

appear that the variation is in any group of masses so marked in character or in degree as to warrant the opinion that the group stands outside the range of the system: the same system which prevails in the book as a whole prevails also in every group, and throughout every group. Further, though the observance of the system may fairly be said to be more exact in some parts of the book than in others, the variation in this matter is never very great. The April masses, perhaps, supply an exception: not only in respect of their cadences, but in general arrangement, they form the least orderly element in the book. But apart from this division, or even including it, the general impression which is left by a comparison of the various sections is not that of a collection of material of various sources and dates brought together without revision. It is an impression of uniformity rather than of difference—of such uniformity as might be found on the one hand in a collection of material composed by different writers guided, as to the forms of their phrases, by a common usage, or on the other in a collection of forms which may have been gathered from different sources or based on material of different dates, but which have for the most part been subjected to revision by a single hand. At the same time there seems to be discernible, behind this general uniformity, a certain amount of variation between particular groups of masses, or between particular prayers which are parts of the same group, such as may support an opinion, formed on other grounds, as to the date at which particular forms or groups of forms were originally composed, or the date and character of the material from which they have been constructed.

H. A. WILSON.

THE EPISTLE OF ST JUDE: A STUDY IN THE MARCOSIAN HERESY.

I. *The date of the Epistle.*

THERE are 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), an expression which implies that the apostolic writings already enjoyed some kind of canonical authority in the Church. It is almost the same view of apostolic times which is taken by the

writer of the Second Epistle of St Peter: 'that ye should remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through the apostles' (2 Pet. iii 2). In the latter epistle this reference to the apostles is linked with the phrase 'from the day that the fathers fell asleep' (2 Pet. iii 4). In a treatise on the Alogi quoted by Epiphanius¹ the apostolic age is limited to ninety-three years, and it has been suggested by Harnack that the year 122 A.D., ninety-three years after the Ascension of our Lord, may be regarded as the date of the death of the daughters of Philip, the last survivors of the apostles in Asia Minor². The Epistle of St Jude may be placed, on these grounds, subsequent to 122 A.D.

The more closely this Epistle is compared with 2 Peter, the more clearly it may be asserted that 2 Peter is dependent on Jude. This subject has been discussed from the point of view of 2 Peter in a recent number of the *Expositor*. 'The judgements of Jude are unrelieved by any touch of mercy (6-16). The judgements of 2 Peter are brightened by the mercies shewn to Noah (ii 5) and to Lot (ii 7-8).' 'This sharpening of the purpose speaks decidedly for the priority of Jude 5-7. There is also in 2 Peter a softening down of the references to Enoch which proves the priority of Jude.'³

It has been suggested in the same article in the *Expositor* that 2 Peter was written by Themison, Bishop of Pepuza, the champion of the Montanist Churches, to justify the position of Montanism against the hostility of the Catholic Church on the one hand, and the antinomian Gnostic sects on the other. He made use of an earlier document, probably of prophetic origin, 'words spoken before by the holy prophets' (2 Pet. iii 2), known to him under the pseudonym of Jude. This document is the Epistle now recognized as the Epistle of St Jude. Themison wrote between the years 185 and 195. This gives the years 122 and 185 as the period within which the Epistle of St Jude was written.

There is, however, another clue to a nearer estimate of the date. The salutation is unique among the canonical books of the New Testament: ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη (v. 2). The Epistle of St Polycarp is dated 110-117 or 117-125⁴. It cannot be placed later than 125. The salutation of Polycarp is: ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν πληθυνθείη. Bishop Lightfoot, in his comment on the form, χάρις ὑμῖν, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, ὑπομονή διὰ παντός of Ign. *Smyrn.* c. xii says: 'The additional words, ἔλεος, ὑπομονή, point to a time of growing trial

¹ Epiph. *Haer.* li 33.

² Harn. *Chron.* i 378.

³ *Expos.* May 1904, pp. 377, 382.

⁴ Harn. *Chron.* i 406.

and persecution.' St Ignatius still opens his salutation with the word *χάρις*, which may be regarded as the apostolic formula. St 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 immediately after the martyrdom 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 [τοῦ] 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.

It is therefore probable that the Epistle was written somewhere in Asia within the range of the traditional use of Smyrna, and about the same period as the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna. If it be dated c. 160, a quarter of a century would separate it from its reproduction by Themison in the Second Epistle of St Peter.

II. *The authorship of the Epistle.*

There is internal evidence that the Epistle may be ranked in the prophetic literature of the early Church, and regarded as the work of a member of the prophetic school. This would render it acceptable to Themison. The post-apostolic character of the Epistle makes it impossible to recognize the words *ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου* as part of the original title. It has the appearance of an early interpolation to give apostolic authority to the letter. It has been argued 'that a forger would hardly have attributed his composition to a man otherwise so entirely unknown as Jude was'¹. But if the reference in the title is to St Jude the Prophet, this argument loses its force. Judas was the companion of Silas (Acts xv 32) and together with Barnabas and Paul was charged by the Church of Jerusalem with the letter to the Churches of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. His duty was not only to deliver the letter, but by word of mouth to exhort the people to abstain from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from fornication. These things entered into Greek life, and it was long before the Gentile converts could altogether set themselves free from their national traditions. Participation in these things was regarded among the more rigid as a following of the teaching of Balaam (Rev. ii 14, cf. Jude v 11). The Christian prophets witnessed against this teaching, and Judas, as having been first commissioned by the Church of Jerusalem to set his face against them, became identified with the witness and protest against this teaching. Nothing is known of him after his return from Antioch (Acts xv 34). He is, however, alluded to by the anti-Montanist writer of 192 as one among the new prophets of the Christian Church.²

¹ Alford, *Gk. Test* vol. iv p. 192.

² Eus. *H. E.* v 17. 3.

The Epistle has a good deal of prophetic colour. It is itself a word of 'exhortation'. The author writes, exhorting (*παρακαλῶν*) them to strive earnestly; and exhortation (*παρακλήσις*) was one of the special features of the prophetic office (Acts xv 31-2, 1 Cor. xiv 3). The Christian prophets like those of old were the watchmen of the Church (Isa. xxi 6, 12).

