

IDENTITY AND SELF-KNOWLEDGE IN THE SYRIAN THOMAS TRADITION¹

Luther H. Martin

The University of Vermont, U.S.A.

I

In studying both the most admired and the most detested figures in any society, we can see, as seldom through other evidence, the nature of the average man's expectations and hopes for himself. — Peter Brown²

The understanding of a Hellenistic period of history, since its first delineation by J.G. Droysen in the mid-nineteenth century as the result of Alexander's challenge to Persian hegemony, has resulted in a tendency to understand Hellenistic culture as a syncretistic homology. Although common systemic structures are indeed identifiable as defining a Hellenistic culture,³ we must take care not to lose sight of such cultural differences as exist, for example between views of self-identity, within this system.

The emergence of individualism in the Hellenistic world did not signal the promise of potential which characterized Renaissance humanism, but presented rather a problematic to be solved in response to those transformations which characterized the Hellenistic period. A locative image of the cosmos had been replaced by the exploded topography of what came to be termed the Ptolemaic system. The ascent of Alexander's Greco-Macedonian empire had challenged the traditional social conventions of political identity with its imposed but often unrealized cosmopolitan ideals. The collective piety of political allegiance or that of antiestablishment Dionysian *orgia* as portrayed in Euripides' *The Bacchae* gave way to the labyrinthian wanderings of Apuleius' *Lucius*. And the classical speculations of Plato and Aristotle about a metaphysical and cosmological order of things were replaced by the ethical concerns of Hellenistic philosophy. These Hellenistic transformations all generated the question asked of Jesus by the anonymous everyman: "What must I do . . .?" (Mk. 10, 17).

Stoic and gnostic ethics represented alternative responses to the new exigencies of existence represented by the Hellenistic world. Both accepted *heimarmene*, or a natural fate, as the normalizing principle of the cosmos, more than the power of any sovereign, whether emperor or god. And both knew the disastrous effects of the passions, of the sensuous world, for self-knowledge. Neither responded, however, in terms of fixed systems of thought, but represented, rather, antithetical strategies of existence within a contiguous cultural and historical context.

The Stoics applied traditional philosophical values to the new individualism and taught the taming of human passions by self-examination in order to effect a harmonious relation with the external order of things. True freedom was the moral freedom of a philosophical self-knowledge which recognized and conformed to an assumed orderly principle of the cosmos.

Gnostics, on the other hand, represented a Hellenistic strategy of individual existence *par excellence*. They were rarely organized into autonomous institutional forms, if ever, but articulated their perspective through existing religious and

philosophical alternatives.⁴ They repudiated this world, along with its ruling powers, altogether. This anti-cosmic rebellion was based upon their absolute certainty of a knowledge which they believed was revealed from beyond the normalizing cosmic limits of what, hitherto, had been considered possible.⁵

To the new exigencies of existence represented by the Hellenistic world, gnostic thought responded, "know yourself, and you will possess," in the well-known words of the second century Valentinian Gnostic, Theodotus:

knowledge of who we were, and what we have become, where we were or where we were placed, whither we hasten, from what we are redeemed, what birth is and what rebirth. Ex. Theod. 78, 2⁶

Or again, in the words of his contemporary, the gnostic Christian theologian, Clement of Alexandria:

It is then . . . the greatest of all lessons to know one's self. For if one knows himself, he will know God. — Paedagogus, III, 1.⁷

An eastern "gnostic" Thomas tradition, probably centered in Edessa, presents this apostle, contrary to the western canonical tradition of a "doubting" Thomas (Jn. 20, 24-29), as the exemplum of individual self-knowledge.⁸ This tradition can be traced from the *Gospel of Thomas* through a *Book of Thomas*, both from the second codex of the Nag Hammadi library, to the *Acts of Thomas*.⁹

II

Simply saying 'Look towards God' is of no avail without teaching how to look.

— Plotinus¹⁰

The Delphic maxim concerning self-knowledge was widely cited in Greek and Hellenistic literature generally,¹¹ and in gnostic literature specifically.¹² Since the *Alcibiades I*, attributed to Plato, self-knowledge had been at the center of western ethical thought. When the young Alcibiades wishes to begin his public life (123 D), Socrates intervenes, and with reference to the Delphic inscription, seeks to lead Alcibiades to a knowledge of himself (124 A-B), for, by knowing oneself, the political leader knows the proper affairs of others and thereby the affairs of state (133 D — 134 A).

