

of Eusebius ; but it may be only an amplification by the historian of what he read in Irenaeus<sup>1</sup>. There is also Origen's statement (Euseb. *H.E.* vi 25) that Matthew was the first to write ; he has been copied by Epiphanius and Jerome. But it is doubtful if much credit is due to this statement. I believe Papias mentioned Matthew before Mark ; so did Irenaeus, and Origen found this order in his Bible. But the fact that Matthew was an Apostle accounts for this.

For St John there is universal consent that he wrote last.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

### THE EPISTLE OF ST JUDE AND THE MARCOSIAN HERESY.

HAVING been for some years engaged on an edition of the Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter, I was interested to see that an attempt had been made, in the April number of this JOURNAL, to bring forward some new evidence bearing on the date and authenticity of the former Epistle. I am not, however, convinced by Mr Barns's paper, and am grateful to the Editors for allowing me to state here the reasons which lead me to an opposite conclusion. I agree with Mr Barns in holding, in opposition to Spitta, Zahn, and Dr Bigg, that Jude's is the earlier of the two Epistles, but I cannot see any plausibility in the suggestion that 2 Peter was written by a Montanist bishop between the years 185 and 195 (p. 392), and cannot therefore attach any weight to the inference that Jude must have been written between 122 and 185. I proceed to examine the more substantial arguments put forward by Mr Barns and others against the traditional view that Jude was written by the Brother of the Lord.

'There are', says Mr Barns, 'two passages in the Epistle which point to its post-apostolic origin. The writer is moved to action by the danger which threatens *the faith once for all delivered to the saints* (v. 3). It is clear that the faith was already recognized as a fixed tradition, treasured by the Church as the safeguard of the *common salvation*. The writer also bids them remember *the words which had been spoken before by the Apostles* (v. 17), which implies that the apostolic writings already enjoyed some kind of canonical authority in the Church.' Again 'the salutation (*ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη*) is unique

<sup>1</sup> St Irenaeus says the Apostles went to the ends of the earth. He then adds that Matthew wrote 'among the Hebrews'. Eusebius may well have supposed that Matthew wrote at Jerusalem before starting for the ends of the earth, and at the request of those whom he was leaving.

among the canonical books of the New Testament. The Epistle of Polycarp . . . cannot be placed later than 125' . . . Its 'salutation is *ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν πληθυνθείη*. Bishop Lightfoot in his comment on the form *χάρις ὑμῖν, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, ὑπομονή διὰ παντός* of Ign. *Smyrna.* xii says: *The additional words ἔλεος, ὑπομονή, point to a time of growing trial and persecution.* Ignatius still opens his salutation with the word *χάρις*, which may be regarded as the apostolic formula. Polycarp, writing at the very close of the apostolic age, leaves out the *χάρις* and uses only *ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη*. The letter of the Smyrnaeans on the Martyrdom of Polycarp, written . . . in 155 or 156, marks a further step in advance. It opens with a somewhat fuller form: *ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη*. It is a fuller form than that of Jude, but the same words *ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, ἀγάπη*, are used, and used in the same order.' Hence he infers that 'Jude' was written 'within the range of the traditional use of Smyrna, and about the same period as the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna'.

