HEGESIPPUS AND THE APOCALYPSE.

TESTIMONY from the second century in regard to the date and authorship of the canonical Apocalypse is both scanty and, in some respects, difficult to interpret. It seems worth while therefore to point out that an anonymous passage, which yields evidence that the Apocalypse was written in the closing years of the reign of Domitian, may with some probability be regarded as an extract from the *Hypomnemata* of Hegesippus, and may therefore be dated c. 180. It is the purpose of the present paper to give such proof as may be available of the truth of that statement.

I. By way of preliminary two passages must be exhibited side by side. The first is reproduced, with some omissions, from Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* Book III chapters xvii–xx § 5. This I designate by the letter *E*. The second has been edited from the Paris MS 1555 A by J. A. Cramer in his *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, Oxford, 1839, ii 88, and from the Bodleian MS, Barocc. 142 by C. de Boor in *Texte und Untersuchungen* v 2 169. I call it *C*, and indicate the four sentences of which it consists by the letters (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) (*d*). Words which are common to the two are underlined.

E	*C*
xvii Πολλήν γε μὴν εἰς πολλοὺς ἐπιδειξάμενος ὁ Δομετιανὸς ὠμότητα, οὐκ ὀλίγον τε τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὐπατριδῶν τε καὶ ἐπισήμων ἀνδρῶν πλῆθος οὐ μετ' εὐλόγου κρίσεως κτείνας, μυρίους τε ἄλλους ἐπιφανεῖς ἄνδρας ταῖς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐνορίαν ζημιώσας φυγαῖς καὶ ταῖς τῶν οὐσιῶν ἀποβολαῖς ἀναιτίως, τελευτῶν τῆς Νέρωνος θεοεχθρίας τε καὶ θεομαχίας διάδοχον ἑαυτὸν κατεστήσατο. Δεύτερος δῆτα τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεκίνει διωγμόν, καίπερ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ μηδὲν καθ' ἡμῶν ἄτοπον ἐπινοήσαντος.	(*a*) Δομετιανὸς υἱὸς Οὐεσπασιανοῦ πολλὰ κακὰ εἰς τοὺς ἐν τέλει Ῥωμαίους ἐνδειξάμενος
	τὴν Νέρωνος νικήσας ὠμότητα
	δεύτερος κατὰ Χριστιανῶν διωγμὸν ἐποίησεν.
xviii 1 Ἐν τούτῳ κατέχει λόγος τὸν ἀπόστολον ἅμα καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἔτι τῷ βίῳ ἐνδιατρίβοντα, τῆς εἰς τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἕνεκεν μαρτυρίας, Πάτμον οἰκεῖν καταδικασθῆναι τὴν νῆσον . . .	(*b*) καθ' ὃν καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἐν Πάτμῳ περιώρισεν.

xix . . . Ταῦτα δὲ δηλοῖ κατὰ λέξιν ὧδέ πως λέγων ὁ Ἡγήσιππος.

xx 1 Ἔτι δὲ περιῆσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ Κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ· οὓς ἐδηλατόρευσαν ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαυίδ . . .

5 ἐφ' οἷς μηδὲν αὐτῶν κατεγνωκότα τὸν Δομετιανόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς εὐτελῶν καταφρονήσαντα, ἐλευθέρους μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀνεῖναι, καταπαῦσαι δὲ διὰ προστάγματος τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωγμόν . . . 7 Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἡγήσιππος.

(*c*) συντυχὼν δὲ Δομετιανὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰούδα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ γνοὺς τὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπαύσατο διωγμοῦ.

(*d*) Ἀναφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἡγήσιππος καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, καί φησιν ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Ζωκήρ, ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος. [Ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἀναγκαῖα[1]]

A comparison of these two passages clearly proves that there is a literary connexion between them. But it is manifestly impossible that *E* is a mere expansion of *C*. May we then suppose that *C* was derived from *E* by way of abridgement? This is certainly a possible hypothesis. But it appears to me to be improbable for several reasons. In the first place we are informed in *C d* that the names of the grandsons of Jude were Zocer and James. This fact the writer cannot have learnt from *E*; for it is not recorded there—nor indeed in any other extant writing. And he expressly tells us that he bases his statement on the authority of Hegesippus. Now it is *a priori* probable that *C a–c* is immediately derived from the same source as *C d*. And, indeed, this seems to be indicated by the very phrase of the epitomizer: Ἀναφέρει δὲ ὁ Ἡγήσιππος καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν. *C*, then, may fairly be assumed to be founded not on *E*, but on the *Hypomnemata* of Hegesippus. And this is the work from which, as Eusebius himself says, *E* xx 1–6 is a quotation. Thus we are led to the conclusion that from the *Hypomnemata* *E* and *C* are alike derived as their common source.

