

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 (שַׁמְחַזַּי) and 'Uziêl (אֲזַיֵּל) 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 (Ἄζαήλ), the only other one of the evil angels who is characterized in the Book of Enoch, corresponds to 'Uziêl. Very likely Azael may be an earlier vocalization.

¹ H. B. Swete *Apocalypse* clxxvi.

² H. E. iv 22.

But the puzzle is only half solved when we have recognized that Σεμαζās represents שמחזאי. What is the origin of this שמחזאי? It is a somewhat queer combination of sounds. As I have already pointed out, it does not appear to be due to the inventiveness of the author of 'Enoch', for it is not in his style for angels' names. And the presence of the ח makes it clear that it is of Semitic derivation. It is therefore a compound which ought to carry the marks of its origin on the surface.

It has occurred to me that it may have come from a misreading of a glossed copy of the Hebrew text of Gen. vi 4, 5, in which וירא (ver. 5) had the Aramaic gloss חזא written over it, thus:—

חזא
המה הנברים אשר מעולם אנשי השם וירא יהוה

It seems possible that this might have been written in such a way that the gloss 'חזא, i. e. 'Jahwe saw,' might appear to have been really part of the last word of the preceding verse, and that the translation was 'They were the giants who were of old, the men of Shamhẓai.' Of course this theory does not take direct account of the article which stands before שם in the Massoretic text. But if the origin of the name is to be found in a misread gloss, we are dealing with a mistake, and the makers of mistakes must be more or less inconsistent. And such a series of letters as שמחזאי could hardly be regarded as a proper name except by a mistake.

2. 'Spirits of Souls,' Enoch xxii 3.

Throughout 'Enoch' the 'soul' (ψυχή) is the total personality, with a 'spirit' (πνεῦμα) belonging to it, which 'spirit' is separated from the person's body at death, and shut up till the day of judgement in the hollow gorges (κοιλώματα) prepared for the spirits of the dead.

This use of 'soul' is of course to be found in the Old Testament, e. g. 'the soul that sinneth, it shall die.' But it is worth while to note that it seems to have survived longer in Egypt than elsewhere (*J. T. S.* ii 273 f, iv 585-587).

It is doubtless through the influence of the more ordinary phraseology of the Song of the Three Children that the Syncellus in Enoch ix 3 has twice τὰ πνεύματα καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, where the Gizeh MS and the Ethiopic have only αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. In Enoch xxii 5, as Dr Charles points out, we must read τεθέαμαι πνεῦμα [ἀνθρώπου] νεκροῦ ἐντυγχάνοντος, instead of τεθ. ἀνθρώπου νεκροῦ ἐντυγχάνοντος (*sic*) of the transmitted text. No doubt some transcriber had a difficulty in supposing Enoch to see the πνεῦμα of Abel.

More curious still is Enoch xvi 1, where after the Giants are slain in the flesh we read of their 'spirits' going forth 'from the soul of

their flesh' (ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν), i. e. going forth, as I suppose, from their expiring but still breathing bodies.

3. *Enoch xxii 9ff.*

On τρίς in this verse Dr Charles remarks 'Corrupt. We expect τέσσαρες'. I should like to suggest that τρίς is right, but that καὶ οὕτως, which occurs several times below (vv. 9^b, 10, 12, 13), is in each case a corruption of καὶ οὖτος. The cause of this corruption, or rather mistaken emendation of some early scribe of Enoch, is the same misapprehension that called forth Dr Charles's remark, viz. that νεκρῶν in xxii 9 is not used in contrast to 'living men', but in contrast to δικαίων. The three dark valleys are set apart for the dead, but the one light valley with its spring of water is set apart for the departed righteous, who are apparently not regarded as really dead, though their πνεύματα are separated from their bodies. Thus the Book of Enoch supports the view set forth in the answer of our Lord to the Sadducees (Mk. xii 26 f and parallels).

