



Type: Book Chapter

---

## Early Christian Millenarianist Interpretation of the Two Witnesses in John's Apocalypse 11:3-13

Author(s): Thomas W. Mackay

Source: *By Study and Also By Faith, Volume 1*

Editor(s): John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks

Published: Provo, UT/Salt Lake City; Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies/Deseret Book, 1990

Page(s): 222-331

---



The Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) existed as a California non-profit corporation from 1979 until about 2006, when it was allowed to go into involuntary liquidation, at which time copyrights held by FARMS and its authors and/or editors reverted back to their original author and/or editors. This chapter is archived by permission of editor Stephen D. Ricks.

# 12

## Early Christian Millenarianist Interpretation of the Two Witnesses in John's Apocalypse 11:3-13

*Thomas W. Mackay*  
Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

One of the curious aspects of early Christian interpretation of the Apocalypse (or the book of Revelation) of John is that a literal view of the Millennium, together with the precise identification of the two witnesses or prophets at Jerusalem who herald the Second Coming of the Lord, later came to be rejected by the "spiritualized" – the "de-mythologized" and, to use Hugh Nibley's expression,<sup>1</sup> "de-eschatologized" – forms of Christian exegesis of the scriptures that predominated after the late fourth century. Thereafter, the two witnesses were taken to be the Old and New Testaments, or the Church preaching the gospel to the world, or some other such allegorical interpretation. Thus, in the explanation of Apocalypse 11 and related scriptures, we find a direct and specific manifestation of the shift from literal to allegorical exegesis that characterized Christianity in the patristic era, an era corresponding roughly to the end of the ancient world (from the accession of Diocletian to the death of Justinian). This period of cultural and political transition heralds the emergence of the Byzantine Empire in the East, and simultaneously in the West it displays the fragmented remnants of the Roman world, the "Dark Ages" of European civilization that ended

with the Carolingian Renaissance in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. The dramatic results of the change from literal to allegorical interpretation of the scriptures are manifest in the medieval Christian exegetical and homiletic traditions in Europe. I shall sketch some of these developments by analyzing references to the two witnesses from the second century to the beginning of the Carolingian Renaissance.

In order to appreciate more fully the nature of differing approaches to the scriptures, I will treat some background material. I will first consider the textual tradition of the Apocalypse. Next, a brief historical overview of the exegesis of the Apocalypse will familiarize us both with the names and with the literary and intellectual relationships of many of the authors I will later quote. With a sketch of the exegetical tradition, its sources, tensions and development, we can better grasp why the interpretation changes over the centuries. Although the passages I have selected and translated are extensive, the sheer weight of the evidence leads irresistably to the conclusions that are also corroborated by artistic evidence in manuscripts.

### **History of the Text of the Apocalypse**

The Apocalypse was not warmly received in many Christian circles. While the second-century apologist Justin Martyr, and he alone, relates "tradition reposing on historical memory" – namely that John wrote it and that he believed in a literal Millennium – later objections to literalist exegesis "were based either on dogmatic or on literary grounds."<sup>2</sup> In the third century, the Roman presbyter Gaius was "still attacking the book in violent terms, and attributing its authorship to St. John's traditional enemy, the heretic Cerinthus."<sup>3</sup> To comprehend the distrust Christians held for the Apocalypse in the third to fifth centuries, we need only to note how reluctantly, and how late, the book gained approval of the councils to become part of the

New Testament. Eusebius records that while many of the books gained ready acceptance (the *anantirrēta*, or “undisputed books” and *homologoumena*, or “agreed-upon books”), James, 2 Peter, Jude, and some others were in the “disputed” class or *antilegomena*, but they were not rejected as outright spurious—*en tois nothois*.<sup>4</sup> The Apocalypse was esteemed to be undisputed by some leaders, spurious by others: at *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 25, 2, Eusebius classes it among the *homologoumena*,<sup>5</sup> but later in that same chapter he notes that others claim it is not genuine:

ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καὶ τῶν Παύλου Πράξεων ἡ γραφή ὃ τε λεγόμενος Ποιμὴν καὶ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἡ φερομένη Βαρναβᾶ ἐπιστολὴ καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι Διδαχαὶ ἔτι τε, ὡς ἔφην, ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανείη· ἦν τινες, ὡς ἔφην, ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσιν τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις.<sup>6</sup>

Among the books that are not genuine, let there be included (in this class) the scripture of the Acts of Paul, the work called the Shepherd (*sc.*, of Hermas), the Apocalypse of Peter, and in addition to these the epistle attributed to Barnabas and the so-called *Didachai* or Teachings of the Apostles and besides, as I stated, the Apocalypse of John, if it should seem (to be best included among the spurious books). As I said, some people reject it, while others judge it to be one of the undisputed [*lit.*, agreed-upon] books.

Because of this hesitation to receive the Apocalypse, the text is not as strongly attested in Greek manuscripts as other books.<sup>7</sup> While there are more than five thousand manuscripts containing at least a portion of the Greek New Testament—and granted most have some of the gospels—only about 250 have the Apocalypse. Vaticanus is missing

the last leaves, including the Apocalypse; the text is found in Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus as well as Leningrad *P*, the Chester Beatty papyrus *P*<sup>47</sup> (late third century), *P*<sup>18</sup> (end of third/beginning of fourth century), and *P*<sup>24</sup> (fourth century). It is also in uncials 046, 051, 052, 0207, and 0229 and in some notable minuscules: 1, 88, 94, 104, 1006, 1611, 1828, 1854, 1859, 2020, 2042, 2053, 2065, 2073, 2081, 2138, 2344, 2432, and 2495.

On ne connaît jusqu'ici que 250 manuscrits environ du texte original de l'Apocalypse; très peu sont antérieurs au x<sup>e</sup> siècle (sept [ou 8] onciaux et un ou deux minuscules) et les derniers sont du xvii<sup>e</sup> siècle. La modicité relative de ce chiffre s'explique naturellement par toutes les discussions qui se prolongèrent dans l'Eglise grecque au sujet de la canonicité du livre. Il existe aussi quelques fragments sur papyrus, et des citations des anciens Pères, Origène, Hippolyte et Methodius.<sup>8</sup>

Up to the present we only know of about 250 manuscripts of the original text of the Apocalypse. Very few are earlier than the tenth century (seven [or eight] uncials and one or two minuscules) and the latest [*i.e.*, most recent] are from the seventeenth century. The relative paucity of this number can be naturally explained by all the discussions that took place over time in the Greek church on the subject of the canonicity of the book. Also extant are some papyrus fragments and citations of the early fathers, Origen, Hippolytus, and Methodius.

The suspicion of the Apocalypse in the Christian east was such that it never came to be used in the liturgy, and it was never admitted into the Peshitta or Syriac New Testament.<sup>9</sup> So, while only a restricted number of fathers referred to one passage or another of the Apocalypse, far fewer composed extensive commentaries on it than they did on the Gospels.

### COMMENTATORS ON THE APOCALYPSE

The earliest references to the Apocalypse are not in systematic exegetical commentaries but are, rather, passing

or incidental comments in **apocrypha** or in early patristic treatises. According to Eusebius, **Papias**, bishop of Hieropolis in Asia Minor in the early second century,<sup>10</sup> was heir to such unwritten traditions as a belief in a literal thousand-year reign after the resurrection of the dead, and he personally listened to John teach.

ἐν οἷς καὶ χιλιάδα τινὰ φησιν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης· ἃ καὶ ἠγοῦμαι τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παρεκδεξάμενον διηγήσεις ὑπολαβεῖν, τὰ ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρημένα μὴ συνεορακώτα.<sup>11</sup>

Among these (rather mythical beliefs) he asserts that there will also be some sort of millennium after the resurrection from the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be physically set up on this earth. I suppose that he got these notions by accepting (literally) the apostolic accounts, simply because he failed to understand that the utterances in their memoirs had been spoken mystically [or, allegorically] by them.

Jerome reports that:

Hic dicitur annorum mille iudaeicam edidisse *deuterōsin*. Quem secuti sunt Irenaeus et Apollinaris et ceteri, qui post resurrectionem aiunt in carne cum sanctis Dominum regnaturum. Tertullianus quoque in libro de Spe fidelium et Victorinus Pitabionensis et Lactantius hac opinione ducuntur.<sup>12</sup>

[Papias] is said to have promulgated the Jewish tradition of a millennium, and he is followed by Irenaeus, Apollinaris, and others, who say that after the resurrection the Lord will reign in the flesh with the saints. Tertullian too in his book on the "Hope of the Faithful" and Victorinus Pitabionensis [*sic* = Petovionensis, *i.e.*, of Pettau] and Lactantius are led by this belief.

We do not have information about the Apocalypse from other orthodox writers contemporary with Papias – writers such as Ignatius, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, and even the archheretic **Cerinthus** (early second century) was reputed to have believed in a literal millennium.<sup>13</sup> In the middle of the second century, scarcely sixty years after the composition of the Apocalypse, **Justin Martyr** attributes the millennial belief to John – a doctrinal position in harmony with Isaiah and others:

καὶ ἔπειτα [v.l., ἐπειδὴ] καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ **χίλια ἔτη** [Apocalypse 20:4] ποιήσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ, συνελόντι φάναι, **αἰωνίαν** ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ **κρίσιν**.<sup>14</sup>

And next, also [v.l., and this is true since] a certain man among us named John, one of Christ's apostles, when he had received a revelation, prophesied that those who had faith in our Christ would dwell in Jerusalem for a thousand years, and that afterwards the universal and, to state it briefly, everlasting resurrection and judgment of all would take place with one accord.

[This is probably the source of Jerome's statement at *De Viris Illustribus* 9 and in his *Chronicle* that Justin had written a commentary on the Apocalypse, an assertion for which there is no other evidence.] A few decades later, **Irenaeus** interprets a number of passages and words from the Apocalypse,<sup>15</sup> stating that John received it near the end of the reign of Domitian.

εἰ δὲ εἶδει ἀναφανδὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦνομα αὐτοῦ, οἱ' ἐκείνου ἂν ἔρρεση τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐωρακότος. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ

σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει  
τῆς Δομετιανου ἀρχῆς.<sup>16</sup>

But if it had been necessary to proclaim his [*i.e.*, John's] name openly at the present time, it would have been spoken by him who in fact beheld the apocalypse. For it was seen not long ago but almost in our own generation, near the end of the reign of Domitian.

As Jerome stated in the passage quoted above about Papias, Irenaeus, too, follows the early Christian tradition of a literal millennium and attendant doctrines, although in other matters his exegesis was allegorical:

Millenarianism is one of the most robust elements in his [*i.e.*, Irenaeus'] thought and piety. . . . The sheet-anchor of all is the assertion, so utterly contrary to his general expository usage when other parts of the Bible are in review, that apocalyptic Scripture must not be interpreted in an allegorical or symbolical manner. It is fundamental that a literal interpretation is alone legitimate. . . . In final token that the religious experience of Irenaeus was robust and prophetic rather than quiet and speculative is his Millenarianism. This too is a Biblical and primitive element.<sup>17</sup>

Bishop **Melito of Sardis**, a contemporary of Irenaeus, is reported to have written on the Apocalypse,<sup>18</sup> but the text is not extant.

At the close of the second and the beginning of the third century, **Tertullian**, the famous Latin lawyer-convert from North Africa who died some time after 220, often cited the Apocalypse, giving a literal interpretation to the Millennium. The idea of *recapitulatio* or *anakephalaiōsis* is usually traced to Tertullian and Irenaeus, although it is later developed by others, including Victorinus and Lactantius, but particularly Tyconius (see below). John of Damascus has preserved a tantalizing quotation from Irenaeus about the beast that is to come forth: *anakephalaiōsis*

*ginetai pasēs adikias*. . . . [“it is the recapitulation of all evil”].<sup>19</sup> In contrast to his predecessors, Tertullian’s contemporary, **Hippolytus** (who died after 235), produced a commentary on the Apocalypse that has not survived intact.<sup>20</sup> But his ideas are retained in a number of fragments and in his other works (especially *De Christo et Antichristo*),<sup>21</sup> including citations by Bar Salibi (see below). Hippolytus comments on the two witnesses and Antichrist in his fragmentary commentary on Daniel.<sup>22</sup> His, too, is a chiliastic approach: the earth awaits its “sabbath” rest after six thousand years of existence. For Hippolytus, following the early Christian tradition, the two witnesses are to be Enoch and Elijah; and, as in Irenaeus, the Antichrist will come from the tribe of Dan.<sup>23</sup> This interpretation persisted: Quoduldeus in the fifth century states,

Hic ostenditur quod ex Iudaeis, de tribu Dan quae hodieque in Perside est, ueniat Antichristus iuxta prophetica benedictionem Iacob patriarchae dicentis: **Dan iudicabit populum sicut aliae tribus. Fiat Dan coluber in uia, cerastes in semita, mordens ungulas equi ut cadat ascensor eius retro.**<sup>24</sup>

It is shown here that Antichrist will come from the Jews, from the tribe of Dan which even today is in the land of Persia, according to the prophetic blessing of the patriarch Jacob when he said, “Dan shall judge his people, just as the other tribes. Dan shall be a serpent along the road, an adder in the path, biting the horse’s hooves so that [or, with the result that] the rider fall backwards” (Genesis 49:16-17).

And Primasius succinctly writes “De tribu enim Dan antichristus traditur nasciturus” (“For it is the tradition that from the tribe of Dan will the Antichrist be born”).<sup>25</sup> Quoting Ambrosius Autpertus, his major source, Alcuin puts it thus:

Dan ergo de spiritali catalogo eiectus, ipsa nominis

sui interpretatione docet, quia in sexta mundi aetate occulto quidem, sed iusto iudicio, iudaica plebs perfida prorsus sedibus expulsa sacerdotii dignitatem perdidit.<sup>26</sup>

Therefore Dan, who has been excluded from this spiritual catalogue, instructs us by the very meaning of his name, because in the sixth age of the world by a hidden but just judgment, the Jewish people lose the honor of the priesthood, for they have been rejected from their abode because they are faithless.

And Bede on Apocalypse 7:5 states:

Conuenienter et a Iuda inchoat ex qua tribu ortus est dominus noster: et Dan praetermisit ex quo dicitur antichristus esse nascendus sicut scriptum est: **Fiat Dan coluber in uia cerastes in semita mordens ungulas equi ut cadat ascensor eius.**<sup>27</sup>

Appropriately he begins from Judah, from which tribe our Lord came forth; and he omits Dan from whom it is said that the Antichrist must be born, just as it is written: (Bede then quotes Genesis 49:17).

In his work *De Antichristo*, Hippolytus apparently used an extracanonical source, an unnamed "prophet," and expressed a similar doctrinal stance.<sup>28</sup> About the middle of the third century, **Commodian** wrote his *Carmen de duobus populis*, using the Sibylline books and various apocryphal texts, but it is virtually useless for exegetical purposes.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, in his *Diuinae Institutiones*, **Lactantius** (early fourth century) uses the Sibylline books, apocrypha, and the Apocalypse to produce a fanciful eschatology that is neither fully in harmony with the primitive church nor with post-fourth-century Christianity, though he does retain some ties to Irenaeus and Hippolytus, for Lactantius, too, is chiliastic:

Haec eos ratio fefellit, quod resurgent defuncti non post mille annos mortis suae, sed ut restituti rursus in uitam mille annis cum Deo regnent. Deus enim ueniet,

ut orbe hoc ab omne labe purgato rediuiuas iustorum animas corporibus innouatis ad sempiternam beatitudinem suscitet.<sup>30</sup>

This explanation completely escapes them [*i.e.*, the pagan poets], because the dead will rise not one thousand years after their own death (each individual, respectively), but so that, when restored again to life, they will reign with God during one thousand years. For God will come, so that when this world has been cleansed of every spot, he may raise up the souls of the just, alive once more with their renewed bodies to eternal blessedness.

**Clement of Alexandria**, whose life ended by 215, appears to have taken a "spiritual" or allegorical approach in his *Hypotyposes*.<sup>31</sup> He was followed by **Origen** (ca. 185-253), who proposed writing a commentary on the Apocalypse (according to a Latin fragment of his Commentary on Matthew 24), and a text of the scholia was published from a manuscript at the Meteora monastery in 1911.<sup>32</sup> But Origen, like Clement, eschewed limiting himself to the literal approach, favoring an allegorical mode built upon but transcending the literal.<sup>33</sup> When Origen departed from Alexandria for Caesarea, his successor as head of the Catechetical School was **Dionysius of Alexandria**, who was later bishop of the city. In response to Nepos' treatise against allegorical interpretation of the scriptures (*Refutation of the Allegorists*), Dionysius composed various treatises on the scriptures, including the Apocalypse, but little remains of his writings; the few extant fragments of the Apocalypse commentary are doubtfully ascribed to him.<sup>34</sup> **Methodius of Olympus**, who died about 311, wrote a Platonic dialogue explaining some passages of the Apocalypse (but particularly Apocalypse 12:1-6) in a purely spiritual or allegorical mode, although he did retain a chiliastic belief in the literal millennium.<sup>35</sup> He also rejected Origen's doctrine of the antemortal existence of the soul and also his

nonmaterialistic or "spiritualistic concept of the resurrection of the body."<sup>36</sup> He uses *recapitulatio* as in Irenaeus: the sense is a summing up of past revelations in the incarnation of Christ and of restoring fallen humanity by obedience to Christ. So the text of the Apocalypse stands still in time, as it were, to summarize God's past dealings with mankind.

In contrast to most of the earlier writers, **Victorinus**, Bishop of Pettau (Poetovio) in Pannonia and martyr under Diocletian (*i.e.*, probably about the beginning of the fourth century), composed a running commentary on the Apocalypse.<sup>37</sup> Like Tertullian, Commodian, and later Lactantius, Victorinus used recapitulation as a means of explaining the scriptural text and its relation to history. Furthermore, he still maintained a literal view of the Millennium, as did Lactantius in the ensuing decades. However, they are among the last writers of note who were chiliastic. The growing animosity towards the literal millennium propounded by the early Christians is manifest in Eusebius' and Jerome's scorn of Papias and in the writings of many fathers of the fourth century.<sup>38</sup> A notable exception is **Apollinarius** (or **Apollinaris**) of **Laodicea** (ca. 310-390), who also wrote on the Apocalypse among his many commentaries on the books of the Old and New Testaments. But most of his works are lost; fragments of the commentaries may be found in the *Catena*e or chains of quotations by the fathers on scriptures,<sup>39</sup> and there are also some fragments of his work *Recapitulatio*.<sup>40</sup> According to Jerome, in his description of Papias quoted above, Apollinarius held the earlier, literalist position in contrast to the later allegorical approach. However his contemporary, **Didymos the Blind of Alexandria** (ca. 313-397), followed Origen's multifaceted mode of exegesis, and, as head of the Christian Catechetical School at Alexandria, he propagated the allegorical approach and taught it to Jerome, among others.<sup>41</sup> Didymos dictated numerous works, particularly explanations of the

scriptures, and among his many compositions was a commentary on the Apocalypse that, unfortunately, has not survived. But he attests to the work in his commentary on Zechariah, for there Didymos says:

σαφήνεια δὲ ἀναντίρρητος περὶ τούτων  
γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν τῆς Ἀποκαλύ-  
ψεως τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους  
Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς.<sup>42</sup>

Undeniable clearness [or, irrefutable interpretation] of these (numbers) has been made in my commentaries on the Apocalypse of John and on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

For the history of the text and commentary of the Apocalypse in the West, the pivotal figure is **Tyconius**, a Donatist Christian living in North Africa in the second half of the fourth century.<sup>43</sup> Although his commentary, written about 380, is not extant in its entirety, it was the basis for the commentaries by Primasius, Caesarius, Bede, Beatus, and perhaps even Ambrosius Autpertus, as well as the **Turin Fragments**<sup>44</sup> of Tyconius where the commentary appears greatly abbreviated and retouched by a Roman Catholic writer.<sup>45</sup> For Tyconius, the two witnesses are the two Testaments, the Old and New. Tyconius made a complete rupture with the old tradition of literal interpretation, giving preference to the Alexandrian allegorical and “spiritualizing” approach. He even established seven basic rules for interpreting the scriptures, his *Liber Regularum*, which Augustine summarized in *De Doctrina Christiana*.<sup>46</sup>

Tout en recommandant de ne lire Tyconius qu’avec précaution, saint Augustin incorpora les sept règles exégétiques son *de Doctrina christiana*, perpétuant ainsi l’influence de cet esprit vigoureux, original, et, en plus d’un cas, déconcertant.<sup>47</sup>

While recommending that Tyconius should only be

read with due care, St Augustine embodied his seven rules of exegesis in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, thus perpetuating the influence of this vigorous, original, and in more than one case, disconcerting mind.<sup>48</sup>

Bede adopted the approach from Augustine; his verbal echoes demonstrate that only Tyconius' commentary, and not the *Liber Regularum*, was known in Bede's Anglo-Saxon England. But because of the dramatic and complete shift in exegesis which Tyconius' commentary on the Apocalypse represents, and because of Jerome's and Augustine's influence on later writers, the de-eschatologizing or "spiritualizing" mode of interpretation held sway.

Thus, Jerome (331-420), the justly famous exegete and scholar who prepared the monumental Vulgate version of the Bible (the form known and used in the West for more than a millennium), revised Victorinus' commentary and in so doing rejected the earlier chiliastic interpretation.<sup>49</sup> He had learned his allegorical approach from Didymos the Blind at Alexandria both in person and from his writings; he even translated Didymos' *De Sancto Spiritu*.<sup>50</sup> Jerome may have known Tyconius' commentary, but there are few verbal echoes of Tyconius in Jerome, and those which do exist were apparently passages already in Victorinus. Tyconius in fact seems to have borrowed a few quotes from Victorinus, but most of what can be recovered was Tyconius' own expression. We are also hindered from a complete analysis of the Victorinus-Jerome commentary because the text is incomplete and because the manuscript tradition is complex. Perhaps an uncollated manuscript I have noted will be of some assistance, but it is not likely. Yet Jerome's views of the Apocalypse pepper his works, and his approach is allegorical.

Apocalypsis Iohannis tot habet sacramenta, quot uerba. Parum dixi et pro merito uoluminis laus omnis inferior est. In uerbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiae.<sup>51</sup>

The Apocalypse of John has as many mysteries as words. Yet I have said almost nothing, and any praise is less than the book deserves. In each individual word multiple levels of meaning lie hidden.

In his introduction to book XVIII of his Commentary on Isaiah, Jerome states

nec ignoro quanta inter homines sententiarum diuersitas sit. Non dico de mysterio trinitatis . . . sed de aliis ecclesiasticis dogmatibus . . . et qua ratione intelligenda sit Apocalypsis Iohannis, quam, si iuxta litteram accipimus, iudaizandum est; si spiritualiter, ut scripta est, disserimus, multorum ueterum uidebimur opinionibus contraire; Latinorum, Tertulliani, Victorini, Lactantii; Graecorum . . . Irenaei, etc.<sup>52</sup>

I well understand how great a difference of opinion men have. I am not speaking of the mystery of the trinity but concerning other church doctrines and also how the Apocalypse of John is to be understood: if we take it literally, it has to be viewed as Jews would take it [*i.e.*, literal millennium, etc.]; if we discuss it allegorically, as it is written, then we will seem to contradict the opinions of many earlier writers: Tertullian, Victorinus, and Lactantius, among the Latin writers, and among the Greeks, Irenaeus, etc.