The writer makes use of three apocryphal works, all of which are prophetic in character. The 'Testament of Moses', which formed the first part of the so-called 'Assumption of Moses'¹ is based on the prophetic office of Moses (Deut. xxxiv 10). 'Then will they remember me, saying in that day tribe unto tribe and each man unto his neighbour: "Is not this that which Moses did then declare unto us in prophecies?"'² The writer of Jude writes in vv. 4, 16, 18: 'There are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, . . . These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words . . . mockers who . . . walk after their own ungodly lusts.' The writer seems to have had these words of the Assumption of Moses before him: 'And in the time of these, scornful and impious men will rule, saying that they are just. And these will conceal the wrath of their minds, being treacherous men, self-pleasers, dissemblers in all their own affairs and lovers of banquets at every hour of the day, gluttons, . . . Devourers of the goods of the poor, saying that they do so on the ground of their justice, but (in reality) to destroy them, complainers, deceitful, concealing themselves lest they should be recognized, impious, filled with lawlessness and iniquity from sunrise to sunset, saying: "We shall have feasting and luxury, eating and drinking, yea, we shall drink our fill, we shall be as princes." And though their hands and their minds touch unclean things, yet their mouth will speak great things.'³

The evil-doers in the 'Assumption' were the Sadducees of 15-70 A.D.⁴ They were the party among the Jews who endeavoured to assimilate Greek thought and Greek culture.⁵ They were regarded as antinomian by the stricter Pharisees whose opinions are reflected by the author of the Assumption of Moses.⁶ And it was against a similar movement in the Christian Church that the writer of Jude directs his attack.

The evil-doers of Jude are complainers (*μεμφίμοιροι*), the 'quaerulosi' of *Assumpt. Mos.* vii 7. 'They walk after their own lust, and their mouth speaketh great swelling words': and in this they agree with the evil-doers of the Assumption: 'et manus eorum et mentes immunda

¹ Charles *Assumpt. Mos.* p. xiii.

² *Ibid.* vii 3-9.

³ Schürer *Gesch. Jud.* ii 406, 416.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii 10-11.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 25.

⁶ *Assumpt. Mos.* p. vii.

tractantes, et os eorum loquetur ingentia' (*Assumpt. Mos.* vii 9). They shew respect of persons for the sake of advantage as do those of the *Assumption*: 'mirantes personas locupletum et accipientes munera' (*Assumpt. Mos.* v 5). The 'mockers' of Jude 18 may be the 'homines pestilentiosi' of *Assumpt. Mos.* vii 3, and the 'ungodly' of Jude the 'impii' of *Assumpt. Mos.* vii 3, 7. This comparison of Jude and the *Assumption of Moses* seems to shew that the Christian prophet was quick to note in the heresy of 160 A.D. a recurrence of the danger which threatened the Jewish Church a century earlier from the Greek movement among the Sadducees.

The original 'Assumption of Moses' was at first a distinct work from the 'Testament of Moses', though published together with it in a Greek version in the first century¹. It only exists in a few fragments, one of which, Jude 9, is alluded to also in the *Acta Syn. Nic.* II 20 as ἐν βιβλίῳ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως². The devil in his dispute with the archangel Michael over the body of Moses says: 'The body is mine, since I am the lord of matter.' Michael answers: 'The Lord rebuke thee, for all things were created by His Holy Spirit, and from the face of God His Spirit went forth, and the world was made.' 'Then the devil brought the charge of murder against Moses, saying: "Moses is a murderer: therefore it is not fitting for him to have lawful burial."' Reference is also made to this contest in the commentary of Didymus of Alexandria on Jude.

The references to Enoch have also a prophetic character. It is as a prophet that Enoch is quoted: 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam', prophesied' v. 14. The chief quotation in St Jude 14-15 is from Enoch i 9: 'And lo! He comes with ten thousands of (His) holy ones to execute judgement upon them, and he will destroy the ungodly, and will convict all flesh of all that sinners and ungodly have wrought and ungodly committed against him.'

The terms in which the inconstancy and instability of the evil-doers is set forth in Jude 12-13 are also to some extent coloured by the language of the Book of Enoch: 'Clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, . . . wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.' They destroy by their antinomian principles the order of the universe. The writer seems to have had before him the words of Enoch immediately following the passage already quoted: 'I observed everything that took place in the heaven, how the luminaries which are in the heaven do not deviate from their orbits' (i. e. are not wandering stars), 'how they all rise and set in order each in its season,

¹ *Assumpt. Mos.* p. xiii.

² *Ibid.* p. 109.

³ The phrase occurs in Enoch xx 8.

and transgress not against their appointed order. Behold ye the earth, . . . how unvarying every work of God appears. Behold . . . how (in the winter season) the whole earth is full of water, and clouds and dew and rain lie upon it (i. e. they are not clouds without water). . . . I observed how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit (i. e. are not without fruit)' (Enoch ii 1-3, v 1). The evil-doers, therefore, like wandering stars, like clouds without water, like trees without fruit, are out of harmony with God's unvarying order in the universe. Therefore the blackness of darkness is reserved for them (Jude 13) as for the rebel angels in Enoch. 'The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgement of the great day.' This judgement is clearly parallel with that of Enoch: 'The Lord spake to Rafael: "Bind Azazel hand and foot, and place him in darkness: . . . and place upon him rough and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness, and let him abide there for ever . . . and in the great day of judgement he shall be cast into the fire"' (Enoch x 4, 6). 'And I asked the angel of peace who was with me, saying: "These chain instruments, for whom are they prepared?" And he said unto me: "These are prepared for the hosts of Azazel . . . Michael, Gabriel, Rafael, and Fanuel will take hold of them on that great day, and cast them on that day into a burning furnace"' (Enoch liv 4-6).

These references to the 'Testament of Moses', the 'Assumption of Moses', and the 'Book of Enoch' not only shew the influence of Jewish apocalyptic literature on the writer of Jude, but also the prophetic point of view from which he looked at the judgements which he knew were laid up for those who were in error in the Church.

The Epistle was therefore written in all probability by a Christian prophet under the name of Jude, after the close of the apostolic age, about the year 160 A. D. The evidence of the Muratorian Canon agrees with this conclusion. It recognizes Jude as the first among the Epistles which are accepted 'in Catholica'. The similarity of the title to that of the Epistle of the Smyrnaeans points to Asia as its home. The study of the heresy of the Epistle in the light of the history of heresy in Asia gives support to the suggested date of 160 A. D.

III. *The heresy of the Epistle.*

This heresy was an extreme form of antinomian Gnosticism. 'Certain men are crept in unawares, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ' (v. 4). 'These filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities' (v. 8). They are not altogether separate from the Church. They have crept in unawares (v. 4). They are spots

in the love-feasts of the Church (v. 12). They walk after their own lust, and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration for the sake of advantage (v. 16). But though still more or less in communion with the Church, and for that reason a danger to faith and character, they are in fact separatists. They separate themselves, being themselves sensual (*ψυχικοί*), not having the Spirit (v. 19). The writer is here evidently throwing their own phrase against themselves. They claimed alone to be 'spiritual', looking down, like most of the Gnostic sects, on the members of the Church as merely 'sensual'.

