

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 ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ πληθύναι ἐν σοὶ τὴν γῶσιν αὐτῆς, ἐγκατασπεύουσα 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.

I. The first item is a fragment of the *Acta Pilati* (chapters ix-xi) in a version differing from those previously known.

II. Two leaves, paged 53, 54 and 59, 60, of an interesting narrative about the Resurrection. Pilate examines the soldiers who guarded the tomb, separately, asking each of them how many men, or who, removed the body of Jesus. They give contradictory answers, that the eleven apostles and their disciples came,—that Joseph and Nicodemus and their family came,—that they, the soldiers, were asleep. Pilate orders them to be imprisoned, and goes with the centurion and the Jewish priests and elders to the tomb. Here they find the grave-clothes, and Pilate asks why, if the body were stolen, these were not taken with it. The Jews answer that these are not the grave-clothes of Jesus. Pilate remembers the words of Jesus—'great wonders must happen in my tomb',—and he embraces the grave-clothes and weeps over them. Then he turns to the centurion, who has but one eye, the other having been destroyed in battle.

Here is a lacuna in which the centurion's eye is healed by the touch of the grave-clothes (as M. Lacau rightly suggests), and he is converted. Then Joseph and Nicodemus are summoned, and it is pointed out by the Jews that in a well in the garden there is the body of a crucified man.

We resume with a broken dialogue between Pilate and the centurion, and then the party go to the well, 'and I Gamaliel followed': an interesting clause, shewing the attribution of the narrative. The corpse is seen in the well, and the Jews cry out that it is that of Jesus. Joseph and Nicodemus, questioned, say that the grave-clothes, which Pilate is carrying, are those of Jesus, and the body is that of the thief who was crucified with Him.

Pilate remembers the words of Jesus, 'The dead shall be raised to life in my tomb', and he suggests to the Jews that if this body be that of Jesus, it ought to be replaced in the tomb.

Here the fragment ends: but it is easy to see, as M. Lacau points out, that the body when laid in the tomb revives, and bears witness to its own identity, and to the resurrection of Christ. I have seen a detached sheet of an Ethiopic MS (of which an account and a rough and incorrect version by myself was printed in the *Newbery House Magazine*, 1892, pp. 641-6, by the Rev. A. Baker, together with a facsimile of two pages) which plainly relates to the same story. I will reproduce the version here 'with all faults'.

p. 1, col. 1. . . the linen cloths, for he said 'O my brother, dost thou not behold how it smells and is beautiful, the fragrance of that linen cloth, and it is not like the smell of the dead, but like the fine linen (purple) of kings' wrappings'. And the Jews said to Pilate, 'Thou

thyself knowest how Joseph put upon Him much spice and incense and (rubbed) Him with myrrh and aloes, and this is the cause why they smell (col. 2) fragrant'. And Pilate said to them, 'Although there was put ointment upon the linen cloth, wherefore is that sepulchre as a chamber which has in it musk and sweet spices, and is warm and smells fragrant?' And they said, 'This odour which is sweet, Pilate, that is the smell of the garden which is what the winds blow into it'. And Pilate heard them and (p. 2, col. 1) . . . Pilate and he said unto them, 'Ye have prepared for yourselves a way of perdition and gone astray, and fallen into a place which shall not be visited for ever'. And they hearkened to him and said to him, 'It is not proper or desirable for thee to come to this sepulchre, for thou (art) governor and the city desires thee: and lo! the elders of the priests and the chiefs (col. 2) of the Jews will learn this speech and deed of thine. And it is not a proper thing for thee to cause war among the Jews on account of a man (who is) dead.' And he<sup>1</sup> said to him, 'Alas, O my brother, look at this great hatred wherewith the Jews hate Jesus. We have done their will and crucified Him: and all the world has come to view through their wickedness and injustice. And He will visit (?)

[Here at least two leaves are gone. We resume with the end of a prayer of Pilate, as it seems.]

(p. 3, col. 1) and giver of life to all, give life (resurrection) to all the dead.

[The rest of the column is occupied by a picture: above, men laying a shrouded corpse in a tomb; below, Pilate praying with extended hands.]