Both in the same prologue and elsewhere, Jerome labels the Millennium a *fabula*.<sup>53</sup> For the two witnesses, he vacillates between Enoch-Elijah or Elijah-Moses and the two testaments or some other allegorical meaning.<sup>54</sup>

Of all the figures in late antiquity, however, **Augustine** is the one who exercised the greatest lasting influence on Western civilization. In his *City of God* book 20, he discusses at length matters pertaining to the Apocalypse – the Antichrist, the beast, the two cities, the Millennium, and the judgment. Yet, in treating 2 Thessalonians 2:3, he cites the scripture using the Old Latin word *refuga* (*i.e.*, *apostates*, an individual Antichrist) instead of *apostasia*. (Let it be

noted that when Paul, who came from a Greek city, Tarsus, wrote to Greeks, they understood the word *apostasia* in its fundamental meaning: a military and political revolt against leaders, in the deliberate attempt to subvert and overthrow the ruling powers and the cultural *mores* they espoused.) Although Augustine refers to Malachi's prophecy of Elijah, he states, *Ipse quippe ante aduentum iudicis saluatoris non immerito speratur esse uenturus, qui [v.l., quia] etiam nunc uiuere non immerito creditur* "Indeed it may very properly be hoped that he will come before the coming of the Savior as judge, because he is believed on good cause to be living even at the present moment."<sup>55</sup> Also, while he had earlier spoken of a sabbath-like millennium,<sup>56</sup> in *de Ciuitate Dei* 20.7 he scorns chiliasm as ridiculous fables: *in quasdam ridiculas fabulas*.<sup>57</sup> The "thousand years" are equated with the spiritual reign of the Church, inaugurated by the First Coming of the Lord; the "abyss" where Satan is chained is the heart of the infidels.<sup>58</sup> Augustine does assent to the notion of recapitulation to explain the events that John prophesies:

Et in hoc quidem libro, cuius nomen est apocalypsis, obscure multa dicuntur, ut mentem legentis exercent, et pauca in eo sunt, ex quorum manifestatione indagentur cetera cum labore; maxime quia sic eadem multis modis repetit, ut alia atque alia dicere uideatur, cum aliter atque aliter haec ipsa dicere uestigetur.<sup>59</sup>

And in this book, the name of which is the Apocalypse, many things are obscurely stated, with the result that they exercise the mind [*i.e.*, test the understanding] of the reader; and there are few things in it which, when understood, clarify the rest with some effort; and this is especially true since he so repeats the same things in so many different ways that he seems to be dealing with various different subjects, although the very same subject is being dealt with in various ways.

But viewed in the larger perspective, Augustine has

borrowed heavily from Tyconius' approach. In the hands of the great Latin church father, the interpretation of the Apocalypse has become "spiritualized" and allegorized (or de-eschatologized), for the literalism of chiliastic interpretation has been rejected. All other points, including the identity of the two witnesses, have been readjusted accordingly. Though Augustine speaks of Elijah's return, he does not equate him directly with the two witnesses who oppose Antichrist.<sup>60</sup> A successor as bishop at Carthage, **Quoduultdeus**, also explained some passages from the Apocalypse in his writings, especially *Dimidium Temporis in Signis Antichristi*.<sup>61</sup>

In the Greek church, the Apocalypse was not warmly received and only later was it admitted into the canon. Hence, **Theodoret of Cyr** included in his writings some discussion about the Apocalypse,<sup>62</sup> as did **Procopius of Gaza** in the sixth century.<sup>63</sup> Of Theodoret Quasten writes:

Theodoret is one of the most successful writers of the Eastern Church and his literary bequest has greater variety than that of the other theologians of Antioch. . . . Though Theodoret does not pretend to originality, his exegetical writings are among the finest specimens of the Antiochene School and remarkable for their combination of terseness and lucidity. In his interpretation of Holy Scripture he adopts a middle course, avoiding the radicalism of Theodore of Mopsuestia and his excessive literalness and allowing an allegorical and typological explanation, whenever this appears preferable.<sup>64</sup>

But the earliest systematic Greek commentator was **Oecumenius**, bishop of Tricca (Thessaly), who produced his commentary in the late sixth century, and the editio princeps was finally published in 1928.<sup>65</sup> According to Hoskier, the editor of Oecumenius, his work antedated that of Andreas.<sup>66</sup> The author of another full Greek commentary is **Andreas of Caesarea**, a contemporary, or perhaps pred-

ecessor, of Oecumenius writing in Cappadocia about 550-600.<sup>67</sup> (The dating traditionally depends on two matters: he cites Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, hence he writes later than 476; but he makes no allusion to the Islamic invasion of 637.) Andreas is important in that he eclectically records differing interpretations of the same passage, and he apparently uses Oecumenius (scholarly debate used to favor Andreas preceding Oecumenius; now he is viewed as following and quoting from Oecumenius, as Hoskier noted). While he is attached to the spiritualizing approach, he records many of the ideas of Irenaeus and Hippolytus (e.g., he states that the Antichrist will issue from the tribe of Dan, and so that tribe is omitted in the list of the 144,000 in Apocalypse 7), though he rejects their millenarianism. But he does assent to recapitulation. Furthermore, Andreas' text of the Apocalypse greatly influenced later manuscripts of that book.<sup>68</sup> Other incidental comments about the Apocalypse are found in the **Chronicon Paschale**<sup>69</sup> and in **John of Damascus**, who preserves excerpts from previous writers.<sup>70</sup> In the ninth century, **Photius** compiled his magnificent *Bibliotheca* at Constantinople where he summarizes, among other books, patristic comments on scriptures.<sup>71</sup> Finally, **Arethas of Caesarea** made use of Andreas in Cappadocia about 900.<sup>72</sup> So great is the antipathy toward the Apocalypse in Greek Christianity that in the eleventh century the exegete Theophylact composed "a series of commentaries on several OT Books and on the whole of the NT except Rev. [the Apocalypse]."<sup>73</sup>

Elsewhere in the East we do not have much written about the Apocalypse. **Ephraem the Syrian** (306-373), a fourth-century contemporary of Didymos the Blind who wrote at Nisibis and especially at Edessa, composed a wide array of works in Syriac, including comments on the Apocalypse. Many of his writings were translated into Greek and Armenian, and some from Greek into Latin and Slavonic. But his style, "characterized by repetitions and the

accumulation of metaphors, is alien to modern taste.”<sup>74</sup> As Angelo de Berardino observes: “The works of Ephrem in Latin present a complete mystery. It is certain that after the deaths of Augustine and Cassian, the Western world showed a greater interest for this type of work than for the speculations of Greek theology.”<sup>75</sup> In the ninth century, the Byzantine writer Photius, mentioned above, devoted a section of his famous *Bibliotheca* to a summary of Ephraem’s works translated into Greek. **Dionysius bar Salibi** (who died in 1171) is notable for providing us with fragments from Hippolytus’ *Capita contra Gaium*.<sup>76</sup> Also, Stan Larson has discovered and edited a twelfth-century Syriac commentary. But the Nestorians and Monophysites did not comment much on the Apocalypse, and the other commentaries which may have been composed were lost or ignored. Recently Leslie MacCoull called attention to a Coptic commentary in an unpublished manuscript at the J. P. Morgan Library. Though written after the Arab Conquest, the text is purportedly from Cyril of Alexandria, and it apparently does incorporate earlier patristic sources as well as an utterly fantastic numerology.<sup>77</sup>

It is in the Latin West, especially in the Roman church, that the exegetical tradition of the Apocalypse became well developed. **Primasius**, bishop of Hadrumetum in North Africa (modern Sousse, Tunisia), prepared a massive commentary about 540.<sup>78</sup> He was greatly dependent on Tyconius and Augustine, and though it appears that he knew Victorinus, it may have been through Tyconius. He has an elaborate development of recapitulation. The two witnesses are Enoch and Elijah; the Antichrist is personal—a king of the Jews. But on the whole, his interpretation is allegorical, not literal. A contemporary, the famous scholar **Cassiodorus**, also composed some notes on Acts and the Apocalypse, but he probably did not use Tyconius though he did know Primasius and the Victorinus-Jerome commentary. His work lies outside the mainstream of the ex-

egetical tradition and, in fact, only survives in a single manuscript at Verona.<sup>79</sup> Another writer of the sixth century, **Caesarius of Arles**, produced nineteen discourses on the Apocalypse. Although they were long known as Pseudo-Augustine or incorrectly attributed to Gennadius, they were finally identified as belonging to Caesarius, and Germain Morin has edited them.<sup>80</sup> Caesarius has used Tyconius but not Primasius, and so he becomes an important witness in establishing the text of Tyconius. Yet another commentator contemporary with these three was **Apringius Bishop of Beja** (now Portugal). The incomplete text was edited by Férotin<sup>81</sup> and depends on the Victorinus-Jerome tradition but has no affinities to the Tyconius tradition. At the end of the sixth century, **Gregory the Great**, who widely used the allegorical method of exegesis, referred to the Apocalypse in several compositions, though he devoted none to that book alone. His quotations on the Apocalypse were later gathered by **Alulfus** and circulated separately.<sup>82</sup>

In the late seventh or eighth century an extremely compressed **anonymous Irish** commentary on the Apocalypse was composed,<sup>83</sup> and this may have been preceded by a commentary, not now extant, composed in the late sixth or early seventh century by a disciple of Saint Columba (ca. 521-97), namely, by a certain Cominus Scotus, although the evidence is highly questionable.<sup>84</sup> The anonymous Irish commentary cites Jerome and names as interpreters of the Apocalypse:

(1) librum antiquum nobis exploratum super hoc qui in priscis temporibus tractatum est, tamen auctor non inuenitur, (2) XII omaeliae Originis, (3) tractatus Anticonii Donatiste, (4) expositio . . . Primasii.<sup>85</sup>

(1) a very old book examined by us on this topic; it was composed in the pristine Christian times, but its author is nevertheless not known; (2) twelve homilies of Origen; (3) the commentary by Tyconius [*for ms. An-*

tyconius] the Donatist; and (4) the exposition of the Apocalypse by Primasius.

This commentary most likely antedates what may be called the **Irish Reference Bible**, a work that draws on Bede and other patristic sources for its brief, basically allegorical comments.<sup>86</sup> Recently Joseph Kelly has asserted that the early insular oral sources of Irish Reference Bible work were known to **Bede of Jarrow** (673-735), the most imposing exegete of the early eighth century.<sup>87</sup> However, the evidence is extremely thin and tenuous and does not conform to Bede's normal method of citation, as may also be stated of Bede's possible use of the anonymous Irish commentary on the General Epistles.<sup>88</sup> Still, Bede *did* know the Apocalypse commentaries by Tyconius and Primasius as well as Augustine's extensive discussion of the text in the *City of God*, and Bede and the anonymous Irish work probably drew upon similar written material as well as perhaps also being influenced by an oral exegetical tradition of insular origin. Since Bede did not have access to Caesarius of Arles, these two writers may be treated as independent witnesses of the text of Tyconius. Furthermore, Bede's position in the exegetical tradition and the extent of his library make him very important for any examination of patristic and early medieval scriptural interpretation. In his fine assessment of Bede's method and contribution, Roger Ray summarizes thus:

Bede's biblical commentaries are the largest single group of his extant writings, the embodiment of his avowed lifework, and the cornerstone of his immense medieval fame. Critical study of them has just begun, but it has already become clear that they shed important light on his better known works, like the *Historia ecclesiastica*. It is also certain that they can no longer be dismissed as merely derivative and allegorical. This essay argues that their patristic contents serve a well-conceived program of pastoral instruction for a new Christian

people and that their allegorical aspects spring from a lively method of rhetorical analysis.<sup>89</sup>

In northern Italy in the second half of the eighth century, **Ambrosius Autpertus** wrote a lengthy treatise on the Apocalypse. He compiled the ten books, composed in two major segments, during the years 758-67. Until a few years ago, the most recent printed edition was 1677; it has now been critically edited for *Corpus Christianorum*.<sup>90</sup> The monumental commentary by **Beatus of Liebana** in Spain (ca. 776) is based on Tyconius as well as Victorinus and Apringius.<sup>91</sup> Finally, **Alcuin of York**, the famous minister of education under Charlemagne, undertook to compose his own commentary at the end of the eighth century. Cardinal Angelo Mai discovered and published it in 1838; it exists only in a single manuscript, Vat. lat. 651 of the ninth century, and the commentary covers only through Apocalypse 12:12.<sup>92</sup> Alcuin's primary source was not his fellow Anglo-Saxon Bede (whom he greatly admired and read)<sup>93</sup> but rather Ambrosius Autpertus, from whom he drew many of the words and phrases for his own commentary.<sup>94</sup> Yet Alcuin names many of his predecessors in the preface, and the prominence of Bede patently indicates his respect:

Beatus Beda in septem periochis dicit Apocalypsin consistere. In prima post salutationem commemorat Domini passiones et glorias ad confirmandos infirmos: deinde commemoratis quae in septem ecclesiis gesta uel gerenda sunt, describit pugnas et uictorias uniuersalis ecclesiae. In secunda uidet quattuor animalia, et uiginti quattuor seniores, et agnum stantem, et librum septem sigillis signatum: narrat etiam pugnas et triumphos ecclesiae. In tertia sub specie septem angelorum tuba canentium uarios euentus ecclesiae describit. In quarta sub figura mulieris et draconis, pugnas et uictorias ecclesiae narrat, ubi ⟨per⟩<sup>95</sup> septem angelos dicta et facta commemorat, etsi non ut prius. In quinta per septem angelos septem plagis terram percutit. In sexta damnationem

meretricis narrat. In septima uxorem agni dicit ornatam de caelo descendere.

De septem regulis Tychonii; quarum prima est de Domino, eiusque corpore; secunda de Domini corpore uero et simulato; tertia de promissis et lege; quarta de specie et genere; quinta de temporibus; sexta recapitulatio. Septima de diabolo, eiusque corpore. Hae septem regulae, non solum in Apocalypsi, sed et in aliis libris inueniuntur, maxime autem in propheticis.

In Apocalypsin primus commentatus martyr Victorinus; quem sequens beatus Hieronymus quaedam quae ille iuxta litteram intellexerat auferens, quaedam ex proprio adiciens, unum in eam condidit librum, promittens, se in ea potissime laboraturum, si uitae spatium adesset: sed opus illud utrum impletum fuerit, incertum est. Donatista etiam Tichonius multiplicem in eam edidit expositionem; sed perfidiae ueneno commiscuit. Post quem Primasius africanae ecclesiae antistes, uir per omnia catholicus, et in diuinis scripturis eruditus, quinque eam libris enodauit, in quibus, ut ipse asserit, non tam propria, quam aliena contexit, eiusdem scilicet Tichonii bene intellecta deflorans; nihilominus et beati Augustini quaedam exposita capitula adnectens. Et quamuis eam plenius quam alii exposuerit, altissimo tamen sermone composuit. Denique etsi numero pauca, luculentissime tamen a sancto Gregorio exposita sunt capitula per eius diuersa opuscula. Postremo beatus Ambrosius Autpertus presbyter quaedam ex his, multa uero ex suo ponens, pulcherrime pertractauit.<sup>96</sup>

Saint [*lit.*, blessed] Bede states that the Apocalypse is comprised of seven units. In the first, after his greetings, he recalls the sufferings and glories of the Lord to strengthen the weak. Next, after mentioning the deeds that have happened in the seven churches and what must (shortly) happen, he describes the battles and victories of the universal [*i.e.*, Catholic] church. In the second section, he sees four animals and twenty-four elders and the lamb standing and a book sealed with seven

seals. He also narrates the battles and triumphs of the church. In the third, he describes various events of the church under the appearance of seven angels sounding trumpets. In the fourth, under the figure of a woman and a dragon [*i.e.*, a great snake], he narrates battles and victories of the church when he recalls the sayings and deeds through the seven angels although differently than before [*lit.*, although not as before = but differently than previously]. In the fifth, through the seven angels he strikes the earth with seven plagues. In the sixth, he recounts the damnation of the whore. In the seventh, he says that the woman, adorned with the lamb, descends from heaven.

Concerning Tyconius' seven rules [*sc.*, of exegesis], the first of which is about the Lord and his body; the second (is) about the true and apparent body of the Lord; the third (is) about covenants and the law; the fourth (is) about species and type [group]; the fifth (is) about times; the sixth (treats) recapitulation. The seventh (is) about the devil and his body. These seven rules are found (*sc.*, to be valid) not only in the Apocalypse but also in other books, and especially in the prophetic ones.

The first commentator on the Apocalypse was the martyr Victorinus. While he [*sc.*, generally] followed Victorinus, Saint Jerome removed some matters that Victorinus had understood literally, added some things on his own, and constructed one book on the Apocalypse; furthermore, he promised that he was going to exert himself very much, if he lived long enough. But it is unknown whether that work was ever completed. Also, the Donatist Tyconius brought forth an extensive exposition on the Apocalypse, but he mixed into it some of his heretical poison. After him, Primasius, a leader [*i.e.*, priest, bishop, or spokesman] for the African church, and a man who was absolutely orthodox Catholic and extremely learned in the holy scriptures, elucidated the Apocalypse in five books. In these he stitched together, as he himself plainly says, not so much his own thoughts and observations but those of others,

namely by culling matters that this same Tyconius had correctly understood. Nevertheless, he also added Augustine's exposition in some chapters. And although he made a fuller exposition on the book than others, still he composed in a very elevated style. Next, Saint Gregory the Great explained some portions, though numerically few, in his various works. Finally, blessed Ambrosius Autpertus, a priest, very beautifully made exegetical interpretation by putting into his work some quotations and paraphrases from his predecessors but also adding much on his own.

### Relations among the Commentators

Alcuin's preface gives the general perspective of early Christian allusions to as well as commentaries and discussions of the Apocalypse.<sup>97</sup> The early writers follow Papias, Tertullian, and Hippolytus in a literal approach to the Millennium, resurrection, and judgment. At the beginning of the fourth century, Victorinus and Apollinarius were the last major exegetes in this tradition. Following the lead of Clement, the Alexandrian school developed an allegorical method of interpretation and applied it systematically to all scriptures, including the Apocalypse. This became the underlying approach of virtually all patristic authors after the midfourth century. Jerome's commentary reworked Victorinus' to produce a more allegorical and less literal explanation, but neither Victorinus' commentary, nor even Jerome's, had wide circulation. Even Cassiodorus did not draw heavily on Jerome.

But Jerome's contemporary, Tyconius, had a major influence on subsequent writers. Augustine used the commentary of Tyconius, his fellow North African, and also his *Liber Regularum* in commenting on the scriptures, especially on the Apocalypse in *de Ciuitate Dei* XX, and in describing the allegorical approach in *de Doctrina Christiana* III. Furthermore, Primasius, Caesarius of Arles, Bede of Jarrow, and Beatus of Liebana all made direct quotations

and paraphrases from Tyconius, and Primasius also became the primary immediate source of Ambrosius Autpertus. In turn, Ambrosius Autpertus and Bede underlie Alcuin and Carolingian commentators. This line of interpretation from Tyconius and Primasius through Bede and, to a much lesser degree, Ambrosius Autpertus is the major exegetical tradition in the West. Consequently, a deepened appreciation for and awareness of Tyconius' interpretation can be very helpful to any serious study both of the exegetical tradition itself and of the changing meaning ascribed to individual passages from ante-Nicean times to late antiquity and continuing to the early Middle Ages.

### A METHOD OF FINDING TYCONIAN QUOTATIONS

#### *Tyconius' Commentary on the Apocalypse*

The last recorded possession of a manuscript of Tyconius' commentary on the Apocalypse is in the first catalogue of Saint Gall in the ninth century, where the notation is added that the manuscript was "old" — *uetus*.<sup>98</sup> Because of the close interrelations of the continental monasteries with insular origins and because of the doctrinally and textually "maverick" nature of Northern Italy and nearby Switzerland, it is not surprising to discover a copy of Tyconius at Saint Gall. It was probably akin to the one known to Bede and to the one that was the source for the anonymous Turin fragments in a manuscript from Bobbio.

Since there is no extant manuscript of Tyconius' commentary on the Apocalypse, we must design a method for recovery. Tyconius was known to Caesarius, Bede, Beatus, and to the redactor of the Turin fragments. He was also used by Primasius, who in turn was known to and used by Bede and Ambrosius Autpertus. The question of Ambrosius Autpertus' first-hand knowledge of Tyconius has not been answered, although the modern editor of Am-

brosius for *Corpus Christianorum* was inclined to believe that Ambrosius did not have a copy of Tyconius. Since Bede, Caesarius, Beatus, and the Turin fragments are fully independent of each other, if we can find passages in two or more commentaries where the wording is precisely the same or so close as to leave no doubt as to quotation from a common source, we may conclude that these comments derive directly from Tyconius. Also, Bede, Caesarius, and Beatus all attribute statements to Tyconius, and these, too, we may accept, even though there is no collaborating witness. Where Primasius has statements that are reflected in Beatus and Caesarius, though they did not have his commentary, we may safely take them to have been drawn from Tyconius. We suspect the same for many quotations of Primasius in Bede, but without confirming evidence of Caesarius or Beatus, we cannot be certain whether Bede has incorporated the words from Tyconius or Primasius, since he knew both. In my edition of Bede's *Explanatio Apocalypseos* for *Corpus Christianorum*, I will cite the identifiable Tyconian verbal parallels of Primasius, Caesarius, Bede, Beatus, and other early commentaries.

### **Tyconius' *Liber Regularum***

Finally, there are a number of passages in those commentaries where the interpretation accords entirely with the principles (and occasionally even with the wording) of Tyconius' *Liber Regularum*.<sup>99</sup> There are only three manuscripts of the *Liber Regularum*. It was not a popular medieval treatise. However, Augustine summarized the seven rules at the conclusion of the third book of *De Doctrina Christiana*, and this was widely known and followed both directly and in Eugippius' extracts. Hence, the method was adopted and propounded by Augustine through whose influence and text Bede, too, summarized the rules in the preface to his Apocalypse commentary. Because Tyconius' methodical description of his allegorical approach accorded with

that used by Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory, it became part of the exegetical tradition in the West. Hence, even in a late thirteenth-century manuscript at Laon, the seven rules are listed and attributed to Tyconius, though without any mention of his Donatist affiliation:

**Regulae Ticonii**

Regula prima caput nostrum cum corpore iungit.  
 Corpore de uero loquitur mistoque secunda.  
 Tertia describit quid lex, quid gratia possit.  
 Quarta genus, speciem, totum partemque rependit.  
 Tempora disiungit maiora minoraque quinta.  
 Sexta refert iterum qu(a)e primo facta fuerunt.  
 Septima serpentis sibi membra caputque resoluit.<sup>100</sup>

The first rule joins our head with the body.

The second speaks concerning the true body and the mixed one.

The third describes what the Law and what Grace can do.

The fourth depends on genus and species and the part and the whole.

The fifth separates [*or, distinguishes*] greater and lesser times.

The sixth speaks again of what happened in the beginning.

The seventh undoes the strength of the serpent's head and limbs.

The *Liber Regularum* contained ideas appropriate to a pivotal shift of scriptural interpretation at a crucial time of development in the western church. This shift includes the notion of *recapitulatio* mentioned by Tertullian but developed by Tyconius. The likelihood is that when commentators use Tyconius' catch-words and categories, much of the passage has originally come from Tyconius' commentary on the Apocalypse, not the *Liber Regularum*. Such an approach to identifying Tyconian quotations is strengthened by the fact that Bede and Beatus often quote their

sources at length with little or no verbal change, an editorial practice which Bede progressively but only moderately deserted in his later commentaries.

### **Tyconian Quotations in Modern Editions of the Commentaries**

One of the fundamental problems in such a search for Tyconian quotations has been the deplorable condition of the texts of these commentaries. Yet, we now have good critical editions for Caesarius, the Turin fragments, Ambrosius Autpertus, Primasius, and a new edition of Beatus, supplementing that by Sanders, has recently been published.<sup>101</sup> My editions of the commentaries by Bede and Alcuin will include source references and exegetical parallels. For with critical editions and with the aid of computer-generated concordances and word-searches, we can more completely and accurately ascertain the verbal remnants of Tyconius imbedded in later commentaries. Fortunately, modern editors have been cognizant of the Tyconian origin of many statements in late antique and early medieval commentaries, and often they have identified such passages. However, since Apringius, Cassiodorus, Jerome, and the anonymous Irish commentary lie outside of the circle of Tyconius' influence, they have nothing to offer the effort to recover Tyconius. But for our broader interest in early Christian interpretation of Apocalypse 11, they too are important, even if they only touch on the issue briefly.