To Alcibiades' query about how he might achieve this self-knowledge (124 B), Socrates responds that he would come to know himself if he takes care of himself (*epimelesthai sautou*) (127 E, 132 C). Thus, for the western tradition, self-knowledge was the function of certain obligations associated with taking care of the self.¹³ The association of taking care of oneself with the Delphic maxim concerning self-knowledge which was characteristic of Greco-Roman ethical literature since Plato, is characteristic of the eastern Thomas tradition as well, but as an interdiction rather than obligation.

The Syrian *Acts of Thomas*, dated in the early third century CE,¹⁴ belongs to an eastern collection of apocryphal *Acts of the Apostles* attributed, since the fifth century, to Leucius Charinus, a supposed companion of the apostle John.¹⁵ The *Acts of Thomas* is generally considered to belong to a genre of Hellenistic-Oriental romances, a somewhat loosely defined genre of literature characterized primarily by the adventurous travels of a hero to exotic foreign places and by his erotic encounters.¹⁶ This "romance" of Thomas elaborates earlier themes of the Thomas tradition in terms of the apostle's supposed missionary activities in India.

The *Acts of Thomas* begins with the disciples of Jesus conducting a lottery to determine which region of the world each would evangelize. Thomas draws India, but, as a Hebrew, is reluctant to travel to so foreign a region. Jesus forces the issue by selling him as a slave to the Indian merchant, Abban, who soon sets sail with Thomas in tow. They arrive first in Andrapolis during a city-wide festival celebrating the marriage of the local king's only daughter.

During the celebrations, a cup-bearer unexpectedly slaps Thomas, presumably because of the attention shown him by one of the entertainers, a Hebrew flute-girl. Responding to this unwarranted attack, Thomas promises that:

My God will forgive this injury in the world to come, but in this world he will show forth his wonders, and I shall even now see that hand that smote me dragged by dogs.

—AcTh. 6

— a somewhat uncharitable response by canonical standards. And indeed, according to the *Acts*, when the cup-bearer goes out to the well for water, he is slain and dismembered by a lion and a black dog picks up the right hand which had struck Thomas, and carries it back to the party.

Having now attracted the attention not only of the flute-girl, but of the entire gathering, Thomas is conscripted by the anxious King to pray for the marriage of his daughter. After praying that Jesus might do “the things that help and are useful and profitable” for these newlyweds, Thomas blesses the couple and departs.

When everyone finally leaves, the bridegroom anxiously approaches his bride, but is amazed to find Jesus, in the likeness of his twin, Thomas, chatting with his new wife in the bedroom. As the three of them sit down together to discuss the situation, Jesus counsels the newlyweds to abandon the “filthy intercourse” they obviously had been anticipating and

become holy temples, pure and free from afflictions and pains both manifest and hidden, and you will not be girt about with care for life (*phrontidas biou*) and children, the end of which is destruction ... But if you obey and keep your souls pure unto God, you shall have living children ... and shall be without care (*amerimnoi*).

—AcTh. 12

Unexpectedly for the modern reader, and likely for Thomas's non-Christian contemporary as well, the bridegroom thanks Jesus for this unsolicited but timely advice and for revealing his corrupt and morally sick condition by directing him to seek himself and to know (*gnonai*) who he was and who and how he now is (AcTh.15).

