selbie (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. II, New York, 1920, p. 179b.



Central to the argument of this paper is rather the Semitic, Eastern-Mediterranean origin of this hieronym, which is assured. ΒΕΡΩΤΘ is, of course, not the only *nomen barbarum* of Semitic origin.<sup>75</sup> Hybrid names, at once Hebrew and Greek or Coptic, are also present,<sup>76</sup> as well as purely Greek<sup>77</sup> or Egyptian names in the vein of ΣΑΚΑΒΕΚ.<sup>78</sup> 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

<sup>75</sup> This is also the case for Abalphe, Daveithe, Eleleth, Harmozel, Oroiael, Saklas, Samael, Sambathas, Yaldabaoth, 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. 183-185; M. BLACK, "An Aramaic Etymology for Jaldabaoth?," in A.H.B. Logan, A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. 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, *L'Hypostase des archontes (NH II, 4)*. *Norea (NH IX, 27,11-29,5)*, *BCNH*, section "Textes" 5, Québec-City/Leuven, 1980, p. 113-114. For Yaldabaoth, we must retain Black's solution; following a suggestion of G. Scholem (*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" (לִדְ בְּהוּתָא), wherein \*לִדְ בְּהוּתָא < \*לִדְ בְּהוּתָא. In a subsequent contribution ("Jaldabaoth Reconsidered," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*, Paris, 1974,

p. 405-421), Scholem proposes a less convincing etymology: *yald-(s)abaoth*. Concerning these names of Semitic aspect, we should however reread this affirmation of F.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 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 Incantatory *Voces Magicae* of Some Names in the Sethian Gnostic System," *VigChr* 43, 1989, p. 77-78).

<sup>76</sup> A good example of mixed theonymy is Aberamenthō, built of אֲבֵרָתָא + qw(o)uq, "Thot, mighty of the waters"; cf. M. TARDIEU, "Aberamenthō," 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 etymons. The Egyptian origin proposed by Jackson (< *imntt*, *AMENTE*; *ibid.*, p. 70) does not explain the first part of the name; it remains highly conjectural.

<sup>77</sup> 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.

<sup>78</sup> Thus ΒΑΪΝΧΩΩΩΧ / ΧΑΪΝΧΩΩΩΧ (*Pistis Sophia* 137; 147), explained by Th. Hopfner as "Seele der Finsternis" (*b; n kkw*) ("Orientalisch-religionsgeschichtliches aus den griechischen Zauberpapyri Aegyptens," *ArOr* 3, 1931, p. 329; *id.*, "Ein neues Θυμοκάτοχον. Über die sonstigen θυμοκάτοχοι, κάτοχοι, ὑποτακτικά und φιωτικά 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,<sup>79</sup> where Ἀληθὴς Λόγος but also *Great Pow.*<sup>80</sup> 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<sup>81</sup> express it openly. Another Nag Hammadi text, of Jewish or Judaizing origin,<sup>82</sup> *The Thunder: Perfect Mind* (16,6–7),<sup>83</sup> 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.

<sup>79</sup> ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum* VII,9, ed., trans. and notes M. Borret, *SourcChr* 150, p. 34–35.

<sup>80</sup> 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.

<sup>81</sup> On this topic, see P. BORGES, *Philo of Alexandria, an Exegete for His Time*,

*NovTest-Suppl.* 86, Leiden, 1997, p. 44, 187, 234.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. P.-H. POIRIER, “Le Tonnerre, Intellect parfait. Notice,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier (eds.), *Écrits...*, *op. cit.*, p. 847.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. P.-H. POIRIER, “Le Tonnerre, Intellect parfait. Notes,” in J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier (eds.), *Écrits...*, *op. cit.*, p. 857, note at 16,6–9.