They are not merely libertines, they claim a superior knowledge and are in the fullest sense Gnostics. Von Soden, who regards the Epistle as the work of Jude, the brother of the Lord, and addressed by him to a Church in Asia, finds in the heresy an extreme form of the antinomian error shadowed forth in the Epistle to the Colossians.¹ Harnack considers the false teachers of the Epistle as early representatives of the group of Syro-Palestinian Gnostics, who are described by Epiphanius under the names of Archontikoi, Cainites, Nicolaitans, &c. He goes so far as to say: 'Hier allein stimmen alle Merkmale'.²

He gives preference to the Archontikoi. They were an old sect in the time of Epiphanius, and the mention of the prophets Martiades and Marsianos he thinks consistent with the visions of Jude (v. 8). They do not occur in Irenaeus or Hippolytus, and the introductory words of Epiphanius imply that they were found in only a restricted area, and that not in Asia: *ἀρχοντικῶν τις αἵρεσις τούτοις ἔπεται· οὐκ ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ τόποις αὕτη φαίνεται, ἣ μόνον ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῳ ἐπαρχίᾳ*.³ There is no evidence that the sect ever existed in Asia, though it may have been akin to Asian Gnosticism. Its late appearance in the lists of heresies and its restricted area would appear to shut it out from being the heresy referred to in this Epistle.

The Cainites also are akin to the evil-doers of the Epistle. They recognized as the heroes of true Gnosticism the great evil-doers of the Old and New Testaments. These heroes of evil had rebelled against the God of the Jews because of the superior knowledge they had received from the Higher Power. Their mission was to overthrow the authority of the Demiurge. Irenaeus, in the opening words of his brief notice on the Cainites says: *ἄλλοι δέ, οὓς Καίνοὺς ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τὸν Κáιν φασὶν ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν αὐθεντίας λελυτρώσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἡσαῦ καὶ τὸν Κορέ καὶ τοὺς Σοδομίτας, καὶ πάντας δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους, συγγενεῖς ἰδίους ὁμολογοῦσι. καὶ τούτους ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ ποιητοῦ μισηθῆναι, μηδεμίαν δὲ βλάβην εἰσδέξασθαι*.⁴ They held Judas Iscariot in high esteem and made use of an

¹ v. Soden *Hd. Komm.* pp. 203-204.

² Harn. *Chron.* 1 466.

³ Epiph. *Haer.* xl 1.

⁴ Iren. *adv. Haer.* 1 31, 1.

apocryphal Gospel of Judas. They were thoroughly antinomian in conduct as in thought. They boasted the presence of an angel when engaged in their unclean deeds, and said: 'O tu angele, abutor opere tuo: O tu, illa potestas, perficio tuam operationem.'¹

There are some features in the Epistle which might be explained by reference to the sect of the Cainites: 'Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain . . . and perished in the gainsaying of Core' (v. 11). There is also in v. 7 an allusion to the judgement on Sodom. It is certainly noteworthy that in this short epistle three of the Cainite heroes are selected as a warning. But the parallelism scarcely goes further. The evil-doers of the Epistle may have been akin to the Cainites, but too little is told of the Cainites in the work of Irenaeus to justify any certainty on this point.

The same may be said of the Nicolaitans. Irenaeus has only one short paragraph about them. He says they have Nicolas the Deacon as their master and refers to the Apocalypse as a witness of their fornication and their practice of eating things sacrificed to idols (Rev. ii 6). He sums up their character in one brief phrase, the most important in the chapter—'qui indiscrete vivunt'.

It is clear from this that they were not a great danger in his time, and that he had little information about them. There is very little reason in the light of Clement of Alexandria for regarding Nicolas as the founder of the sect. They may have chosen him as their representative to give prominence to their teaching in later times, or to identify themselves with the Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse.²

The teaching and works of the Nicolaitans are fiercely attacked in the Epistles to Ephesus and Pergamum (Rev. ii 6, 15). But they represent not so much a sect as a tendency. They endeavoured to combine Greek life with Christian teaching.³ They failed, and emphasized the contrast between the two systems. But their attempt to preserve the customs of Greek life while adopting the principles and enjoying the privileges of the Christian revelation was repeated again and again. The earliest records of Asia are rich in evidence of the close contact of Greek life and Christian thought during the first three centuries. The history of heresy in Asia is the record of the Church from time to time sharpening its discipline against these customs of Greek society, 'the teaching of Balaam' (Num. xxxi 16, xxv 1 sq.), and of the Gnostic sects assimilating their formularies and religious rites as closely as possible to those of the Church. Fierce and stern as the invective against the Nicolaitans is, they did not constitute so urgent a danger to the faith as the heresy against which the Epistle of Jude is written. The

¹ Iren. *adv. Haer.* i 31, 2.

² Neander i 513.

³ Ramsay *Expos.* (July 1904) p. 44.

elaborate system attributed by Epiphanius to the Nicolaitan heresy¹ belongs to a later age. Much of it is common to the Barbelo group of heresies. They had their special apocalyptic books, but there is nothing distinctive in the Epistle of Jude to connect the Asian heresy of 160 A. D. either with the Nicolaitans of the Apocalypse or with the well-defined heresy of a later date known under the same name.

The heresy of the Epistle has also been identified with the Carpocratian Gnosticism of Alexandria on the ground that Clement of Alexandria refers to the language of Jude as a prophetic anticipation of this form of Gnosticism. Clement identified Jude as 'brother of the sons of Joseph', and regarded the Epistle as 'Catholic'. But if the later date be accepted, the writer would be a contemporary of Carpocrates. The Asian origin of the Epistle is against the identification of the heresy with that of the Carpocratians.² But Clement does not limit the reference of St Jude to the Carpocratians: ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἰρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι.³

IV. *The Marcosian heresy.*

The note of urgency in vv. 2-3 has led Harnack to assign the Epistle to the early part of the second century, when Gnosticism was first becoming a danger to the Christian faith.⁴ But the same note would be equally suitable if the Epistle was directed against the outburst of the Marcosian heresy. Irenaeus devotes nine chapters (i 13-21) to the heresy of Marcus the Magician, the scholar of Valentinus. These chapters are based not only on the writings of Marcus himself and apocryphal works, such as the Gospel of Eve,⁵ which he used, but also on the testimony of an Asian opponent of the Marcosian heresy, ὁ θεοφιλῆς πρεσβύτερος, the author of the iambic verses against Marcus.⁶

The Benedictine editor of the works of Irenaeus, Dom R. Massuet, assigns the year 160 to the beginnings of the Marcosian heresy. After stating that Irenaeus wrote about 180,⁷ he adds: 'Cum vero iam longe lateque propagata esset Marcosiorum secta, in ipsumque etiam Occidentem invasisset, nec id nisi plurium annorum spatio fieri potuisset; non male coniecerit quisquis huius initia ad annum circiter 160, immo paulo citius ad extrema Valentini vitae tempora retulerit.' The date assigned to the outbreak of the Marcosian heresy corresponds therefore to that assigned on independent grounds to the composition of the Epistle of Jude against the outbreak of an antinomian heresy in Asia.