And this conclusion is confirmed by another consideration. There is nothing in *C* to correspond to *E* xviii 2–4. Now on the supposition that *C* is an epitome of *E* this omission is not easy to explain. For the latter part of *E* xviii gives information which is both important and interesting. In §§ 2, 3 evidence is given as to the date of the Apocalypse; § 4 records the banishment of Flavia Domitilla. Why

[1] In the Oxford MS only.

should such things have been passed over by one who undertook to give a summary, however brief, of *E*? On the other hand, on the theory which is advocated in this paper their absence from *C* is accounted for without difficulty. For §§ 2, 3 are a quotation from Irenaeus; and § 4 is based, as we are told, on τοὺς ἄποθεν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου συγγραφεῖς. Whatever the latter phrase may mean, it is at least certain that Hegesippus cannot be among the writers whom it includes: and it is abundantly evident from the parallel passage in the *Chronicle*[1] that Bruttius, or Brettius, was the principal, if not the only, authority on whom Eusebius relied for his account of Flavia Domitilla. Thus on the supposition that the writer of *C* had before him not *E*, but the *Hypomnemata* of Hegesippus, it was impossible for him to include in his summary the facts recorded in *E* xviii 2–4.

Assuming then the correctness of our hypothesis as to the relation between *C* and *E*, we can now form a pretty accurate conception of the method of work of the compiler to whom we are indebted for *C*. For *E* xx 1–6 is a quotation, in part direct, in part indirect, from Hegesippus. We have in it, in great measure, the *ipsissima verba* of the passage of which *Cc* is a summary. Comparing the two together we observe, in the first place, that the writer of *C* has much reduced the length of his original: *Cc* contains only twenty-one words, *E* xx 1–5 contains 200. But we notice also that he has been careful to preserve, as far as possible, the phrases of Hegesippus. Of his twenty-one words, eleven are found in *E*. In fact, it would scarcely be untrue to say that he never departs from the words of Hegesippus except for the purpose of abbreviation. Thus συντυχών sums up the series of events recounted in *E* xx 1b—the laying of an information against the sons of Jude, and their appearance before the emperor in charge of the evocatus; while τὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν very fairly describes their hard-working honesty and faith, described in detail in *E* xx 2–4. Now we find that the relation between *Ca*, *b* and *E* xvii, xviii 1 is similar to that which exists between *Cc* and *E* xx 1–5, though the disparity in length between the passages to be compared is not so marked in the former case as in the latter. In *E* xvii there are seventy-one words; in *Ca* twenty, of which twelve are in *E*. And *E* xviii 1 has twenty-four words, six of which are found among the eleven of which *Cb* consists. Moreover, as indicating anxiety on the part of the writer of *C* to retain the words of his source, we may mention the strange phrase, πολλὰ κακὰ εἰς τοὺς . . . Ῥωμαίους ἐνδειξάμενος: we can understand it when we remember that *E* has πολλὴν . . . εἰς πολλοὺς ἐπιδειξάμενος . . . ὠμότητα. As before, most of the words in *C* which are not also found in *E* are briefer equivalents of its phrases,

[1] Ed. Schoene 160, 163. Cf. Lightfoot *Clement of Rome* i 46 ff.

e. g. *κακά*, *τοὺς ἐν τέλει*, *νικήσας*, *περιώρισεν*; *Χριστιανῶν* and *ἐποίησεν* however are exceptions.

The obvious inference from these facts seems to be that *E* xvii, xviii 1 adheres pretty closely to the phraseology of Hegesippus. And we may, at any rate, feel confident that the expressions which are common to this part of *E* and *C a*, *b* were also used by him. But, if so, we find in *E* xviii 1 ground for believing that Hegesippus testified that John, definitely described by him as the Apostle and Evangelist, was banished to Patmos in the reign of Domitian.

II. If it were possible to leave the matter at this point, a good many of my readers would perhaps concede that the hypothesis here suggested has a reasonable degree of probability. But it now becomes my duty to mention some facts, which, though I do not regard them as destroying the validity of my argument, must be regarded as in some degree mitigating its force.