### **LITERAL AND SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURES**

Anciently there were various approaches to understanding the scriptures. One very respected mode of interpretation, associated with the School of Antioch, emphasized the traditional early Christian practice of interpreting the text literally.<sup>102</sup> A leading exponent was a late contem-

porary of Didymos and Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-428), but unfortunately he apparently did not comment on the Apocalypse.<sup>103</sup> He was followed by Theodoret of Cyr, a notable fifth-century proponent of Antiochene literalist exegesis, although, as was noted above, Theodoret cautiously admitted some allegorical meanings. He thus sought to unify the competing traditions by fusing the best parts of the two approaches into a new amalgam.

However, since it is primarily from fourth-century Alexandria – location both of the Museion, the justly famous center for scholarship on classical literature, and of the Christian Catechetical School – that later mainstream Christianity, both Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic, derives its exegetical tradition, and since most of the patristic commentators date to the fourth century or later, they use an extremely refined mode of allegorical interpretation of the scriptures. This tradition had been developed at the famous Christian Catechetical School at Alexandria in the late second and early third centuries by Clement of Alexandria, following the example of the Jewish scholar, Philo, and it was furthered by Origen in the third century. Origen left Alexandria and went to Caesarea, taking manuscripts of texts and commentaries with him, and there he propagated his method. Ironically, in later centuries Origen was anathematized for teaching incorrect doctrines; however, many of these doctrines were early Christian teachings later rejected by the church.<sup>104</sup> But the tradition of the Catechetical School also persisted and flourished at Alexandria. During the last half of the fourth century, Didymos the Blind was the teacher of Jerome, Rufinus, and some of the Greek fathers, including Gregory of Nazianzus; he was, in essence, the disseminating force by which the allegorical method developed by Clement and Origen was widely transmitted to influential Christian writers and teachers. But he came under the same condemnation as Origen, and for the same early doctrines;

his commentaries were repressed and unknown until the discovery of five papyrus codices in 1941.<sup>105</sup> Thus the survival of texts became linked to doctrinal stance and exegetical method, for “orthodox” and “heretical” were labels subject to changing and conflicting values in the complex world of Christian polemics of the first centuries of our era.<sup>106</sup>

Moreover, Christians were not alone in approaching texts allegorically. This had been a time-honored practice in the ancient Near East, especially in Egypt, and the great scholars associated with the Museum (or *Mouseion*) also employed it. But it was particularly with the Neoplatonists of the second and third centuries that allegorical interpretation flourished, and it was widely applied to classical authors.<sup>107</sup> It was in this intellectual environment and with the tradition of the Jewish scholar Philo of Alexandria<sup>108</sup> that the Catechetical School systematized their allegorical and spiritual interpretation of the scriptures.

Among Christian exegetical authors of the Alexandrian School and their intellectual heirs in the Middle Ages, there was, as Henri de Lubac and others have noted, a systematic approach that allowed for four different levels of interpretation. The first is the literal (*iuxta litteram* or *ad litteram* – “to the letter”) mode of understanding, that is, reading the text grammatically and making appropriate references to linguistic (including morphological, syntactical, and lexical or philological), historical, and cultural matters. The other three we tend to group broadly into the term allegorical, but anciently the three levels were called allegorical, tropological and anagogical; their generic term was “spiritual.”<sup>109</sup> We recognize in Didymos’ commentaries all four levels, just as they are used by Origen, but Didymos and church fathers of the late fourth and fifth centuries paid greater attention to the allegorical than to the literal meaning. And even Jerome, who used the allegorical method himself, lamented that Didymos distanced himself

too much from the literal approach.<sup>110</sup> Occasionally a medieval commentator began to develop and to apply the literal mode of interpretation, but it was only in the twelfth century at Paris that it again became strongly linked to the allegorical levels.<sup>111</sup>

One example of the shift from literal to allegorical interpretation is the rejection of a literal millennium, mentioned above.<sup>112</sup> This could not be reconciled with the de-eschatologized exegesis of the scriptures:

Throughout its long history, the church has been the steady enemy of the old Christian eschatology which, as Harnack says, emerges only at critical moments. When, as has happened in every century, groups and individuals within the church have sought the old literalism in normal times, they have been held to display exceedingly bad taste, and vigorously suppressed.<sup>113</sup>

The same churchmen who gloried in the irresistible forward march of their invincible church suddenly remembered, when that church suffered collapse and dissolution before their eyes, that the real church of Christ was not to be a triumphant world church at all; they remember what they had forgotten: that Christ's church is only to be victorious at the end of the world. "The Apocalyptic element of Chiliasm," Harnack wrote, "it is true, lay dormant for long periods, but at critical moments constantly emerged."<sup>114</sup>

Similarly, the Christian fathers viewed the temple with apprehension and misgiving, and they could only interpret the temple in the Apocalypse allegorically:<sup>115</sup>

It is commonly admitted that John's reference to the Temple is to be taken symbolically and not literally. Nearly all Catholic interpreters explain the Temple allegorically, although all do not explain the allegory in the same way, some referring it to the Church militant and others to the Church triumphant. This symbolical interpretation can be traced from Victorinus through the

Middle Ages, for instance through Albert the Great,<sup>116</sup> to the present time. This also is the meaning given to the Temple by most orthodox Protestants and by some independent critics. Unless it is taken symbolically it has no meaning in the passage, for when John wrote, the Temple of Jerusalem was already in ruins for many years.<sup>117</sup>

Another significant example of the allegorical approach coming into conflict with pristine Christian literalism is in the identification of the two witnesses in Apocalypse 11:3-13, also identified as the two lampstands and the two olive trees (Zechariah 4:3). The earliest Christian tradition holds firmly that the witnesses are to be identified with Enoch and Elijah. Such was the meaning given by Tertullian, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, and others whom Eusebius castigated for the millenarianist or chiliastic views, for the fourth century was inimical to pristine Christian literalism and eschatology. Yet, the tradition of Enoch and Elijah was strong enough to gain mention in Primasius, Cassiodorus, and even in one of Jerome's letters.<sup>118</sup> Similarly, some late apocalypses inspired by this scripture include such an identification. Although Origen's brief scholia do not discuss Apocalypse 11:3-13, Andreas later asserts that many Doctors of the eastern or Greek church even in his day held the position that the witnesses are Enoch and Elijah, and Arethas notes that it is the traditional view. Even the Coptic commentary of Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria gives Enoch and Elijah as the witnesses. In the Latin west, Victorinus asserts that the witnesses are Elijah and Jeremiah or Elijah and Moses, the latter probably influenced by the type of plagues that the prophets invoke against their enemies as well as by the Transfiguration account in Matthew 17. Yet, even this shift points to the progressive loss that the church endured in those first centuries, for the interest shown early in Enoch and Melchizedek subsides and then is lost. So when Augustine speaks of the eschatological return of

Elijah, it is with reference only to Malachi, not to the Apocalypse.<sup>119</sup>

In Tyconius, the typological and allegorical interpretation is systematically expanded and applied. Hence, to follow Caesarius, Beatus, Bede, and the Turin fragments, we must conclude that Tyconius, motivated by a strong ecclesiological interest, used the witnesses as types of the unified power and tradition of the church, in particular calling them the two testaments, New and Old. Variations of this idea can be found throughout the Middle Ages, and the notion persists today. But it was not what the Primitive Church believed. Since the fifth century, interpreters have variously identified the two witnesses with individuals such as Peter and Paul; "for Nicholas of Lyra, the Two Witnesses are Pope Sylvester and Mennas, the Patriarch of Constantinople at the time of the Monothelite heresy"; yet others suggest two prophets similar to Elijah and Moses. Alcazar asserts "that the Two Witnesses are types of persecuted and resuscitated Christianity. . . . For Bousset, the Two Witnesses are not Elias and Henoch but the might and power of the Church, although he hesitates to deny the tradition relating to Elias and Henoch."<sup>120</sup> In the twelfth century, Peter Cantor, one of the great "masters of the sacred page,"<sup>121</sup> wrote in his commentary on the Apocalypse:

**Et dabo** ad consolationem et auxilium electorum; **dabo** supple officium predicationis **testibus** Helye et Enoch per quos alii praedicatores intelliguntur. **hii sunt** commendat Helyam et Enoch ostendens quanti sint meriti quantaeue potestatis et in ill(is) commendat omnes praedicatores.<sup>122</sup>

"And I shall give" to the comfort and help of the elect; "I shall give" supply the responsibility of preaching; "to the witnesses" Elijah and Enoch, through whom other preachers are understood. "These are" he commends Elijah and Enoch by demonstrating how much

merit and power is in them, and in them he commends all the preachers.

Jewish pre-Christian traditions, including the Pseudo-Philo *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,<sup>123</sup> often associated Elijah and Enoch as two precursors who would return and be slain; and the Apocalypse of Elijah recognizes sixty such precursors.<sup>124</sup> Because of this confusing welter of explanations, and because the allegorical and typological interpretations permeate the tradition, at the expense of the literal approach, we present the actual quotations from the early Christian writers through Alcuin of York in the West and through Photius and Arethas in the East.

### PASSAGES FROM THE COMMENTATORS AND OTHER CHRISTIAN WRITINGS RELATING TO APOCALYPSE 11

#### **Descensus Christi ad inferos**

9. Dominus autem tenens manum Adae tradidit Michaeli archangelo: et omnes sancti sequebantur Michaelem archangelum, et introduxit omnes in paradisi gratiam gloriosam. Et occurrerunt eis obuiam duo uiri uetusti dierum. Interrogati autem a sanctis: Qui estis uos qui nobiscum in inferis mortui nondum fuistis et in paradiso corpore collocati estis? respondens unus ex eis dixit: Ego sum Enoch, qui uerbo domini translatus sum huc; iste autem qui mecum est Elias Thesbites est, qui curru igneo assumptus est hic, et usque nunc non gustauimus mortem, sed in aduentum Antichristi reseruati sumus, diuinis signis et prodigiis proeliaturi cum eo, et ab eo occisi in Ierusalem, post triduum et dimidium diei iterum uiui in nubibus assumendi.<sup>125</sup>

#### **Christ's Descent into Hell: The Gospel of Nicodemus**

Thus the Lord went into paradise holding the hand of Adam and entrusted him to Michael the archangel;

and all the saints were following Michael the archangel, and he led them all through the glorious door into paradise. Two very old men met them there. When they were asked by the saints, "Who are you who, though dead, have not yet been with us in hades but have been placed in paradise with your bodies?" one of them replied and said, "I am Enoch who was translated hither by the word of the lord. And this man who is with me is Elijah the Tishbite, who was caught up here in a chariot of fire. And we have not tasted death until the present moment, but rather we have been preserved to counter the coming of Antichrist. Using divine signs and prodigies [miracles], we shall battle against him, and when we have been killed at Jerusalem, after three and a half days we shall assuredly be raised up in clouds, alive once again."<sup>126</sup>

### **Historia Iosephi Fabri Lignarii**

32. Et diximus: O domine noster, deus et seruator noster, quinam sunt illi quattuor, quos dixisti e medio sublaturum esse Antichristum ob exprobatorem eorum? Respondit seruator: Illi sunt Henoch, Elias, Schila, et Tabitha.<sup>127</sup>

And we said, "Our Lord, our God and Savior, whoever are these four whom you have said the Antichrist will bear off from the midst [sc., of the people] because of them being proved? The Savior replied, these are Enoch, Elijah, Schila, and Tabitha.

### **Tertullian**

Translatus est Enoch et Helias nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet; ceterum morituri reseruantur, ut antichristum sanguine suo extinguant. Obiit et Iohannes, quem in aduentum domini remansurum frustra fuerat spes.<sup>128</sup>

Enoch and Elijah were translated nor did they experience death; it was postponed. However that may

be, although they are going to die, they are preserved so that by their blood they may destroy the Antichrist. Even John died who had vainly hoped that he would remain alive until the second coming of the Lord.

### *Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses*

Τί δὲ καὶ περὶ ἐκείνων λέγομεν, ὅπουγε Ἐνὼχ εὐαρεστήσας τῷ θεῷ, ἐν σώματι μετετέθη, τὴν μετάθεσιν τῶν δικαίων προμηνύων, καὶ Ἡλίας ὡς ἦν ἐν τῇ τοῦ πλάσματος ὑποστάσει, ἀνελήφθη, τὴν ἀνάληψιν τῶν πνευματικῶν προφητεύων; καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνεπόδισεν αὐτοῖς τὸ σῶμα πρὸς τὴν μετάθεσιν καὶ ἀνάληψιν. δι' ὧν γὰρ χειρῶν ἐπλάσθησαν τὴν ἀρχὴν, διὰ τούτων τὴν ἀνάληψιν καὶ μετάθεσιν ἐλάμβανον.<sup>129</sup>

Quid autem de illis dicimus, quando quidem Enoch placens Deo in quo placuit corpore translatus est, translationem iustorum praemonstrans, et Helias sicut erat in plasmatis substantia assumptus est, assumptionem patrum prophetans? Et nihil impediit eos corpus in translationem et assumptionem eorum: per illas enim manus per quas in initio plasmati sunt, per ipsas assumptionem et translationem acceperunt.

And what do we say of them? Wherever Enoch is, the one who well pleased God, he was translated in his body, thus proclaiming in advance the change of the righteous. And Elijah, when he was in the hypostasis [*i.e.*, the substance, essence, or foundation] of the creation [*lit.*, plasma, image, or the shaped creation], was caught up, prophesying the event of the spiritual [*i.e.*, the righteous] people being caught up to heaven. And their bodies did not impede them at all in the change and being caught up. For they received their change and ascension through the hands of those by whom they were fashioned in the beginning.

### **Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses***

Manifestius adhuc etiam de nouissimo tempore et de his qui sunt in eo decem regibus in quos diuidetur quod nunc regnat imperium significauit Iohannes, domini discipulus, in Apocalypsi, edisserens quae fuerint decem cornua quae a Daniele uisa sunt dicens sic dictum esse sibi [quotes Apocalypse 17:12-14; then Daniel 2:33-45].

Illo enim ueniente, et sua sententia apostasiam recapitulante in semetipsum et sua uoluntate et arbitrio operante quaecumque operabitur et in templo dei sedente, ut sicut Christum adorent illum qui seducentur ab illo, quapropter et iuste **in stagnum proicietur ignis** [Apocalypse 19:20], deo autem secundum suam prouidentiam praesciente omnia et apto tempore eum qui talis futurus erat, immittente, **ut credant falso, ut iudicentur omnes, qui non crediderunt ueritati, sed consenserunt iniquitati** [2 Thessalonians 2:11-12].

Cuius aduentum Iohannes in Apocalypsi significauit ita [quotes Apocalypse 13:2-10].

Nouissimus enim agon hic iustorum, in quo uincentes coronantur incorruptelam. Et propter hoc in bestia ueniente recapitulatio fit uniuersae iniquitatis et omnis doli ut in ea confluens et conclusa omnis uirtus apostatica in caminum mittatur ignis.<sup>130</sup>

Rather plainly to this point has John, the Lord's disciple, indicated in the Apocalypse concerning the very last time and concerning those who are at that time the ten kings among whom the current ruling power is to be divided. John explains what the ten horns, seen by Daniel, were to be, stating that it had been told to him as follows [Irenaeus then quotes Apocalypse 17:12-14 and Daniel 2:33-45]. . . . For he [*sc.*, the Antichrist] will come, and his intention will summarize [*lit.*, recapitulate] the apostasy in and for himself, and his will and desire will accomplish whatever is to be done [*i.e.*, whatever he wants he will do], and he will sit in the temple of God so that those who are seduced by him may wor-

ship him as though he were Christ. Hence, justly “he will be cast into the lake of fire” [Apocalypse 19:20]. But God, who because of his providence, knows all things, and at the apt time he will send forth him who was to be such “that they believe in a falsehood and that there be judged all who did not have faith in the truth but consented to iniquity” [2 Thessalonians 2:11-12]. In the Apocalypse John thus indicated the coming of that person [*sc.*, the Antichrist; Irenaeus then quotes Apocalypse 13:2-10]. . . .

For this is the very last conflict of the righteous, and if they are victorious in it, they will be crowned with an incorruptible crown [*sc.*, of glory]. And consequently with the arrival of the beast there is produced a recapitulation of all evil and of every deceitfulness so that the entire power of apostasy, flowing together and being enclosed in the beast may be sent with it into the fiery furnace.

### *Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses*

His autem sic se habentibus, et in omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et ueteribus scripturis numero hoc posito, et testimonium perhibentibus his qui facie ad faciem Iohannem uiderunt . . . (numerus enim qui dicitur sex similiter custoditus recapitulationem ostendit uniuersae apostasiae eius quae initio et quae in mediis temporibus et quae in fine erit). . . .

Cum autem deustauerit Antichristus hic omnia in hoc mundo, regnauerit annis tribus et mensibus sex et sederit in templo Hierosolymis, tunc ueniet dominus de caelis in nubibus in gloria patris, illum quidem et obaudientes ei in stagnum ignis mittens, adducens autem iustis regni tempora, hoc est requietionem, septimam diem sanctificatam, et restituens Abrahae promissionem hereditatis.<sup>131</sup>

Since that is the way matters stand, and since this number is found in all of the most ancient and proven [*or*, approved] (manuscript) copies of the scriptures, and

since those who saw John face to face bear testimony of it . . . (for the number that constitutes the digit six, consistently preserved (in the Apocalypse text) points out the recapitulations of its universal [worldwide] apostasy that occurred in the beginning, in the meridian of time [*lit.*, the middle times], and that will occur at the end). . . .

But when this Antichrist shall have destroyed everything in this world, he will reign for three years and six months, and he will even sit down in the temple at Jerusalem. Then shall the Lord come from heaven in clouds, in the glory of the Father, sending this man [the Antichrist] and those who obey him into the lake of fire. But he shall bring forth for the righteous the times of his kingdom, that is, the rest, the hallowed seventh day, and restore to Abraham the covenanted inheritance.

### ***Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses***

Si autem quidam tentauerint allegorizare haec quae eiusmodi sunt, neque in omnibus poterunt consonantes sibimetipsis inueniri, et conuincuntur ab ipsis dictionibus disserentibus [*v.l.*, differentibus]. . . . Haec enim alia uniuersa in resurrectionem iustorum sine controuersia dicta sunt, quae fit post aduentum Antichristi et perditionem omnium gentium sub eo existentium, in qua regnabunt iusti in terra, crescentes ex uisione domini, et per ipsum assuescent capere gloriam dei patris, et cum sanctis angelis conuersionem et communionem et unitatem spiritalium in regno capient. et illi quos dominus in carne inueniet exspectantes eum de caelis et perpressos tribulationem, qui et effugerint iniqui manus.<sup>132</sup>

But if certain individuals shall attempt to allegorize these matters, which are of that sort, they shall not be found agreeing among themselves on all issues, and they will be found guilty by the very people who argue with their public statements [*v.l.*, by themselves because of their conflicting statements]. . . . For all these other points and issues have been stated without controversy about the resurrection of the just, that it happens after

the coming of Antichrist, and also about the destruction of all nations that exist under him [*i.e.*, under his domination and control]. At the time of that destruction the righteous shall reign upon the earth, growing because of the overseeing and revelations of the Lord, and through him they will become accustomed to receive the glory of God the father, and, with the holy angels, they shall receive in the kingdom the behavior, communion, and unity of spiritual beings. And those whom the Lord will find [*sc.*, still living] in the flesh, waiting for him [*sc.*, to come] from the heavens, and suffering tribulation, these will also flee from the hands of the evil one.

### Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichristo*

μίαν μὲν οὖν ἑβδομάδα εἰπὼν [*v.l.*, ἐτῶν], τὴν ἐσχάτην τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ τέρματι τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου ἐσομένην ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἐσήμανεν ἢς ἑβδομάδος τὸ μὲν ἡμισυ λήμψονται οἱ δύο προφηταί, Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἡλίας. οὗτοι γὰρ κηρύξουσιν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα, περιβεβλημένοι σάκκους [Apocalypse 11:3], μετάνοιαν τῷ λαῷ καὶ πασὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι καταγγέλλοντες.<sup>139</sup>

When he said one week [*v.l.*, By one week of years], therefore, he signified the last week that is to be at the end of the whole world. The two prophets, Enoch and Elijah, will take up half of the week. For they will preach 1,260 days clothed in sackcloth, proclaiming repentance to the [*sc.*, chosen] people and to all the nations.

### Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichristo*

ἀναγκαίως δεῖ τοὺς προδρόμους αὐτοῦ πρώτους φανερωθῆναι, καθὼς διὰ Μαλαχίου τοῦ ἀγγέλου [*v.l.*, καὶ Ἀγγαίου] φησὶν· Πέμψω ὑμῖν Ἡλίαν τὸν Θεσβίτην πρὶν ἢ ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίας

πατέρων πρὸς [v.l., ἐπὶ] τέκνα, καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, μήποτε ἔλθων πατάξω [v.l., πατάξῃ] τὴν γῆν ἄρδην. Οὗτοι συμπαραγενόμενοι [v.l., οὖν παραγενόμενοι] κηρύξουσι τὴν μέλλουσαν ἔσεσθαι ἀπ' οὐρανῶν Χριστοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν, οἱ καὶ ποιήσουσι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα εἰς τὸ κἄν οὕτω δυσωπῆσαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς μετάνοιαν, διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν αὐτῶν ανομίαν τε καὶ ἀσέβειαν.

Λέγει γὰρ Ἰωάννης· Καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυοῖν μάρτυσί μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα, περιβεβλημένοι σάκκους, τουτέστι τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς ἐβδομάδος, ὃ [v.l., ἧς] εἶρηκε Δανιήλ.<sup>134</sup>

He must assuredly cause his forerunners to appear first, just as he says through Malachi, his messenger: "I shall send to you Elijah the Tishbite before the arrival of the great and glorious day of the Lord. And he shall restore [establish] the hearts of the fathers upon the children, and the disobedient in [= to or by] the thought [= wisdom] of the righteous, so that I might not ever come and utterly strike down the earth" [Malachi 4:5-6]. These will [v.l., therefore] come and proclaim the impending appearance of Christ from heaven. And they shall also perform signs and wonders that they might shame men and turn them to repentance, because of their haughty lawlessness [wickedness] and disobedience [impiety].

For John says, "And I shall grant to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy for 1,260 days, dressed in sackcloth" [Apocalypse 11:3]. That is, the half of a week, that which [v.l., of which] Daniel spoke.

### Hippolytus, *Capita contra Gaium*

Et dabo duos testes meos et prophetabunt, et cetera. H(oc) e(st) uenient duo testes, prophetae Henoch et Elias. Et uocat eos duas oliuas, sicut eos uocauit Za-

charias [Zechariah 4:3, 11, 14]. Et de Elia dixit Dominus noster: "Eliam oportet uenire ut stabiliat omnia" [Matthew 17:11]. Illos dicit facturos esse miracula et signa et adducturos plagas super infideles ut sit requies fidelibus.

Illi duo prophetae surgent aduersus Antichristum. . . . Dicit Iohannes: **accipient potestatem** Henocho et Elias et **praedicabunt dies mille et ducentos et sexaginta, amicti saccis**, et docentes poenitentiam populum et gentes. Illi dies sunt **dimidium hebdomadis**, et illae **duae oliuae et duo candelabra** sunt, sicut dixit Zacharias, Henocho et Elias.<sup>135</sup>

"And I shall give my two witnesses and they shall prophesy, etc." That is, two witnesses shall come, the prophets Enoch and Elijah. And he calls them two olive trees, just as Zechariah called them. And our Lord said of Elijah, "it is necessary for Elijah to come to restore all things." He says that they are going to perform miracles and signs and that they will bring plagues on the faithless [disobedient] so that there may be peace for the faithful.

These two prophets shall rise up against the Antichrist. . . . John says, Enoch and Elijah "shall receive power and shall prophesy during 1,260 days, dressed in sackcloth," and teaching repentance to the [God's] people and to the gentile nations. These days are "half a week," and "the two olive trees and the two candlesticks," just as Zechariah said, are Enoch and Elijah.