The *Acts of Thomas* presents a self-knowledge constituted by secret teachings (*gnosis*) which Thomas has received from Jesus (AcTh. 39) and which are now recorded in this account of his missionary activities. Contrary to the western ethical tradition, this self-knowledge results in a freedom from care (*aphrontis, amerimnos*) (AcTh. 12; 35). This antithetical relationship between self-knowledge and taking care of oneself is soteriological. In her rejection of “filthy intercourse” (see also AcTh. 43.), the bride did not become yoked to a “short-lived” husband but to the “true man” (AcTh. 14); the bridegroom came to know his true self (AcTh. 15; see also 43 and 144); and even the flute-girl found soteriological rest (*anapausis*) as a result of these events.¹⁷ Similarly, in the third act of Thomas, a young man who had been killed by a giant serpent but resuscitated through the intercession of Thomas concludes that: “I have become free from care (*phrontidos*) ... from the care (*phrontidos*) of night, and I am at rest (*anapaen*) from the toil of day” (AcTh. 34)

In the Socratic obligation to take care of oneself, two points of view intersect, the political and the erotic. When the young Alcibiades wishes to enter political life, he submits to Socrates, the first of his lovers (103 A, 104 E). According to Socrates, to know oneself one must know both one's body, one's sexuality, and how to participate in the socio-political world. This positive relationship between techniques of self and that which is not-self — teachers, the city (or the socio-political realm), and the cosmos — is a persistent theme of western philosophizing.

Similarly, in the *Acts of Thomas*, a political context is established when Thomas attends the wedding celebration of the princess at the court of the king, and then participates in this royal celebration by blessing the union. However, this participation in public life is required of Thomas against his will, whereas Alcibiades aspired to political life. An erotic context is also established in the *Acts of Thomas* when the groom approaches his new bride for the first time. However, the new wife does not submit physically to her husband, but spiritually to the "true man", Jesus.

Jesus shows the bride and groom, even as Socrates taught Alcibiades, that self-knowledge is not of the body, but of the soul (Alc. 130 E; 132 B-C). However, and here the two traditions diverge, in the Platonic and later Stoic traditions, self-knowledge requires practices of taking care of one's self characterized by a network of obligations and services, whereas in the eastern Thomas tradition, self-knowledge results in a carefreeness characterized by a network of interdictions.

The Coptic *Book of Thomas*, from the same Nag Hammadi codex as the *Gospel of Thomas*, is dated earlier in the second century CE than the *Acts of Thomas*.¹⁸ It introduces the same interdiction as does the *Acts*, but in the context of a revelatory dialogue. This form is revealed as pseudo-dialogical, however, when Thomas tell Jesus that, "It is you Lord whom it benefits to speak, and me to listen" (BkTh. 142, 9).

Although Jesus points out that the secret teachings are already known to and have been pondered by Thomas, he invites Thomas to examine himself in order to know who he is in light of this revelation. Jesus does not consider it seemly that his twin brother should be ignorant of himself (BkTh. 138, 10-12): "for he who has not known himself has known nothing, but he who has known himself has at the same time already achieved knowledge about the Depth of the All" (BkTh. 138, 16-18).

The relation between self-knowledge and rejection of the world is clearly summarized by Jesus in a concluding section of the *Book of Thomas*.¹⁹ Those who have not received the revealed doctrine are ignorant and, thus, are renounced. Their soul has been corrupted by the body and by the world. The Blessed, on the other hand, are those who, like Thomas, have prior knowledge of these things.

The general rejection of the world by the *Book of Thomas* (143, 13f.) does not explicitly refer to political involvement as does the *Acts of Thomas*, but it is explicit concerning rejection of the body.²⁰ The body is transitory (BkTh. 139, 4), it decays and perishes (BkTh. 139, 5). This cycle of fleshly life derives finally from "intimacy with women and polluted intercourse" (BkTh. 144, 9f.; and 139, 8-10), the fire of lust "that scorches the spirits of men" (BkTh. 140, 3f.), "the bitter bond of lust for those visible things that will decay and change" (BkTh. 140, 33f.).

The rejection of world by Jesus is summarized in the *Book of Thomas* by the interdiction against *prooush bios* (BkTh. 141, 12-14; 38f.). The Coptic word *rooush* translates not only *phrontis* and *merimna*, the words for "care" used in the Greek version of the *Acts of Thomas*, but also *epimeleia*, the technical term for "care" in the Western ethical tradition.²¹ This interdiction against any concern or care for this life seems to include the practice of care itself. When Thomas shows care (*merimna*) for those deprived of the kingdom (BkTh. 142, 3-5), he is persuaded

by the savior not to care for them, for their depravation is the lot of the ignorant (BkTh. 142, 11-19).

