

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 (*βάθος ἀμέτρητον*), 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 (*Σηθεύς*) is more difficult to say. The treatise is full of Names, some Greek like *Sophia* and *Doxophania*, some pseudo-Greek like *Strempsuchos* and *Zögenethlēs*, 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 (*βάθος*), *Aphrēdōn* takes the *ἐπίνοια* and presents it to the Monogenes (p. 66)!

Lōia (*λωϊα*) and *Iuēl* (*ιουηλ*) 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* (*μιχαρ, μιχευ*, apparently corrupt forms of Michael) preside over the Living Water; with them is associated *Barpharangēs* (*Βαρφαραγγης*), 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 queerly-named 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 *Σ* 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 *ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ κτλ.* in the later verse.

Even if **Σ** stood alone in this reading, therefore, one might suspect that it had preserved the true text; but Dr Streeter kindly tells me that *προσεύχεσθαι* is supported by 'W, **Θ**, N, 13 and 50b'. D⁸⁷ has *προσεύχεσθαι μὴ εἰσέλθητε*. There may be other unrecorded support for the infinitive elsewhere; but even now there seems to be good ground for thinking that **Σ** is right.

H. N. BATE.