We will take these arguments backwards. Those who hold that the Epistle was written by its professed author may, I think, justly take exception to the last inference, that because the salutation in the Smyrnaean letter resembles that in Jude, therefore it is antecedent to it. Precisely on the same grounds it has been argued by some that Hermas wrote before St James. While far from agreeing with the late Canon Cook in his article on Peter in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* or Bishop Christopher Wordsworth in his commentary on the New Testament in their vehement protests against any questioning of canonical tradition, I think it is only a matter of common sense to regard such tradition as having a *prima facie* presumption in its favour, though a presumption which is of course liable to be set aside if opposed by real evidence. What then is the real evidence against the salutation in Jude having been written, say, before 80 A.D.? The form, we are told, is unique in the New Testament. But there is great variety in these salutations. On the one hand we have the simple *χαίρω* of James and *εἰρήνη* of 3 John 15; on the other hand, every part of the salutation of Jude is found elsewhere in the canonical writings. Thus *ἔλεος* and *εἰρήνη* occur in Gal. vi 16 *εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and with *χάρις* prefixed in the two Epistles to Timothy and 2 John 3: *εἰρήνη* is joined with *ἀγάπη* in Eph. vi 23 *εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and 2 Cor. xiii 11 *ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν*; while *ἀγάπη* is found joined with *χάρις* and *κοινωνία* in another salutation (2 Cor. xiii 13). Lastly *πληθυνθείη* occurs in the two Epistles of Peter and in Dan. vi 25 (*εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη*). I see therefore nothing to wonder at in Jude's form of salutation or in its being imitated first by Polycarp and afterwards by the Church of Smyrna. But is not *χάρις*

an essential part of the apostolic formula? We have seen that it is wanting in James and 3 John, and there does not seem to be anything remarkable in its being replaced by its equivalent *ἔλεος* in our Epistle. After all, is there any reason why people should be bound down to a single form of salutation any more than they are to a single form of doxology? Whoever the writer of this Epistle may have been, he was certainly no mere machine for the repetition of ecclesiastical formulas, but a very vigorous personality, quite as capable of devising new ways of expressing himself as the gentle and lovable Polycarp. Mr Barns makes one other point with regard to the salutation. He quotes Bishop Lightfoot's comment on Ign. *Smyrn.* xii to the effect that 'the words *ἔλεος, ὑπομονή*, point to a time of growing trial and persecution'. This is true, no doubt, as regards *ὑπομονή*; but the force of *ἔλεος* by itself needs no outward persecution to justify it, and the internal dangers against which Jude's warning is directed are quite sufficient to account for it.

I turn now to the argument based on *v. 17 μνήσθητε τῶν βημάτων τῶν προκηρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, to which I take leave to add the following words *ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν*. These last explain that 'the words spoken by the apostles' were not written epistles, but words uttered on more than one occasion to those who are here addressed. I do not think this language justifies the inference that 'the apostolic writings already enjoyed some kind of canonical authority in the Church'. But, as regards the date implied by the recognition of an established tradition and of apostolic authority, I will quote a writer who certainly cannot be charged with an over-regard for tradition. Prof. Paul Wernle in his treatise on *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Eng. tr. p. 120) says: 'From the very first the Apostles were to be the incarnation of the idea of tradition. However much they might differ externally from the rabbis, they were to agree with them in the value they attached to the careful handing down of the sacred tradition, in the one case the oral law, in the other the words of Jesus.' Though, however, I see no reference to apostolic writings in Jude 17, I fully agree that it implies a very real authority attaching to the living Apostles. As Professor Wernle says (p. 119), 'The Apostles were animated by a lofty self-consciousness. They felt themselves to be the representatives of Jesus . . . The self-consciousness of the Apostles and the veneration of the disciples helped to complete each other almost from the first.' How could it possibly be otherwise? Bearing, as they did, the commission of the Lord; chosen witnesses of His three years' ministry, of His death and Resurrection; organs of the Holy Spirit; founders and rulers of the Church, the promised kingdom for which the Old Dispensation was merely the preparatory discipline—how could they but feel that they

had a higher inspiration than that which spoke to Israel of old through the Law and the Prophets, and how could those who had received from them the gift of the Holy Spirit fail to acknowledge the work and the teaching of Christ in the work and teaching of His Apostles? We may go beyond this. The written words of the Apostles, like the spoken words of their Master, carried a higher authority than any written words of the Old Testament. As Christ had set aside the teaching of Moses, as He had said of John the Baptist that, though there was no greater prophet than he, still he was less than the least in the kingdom of heaven, so St Paul and St John feel themselves to be uttering truths of a value incomparably greater than those which were known before the coming of Christ. Hence they had no hesitation in ordering that their Epistles should be read in the Churches. As an evidence of this lofty tone, it is sufficient to quote one sentence from Eph. iii 3-5 *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγιώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη . . . ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι*: or, if earlier evidence is required, take the summary decision in 1 Cor. xi 16, 'we have no such custom, nor the churches of God.'

