The first testimony we have to the newly discovered Gospel of Judas is in Irenaeus, Adv. haer. I, 31, 1. Here it is said that certain Gnostics adduce a *confictio* which they call ‘the Gospel of Judas’. The question is: what does the noun *confictio* mean here?

Up to now the word has been translated into English as ‘a fictitious history’, ‘a fabrication’, ‘a fabricated work’, ‘a fabricated book’. The suggestion in all of these translations is that the Gospel of Judas is considered to be ‘a fiction’. One may dispute this opinion, however.

According to TLL, *confictio* has a negative meaning indeed: *dolosa excogitatio*. But apart of this first (mentioned) meaning it also denotes *formatio*. The positive meaning of this last word is illustrated by a quote from the Collectio Avellena: *qui ... plasmatus est et confitionem* (Gr. *σύστασιν*) in muliebri accepit ventre. Moreover, it is also indicated that the noun is derived from *confingere* and that its equivalent according to glossaria is *σύνθεσις, σύμπλασις*. For the correct understanding of *confictio* in the Latin Irenaeus we deem this information to be of vital importance.

As regards *confingere*, TLL starts by indicating that the verb is composed of *con* and *fingere*. Its first and, so it appears on the basis of its many testimonies, preponderant meaning is: *fingendo efficere comminisci*. Its second and, in view of the considerable number of testimonies, also well-attested meaning is *componere, conficere*. Among the testimonies of the second category one reads, for instance, one example from Varro belonging to the discipline of linguistics and some from Pliny ‘the Elder’ belonging to natural history. It is this second but at the same time most literal, elementary and hence basic meaning which, according to my opinion, the person who once translated Irenaeus original Greek into Latin had especially in view.

Evidence to support this claim is primarily found in Epiphanius. In his report on the Gospel of Judas and the Gnostics who adduce (*φησιν*) it, he terms it a *συνταγμάτων*. This seems to indicate a (small) work that has been put together from several components. From the Latin translation of Irenaeus’ testimony, it is true, one cannot deduce that the writing we are dealing with was small; the suggestion brought about by the word *confictio* is supported by Epiphanius’ *συν-ταγμάτων*, however. It is fairly possible that
Irenaeus in his original Greek text used this word.\textsuperscript{15} It might also be possible that he termed the work a $\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ or $\sigma\upsilon\nu\theta\varepsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$. Be that as it may, one thing seems to be evident: both Irenaeus and, in his wake, Epiphanius hand down the information that the Gospel of Judas was a composition in the original sense of the word, i.e. a work put together from several (in all likelihood: Gnostic) traditions.

As a matter of fact the word *confictio*, like its suggested equivalent $\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$,\textsuperscript{16} has the negative connotation of ‘feigned’ or ‘fabricated’. But this connotation is not inherent to the meaning of $\sigma\upsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha/\sigma\upsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha\iota\nu\iota\upsilon$ (or $\sigma\upsilon\theta\varepsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, for that matter).\textsuperscript{17}

By opting for an ambiguous word such as *confictio* in order to indicate the peculiar work the Gospel of Judas according to Irenaeus’ description was, the Latin translator made an appropriate choice. His readers are endangered, however, to overlook the original meaning of the word and, in this way, to miss a cardinal characteristic Irenaeus intended to transmit. From the course of Irenaeus’ exposition in *Adv. haer.* it is clear that in I, 31 he is dealing with a group of Gnostics (later on, for instance by Epiphanius and Theodoretus, they are termed ‘Cainites’) whose teachings are based upon doctrines several of which we also find in other Gnostic groups.

A glance at the original meaning of *confictio* we finally get from Theodoretus of Cyrrhus. In his *Haereticorum fabularum compendium* I, 15 he hands down an abstract from Irenaeus’ original Greek passage on the Gospel of Judas and their Gnostics. As regards the Gospel, he emphatically communicates:

\[ \delta\omega\rho\varepsilon\;\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\iota\;\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\nu. \]\textsuperscript{18} The stress in this phrase, it should be observed, is on $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\nu$: Theodoretus is explaining to his readers that Judas did not write the Gospel named after him, but that it originated from others. In the choice of the verb $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\mu\iota$, however, we may hear an echo of Irenaeus’ original Greek noun which his Latin translator transmitted as *confictio*.

Our concluding remarks may be brief. Already from Irenaeus’ testimony it may be derived that the Gospel of Judas was a composite, the word *confictio* at the same time bearing the negative connotation of something put together. But Irenaeus (and the same goes, in his wake, for Epiphanius and Theodoretus) does not term it a mere fabrication or fiction. From the recently discovered Gospel of Judas we learn that the information provided by Irenaeus is correct. The Gospel of Judas is a work composed of several Gnostic (mainly ‘Sethian’) and also other traditions.\textsuperscript{19}
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