(even better perhaps the κοινή form ἐπαράσατο, which, however, Chariton does not use elsewhere). Rather than accepting Jackson’s μὲν, which is not in line with the scarcity of coordinators in this passage, I would delete the δὲ after ἐξέν, restoring an absolute accusative. 5, 7 θεν δὴ τοὺς θέους καὶ μακάριζε σειστή, καὶ νῦττε (ἀνυτε D’Orville) ὅπως ἀρέσης μᾶλλον αὐτῷ] νῦττε may be correct, “impinge upon him”, cf. LSJ II 1. 6, 5 (jealousy) ἵνα ὀυκ ἦνεγκε Χαιρέως, ἀνὴρ Ἐλλήν, τί ποιήσει γυνή καὶ δέσποινα βαρβα-ρος.] Jackson changes this to γυναίκα καὶ δέσποιναν βάρβαρον, but the change from object to subject is not in keeping with Chariton’s style. The relative pronoun need not have a syntactic role in the main clause, since this is a case of relative attraction: “If even a man and a Greek couldn’t control his jealousy, what will a woman do, and an oriental queen at that?” (I borrow shamelessly from G.’s translation here). 7, 7 πάρεσιν ὁυν σοι δυο ὁδοι ὀποτέρον βούλει τρέπεσθαι (πάρεσιν... δυον ὁδοιν Cobet)] This is, as G. duly notes, a reminiscence of Hdt. I 11, 2. But it is unlikely that Hdt. wrote the dual form ὀδοῦν, and Chariton doesn’t use the dual elsewhere. F’s text is good, provided the infinitive is taken to depend on πάρεσιν, a construction for which there are parallels in Chariton’s Greek: “There are two roads for you, to take whichever you want.”

It is easy to multiply these critical remarks, but it would be unfair not to terminate this review with expressing our heart-felt gratitude for what G. has done to make this rattling good piece of entertainment more accessible. I am confident that it will stimulate many to study an undeservedly neglected novelist, and a writer of good Greek.

AMSTERDAM, Free University
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J. HOLZHAUSEN, Der ‘Mythos vom Menschen’ im helle-
nistischen Ägypten. Eine Studie zum ‘Poimandres’ (= CH I),
zu Valentin und dem gnostischen Mythos [Theophaneia, 
299 p.

This book is a research into the origin of the gnostic myth of 
man. In the past scholars like W. Bousset and R. Reitzenstein 
sought this origin in Iranian traditions, but nowadays it is generally
accepted that Jewish—Hellenistic interpretations of the biblical story of the creation of man in Genesis are forming its background. Less certainty there is how the gnostic doctrine of original man could develop out of these interpretations. Two explanations have been defended. One is that there must have been a pre-Christian form of gnosis that influenced Jewish interpretations, the other that the origin of the gnostic concept is only understandable within a Christian context. Jens Holzhausen, who is a scholar attached to the department for Classical Philology and Evangelical Theology of the Freie Universität Berlin tries in this book to solve the complex questions at stake. For this reason he analyses some important texts in which the myth of man is in order. These texts are: The hermetic tractate Paimandres (CH I), a writing that in all discussions about the myth of man has played an important rôle; some fragments of Valentinus quoted by Clement of Alexandria [especially Strom. II 8 (36.2-4) and Strom. IV 13 (89.6-90.1)]; references to the myth in Irenaeus and the Apocryphon of John, and lastly two gnostic writings from the library of Nag Hammadi: The origin of the world and The Hypostasis of the Archons (resp. NHC II 5 and 4). The book has three chapters. The first two deal resp. with Paimandres and Valentinus. They form the main part of H’s research. The third chapter contains an analysis of the development of the myth amongst Valentinus’ successors. Conclusions, a bibliography and extensive indices of classical authors and of bible-quotations complete the book.

The author comes to the conclusion that the gnostic myth of man has its origin in an earlier non-gnostic concept based on a Platonic Jewish-Hellenistic exegesis of Gen. 1:26 en 2:7. According to H. Valentinus was the first to introduce a gnostic element into this earlier non-gnostic concept. In his successors this led to the full-grown gnostic myth. In the following I shall summarise the evidence on which H. bases his conclusions.

To begin with, H. finds in Paimandres,—a treatise that according to him ought to be removed from the list of gnostic writings,—, and Philippians 2:6-11 traces of the original Platonic model. Characteristic for this model is that the two sayings in Genesis about the creation of man, i.e. Gen. 1:26 man made according to the image of God and Gen. 2:7 man made out of the dust of the earth, are taken as expressions of one and the same act and are interpreted as the biblical version of a Platonic concept in which earthly man is in his body and soul an appearance and image of the heavenly anthropos or ideal man. In this model God (= heavenly man him-