Lastly, I take the argument founded on the words *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*. Others besides Mr Barns have taken objection to the phrase *πίστις*, used for the object of faith, as alien to the apostolic period. It is, however, found in Gal. i 23 *ὁ δὲ δὴ δὴ ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει*, *ib.* iii 23 *πρὸ τοῦ δεῖ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα*, Phil. i 27 *συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* (where see Lightfoot) and Acts vi 7 *πολὺς ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει*. Nor is there any reason why we should object to such a use of *πίστις*, any more than to the corresponding use of *ἐλπίς*, which we find in Col. i 5 *διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν*, and 1 Tim. i 1 *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν*. Of course, if people choose to translate *τὴν πίστιν* by 'the Creed' they are guilty of an anachronism. The more correct equivalent would be 'the truth' or 'the Gospel'. 'Contending for the faith' here is pretty much the same as 'holding the traditions' in 2 Thess. ii 15 and 1 Cor. xi 2; the weightiest of all traditions being that singled out as the essence of the Christian religion both by St John (1 John iv 2) and by St Paul (Rom. x 8, 1 Cor. xii 3), *viz.* *κύριος Ἰησοῦς*.

Having satisfied himself that the Epistle is post-apostolic, Mr Barns naturally finds that the words *ἀδελφὸς δεῖ Ἰακώβου* must be an interpolation intended to give apostolic authority to the letter. He meets the objection that 'a forger would hardly have attributed his composition to a man otherwise so entirely unknown as Jude' by suggesting that

the character assumed by the writer is not the obscure brother of James, but Judas the prophet, who was commissioned together with Barnabas and Paul to carry the decisions of the Council at Jerusalem to the Churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. This protest of his against fornication and the eating of *εἰδωλόθινα* was remembered in after times, and he is thus mentioned, with Agabus and Silas and the daughters of Philip, by an anti-Montanist writer in 192 as one of the prophets of the Christian Church. Mr Barns takes some pains to prove that our Epistle has a prophetic character, which I have no wish to deny, holding, as I do, that both Jude and his brother James are rightly regarded as prophets. He considers that the Muratorian Canon agrees in his conclusion that the Epistle was written about 160 A.D., because 'it recognizes Jude as the first among the Epistles which are accepted in *Catholica*'. I am entirely at a loss to understand this argument.

I now go on to the second, and more original part of Mr Barns's article, in which he endeavours to prove that the heretics referred to in Jude are the Marcosians. He seems to have been first attracted to this view by finding (1) that the latter heresy arose about the year 160, corresponding to the date 'assigned on independent grounds to the composition of the Epistle of Jude', and (2) that the scene of the activity of the heresiarch Marcus is said to have been Asia, which agrees with the inference previously drawn from the resemblance between the forms of salutation used in Jude and in the Epistle and Martyrdom of Polycarp. I have endeavoured to shew that probability is against both of these assumptions; but one can imagine such a close resemblance in the characteristics of the two heresies as to upset any *a priori* improbability on the other side. On the contrary, I believe that it can be shown (a) that the resemblances are to be found in other parts of the New Testament as much as, or more than in Jude; (b) that they are to be found in other Gnostic heresies as much as, or more than in the Marcosians; (c) that the most striking features of the Marcosian heresy are absent from Jude.

