The Two-Way Schema in Valentinian Paraenesis

Philip L. Tite, *McGill University*

In honour of Frederik Wisse's contribution to the study of the Nag Hammadi codices, I offer this brief analysis of the paraenetic contours of the Valentinian texts. Wisse's contribution to the study of Gnosticism and the Nag Hammadi codices is well known. Not only has he played a leading role in the Brill critical edition, contributing to both establishing the Coptic text as well as the now standard English translation of several tractates, he has furthermore offered several challenges to the historical reconstruction of early Christianity and Gnosticism. Never to accept uncritically any interpretation, Wisse has demanded that scholars approach these texts with a meticulous and cautious methodology (see, for example, Wisse 2002). Only through challenging the mainstream, even if to extreme degrees, can new and insightful perspectives on these texts emerge.

During my dissertation work under Professor Wisse's co-supervision (with Professor Ian H. Henderson), I attempted to locate the Valentinian tractates within a fresh analytical perspective. Over the past twenty-five years, scholars have increasingly recognized and appreciated the social and ethical dimensions of the Nag Hammadi texts. Such recognition, however, tends not to explore the ancient conventions of moral discourse. Despite the prominence of moral exhortation within these texts, scholars who contribute to the study of paraenesis in early Christianity have not given much attention to the Nag Hammadi material (perhaps most notably absent in the recent collection of essays in Engberg-Pedersen and Starr 2004). It is my hope that by exploring the paraenetic contours of Valentinianism, scholars in both specialities will begin more consciously to appreciate the value of the other.

In this article, I offer an exploration of one aspect of paraenesis, the two-way schema. As a literary indicator of paraenetic discourse, the two-way schema offers conceptual and structural contours within which moral exhortation could be given in ancient texts. I will discuss this

Essays in Honour of Frederik Wisse
ARC, The Journal of the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill, Vol. 33 (2005): 197–211

literary form in Valentinianism by first exploring the presence of the two ways within the broader Greco-Roman world, in particular Jewish and Christian contexts. My goal is to locate Valentinian moral exhortation within its cultural and religious context, as well as to call attention to the importance of the Nag Hammadi material for those who study early Christian moral discourse.

As a common framing mechanism for paraenetic discourse the two-way schema is perhaps most widely known due to its presence in *Didache*. Indeed, most attention has been given to the literary relations between *Didache*, *Epistle of Barnabas*, and *Doctrina Apostolorum* (among other possible texts standing in relation to these texts, such as the *Canons of the Holy Apostles* [also referred to as the *Apostolic Church Order*], *Life of Schnudi*, and *Apostolic Constitutions*) in order to determine both the literary nature of a now lost "Two Ways" document as well as the origins of the two way tradition. Charles Taylor argued that *Doctrina Apostolorum* and *Didache* came from a common Jewish source, a position accepted by Adolf von Harnack, who had previously agreed with Adam Krawutzcky that *Barnabas* was the originating source for the two-ways tradition (Taylor 1886; Harnack 1884, 1896; Krawutzcky 1884; cf. Funk 1884 who argued for an opposite direction of influence between *Barnabas* and *Didache*). Although the Jewish background for a two-ways source dominated, by the early twentieth century J. A. Robinson and James Muilenberg moved scholarly opinion in favour of *Barnabas* preceding *Didache* as the origin for the two-ways source (Robinson 1912; 1920; 1934; Muilenberg 1929). Within twenty years, however, a common Jewish source for the two-ways source would rise to prominence under the landmark study of the two-ways tradition in the *Manual of Discipline* (IQS) by Jean-Paul Audet (1958). The presence of a two-way schema in IQS evidenced an early, Jewish, instance of a two-ways tradition that points to a pattern that would have been the basis for the Christian two-ways tradition or source that eventually emerges in redactional form in the early Christian material of the late first, early second century. In his analysis of the Jewish context for the two-ways tradition, M. Jack Suggs (1972) has argued (contra, e.g., Klaus Baltzer's comparison of covenantal theology and the two-way schema; 1960, 103–141; cited in Suggs 1972, 65) that despite the presence of two-way metaphors in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Deut 30:15–20; Jer 21:8; Ps 1:1, 6; and Prov 2:12–15) the biblical material is not the source for the two ways.