The obligation to know oneself is central also to the teachings of the *Gospel of Thomas*. One of the first things Jesus tells his disciples in this *Gospel* is that:

When you come to know yourselves, then you will become known, and you will realize that it is you who are the sons of the living Father. But if you will not know yourselves, you dwell in poverty and it is you who are that poverty.—GosTh. 3

Consequently, they are repeatedly exhorted to seek this knowledge until it is found (GosTh. 2; 92; 94). This is a difficult task, however, for the knowledge which is to be sought has already come and the disciples have not recognized it (GosTh. 51). As Jesus says in another passage, “That which you have will save you if you bring it forth from yourselves” (GosTh. 70).

Dated from the second half of the first century CE to the first half of the second century CE,²² the opening lines of the *Gospel of Thomas* differ significantly from the *Book of Thomas* only in that Thomas himself is represented as recording “the secret sayings which the living (or resurrected) Jesus spoke” (GosTh. incip.), rather than the secretary, Mathias (BkTh. 138-1-3). Thomas, however, is not simply the secretary for Jesus and the other disciples in the *Gospel*, for Jesus takes him aside and reveals to him knowledge not shared with the other disciples (GosTh. 13). In other words, the knowledge which saves and is revealed by Jesus only to Thomas (GosTh. 13) is an inner knowledge (GosTh. 108) which Thomas has written down (GosTh. incip.) for whoever has ears to hear (GosTh. 8, 21, 63, 65, 96), or, for his reader’s eyes to see.

For the *Gospel of Thomas*, self-knowledge seems to result in a negative stance towards the external world: “Whoever finds himself is superior to the world” (GosTh. 111). However, this priority of knowledge to action is not so clear as it comes to be in the *Book of Thomas*. Other sayings of Jesus in this *Gospel* seem to suggest that self-knowledge is the result of certain practices of world-rejection: “Be on your guard against the world,” Jesus warns (GosTh. 21), for “If you do not fast as regards the world, you will not find the Kingdom” (GosTh. 27). In either case, the self-knowledge is clearly understood by the *Gospel of Thomas* to be inner, apart from and other than the external world: “Whoever has come to understand the world has found (only) a corpse.” (GosTh. 56).

Although a specific interdiction against care does not appear in the *Gospel of Thomas*, the earliest of the Thomas texts, its sense is clearly present. Like the *Acts of Thomas*, the *Gospel* not only rejects the external “world” generally but also the sexual and political activities of this world specifically. “Blessed are the womb which has not conceived and the breasts which have not given milk,” Jesus tells an adoring woman (GosTh. 79), for only those who “make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male not be male nor the female female” will enter the Kingdom (GosTh. 22). And again Jesus commands his disciples:

Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar, give God what belongs to God, and give Me what is Mine.—GosTh. 100; see also 81 and 110

Self knowledge for the *Gospel of Thomas*, therefore, is other than the social relationships required by sexual and political activity. “Many are standing at the door,” Jesus says, “but it is the solitary who will enter the bridal chamber” (GosTh. 75; see also 49).²³

The rejection of socio-political obligations in the eastern Thomas tradition stands in marked contrast to their necessary inclusion within practices of self-identity in the western tradition. In the Platonic and later Stoic traditions, self-knowledge is the result

of "caring for the self," characterized by a network of external obligations and practices, whereas in the Thomas tradition self-knowledge is a revealed or prior knowledge, resulting in a carefreeness characterized by inner discipline within a network of interdictions. This revealed "prior" knowledge is the subject of the "gnostic" Thomas literature.

III

There is a dialogue between the author and the model reader ... He wants to reveal the reader to himself.—Umberto Eco²⁴

Asked by Alcibiades what he must do to take care of himself and thereby come to know himself, Socrates responds that he must engage in dialogue (127 E), a technique which ensures social relationships. Socratic dialogue, however, was literary dialogue, the fictive device of Plato. This technique of dialogically writing the self was perfected by the Stoics whereby they remembered the day's activities in letters written to others.²⁵ By contrast, the self-emphasis by the Thomas tradition on the writing of revelation suggests rather a solitary, inner, technique of reading the self.