The passage which I have called *C* is, in the Bodleian manuscript from which C. de Boor extracted it, one of a series extending from f. 212 to f. 216. At the beginning of the series stands this title, *Συναγωγὴ ἱστοριῶν διαφόρων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἑξῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου λόγου τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου*. At the end is the note, *ἕως τούτων ἱστορεῖ ὁ Εὐσέβιος*. It is thus clearly intimated that the whole series of passages is a collection of excerpts from Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*. Moreover, the passages are arranged in groups, each group having a heading indicating the book of the *History* from which the excerpts in it are taken.[1]

Now it appears that these notes so far agree with the phenomena of the passages to which they refer, that the large majority of them have a manifest connexion with the text of Eusebius, if they cannot in all cases be reckoned as summaries of it. It may be asked, Does not all this directly contradict the theory that *C* is an excerpt not from Eusebius, but from the source which Eusebius used? And, that being so, is not the theory untenable?

Several considerations forbid us to give with confidence an affirmative answer to this question. For it must be remarked that the notes to which our attention is directed are not in complete accordance with the facts. Several of the passages in the MS are not, as they stand, mere epitomes of Eusebius. There is, for example, a reference to Nestorius, in connexion with Paul of Samosata. There is also a citation from St Chrysostom. And there is a passage about the later kings of the Jews which could not have been compiled from Eusebius alone. And besides these there are seven pieces, the earlier part of each of which *may* be a summary of a passage in Eusebius, while the latter part

[1] C. de Boor in *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.* vi 486, *Texte u. Untersuch.* v 2 168.

is certainly taken from the writer whom Eusebius happened to be using at the moment—Papias, Hegesippus, Origen, or Pierius—but from a passage which he does not quote[1]. Since the notes in the Bodleian MS are not strictly accurate, it is legitimate to enquire with regard to each of these seven, whether the compiler has been content to follow Eusebius as far as he went, or whether he did not resort in each case for the whole of his summary, and not only for its closing sentences, to Eusebius's source.

But, further, these notes are peculiar to the manuscript used by C. de Boor. We have therefore no right to assume that they were in the collection of excerpts from which both it and Cramer's Paris MS were ultimately derived. It is at least conceivable that they are due to an editorially-minded scribe—the writer of the Oxford MS, or of an exemplar from which it is descended. In that case they have no more authority as a description of the procedure of the original compiler, though they doubtless agree more closely with the facts, than the note which appears in the Paris copy as the title of the series, *Εὐσταθίου Ἐπιφανέως Συρίας ἐπιτομὴ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας Ἰωσήπου.*

But whatever weight the objections drawn from the notes in the Oxford MS. may seem to have against the argument with which it and its companion manuscript at Paris supply us, our original conclusion may be reached by an entirely different process of reasoning which they do not affect. This I shall now proceed to shew.

III. In passing from the tenth to the eleventh chapter of the third book of the *Ecclesiastical History* we experience one of those jolts to which readers of Eusebius soon became accustomed. Chapters v–x have dealt with the siege of Jerusalem and its historian Josephus, and they have been entirely based on his writings. Chapters xi–xxiii are a fairly consecutive narrative, dealing for the most part with the history of the Christian Church, and covering the period from Vespasian to Trajan. Eusebius leaves the impression that for it he has had recourse to many authorities, from one to another of which he passes rapidly. I shall here set out a table of the contents of chapters xi–xx, stating under each head the authority which Eusebius professes to have consulted. In doing so, however, I omit the records of the successions of emperors and bishops which, according to his wont, he inserts here and there in his narrative.

[1] *Texte u. Untersuch.* v 2 168 ff. One of these passages is, of course, that with which we are immediately concerned. At least one of the others occurs also in the Paris MS, but without the passage of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii 25) which precedes it in the Oxford MS. In the Paris MS it immediately follows our extract from Hegesippus. See Cramer ii 88.

chap. xi. The election of Symeon as bishop of Jerusalem. Introduced with the phrase λόγος κατέχει. An incidental remark at the end is covered by the words Ἡγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ.

chap. xii. Vespasian's proceedings against the descendants of David. An indirect quotation depending either on λόγος κατέχει or Ἡγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ in the previous chapter.

chap. xvi. Digression on the Epistle of Clement. For the disturbance at Corinth which gave occasion to it reference is made to Hegesippus.

chap. xvii. The persecution of Domitian. No authority given.

chap. xviii. § 1. St John's banishment: κατέχει λόγος.

§ 2. The date of the Apocalypse: Irenaeus.

§ 4. The banishment of Flavia Domitilla: οἱ ἄποθεν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου συγγραφεῖς.

chap. xix. Summary account of Domitian's proceedings against the grandsons of Jude: παλαιὸς κατέχει λόγος.

chap. xx. § 1. More detailed account of the same: Hegesippus.