I will take the last point first, though it will be hardly possible to keep it quite distinct from the others. Marcus was famed as a magician, as is shewn in the iambic verses quoted on p. 400<sup>1</sup>. Irenaeus, who gives the quotation in I xv 6, dwells much on the juggling performances of Marcus in I xiii 1, saying that he borrowed them from Anaxilaus, 'Anaxilai enim ludicra cum nequitia eorum qui dicuntur magi com-

<sup>1</sup> I do not understand why Mr. Barns prints the corrupt  $\delta$  *ὁδ* *χορηγεῖς* *ὡς* *πατήρ* *Σατανᾶ*, *εἰ* *δὲ* *ἀγγελικῆς* *δυνάμεως* *Ἄ*(*α*)*ἡλ* *ποιεῖν*, instead of the generally accepted amendment of Scaliger  $\delta$  *σοι* *χορηγεῖ* *ὁδὸς* *πατήρ* *Σατανᾶν* *δεῖ* *κ.τ.λ.* i. e. 'the works which your father Satan always enables you to perform through the angelic power, Azazel.'

miscens, per haec virtutes perficere putatur apud eos qui sensum non habent et a mente sua excesserunt.' The original Greek has been preserved by Epiphanius (xxxiv 1) with occasional variations and additions. In this passage it seems to be faithful enough: τὰ γὰρ Ἀναξιλίου παίγνια τῇ τῶν λεγομένων μάγων πανουργία συμμίξας, δι' αὐτῶν φαντάζων τε καὶ μαγεύων εἰς ἐκπλήξιν τοὺς ὄρωντάς τε καὶ πειδομένους αὐτῶ περιέβαλεν . . . οἱ δὲ τὰ ἀπὸ περιεργίας ὄρωντες δοκοῦσι δυνάμεις τινας ἐν χερσὶν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι . . . μὴ γινώσκοντες δοκιμάσαι ὅτι ἀπὸ μαγείας ἡ σύστασις τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ παιγνίου ἐπιτελεῖται. αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐμβρόντητοι παντάπασιν γεγόνασιν. Some particulars of the methods of Anaxilaus are mentioned by Pliny (*H. N.* xxxv 15 175), 'lusit et Anaxilaus eo (sulphure), candens in calice novo (*al.* addens in calicem vini) prunaque subdita circumferens, exardescens repercussu pallorem dirum, velut defunctorum, offundente conviviis'. From these different authorities Mr Barns extracts the following result, 'By means of these fumes he not only frightened his followers by the death-like pallor, but induced a state of drowsiness which became the occasion for dreams and obscene practices'. He then adds that 'Epiphanius alludes to these dreams in his chapter on the Gnostic heresies (xxvi 13), and quotes Jude 8: *These in their dreamings defile the flesh*'. I shall presently say something as to this last sentence, but will meanwhile point out that neither Irenaeus nor Pliny is responsible for the statement that Marcus or Anaxilaus by the use of sulphur 'induced a state of drowsiness which became the occasion for dreams and obscene practices'. Pliny says nothing beyond what has been quoted, and Irenaeus suggests no connexion between these juggling tricks and the immoralities of which Marcus and his followers were guilty. Mr Barns may have been misled by the word *nequitia*, which occurs in the old Latin version, but the Greek is πανουργία, more correctly rendered by *versutia* in the later version. All that is implied is that Marcus joined to his dealings with evil spirits the ordinary tricks of the conjuror, and thus caused a belief in his miraculous powers (*δυνάμεις, virtutes*) on the part of his infatuated followers, who could no longer trust their senses (*εἰς ἐκπλήξιν περιέβαλεν, μὴ γινώσκοντες δοκιμάσαι, ἐμβρόντητοι*). Irenaeus goes on to mention some of these magic tricks, such as causing white wine to assume the colour of blood, over-filling a large chalice with the contents of a smaller one.

I turn now to the book of Epiphanius in which, treating of the twenty-sixth heresy, he quotes Jude 8. But this book is headed κατὰ τῶν λεγομένων Γνωστικῶν, and I do not think it contains a single mention of the Marcosians, who rank as the thirty-fourth heresy. It is of course possible that the evil practices ascribed to one heresy may have prevailed also in another, but when an attempt is made to show that the Marcosian heresy is particularly referred to in St Jude, it is

surely incumbent on a writer, who is looking for resemblances, to use the utmost care to confine himself to what is undoubtedly Marcosian. The charges made by Epiphanius against the Gnostics, whether true or false, are such as St Paul would have considered it a shame to speak of. It seems that they actually defended themselves by appealing to Jude 8. Epiphanius replies that they misinterpret the verse, οὐ περὶ τῆς ἐνυπνιάσεως λέγει τοῦ ὕπνου, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς μυθώδους αὐτῶν τραγῳδίας καὶ ληρολογίας, ὡς διὰ ὕπνου λεγομένης καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ ἔρρωμένης διανοίας. As bearing on Mr Barns's contention, the fact that they tried to claim the authority of Jude on their side, is not without importance.