The Thomas tradition consists of the secret teachings of Jesus "received" by "listening" to the revelations of Jesus (GosTh. *incip.*; BkTh. 138, 1-4; 142, 9f.; AcTh. 39),²⁶ which, according to the *Gospel of Thomas*, Thomas wrote down, while according to the *Book of Thomas*, they were written down by a secretary. Whatever the historical origin of these pseudo-dialogues, they claim to reveal a prior *gnosis* in writing. They do not recommend dialogic activity, for which the questioning Thomas of the western canon might have served as model, but instead record a particular content to be read and known.

The practice of reading as a technique for knowing self is described in the *Acts of Thomas* itself, in the "Hymn of the Pearl," which was sung by Thomas while in prison to encourage his fellow inmates (AcTh. 108-113). In this famous hymn, a king's son, the first person author of the song, is sent forth to seek a precious pearl, an allegorical destination for his true self,²⁷ which is guarded by a ferocious serpent in Egypt. But the son soon forgets his task, and himself, as he takes up a foreign way of life.

The royal parents write their lost son a letter, identical to what is already "written" in his heart, recalling him to its contents so that he might know who he really is. When the son reads this letter, he is awakened to his true self and is able successfully to complete his quest for the pearl and return home.

In this hymn, the son's knowledge of himself is arrived at by reading a text. This text reveals a prior knowledge of his true self already written within, but forgotten. In other words, this eastern tradition represents a practice of reading the self in which the reader is disclosed to himself.

This technique of "reading of the self" recalls the thesis advanced by Richard Reitzenstein early in this century of a genre of *Lese-Mysteria*, or literary-mysteries.²⁸ This genre, he argued, preserved the outward form of a Hellenistic mystery religion through a series of discursive and doctrinal writings. If the reader of such a literary mystery were one who had turned away from the world, the literary presentation would affect him just as if he had actually participated in a mystery ritual.²⁹ Festugiere has also described the enigmatic Orphic literature as such a literary-mystery,³⁰ following the lead of Pausanias who equated a reading of Orphic writings with the witnessing of initiation at the Eleusinian Mysteries (I, 37, 4).

Reinhold Merkelbach also has argued that the Hellenistic romances were written in the service of the Hellenistic mystery cults.³¹ While his view has been challenged,³²

it is generally agreed to hold true for two late romances, Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, and the *Acts of Thomas*.³³ Apuleius' romance is clearly propaganda for the Hellenistic cult of Isis, while the *Acts of Thomas* present a Christian-Gnostic mystery of redemption.³⁴ As such, their point is not to recommend dialogic — or social — activity, but like the *Gospel* and the *Book of Thomas*, to present a particular content through the written word. The reading of such texts constituted a hermeneutics of the self.

In conclusion, two differently situated technologies of the Hellenistic self may be identified. The first, which is characteristic of the western ethical tradition, might be termed an epistemological technology of self. This tradition emphasizes the activity of self-disclosure always in terms of an other. By disclosing oneself in dialogue, self was constituted. The second, exemplified by the eastern Thomas tradition, might be termed an ontological technology of self. This tradition emphasizes the discernment or deciphering of what the self already is. This knowledge is reclaimed by passive listening and later, through the solitary activity of reading. The first, dialogic activity, is social. The second, contemplative activity, was more conducive to the Syrian encratic technology of self generally considered to have been introduced to Western Christianity by John Cassian only at the end of the Hellenistic period in the early fourth century.³⁵