§ 7. General account of Domitian's reign: Tertullian.

§ 8. Nerva's reversal of Domitian's policy: ἱστοροῦσιν οἱ γραφῇ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους παραδόντες.

§ 9. Return of St John to Ephesus: ὁ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαίων παραδίδωσι λόγος.

An examination of this table reveals the fact that in chapters xi–xx Hegesippus is indicated as Eusebius's authority three or four times, while statements are introduced by the formula λόγος κατέχει or its equivalent five or four times. And the phrase λόγος κατέχει in Eusebius seems everywhere to imply a written document.[1] It seems natural to assume that throughout the narrative which we are considering, it always refers to the same authoritative writing. But indeed this way of stating the theory exaggerates the amount of assumption which it involves. For it is, I believe, quite certain that chapters xi, xii, and xix are all founded on passages in the *Hypomnemata*. Chapter xi gives the Hegesippean date for the martyrdom of St James the Just, though when Eusebius expresses his own opinion he prefers the earlier date given by Josephus; and its opening words, μετὰ τὴν Ἰακώβου μαρτυρίαν, are clearly a paraphrase of μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον in the Hegesippean passage in *H. E.* IV xxii 4, a passage to which it displays other manifest tokens of relation.[2] But if chapter xi is a paraphrase of

[1] For proof I must be content to refer to *Hermathena* xxvi (1900) 16 f. Cf. Lightfoot *Ignatius* i 58, 238.

[2] Cf. *Hermathena* l. c. Zahn *Forsch. zur Gesch. des NTlichen Kanons* vi 238.

Hegesippus, so is also chapter xii, whether it depends grammatically on λόγος κατέχει or on Ἡγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ. And it is beyond question that chapter xix is a paraphrase of part of the passage which is actually quoted in chapter xx and is there stated to be from Hegesippus. Thus in two (or three) out of the four (or five) cases in which the authority is indicated by the words λόγος κατέχει, the identity of the work referred to is indubitable. And further, few will read together chapter xviii § 1 and chapter xx § 9 without being convinced that they are based on a single document. It would be arbitrary in the extreme to postulate one source for the statement that St John went to Patmos, and another for the statement that he left it. There is a minimum of assumption in the further inference that that document is the same as that from which Eusebius drew his information in the two (or three) cases previously mentioned, or in other words, that it also is the *Hypomnemata* of Hegesippus. The assumption is made, if possible, less formidable when we observe that elsewhere in his third book Eusebius uses the formula κατέχει λόγος for the *Hypomnemata*. In chapter xxxii §§ 1, 2 he writes, Μετὰ Νέρωνα καὶ Δομετιανόν, κατὰ τοῦτον οὖ νῦν τοὺς χρόνους ἐξετάζομεν, μερικῶς καὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἐξ ἐπαναστάσεως δήμων τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν κατέχει λόγος ἀνακινηθῆναι διωγμόν, ἐν ᾧ Συμεῶνα . . . μαρτυρίῳ τὸν βίον ἀναλῦσαι παρειλήφαμεν. καὶ τούτου μάρτυς αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος . . . Ἡγήσιππος. And then he proceeds to paraphrase the account of the martyrdom of Symeon which he quotes verbatim in § 6 of the same chapter.

Eusebius gives us no hint as to the source from which he borrowed his general account of the reign of Domitian in chapter xvii. But its closing words fit in most appropriately with chapter xii. Vespasian, says Eusebius in chapter xii, attempted to extirpate the house of David, and in consequence *the Jews* were persecuted. The very same policy, he says in chapter xvii, led Domitian further than his father had gone: he persecuted *the Christians*. The antithesis may appear to suggest that these two chapters were founded on passages which lay not far apart in the same treatise. But chapter xii certainly, as we have seen, came ultimately from Hegesippus. And it will be remembered that Hegesippus was in the mind of Eusebius, if the *Hypomnemata* were not actually open before him, when he began to write chapter xvii. For chapter xvi ends with a reference to that work. And finally it may be added, by way of confirmation, that Rufinus believed that chapter xvii was a quotation from Hegesippus. For he renders the closing sentence of chapter xvi thus: 'Verum de seditione facta apud Corinthios ac dissensione plebis testis valde fidelis Hegesippus indicat, *hoc modo dicens*.' Rufinus, it is of course admitted, was mistaken in supposing that the sentences which follow make any allusion to the affairs of the Church of Corinth.