Although Suggs believes that "the content of the Two Ways is thoroughly Jewish," something "more than the metaphor itself [of 'two paths'] is needed to establish connections" (Suggs 1972, 63–64; Suggs further applies this same criticism against New Testament examples, such as Matt 7:13–14, in opposition to Kenneth E. Kirk 1931). He suggested a basic literary form: 1) Sharply dualistic introduction; 2) Lists of "virtues" and "vices"; and 3) Concluding eschatological admonition (Suggs 1972, 64). Rather than seeing this formula emerging within Judaism from a biblical tradition, Suggs follows Kamlah's lead in identifying an Iranian influence upon Jewish thinking, locating the two-way schema within a mythological conflict between Ormazd (Prince of Light) and Ahriman (Prince of Darkness). This Two Angels tradition is also evident in 1QS, where we find a shift from the mythological (Two Angels) to the ethical (Two Ways) (Suggs 1972, 66; referring to Kamlah 1964, 163). A similar, or perhaps more pronounced, process of demythologizing (i.e., de-emphasizing the external myth) and ethicizing (i.e., emphasizing the internal and individual moral struggle) is found in the *Testament of Asher* (Suggs 1972, 68). For Suggs, the social function of two ways (with the mythological emphasis) is to establish and maintain group identity by constructing a demarcation of insiders and outsiders. As with the *Testament of Asher*, which moved away from the mythological social function of IQS, early Christian instances of the two ways is most likely (though not exclusively) connected to initiation into the group.[1]

Recently, John S. Kloppenborg has argued that the relation between the *Epistle of Barnabas* 18–20 and *Didache* 1–5, is such that a literary relationship, rather than a simple oral tradition, is most plausible (Kloppenborg 1995). Thus, a Two Ways Document, no longer extant, is discerned by Kloppenborg; this document, he goes on to argue, has a three-fold transmission into the extant sources. The first form (α) is a loosely organized presentation of two-ways material and is what is evident in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The second (β, with a derivation as form δ underlying *Doctrina Apostolorum*) is more topical in organization and was used by *Didache*, from which is derived the two-ways tradition in *Apostolic Constitutions*. The third form (γ) is paralleled to β except for the Way of Death motif (this is the form found in the *Canons*) (1995, 92).

For Kloppenborg form α is far more mythological in language, fitting a type that is illustrated by IQS and the *Testament of Asher*

(though without direct literary connections). The *Epistle of Barnabas* places the two ways or teachings within a cosmic contrast of φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ and ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ (18.1; all texts and translations from the Apostolic Fathers are from Lake 1965) along with an eschatological motivation. Forms β and γ, however, radically demythologize the two ways, thereby more thoroughly ethicizing and de-eschatologizing the tradition (1995, 93-97). Although correct in noting the mythological aspect of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, this distinction is not fully accurate in portraying the two-way schema of this text. First, in chapter 18 itself (where most scholars see the beginning of the two ways), there are ethical indicators worth noting: a reference to "the present time of iniquity" (18.2), is not only eschatological (ὁ δὲ ἄρχων καιροῦ . . .) but also ethical (. . . τῆς ἀνομίας; "lawless"); a reference to human will and human zeal as defining the Way of Light (θέλων; σπεύσῃ) linked with knowledge necessary for walking this way (γνῶσις) (18.2; 19.1). As with the Jewish material related to form α, we find here a connection between cosmological mythology and individual or human moral responsibility. Secondly, although most scholars focus on the two ways that begin at 18.1, it is important to recall that the two-way schema is also present earlier on in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. Couched between two christological *exempla* is a reference to the "way of righteousness" and the "way of darkness" (ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης, ὁδὸν σκότους; 5.4). Again, "knowledge" emerges as a key distinction between these two ways, thereby recalling Graeco-Roman moral philosophy (especially Stoic rationality) modified with a Christian nuance. Earlier, at 4.10 another reference to the way of wickedness is mentioned (τῆς πονηρᾶς ὁδοῦ), preceded by an imperatival statement (φύγωμεν ἀπὸ . . .) and framed within a behavioural ethic (note especially the description of the way of wickedness: . . . πάσης ματαίοτητος, μισήσωμεν τελείως τὰ ἔργα . . . "Let us flee all *futility*, completely despising the *works* of the way of wickedness")[2] grounded within a covenantal perspective (4.6b-8a, 14). Again, moral and cosmological (including eschatological) elements are mutually present.

