that ὅπωμένων is original. His case is stronger than he states as can be seen from the LXX use of ὅπωμένων etc. in translation from the Hebrew, but, as far as I know, no one has systematically examined ὅπωμένων etc. to see how often in the NT they may have the meaning "hope".

At Mk. 1:16 the authors argue (295) that τὸν ἄδελφον Σίμωνος is original and that the reading τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σίμωνος is a conflation of this and τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ. This argument overlooks the possibility that the longer text reflects Aramaic idiom (cf. M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 97). Black argues for this idiom being behind Mk. 6:22 and other passages in Mark. The UBS committee has the shorter reading at Mk. 1:16 and does not follow Black at Mk. 6:22.

We may want to discuss many other features of the book, but we must now deal with its general character. It is informative and useful and much hard work has gone into its making, but, as can be seen, many of the authors' decisions are debatable, and we are given little warning how debatable they are.

The dogmatic character of the book is noteworthy. We have noticed the influence of WH's doctrine on it. With this dogmatism we may notice how scholars like Blass, Wellhausen, Zahn, Lietzmann, Burkitt, C. H. Turner are ignored or mentioned only in trivial detail, though they are clear evidence that NT textual critics after WH were far from following WH regularly, but seemed ready to argue that a reading may be correct for internal reasons even though its attestation is slight and it does not occur in WH's good manuscripts.

Despite the usefulness of the book we may in conclusion suggest that it presents a dogmatism that is misleading. Both in statement of fact and in enunciation of principles the book may mislead. The most serious consequences may follow from the use of principles which are often questionable.

The book has been generously provided with illustrations and the printer and publishers have done their work well.


A SEMINAR ON SETHIAN Gnosticism


The problems with regard to "Sethian Gnosticism" are as follows: In a number of Gnostic writings Seth, the son of Adam, plays a more or less prominent part. The more elaborate descriptions of Seth's origin and life clearly correspond to similar remarks in Jewish writings. This leads to the question whether Gnostic writings concerning Seth originated within a particular Gnostic school or sect that can be called "Sethian" and, secondly, whether Jewish parallels should in turn, also be explained as deriving from a school among Jews particularly interested in Seth.

From the discussions during the Seminar we see that among the participants two groups emerged gradually, viz. one sharing the viewpoint of Wisse, who rejects the

1 In: Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen) XLI, Leiden 1981.
idea of a special Sethian group, and one agreeing with Schenke who defends the existence of "Sethian Gnosticism". Opinions with regard to the Jewish background were less clear.

Before we go into these major problems we must consider some minor points. The Seminar firmly rejected the idea—once mentioned by Böhlig and Wisse— that the Egyptian Seth had any influence on Gnostic ideas with regard to Seth, son of Adam.

The participants dealt with the Jewish background in a rather superficial way. This is understandable since the Seminar was devoted to Gnosticism. Kraft wrote a few pages about Seth in the works of Philo, in which he launched the interesting idea that Philo rejected the name ἄδελφος for Seth because heretical Jewish groups accepted this name to show Seth's fundamental difference from other people. He is supposed to be no more than ἄνωτερος. Pearson spoke about the Jewish background in a more extensive way but his main subject too was "Sethian Gnosticism".

Nevertheless, it is to be regretted that apart from some well known facts about Seth in Jewish literature there was no mention of three important non-Gnostic sources that refer to Seth. Before we mention these sources we would like to show why Seth is important for Gnostics.

Already in Jewish literature importance is attached to Seth because he is of "another seed" (cf. Gen. 4:25). He differs from his brother Cain regarding not only his origin but his offspring too (Gen. 4:17-24 and 5:6-32). In the second place Seth is supposed to have special knowledge of Paradise given to him by his father Adam. It is obvious that these two characteristics of Seth appealed to the Gnostic mind. However, in Jewish literature the special position of Seth and his descendants is restricted to antediluvian times. But we know of three non-Gnostic sources which mention Seth's descendants as not being limited to a particular time but surviving after the flood as a special race. We can refer to the second Dream Vision in 1 Enoch 85-90 in which the coming Messiah is supposed to be of Seth's offspring, to Philo's De posteritate Caini, in which the descendants of Seth are the righteous ones of all times, and to the Samaritan writings that speak of the "chain of purity" starting with Seth and ending with the coming of Taheb.

The presence of this idea in these writings does not prove the existence of some Jewish school, the members of which identified themselves with Seth or his offspring. But it certainly shows that the Gnostics were not the first to identify themselves with the offspring of Seth.

Since Stone made an interesting contribution on Armenian and Georgian writings about Seth, we should like to go into the Christian interpretation of Gen. 6:1ff. which is important for a clear understanding of these writings.

---

4 De posteritate Caini 172.
5 For example in Vita Adae et Evae.
7 See Klijn, o.c., p. 29-32.