### Hippolytus, *In Daniele*

τῶν γὰρ ἑξήκοντα δύο εβδομάδων πληρωθεισῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ παραγενομένου καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ κηρυχθέντος ἐκκενωθέντων τῶν καιρῶν, μία ἐβδομάς περιλειφθήσεται ἡ ἐσχάτη, ἐν ἣ παρῆσται Ἡλίας καὶ Ἐνώχ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει αὐτῆς ἀναφανήσεται τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἔρημώσεως, ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ἐρήμωσιν τῷ κόσμῳ καταγγέλλων. <sup>136</sup>

For when the sixty-two weeks shall be completed,

and Christ shall have come, and the gospel shall be preached in every place – when these critical times shall be fulfilled, one week – the last – shall remain. During this time there shall appear Elijah and Enoch, and at the middle of the week shall appear the “abomination of desolation,” that is the Antichrist, proclaiming desolation to the world.

### Hippolytus, *In Daniele*

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὕτως ὁ προφήτης διηγείται περὶ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὡς [*v.l.*, ὅς] ἔσται ἀναιδής, πολεμοτρόφος καὶ τύραννος . . . ὅς ὑπὲρ πάντας βασιλεῖς καὶ πάντα θεὸν ἐπαρθείς οἰκοδομήσει τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναὸν ἀναστήσει . . . καὶ τούτῳ προσκυνήσουσιν ὡς θεῷ οἱ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ τούτῳ γόνυ κλινούσιν, ὑπονοοῦντες αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν . . .

οὗτος ἀνελεῖ τοὺς δύο μάρτυρας, καὶ προδρόμους Χριστοῦ κηρύσσοντας τὴν ἔνδοξον αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν παρουσίαν [*v.l.*, βασιλείαν]: ὡς λέγει διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.<sup>137</sup> **καὶ δώσω τοῖς δυσὶ μάρτυσί μου . . . σάκκους** [Apocalypse 11:3]· καθ’ ἃ [*v.l.*, καθὼς] καὶ τῷ Δαυιὴλ εἶρηκε· **καὶ διαθήσει διαθήκην . . . καὶ σπονδὴν** [Daniel 9:27], ἵνα δειχθῇ ἡ μία ἑβδομάς εἰς δύο μεριζομένη, τῶν μὲν δύο μαρτύρων τρία ἥμισυ ἔτη κηρυσσόντων, τοῦ δὲ ἀντιχρίστου τὸ ἐπίλοιπον τῆς ἑβδομάδος τοὺς ἁγίους πολεμοῦντος καὶ πάντα τὸν κόσμον ἐρημοῦντος· ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ εἰρημένον· **καὶ δώσουσι βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐνενήκοντα** [Daniel 12:11–12].<sup>138</sup>

Therefore the prophet thoroughly explains about the Antichrist: he will be shameless; he will nurture himself on war [*i.e.*, be a war-monger]; he will be a ty-

rant . . . who will audaciously exalt himself above all kings and every god; he will build up the city of Jerusalem and will restore the sanctuary of the temple; . . . and the disobedient will worship him as though he were God and will bow their knee to him, deeming him to be the Christ.

He shall destroy the two witnesses and precursors of Christ as they proclaim his glorious coming [*v.l.*, kingdom] from heaven, as (John in the Apocalypse) says: [quotes Apocalypse 11:3] and according to what [*v.l.*, just as] was also stated by Daniel: [quotes Daniel 9:27] – that the one week might be shown to be divided into two parts. So, the two witnesses preach during three and a half years, and during the rest of the week the Antichrist makes war upon the saints and devastates the world, that the scripture [*lit.*, utterance, what has been spoken (by the prophet)] may be fulfilled: [quotes Daniel 12:11-12].

### (Pseudo-)Methodios, *Apocalypsis*

ἔξαποστελεῖ οὖν ἐν συντόμῳ τοὺς ἰδίους αὐτοῦ καὶ γνησίους θεράποντας τὸν Ἐνώχ καὶ τὸν Ἐλίαν εἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ ἀντικειμένου.<sup>139</sup>

Therefore he shall soon send forth his very own and legitimate servants, Enoch and Elijah, to expose [refute] the adversary.

ἔξαποστελεῖ οὖν ἐν συντόμῳ τοὺς ἰδίους αὐτοῦ καὶ γνησίους θεράποντας τὸν τε Ἐνώχ καὶ τὸν Ἐλίαν, οἵτινες ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐλέγχουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλάνην.<sup>140</sup>

Therefore he shall soon send forth his very own and legitimate servants, Enoch and Elijah, who shall expose his error to all nations.

ἀλλ' ἔξαποστελεῖ τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους αὐτοῦ τὸν τε Ἐνώχ καὶ Ἐλίαν καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν θεολόγον εἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου.<sup>141</sup>

But he shall send his own servants, Enoch, Elijah, and John the theologian, to the confrontation with the Antichrist.

### Commodian

Sed priusquam ille ueniat, prophetabit Helias  
 Tempore partito, medio ebdomadis axe[m].  
 Conpleto spatio succedit ille nefandus,  
 Quem et Iudaei simul tunc cum Romanis adorant.  
 Quamquam erit alius, quem expectent ab oriente,  
 In nostra caede tamen saeuient cum rege Nerone.  
 Ergo cum Helias in Iudea terra prophetat,  
 Et ⟨signo⟩ signat populum in nomine Christi;  
 De quibus quam multi quoniam illi credere nolunt,  
 Supplicat iratus Altissimum, ne pluat inde:  
 Clausum erit caelum ex eo nec rore madescet,  
 Flumina quoque iratus in sanguine uertit.<sup>142</sup>

But before he comes, Elijah shall prophesy at the division of time, the midaxis of the week. After the space of time is filled, that accursed man will come forth whom the Jews together with the Romans worship. Although there will be another whom they anticipate from the east, nevertheless, they will rage with the King [= Emperor] Nero in our slaughter. Therefore while Elijah prophesies in the land of Judah and with a mark seals the people in the name of Christ, since many of them refuse to believe in him, in anger he will pray to the most high [God] that it not rain henceforth. From that time heaven will be closed nor will it become wet from dew. Furthermore, because of his anger he will turn rivers to blood.

### Victorinus

Aquila uolans medio caelo: spiritus sanctus significatur in duobus prophetis contestans magnam plagarum iram imminere, si quo modo, quamuis sit nouissimum tempus, aliquis adhuc saluus esse possit.<sup>143</sup>

An eagle flying through the midst of heaven; by the

two prophets is the Holy Spirit signified, opposing the great anger of the plagues that is ready at hand, [to see] whether perchance, although it is the very last time, someone can yet be saved.

### Jerome

[*Et uidi unam aquilam uolantem per medium caelum.*] Aquila magna medio caelo uolans: spiritus sanctus significatur in duobus prophetis contestans magnam plagarum iram imminere, si quo modo, quisque uolens sit nouissimo tempore conuersus, ut aliquis adhuc saluus esse possit.<sup>144</sup>

A great eagle flying in the midst of heaven; by the two prophets is the Holy Spirit signified, opposing the great anger of the plagues that is ready at hand, [to see] whether perchance, anyone willingly might be converted at the last time, so that anyone could be saved up to the present moment.

### Victorinus

Multi putant cum Helia esse Heliseum aut Moysen, sed utrique mortui sunt. Hieremiae autem mors non inuenitur. Per omnia ueteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Hieremiam.<sup>145</sup>

Many people think that Elisha or Moses is [going to be coming] with Elijah, but both of them died. However, the death of Jeremiah is not found [recorded in the scriptures]. Through all matters, our predecessors have passed down the tradition that this [other] person is Jeremiah.

### Jerome

Multi putant cum Helia esse Heliseum aut Moysen, sed utrique mortui sunt. Hieremiae autem mors non inuenitur. Perque omnia ueteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Hieremiam.<sup>146</sup>

Many people think that Elisha or Moses is [going to

be coming] with Elijah, but both of them died. However, the death of Jeremiah is not found [recorded in the scriptures]. And through all matters, our predecessors have passed down the tradition that this [other] person is Jeremiah.

### Victorinus

Deinde ait: **factum est in caelo bellum: Michael et nuntii eius pugnauerunt cum dracone, et draco pugnavit et nuntii eius, et non est inuentus ei locus in caelo. et iactatus est draco magnus, anguis antiquus, recidit in terram.** hoc est initium aduentus Antichristi. ante tamen oportet praedicare Heliam et pacifica tempora esse, et sic postea consummato triennio et mensibus sex praedicationis Heliae iactari Antichristum de caelo, ubi habuit potestatem ascendendi usque ad illud tempus, et angelos refugas uniuersos. sic Antichristum de inferno suscitari, hoc et Paulus apostolus ait: **nisi prius uenerit homo peccati, filius perditionis, aduersarius, qui se eleuabit super omne quod nominatur deus aut colitur.**<sup>147</sup>

Then he says: "There was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought with the dragon, and the dragon and his angels fought; and there was not found any place in heaven for the dragon. And that great dragon, the old viper, was hurled out and fell to the earth." This is the beginning of the coming of the Antichrist. For before that time it is necessary for Elijah to preach and for the times to be peaceful; and thus after the completion of three years and six months of the preaching of Elijah, the Antichrist is thrown from heaven, where he had the power of ascending until that time, he and all his apostate angels. That Antichrist is thus raised up from hell, even the apostle Paul says: "except there should first come the man of sin, the son of perdition, the adversary, who will lift up himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped."

### Jerome

Deinde ait: [**factum est proelium in caelo: Michael et angeli eius pugnabant cum dracone, et draco proe-**

**liatus est et angeli eius, et non ualuerunt neque inuentus est eorum locus etiam nunc in caelo. et proiectus est draco ille magnus, serpens antiquus, proiectus est in terram.] factum est bellum in caelo: Michael et nuntii eius pugnaverunt cum dracone, et draco pugnavit et nuntii eius, et non est inuentus ei locus in caelo. et iactatus est draco magnus, anguis antiquus, iactatus in terram. hoc est initium Antichristi. ante tamen oportet praedicare Heliam et pacis tempora esse, et postea consummato triennio et sex mensibus praedicationis Heliae iactari eum de caelo, ubi habuit potestatem ascendendi usque ad illud tempus, et angelos refugas uniuersos. sic et Antichristum de inferno suscitari Paulus apostolus ait: nisi prius uenerit homo peccati, filius perditionis, aduersarius, qui se eleuabit super omne quod nominatur deus aut colitur.<sup>148</sup>**

Then he says [twice quoting Apocalypse 12:7-9]: This is the beginning of Antichrist. However, before that time, it is necessary that Elijah preach and that there be times of peace; later, after the completion of the three years and six months of Elijah's preaching, he [the Antichrist], together with all his apostate angels, is cast from heaven where he had power of ascending up until that time. Thus Paul the apostle says that the Antichrist is raised up from Hades: "except there first come the time of the apostasy and that there appear the man of sin, the son of perdition, the adversary who will raise himself up above all that is called God or above all that is worshipped" [2 Thessalonians 2:3-4].

### **(Tyconius) Turin Fragments**

**332 Et dabo duobus testibus meis, et prophetabunt dies mille ducenti sexaginta. 333 Id est, ante dixerat: Oportet te iterum prophetare, hoc nunc de duobus testibus suis uoluit demonstrare. 334 Duos enim testes quos dicit, duo testamenta intellegi uoluit, in quibus ecclesia ipsius gubernatur ac regitur. 335 Non enim dixit: facio mihi testes, tanquam qui non fuerint, sed Dabo testibus,**

qui ab initio mecum sunt et a me penitus non disceserunt. **336 Dies autem mille ducenti sexaginta**, non tempus est pacis sed nouissimae persecutionis, in quibus in christianos diabolus exardescet, quando ad probandum ecclesiam potestatem acceperit. **337** Et sicut ante diluuium, quando peccata hominum usque ad caelum extulerant caput, non defuit qui iram Domini pereuntibus praedicaret, ita tunc non deerunt qui regnum Dei et nouissimum diem adnuncient, exemplo suo peccatoribus paenitentiae uiam demonstrant. **338 Saccis, induiti**. Id est, in exomologesim constituti, **339** sicut propheta dicit: **cum mihi molesti essent, induebam me cilicium**. **340** Et Iob: **Adsuerunt, inquit, cutibus meis cilicium**. **341** Deinde qui sunt isti duo testes in consequentibus dicit.<sup>149</sup>

**332** "And I shall grant . . ." **333** That is what he had previously said: "you must prophesy again," this is what is now wanted to demonstrate about his two witnesses. **334** For the two witnesses whom he mentions he wanted to be understood as the two testaments, whereby his own church is governed and ruled. **335** For he did not say: I shall make witnesses for myself, as if they didn't exist, but "I shall grant unto my witnesses" who have been with me from the beginning and have not at all defected from me. **336** Moreover, the 1,260 days are not a time of peace but of the very last persecution. On those days the devil will burn with rage against the Christians, since he will have power to try the church. **337** And just as before the flood, when the sins of men had raised their head [*i.e.*, the summary titles in a list] to heaven, there was no lack of a person who was to prophesy the wrath of God to those who were about to perish, so then there will not be a lack for people who will proclaim the kingdom of God and the very last day [*i.e.*, the judgment day] and who, by their own example, will point out the way of repentance unto the sinners. **338** "Dressed," he said, "in sackcloth." That is (to say), established to bear witness [*or*, to confess], **339** just as the prophet said:

“although they were a nuisance to me, I dressed myself in sackcloth” [Vulgate Psalm 34:13]. 340 And Job: “they have placed,” he says, “sackcloth on my skin [Old Latin Job 16:16]. 341 Then he states who these two witnesses are in what follows.

### (Tyconius) Turin Fragments

342 *Hi sunt duo olivae et duo candelabra, qui in conspectu Domini terra(e) stant.* 343 *Hi sunt qui stant, ait. Non autem dixit stabunt, sicut stare non possint.* 344 *In duo candelabra ecclesia signata est, quae duorum testamentorum munitione uallata est.* 345 *Nam et in septem angelis et septem candelabris unam ecclesiam designavit, ita ut cum unum nominaverit etiam caetera nominavit.* 346 *Nam cum Zacharias propheta in figura nostra e somno excitaretur ut ecclesiae lumen aspiceret, unum candelabrum septiformem uidit, in quo mysterium septiformis ecclesiae declaravit.* 347 *Nam duae oliuae duo sunt testamenta, oleum scientiae candelabro infundentia.*<sup>150</sup>

342 “These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks. . . .” 343 “These are those who stand,” he says. However, he did not say “they will stand” as if they could not stand. 344 In “two candlesticks” the church is signified, which is protected by the fortification of the two testaments. 345 For both in the seven angels and in the seven candlesticks he has designated one church, so that when he named the one he also named the others. 346 For when the prophet Zechariah was aroused from sleep in our image, so that he might look upon the light of the church, he beheld a sevenfold candlestick whereby he stated that the mystery of the sevenfold church was made plain. 347 For the two olive trees are the two testaments, pouring forth the oil of knowledge upon [or, into] the candlestick.

### *Ambrosius, Commentarii in Epistolam I ad Corinthios*

Sicut passuri sunt Enoch et Elias, qui ultimo tempore futuri sunt apostoli. Mitti enim habent ante Christum

ad praeparandum populum Dei, et muniendas omnes Ecclesias, ad resistendum Antichristo, quos et persecutiones pati et occidi lectio Apocalypsis testatur (Apocalypse 11:8-9).<sup>151</sup>

Just as Enoch and Elijah, who will be sent forth [*lit.*, apostles] at the last time, are going to suffer. For people hold that they are sent before Christ to prepare the people of God and to fortify all the churches to combat against the Antichrist. Reading the Apocalypse bears witness that these two will suffer persecutions and be killed.

### Didymos the Blind, *In Genesim*

[quoting Genesis 5:21–24, concluding with 5:24] . . . καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνώχ [τ]ῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκετο, ἢ ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. . . . περὶ δὲ τούτου λέγει[ται] ὅτι μ]ετετέθη, περὶ οὗ νοοῦμεν ὅτι ἢ ὡς Ἡλίας ἀναλήμφθη ἢ καθ' ἕ[τ]ερον τρόπον εἰς θεῖον ἡρπάγη χώρον. . . .

θειωρίαν ἄρα πρέπουσαν ἔχει τὸ προκείμενον, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῷ εἰθισμένῳ τὸ νῦν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις θανάτῳ κεκοινώνηκασιν, ἀλλὰ ἢ τῷ τὴν ἔνυλον ζωὴν ἀποτεθεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν ἀπόρρητον ἡμῖν ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον τὸ θνητὸν αὐτῶν δεῖ νοῆσαι.

εἰ δὲ τῷ φίλον ἢ κα[ὶ] τὴν βίβλον τῆς διαθήκης ἀναγιγνώσκειν, γινώσεται ὡς [εἰς] τὸν παράδεισον ἡρπᾶσθαι λέγεται. ἢ καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ εἰδέναι, [εἰ κα]ὶ μὴ ἐξ ἀναντιρρήτου βιβλίου ἐστίν, ἢ οὐκ ἄτοπον.<sup>152</sup>

“And Enoch pleased God, and he was not found any more, because God transported him” [Genesis 5:24]. . . . Concerning him [*sc.*, Enoch] it is said that “he was transported” [Genesis 5:24], about whom we understand that either, like Elijah, “he was taken up” [*sc.*,

to heaven; 2 Kings 2:11] or “he was caught up” [2 Corinthians 12:4] in some other manner to a divine place. . . .

Therefore, this matter [*or*, what has earlier been put forth, *namely the verb in Genesis 5:24 translated “and he was transported”*] has an explanation appropriate (to Enoch and Elijah) [*or*, an appropriate consideration], although they [*sc.*, Enoch and Elijah] have not partaken of [*lit.*, shared in] the (sort of) death usual to men nowadays; but rather it is requisite for us to understand, according to the ineffable word of God [*or*, using God’s explanation that is secret to us], their mortal condition by their having laid aside their material life [*or*, by the fact that their material life has now thoroughly been laid aside].

And if someone enjoys reading [*or*, is willing to read] *The Book of the Testament* [*sc.*, of Enoch], he will realize that Enoch is said to have been caught up to paradise. And in fact it is not bizarre to know this [*i.e.*, to learn or ascertain this fact from this source], even though it is not from an irrefutable book.

### **Didymos the Blind, *In Zachariam***

διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὴν λυχνί[αν χρυ]σῆν ὅλην εἶναι, δηλοῖ ὅτι ὅλη δι’ ὅλων ἢ φωτῶν πεπληρωμέν[η λυ]χνί[α] νοερὰ καὶ ἀσώματος ἐστίν.<sup>153</sup>

Because he says that the entire lampstand is gold, it is obvious that the lampstand, entirely filled with lights, is spiritual and immaterial.

### **Didymos the Blind, *In Zachariam***

[lemma: Zechariah 4:11–14] 335. ἐπηρωτήσαντος τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦτος ἐν τῷ προφήτῳ· “Τί βλέπεις σύ;” ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν πευστικῶς· “Τίνες αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι αἱ ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων τῆς λυχνίας;” ἀπεκρίσεως

αὐτῷ μὴ δοθείσης, ἐκ δευτέρου ἐπερωτᾷ περὶ δύο κλάδων τῶν ἐλαιῶν οἱ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν τῶν δύο μυξωτήρων τῶν ἐπιχεόντων καὶ ἐπαναγόντων τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας τὰς χρυσᾶς. πρὸς ὃν ὁ ἄγγελος· “οὐ γινώσκεις τί ἐστὶν ταῦτα;” “Οὐχί, κύριε,” εἰπόντος τοῦ προφήτου, ὁ ἄγγελος ἔφη· “Οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοὶ τῆς πιότητος παρεστήκασιν τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς.”

336. τῷ ἀρχὴν ἔχοντι μυσταγωγίας οὐ δυνατὸν πω γνῶναι τίνες ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων τῆς λυχνίας ἐλαῖαι· διὸ ἐκ δευτέρου ἐπερωτᾷ περὶ κλάδων δύο τῶν ἐλαιῶν. σεσαφήνισται ἐν τοῖς πρότερον λόγους εἶναι μελέτης θείας, ἐλαίας ὀνομαζομένους διὰ τὸ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν αὐξεῖν καὶ τρέφειν τὸ φῶς. 337. ἐπεὶ οὖν [οὐ] δυνατὸν τὸν ἐκ μέρους γινώσκοντα καὶ προφητεύοντα θεωρῆσαι ἐξ ὅλων τὰ στελέχη καὶ τὰ ἔρνη τῶν [ἐ]κκειμένων φυτῶν, ἐκ δευτέρου ἐπηρώτησιν προσάγει [περ]ὶ δύο κλάδων ἐλαιῶν, τούτων γὰρ μόγις γνῶσιν [ἔχε]ιν δυνατὸν τὸν δι' ἐσόπτρου καὶ αἰνίγματος ἐπιβάλλον[τα] τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἴν' ἐκ τῶν μερικῶν ὠφεληθεῖς δύνῃθῃ ποτε γνῶναι τίνες αἱ ἐλαῖαι τυγχάνουσιν.

338. καὶ ἐπεὶ μία ἀποδόσεων κατὰ τινα τῶν ἐξηγησαμένων τὸ ρητὸν ὃς τὰς δύο ἐλαίας εἰς τὸν περὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος λόγον ἐξέλαβεν, ὅρα εἰ οἱ κλάδοι τῶν ἐλαιῶν τούτων ἐκλαμβάνοιντο τὰ ἐφικτὰ τῷ ἐκ μέρους γινώσκοντι. καὶ Χριστοῦ μὲν ἐλαίας ὄντος, κλάδος εἴη τὸ σάρκα γεγονέναι τὸν λόγον· τοῦ δ' ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἡ εἰσαγωγικὴ θεωρία αὐτοῦ, ὀνομαζομένη “ἄρραβῶν” αὐτοῦ. . . .

342. ἐπίστησον εἰ δύνασαι πιότητος υἱοῦς δύο ἐκλαβεῖν παρεστηκότας τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς, τοὺς ὀφθέντας ἐν δόξῃ μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐν

τῷ ὄρει Μωϋσέα καὶ Ἡλίαν, τὸν νομικὸν καὶ προφητικὸν δηλονότι λόγον. ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ πνευματικὸς νόμος υἱὸς τυγχάν[ει] τῆς ἀποδοθείσης πιότητος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀνηγμένος προφήτ[ου] λόγος. ἀνέγνω ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ βιβλίῳ τὸν Ἐνώχ καὶ τὸν Ἡ[λίαν] τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς τῆς πιότητος εἶναι, ὡς εἰκὸς διὰ τὸ προσόνα[σθαι] παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους. [Didymos quotes Hebrews 11:5 and 2 Kings 2:11 as proof.]<sup>154</sup>

335. When the angel who spoke with the prophet asked the question, "what do you see?" he replied by inquiring, "who are the two olive trees at the right and at the left of the lampstand?" Since no response was given to him, he asked a second time concerning the two branches of the olive trees who have in their hands the golden lamp-oil containers of the two spouts that pour out and bring up the oil (for burning in the lamp wicks). The angel replied, "don't you know what these things are?" So when the prophet said, "not at all, my Lord," the angel said, "these two sons of the anointing [*lit.*, children of fatness] stand before the lord of all the earth."

336. To him who has (only) the beginning of initiation into the mysteries it is not at all possible for him to know the identity of the olive trees on the right and left of the lampstand. Hence, a second time he inquires about the branches of the two olive trees. It has been made adequately clear in the preceding comments that there are topics of divine practice [study] that are called olive trees because their fruit increases and nurtures the light. 337. Therefore, since it is not possible for the person who "knows and prophesies in part" [1 Corinthians 13:9] to contemplate completely the trunks and branches of the aforementioned plants, he (the prophet) asks a second time about the two branches of the olive trees. For to acquire knowledge is scarcely possible [= only with great

difficulty] for a person who devotes himself to the truth "through [*or, in*] a mirror and with uncertainty" [1 Corinthians 13:12 "see through a glass darkly"]. And this is that by not being concerned about details, he might sometime be about to come to know who the olive trees happen to be.