Although scholarly concern has primarily been focussed on literary relations and especially the possible Two Ways Document that might have circulated within early Christian circles,[3] the two-way schema need not only be a literary work or works that can be reconstructed by source and redactional analysis. Rather, we have a framing mechanism for a conceptual two-way schema within early Christian texts. Two

ways emerge within, for example, Psalm 1, without reference to a literary formula: "Happy are those who do not follow the advice of the wicked, or take the path that sinners tread, or sit in the seat of scoffers; but their delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law they meditate day and night" (1:1–2; the two ways continue through this Psalm with contrasting agricultural metaphors linked to life and death). Here we have neither a mythologized Two Angels tradition, nor the formal literary pattern advocated by Suggs. Yet we have a clear instance of two paths that a person can choose to follow, one positive (the blessed, those who are obedient to the commands of the Lord, those who live) and the other negative (the wicked, who obey the advice of the wicked, with death as an end). Even within the early Christian material, we find a less formal presentation of the two-way schema. In *1 Clement* 36.1, for example, there is a direct reference to "the way" (ἡ ὁδός) that is found only in Jesus Christ. The demonstrative pronoun directs the reader's attention to the preceding discussion, and likely recalls for the reader the earlier reference to "the way" at 35.5 (τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας) where we find a vice list following the "the Way of Truth" (there is not, however, an eschatological warning or conclusion—thus, 35.5 does not perfectly fit the literary pattern proposed by Suggs).

Another instance of the two-way schema that is more conceptual and less source based arises in Ignatius's *Epistle to the Magnesians* 5:

> Seeing then that there is an end (τέλος) to all, that the choice is between two things (τὰ δύο ὁμοῦ), death and life (ὅ τε θάνατος καὶ ἡ ζωή), and that each is to go to his own place; for, just as there are two coinages, the one of God, the other of the world (ὃ μὲν θεοῦ, ὃ δὲ κόσμου), and each has its own stamp impressed on it, so the unbelievers (οἱ ἄπιστοι) bear the stamp of this world, and the believers (οἱ πιστοὶ) bear the stamp of God the Father in love through Jesus Christ, and unless we willingly choose to die through him in his passion, his life (τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ) is not in us.

This two-way schema precedes a hortatory section that explicitly exhorts the Magnesian Christians (παραῖνω, with οὖν linking the sentence to the two-way schema). An eschatological warning is present here, along with two paths that can be followed, one of life and the other implied with death, with a christological foundation for the exhortation. An analogy reflecting citizenship is also invoked,

perhaps drawn from Matthew 22:19–21. There is a further distinction between those with faith and those without faith (οἱ πιστοὶ; οἱ ἄπιστοι). The ways of faith and unfaith will emerge as an alternative way to frame the two ways (e.g., Pseudo-Clementines, *Homily* 7.6–8 where death and life are connected to the ways of unbelief and belief). The two-way schema in this letter, however, does not follow the literary pattern that might indicate a literary link to the Two Ways Document, and, therefore, is better understood as an example of the two-way schema as a conceptual model for moral exhortation. A similar instance arises in Ignatius's *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*, where a two-way schema precedes a reference to hardships (perhaps an abbreviated form of a peristasis catalogue). The contrast is between those who advocate death (ὄντες συνήγοροι τοῦ θανάτου) rather than truth (τῆς ἀληθείας). The application of two ways is to false teachers. Again an implication of the two ways is present, though not explicitly enough to warrant a source connection.