(Col. 2) I believe that Thou hast risen and hast appeared to me and Thou wilt not judge me, O my Lord, because I acted for Thee (did this to Thee) fearing this from the Jews. And it is not that I deny Thy resurrection, O my Lord, I believe in Thy word and in the mighty works which Thou didst work amongst them when Thou wast alive; Thou didst raise many dead. Therefore, O my God, be not angry with me because of what I did (p. 4, col. 1) (putting) another body in the place where they put therein Thy body, for I did that, that there might be shame and disgrace upon those who believe not in Thy resurrection, false ones, for upon them is shame for ever. Praise and honour and power becometh Thee from the mouth of Thy creatures for ever and ever. Amen.' (Col. 2) And when Pilate had finished this prayer, while he stretched forth his hands over the sepulchre, there came a voice from the mouth of the dead and said, 'O my Lord (?) I behold Thy sepulchre how Thou hast opened it. I behold the garden before (?). Roll away the stone O my

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps 'she said': it is not unlikely that Pilate's wife was introduced into the story.

Lord Pilate, that I may go and come out in the power of my Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead'. And Pilate cried out with great joy.

That this is nearly related to the Coptic story does not need to be explained. Whether it is actually part of the same document is not clear: there are differences. In the Coptic, for instance, the Jews deny that the grave-clothes belonged to Jesus; in the Ethiopic they allow it. But the central point, of the placing of a body in the tomb of Christ which revives and bears testimony to the resurrection, is common to both: and this is an episode which we do not find anywhere else. M. Lacau refers to an Arabic *Martyrium Pilati* in MS Arab. 152 at the Bibl. Nat. as containing or likely to contain similar matter. This clearly deserves investigation: it would be most interesting to have the story in a completer form.

III. Three fragments, the last preserved partly in two recensions, of a narrative connected with the Passion.

Christ and the Apostles are at table: the table, it is said, used to turn of its own accord after Christ had partaken of a dish, in order to present the dish to each of the Apostles.

Matthias (not yet, of course, one of the twelve, but represented, one supposes, as an attendant<sup>1</sup>: just as St Martialis and St Ursinus were represented in Western legends) places a cock on the table in a dish, and tells how, when he was killing it, the Jews taunted him by saying that his Master's blood would soon be shed like that of the cock. Jesus, smiling, assents to this, comparing the cock to John Baptist, as the herald of light. Then touching the cock, He revives it and bids it fly away and announce the story of His betrayal (one would have expected 'of His resurrection', but the word is *παράδιδόμαι*).

The second fragment, which has many gaps, tells shortly how Judas received the pieces of silver. Then, that Judas's wife was nursing the child, only seven months old, of Joseph of Arimathaea. On the day of Judas's bargain the child fell ill (apparently), and Joseph was summoned to see it. On his arrival it cried out, begging to be taken away 'from the hands of this *θηρίον*, because yesterday at the ninth hour they received the price (of blood)'. Joseph took the child away accordingly.

Then follows a very short narrative, only a few lines, of the Passion and Crucifixion.

The third fragment tells the story of a man of Bethlehem, by name Ananias, who, after the death of Jesus, ran forward and embraced the body and the cross. A voice came from the body, blessing him and

<sup>1</sup> Or as the master of the house in which the meal takes place. In the apocalypse of Bartholomew (Lacau p. 77) Matthias is said to have been rich in worldly goods, this is no doubt the result of confusion with Matthew. Matthew is mentioned in this same paragraph, without any allusion to his riches.

promising him immortality. The Jews in wrath stoned him without effect, then placed him in a burning furnace for three days and three nights, and finally the high priest pierced him with a lance. The voice of God was heard blessing him, and promising that his body should never decay.

The episode of the resuscitation of the cock in the first of these fragments is one which took hold on popular imagination, both in East and West. It is told in Danish and other northern ballads, and represented in early northern art, in connexion with Christ's birth, the actors being St Stephen and Herod; and again in connexion with the Passion in late Greek forms of the *Acta Pilati*, and in a good many Latin MSS, as a detached story, the actors being Judas and his wife or mother. An Ethiopic writing called the Book of the Cock<sup>1</sup>, described in D'Abbadie's catalogue, contains the tale in a form probably much like the Coptic. It deserves publication.

To the other two fragments I can at present adduce no parallel.

IV. A large portion of the Apocalypse of Bartholomew, in two recensions. Both of these are from the convent of Amba Schenoudah (whence, indeed, most of the other fragments also come), where Bartholomew's body was thought to be preserved.

One portion of this Apocalypse had been long known by a publication of E. Dulaurier in 1835. We now have an important accession. The extracts of the whole are as follows:

Christ has descended into Hell. He tramples on Beliar and Melchir (cf. Belkiras in the *Ascension of Isaiah*). Meanwhile Death is conversing with the grave-clothes of Christ in the sepulchre. The grave-clothes, it is evident, are caused to personate Christ and to hold Death in parley while Christ descends to harry Hell.