¹ Epiph. *Haer.* xxv 2.

² Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii 2.

³ Iren. i 13, cf. Harn. *Alt-chr. Lit.* i 175.

⁴ Harnack dates it 181-189, *Chron.* i 320.

⁵ *Encyc. Bibl.* p. 2631.

⁶ Harn. *Chron.* i 466.

⁷ *Ibid.* i 15.

⁸ *Op. Iren.* (Paris, 1710), p. 1.

Valentinus worked at Rome from c. 135 to c. 160 A. D.¹ He came there in the episcopate of Hyginus (136-140), he flourished under Pius (140-155) and remained there until the time of Anicetus (155-166). There is some doubt as to whether he visited Cyprus before or after his stay in Rome. Epiphanius states that having worked in Egypt, he visited Rome, and afterwards left Rome for Cyprus; and Harnack accepts the testimony of Epiphanius, against Lipsius, Hilgenfeld, and Zahn². It is probable therefore that this was the occasion of the visit of his scholar Marcus to Asia. Harnack discusses the question as to whether the opponent of Marcus was a *πρεσβύτερος* of Asia or of Gaul, and decides in favour of Asia³. The writings of this Asian opponent of Marcus, incorporated in the chapters of Irenaeus, are therefore evidence of the highest importance for the history of the Asian heresy in 160.

Marcus appealed to the credulity of the people of Asia by the practice of magical arts, as the following iambic verses shew :

Εἰδωλοποιεῖ Μάρκε, καὶ τερατοσκόπε,
 ἀστρολογικῆς ἔμπειρε καὶ μαγικῆς τέχνης,
 δι' ᾧν κρατύνεις τῆς πλάνης τὰ διδάγματα,
 σημεῖα δεικνὺς τοῖς ὑπὸ σου πλανωμένοις,
 ἀποστατικῆς δυνάμεως ἐγχειρήματα,
 ἃ σὺ χορηγεῖς ὡς πατὴρ Σατανᾶ, εἰ
 δι' ἀγγελικῆς δυνάμεως Ἀζαζήλ ποιεῖν
 ἔχων σε πρόδρομον ἀντιθέου πανουργίας⁴.

He led away men and women, inducing them to come to him as to one endued with the highest knowledge and power: he claimed the assistance of angelic power, and under its evil influence was guilty of gross wickedness.

He played the tricks of Anexilaus as described by Pliny: 'Lusit et Anexilaus eo (sulphure) candescens in calice novo, prunaque subdita circumferens, exardescantis repercussu pallorem dirum, velut defunctorum, offundente conviviis.'⁵ 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. Epiphanius alludes to these dreams in his chapter on the Gnostic heresies⁶, and quotes Jude 8: 'These in their dreamings defile the flesh.' The words of Irenaeus illustrate the language of Jude: 'Anaxilai enim ludicra cum nequitia eorum qui dicuntur magi

¹ Harn. *Chron.* i 291.

² *Ibid.* i 293.

³ *Ibid.* i 295.

⁴ Iren. i 15. These are the eight iambic lines of the *πρεσβύτερος*. *vid.* p. 411.

⁵ Pliny xxv 15.

⁶ Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi 13.

commiscens, per haec virtutes perficere putatur apud eos, qui sensum non habent et a mente sua excesserunt.’¹ Marcus and his followers were thus in very truth ‘spots in the feasts of charity’ (Jude 12).

The prophesyings of Marcus had so great a resemblance to Christian prophecy that they must be supposed to be not so much exercises peculiar to Marcus as exercises practised within the assemblies of the Church. There is authority for this in the story of the deacon of Asia.

The Deacon received Marcus into his house, not aware perhaps of his evil practices. The Deacon’s wife fell a victim to the wiles of Marcus and followed him, and it was only with much labour that she was brought back by the brethren: *τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ εὐειδοῦς ὑπαρχούσης καὶ τὴν γνώμην καὶ τὸ σῶμα διαφθαρείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ μάγου τούτου, καὶ ἐξακολουθησάσης αὐτῷ πολλῷ τῷ χρόνῳ, ἔπειτα μετὰ πολλοῦ κόπου τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστρέψάντων, αὐτὴ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐξομολογουμένη διέτελεσε.*² Marcus, like the evil-doers of Jude, ‘crept in unawares’ (v. 4), and ruined all who listened to his seductive words.

Some resisted his charms, and from the first refused to hold communion with him: *ἤδη δὲ τῶν προτέρων (int. πιστοτάτων) τινὲς γυναικῶν τῶν ἔχουσῶν τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσῶν, ὥς ὁμοίως ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐπετήδευσε παραπείθειν, κελεύων αὐταῖς προφητεύειν, καὶ καταφυσήσασθαι καὶ καταθεματίσασθαι αὐτόν, ἐχωρίσθησαν τοῦ τοιοῦτον θιάσου.*³ It is impossible to read this thirteenth chapter of Irenaeus without being convinced that Marcus took advantage of the regular assemblies of the Church to further his teaching, and that he took many of the faithful unawares. The whole chapter illustrates the force of the appeal in Jude 3-4: ‘Beloved, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares . . . ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.’

He professed to have a familiar spirit through whose influence he prophesied, and taught those women who were worthy of being partakers of his grace that they would be enabled to prophesy as he did.⁴

He especially frequented the company of rich women, *τὰς εὐπαρέφους καὶ περιπορφύρους καὶ πλουσιωτάτας*, and flattered them with his cajolery. ‘I want you to partake of my grace, since the Father of all ever sees your Angel in His presence. . . . We ought to be one. Take first of me, and through me receive grace.’ The women at first resisted: ‘I have never prophesied and I do not know how to.’ He then mesmerized them, *ἐπικλίσεις τινὰς ποιούμενος*, and having put them

¹ Iren. i 13, 1.

² *Ibid.* i 13, 5.

³ *Ibid.* i 13, 4.