NOTES

1. A first draft of this paper was read at Professor Michel Foucault's seminar at The University of Vermont in 1982, and is dedicated to his memory.
2. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," 1972. *Society and The Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: U California Press, 1982, 103-152) 106.
3. Luther H. Martin, "Why Cecropian Minerva?: Hellenistic Religious Syncretism as System," *Numen*, (1983) XXX: 131-145.
4. Kurt Rudolf, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. ed. Robert McLachlan Wilson (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983) 54-5.
5. The ascetic rejection of the ethical in its conventional sense suggests the basis for representing gnostic ethic as "licentious." Based upon accusations by Christian apologists, it has been argued, at least since the end of the 19th century, that the ascetic renunciation of the sensuous nature of the self had a counterpart in a libertine indifference towards the sensuous, (Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 1885, trans. from 3rd German ed. Neil Buchanan, 7 vols. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1958) I: 263), and even a "positive obligation" to violate this-worldly ethical standards (Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, 2nd ed., rev. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963) 273).
6. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. Robert P. Casey, (London: Christophers, 1934).
7. Trans. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed. Vol. II (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing House, 1885).
8. On the identity of the eastern with the western Thomas, see Helmut Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971) 127-8 and 133-4. On the origins of Christianity in Syria, see A.F.J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Supplement to Novum Testamentum V (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962) 30-33; Arthur Voceobus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, 2 vols. (Louvain: CSCO, 1958-1960); and Han J.W. Drijvers, "Facts and Problems in Early Syriac-Speaking Christianity," *The Second Century* (1982) 2: 157-175.
9. Robinson and Koester 126-143; see also John D. Turner, *The Book of Thomas the Contender* (Missoula, Montana; Scholars Press, 1975), 233-239; and Drijvers 157-175.
10. Ennead II, 9, 15.
11. Eliza Gregory Wilkins, "Know Thyself" in *Greek and Latin Literature* (1917; rpt. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1980, especially the compilation of passages in which the maxim either is explicitly cited, or indirectly expressed (100-104).

12. Rudolf, 113; and Hans Dieter Betz, "The Delphic Maxim GNOTHI SAUTON in Hermetic Interpretation," *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 465-484.
13. Foucault, *supra* and *Histoire de la Sexualité*, Vol. III: *Le Souci de Soi* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984), esp. Ch. 2: "La Culture de Soi", 53-85; Wilkins, 60f.
14. Syriac text with English trans. W. Wright, in *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 2 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1871); Greek text, ed. R.A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (1903. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959; Intro. and trans. Gunther Bornkamm in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson, 2 Vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965) 2: 442-531.
15. Bornkamm 427; W. Schneemelcher and K. Schaeferdiek, in *New Testament Apocrypha* 178-188.
16. Albin Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, trans. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966) 857-879; Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley: U of California P. 1967); and P.G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel: The 'Satyricon' of Petronius and the 'Metamorphoses' of Apuleius* (Cambridge UP, 1970).
17. See AcTh. 142 where carefreeness (*aphrontis*) is equated with "rest."
18. Trans. John D. Turner, in Robinson, *the Nag Hammadi Library* 188-194.
19. This section originally may have been a separate work (Turner, *The Book of Thomas the Contender* 164-199, 215-225).
20. Turner, *The Book of Thomas the Contender* 235.
21. W.E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford UP. 1939) 307b.
22. But see, for example, Drijvers 173.
23. For "solitary" the Coptic text uses the Greek word "monachos" — "monk."
24. *Postscript to The Name of the Rose*, trans. William Weaver (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984) 47-49. See also *The Role of the Reader* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979).
25. For example, the correspondence between Fronto and his student, Marcus Aurelius.
26. In the *Acts of Thomas*, The Greek word used for "receive," (*dechomai*) also means "to listen."
27. Richard Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*, 3rd ed. 1927, trans. John E. Steely (Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1978) 58; Jonas 125-6.
28. Reitzenstein 51-52, 62.
29. Reitzenstein 51-2.
30. A.J. Festugiere, *L'ideal religieux des grecs et l'evangiel* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1932; "Les mysteres de Dionysos," *Revue biblique* (1935) 44: 192-211, 366-96.
31. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (Munich and Berlin: C.H. Beck, 1962).
32. E.g., Perry.
33. Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament, Vol I: History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*, trans. Helmut Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press and Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982) 139.
34. Bornkamm 429.
35. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross (Oxford UP, 1958) 243. On Cassian, see Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian: A Study in Primitive Monasticism*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge UP, 1968).

Related works by the author of this paper:

- "Why Cecropian Minerva? Hellenistic Religious Syncretism as System", *Numen* XXX (1983).
 "Artemidorus: Dream Theory in Late Antiquity", *The Second Century*, forthcoming, 1985.
 "Those Elusive Eleusinian Mystery Shows", *Helios*: Special issue on Greco-Roman Religions, forthcoming, 1986.