Christ addresses the soul of Judas in terms resembling those of the lamentation over Elihu in the *Testament of Job* (ch. xliiii). Only the beginning of this remains. Two pages (one leaf) are lost<sup>2</sup>.

After this speech Death (Abaddon), who must have found out the trick

<sup>1</sup> D'Abbadie's account (*Catal. Raisonné de MSS Éth.* 1859, p. 10) is: ' Aussitôt après la Sainte Cène, Akrosina, femme de Simon le Pharisien, apporta un coq rôté dans un pot, le mit sur un joli plat et le posa devant notre Sauveur . . . et Jésus lui rendit la vie en le touchant et l'envoya épier Judas dans Jérusalem; il lui donna aussi la voix humaine. Et Rigrimt, femme de Judas, l'envoya aux Juifs. Le coq assista au marché conclu par Judas et s'en alla l'annoncer à Jésus, qui, après l'avoir écouté, l'envoya monter en volant jusqu'au ciel pendant 10,000 ans . . . Ensuite vient l'histoire de la Passion . . . Saül, Yodnan et Alexandre sont parmi les persécuteurs de Notre Seigneur.'

<sup>2</sup> It will be remembered by some that in the fragmentary Coptic Acts of Andrew and Paul, there is a long conversation between Paul and the soul of Judas, which is found alone in Hell by the former.

practised upon him, descends into Hell with his Power, the Pestilence (λοιμός), and his six Decani. They find the place laid desolate, and only three souls left, namely, those of Cain, Herod, and Judas. We are reminded of Dante's *Inferno* here: a mutilated sentence reads, 'Ils se trouvaient dans ce lieu comme un κελος (?) à trois têtes (τρικέφαλος) de l'absence de pardon qui était sur eux, etc.'

Meanwhile Christ with the delivered souls emerges to find the angels singing the hymn of dawn.

The holy women had come to the tomb. They were Mary Magdalene, Mary mother of James, whom Christ had delivered from Satan, Salome who tempted Him, Mary and Martha, Johanna wife of Chuza, Berenice whom He healed of an issue at Capernaum, Lia the widow, whose son He raised at Nain, and the woman that was a sinner, to whom He said, 'Thy sins which are many are forgiven thee'. They were in the garden of Philoges the gardener, whose son Simeon Christ healed when He came down from the Mount of Olives with His disciples (i. e. after the Transfiguration).

Then follows a conversation between Philoges and the Virgin, in which he tells her how the Jews had buried Jesus in his garden, and how in the night a vast multitude of angels and His Father had come and raised Him.

Now the Saviour appears in His chariot and calls to the Virgin in the language of His deity. She answers 'Rabboni' (with other words), and He addresses her in a long benediction. After this, in one recension, she says, 'If thou permittest me not to touch thee, bless me'. In both texts she asks for a blessing, which is given. Then she goes to summon the apostles. Two leaves (four pages) are gone. After the gap follows the passage published by Dulaurier treating of the forgiveness of Adam, the blessings pronounced on the several apostles, and the appearance in Galilee. Bartholomew appears throughout as the narrator.

The device of the talking grave-clothes in this fragment is new and curious. It has a flavour of the familiar popular tale in which drops of blood are made to call in answer to the ogre or wizard and make him believe that his prisoner is still in the house, and so delay his pursuit. A more interesting point is the mention of Salome as having tempted Christ. We can hardly be wrong in seeing here a reference to the dialogue between Salome and our Lord which was contained in the Gospel according to the Egyptians<sup>1</sup>. Any indication of the continued

<sup>1</sup> In the *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres* 1903 pp. 246-247 in an account of a paper read by M. Révillout on these same apocrypha. The only document of which no notice is given in the other publications before me is one relating to Salome. I will quote what M. Révillout says of it:

'À un Évangile de l'enfance encore inconnu appartient sans doute le récit des aventures de Salomé. Ces aventures sont peu édifiantes . . . Selon notre

influence of this book in Egypt is welcome and valuable. Perhaps the strangest thing in the whole is the apparent confusion between the Virgin and Mary Magdalene. The Virgin is not mentioned in the list of holy women; and the incident of the *Noli me tangere* is pretty clearly transferred from the Magdalene to her. So grave a mistake is hardly conceivable, as a mistake. It must be rather an intentional and conscious perversion. It recurs in another document, of which a notice will be found later on in this paper.

The general tone of the book is late. There is, indeed, one mention of Aeons ('Hail to thee [the Virgin] who hast united the seven Aeons in a single creature'), but it is very vague. The primacy of Peter, 'the great archbishop', is strongly emphasized.