⁴ *Ibid.* i 13, 3.

into a trance (εἰς κατάπληξιν), he said 'open your mouth, and say what you like, and you will prophesy'. At last they were overcome by his wiles, and thinking themselves prophetesses, they thanked him for his grace, and not only paid him handsomely, but gave way to the grossest sin: καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου λοιπὸν προφήτιδα ἐαυτὴν μεταλαμβάνει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ Μάρκῳ τῷ ἐπιδιδόντι τῆς ἰδίας χάριτος αὐτῇ· καὶ ἀμείβεσθαι αὐτὸν πειράται, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων δόσιν (ὅθεν καὶ χρημάτων πλῆθος πολλὸν συνενήνοχεν), ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίαν, κατὰ πάντα ἐνοῦσθαι αὐτῷ προθυμουμένη, ἵνα σὺν αὐτῷ κατέλθῃ εἰς τὸ ἐν.¹ It is conduct such as this which the writer of the Epistle condemns when he speaks of the false teachers not only as turning the grace of God into lasciviousness (ver. 4) but as walking after their own lusts, their mouth speaking great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration (shewing honour to persons) for the sake of advantage (ver. 16).

Marcus took advantage of the position of women in the Churches of Asia to further his purpose. The testimony of the *πρεσβύτερος* of Asia is an interesting illustration of the permanence of the condition which existed in the Church of Thyatira at an earlier date, on which so much light has been thrown by Professor Ramsay in recent numbers of the *Expositor*. 'The prophetess of Thyatira was not all evil; that idea is absolutely contradictory of the already quoted words of the letter (Rev. ii 18). There were certain accepted customs, rules of politeness and courtesy, ways of living and acting, which were recommended by their graceful, refined, elegant character.'² Such things would commend themselves to women who were *περιπόρφυροι καὶ πλουσιώταται*—the women who hesitated at first: 'I have never prophesied, and I don't know how to prophesy.' The warnings of St John were not forgotten. Some fell, for 'the idolatrous ritual of paganism was always in practice associated with immoral customs of various kinds'.³ Some fell, but others cursed Marcus, and separated themselves from his society. They were not shocked at his pretensions or his practice of prophesying. They were only shocked when they realized his evil purpose. The women of Anatolia enjoyed considerable liberties,⁴ and the practice of the Montanist Churches is witness to the practice of prophesying by women. But they knew, because it was the teaching of the Church, that only those could prophesy to whom God had given His grace: ἀκριβῶς εἰδύαι, ὅτι προφητεῦειν οὐχ ὑπὸ Μάρκου τοῦ μάγου ἐγγίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' οἷς ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἄνωθεν ἐπιπέμῃ τὴν χάριν αὐτοῦ, οὗτοι

¹ Iren. i 13, 3.

² *Expositor*, July 1904, pp. 47, 51.

³ Ramsay *ibid.*

⁴ Ramsay, *Exp.* July 1904. Harnack refers in one place to an Anatolian branch of the Marcsonian heresy.

θεόσδοτον ἔχουσι τὴν προφήτειαν καὶ τότε λαλοῦσιν ἔνθα καὶ ὅποτε θεὸς βούλεται, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅτε Μάρκος κελεύει.¹ It would seem that Marcus took advantage of these conditions of early church life. He and his followers 'crept in unawares', and by their abuse of Christian prophecy turned the grace of God into lasciviousness and undermined 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints'.

Irenaeus in the two following chapters gives in great detail the system of letters and numbers by which Marcus explained the Creation and the coming of Christ. Much of it is common to the system of Valentinus. The 'genesis' of Jesus is unfolded by means of numbers. 'From the Mother of all, that is, the first Tetrad, the second Tetrad came forth in the place of a daughter. The Ogdoad was made, from which came forth the Decad. Thus originated the Ogdoad and the Decad. The Decad being joined to the Ogdoad by way of multiplication produced the number LXXX: and again eighty tens made the number DCCC, so that the sum of the letters progressing from the Ogdoad to the Decad is 8 and 80 and 800, which is Ἰησοῦς. For the name Jesus, according to the reckoning of Greek letters, is DCCC LXXX VIII. Thou hast here the genesis of the supercelestial Jesus according to the Marcosians.'² Irenaeus becomes impatient at last: *ἡ πάλιν τίς ἀνέξεται σου εἰς σχήματα καὶ ἀριθμούς, ποτὲ μὲν τριάκοντα, ποτὲ δὲ εἰκοσιτέσσαρα, ποτὲ δὲ ἕξ μόνον, συγκλείοντος τὸν τῶν πάντων κτιστὴν καὶ δημιουργὸν καὶ ποιητὴν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, κατακερματίζοντος αὐτὸν εἰς συλλαβὰς μὲν τέσσαρας, στοιχεῖα δὲ τριάκοντα, καὶ τὸν πάντων Κύριον τὸν ἑσπερωκότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς εἰς ὡ π η κατὰγοντος ἀριθμόν.*³

He returns to the theory of the alphabet in chapter xvi, where he criticizes the Marcosian exposition of the parable of the lost sheep and the lost coin by means of numbers. 'These men who are bold enough to reduce all things to numbers, saying that all things arise from the Monad and the Decad, explain the wandering and the finding of the sheep by this mystical theory of aeons and numbers'—*ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν οὗτοι, οἱ τὸν ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς μόνον θεὸν παντοκράτορα, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος θεὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐξ ὑστερήματος, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἄλλου ὑστερήματος γεγονότος, προβεβλῆσθαι λέγοντες.*⁴

This summary is important as giving point to the words of Jude: 'There are certain men crept in unawares, ungodly men (*ἀσεβεῖς*) denying the only (*μόνον*) Master and Lord, Jesus Christ' (ver. 4). It has been stated by von Soden⁵ that the phrase *μόνος δεσπότης* is liturgical. The word *μόνος* may be liturgical in the ascriptions of Jude 25 and in Rom. xvi 27, and perhaps in 1 Tim. i 17 and vi 15, 16; but in Jude 4 as in John v 44, xvii 3 it would seem to have its full

¹ Iren. i 13, 4.

² *Ibid.* i 15, 2.

³ *Ibid.* i 15, 5.

⁴ *Ibid.* i 16, 3.

⁵ *Hd. comm.* pp. 204, 209.

value, a theological phrase introduced to emphasize the true faith against the theological and theosophical teaching of early Gnosticism.