By appreciating the presence of the two-way schema within both a literary relationship (including a possible Two Ways Document) and a conceptual framework of a two ways antithesis, we can further broaden the discussion of two-way schema to include the broader Greco-Roman world. Most scholarly discussions place stress on the Jewish origins for the two ways. Although I agree that Judaism, perhaps influenced by Iranian dualism, had a profound impact on early Christian utilization of two-way schema, the influence on early Christianity is not limited to Judaism. Indeed, people in the Graeco-Roman world, with or without a background in the tenets or traditions of Judaism, would have likely been able to link the Christian two-way schema with broader cultural forms of moral discourse. Stoic virtues, for instance, implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, evoked an antithesis of corresponding vices (see Charles 1997; Rist 1969; and Reesor 1957). A more direct example, however, of the two ways is illustrated in Ps.-Crates, *Epistle* 15:

> Shun [or "flee"; φεύγετε][4] not only the worst of evils [τὰ τέλη τῶν κακῶν], injustice, and self-indulgence, but also their causes, pleasure. For you will concentrate on these alone, both present and future, and on nothing else.

> And pursue [καὶ διώκετε] not only the best of goods [τὰ τέλη τῶν ἀγαθῶν], self-control and perseverance, but also their causes, toils, and do not shun them on account of their harshness.
>
> For would you not exchange inferior things for something great? As you would receive gold in exchange for copper, so you would receive virtue in exchange for toils.

This letter is structured by the two imperatives. These imperatives place in contrast two ways of life: the way of the Cynic lifestyle (the best of goods); and the way of non-Cynic lifestyle (the worst of evils) (cf. Martin 1997). Following each way is a short virtue or vice list (and the cause of each: pleasure contrasted with toils), along with a discussion of the lifestyle that serves as an added motivation to the paraenesis.[5] Even though this letter does not conform to a specific literary arrangement of the Two Ways Document, it is saturated with the conceptual framework of the two ways.

When we turn to the Valentinian material, moral exhortation draws upon a two-way schema. The most pronounced instance of the two ways is found in the *Interpretation of Knowledge*, where a contrast between the way of faith (= life) and the way of unfaith (= death) arises in the exordium:

> If he disbelieves them, then [he] would be unable [to be persuaded]. But it is a great thing for a man who has faith, since he is [not] in unbelief, which is the [world]. [Now] the world [is the place of] unfaith [and the place of death]. And death [exists as . . . likeness and] they will [not believe]. A holy thing is the faith [to see the likeness]. The opposite is [unfaith in the likeness]. The things that he will grant [them will support] them. It was impossible [for them to attain] to the imperishability [...] will [become ...] loosen [... those who] were sent [...] For [he who] is distressed [will not believe]. He [is unable] to bring [a great church] since it is gathered out of [a small gathering]. (1,31–2,28) (all texts and translations of the Nag Hammadi codices from the Brill critical edition).

As I have argued elsewhere (Tite 2004; cf. Dunderberg 2004), this tractate is a sustained paraenesis addressed to a divided Christian community that comprised, as one faction, Valentinian Christians. The author calls for reconciliation of the two factions, framing the

conflict within a two-way schema of faith (=life) and unfaith (=death). These two ways are explicitly indicated in the exordium, where this statement emerges, thereby setting forth the major themes of the tractate. A two-way distinction between faith and unfaith, linked to life and death, frames the rhetoric of this paraenesis. This is the most explicit instance of the two-way schema in the Valentinian materials. The usage of faith/unfaith as the opposing ways of life and death is not without parallels. Ignatius's *Epistle to the Magnesians* 5, with its contrast between "οἱ πιστοὶ ... οἱ ἄπιστοι", has already been mentioned. Another instance of faith/unfaith being used to frame a two-way schema (from the mid-fourth century) is the pseudo-Clementines, *Homily* 7.6–8:

> Next, when Peter entered Sidon, the people set before him many sick persons carried out in cots. But he said to them, "Do not think that I—a mortal man also capable of being afflicted by many ailments—can send any of your sick ones back home cured. I am not hesitant, however, to show you the means by which you may save yourselves . . ."
> "These good and evil deeds I knowingly declare to you as two ways. Those strolling down the one will perish, while those trekking the other (being led by God) will be rescued. For *the way of those who will perish* is wide and smooth—and will be utterly and effortlessly destroyed. *The way of those who will be saved*, however, is narrow and difficult—but will finally save those braving its difficulties. Before these *two ways* stand *Unbelief* and *Faith*. Setting out in Unbelief are those who prefer pleasure, on account of which (doing what is displeasing to God and not concerning themselves with the soul's welfare) they have forgotten *Judgment Day* and do not care to seek after that which is useful. . ."
> Next, this is the holy conduct defined by [Peter]. . . [6]

This fourth-century homily presents belief and unbelief as embodying the two ways. This particular two-way schema may also parallel Ps.-Crates's *Epistle* 15, where the contrast is between the ease/pleasure and the toilsome way. An eschatological judgment is also present. This homily, along with Ignatius's letter, illustrates that faith and unfaith were utilized by Christians (at least from early second century to mid-fourth century) as one form of two-way antithesis. Here in *Interp. Know.* the contrasting two ways are linked to a cosmic order of being captured in this world. The mythological aspects of the

Valentinian system will emerge more fully throughout the tractate, linking death (way of unfaith) while being trapped in the material realm, and life (way of faith) with freedom or ascent through the activity of the Saviour. This ascent motif will emerge later in the tractate, perhaps recalling this opening two-way presentation, at 13,19 ("scorched the path of [the] ascent") and 15,30–33 ("he who is jealous is an obstacle to his own [path], since he destroys only himself with the gift and he is ignorant of God"). This two-way schema, however, does not follow the pattern of the Two Way Document—indeed, there are no ethical lists given in this tractate, let alone in connection with the two ways.

Other instances of the two-way schema can be found in the Valentinian sources. Twice in the *Second Apocalypse of James* is there a distinction between two ways. The first, at 54,24–55,14, reads:

> Now before those things [have happened] they will make a [...]. I know [how] they attempted [to come] down to this place [that] he might approach [...] the small children, [but I] wish to reveal through you and the [Spirit of Power], in order that he might reveal [to those] who are yours. And those who wish to enter, and who seek to walk in the way [ϵϒϵMOOϣϵ 2I TϵIH] that is before the door, open the good door through you. And they follow you; they enter [and you] escort them inside, and give a reward to each one who is ready for it.

Despite the damage to these pages, the reference to the good door is clear enough. If the textual reconstruction "Spirit of Power" (ⲡⲓ[ⲡⲛⲁ] [ⲛⲧⲥ]ⲟⲙ) is correct, then we could have an instance of the Two Angels/Spirits form of the two-way schema. The second reference to a two-way schema is in a hortatory passage at 59,1–11:

> [Renounce] this difficult way, which is so variable, [and] walk in accordance with him who desires [that] you become free men [with] me, after you have passed above every [dominion]. For he will not [judge] you for those things that you did, but will have mercy on you. For it is not you that did them, but it is [your] Lord that did them. [He was not] a wrathful one, but was a kind Father.

This hortatory passage follows a reference to divine will (58,23–24, though missing text at the bottom of page 58 renders this connection only a suggestion). The divine will—which is an ethical motif—is

explicated in the two-way distinction in this passage: there are two ways, one is the difficult way and is to be avoided or renounced; the other way is to walk in accordance with divine will. A theme of obedience emerges here, which is typical of early Christian treatments of the moral motif of divine will (see Dihle 1982). This two-way schema, however, is not linked to virtues and vices, but is rather linked to a mythological framework of the ascent of the soul. Again, cosmology and ethics are linked within the two-way framework.