Let us assume, then, that all the passages of Eus. *H. E.* III xi–xxi which we have examined were taken from the *Hypomnemata*. On that hypothesis we find ourselves able to give a reasonable account of the construction of this part of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Eusebius acted, it would seem, exactly as we might expect that a historian would act whose design was to give a narrative of a series of events, which should practically consist of extracts from earlier writers. He took as his basis Hegesippus, who gave the fullest account known to him of the history of the Church during the period with which he was concerned. And here and there he added to his Hegesippean narrative illustrations from other authorities—Irenaeus, Tertullian, Brettius, and the rest.

Thus by a completely different path we have arrived once more at our former conclusion, that Eusebius drew from Hegesippus the statement of chapter xviii that the Apostle St John was banished under Domitian to Patmos; and we have extended it by tracing to the same source the further statement in chapter xx that the Apostle returned to Ephesus in the reign of Nerva. These two statements, taken together, imply that Hegesippus, if he was indeed their author, believed in the late date and Apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse.

IV. I have ventured to print the foregoing argument, not because I believe it to be incontrovertible, though I confess that the more I consider it the more I am inclined to regard it as correct, but because the conclusion to which it tends, seems, if true, to be of considerable importance.

It is not only that, if the conclusion be accepted, Hegesippus is the earliest known witness to the banishment of St John to Patmos in the reign of Domitian, and his subsequent return to Ephesus. That we can certainly claim for him. Clement of Alexandria, who speaks of the exile in Patmos, died no earlier than between 212 and 217[1]; Irenaeus, who affirms that 'John the disciple of the Lord' resided in his later years in Asia, first comes into notice in the year 177 when he became bishop of Lyons.[2] But Hegesippus, who wrote his *Hypomnemata* under Pope Eleutherus (c. 180), seems to have already held a prominent position in the Church when in the time of Anicetus or earlier (c. 150, Harnack) he journeyed to Rome.[3] He may have been only a few years younger than Papias of Hierapolis.[4]

But the importance of the testimony of Hegesippus seems to lie rather in another direction. A fragment attributed to Papias, which is extant in two MSS, contains the assertion that St John the Apostle was put to death by Jews. If this is true 'it disposes of the Apostolic

[1] Harnack *Chronologie* ii 6. [2] Eus. *H. E.* v 4 f. [3] Eus. *H. E.* iv 22.

[4] Harnack, *op. cit.* i 357 dates the Ἐξηγήσεις of Papias c. 145 x 160. Others however put his *floruit* much earlier, e.g. Sanday *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* 250 f.

authorship of the Apocalypse'.[1] And the testimony of Papias has great weight. If the Apostle was martyred by Jews, he cannot have spent the closing years of his life at Ephesus. And if he lived at Ephesus, the bishop of Hierapolis cannot have been ignorant of the fact. But, on the other hand, Hegesippus, if he was not, as Eusebius supposed, a convert from Judaism,[2] was yet obviously in close touch with Palestinian Christianity. It is very difficult to believe that if St John had suffered martyrdom in Palestine he would not have been aware of it. And if he had heard the story and gave credence to it he could not have stated that the Apostle was sent to Patmos by Domitian, and lived at Ephesus under Nerva.

H. J. LAWLOR.

FOUR NOTES ON THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

THE four Notes which follow have been suggested by a perusal of Dr R. H. Charles's admirable edition of the Ethiopic text, together with the Greek fragments (Clarendon Press, 1906).

1. *On the name of the Angel Semiazas.*

The Book of Enoch treats of the Watchers, i. e. the heavenly beings sent down to earth to watch over Adam's descendants. It tells us how the Watchers became enamoured of the daughters of men, and thereby brought all sorts of evils upon the earth. The Chief or Archon of these watchers is called *Semiazas* (Σεμιαζᾶς).

This very peculiar name is quite different from that of all the other angels, good and bad, mentioned in the Book of Enoch. These are almost all formed after the analogy of Michael and Gabriel, and no doubt a good many of them were invented by the author of Enoch. *Semiazas* is so different that we cannot suppose the name to have been invented by him: it must belong to an older stratum of legend.

As a matter of fact the Semitic original has been preserved, e. g. in the 'Jerusalem' Targum to Gen. vi 4. There we read that Shamḥzâi (שמחזאי) and 'Uzîêl (עזיאל) were those who fell from heaven, i. e. they were the Nephilim. It has long been recognized that Σεμιαζᾶς is the Greek equivalent of Shamḥzâi, and that the angel Azael (Ἀζαήλ), the only other one of the evil angels who is characterized in the Book of Enoch, corresponds to 'Uzîêl. Very likely Azael may be an earlier vocalization.

[1] H. B. Swete *Apocalypse*[1] clxxvi.

[2] *H. E.* iv 22.