But though St Jude says nothing about the practice of magic by false teachers, Epiphanius, in the same passage in which he speaks of Anaxilaus, seems to refer to another writing of the New Testament as giving a warning against its use by Marcus. His words are: γύναια γὰρ καὶ ἄνδρας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πεπλανημένα τε καὶ πεπλανημένους ἐπηγάγετο . . . μαγικῆς ὑπάρχων κυβείας ἐμπειρότατος, ἀπατήσας τε τοὺς προειρημένους πάντας προσέχειν αὐτῷ ὡς γνωστικωτάτῳ καὶ δύναμιν μεγίστην ἀπὸ τῶν ἀοράτων . . . τόπων ἔχοντι. Again (in xxxiv 22) he says οὐκ ἂν δυνηθείη κυβευτική τις ἐπίνοια ἀντισχεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀκτίνα τῆς ἀληθείας. Both these passages are quoted by Dr Armitage Robinson in illustration of Eph. iv 14 ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδίαν τῆς πλάνης. Perhaps we might also compare Eph. v 6 foll. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις . . . ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ . . . καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους . . . τὰ γὰρ κρυφῆ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν αἰσχρὸν ἐστὶν καὶ λέγειν κ.τ.λ.

A second note of the Marcosians is their influence with women, of which Mr Barns speaks in pp. 401, 402. We do not find this referred to in Jude, but we do find it elsewhere in the New Testament as in 2 Tim. iii 6 ἐκ τούτων γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναῖκαρια σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις, πάντοτε μαθάνοντα, καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα, where Alford refers to the account given by Irenaeus of Marcus. A special point mentioned by Irenaeus I xiii 3 is that Marcus encouraged and even commanded women to prophesy, in reference to which Mr Barns quotes 1 Cor. xiv 34, 1 Tim. ii 12 διδάσκειν γυναῖκί οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρός, ἀλλὰ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. Nothing of the sort occurs in Jude; but Mr Barns's paraphrase of Irenaeus suggests that he has still in his mind the ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι of Jude 8. Irenaeus says that if a woman, being called on to prophesy by Marcus, replied οὐκ οἶδα προφητεύειν, 'Marcus made certain invocations' (I suppose, of his familiar spirit), where Mr Barns seems to translate ἐπικλήσεις τινὰς ποιούμενος 'mes-

merized them', and continues 'having put them into a trance' (εἰς κατάπληξιν) 'he said *Open your mouth and say what you like, and you will prophesy.*' But κατάπληξις does not mean a *trance*, but rather awe or terror at being brought into the presence of a supernatural power; cf. its use in the passage quoted below as to apocryphal books. A third mark of the Marcosian heresy is the stress laid upon genealogies made up of mystical words and numbers, which occupy some sixty pages in Stieren's edition. The only allusion to this which Mr Barns can find in Jude is in the μόνον δεσπότην of v. 4, but such γενεαλογίαι are condemned by name in 1 Tim. i 4 μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, and Tit. iii 9 μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας . . . περιόστασο: cf. 1 Tim. iv 7 τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραῶδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ.

Irenaeus, in his Preface, cites 1 Tim. i 4 as referring generally to the Gnostic heresies which had arisen since the time of Paul; but Mr Barns, if he is to be consistent, must regard the Pastoral Epistles as direct answers to the Marcosians, written therefore not earlier than 160 A. D.