It will be asked what connexion there is between the Coptic Apocalypse and the *Questions of Bartholomew* (Greek and Slavonic), edited by Vassiliev and by Bonwetsch. Both, it may be answered, have this in common—that the scene is laid after the Resurrection, and that the Virgin is prominent in both. But there is no actual coincidence of matter, though I feel the probability that a complete text of the Coptic Apocalypse would furnish some point of connexion. I am inclined to suspect that the Coptic text was an elaboration, made at Amba Schenoudah, in honour of the local saint, of some earlier text, whereof relics are also embedded in the *Questions of Bartholomew*.

V. Eleven leaves containing matter relating to the ministry of our Lord. Most of this has already been published by Révillout and Guidi, and translated by Forbes Robinson. M. Lacau gives a translation of the inedited portions. These are two in number.

The first continues the text at the point where Robinson's fragment III (p. 176) ends. It tells of the intrigues for and against the making Jesus king of the Jews. John the Apostle, it is said, was taken by Carius (an

apocryphe, Salomé était une demi-mondaine très connue, qui avait autrefois acquis une grande fortune. Le saint vieillard Siméon, qui bénit le Christ à sa naissance, était allé alors la trouver, comme si la réputation de sa beauté l'avait attiré. Salomé très émue croit le reconnaître sans en être certaine. Sur sa demande, elle l'emmène dans des chambres de plus en plus secrètes, pour éviter de le compromettre. Enfin il s'ouvre à elle de ses intentions et finit par la convertir. Elle abandonna alors sa maison et ses richesses. Il la baptise au nom de la Sainte-Trinité, qui lui a été révélée sur le Jourdain, que le Christ devait plus tard visiter, il le sait. Salomé se retire à Bethléem, où elle construit des lieux de refuge pour y servir les voyageurs. C'est là que viennent plus tard Joseph et Marie. Sur la demande de Joseph, Salomé va chercher une sage-femme (comme dans le proto-évangile de Saint-Jacques). La sage-femme et elle devaient, d'après le dernier texte, assister au miracle qui lui montra, ainsi qu'à Salomé, en Jésus le Fils de Dieu.'

Provisionally this must be regarded as not at all an early story, and as very probably influenced by such legends as that of Mary of Egypt.

imperial officer) to Tiberius, and gave him an account of Jesus. Jesus, 'as it is written in the Gospels', retires to a mountain with the Apostles. And here follows a solemn blessing of Peter, not unlike that in the Apocalypse of Bartholomew. Similar blessings of other apostles appear to be contained in a fragmentary leaf (pp. 97, 98) not translated by the editor. Then, after no long gap, in all probability, we resume with Robinson's fragment IV (pp. 177-9). This, it may be remembered, ends with an appearance of the devil as a fisherman, who catches men by different parts of their bodies. A leaf in Lacau (pp. 99, 100: translation p. 108) gives us the continuation of this scene. The devil is put to flight by John: Bartholomew then asks to see 'him whom Thou didst create to laugh at him (i. e. Leviathan: see Ps. civ 26), whom Thou didst cast down from the height of the heaven'. Jesus replies that no man can bear the sight, but that He Himself, who puts all fear to flight, is with them. A cloud then appears in the sky, which is that same cloud on which Moses and Elias went up to heaven, and from which the voice of the Father was heard: 'This is my (Son)'. Here the fragment ends.

It seems not doubtful that a vision of Satan is to be vouchsafed to the Apostles in answer to Bartholomew's request. In this I see a near resemblance to the *Questions of Bartholomew*, where (ed. Bonwetsch pp. 18 sqq.) Bartholomew makes the same demand and receives a very similar answer: Beliar is then brought, chained, by angels, and reveals many mysteries to the inquisitive Apostle. This affinity between the Coptic fragment and the Greek book is to my mind in favour of the notion that the Coptic Apocalypse of Bartholomew will be found to be ultimately identical with the *Questions*: at the least it points to an acquaintance with the *Questions in Egypt*.

Another Greek document which should be mentioned in connexion with this incident is the *Dispute of Christ with Satan*, edited in two late texts by Vassiliev. In this there is no mention of Bartholomew, but there is a rather similar setting; and there is the common feature of a cloud appearing (which suspends Satan in the air). I rather imagine that this would be the ultimate function of the cloud in the Coptic fragment.