An exception to the separation of the two-way schema and ethical lists is *Authoritative Teaching* 24,10–13: "For death and life are set before everyone. Whichever of these two they wish then, they will choose for themselves." This very explicit statement on the way of death and life as two options for people to choose, is placed within a large paraenetic section in which a long vice list and metaphors of debauchery and prostitution for those vices precedes the two ways (with drunkenness again following the two ways). The structure of this section, as well as the exact wording, makes a literary link to the Two Ways Document highly unlikely. A cosmological mythical connection, however, may fit this instance of two ways when placed within the broader context of the tractate, specifically the cosmological threat for the ascent of the soul (especially the dragnet parable at 29,3–30,4).

Three other possible Valentinian instances of a two-way schema can be found in the Nag Hammadi codices. In the *First Apocalypse of James* there is a reference to "the sons of light" (25,17–18; ⲛⲛ†ⲱⲟⲏⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ ⲧⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ), which might betray awareness of the Two Angels motif of "sons of light" and "sons of darkness" in IQS. The reference, however, is not developed enough to warrant classifying this as an instance of the two ways. A second possible instance is the *Valentinian Exposition*'s demarcation of the heavenly and the carnal place (37,25–31; cf. 38,30–35). Again, the instance may only reveal an awareness of a two-ways tradition rather than an actual presentation of a two-way schema. The third instance is the *Epistle of Peter to Philip*'s paraenetic aside, where an implicit two ways might be seen. The *Epistle of Peter to Philip*'s paraenetic aside (139,29–30) is marked off by the usage of the imperative.[7] Following a discussion on suffering, Peter exhorts the other disciples with a co-hortative, "let us therefore not obey these lawless ones and walk in. . ." (the text breaks off at this point on the page). The co-hortative (ⲙⲡⲣⲧⲣⲉⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ) is most likely the

primary verb in this sentence,[8] and it establishes the imperatival direction of what Peter then says (the conjunctive second future ⲛⲧⲛⲙⲟⲟⲩϣⲉ is dependent on this cohortative).[9] The continuous function of the conjunctive second future ⲛⲧⲛⲙⲟⲟⲩϣⲉ, suggest that a clear two-way schema is not being presented. The lacuna may have offered just such a distinction, but what remains is only suggestive. The author exhorts a particular way for the recipients to avoid: "My brothers, let us therefore not obey these lawless ones and walk in ..." (139,28–40). In each of these three instances, an awareness, rather than an explicit utilization, of the two ways is present.

The two-way schema is used in those Valentinian sources that have paraenetic material.[10] The most prominent utilization of the two-way schema is the *Interpretation of Knowledge*. Some texts, while not actually using the two ways as a discursive motif, may reveal awareness of the two-ways tradition, and, thus, perhaps evidence a wider appreciation or usage of this device for moral discourse within Valentinian Christianity. Unlike some other Christian instances of the two ways, only the *Authoritative Teaching* discusses the two ways along with ethical lists. Nearly every instance of the two ways, however, is linked to a cosmological context, bringing together, as did the *Epistle of Barnabas*, external mythological frameworks (in this case relating to the ascent of the soul from the realm of matter) with ethical concerns. This myth-ethical motif suggests that Valentinians tended to follow the two ways of Kloppenborg's type α, and, therefore, might indicate an earlier stream of the two ways tradition within early Christianity. None of the Valentinian sources indicates a literary link with the Two Ways Document that many scholars have attempted to locate. Rather, the Valentinian material suggests that the two ways circulated not simply through a series of literary relations and source dependencies, but as a conceptual framework for bringing together moral hortatory discourse. The presence of the two-way schema in the Valentinian material further suggests the presence and importance of paraenesis for these Christians.

