

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology



https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal

https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\_jts-os\_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1st page of article]

The significance of these passages is best explained by another quotation. On p. 122 we read that the Holy and All-perfect Father, in whom is all the fullness and from whose fullness we have received the Grace (John i 16), stood above the Immeasurable Deep ( $\beta \acute{a}\theta o\sigma \ \mathring{a}\mu \acute{e}\tau \rho \eta \tau \sigma \nu$ ), and 'then the Aeon was established, it ceased from moving, the Father established it that it shall not move for ever'. Meanwhile the Aeon of the Mother awaited till commandment came forth from that which was hidden in the Primal Father, 'so that His Son should establish the Universe again in his Gnosis' (p. 122). In more orthodox phraseology, Setheus is used for the Father in action: what is described here (on pp. 122, 124) is the generation of the eternal Son.

What, in the mind of the Gnostic writer, was the generation of the name Setheus  $(\Sigma_{\eta}\theta\epsilon\hat{\nu}\sigma)$  is more difficult to say. The treatise is full of Names, some Greek like *Sophia* and *Doxophania*, some pseudo-Greek like *Strempsuchos* and *Zōgenethlès*, some of no language at all like *Sellaō* and *Selmelche*. Particularly curious is *Aphrēdōn*, which occurs four times, and from which is formed an abstract noun *Aphrēdōnia* (p. 127). It seems to be intended to mean 'unutteredness'. But that does not explain why, when an idea comes out from the Deep  $(\beta \acute{a}\theta o\sigma)$ , Aphrēdōn takes the  $\acute{e}\pi\acute{\nu}voa$  and presents it to the Monogenes (p. 66)!

 $L\bar{o}ia$  ( $\lambda\omega\bar{i}a$ ) and  $Iu\bar{e}l$  ( $i\omega\eta\lambda$ ) occur on pp. 70 and 149, and are said to mean 'God-with-us' and 'God-unto-everlasting' respectively. Here is obvious corruption, but at a stage earlier than the present Coptic book. *Michar* and *Micheu* ( $\mu\chi\alpha\rho$ ,  $\mu\chi\epsilon\nu$ , apparently corrupt forms of Michael) preside over the Living Water; with them is associated *Barpharangės* ( $Ba\rho\phi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta\sigma$ ), possibly the Angel or Aeon of Baptism, but the derivation of the name is a puzzle.

These scattered and rather incoherent remarks will shew what a queer company Mrs Baynes has put before English readers. She has certainly made this Setheus-document clearer than her predecessors, even including Dr Carl Schmidt, did. It is to be hoped that it will stimulate the elucidation of 'Gnostic' systems, but I feel that we shall not be able to understand them really until some solution be found for their queerlynamed hierarchy.

F. C. Burkitt.

## LUKE xxii 40

In this verse all the printed texts read γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. I noticed recently, when looking at  $\aleph$  in the British Museum (it lies open at this passage) that it has εἶπεν αὐτοῖς προσεύχεσθαι μὴ εἰσελθεῖν. Editors seem to have passed this reading as a mere itacism of the usual kind; it is not

recorded by Tischendorf or by von Soden. But it ought to have been recorded; it is good Lukan Greek, and Luke may very well have made a stylistic difference at this point between vv. 40 and 46, putting an indirect imperative at 40, and the direct  $d\nu a\sigma\tau d\nu\tau \epsilon s$   $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon \ell\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$   $\ell\nu\alpha$   $\mu\dot{\gamma}$   $\kappa\tau\lambda$ . in the later verse.

Even if  $\aleph$  stood alone in this reading, therefore, one might suspect that it had preserved the true text; but Dr Streeter kindly tells me that  $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\dot{\nu}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  is supported by 'W, @, N, 13 and 506'. Der has  $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\dot{\nu}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$   $\mu\dot{\eta}$  elock $\lambda\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$ . There may be other unrecorded support for the infinitive elsewhere; but even now there seems to be good ground for thinking that  $\aleph$  is right.

H. N. BATE.