338. And since this is one (possible) explanation according to one of the exegetes [probably Athanasius] of this passage, a person who took the two olive trees to mean the study of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, consider whether the branches of these olive trees might receive [= admit, understand] matters accessible to one who knows only in part. And so if the olive tree should be [= signify] Christ, then the branch would be the word made [*lit., become*] flesh [*or, the incarnation of the word*], but if it should be [= signify] the Holy Spirit, then it would be the introductory (spiritual) contemplation, something called "the earnest" [*or, down payment, first installment of the Spirit*] [2 Corinthians 5:5]. . . .

342. Come to understand whether you are able to accept that the two sons of the anointing who stand in the presence of the lord of all the earth are (to be identified with [*or, the same as*]) Moses and Elijah—obviously the word of the Law and the prophetic word—who were seen in glory on the mount with Jesus. For just as the spiritual law happens to be the son of the anointing as has been explained, even so it is with the word of the prophet that has been brought up [*or, that we have been discussing; alternatively, even so it is with the anagogical or allegorical word of the prophet*]. I have read in an apocryphal book that Enoch and Elijah are the two sons of the anointing, as is likely because of their having an advantage in comparison with the rest of mankind.

### *Jerome, Commentarii in Zachariam*

Dicamus igitur singula percurrentes, primum quid uideatur Hebraeis, a quibus in ueteri testamento eruditi sumus; deinde per hos quasi gradus ad Ecclesiae culmina conscendamus. Candelabrum aureum solidum, legem,

id est, *nomon* interpretantur. Lampadem autem, id est flammam in uertice candelabri lucentem atque fulgentem, Christum, qui caput legis sit, et omnem mundum illuminet. Septem lucernas super candelabrum, septem gratias Spiritus sancti, de quibus supra diximus, quod in lapide uno septem oculi sint. Nulli enim dubium quin lex, Spiritu sancto dictante, conscripta sit. Septem autem infusoria in quibus oleum sit, quod mittatur in lucernas, quae super candelabro luceant, hoc intellegi uolunt, septem istas gratias de caelo ad homines per legem descendere. Duas autem oliuas super candelabrum a dextera parte et sinistra, inter quas media lampas luceat, legem et prophetiam interpretantur.<sup>155</sup>

Therefore, as we examine each particular issue, let us state first what seemed best to the Jews, from whom we have been educated in the Old Testament. Next, let us ascend through these people the steps, as it were, to the heights of the church. The solid gold candlestick they interpret to be the Law, that is, the *nomos*. But the lampstand on the candlestick, which is the flame shining and burning, illumines Christ, who is the head of the Law, and the entire world. The seven lamps upon the candlestick are the seven graces of the Holy Spirit, concerning which we spoke above, that there are seven eyes in one rock. For no one has any doubts but that the Law was written as the Holy Spirit dictated it. Moreover, the seven pipes through which there is oil that can be put into the lamps, they want this to be understood as the seven graces that descend from heaven upon men through the Law. Moreover, (the commentators) interpret the two olives above the candlestick on the right and left, such that a balanced brilliance shines between them, to be the law and prophecy.

### Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam*

Haec ab Hebreis dicta reperimus. Nunc quid ab ecclesiasticis uiris in commentariis scriptum sit disseramus. . . . Duas oliuas super candelabrum, et ipsi Moy-

sen et Heliam intellegunt, qui cum Domino loquebatur in monte, et significabant quid in Hierusalem passurus esset. Omnis enim lex et prophetae de Christi praedicant passione. Alii duas oliuas a dextris, et a sinistris, legem et euangelium interpretantur, ut in dextra euangelium sit, in sinistra lex . . . . Mons ibi aperte diabolus accipitur. Alii autem temeritate non parua, hoc quod manifeste de diabolo dicitur, ad Christum referunt, qui in scripturis sanctis mons saepius dicitur. Nec necesse est dare exempla, quorum magna copia est. . . . Et ab Hebraeis et a nostris multa dicuntur, quorum pleraque sectantes, et alia repudiantes, quid nobis placeat, inferamus, seruantes historiae ueritatem, ut ex hac possimus eum, qui per historiam prophetatur, agnoscere.<sup>156</sup>

This is what we find stated by the Jewish (scholars). Now let us discuss what has been written in commentaries by men of the Church. . . . They themselves understand the two olive trees above the candlestick as Moses and Elijah, who spoke with the Lord on the Mount [*sc.*, of Transfiguration], and they indicated what he would have to suffer at Jerusalem. For all of the law and the prophets foretell of the passion of Christ. Other exeges interpret the two olives—on the right and on the left—to be the law and the gospel, such that the gospel is on the right and the law on the left. . . . There obviously the mount is to be taken as the devil. But others, with extreme audacity, apply this [*sc.*, notion], that clearly is spoken about the devil, to Christ, as he is very often called a mountain in the scriptures. And there is no need to provide examples, for there is a great abundance of them. . . . Many things are stated both by the Jews and by ours [*i.e.*, by the Christian scholars]; though we follow much of what they say, and though we repudiate other parts, let us accept and admit what might please us, while preserving the historical truth, so that we may be able to recognize him, for he was prophesied throughout history.

### Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam*

Cumque et de duobus ramis propheta quaereret, et rursum interrogaretur ab angelo, utrumnam sciret quid duo rami significarent, et ille dixisset: **Non, domine** [Zechariah 4:13], respondit angelus Domini: **Isti sunt duo filii olei**, ut Symmachus uoluit, siue *zilpnotētos*, ut interpretatus est Aquila, id est splendoris; uel *piotētos*, hoc est pinguedinis, ut uerterunt Septuaginta; aut *lamprotētos*, id est claritatis, ut Theodotio transtulit, **qui assistunt Dominatori uniuersae terrae** [Zechariah 4:14]. De duabus oliuis quae erant ad dextram lampadis et sinistram, supra legimus. Et idcirco nunc interrogans super his propheta, non meretur audire, quia priora non retinet, siue quod ibi obscurius dictum est, hic manifestius audire desiderat, aut certe silentio angeli confutatur eius pertinacia, quod maiora se scire contendat : quamquam Hebraei ideo eum de oliuis interrogantem, nihil audisse confirmant, quia non bene interrogauit, nec totum quaesierit quod scire debuerat. Denique postea plenius sciscitatur addens, spicas uel ramos oliuarum, de quibus supra tacuerat. Ibi enim dixit: **Quid sunt duae oliuae istae?** Hic interrogat: **Quid sunt duae spicae oliuarum?** *Metaphorikos* quod in morem spicarum rectae sint arbores, et quasi spicae aristis, sic istae uallo quodam ramorum atque foliorum tectae sint et in sublime surgentes. Duas oliuas quidam e nostris Filium interpretantur, et Spiritum sanctum, et mediam lampadem Deum Patrem. Sed nescio quomodo absque blasphemia, alterum a dextris, et alterum accipiant a sinistris. Ramos quoque siue spicas oliuarum, incarnationem Saluatoris et similitudinemque columbae Spiritus sancti edisserunt, quia totas oliuas uidere nequeamus, sed partem quandam et, ut ita dicam ramusculos incarnationis Christi, et ostensionis Spiritus sancti nobis esse monstratos. Alii duo intellegunt testamenta, a dextris euangelium, a sinistris legem, eo quod in altero spiritualis sensus sit, in altero corporalis; et quod nec totum euangelium, nec totam legem explanare possimus: **Et nunc**

**ex parte cognoscamus, et ex parte prophetemus**, et necdum possimus intellegere quod perfectum est. Sunt qui duos ramos oliuarum uel duas spicas, et filios pinguedinis uel splendoris, sacerdotium interpretentur et legem, quae praebeant gaudium uniuersae terrae. Alii Henoeh et Heliam, quorum alter in praeputio, alter in circumcissione placuit Deo, et cum corpore raptus in caelum est. Pro splendore et oleo, et pinguedine et claritate, in Hebraico legimus Isaar, iuxta illud quod de gaudio et felicitate sanctorum in psalmis scriptum est: **Inebriabuntur ab ubertate, siue pinguedine domus tuae**: *piotes* enim magis pinguedinem quam ubertatem sonat. Haec ut quiuimus, et ut uires ingenioli nostri ferre potuerunt, locuti sumus, et Hebraeorum et nostrorum uarias opiniones breuiter perstringentes, si quis melius immo uerius dixerit, et nos libenter melioribus acquiescimus.<sup>157</sup>

And when the prophet inquired about the two branches, and again while he was being questioned by the angel as to whether he knew what the two branches signified, when he said "No, Lord [Zechariah 4:13]," the angel of the Lord replied, "These are the two sons of the olive oil," as Symmachus wanted (to say) it, or *zilpnotetos*, as Aquila translated it—that is "of brilliance"—or else *piotetos*, that is "of fatness or richness," as the Septuagint translated it; or *lamprotetos*, that is "of shining or gleaming light," as Theodotion translated it [*sc.*, in his version of the Septuagint Old Testament], "who stand beside the Lord of the whole earth" [Zechariah 4:14]. Concerning the two olive trees that were at the right and left of the lampstand, we read above. And therefore when the prophet now asks about them, he does not deserve to hear because he does not retain the previous answers whether here he wants to hear it stated more openly, because it was stated there too obtusely [*or*, in a rather obscure fashion], or his impertinence is castigated [refuted] by the angel's silence, because the prophet seeks to know greater matters [*sc.*, than he ought to know]. However, the Jewish writers thus assert that

the prophet heard nothing when he inquired about the olive trees, on the grounds that he was not asking well his question nor did he ask everything that he ought to know.

Next, he later seeks to know more fully, adding a question about the spikes or branches of the olives, about which he had been silent earlier. For there he said, "what are these two olive trees?" [Zechariah 4:12] He inquires, "what are the two twigs of the olives?" [Zechariah 4:13] (They are to be understood) metaphorically, because the trees are standing straight up, in the same way as spikes of grain, and as though they were shoots with ears of grain, so these have been covered by a sort of wall of branches and leaves, and they ascend upwards. Some of our people interpret the two olives as the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the lampstand in the midst as God the Father. But I do not comprehend how they can take one on the right and the other on the left without blaspheming. They explain that the branches or twigs of the olives are the incarnation of the Savior and the likeness of the Holy Spirit to a dove, because we are unable to see the entire olive trees, but just a certain part, and, if I say it this way, the branches of the incarnation of Christ and also of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit have been shown to us. Others understand [*sc.*, the two olive branches or trees to be] the two testaments, the gospel on the right, on the left the law [*sc.*, of Moses], because in the one is a spiritual [or allegorical] sense, in the other a corporal [or material sense], and because we can neither explain the totality of the gospel nor all of the law: "And now we know in part, and we prophesy in part" [1 Corinthians 13:9], and we are not yet capable of understanding that which is perfect. Some people interpret the two branches of the olives or the two twigs, as well as the sons of richness or brilliance, as the priest and the law, that furnish joy to all the earth. Others (interpret them to be) Enoch and Elijah — the one pleased God because of the foreskin [*i.e.*, although he lived prior to the covenant with Abraham] and the other because of cir-

cumcision [*i.e.*, he complied with circumcision as a mark of the covenant with Abraham] – and each was taken to heaven with [in] his body. Pertaining to brilliance and olive oil, and also richness and glory, in the Hebrew we read “Isaar” following which concerning the joy and felicity of the saints it is written in the Psalms: “They will become drunk from the plenty” or “from the richness of thy house.” For *piotēs* corresponds more closely to richness than to plenty and copiousness. We have said what we could and as the strength of our feeble mind has allowed, briefly grazing [*or*, touching] diverse opinions held by Jewish and Christian scholars, whoever said anything a little better and more accurately, and we now freely yield to others better than us.

### Jerome, *Commentarii in Amos*

Et si ascenderint, inquit, usque ad caelum, inde detraham eos, quia et Henoch et Helias rapti cum corporibus in caelum, Dei reguntur arbitrio.<sup>158</sup>

And so, he says, if they shall ascend into heaven, from whence I shall draw them down, because both Enoch and Elijah were caught up to heaven with their bodies [*i.e.*, corporeally; and there] they are ruled [*or*, governed] by the will of God.

### Jerome, *Epistula LIX*

Cum et dominus noster mortuus sit et Enoch atque Helias secundum Apocalypsin Iohannis morituri esse dicantur. . . . De Enoch autem et Helia, quos uenturos Apocalypsis refert et esse morituros, non est istius temporis disputatio, cum omnis ille liber aut spiritaliter intellegendus sit, ut nos aestimamus, aut, si carnalem interpretationem sequimur, Iudaicis fabulis adquiescendum sit, ut rursus aedificetur Hierusalem et hostiae offerantur in templo et spiritali cultu inminuto carnales obtineant caeremoniae.<sup>159</sup>

Since even our Lord died, and Enoch and Elijah are

said to be going to die, according to the Apocalypse of John. But now is not the time to discuss Enoch and Elijah, who, as the Apocalypse states, will come [back to earth] and die, since that entire book either must be allegorically understood, as we believe and assert, or, if we follow a literal [mundane] interpretation, we must acquiesce to Jewish myths that Jerusalem will again be built up and that [blood] sacrifices will be made in the (restored, rebuilt) temple and that the carnal rituals will prevail because spiritual worship will abate.

### **Augustine, *Epistula CXCI***

Illud uero, quod in litteris tuis commemorasti obicere nobis Enoch et Heliam, quod mortui non fuerint, sed cum suis corporibus ex ista hominum conuersione translati, quid eos ad hoc, unde agitur, adiuuet, non intellego, ut enim omittam, quod ipsi quoque morituri postea perhibentur, sicut plerique exponunt Apocalypsin Iohannis de duobus illis prophetis, de quibus tacitis eorum nominibus loquitur, quod isti duo sancti cum suis tunc corporibus apparebunt, in quibus nunc uiuunt, ut etiam ipsi quem ad modum ceteri martyres pro Christi ueritate moriantur, ut ergo hoc omittam, ista questione dilata.<sup>160</sup>

As to the matter you have called to our attention in your letters, that Enoch and Elijah are not dead but have been translated with their bodies from this life among men, I don't understand what that can do to help them in the present issue. For let me postpone the question because they, too, are said to be going to die later, just as many commentators explain the Apocalypse of John about these two prophets, concerning whom John spoke although he did not mention their names, that these two saints shall appear with their bodies as they now have them and in which they now live, so that they, too, may die for Christ's truth the same as the other martyrs. As I say, let me pass over the matter and postpone the question for later.

### Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*

Nam si Enoch et Elias, in Adam mortui mortisque propaginem in carne gestantes, quo debitum ut soluant creduntur etiam redituri ad hanc uitam et, quod tamdiu dilatatum est, morituri, nunc tamen in alia uita sunt ubi, ante resurrectionem carnis, antequam animale corpus in spiritale mutetur, nec morbo nec senectute deficiunt.<sup>161</sup>

For if Enoch and Elijah, who died in [=because of] Adam and who bear the seed of death in their flesh, whereby it is required that they should die, are believed to be going to return to this life and to die—though it is temporarily postponed—but that they are now in another condition of life where, before the resurrection of the flesh, before the animate [living, mortal] body be changed into a spiritual one, they are not overwhelmed by disease or old age.

### Theodoret of Cyr (Pseudo-Justin Martyr)

Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐδὲ ἐτελεύτησαν πάλιν, ἀλλὰ μένουσιν ἐν ἀθανασία, καθάπερ ὁ Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἡλίας, καὶ εἰσι σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἀναμένοντες τὴν ἤδη αἰωνίαν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναστάσεως γινομένην κατὰ ἐναλλαγὴν, καθ' ἣν, ὡς φησιν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, Πάντες ἀλλαγησόμεθα.<sup>162</sup>

For that reason they did not die again but remain in an immortal condition, just like Enoch and Elijah, and they are with them in paradise awaiting the eternal life of the resurrection of Christ, the condition produced by an interchange, according to which, as the divine apostle says, "we shall all be changed" [1 Corinthians 15:51].

### Quoduultdeus, *Liber Promissionum*

Pro Abel quem Cain occidit natus est Seth, ex quo per ordinem successionis uenit Enoch; qui deo dum placeret, translatus est ne gustaret mortem, Heliae socian-

dus ut duo testes idonei secundo Christi aduentui prae-  
pararentur, in confutatione Antichristi et in gloria  
iudicantis filii dei: de quibus suo loco testimonia pro-  
feremus.<sup>163</sup>

In the place of Abel, whom Cain killed, was born Seth; from him in the order of succession came Enoch. While he pleased God, he was translated so that he should never tasted death, and he is to be associated with Elijah so that the two may be prepared as ideal witnesses for the second coming of Christ, readied for the confrontation with Antichrist and (to come) in the glory of the son of God who will judge. Concerning these two we will bring forth testimony in the appropriate place.

### *Quoduultdeus, Dimidium Temporis in Signis Antichristi*

22. [Apocalypse 11:3-4, 6, Old Latin version]. Ecce et hic tripartita etiam testium diuisio. Contra Pharaonem duo testes Dei missi sunt, Moyses et Aaron, et duo magi Pharaonis Iamnes et Mambres resistentes Moysi qui simul cum suo rege perierunt. Et contra Neronem duo Petrus et Paulus apostoli; a contrario Simon magus qui et se perdidit et Neronem decepit. Et contra Antichristum duo Enoch et Helias prophetae aduersus quos tres pseudoprophetae Antichristi exsurgent.<sup>164</sup>

22. [Quotes for lemma Apocalypse 11:3-4, 6, Old Latin version]. Here, too, we find a tripartite division of witnesses. Against Pharaoh two witnesses were sent, Moses and Aaron, and there were two magicians of Pharaoh, Iamnes and Mambres, who opposed Moses; they perished with the king. And against Nero there were the apostles Peter and Paul; opposing was Simon Magus (the magician) who both deceived Nero and destroyed himself. Also, against Antichrist there will be two prophets, Enoch and Elijah, against whom three false prophets of Antichrist will rise up.

**Quoduultdeus, *Dimidium Temporis*  
in *Signis Antichristi***

24. In Apocalypsi Iohanni dicitur: [Apocalypse 11:7-8, Old Latin version]. Haec platea conscientia est omnium impiorum in mundo plaudentium in morte sanctorum quod acerrimos quasi caruerint inimicos. . . .

25. Apocalypsis Iohannis dicit: **Post tres et dimidium diem spiritus uitae a Deo intrauit in illos et steterunt super pedes suos.** De his arbitror apostolum dixisse Paulum: **Et mortui in Christo resurgent primi.** Tres igitur et dimidius dies tribus annis et sex mensibus respondent quibus potestas erit Antichristo; eisque suppletis coram oculis inimicorum Helias et Enoch ascendentes in caelum occursum ire Christo uero regi et iudici uenienti; qui Antichristum omnesque eius **interficiet spiritu oris sui,** ut regnet in domo Iacob ipse de quo dictum est: **Regni eius non erit finis.**<sup>165</sup>

24. In the Apocalypse it is stated by John: [quotes for lemma Apocalypse 11:3-4, 6, Old Latin version]. This plaza [open city square] is the conscience of all the wicked in this world who give praise at the death of the saints because, (as they suppose), they are freed, as it were, from their most terrible enemies. . . .

25. The Apocalypse of John says: "After three and a half days, the spirit of life from God entered them and they stood up on their feet" (Apocalypse 11:11). Concerning them I think the apostle Paul said: "And those who died in Christ will resurrect the first" (1 Thessalonians 4:16). Therefore, three and a half days correspond to the three years and six months in which power is granted to Antichrist. And when they are filled (with the spirit of life) before the eyes of their enemies, Elijah and Enoch (will show themselves) ascending into heaven to meet Christ, the true king and judge, as he comes. And he will "slay with the breath of his mouth" (2 Thessalonians 2:8) Antichrist and all his (servants) so that he may rule and reign in the house of Jacob, (for) of him it

is said: "And of his kingdom there will be no end" (Luke 1:33).

### Procopius of Gaza

ἠρπάγη καὶ ὁ δίκαιος Ἐνώχ, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἀναιρεθῆ διὰ Λάμεχ· ἐπίστευσε τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον [Hebrews 11:5], καὶ παρέσχεν ἡ πίστις τῇ φύσει τὴν χάριν· ὅς καὶ ἤλεγξε τὸν Ἄδὰμ, θνητὸς ὢν, καὶ μὴ ἀποθανῶν, τὸν ἀποθανόντα μὴ ὄντα θνητὸν, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἐντολὴν οὐκ ἐφύλαξεν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, ὁ δὲ ἐκβέβληται· ἀλλ' οὔτε Ἐνώχ, οὔτε Ἡλίας τὸν θάνατον κατήργησαν· ὡσπερ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν φύσιν αὐτὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ διορθούμενος, κάκεινοις φύσει θνητοῖς οὔσι τὴν ἀθανασίαν μετὰ πάντων δωρούμενος· εἰ καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τύπον τῆς μελλούσης ἀθανασίας παρέσχετο· ὡς ἂν μὴ εἰς τὴν ἀθυμίαν ἐμβάλῃ τῶν δικαίων χορόν· ἔδειξε γὰρ διὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἐνώχ πῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος οἱ δίκαιοι τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν χωρίζονται· ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἡλίᾳ, πῶς τὰ σώματα ἐν ἀέρι κουφίζονται.<sup>166</sup>

Also, the righteous Enoch was taken up so that he might not be slain because of Lamech. He had faith "so that he not see death" [Hebrews 11:5], and his faith furnished grace to his natural condition. And since he did not die, though mortal, he also reproached Adam, who had died and (originally) was not mortal, because he had not kept the commandment. For whereas the one entered into paradise, the other was cast out. But neither Enoch nor Elijah were (completely) snatched away from death. Just as Christ set on the proper path nature itself in himself, so, too, upon them, who were mortal by nature, he bestowed immortality with all (the rest), although through them he provided a type of future immortality, so that he might not hurl the choir of the righteous into despair. For he demonstrated through

Enoch how the just are going to be separated from the wicked in the future; and in the case of Enoch, how the bodies are lifted up into the air.

### Caesarius of Arles

**Et dabo duobus testibus meis, id est, duobus testamentis. . . . Duo candelabra ecclesia est, sed pro numero testamentorum dixit duo; sicut quattuor angelos dixit ecclesiam, cum sint septem pro numero angelorum terrae, ita ex septem candelabris, si unum uel amplius pro locis nominet, tota ecclesia est. Nam Zacharias unum candelabrum uidit septiforme; et has duas oliuas, id est testamenta, infundere oleum candelabro, id est ecclesiae.<sup>167</sup>**

“And I shall give to my two witnesses,” that is, to the two testaments. . . . The two candlesticks are the church, but he said two because of the number of the testaments. Just as he says four angels for the church, since there are seven for the number of the angels, so the whole church is from the seven candlesticks, if he names one or two for the places. For Zechariah saw one sevenfold candlestick; and these two olive trees, that is, the testaments, pour the olive oil into the candlestick, that is, upon the church.

### Primasius

**Et dabo inquit duobus martyribus meis, ut prophetent diebus mille ducentis sexaginta, saccis amicti. Quod dixerat oportet te iterum prophetare, hoc est dabo duobus testibus meis et prophetabunt; quod est enim Ioannes, hoc duo testes, id est ecclesia duobus Testamentis praedicans et prophetans. Aliter duo genera esse martyrii ueritas protestatur, unum in habitu, alterum in actu.<sup>168</sup>**

“And I shall grant,” he says, “to my two witnesses, that they prophesy 1,260 days, dressed in sackcloth.” What he had said, “it is necessary for you to prophesy

again," that is, "I shall grant to my two witnesses and they shall prophesy," that is what John says – they are the two witnesses, that is (by interpretation) the church preaching and prophesying with its two testaments. Another way to interpret is that the truth puts forth two types of witness, the one in manner of dress, the other in action and deed.

### Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus

Hi sunt qui in finem saeculi per tres et semis annos, Antichriste regnante, in martyrum sanguinem bacchabuntur. Fit quoque Enoch et Eliae commemoratio, quod palam iacebunt, et insepulti triduo, donec uocati subito ascendere uideantur in caelum.<sup>169</sup>

These are those who at the end of the world during three and a half years, while the Antichrist reigns, will revel in the blood of the witnesses. He also recalls Enoch and Elijah who will openly lie and be unburied for three days, until when they are called [summoned], they will seem immediately to ascend into heaven.

### Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam*

8. Reprobis ergo tunc praedicatorum scientia tacere compellitur. Unde et hic subditur: **Et linguam tuam adhaerescere faciam palato tuo et eris mutus, nec quasi uir obiurgans, quia domus exasperans est** [Ezekiel 3:26]. Sed quia, Enoch et Helia praedicante, multi ex his qui tunc ex Iudaeis in infidelitate remanserint ad cognitionem ueritatis redeunt, sicut de eodem Helia dicitur: **Helias ueniet, et ipse restituet omnia** [Matthew 17:11], qui utrique per Zachariam duae oliuae, et per Iohannem duo candelabra nominantur, recte hic quoque subiungitur:

9. **Cum autem locutus fuero tibi, aperies os tuum, et dices ad eos: Haec dicit Dominus Deus** [Ezekiel 3:27]. Tunc enim uelut in extremo os prophetae aperitur, cum in praedicatione Enoch et Heliae a Iudaeis ad fidem re-

deuntibus prophetia sacri eloquii de Christo fuisse cognoscitur. Sed quia haec typice diximus, nunc uerba eadem caritati uestrae moraliter disseramus.<sup>170</sup>

Therefore the knowledge of the preachers is then obliged to silence the wicked. Consequently it is also added for them: "And I shall cause that your tongue shall cleave to your palate and you will be mute, nor will you be like a man who rebukes and finds fault, because his house is blazing" [Ezekiel 3:26]. But while Enoch and Elijah preach many of those who (until) then shall have remained in the infidelity from the Jews shall return to the knowledge of the truth, just as it is said of the same Elijah: "Elijah shall come and he himself shall restore all things" [Matthew 17:11]. The two of them are the two olive trees, according to Zechariah, and they are called the two candlestickes by John; and so he also correctly adds:

9. "But when I shall have spoken to you, open your mouth and you shall say to them: 'Thus saith the Lord God' " [Ezekiel 3:27]. For then the mouth of the prophet is opened, as it were at the last moment, when in [= by or through] the preaching of Enoch and Elijah the prophecy of the holy word is recognized by the Jews, who come back to the faith, to have been concerning Christ. But because we have said these things allegorically [or, by types and shadows], now we shall explain morally the same things for [sc., the benefit of] your love.

### Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob*

Hi qui in fine mundi electi reperientur in morte carnis prosternendi sunt, et illi etiam qui a prioribus mundi partibus processerunt; Enoch scilicet et Elias, ad medium reuocabuntur et crudelitatis eius saeuitiam in sua adhuc mortali carne passuri sunt.<sup>171</sup>

Those who at the end of the world will be found to be chosen must be cast down to the earth in the death of the flesh, even those who had departed from the earlier parts [times and places] of the world; namely,

Enoch and Elijah will be summoned back to the midst and will suffer the fierceness of his [the Antichrist's] cruelty in their own flesh that is still mortal.

### Isidore of Seville

Enoch filius Jared, septimus ab Adam, placens Deo, malorum nescius, mortis ignarus, qui sceleratorum hominum non ferens angustias, a perniciosis contractibus mundi subtractus . . . trecentorum sexaginta quinque. Manet autem hactenus in corpore; in consummatione mundi restituet cum Elia mortalem uitae conditionem.<sup>172</sup>

Enoch was the son of Jared, the seventh from Adam; because he pleased God and knew not evil, he did not experience death, although he was subjected to the tight straights of wicked men, he was snatched away from the difficulties of the world at age 365. Moreover, he is still in his body, even to today. And at the end of the world, he and Elijah will recover a mortal condition of life.

### Cosmas Indicopleustes

< Ἡλίας > ὁ μακροχρόνιος καὶ ἀγήρως ἄνθρωπος, ὁ τῷ Ἀντιχρίστῳ διατηρούμενος στρατηγός, ὁ ἀντικαθιστάμενος καὶ διελέγγων τὴν ἀπάτην καὶ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν αὐτοῦ.<sup>173</sup>

The long-lived and unaging man, the general preserved for [*i.e.*, against] the Antichrist, he who is positioned as his adversary and reproaches his deceit and his arrogance.

### Pseudo-Hilarius (Pseudo-Isidore, An Anonymous Irish Commentator)

(17) **Helias homo erat, licet diuina opera perfecerit. Similis nobis passibilis.** Inferiorem se prophetis imponit apostolus. Sed sciendum est, passio ista de ieiunio et edulio specialiter intellegi. **Et orationem orauit.** Philosophicae et mysticae loquitur, ut est illud: **Locutus est**

**ore mysticae.** Haec est oratio exortatio quae sanctis hominibus in angelos transfertur; et oratio(ne) exortationeque, quod orat, implorat. **ut non plueret super terram.** et ipse Dominus noster dicit: Serui mei **potestatem habent claudere caelum.** Sicut in peccatum primi hominis factum est, ita in peccato scelestissimi actum est, ut cooperatores sint creaturae peccato, sicut dictum est: **Maledicta terra in operibus tuis. Annos tres et menses sex,** id est ante legem et in lege et post legem. Moraliter autem intellegi debet annos tres paenitentiae delinquentibus imponi. Sciendum est temptationem istam omni terrae insidisse, sicut in euangelio Lucae legitur, quae **facta est in omni terra.**<sup>174</sup>

"Elijah was a man," although he fulfilled divine works. "Like us he was subject to passions." The apostle places himself lower than the prophets. But we must learn that this passion must be especially understood about fasting and feasting. "And he prayed" a prayer. He speaks philosophically and allegorically, as in this: "he spoke with his mouth allegorically." This prayer is the imprecation that is passed by holy men to the angels, and he implores what he prays for by prayer and imprecation. "That it should not rain upon the earth." And our Lord himself said: My servants "have power to close the heaven." Just as the deed of the first man was [sc., counted *or* esteemed] for sin, so it happened in the sin of the most wicked one that we became coworkers in the sin, just as it says: "Cursed be the earth because of your deeds." "During three years and six months," that is, before the law and in [= during *or* under] the law and after the law. It ought to be understood morally [*i.e.*, allegorically] that the "three years" are placed upon those who need repentance. We must understand that this temptation has afflicted all the earth, just as we read in the Gospel of Luke that "it happened upon the entire earth."

## Anonymous Irish Commentator (Pseudo-Isidore)

Heliam et Enoch, spiritualiter uidelicet<sup>175</sup>

Elijah and Enoch, spiritually [allegorically] understood, of course

**duos testes** Heliam et Enoch.<sup>176</sup>

“the two witnesses” (are) Elijah and Enoch.

## Andreas of Caesarea

Τούτους [τοὺς δύο μάρτυρας] Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἡλίαν, πολλοὶ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐνόησαν, καιρὸν θεόθεν τοῦ προφητεύειν [τὰ] ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ λησομένων, ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία ἀπὸ τριακοσίων ἐξήκοντα ἡμερῶν ἀριθμούμενα· καὶ διὰ τῆς περιβολῆς τῶν σάκκων, τὸ σκυθρωπὸν καὶ πένθους ἄξιον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀπατωμένοις ἐμφαίνοντας, καὶ τοὺς τότε εὕρισκομένους τῆς πλάνης τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου ἀπάγοντας· οὗς Ζαχαρίας [ὁ προφήτης] ἐν εἴδει τῶν δύο ἐλαιῶν καὶ [τῶν δύο] λυχνιῶν ἠνίξατο, διὰ τὸ τὴν τροφήν τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς γνώσεως τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῶν θεαρέστων πράξεων ἐπιφέρεισθαι.<sup>177</sup>

These [two witnesses], Enoch and Elijah, many of the teachers have thought, will receive from God (the charge) to prophesy at the end of the world for three years, counting from the 360 days. And because of their being encircled with sackcloth, (he means that) they show to those who are being deceived a countenance that is sad and worthy of mourning, and those who are found at that time they lead from the deception of the Antichrist. Zechariah spoke of these allegorically in his vision of the two olive trees and the two lampstands, because of providing the nourishment of knowing the light by the olive oil of deeds pleasing to God.

### Chronicon Paschale (ca. s. vii<sup>1</sup> A.D.)

Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἐνώχ ὁ μετατεθείς εἰς ζωὴν εἰς δείγμα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως ταῖς μετὰ ταῦτα γενεαῖς τῆς δυναμένης διατηρῆσαι τοὺς θνητοὺς μὴ ἀποθανεῖν ἀλλὰ ζῶντας τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖτον ἀλλαγὴν ὑπομένειν.

Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἅμα τῷ Ἡλίᾳ ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀντικαθιστάμενος τῷ Ἀντιχρίστῳ καὶ ἐλέγχων τὴν πλάνην αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας παράδοσιν.<sup>178</sup>

This is Enoch who was translated to life as a demonstration of God-s power to later generations, for it has the power so that mortals die not but rather, while still alive, that they may wait for a change to a better condition.

This is the one who, together with Elijah, will be set up to oppose the Antichrist in the last days, and he shall reproach his erroneous way against the entrusted tradition of the church.

### John of Damascus (ca. 675-749)

Ἀποσταλήσεται δὲ Ἐνώχ καὶ Ἡλίας ὁ Θεσβίτης, καὶ ἐπιστρέψουσι τὰς καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα [cf. Malachi 4:6], τουτέστι τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κήρυγμα, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀναιρεθήσονται.<sup>179</sup>

Enoch and Elijah the Tishbite will be sent forth, and they shall turn the hearts of the fathers to their children [cf. Malachi 4:6], that is to say, they shall turn the synagogue to our Lord Jesus Christ, and the preaching of the apostles, and they shall be destroyed by him [Antichrist].

*Enoch et Elias cum Antichristo pugnaturi. Mittentur autem Enoch et Elias Thesbites, qui Patrum corda in*

filios, hoc est, Synagogam ad Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, atque apostolorum doctrinam conuertent: ab eoque trucidabuntur.<sup>180</sup>

Enoch and Elijah will battle with the Antichrist. But Enoch and Elijah the Tishbite will be sent forth to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, that is, they shall convert the synagogue to our Lord Jesus Christ and to the teaching of the apostles; and by him [the Antichrist] they will be cut down.

### Oecumenius

ὡσπερ ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς νῦν τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν διδάσκεται, ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἤξειν Ἡλίαν τὸν Θεσβίτην προηγόρευσεν ἡμῖν ἡ θεία γραφή παντίπου δῆλον . . . [Oecumenius then quotes Malachi 4:5–6; Matthew 11:14] . . . περὶ ἐτέρου δὲ προδρόμου οὐδαμοῦ σαφές ἀκηκόαμεν, πλὴν ὅτι περὶ τοῦ Ἐνώχ εἶπεν ἡ Γένεσις ὅτι εὐαρεστήσας τῷ Θεῷ μετετέθη [Genesis 5:24] καὶ ὁ σοφὸς ἀπόστολος περὶ αὐτοῦ πίστει Ἐνώχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ ἠῦρέ-σκετο διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός [Hebrews 11:5]. λόγος δὲ παλαιὸς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κρατεῖ· μετὰ Ἡλίου τοῦ Θεσβίτου ἤξειν καὶ τὸν Ἐνώχ προτρέχοντα τῆς δευτέρας Χριστοῦ παρουσίας μέλλοντος ἐφίστασθαι τοῦ ἀντίχριστου· φασὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς προελθεῖν καὶ προδιαμαρτύρασθαι ἀπάτην εἶναι τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ γενησόμενα σημεῖα καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ πιστεῦσαι τῷ ἀλητηρίῳ. περὶ τούτων νῦν ἡ ὀπτασία διαλέγεται· ὅτι προφητεύσουσιν ἡμέρας τοσάσδε ἢ μυστικόν τινα λέγουσα ἀριθνὸν ἢ τὸν πάντως ἐσόμενον. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσουσι περιβεβλημένοι φησὶ σάκκους. πενήθουσι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπειθείᾳ τῶν τότε

ἀνθρώπων. οὗτοί φησὶν εἶσιν αἱ δύο ἑλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστῶσαι. Ζαχαρίας ὁ θεσπέσιος προφήτης εἶδε λυχνίαν, ἑπτὰ λύχνους ὑπερδίδουσας, καὶ δύο κλάδους ἑλαιῶν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς κλάδους ἐστῶτας ἐν δύο λύχνων μυξωτήρσιν.<sup>181</sup>

Just as if because of returning [*i.e.*, because of the body returning to the earth upon death], these matters are now taught (in the church) about them – that the holy scripture has proclaimed to us how Elijah the Tishbite will indeed come, it is everywhere obvious [quoting Malachi 4:5-6; Matthew 11:14]. Concerning the other precursor, we have nowhere heard anything clear, except that Genesis says of Enoch that “because he pleased God he was taken to another place [*i.e.*, translated]” and the wise apostle (says) about him, “on account of his faith Enoch was translated so that he not see death, and he was not (ever) found because God had translated him” [Hebrews 11:5]. The time-honored [*lit.*, old] word from tradition is still valid in the church: with Elijah the Tishbite Enoch, too, will come as a precursor of the second coming of Christ who will oppose the Antichrist. For they say that they [*sc.*, Enoch and Elijah] will precede and will affirm by their testimony that the signs that shall be produced by him are a deception and also that people should not have faith in the vagrant deceiver. Now of these two (prophets), the divine vision relates that they shall prophesy so many days either uttering a mystical [*or*, allegorical] number or else one that is actually going to occur. And they shall do this “clothed,” he says, “in sackcloth.” For they shall mourn at the lack of faith of people at that time. “These,” he says, “are the two olive trees and the two lampstands standing before the face of the Lord upon the earth” [Apocalypse 11:4]. Zechariah the divine prophet saw the lampstand, providing seven lamps, and also the two branches of the

olive trees, but the branches (he saw) standing in the two nostrils [*i.e.*, wick feeder pipes] of the lamps.

### Andreas of Caesarea

καὶ ὅτι μὲν Ἠλίας ἦξει ὁ προφήτης δῆλον. . . [quoting Malachi 4:5–6; Matthew 11:14] . . . περὶ μὲν οὖν Ἠλία ταῦτα. περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἐνώχ μαρτυρίαν μὲν ὅσον πρὸς τὴν παρουσίαν ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς οὐκ ἔχομεν, πλὴν τοῦ διὰ μεταθέσεως ἀπαθανατισθῆναι. λόγος δὲ φέρεται ἐκ παραδόσεως φοιτῶν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρατρέπτως καὶ αὐτὸν ἦξειν μετὰ Ἠλίου τοῦ Θεσβίτου (φασὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου ἦξειν καὶ προδιαμαρτύρασθαι τοῖς οὖσι τότε, μὴ τοῖς ἀπατηλοῖς τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου παράγεσθαι σημείοις), καὶ τῇ διαμαρτυρίᾳ ταύτῃ τριβῆναι χρόνον τριετίας καὶ ἡμίσεως. τοῦτο γὰρ αἱ χίλια διακόσια ἐξήκοντα ἡμέραι χρονικὸν ἀποτελοῦσι διάστημα.<sup>182</sup>

And it is clear that Elijah the prophet will come . . . [quoting Malachi 4:5-6 and Matthew 11:14]. So much about Elijah. Concerning Enoch, we do not have witness [evidence] from the scriptures so much concerning his coming except that he became immortal because of a change of state [*i.e.*, he was transported to a different condition or sphere], but the report is that he too will come with Elijah the Tishbite (for they [*i.e.*, earlier ecclesiastical writers] state that they will come at the time of the Antichrist and first suffer martyrdom with those who live at that time, so that they not be overcome [*or*, led astray] by the false miracles of the Antichrist) and they will suffer this martyrdom over a time of three and a half years. For the 1,260 days fill this time interval.

### Arethas of Caesarea (Cappadocia) [= shorter version of Andreas]

Καὶ δώσω τοῖς μάρτυρσί μου . . .  
 [quotes Apocalypse 11:3–6 for the lemma].  
 Καὶ ὅτι μὲν Ἡλίας ἤξει ὁ προφήτης δῆλον. . . .  
 [quotes Malachi 4:5–6] Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἐνώχ  
 μαρτυρίαν μὲν ὅσον πρὸς τὴν παρουσίαν ἀπὸ  
 τῆς φραγῆς οὐκ ἔχομεν, πλὴν τοῦ διὰ μετα-  
 θέσεως ἀπαθανατισθῆναι. λόγος δὲ φέρεται ἐκ  
 παραδόσεως φοιτῶν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρατρέπ-  
 τως καὶ αὐτὸν ἤξειν μετὰ Ἡλίου τοῦ Θεσβίτου  
 (ἤξουσι γὰρ ἄμφω προδιαμαρτύρασθαι τοῖς  
 οὔσι τότε, μὴ τοῖς ἀπατηλοῖς τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου  
 παράγεσθαι σημείοις), καὶ τῇ διαμαρτυρία  
 ταύτῃ τριβῆναι χρόνον τριετίας καὶ ἡμίσεως.  
 τοῦτο γὰρ αἱ χίλια διακόσια ἐξήκοντα ἡμέραι  
 χρονικὸν ἀποτελοῦσι διάστημα.<sup>183</sup>

[Arethas quotes Apocalypse 11:3-6 for his lemma.]  
 And it is clear that Elijah the prophet will  
 come . . . [quoting Malachi 4:5-6]. So much about Elijah.  
 Concerning Enoch, we do not have witness [evidence]  
 from the scriptures so much concerning his coming ex-  
 cept that he became immortal because of a change of  
 state [*i.e.*, he was transported to a different condition or  
 sphere], but the report is that he too will come with  
 Elijah the Tishbite (for they both will come suffer mar-  
 tyrdom with those who live at that time, so that they  
 not be overcome [*or*, led astray] by the false miracles of  
 the Antichrist) and they will suffer this martyrdom over  
 a time of three and a half years. For the 1,260 days fill  
 this time interval.

### *Beda, Expositio in Apocalypsin*

11:3A Et dabo duobus testibus meis et prophetabunt  
 diebus mille ducentis sexaginta. Ne saeuitia prauorum  
 terreret audientem ecclesiam quoque duobus ex populis

unitam gratia commemorat inlustrandam esse uirtutum. Quae et ipsa caput suum Christum uidelicet in carne docentem semper intuens tribus semis annis prophetura narratur. Menses enim trium semis annorum id est tricies quadrageni et bini mille ducentos sexaginta dies efficiunt. Danihel autem scribit dies mille ducentos nonaginta temporis eiusdem quo ponenda sit abominatio in desolatione.<sup>184</sup>

“And I shall grant unto my two witnesses and they shall prophesy 1,260 days.” So that the fierceness of depraved people not frighten the church, united from the two peoples, as it listens, he recalls that it [the church] must be made illustrious by the grace of virtues. The church, he relates, while ever beholding Christ, its head, as he taught in the flesh, will prophesy during three and a half years. For the months of three and half years, that is thirty (days) times forty and two (months), make 1,260 days. Moreover, Daniel writes 1,290 of the same period of time when the abomination must be placed in [or, sent to] desolation.

### ***Beda, Expositio in Apocalypsin***

11:4 **Hi sunt duae oliuae et duo candelabra in conspectu domini terrae stantes.** Ecclesia duorum testamentorum lumine radiata domini semper iussis adsistit. Nam et propheta Zacharias unum candelabrum uidit septiforme et has duas oliuas id est testamenta infundere oleum candelabro. Haec est ecclesia cum oleo suo indeficiente quod eam facit in lumine orbis ardere.<sup>185</sup>

“These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing in the view of the Lord of the earth.” The church, radiant with the light of the two testaments, carefully abides by [hearkens to] the Lord’s commands. For the prophet Zechariah, too, saw a single sevenfold candlestick and the two olive trees, that is the testaments, pouring the oil into the candlestick. This is the church with its never-failing supply of oil which makes the church burn in the light of the world.

### *Beda, Expositio in Apocalypsin*

11:6 **Hi habent potestatem claudendi caelum ne pluatur diebus prophetiae ipsorum.** Data est ecclesiae in Christo omnis potestas in caelo et in terra clauibus ei ligandi atque soluendi dimissis. Sed et spiritualiter caelum clauditur ne imbrem pluatur ne super terram sterilem de ecclesia benedictio descendat.<sup>186</sup>

“These have the power of sealing the heavens so that it not rain in the days of their prophecy.” All power in heaven and on earth has been given to the church in Christ with the keys of binding and of loosing sent forth. But heaven is also spiritually closed lest it rain, lest any blessing from the church fall upon sterile ground.

### *Beda, Expositio in Apocalypsin*

11:13e **Et dederunt gloriam deo caeli.** Isti sunt super petram aedificati qui aliis terrae motu ruentibus de stabilitate sua recta deum confessione clarificant. Laetabitur enim iustus cum uiderit uindictam impiorum. Quidam duos prophetas Enoch et Heliam interpretantur qui tribus semis annis praedicantes contra mox secuturam antichristi perfidiam fidelium corda confirmant illisque occisis tantundem temporis saeuitiam eiusdem grassaturam . . . dicente Danihele, **confirmabit [v.l., confirmauit] pactum multis ebdomadas una et in dimidio ebdomadis deficient hostia et sacrificium et in templo erit abominatio desolationis** [Daniel 9:27]. Et in subsequentibus, **Et posita fuerit abominatio in desolatione dies mille ducentos nonaginta** [Daniel 12:11]. Qui numerus circa trium annorum et sex mensium curricula diuersatur. Denique Helias igne quondam perdidit aduersarios et tres semis annos latitans imbres continuit, tandemque pseudoprophetis interfectis per sacrificium quod ablatum fuerat conuertit Israel ad dominum. Hucusque recapitulatio.<sup>187</sup>

“And they gave glory to the God of heaven.” These are those built upon the rock who glorify God with correct confession because of their own stability while oth-

ers are falling into ruins because of the earthquake. For the just will rejoice when he sees the vindictive judgment of [upon] the wicked. Some people interpret the two prophets as Enoch and Elijah who will strengthen the hearts of the faithful, while preaching for three and half years against Antichrist's heresy that is soon to follow. When at last they are killed, the fierceness of that time will proceed violently.

According to the statement of Daniel, "he will confirm the covenant of one week (made) to many, and in the half of the week [*i.e.*, under the rule of Antichrist] the eucharist and sacrifice will fail, and in the temple there will be the abomination of desolation" [Daniel 9:27; KJV: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate"]. And in the following (verses, Daniel says), "And the abomination in desolation shall be placed for 1,290 days" [Daniel 12:11]. This number is about equivalent to three years and six months. Next, Elijah once destroyed his enemies by fire and while in hiding for three and a half years, he withheld the rains; at long last Israel killed the false prophets and returned [*or*, converted] to the Lord with the sacrifice that had been omitted. A recapitulation to this point (is inserted by John).