Notes

1. Suggs 1972, 67: "It sharpens the sense of 'we-ness' among the sons of Light, who are expected to identify themselves unambiguously as the 'guys in the white hats.' Those instructed are meant to learn the differences between 'we' and 'they'. . ."; on the shift to an initiatory setting, see 72–73.

2. My translation with added emphasis.

3. A recent argument has been made to link the Two Ways Document with a Petrine tradition, specifically a fifth century reference in Rufinus of Aquileia to *Iudicium Petri* as another name for the *Two Ways*; see Robert E. Aldridge (1999). Aldridge is clear that Peter is not to be considered the author of the Two Ways Document. However, his Petrine connection is still questionable, as there was no particular Petrine Circle or a basis for a Petrine corpus of material (see the definitive critique on this point by David Henry Schmidt 1972). Still, Aldridge's comparison of two-way schema in the second century material with later traditions (including the mid-fourth century Pseudo-Clementines, Optatus's appended *Gesta apud Zenophilum* in the fourth century, Nestorian tracts of the seventh century, and St. Boniface's eighth-century homily, *De abrenuntiatione in baptismate*) is helpful in highlighting the continued, and diverse, interest in two-way schema even beyond a first- or second-century Two Ways Document.

4. I prefer "flee" rather than "shun" here, as the former better articulates the contrast that Ps.-Crates is presenting for his disciples. The metaphors of motion are thereby more effectively illustrated. Text and translation are taken from Malherbe 1977.

5. A slight irony arises in the motivation/discussion of the way of toils, given the anti-mining motif in Cynicism.

6. Pseudo-Clementines, *Homily* 7.6–8; cited from Aldridge 1999, 249–50; emphasis Aldridge's. Editorial punctuation, except at the end of the quote, indicates missing text of approximately 53 words and then 95 words.

7. I am not the first to recognize the paraenetic nature of this fragmentary statement. Recently, and independent of my own reading, Hans-Gebhard Bethge has labeled this passage (running from 139,28–140,1) as "Paränetische Konsequenzen"—this paraenetic material develops from, and directly applies to the recipients, the ethical implications of the preceding discussion of Christology and soteriology (which, in my opinion, are both grounded in a suffering motif in this tractate) (1997, 141; Bethge's text and translation of this passage is offered on pages 28–29).

8. In Coptic, the injunctive (i.e., the optative) is the usual way to form the co-hortative, like the subjunctive hortative in Greek. ⲙⲡⲣⲧⲣⲉⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ is the only occurrence of the optative in *Ep.Pet.Phil.* (so also noted in Marvin W. Meyer 1981, 77). This single instance of the optative, here formed in the negative with ⲙⲡⲣ- prefixed to the causative infinitive, reinforces the paraenetic aspect of this aside in contrast to the rest of the tractate.

9. The conjunctive form of the second future, as Thomas O. Lambdin (1988, 107) notes, is "used to continue the force of a preceding verbal prefix"

and "is especially frequent after a First Future or an Imperative." This is the very case here at 139,30. Given the break in the text, I am hesitant to explicate further the paraenetic construction or implications of this hortatory statement on Peter's part. Given the dependence of this conjunctive second future on the preceding cohortative verb, it might be more effective to translate the ⲁⲩⲱ as "nor" rather than "and"; thus, offering the interpretative translation, "My brothers, let us therefore neither heed these lawless ones nor walk in . . . ". This translation clarifies that the two verbs are both admonitions against the influence of the lawless ones, rather than a two-way schema of not obeying the lawless ones (admonition) but rather walking in the way advocated by the author (exhortation). The dependency of the second future with its conjunctive force, instead, offers a two-fold admonition against the way of the lawless ones. Perhaps with an even more free translation (in order to stress the continuous relation between the verbs), we could render the second future as follows: "My brothers, let us therefore not heed these lawless ones, walking in . . . ". Thus, instead of two separate admonitions, we have a major admonition with a following, or continuing, explication of the optative with the conjunction application. Such a conjunctive addition adds stress and weight of importance to the paraenetic exhortation.