In the twentieth chapter Irenaeus speaks of the apocryphal books which Marcus used in his teaching. This also forms an interesting link with the similar use of apocryphal literature by the writer of the Epistle of Jude. There is indeed one passage which shews that the writer of the iambic verses against Marcus also had the Book of Enoch in his mind in his controversy with Marcus :

‘Α σὺ χορηγεῖς ὡς πατὴρ Σατανᾶ, εἰ
δι’ Ἀγγελικῆς δυνάμεως Ἀζαζήλ ποιεῖν
ἔχων σε πρόδρομον ἀντιθέου πανουργίας.

Azazel is the evil angel of the Book of Enoch : ‘The whole earth has been defiled through the teaching of the works of Azazel : to him ascribe all the sin.’¹ The anti-Marcosian writer of Asia and the author of the Epistle both recognize the value of Enoch. This, though not a proof, is a clue to the identification of the heresy of Jude.

V. *The Liturgical formularies of the Marcosian heresy.*

Irenaeus, in his account of the teaching of Marcus, not only derived his facts from the anonymous elder of Asia and from the testimony of those who had left the heresy and returned to the Catholic faith, but from the writings of Marcus himself.² The mystical and astrological speculations of chapters xiv and xv are from the latter source. The knowledge of his rites and formularies is probably from the former sources.

1. Marcus in his Eucharist made use of a mixed cup, and reciting over it the epiklesis or word of invocation (τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως) made it appear ruddy, that the Grace which is from above might be thought to pour his blood into the cup at his invocation. Those who partook of the cup were led to think that they received into themselves ‘that which was called by this magician Grace’.³ He also gave cups to the women, and made them consecrate them in his presence.⁴ The whole description is vivid with life, and is almost certainly based upon the evidence of eye-witnesses. It throws considerable light on the meaning of Jude 12 : ‘they are spots in your feasts of charity.’

The practice has its parallels in the early history of Christianity in Asia. Epiphanius, writing of the Pepuziani, a branch of the Montanist Church, says : ἐπίσκοποί τε παρ’ αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες, καὶ πρεσβύτεροι γυναῖκες, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα· ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρειν φύσιν.⁵ And Firmilian in his letter to

¹ Enoch x 8.

² Iren. i 13, 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*

³ Harn *Alt.-chr. Lit.* i 175.

⁵ Epiph. *Hær.* xlix 2.

Cyprian makes mention of a Cappadocian prophetess who took upon herself to administer Baptism and celebrate the Eucharist: 'Atqui illa mulier, quae prius per praestigias et fallacias daemonis, multa ad deceptionem fidelium moliebatur, inter caetera quibus plurimos deceperat, etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino sine sacramento solitae praedicationis offerret; baptizaret quoque multos usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans ut nil discrepare ab ecclesiastica regula videretur.'¹

The practice of Marcus may not therefore have been new. It became necessary to extend the Apostolic rule as to the ministry of women (1 Cor. xiv 34; 1 Tim. ii 12) from teaching to every other exercise. Tertullian wrote between 204 and 206, just before he joined the Montanists, 'Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tinguere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi vindicare'.²

The Eucharistic formula of Marcus is given in Iren. i 13, 2 ἡ πρὸ τῶν ὄλων, ἡ ἀνενόητος καὶ ἄρρητος χάρις πληρῶσαι σοῦ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ πληθύναι ἐν σοὶ τὴν γνώσιν αὐτῆς, ἐγκατασπείρουσα τὸν κόκκον τοῦ σινάπεως εἰς τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν. The form finds an echo in the words of 2 Pet. iii 18: 'Grow in the grace (χάρτι) and knowledge (γνώσει) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

2. The formula of dedication to the Prophetic office is given in Iren. i 13, 3: μεταδοῦναί σοι θέλω τῆς ἐμῆς χάριτος . . . λάμβανε πρῶτον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δι' ἐμοῦ τὴν χάριν . . . Ἰδοὺ ἡ χάρις κατήλθεν ἐπὶ σε· ἀνοίξον τὸ στόμα σου καὶ προφήτευσον. The words of St Paul, Rom. i 11, 'I long to see you, that I may impart (μεταδῶ) 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 some echo of the formula of the Church. This suggestion is strengthened by a comparison of the words of Ezekiel ii 8, 'open thy mouth, and eat what I give thee', with Rev. x 8-11, 'Take it and eat it up: . . . and I took it and ate it up. . . . And they say unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings'. The Marcossian rite may be a clue to an early rite of dedication to the Prophetic order in the Church.

3. A form of prayer is preserved in Iren. i 13, 6, which is addressed to Wisdom (σοφία)³: ὦ πάρεδρε θεοῦ καὶ μουσικῆς πρὸ αἰῶνος Σιγῆς . . . ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς ἐγγύς, καὶ ὁ κήρυξ με κελεύει ἀπολογεῖσθαι. σὺ δὲ ὡς ἐπισταμένη τὰ ἀμφοτέρων τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν λόγον, ὡς ἕνα ὄντα τῷ κριτῇ

¹ St Cyprian *Ep.* lxxv.

² Tert. *de virg. vel.* c. ix.

³ Ben. ed. note ad loc. Harnack says it is addressed to Σιγή.

παράστησον. The words ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς ἐγγύς are similar to Jas. v 9 ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔστηκεν. They may both be an echo of the old formula 'Maran atha' of 1 Cor. xvi 22 and *Didache* c. x. The words ὁ κηρύξ με κελεύει ἀπολογεῖσθαι may refer to the authority vested in the apostle in the earliest ages of the Church: εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κηρύξ καὶ ἀπόστολος. The Σὺ δὲ recalls the old apostolic formula Σὺ κύριε καρδιωγνώστα πάντων, Acts i 24. It was to check such perversions of the forms of prayer that the writer of the Epistle of St Jude bids the faithful to 'pray in the Holy Ghost' (Jude 20).

4. The Baptismal formula in Iren. i 21, 3 is of special interest, because it has every appearance of being a Gnostic travesty of the Baptismal Creed of the Church, 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints' (Jude 3), 'the most holy faith', in which the faithful were to build themselves up. The Creed consists of six short articles:

- i. εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων.
- ii. εἰς ἀλήθειαν μητέρα πάντων.
- iii. εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς Ἰησοῦν.
- iv. εἰς ἔνωσιν.
- v. καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν.
- vi. καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων.

The first three articles have the Baptismal formulary of St Matt. xxviii 18 and *Didache* c. vii behind them; the last three are almost the earliest witness to the articles on the unity of the Church, the Remission of sins, and the Communion of Saints in the Apostles' Creed.