### *Beda, De Temporibus Ratione*

Duo sane certissima necdum instantis diei iudicii habemus indicia, fidem uidelicet Israheliticae gentis et regnum persecutionemque Antichristi, quam uidelicet persecutionem trium semis annorum futurum [*v.l.*, futuram] fides ecclesiae tenet. Sed ne haec improuisa ueniens omnes passim quos inparatos inuenerit, inuoluat, Enoch et Heliam maximos prophetas et doctores ante huius exortum uenturos in mundum, qui Israheliticam plebem ad fidei conuertant gratiam atque ad pressuram tanti turbinis in parte electorum insuperabilem reddant. Qui cum ipsi primo tres semis annos praedicauerint, et

sicut de uno eorum Helia propheta Malachias praedixit, **conuerterint corda patrum in filios**, id est, antiquorum fidem dilectionemque sanctorum in eorum qui tunc uicuri sunt mente plantauerint, tunc excandescens illa horrenda persecutio ipsos inprimis martirii uirtute coronet, dein ceteros fideles corripiens uel martyres Christi gloriosissimos uel damnatos apostatas faciat. Quod significare uidetur apostolus Iohannes ita scribens in Apocalypsi: **Atrium autem quod est foris templum eice foras et ne metieris eum, quoniam datum est gentibus, et ciuitatem sanctam calcabunt mensibus XLII**, id est eos qui nomine tenus fideles sola exteriora diligunt, ab electorum sorte separatos ostende. Quia et ipsi ad persequendam ecclesiam conuertentur nouissima illa persecutione trium semis annorum. **Et dabo, inquit, duobus testibus meis, et prophetabunt diebus mille CCLX amicti saccis**, id est, artissimis continentiae et praessurarum laboribus accincti praedicabunt.<sup>188</sup>

Indeed, we have two absolutely positive indications that the day of judgment is not at hand, namely the faith of the house of Israel and the kingdom and persecution of Antichrist. The (traditional) faith of the church holds that this persecution will last for three and a half years. But lest this come unforeseen and swirl upon all, here and there, whom it discovers unprepared, (he reassures that) Enoch and Elijah, the greatest prophets and teachers, shall come into the world before he [Antichrist] arises. They shall (be able to) convert the people of Israel to the grace of faith and render it invincible to the tribulation of such a great storm [*sc.*, of persecution] in the midst of the elect. After they have first preached for three and a half years, and when – as Malachi prophesied about one of them, namely the prophet Elijah – they “have turned the hearts of the fathers to the children,” that is, when they have grafted the faith of the ancestors and the love of the saints in the minds of those who will then be victorious, then at that time that horrifying persecution will flare up and (be able to) crown these two [*sc.*, Enoch and Elijah] with the virtue [*or*, power] of

martyrdom. Next , as it violently attacks others of the faithful, it will (be such as to) make them either the most glorious martyrs of Christ or utterly damned apostates. The apostle John seems to indicate this when he wrote in the Apocalypse thus: "But the court . . . and they shall trample under foot the holy city for forty-two months" [quoting Apocalypse 11:2], that is, show as separated from the lot of the elect those who, while nominally faithful, love only the exterior matters. Because they, too, shall be turned [*or*, converted] at the last persecution of three and a half years to persecute the church. "And I shall grant," he says, "unto my two witnesses, and, being clothed in sackcloth, they shall prophesy for 1,260 days" [Apocalypse 11:3], that is, they shall preach girded about by the most strict labors of continence and tribulations.

### **Beda, *In Genesim***

[The relevant passage was directly quoted from Augustine; see above, Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*].<sup>189</sup>

### **Beatus**

**Et dabo duobus testibus meis, et prophetabunt dies mille ducentos nonaginta.** Hi dies mille ducenti nonaginta anni sunt tres et menses sex. hoc erit praedicatio Eliae, et regnum antichristi alterum tantum, quod fiunt sub uno septem anni. ceterum uero spiritualiter in ecclesia **duo testes** duo sunt testamenta, id est, lex et euangelium. . . . haec omne tempus est a passione domini usque ad antichristum. et nunc spiritualiter in tipo Eliae, et qui cum eo uenerit, duo testes, id est, lex et euangelium, ab eis occiditur, a quibus non obseruabatur; hoc sunt duo testes, id est, ecclesia duobus testamentis prophetans. qui sunt enim testes domini nisi Christiani?<sup>190</sup>

"And I shall grant to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy for 1,290 days." The 1,290 days are three years and six months. This will be the prediction of Elijah, and the kingdom of the Antichrist is something

entirely different because the seven years will occur under one [*i.e.*, under just the kingdom]. Moreover allegorically [*lit.*, spiritually] in the church the "two witnesses" are the two Testaments, that is, the Law and the Gospel. . . . All these (measures of time) are the entire period of time from the passion of our Lord until the Antichrist. And now spiritually in the type [*i.e.*, likeness, manner, or imitation] of Elijah and him who shall come with him, the two witnesses, that is, the Law and the Gospel, are killed by those who do not preserve it [*i.e.*, keep the commandments]. These are the two witnesses, that is, the church, prophesying, with the two testaments. For who are the witnesses of the Lord if not the Christians?

### Beatus

**Hi sunt duae oliuae et duo candelabra etc.** hi sunt, inquit, qui stant, quod nunc est in praedicatione. duo candelabra ecclesia est . . . nam Zacharias propheta **unum candelabrum uidit septiformem et duas oliuas**, id est, duo testamenta infundere oleum candelabro, haec est ecclesia cum olio suo indeficiente . . . et de oliuis, quod sunt duo testamenta, interroganti sic ait.<sup>191</sup>

"These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks," etc. These are, he says, those who stand (in God's presence) because now it [*i.e.*, the church] is (involved) in preaching. The two candlesticks are the church, for Zechariah the prophet saw "one sevenfold candlestick and two olive trees," that is, the two testaments pouring the oil into the candlestick, that is the church with its un-failing oil, and concerning the olive trees, because they are the two testaments, it is so said to the one who inquires.

### Alcuin (summarizing Ambrosius Autpertus)

**Et dabo duobus testibus meis, et prophetabunt diebus mille ducentis sexaginta, amicti saccos.** Victorinus martyr duos testes Eliam, et Hieremiam intellegit; dicit

enim quia nusquam Hieremiae legatur interitus. Sed melius alii Eliam et Enoch. Nos autem etiam in specie genus intellegamus; id est per duos testes ecclesiam, et per dies mille ·CC·⟨LX⟩<sup>192</sup> non solum Antichristi tempus sed etiam retroacta tempora uoluuntur. Et bene per duos testes ecclesia, propter duo testamenta, duos populos, duo mandata dilectionis, et duo martyrii genera. Per saccum uero intellegimus humilitatis confessionem, uel despectam malis claritatem sanctorum.

**Hi sunt duo oliuae, et duo candelabra in conspectu Domini terrae stantes.** Ecclesia siue in illis duobus, siue generaliter in omnibus praedicatoribus propter unctionem sancti Spiritus, per oliuam; propter lumen fidei et operationis, per candelabra exprimitur. Cum autem una sit ex duobus populis, oliua et unum candelabrum propter duo testamenta duae oliuae et duo candelabra dicuntur. In conspectu Domini stant, quia intima contemplatione conditori suo inhaerent. Hinc Elias cui specialiter ista adscribuntur dicit; **uiuuit Dominus in cuius conspectu sto** [4 Reg. 3:14]. Potest hoc sub alio intellectu specialiter ad Eliam et Enoch referri, qui humanis aspectibus subtracti Deo secretius inhaerent.<sup>193</sup>

“And I shall grant unto my two witnesses and they shall prophesy 1,260 days, dressed in sackcloth.” Victorinus the martyr understands that the two witnesses are Elijah and Jeremiah; for he says that nowhere do we read of the burial of Jeremiah. But better, others maintain that the two are Elijah and Enoch. Moreover, let us understand the genus in the species, that is, through the two witnesses the church and through the 1,260 days not only the time of the Antichrist but also past times roll back again. And well does he identify the church with the two witnesses, because of the two testaments, the two peoples, the two mandates of choosing, and the two types of witness. Through the sackcloth we understand the confession of humility or the brightness of the saints looking down upon the evil.

“These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing in the presence of the Lord.” Through

the olive the church (is to be understood), whether in these two (witnesses), or whether more generally in all preachers because of the anointing of the Spirit. It is expressed by the candlestick because of the light of faith and works. However, since it comes from the two peoples, the olive tree and a single candlestick are called the two olive trees and the two candlesticks because of the two testaments. "They stand in the presence of the Lord" because they cling to their creator with intimate contemplation. At this place he mentions Elijah, to whom these responsibilities are ascribed; "the Lord lives in whose presence I stand" [2 Kings 3:14]. Taken in another way, this can especially be making reference to Elijah and Enoch who, when they were taken from human view, came to cling closely to God.

**Photius, *Bibliotheca* (summarizing Ephraem the Syrian)**

Καὶ οὐκ ἄν τις εἶποι τὸ σῶμα τότε εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μεταβαλεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς· εἰ γὰρ καὶ λεπτότερον καὶ διαυγέστερον γίνεται, ἀλλ' οὖν τὰ ἰνδάλματα σφῆζει τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἄνθρωπός ἐστι, τὰ ἀνθρώπου φέρων γνωρίσματα. Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις Ἐνώχ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ὁ τῆς βροντῆς υἱὸς Ἰωάννης, ἔτι περιόντες ἐν τῷ σώματι· καὶ γὰρ τούτους ὡς ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ ὄλου φυράματος ἡμῶν ὁ δημιουργὸς λαβὼν ἔδειξε πᾶσιν ὡς εἰ μὴ ἤμαρτεν ὁ Ἀδάμ, ἔτι ἄν περιῆν μετὰ τοῦ σώματος. Πλὴν καὶ οὗτοι πολυχρόνιον βίον ἀνύοντες γεύονται ποτε θανάτου, καὶ ἐν ριτῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ.

Ὅρα δὲ τὴν δι' αὐτῶν πίστιν, ὡς ἐκ τῶν τριῶν προάγεται γενεῶν, ἐκ μὲν τῶν πρὸ νόμου ληφθέντος τοῦ Ἐνώχ, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μετὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ Ἡλίας, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μετὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἐπιστηθίου τῶν μαθητῶν. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ Ἀδάμ,

εἰ τὴν ἐντολὴν ἐφύλαττε, τούτοις ἂν ἀδιστακτικῶς συμπεριῆν.

Ὅτι δὲ περίεστιν ὁ παρθένος Ἰωάννης, ὅπερ ἐζήτησας, ὡσπερ τὸν Ἐνῶχ καὶ τὸν Ἥλιαν παράδοσις μαρτυρεῖ, οὕτω καὶ τοῦτον. . . . Οὐ γάρ τις αὐτὸν ἀθάνατον εἶναί φησιν, ἀλλὰ διαμένειν μετὰ Ἐνῶχ καὶ Ἥλια μέχρι τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ δεσπότητος παρουσίας.<sup>194</sup>

And a person could not say that the body has changed into the essence of the spirit at a specific moment. For although it becomes lighter and more luminous, it still preserves the characteristic appearance of the body; and it is human [*i.e.*, mortal], since it bears the identifying marks of a human being. Since they still remain [*or*, survive] in their bodies, Enoch and Elijah and John, the son of thunder, bear witness to these statements. For in fact the creator took these as [*or*, so as to become] the firstfruits of our entire human compound [*or*, existence; *i.e.*, with reference to our mortal bodies as being temporarily mixed and joined together]. Thus he showed to all that if Adam had not sinned, he would have continued to exist with his mortal body. But these, too, [*i.e.*, Enoch, Elijah, and John] while effecting a lengthy life will at some time taste of death, even if it should be in the blink [*or*, twinkling] of an eye (1 Corinthians 15:52).

But consider the (reaffirmation of our) faith (that comes) because of them – how it is brought forth from the three different generations: Enoch was taken up before the law (of Moses), Elijah after the law (had been given), and the preferred disciple after grace [*i.e.*, “the gospel”] was given. And so it is obvious that if Adam had been keeping the commandment, he would have assuredly continued to survive with them (to the present time).

Furthermore, as to the precise point you attempted to search out – that the virgin John still survives alive – our (Christian) tradition attests that he, too, is alive, just as it also attests to Enoch and Elijah. . . . For no one

asserts that he [John] is immortal but rather that he continues to live [*lit.*, to continue to remain *or* to abide] with Enoch and Elijah until the second coming of our Lord.

### EVIDENCE FROM ILLUSTRATED MANUSCRIPTS OF BEATUS

This much we see in the texts themselves. But an especially curious circumstance is found in some of the manuscripts of Beatus of Liebana. Beatus' commentary on Apocalypse 11 is clearly allegorical, as we have just quoted. Several manuscripts of Beatus also exhibit some beautiful illustrations of the text.<sup>195</sup> One is called the Gerona Apocalypse. I will refer to it inasmuch as it is available in facsimile form.<sup>196</sup> On three different folios the two witnesses are portrayed, and twice [on fol. 164r and on 167v] the artist has included their names: *Henoch et Elias!* Obviously, since this interpretation does not correspond to Beatus' contextual identification, the tenth-century artist did not derive the names from the text of his commentary. Moreover, the Gerona Apocalypse is only one of thirty-four illuminated manuscripts of Beatus, so the complex artistic heritage is to be sought in their common source, the original manuscript of Beatus. But that still would not explain the discrepancy between picture and text, for Beatus himself would not have designed miniatures in direct conflict with his own composition. What, then, is the origin of the iconographic tradition? It is probable that the pictures were copied directly from Beatus' manuscript of Tyconius where the pictures *again* did not illustrate the text but rather reproduced some earlier series of paintings developed from a traditional Christian interpretation of the Apocalypse, antedating the fourth century, that may underlie some of Tyconius' text just as Victorinus' underlies Jerome's. Thus, the early Christian identification of the two witnesses with Enoch and Elijah was so deeply imbedded that even when Tyconius shifted to an allegorical and typological approach in the late fourth century, the earlier view persisted in art.

Such a transmission of the artistic tradition from antiquity to the early Middle Ages is not limited to Tyconius and Beatus. There are a number of manuscripts from late antiquity which have full- or half-page color illustrations. Among classical authors, such manuscripts exist for Vergil, Homer, and Terence,<sup>197</sup> and it is curious to see a ninth-century copy of Terence exhibiting actors with authentic antique Roman masks.<sup>198</sup> For the artist must have copied these from his source manuscript since the live comic tradition had long before ceased.

In the same manner, the Gerona Apocalypse of Beatus and its kindred manuscripts reproduce pictures from the fourth or fifth centuries whose artistic tradition seems to hark back to the second or third centuries. The implication is that at least one late antique manuscript of Tyconius displayed such pictures and that they too were derivative. Were they perchance developed for an early fourth-century manuscript of Victorinus? The answer to that question is probably not, since Victorinus identified the witnesses with Elijah and Jeremiah or alternatively with Elijah and Moses, and also since Beatus' exegetical discussion is highly dependent textually on Tyconius and apparently not on Victorinus. But the mere fact that there is such an extensive set of illustrations of the Apocalypse in Beatus and that at least the representation of the two witnesses antedates the late fourth century demonstrates that the artistic tradition developed rather early before Alexandrian allegorical interpretation gained sway among commentators. So even the art becomes an independent attestation of the early Christian identification of the two witnesses as Enoch and Elijah.<sup>199</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus we can see that Tyconius, by precept and by example, helped to infuse into the Christian exegetical tradition in the West Alexandrian allegorical, typological, and

“spiritual” interpretation of the scriptures. Through his *Liber Regularum* and its summary by Augustine in *De Doctrina Christiana*, these principles were widely taught. Through his commentary on the Apocalypse, which became the basis for the major exegetical tradition of that book, he provided an allegorical paradigm, applying the theory in practice. Although we do not possess that commentary, its influence can be traced in quotations and in the approach found in later writers. Tyconius’ allegorical method – his systematic exposition of the Alexandrian exegesis – underlies Augustine’s synthesis and mode of interpretation and, through him, the western exegetical tradition.

But while the “spiritualizing” approach of Origen, Didymos, Jerome, Tyconius, and Augustine changed the future of Christian exegesis, our earliest sources – and some remnants even in later sources, such as the commentary Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria and the artistic tradition accompanying the text of Beatus – concur in naming Enoch and Elijah as two literal prophets ushering in a literal millennium upon the earth. This identification goes back to the second century, to an era not far removed from John’s composition and promulgation of the Apocalypse, and Papias, who knew and listened to John, is squarely in the literal tradition of scriptural exegesis. Given the evidence, the preallegorical interpretation and identification of Enoch and Elijah, of Dan as the source of Antichrist, of the restoration of a literal temple, and of a literal millennium on earth may well reflect John’s own oral explanations of his text.

### Notes

Note: Some common abbreviations used in the footnotes are: *AB* = *Anchor Bible* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday); *BT* = *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* (Leipzig: Teubner); *CCCM* = *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievals* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); *CCSL* = *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); *CPG* = *Clavis Patrum*

*Graecorum* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); CPL = *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols) [SE = *Sacris Erudiri* 3, 2nd ed. (1961)]; CSEL = *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna); DS = *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1937–); GCS = *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, and Berlin: Akademie, 1897–); ICC = *International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark); ODCC = F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed., rev. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); PG = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (Paris; repr. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); PL = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina* (Paris; repr. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); PLS = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Supplementa* (Paris; repr. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols); PTS = *Patristische Texte und Studien* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter); RBMA = F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1940–); SC = *Sources Chrétiennes* (Paris: Société d'Édition, "Les Belles Lettres"); TU = *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leipzig and Berlin).

1. Hugh Nibley, "The Way of the Church," in *Mormonism and Early Christianity*, vol. 4, *The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and F.A.R.M.S., 1987), 300–13; see also Hugh Nibley, "The Passing of the Primitive Church: Forty Variations on an Unpopular Theme," in *Mormonism and Early Christianity*, 183–90, and Hugh Nibley, "Prophets and Crisis," in *The World and the Prophets*, vol. 3, *The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and F.A.R.M.S., 1987), 191–99.

2. Austin Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), 2–3.

3. Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John*, 2; cf. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 25, 2, in SC 41:204–5, quoting Dionysius of Alexandria.

4. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 25, 4, in SC 31:134; for the development of the canon, see Henry C. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1943), 3–30, and especially Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987). English translations accompanying the quotations in the text and footnotes were prepared by the author. Significant variant readings [*v.l.*] of manuscripts (and editions) are in square brackets within the Greek or Latin text, and alternate English renderings are also enclosed in square brackets in the translation. Scriptural quotations within the Greek and Latin passages are in bold-face type.

5. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 25, 2, in SC 31:133.
6. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 25, 4, in SC 31:134.
7. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 8.
8. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Jean l'Apocalypse*, 2nd ed. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1921), ccli; for a fuller discussion of the manuscripts, see Bernhard Weiss, *Die Johannes-Apokalypse*, TU 7.1 (1891); Wilhelm Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum neuen Testament*, TU 11.4 (1894): 1–44; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, ICC 1 (1920; repr. 1985): clx-clxxxiii; Allo, *Saint Jean l'Apocalypse*, ccli-cclxiv; and especially H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929).
9. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 15–16, 318. See also Henry B. Swete, *Commentary on Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977; repr. of *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 3rd ed. [London: Macmillan, 1911]), clxxxvi-cxcvi for matters of text and versions.
10. For the Greek Christian writers discussed below, an older but still valuable survey is Aime Puech, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque Chrétienne*, 3 vols. (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1928–30); similarly for the Latin, see Pierre de Labriolle, *Histoire de la Littérature latine chrétienne*, rev. by Gustav Bardy, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1947) and the English translation, *The History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*, tr. Herbert Wilson (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968); see also Pierre Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1901–1923; repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilization, 1963); and Frances M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (London: SCM, 1983). The best starting point is Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950, 1953, 1960) and Angelo de Berardino and Johannes Quasten, *Patrology 4* (tr. Placid Solari; Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1986).
11. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 39, 12, in SC 31:156; for the fragments of Papias see CPG 1:10.1047; cf. ODCC 1028.
12. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 18, ed. E. C. Richardson, TU 14.1A (1896): 19; and ed. Wilhelm Herding, BT (1879), 22.
13. Gustave Bardy, "Cerinthe," *Revue Biblique* 30 (1921): 344–73; Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* VII, 33 in PG 16:3342A; see the recently published critical edition, Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Hippolytus. Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, PTS 25 (1986): 317; cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* I, 26, in PG 7:686A-B; SC 264:344–46.
14. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo* 81, in PG 6:609A; Edgar J. Goodspeed, ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen: Van-

denhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914), 193–94, the text I have quoted; CPG 1:31–32.1076.

15. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* especially in V, in SC 152–53; cf. CPG 1:110–111.1306.

16. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 30, 3, in PG 7:1207A-B; SC 153:384, with the Greek text quoted in Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 18, 3, in SC 31:122, and repeated at Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V, 8, 6, in SC 41:36, where Eusebius' text reads almost exactly as at III, 18, 3, noted above. Only after the end of Domitian's reign did John return: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 23, 1, in SC 31:126.

17. John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus* (London: Epworth, 1948), 279 and 293, with specific reference to Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 35, 1–2, in PG 7:1218B-1219A; SC 153:436–52, from which the key excerpt is quoted below.

18. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV, 24, in SC 31:206; for Melito see ODCC 900; DS 10:979–90.

19. John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, in PG 96:525B.

20. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 61, in Richardson, 35; Herding, 41–42; cf. CPG 1:268–69.1890; see P. Prigent and R. Stehly, "Les Fragments du De Apocalypsi d'Hippolyte," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 29 (1973): 313–33; cf. John A. Green, "Hippolytus of Rome and the Apostolic Tradition," *Improvement Era* 67 (August 1964): 648–51, 672–74; ODCC 652–53; DS 7:531–71.

21. Text in PG 10:725–88 and GCS 1.2:3–47; cf. CPG 1:259.1872.

22. Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, in PG 10:637–69, 669–700; GCS 1.1:2–340; SC 14; cf. CPG 1:259–60.1873. See Marcel Richard, "Les Difficultés d'une édition des oeuvres de S. Hippolyte," *Studia Patristica* (1971 Oxford Conference on Patristic Studies), 12.1, TU 115 (1975): 51–70; Marcel Richard, "Les difficultés d'une édition du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur Daniel," *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 2 (1972): 5–7; and also Marcel Richard, "Pour une nouvelle Édition du Commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur Daniel," in Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann, ed., *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, 2 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 1:69–78.

23. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 30, 2, in PG 7:1205B; SC 153:376–78; cf. Hans Achelis, *Hippolytstudien*, TU 16.1.4 (1897): 3–16, 169–84 and also Charles, ICC 1:208–9. The reference to Enoch in 1 Clement 9 comes from Genesis 5:24 and does not associate him with Elijah. At Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 5, 1, in PG 7:1123B-C; SC 153:62, quoted below, Enoch and Elijah are mentioned, though they are not specifically identified as the two prophets or witnesses at Jerusalem.

24. Quoduultdeus, *Dimidium Temporis in Signis Antichristi* IX, 17: "Praedictio implenda in moribus Antichristi," in CCSL 60:202.13–18; SC 102:620.

25. Primasius, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin* III, 11:7, in CCSL 92:169.91; PL 68:867D.

26. Alcuin, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin* IV, 7:5, in Angelo Mai, ed., *Alcuini Commentariorum in Apocalypsin Libri Quinque*, *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus edita* 9 (Rome: Vatican, 1837): 308–11; PL 100:1132C; for Alcuin's principal source cf. Robert Weber, ed., *Ambrosii Autperti Opera, pars I: Expositionis in Apocalypsin Libri I-V; pars II: Expositionis in Apocalypsin Libri VI-X*, in CCCM 27–27A. For the parallel and source of the passage cited from Alcuin, see Ambrosius Autpertus, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* IV, 7:5–8, in CCCM 27:306.238–42. Alcuin omits *mediatore nostro adueniente* between *aetate* and *occulto*, and he also makes a minor inversion and omission for his source's *iudaica perfida plebs propriis sedibus expulsa*.

27. Beda, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* I, 7:5, in PL 93:150B–C.

28. Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 15 and 54, in PG 10:737C–740A; GCS 1.2:11.20; and PG 10:773AB; GCS 1.2:28.10.

29. Commodian, *Carmen de duobus populis*, ed. Joseph Martin; CCSL 128:73–113.

30. Lactantius, *Diuinae Institutiones* VII, 22, 8, ed. S. Brandt and G. Laubmann; CSEL 19:654; cf. CPL 18.85; ODCC 791–92; DS 9:48–59 (54 for a discussion of "les fins dernières").

31. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VI, 14, in SC 41:106–7; ODCC 303; DS 2:950–61; see CPG 1:138.1380 for the extant fragments.