10. Although it might also have a reference to two ways (71,18–23 with clear behavioural application), the *Tripartite Tractate* is excluded from my discussion, as it does not fit any of the forms of paraenesis (genre, subsection, aside). Although not paraenetic, this tractate is replete with moral discourse (most notable is the continual references to divine will). Indeed, the *Tripartite Tractate* is an excellent example (better than even Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora*) of a Valentinian work that is very concerned over moral discourse without being hortatory in nature.

Works Cited

Aldridge, Robert E. 1999. Peter and the 'Two Ways'. *VC* 53:233–64.

Audet, Jean-Paul. 1958. *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda.

Baltzer, Klaus. 1960. *Das Bundesformular*. WUANT 4. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag.

Bethge, Hans-Gebhard. 1997. *Der Brief des Petrus an Philippus: Ein Neutestamentliches Apokpyphon aus dem fund von Nag Hammadi (NHC VIII,2)*, TUGAL 141. Berlin: Verlage.

Charles, J. Daryl. 1997. *Virtue amidst vice: The catalog of virtues in 2 Peter 1*. JSNTSup 150. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Dihle, Albrecht. 1982. *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dunderberg, Ismo. 2004. Body Metaphors in the *Interpretation of Knowledge* (NHC XI,1). Paper presented to the Eighth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Paris, June 28–July 3.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels and James M. Starr, eds. 2004. *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Berlin: de Gruyter

Funk, Francis Xavier. 1884. Die Doctrina apostolorum. *TQ* 66:381–402.

von Harnack, Adolf. 1896. *Die Apostellehre und die jüdische beiden Wege*. Leipzig.

_____. 1884. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. TUGAL 2. Leipiz: Hinrichs.

Kamlah, Ehrhard. 1964. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

Kirk, Kenneth E. 1931. *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of Summun Bonum*. The Brampton Lectures for 1928. London: Longmans, Green & Co. (abridged version, 1934).

Kloppenborg, John S. 1995. The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in *Didache* 1-5. In *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History and Transmission*. Ed. Clayton N. Jefford, 88–109. Leiden: Brill.

Krawutzcky, Adam. 1884. Uber die sog. Zwölfapostellehre, ihre hauptsächlichsten Quellen und ihre erste Ausnahme. *TQ* 4:547–606.

Lake, Kirsopp, trans. 1965. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. LCL. London/Cambridge: William Heinemann/Harvard University Press.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1988. *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic*. Macon: Mercer University Press.

Malherbe, Abraham J, ed. 1977. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.

Martin, Troy W. 1997. The Chronos Myth in Cynic Philosophy. *GRBS* 38.1:85–108.

Meyer, Marvin W. 1981. *Letter of Peter to Philip: Text, translation, and commentary*, SBLDS 53. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.

Muilenberg, James. 1929. *The literary relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Marburg.

Reesor, Margaret E. 1957. The Stoic Categories. *AJP* 78:63–82.

Rist, John M. 1969. Categories and Their Uses. In *Stoic Philosophy*, 152–72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, J. A. 1934. The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache. *JTS* 35:113–46.

———. 1920. *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. London.

———. 1912. The Problem of Didache." *JTS* 13:339–56.

Schmidt, David Henry. 1972. *The Peter Writings: Their Redactors and Their Relationships*. Ph.D. diss. Northwestern University (Evanston, Ill.).

Suggs, M. Jack. 1972. The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function. In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*. NovTSup 33. Ed. David E. Aune, 60–74. Leiden: Brill.

Taylor, Charles. 1886. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tite, Philip L. 2004. An Exploration of Valentinian Paraenesis: Rethinking Gnostic Ethics in the *Interpretation of Knowledge* (NHC XI,1). *HTR* 97.3:295–304.

Wisse, Frederik. 2002. Indirect Textual Evidence for the History of Early Christianity and Gnosticism. In *For the Children, Perfect Instruction: Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year*. NHMS 54, ed. Hans Gebhard Bethge et al., 215–30. Leiden: Brill.