The general tenor of Enoch xxii 13 seems to me to suggest that the third valley is set apart for the indifferent. Of those for whom it is set apart the Gizeh MS, which is here practically supported by the Ethiopic, says—

καὶ οὕτως (leg. καὶ οὖτος, sc. ὁ τόπος) ἐκτίσθη τοῖς πνεύμασιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅσοι οὐκ ἔσονται ὅσοι ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοί, ὅσοι ἀσεβεῖς καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀνόμων ἔσονται μέτοχοι.

This is in any case very confused, and the confusion may go back to the translator himself. Possibly he may have read $\aleph\aleph$ (= ἀλλά), where the original had $\aleph\eta$ (= οὐδέ). In any case I cannot help conjecturing that the original author meant to say that the spirits in this place were those of men who were neither holy nor (actually) sinners, but that they had on the whole sided with the impious. Therefore they will be left in indifference at the Day of Judgement: they will receive no further punishment, but they will be left in the dark valley. This at least seems to be the meaning of the words which follow: οὐ τιμωρηθήσονται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως, οὐδὲ μὴ μετεγερωθῶσιν ἐντεῦθεν.

4. *On the Ethiopic for 'the Son of Man'.*

As is well known, the middle section of our Book of Enoch, comprising chapters xxxvii–lxx, speaks also of the Messiah as the Son of Man, in imagery which is ultimately derived from Dan. vii 13. Unfortunately nothing of this part of the Book of Enoch is extant in Greek, and we are entirely dependent on the Ethiopic. There can, however, be very little doubt that the 'Son of Man' was represented in the Greek by υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου as in Dan. vii 13, Apoc. i 13, xiv 14, or by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

ἄνθρωπον as in the Gospels. In the Ethiopic we find three terms, *walda sab'ē*, *walda bē'ēsī*, and *walda 'ēguāla 'ēmaḥayāw*. Of these words, *walda* means 'son of' (or, 'the son of'); *sab'ē* means 'hominis', *bē'ēsī* means 'uiri' and *'ēguāla 'ēmaḥayāw* means literally 'the offspring of the mother of the living', an odd phrase which is regularly used in Ethiopic for 'mortal man'. *Walda 'ēguāla 'ēmaḥayāw* is the constant equivalent for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the New Testament, at least in the printed texts, so that we are not surprised to find it in the Book of Enoch.

The actual occurrences of the three terms are as follows:—

Walda 'ē. 'ē. occurs lxii 7, 9, 14; lxiii 11; lxix 26, 27; lxx 1.

Walda sab'ē „ xlvi 2, 3, 4, xlvi 2.

Walda bē'ēsī „ lxii 5; lxix 29^a, 29^b.

The second term, *walda sab'ē*, exactly corresponds to 'filius hominis', and it might be regarded as the natural equivalent. But as a matter of fact it does not appear to be much used elsewhere. The third term is curious, and my chief object in writing this note is to point out its bearing upon the date of the translation of the Book of Enoch into Ethiopic. Later scribes found a difficulty in it, and so the inferior MSS tend to read *walda bē'ēsī*, i. e. 'son of woman.' I venture to suggest that *walda bē'ēsī* was used by the translator of Enoch for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου because it was already a current expression in Ethiopic for 'the Son of Man', and that it was a current expression because it is a literal translation of the strange Syriac term ܐܘܪܝܢܐ (i. e. filius uiri), which is used occasionally to render 'Son of Man' in the earliest Syriac Gospel texts.

What the Syriac-speaking Christians who introduced or used this term understood by it is quite uncertain, but its use is characteristic of the earliest stratum of Syriac literature now surviving. The earliest text of the Gospel in Ethiopic seems to have been a translation from the Syriac, and I venture to claim the very existence of the phrase *walda bē'ēsī* as an indication that this Syriac original must have been of a pre-Rabban, pre-Vulgate type. This earliest Ethiopic text of the Gospel must have been still familiar to the translator of Enoch: the Ethiopic translation of Enoch must therefore date from a very early period, probably from the period of the earliest translations from Greek into Ethiopic.

F. C. BURKITT.