Art. i is a Gnostic variation of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς (St Matt.). The phrase τῶν ὅλων appears also in the Creed of Theophronius of Tyana among other Asiatic formulae. The ἀγνώστου is Gnostic, and cf. Acts xvii 23.

Art. ii is a perversion of the καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ of St Matthew, the words of St John xiv 6 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια being the link between the two forms. The μητέρα πάντων is Gnostic.

Art. iii is equivalent to καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (St Matt.), and refers to the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism of our Lord.

Art. iv. The phrase εἰς ἔνωσιν is illustrated by the Epistles of St Ignatius, where the words ἐνοῦσθαι &c. are frequent.¹ The words ἔνωσιν σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος (Ign. *Magn.* i) must, according to Lightfoot, be referred to the Churches and not to Christ. This unity is brought into close relationship with the Church in Ign. *Ephes.* v: ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί, ἵνα πάντα ἐν ἐνότητι σύμφωνα ᾗ, and is expressed clearly in Ign. *Phil.* v: ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐν ἐνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The whole group of passages is

¹ Lightfoot, vol. ii p. 109.

an echo of the unity of the Church as the Body of Christ which is expressed in St John xvii 22, 23 and Ephes. iv 4-13. The Creed-form of Marcus is little more than a variant of the Creed-form *εἰς μίαν ἐκκλησίαν*, which would appear to have been in the Creed of Firmilian of Caesarea in 256.

Art. v καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν. This Redemption was among the Marcosians a form of initiation, accompanied with certain outward signs, such as the use of water, oil, or balsam, and a set formula. This Gnostic idea of ἀπολύτρωσις was not new. Something of the same kind was practised in the Colossian Church, and is referred to in the words ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, Col. i 14. Irenaeus recognizes this relation to Baptism in the words: καὶ ὅτι μὲν εἰς ἐξάρτησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν ὑποβέβληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦ (τοῦτο) ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ἐλέγχοντες αὐτοὺς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν ἐν τῷ προσήκοντι τόπῳ.¹ There is therefore little doubt that the article in the Marcosian Creed corresponds with the article on Remission of sins in the Apostles' Creed. The Marcosian form emphasized the idea of Perfection, the Church the idea of Remission and Regeneration.

Art. vi καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων. Zahn² says of the article *sanctorum communionem* — 'It is highly probable that the Latin words are the translation of a Greek original. This could scarcely have been anything else than τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων. Ἁγία would certainly first suggest to Greeks the Lord's Supper.' This interpretation of *sanctorum* as referring to the holy things, *sancta*, rather than to members of the Church, *sancti*, was lost very early in the expositions of the Creed. Niceta of Remesiana in the fourth century interprets it of the *sancti*. Dom Morin, in an article on Codex Sessorianus 52, writes: 'A propos de l'article *sanctorum communionem* on rappelle l'obligation imposée à chaque fidèle de communier tous les dimanches; ce qui oblige d'assigner à la pièce une assez haute antiquité.'³ The older meaning had not been lost. The Collection of sermons in this Codex was formed in the ninth century. Caspari assigns the particular sermon to which Dom Morin refers to the seventh century. But a reference to the 'septem remissiones peccatorum' with its third 'remissio per martyrium' points to an even earlier date. The article 'sanctorum communionem' first occurs in the Danubian Creed of Niceta, and then in the Gallican Creed. It may be traced with other Greek features of the Gallican use to the influence of the Latin Christianity of the Danube, a Christianity which was in close contact with the Greek Christianity of Thrace, and owed its origin ultimately

¹ Iren. i 21, 1.

² *Expos.* 1898, 2, p. 140.

³ Kattenbusch *Ap. Symb.* ii 743.

to Asia¹. It may be therefore that this Marcosian formulary of 160 is the first evidence of this article in the Creed of the Church. It is also noteworthy that in the Creed of the Bangor Antiphonary the article 'sanctorum communionem' follows the article 'abremissa peccatorum' as the Marcosian article on the Communion follows that on the Redemption. This would seem to shew that the Creed Article on the Holy Communion originally followed that on Holy Baptism, and that its position was altered only when its original meaning was obscured.

Is there not some reason therefore for restoring the 'most holy faith' of Jude 20, the form of faith 'once for all delivered to the saints' ver. 3, from this Baptismal formula of the Marcosians, and to recognize in the restoration the form of the Baptismal Creed of Asia in 160?

Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα
εἰς τὸν υἱόν,
εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,
εἰς μίαν ἐκκλησίαν,
εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν,
εἰς κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων.

5. The rite of initiation (λύτρωσις) was accompanied by the following formula: τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ πάσης θεότητος καὶ κυριότητος² καὶ ἀληθείας, ὃ ἐνεδύσατο Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνὸς ἐν ταῖς ζωαῖς, τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Χριστοῦ ζῶντος διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικὴν. This giving of a hidden name recalls the new name referred to in the Epistle to the Church of Pergamum: 'To him that conquereth will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give to him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written which no one knoweth, but he who receiveth it' (Rev. ii 17). The Hidden Name in the Marcosian rite was the Name of Christ, the Living Christ, the Living One of Rev. i 17. The form used in the Marcosian rite was probably closely akin to the form which accompanied the giving of the white tessera in the Pergamene Church. The rite corresponds to the 'sealing' in the Church, in all probability a ceremony rather than a mere metaphor. The Church in Asia regarded this sealing as part of the ministry of the Holy Ghost: 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption (ἀπολυτρώσεως)' Eph. iv 30. So also the Marcosian formula has διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου. And the place of the Angels in the rite of

¹ 'Das thracische Christentum war das bithynische.' Harn. *Mission und Ausbr.* p. 491.

² It is noteworthy that the evil doers of Jude 'set at nought dominion (κυριότητα)'. The word only occurs in 2 Pet. ii 10, Eph. i 21, Col. i 16, all Asian witnesses.

sealing, εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικὴν, is illustrated by the sealing of the 140,000 in Rev. vii 1-8. The angel has the 'seal' of the Living God (Θεοῦ ζῶντος) engraven perhaps with the name of the Living Christ (Χριστοῦ ζῶντος) of the Marcosian formula. It is perhaps in reference to this 'angelic redemption' that the writer of St Jude alludes in his censure of the angels who 'kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation' (ver. 6).