The general complexion of the piece is, of course, already known. It is professedly not in the nature of a supplement to the Gospels (Robinson p. 165), but one cannot easily find another description for it. It constantly refers to the Gospels, and gives information which they do not contain. Possibly we ought to regard these narratives as illustrative extracts from older books introduced by the preacher to add interest to his sermon (for these documents are nearly all in the form of sermons): at least in the case before us we have seen what looks like a borrowing from an *apocryphon* of Bartholomew. Other amplifications,

e.g. the long address of Christ to Thomas (p. 170), may be put down confidently to the writer's imagination. In the case before us it does not appear (as it does in some others) that the author is supposed to be an eye-witness, or a companion of the Apostles. But until some more complete text containing the beginning or end of these homilies is discovered, we cannot pronounce with certainty on the claims which their writers made for them.

It is now time to take account of the fragments which M. Révillout has translated in his pamphlet *L'Évangile des Douze Apôtres récemment découvert* (pp. 56). His main thesis in this work is one for which he will not find many supporters. It is that the fragments described above under Nos. II, III, and V, together with many others, belong to a single work which he identifies with the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles mentioned by Origen (*in Lucam*): that this was an orthodox compilation attributed to Gamaliel, and dating from the beginning of the second century. However, as far as our present knowledge goes, we are not justified in regarding the 'homiletic' fragments (No. V) as belonging to the same work as Nos. II or III: and I shall be surprised if many or any students incline to assign to any of the documents a date anterior to the fourth century at earliest in their present form. Still, we must be grateful to M. Révillout for what he has given us in the way of new matter, and we shall look eagerly for his promised full publication of the texts in M. Graffin's series.

His pamphlet is arranged in a rather confusing order. He follows the Gospel story and intercalates his texts in the midst of his comments, and extracts from the canonical Gospels. It may be useful to give a list of the passages.

p. 7. = Robinson p. 168.

p. 10. R. p. 169.

p. 11. New. Accusation of Philip the Tetrarch by Herod to Tiberius, and deposition of Philip.

p. 12. Robinson p. 169. Miracle of the loaves.

p. 14. Robinson p. 169. Lazarus. p. 16. R. p. 172. pp. 17-19.

R. pp. 173-5.

p. 19. Lacau p. 105.

p. 22. Lacau p. 106.

On p. 24 is a paragraph from the Apocalypse of Bartholomew. Lacau p. 75.

p. 25. Robinson pp. 176-8. p. 28. R. p. 178.

The fragments on pp. 7-25 are (except that on p. 24) from the 'homiletic' narrative.

p. 30. New. A paragraph on Judas, who is instigated by his wife to take money from the purse, and also to betray Christ. This resembles

Lacau's No. III, in that mention is made of Judas's wife: but it does not fit into that text.

p. 32. Lacau p. 33, No. III.

On pp. 36, 37 is given the Strasburg fragment published by Jacoby. This also Révillout considers to form part of the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles.

pp. 38, 39. New. A conversation between Jesus and Pilate. A longer one discovered subsequently by the editor is given in a note on p. 37.

p. 41. Lacau pp. 34-6. The episode of Ananias of Bethlehem. At the end of this, on p. 42, Révillout adds a new fragment which to my mind cannot but be an address of Christ to Thomas after the resurrection. It is an amplification of the words, 'Reach hither thy finger', &c.

p. 44. New. An account of the appearance of Christ to the Virgin in the garden, in which the words *Noli me tangere* are undoubtedly addressed to the latter, and not to Mary Magdalene: 'Ô mère, ne me touchez pas . . . Il n'est pas possible que rien de charnel me touche jusqu'à ce que j'aïlle au ciel.'

pp. 46-8. Lacau pp. 19 sqq., No. II.

On pp. 49 sqq. fragments of an account of the Assumption of the Virgin are given, which the editor conjecturally attributes to the same hand and source as the rest.

It will have been gathered from what I have said that I do not assign a very early date to any of the fragments I have described. In spite of this, I feel that considerable interest attaches to them in view of the fact that they probably embody (in the allusion to Salome they do plainly embody) matter taken from much earlier books. This element will have to be carefully strained out by protracted study; and before that study can be usefully prosecuted, we must have a *Corpus* of the texts such as we hope M. Révillout will shortly give us. Besides their borrowed ingredients, however, these writings have an interest of their own. The wealth of fancy, the boldness of invention which they display (side by side with a good deal of poor rhetoric, it is true), is really remarkable. I think even the 'general reader', if he be not too impatient of asterisks and broken sentences, would be interested and pleased by the perusal of them. But perhaps a long familiarity with this department of fiction has inclined me to an undue tolerance.

M. R. JAMES