Another 'link' between the Marcosians and Jude is found in their common use of apocryphal literature, on which reference is made to Iren. I xx i ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν, ἃς αὐτοὶ ἔπλασαν, παρεισφέρουσιν εἰς κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀνοήτων. But no one has accused Jude of forging apocryphal books or of using books forged by the Marcosians. Nor do we know for certain that Marcus used the old apocryphal books with which Jude was acquainted. All that is known is that he is stated by an opponent<sup>1</sup> to have received the aid of Azazel in his sorcery, and that the name Azazel occurs in the book of Enoch.

I come at last to what I allow to be real agreements between the Marcosians and the heretics of Jude. These are (1) the abuse of the Agapae, (2) antinomianism, (3) flattery of the rich. But there is nothing distinctive in these general characteristics. They are applicable to various forms of Gnostic heresy; and St Jude does not enter into particulars which would suit one more than another. One minute point is made by Mr Barns. He says that 'it was to check such perversions of forms of prayer (seemingly such as are involved in the use of σὸν δέ) that the writer of the Epistle bids the faithful to *pray in the Holy Ghost* (Jude 20)'. I can hardly think that this is seriously urged. At this point in his Epistle Jude has left the heretics behind and turns to his own people to encourage them in the use of that highest form

<sup>1</sup> I do not quite understand the remarks made in p. 411, that the iambic verse referred to 'help to shew the identity of thought and responsibility between the elder of Asia (i. e. the iambist) and the writer of the Epistle'. What 'thought', what 'responsibility' is common to the two?



of prayer which St Paul had urged on the Ephesians (vi 18) and the Romans (viii 26, 27).

I have no remarks to make upon the fifth part of the Article, dealing with the Liturgical formularies of the Marcosian Heresy, except that I notice a difference between the way in which Mr Barns speaks of the resemblance between certain formulas of Marcus and passages of 1 Cor. and of 2 Pet. Of the former he says 'The words of St Paul Rom. i 11 *I long to see you, that I may impart (μεταδώ) to you some spiritual gift (χάρισμα), taken in connexion with 1 Cor. xiv 1 Desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy, seem to suggest that there is possibly in the words of Marcus (Iren. I xiii 3: μεταδοῦναι σοι θέλω τῆς ἐμῆς χάριτος . . . λάμβανε πρῶτον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δι' ἐμοῦ τὴν χάριν) some echo of the formula of the Church'. In this I am disposed to agree; but it is strange to find Mr Barns so much the slave of his theory as to the date of 2 Peter, that he speaks of the beautiful words in 2 Pet. iii 18 *Grow in grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* as being merely an echo of the eucharistic formula of Marcus, ἡ ἀνενόητος καὶ ἀρρητος χάρις πληρῶσαι σοῦ τὸν ἕσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ πληθύναι ἐν σοὶ τὴν γῶσιν αὐτῆς, ἐγκατασπείρουσα τὸν κόκκον τοῦ σιτάριου εἰς τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν.*

J. B. MAYOR.

## SOME NEW COPTIC APOCRYPHA.

A RECENT publication of M. Pierre Lacau (*Fragments d'Apocryphes Coptes: Mémoires . . . de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1904*) has given us a welcome supplement to the texts edited in former years by MM. Révillout and Guidi, and augmented and translated by Forbes Robinson in *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* (Cambridge, 1896).

M. Lacau has edited from the MSS in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* such fragments as relate to the life of our Lord. His intention was to continue with those that concern the Virgin, Joseph, and the Apostles: but this intention, we regret to learn, he has relinquished in view of the fact that M. Révillout has undertaken a complete edition of the Coptic Apocrypha for a forthcoming series of *Scriptores Christiani Orientales*. The latter scholar has given a French version of nearly all that is new in M. Lacau's publication, in a pamphlet entitled *L'Évangile des Douze Apôtres récemment découvert*, of which account must be taken in conjunction with M. Lacau's work.

A brief analysis must first be given of M. Lacau's texts.