The Marcosian formulary is, like the others, similar to or identical with the form of initiation used in the early Church of Asia in connexion with or as the complement of Holy Baptism. It was the prototype of Confirmation, the Sacrament of Perfection. 'They say that it is necessary to those who have received the perfect knowledge to be regenerated into that power which is above all. Otherwise it is impossible to enter into the Pleroma.' τὸ μὲν γὰρ βάπτισμα τοῦ φαινομένου Ἰησοῦ, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστοῦ κατελθόντος, εἰς τελείωσιν· καὶ τὸ μὲν ψυχικόν, τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν εἶναι ὑφίστανται.¹ The distinction not only shews the difference between remission and perfection among the Marcosians, but also gives point to the words of Jude 19: 'These be they who separate themselves (i.e. make separations), sensual (ψυχικοί), having not the Spirit (πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες).'

After the giving of the Hidden Name, the candidate for initiation (or Redemption or Confirmation) responded in the following words: Ἐσθίριγμαί καὶ λελύτρωμαι καὶ λυτροῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ πάντων τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαῶ, ὃς ἐλυτρώσατο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ τῷ ζῶντι.² Then those who were present add Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν ἐφ' οἷς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο ἐπαναπαύεται. Afterwards they anoint the initiate (τὸν τετελεσμένον) with opobalsamum, which is a type of the sweetness which is above all things.

The whole passage throws light on the words of 1 John ii 20-27: 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things . . . And the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you.' The testimony of 1 John is Asian, and the passage seems to refer to the Catholic form of this Sacrament of Redemption, which in 160 the Marcosians said was 'necessary for perfect knowledge'.³

There is therefore good reason for regarding the form and ritual of this Sacrament as a witness to the form and ritual of the Sacrament of Confirmation in the early Church. The Hidden Name which was given in the Church was the Name above every name (Phil. ii 9). The form of Invocation used is probably identical with that of the

¹ Iren. i 21, 1.

² Ibid. i 21, 3.

³ Ibid. i 21, 2.

Church: ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δύναμιν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπικαλοῦμαι φῶς ὀνομαζόμενον καὶ πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν καὶ ζωὴ· ὅτι ἐν σώματι ἐβασίλευσας. The form for the giving of the Name τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον, &c., which Irenaeus gives in Greek and Hebrew, varied little from the Church form. It was accompanied, according to Clement of Alexandria, by the laying on of hands: διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ λέγουσιν ἐπὶ τέλους· εἰς λύτρωσιν ἀγγελικὴν.¹ The form of response, also given in two languages, in the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαῶ, is an echo of the Apostolic formulary 'in the Name of Jesus' (Phil. ii 10, Acts xix 5). The Pax is the εἰρήνη σοι of 3 John 15. The whole description of the Marcosian Sacrament of Redemption is therefore of the utmost value as a witness to the form and rite of 'Laying on of hands' as practised in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church.

6. One other liturgical form is preserved by Irenaeus, the form for the Baptism or Unction of the Dead: 'Alii sunt qui mortuos redimunt ad finem defunctionis mittentes eorum capitibus oleum et aquam, sive praedictum unguentum cum aqua, et supradictis invocationibus, ut incomprehensibiles et invisibiles principibus et potestatibus fiunt, et ut superascendat super invisibilia interior ipsorum homo ('the inner man' of Eph. iii 16) quasi corpus quidem ipsorum in creatura mundi relinquatur, anima vero proiciatur Demiurgo.'² The water points to Baptism, the oil to Unction. This Baptism and this Unction are given that the person may rise—'ut superascendat'. It is an echo of the early rite of Baptism for the Dead: 'What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not?' 1 Cor. xv 29. The Old Latin 'qui mortuos redimunt' has been turned by the Benedictine editor into 'morientes'. But the periphrastic Greek of Epiphanius—τοὺς τελευτώντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἑξοδὸν φθάνοντας . . . λυτροῦνται . . . ποτὲ γάρ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔλαιον ὕδατι μίξαντες ἐπιβάλλουσι τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ ἐξελθόντος—seems to confirm the translation *mortuos*. The Baptism in 1 Cor. xv 29 was perhaps a vicarious Baptism. Tertullian speaks of it as such³. But the Baptism of the Dead was practised in the early Church, and especially among the Phrygian followers of Montanus⁴. Two forms of commendation are given: the first of them contains the words ἐγὼ υἱὸς ἀπὸ πατρὸς, πατρὸς προόντος, υἱὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ παρόντι. ἦλθον πάντα ἰδεῖν, τὰ ἀλλότρια καὶ τὰ ἴδια. They are taught to say these words when they come to the Powers. The word of Commendation on the Cross, taken with the verse that follows it, connects the Christian idea of commendation and redemption with that shadowed forth in the Marcosian rite:

¹ St Clem. *Alex. Excerpt. Theod.* xxii.

² Iren. i 21, 5.

³ *De Carn. Res.* c. xlviii.

⁴ Philastr. *de Haer.* c. 2; *Dict. Antt.* i 535.

'Father, into Thy Hands I commend my Spirit ; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, Thou God of Truth' (St Luke xxiii 46, Ps. xxx 6).

St Jude will have nothing of Achamoth and Sophia in his view of the last things. He says 'Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life' (Jude 21).

VI. *The Verses against Marcus.*

The iambic verses cited above are interesting not only as corroborating the evidence brought forward by Irenaeus in his chapters on the Marcisian heresy, but because, if the identity between this heresy and that of the Epistle of St Jude be established by the foregoing study, they help to shew the identity of thought and responsibility between the 'elder' of Asia and the writer of the Epistle, in their treatment of the apostate magician.

THOMAS BARNS.

NOTES ON THE DIDACHE.

III.

THERE are some other points in the *Didache* that call for notice.

Let us look at xvi 3 'Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ οἱ φθορεῖς καὶ στραφήσονται τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος. αἰξανούσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσιν καὶ παραδώσουσι.

The passage is modelled upon Matt. vii 15, xxiv 10 ; but the word *παραδώσουσι* is the only one which in any way suggests danger from heathen magistrates. The writer would hardly have expressed himself thus, if he had lived within range of Nero, Trajan, Decius or Diocletian. What he appears to have in his mind is the persecution of Christians by Christians, when sheep turn into wolves. Now he was certainly not a Gnostic nor a Quartodeciman, but he may have been a Montanist. The Montanists were persecuted by Christians in the second century (see the words of Maximilla *Eus.* v. 16, 17 *διώκομαι ὡς λύκος ἐκ προβάτων*, and Tert. *adv. Prax.* 1), by Constantine (Soz. ii 32 ; vii 19 : *Eus.* V. C. iii 63-66 : Epiph. *Haer.* xlviii 14), and by later emperors (see *Cod. Theod.* xvi 5, 59, 65), and are classed with heathen in what is given as the seventh canon of the council of Constantinople.

Immediately after this passage on persecution comes the prophecy