32. C. Diobouniotis and A. von Harnack, eds., *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis*, TU 38.3 (1911): 21–44, and C. H. Turner, "Document: Origen, Scholia in Apocalypsin," *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1923):1–15; CPG 1:167.1468. But see also A. de Boysson "Avons-nous un commentaire d'Origène sur l'Apocalypse?" *Revue Biblique* 22 [n.s. 5] (1913): 555–67.

33. See Karen Jo Torjesen, *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis*, PTS 28 (1986); also P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa Vie et son Oeuvre*, *Christianisme Antique* 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977); Jean Danielou, *Origène*, tr. Walter Mitchell (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955); and Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, eds., *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, *Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity* 1 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988). For other studies on Origen, see Henri Crouzel, *Bibliographie Critique d'Origène*, 2 vols., *Instrumenta Patristica* 8–8A (Le Hague: Martinus Nijhoff and Steenbrugge, Belgium: Abbatia Sancti Petri, 1971 and 1982).

34. Eusebius, VII, 24–25, in SC 41:201–10, for his two books *On the Promises*, the first against Nepos, the second treating the Apocalypse. Eusebius gives a lengthy summary and quotation from Dionysius on the Apocalypse. See Wolfgang A. Bienert, *Dionysius von Alexandrien zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert*, PTS 21 (1978), especially 197–200.

35. Anastasios Lolos, ed., *Die Apokalypse des Ps.-Methodios*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 83 (1976) and also *Die dritte und vierte Redaktion des Ps.-Methodios*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 94 (1978). See Paul J. Alexander, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California, 1985); Quasten, *Patrology*, 2:129–37; CPG 1:252–53.1830. See also Methodius *Symposium* 8.4–11, in PG 18:143B–158B) and 9.1–5, in PG 18:175C–192B; for Methodius see ODCC 910–11; DS 10:1109–1117.

36. Quasten, *Patrology*, 2:129.

37. Victorinus Petovionensis, *Commentarii in Apocalypsim*, ed. Iohannes Haussleiter, CSEL 49; PLS 1:103–72; CPL 80. An early edition is PL 5:317–44, but it is not textually reliable.

38. Cf. Manlio Simonetti, “Il Millenarismo in Oriente da Origene a Metodio,” in Eligius Dekker, ed., *Corona Gratiarum*, 2 vols., Instrumenta Patristica 10–11 (Brugge: Sint Pietersabdij, 1975), 1:37–58.

39. ODCC 72–73; see J. A. Cramer, *Catena in Epistolas Catholicas accesserunt Oecumenii [sic] et Arethae Commentarii in Apocalypsin ad fidem Codd. Mss.*, vol. 8 of *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, 8 vols. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967; repr. of Oxford, 1840).

40. CPG 2:308.3658.

41. ODCC 402; DS 3:868–71; see also Thomas W. Mackay, “Didymos the Blind on Psalm 28 (LXX): Text from Unpublished Leaves of the Tura Commentary,” *Studia Patristica* 20 (1987 Oxford Conference on Patristic Studies; Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989): 40–41. In addition to five papyrus codices of the writings of Didymos, the cache at Tura also included a previously unknown work by Origen on Easter: Octave Guéraud and Pierre Nautin, *Origène sur la Pâque*, *Christianisme Antique* 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1979).

42. Didymus Caecus Alexandrinus, *In Zachariam III*, 73 = ZaT 200.14–16, in Louis Doutreleau, ed., *Didyme l’Aveugle sur Zacharie* [SC 83–85], SC 84:654. ZaT is the technical abbreviation for the Didymos commentary on Zechariah in the papyrus from Tura. Doutreleau has also given book and paragraph notations to the commentary, hence the double reference. Doutreleau, in SC 83:123,

credits Devresse, in an article on the *Catena* or "chain" of patristic quotations, with the tentative discovery that Didymos had written on the Apocalypse: "peut-être aussi un fragment de Didyme (Schol. 1)," R. Devresse, "Chaînes exégétiques grecques," in F. G. Vigouroux, ed., *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 5 vols. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1895–1912), with Supplément, ed. Louis Pirot, A. Robert, Henri Cazelles, and André Feuillet, 10 vols. to date (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928–), Suppl. 1:1228.

43. ODCC 1400; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 5:165–219.

44. Francesco Lo Bue, *The Turin Fragments of Tyconius' Commentary on Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963); repr. *PLS* 1:621–52, 1749–50. The text is found in Turin Biblioteca Nazionale F.iv.18, from Bobbio.

45. See Gerald Bonner, *Saint Bede in the Tradition of Western Apocalyptic Commentary*, Jarrow Lecture, 1966 (Jarrow: The Rector, 1966), 6; cf. Lo Bue, 23: the Turin manuscript "does not preserve the Tyconian text which other commentators had before them, but a text which at a certain period of its history underwent some degree of modification." See also Alexander Souter, "Tyconius's Text of the Apocalypse: A Partial Restoration," *Journal of Theological Studies* 14 (1913): 338–58; Gerald Bonner, "Towards a Text of Tyconius," *Studia Patristica* 10.1 (1967 Oxford Patristic Studies Conference), *TU* 107 (1970): 9–13; and, in a recent study, K. Steinhauser, *The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius: A History of Its Reception and Influence* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1987).

46. Thomas W. Mackay, "Bede's Biblical Criticism: The Venerable Bede's Summary of Tyconius' *Liber Regularum*," in Margot H. King and Wesley M. Stevens, eds., *Saints, Scholars and Heroes: Studies of Medieval Culture in Honour of Charles W. Jones*, 2 vols. (Collegeville, MN: Saint John's Abbey and University, 1979), 1:209–231; see George Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, Twayne's English Authors Series 443 (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1987), 50 and 119, n. 17. For Tyconius' influence on Augustine, see Alberto Pincherle, "Da Ticonio a Sant'Agostino," *Ricerche Religiose* 1 (1925): 443–46, but particularly now Charles Kannengiesser and Pamela Bright, *A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman Africa: Tyconius and Augustine* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies and University of California, 1989).

47. De Labriolle, *Histoire de la Littérature latine chrétienne*, 1:427.

48. De Labriolle, *The History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*, 293–94.

49. J. Hausleiter, "Die Commentare des Victorinus, Tichonius

und Hieronymus zur Apokalypse," *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben* 7 (1886): 241.

50. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 135, in Richardson, 55-56, and Herding, 66: "*De Spiritu Sancto Didymi, quem in Latinum transtuli, librum unum*" "*On the Holy Spirit by Didymos, one book that I translated into Latin*"; cf. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 109, in Richardson, 50, and Herding, 59: "*et De Spiritu Sancto librum unum quem ego in Latinum uerti.*" See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), 85, 121-26, 142-43. The text is preserved in several manuscripts, probably because of the association with Jerome. Bede quoted three passages from a copy of the text for his *Expositio in Actibus Apostolorum*, and his text is quite close to (but usually better than) British Library Royal 5 B VII, fol. 22v-56r (quotations are parallel to text found on fol. 23r-v, 39v, and 54r-v). But curiously no extant manuscript of *De Sancto Spiritu*, including Oxford Jesus College 3, Durham Cathedral Library B.III.2 (fol. 1r-18v) and B.IV.16, and the British Library manuscript Royal 5 B VII – all from the early or mid-twelfth century, comes from Anglo-Saxon England; Helmut Gneuss, "A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100," *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981): 1-60.

51. Jerome, *Epistula* LIII, 9 [*ad Paulinum*], in CSEL 54:463.

52. Jerome, *Commentarii in Isaiam* XVIII, prologue, in CCSL 73A:740.9-741.19.

53. Jerome, *Commentarii in Daniele* II, on Daniel 7:17-18A, in CCSL 75A:848.713-14: "*Cessat ergo mille annorum fabula*" "so let the fable of a millennium cease!" Elsewhere he says: [Dionysius Alexandrinus] "*irridens mille annorum fabulam et . . . instaurationem templi.*" "[Dionysius of Alexandria] ridiculing the fable of the millennium and the restoration of the temple." Jerome, *Commentarii in Isaiam* XVIII, prologue, in CCSL 73A:741.22-24.

54. Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam* I, on Zechariah 4:11-14, M. Adriaen, ed., in CCSL 76A:784.267-85.286; cf. *Commentarii in Amos* III, on Amos 9:2-5, M. Adriaen, ed., in CCSL 76:337.79-82.

55. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 29, in CCSL 48:752.11-13.

56. Augustine, *Sermo* CCLIX, in PL 38:1196-1201, esp. 1197-98.

57. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 7, in CCSL 48:708.4.

58. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 9, in CCSL 48:715.1-719.139.

59. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 17, in CCSL 48:728.48-729.53; cf. *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 9, in CCSL 48:717.56-59.

60. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 29, in CCSL 48:752.1-753.43.

61. His writings are edited in CCSL 60 and SC 101-2. For *Quod uult deus*, see de Berardino and Quasten, *Patrology*, 4:501-3; DS 12:2882-89.

62. The texts *Expositio Rectae Fidei* and *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* were formerly attributed to Justin Martyr; see CPG 3:218.6284-85 and Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:536-54. For Theodoret, see ODCC 1360-61.

63. ODCC 1130; CPG 7430 (for his commentary on Genesis).

64. Quasten, *Patrology*, 3:538-39.

65. H. C. Hoskier, *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*, University of Michigan Humanistic Series 23 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1928): 29-260. CPG 3:394.7470; ODCC 993; DS 11:681-82.

66. Hoskier, *Commentary of Oecumenius*, 4.

67. In PG 106:207-458; CPG 3:395-96.7478.

68. See Allo, *Saint Jean l'Apocalypse*, ccxxv. Some sixty manuscripts of the Apocalypse text—about one-fourth of the total—also contain Andreas' commentary (Swete, *Commentary on Revelation*, cxcix). An anonymous abridgment of Andreas is in Cramer, *Catena*, 8:497-582. This was formerly, but quite incorrectly, attributed to Oecumenius.

69. ODCC 284.

70. ODCC 748-49; DS 8:452-66.

71. ODCC 1087-88; DS 12:1397-1408.

72. In PG 106:487-786.

73. ODCC 1364.

74. ODCC 463. For Ephraem, see DS 4:788-822; ODCC 462-63. Older but still of value is Guisepppe Ricciotti, *Sant' Ephrem Siro. Biografia, Scritti, Teologia* (Turin and Rome: Marietti, 1925).

75. De Berardino and Quasten, *Patrology*, 4:207.

76. Latin translation from Syriac by I. Sedlacek, in CSCO 60:1-22; CPG 1:269.1891.

77. Stan Larson, "The Earliest Syriac Commentary on the Apocalypse," *Studia Patristica* 18.4 (1983 Oxford Conference on Patristic Studies; Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, forthcoming). Leslie S. B. MacCoull, "MS. Morgan 591: The Apocalypse Commentary of Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria," *Studia Patristica* 20 (1987 Oxford Conference on Patristic Studies; Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989): 33-39.

78. A. W. Adams, ed., *Primasius Episcopus Hadrumetinus, Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, in CCSL 92; the previous edition, with defective text is PL 68:793-936. For additions and corrections to the PL

text of Primasius, see *PLS* 4:1207-21; but Adam's text in *CCSL* now supersedes all other editions. For Primasius, see *RBMA* 4:480-82.6988; *ODCC* 1124; *DS* 12:2351-53; *CPL* 873; Johannes Haussleiter, *Die lateinische Apokalypse der alten afrikanischen Kanon*, in T. Zahn, ed., *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 4 (Erlangen and Leipzig: Andr. Deichert'sches Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. [G. Bohme], 1891). A fine study of the manuscript Oxford Bodl. Douce 140, an important early copy of Primasius very close to that known to the Venerable Bede in Anglo-Saxon England in the late seventh century, is A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1918; repr. 1969), 104-23.

79. E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 4 (Oxford: Clarendon 1947): 27.496; *RBMA* 2:238.1918; *PL* 70:1405-1918; *ODCC* 246-47; *DS* 2:276-77; James O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 225-29.

80. Caesarius of Arles, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, in Germain Morin, ed. *Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. (Maredsous, Belgium: Abbaye de Maredsous, 1942): 2:209-77; see also Germain Morin, "Le Commentaire Homilétique de S. Cesaire sur l'Apocalypse," *Revue Bénédicte* 45 (1933): 43-61; *CPL* 1016; *RBMA* 2:146-47.1495, and also 2:335.2445, where it was attributed to Gennadius. For Caesarius see *ODCC* 218; *DS* 2:420-29. The earlier edition is reprinted in *PL* 35:2417-52.

81. M. Férotin, *Apringius de Béja: Son Commentaire de l'Apocalypse* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1900); text is reprinted in *PLS* Roman 4:1221-48. *RBMA* 2:127-28.1422.

82. Alulfus, *De Expositione Noui Testamenti*, in *PL* 79:1137-1424, with 1397C-1424C for the Apocalypse citations, but there is nothing on the two witnesses. Alulfus (d. 1143/44) was a monk at Saint Martin's in Tournai (*DS* 1:403).

83. Joseph F. Kelly, "Bede and the Irish Exegetical Tradition on the Apocalypse," *Revue Bénédicte* 92 (1982): 393-406. This text was edited by Hartung from Bamberg MS Patr. 102 (B.V. 18), with frequent reference to Munich clm 14469: K. Hartung, *Ein Traktat zur Apokalypse des Apostels Johannes in einer Pergamenthandschrift der K. Bibliothek in Bamberg* (Bamberg: Gustav Duckstein, 1904). Later G. Lo Menzo Rapisarda made a full analysis of the manuscript tradition, *Miscellanea di Studi di Letterature Cristiana Antica*, 15 (Catania: Centro di Studi sull'Antico Cristianesimo, 1965): 119-40, and edited the text: G. Lo Menzo Rapisarda, *Incerti Auctoris Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, *Miscellanea di Studi di Letterature Cristiana Antica*, 16 (Catania: Centro di Studi sull'Antico Cristianesimo, 1967), and the text was reprinted in *PLS* 4:1850-63, with a note on the manuscripts

and editions at *PLS* 4:1844; *RBMA* 3:491.5271 (= 3:86.3461); *CPL* 276.1221. The seminal study for early Irish exegesis is Bernhard Bischoff, "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Irish Church: A.D. 650-800," in Martin MacNamara, ed., *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1976), 74-160, a translation of "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter," published in Bischoff's *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966): 205-73, and revised from original article in *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954): 189-279. For this text see Bischoff, "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis," 143 (= Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1:268).

84. J. F. Kelly, "Bede and the Irish Exegetical Tradition on the Apocalypse," 394 and n. 2, names and characterizes the source: "according to the notorious Thomas Dempster, Scottish patriot and liar." *RBMA* 2:250.1990.

85. Bischoff, "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Irish Church: A.D. 650-800," 143 (= Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* 1:268).

86. J. F. Kelly, "Bede and the Irish Exegetical Tradition on the Apocalypse," 395, citing Paris BN lat. 11561, fol. 1v-217v, a manuscript from the second half of the ninth century. Primasius is the only patristic authority named in the Reference Bible commentary on the Apocalypse (Paris BN lat. 11561, fol. 203r). Consult also Joseph F. Kelly, "Hiberno-Latin Exegesis and Exegetes," *Annuaire Mediaevale* 21 (1981): 46-60, and Charles D. Wright's entry on Hiberno-Latin exegesis in the forthcoming volume, Fred Biggs, Tom Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach, eds., *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1990).

87. J. F. Kelly, "Bede and the Irish Exegetical Tradition on the Apocalypse," 405-6; see Bonner, *Saint Bede*; Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, 42-61; Henry Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to England* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 140, 209-19; and Claudio Leonardi, "Il Venerabile Beda e la Cultura del Secolo VIII," *I Problemi dell'Occidente nel Secolo VIII*, *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, 20 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1973): 603-58. A fine assessment of Bede's method and of the importance of his contribution is Roger Ray, "What Do We Know about Bede's Commentaries?" *Recherches de Theologie ancienne et medievale* 49 (1982): 5-20. Roger Ray has also prepared an excellent article on Bede for a future volume in the series *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* (Berlin and

New York: De Gruyter, forthcoming). Bede's Apocalypse commentary is CPL 1393, RBMA 2:185.1640.

88. Robert McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores*, Pars I, CCSL 108B: xii-xiii; but for a different assessment, see Rand H. Johnson, *Bedaе Venerabilis Explanatio Epistolae Iudae Apostoli*, master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1979, 4-6.

89. Ray, "What Do We Know about Bede's Commentaries?" 20.

90. Weber, *Ambrosii Autperti Opera* (CCCM 27-27A). RBMA 2:95.1275; DS 1:429. The date of composition is established by the author's words preserved at the end of book X (CCCM 27A:872) only by Vat. Reg. lat. 96 and Oxford Bodl. Laud. misc. 464 (767).

91. H. A. Sanders, ed., *Beati in Apocalypsim Libri XII*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy at Rome 7 (Rome: American Academy at Rome, 1930); also E. Romero-Pose, ed., *Sancti Beati A Liebana Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, 2 vols.; *Scriptores Graeci et Latina Consilio Academiae Lynceorum Editi* (Rome: Accademia dei Lincei, 1985). RBMA 2:172-74.1597.

92. Mai, *Alcuini Commentariorum in Apocalypsin Libri Quinque*, 257-338; reprinted in PL 100:1055C-1156C; cf. RBMA 2:62.1102. See Marcus Vatasso and Pius Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Latini* 1 (codd. 1-678; Rome: Vatican, 1902): 505.

93. For Alcuin letters requesting Bede's commentaries, see E. Dümmler, ed., *Epistolae Alcuini*, MGH, *Epistolae* 4 (Karolingi Aevi 2), 2, no. 216. A few decades earlier Saint Boniface, Anglo-Saxon missionary to Germany, called Bede a "candle of the Church" [*candela ecclesiae*]: M. Tangl, ed., *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Epistolae selectae*, 1, nos. 75, 76, 125, and 131.

94. The details of this will appear in my forthcoming article on Alcuin's commentary. For an example of his close quotation and paraphrasing, see above, n. 26.

95. Mai inserts ⟨per⟩; alternatively, read "septem angelor(um) dicta et facta commemorat" or else punctuate the passage "septem angelos—dicta et facta [sc. eorum]—commemorat."

96. Alcuin, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin praefatio*, in Mai, *Alcuini Commentariorum in Apocalypsin Libri Quinque*, 257-58; PL 100:1057A-58A. The first two paragraphs summarize Bede's *praefatio*, including his brief account of Tyconius' rules; see Mackay, "Bede's Biblical Criticism," 1:209-31. The final paragraph comes from Ambrosius Autpertus' own preface (CCCM 27:5.8-31).

97. For the exegetical tradition, see Swete, *Commentary on Rev-*

elation, cxcvii-ccxix; Allo, *Saint Jean l'Apocalypse*, ccxvii-ccl; and Devresse, "Chaînes exégetiques grecques," Suppl. 1:1228-31.

98. Gustav Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn: M. Cohen, 1885; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1973), 48. Becker has reprinted the catalog from Saint Gall MS 728 (also recopied in the early tenth century in MS 267). Becker's entry reads: 242. Expositio tichonii donatistae in apocalipsim vol. I vetus. 243. Expos(itio) primasii in apocalipsim libri. V. et glosule gregorii in apocalipsi(m) sp(ir)italis intelligentie in volumine I.

99. F. C. Burkitt, ed., *The Book of Rules of Tyconius Newly Edited from the Manuscripts*, Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894); D. L. Anderson, "The Book of Rules of Tyconius: An Introduction and Translation with Commentary," Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1974. For fine recent analysis see Pamela Bright, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and Inner Logic* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1987).

100. Laon Bibliothèque Municipale 89 (from Laon) on verso of last leaf; *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques des Départements*, 1 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1849): 88; see also Bright, 15-16.

101. See n. 91 above.

102. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952; repr. Notre Dame, 1964), 14-19.

103. Louis Pirot, *L'Oeuvre Exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Rome: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1913) and Robert Devresse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi 141 (Rome: Vatican, 1948): 53-92 (= ch. 2 "La Méthode d'Exégèse"); cf. ODCC 1358-59.

104. The teachings include antemortal existence of spirits and *apokatastasis*, the doctrine that punishment is not ever-enduring but that after punishment the souls may still be granted some sort of reward in the kingdom of God. This doctrine was propounded by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymos, and Gregory of Nyssa but rejected by Augustine; it was formally condemned at the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 553 (ODCC 69-70). For the rejection of the early Christian doctrine of the antemortal existence of spirits, see *Edictum Iustiniani imperatoris contra Origenem* (CPG 3:303.6880). For the text of the *Edict* of the Third Council of Constantinople, see Joannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum noua et amplissima collectio*, 54 vols. (Graz: Akademische, 1960-61; repr. of Paris and

Leipzig: Hubert Welter, 1901-27), 9:488D-533D; Eduardus Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* 4 tomes, 15 vols., in 29 parts (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1914-), 3:189-214; also PG 86:945-94 and PL 69:177-226. The *Edict* states:

εἰ δὲ προὔπηρχεν ἡ ψυχὴ, καθὼς Ὀριγένους ληρεῖ

in PG 86:953A; Mansi, 9:496A; "si autem anima praeexistebat, ut delirat Origenes," in PL 69:186A; Mansi, 9:495A: "But if the soul existed before this life [preexisted], as Origen deliriously babbles."

105. Thomas W. Mackay, "Didymos the Blind on Psalm 28," 2:40-41; J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome*, 142; ODCC 402; DS 3:868-71; for Didymos' method see also W. A. Beinert, "Allegoria" und "Anagoge" bei Didymos dem Blindem von Alexandrie, PTS 13 (1972).

106. The seminal work on this subject is Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, tr. Robert A. Kraft, Gerhard Krodel, et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

107. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968); D. A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981); cf. D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom, *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), and G. M. A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), esp. 122-49, 325-56.

108. ODCC 1083-84; a fine overview is Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); see also Ronald Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo*, Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D. 200, vol. 1, part 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

109. ODCC 37; see D. E. Nineham, *The Church's Use of the Bible, Past and Present* (London: SPCK, 1963) and K. Froelich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, in *Sources of Early Christian Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984). For the setting of the Alexandrian school and Christianity in Egypt in the first four centuries, see C. Wilfred Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989) and Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, eds., *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); note also Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, Schweich Lecture of the British Academy 1977 (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1979).

110. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome*, 125.

111. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 87-88, 97,

106-95 (on Andrew of St. Victor). For medieval exegesis, see also C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une Histoire de l'Exégèse latine au Moyen Age* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1944), and Henri de Lubac, *L'Exégèse médiévale: Les Quatre Sens de l'Écriture*, 2 vols. in 4 parts (Paris: Aubier, 1959-60); Robert Kaske et al., *Medieval Christian Literary Imagery: A Guide to Interpretation*, Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 11 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

112. For a discussion of the issue, see Simonetti, "Il Millenarismo in Oriente da Origene a Metodio," 37-58; also Robert E. Lerner, "Refreshment of the Saints: The Time after Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought," *Traditio* 32 (1976): 97-144.

113. Nibley, *The World and the Prophets*; 178; also n. 1 above and Thomas W. Mackay, "Early Christian Exegesis of the Apocalypse," *Studia Biblica* 1978, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series 3 (1980): 257-63.

114. Nibley, *The World and the Prophets*; 176, citing A. von Harnack, *Monasticism and the Confessions of St. Augustine* (London, 1901), 69; see Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed., rev. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), and Werner Verbeke, Daniel Verhelst, and Andries Welkenhuysen, ed., *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia*, Series 1, *Studia* 15 (Louvain, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1988).

115. Hugh Nibley, "Christian Envy of the Temple," in *Mormonism and Early Christianity*, 391-434.

116. Albertus Magnus, *Enarrationes in Apocalypsim*, *Opera Omnia*, 38 vols. (Paris: Ludovicum Vives, 1895-99), 38:465-792; listed in *RBMA* 2:47.1041 under Pseudo-Albertus Magnus.

117. Joseph S. Considine, "The Two Witnesses: Apoc. 11:3-13," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8 (1946): 390.

118. Jerome, *Epistula* LIX, 3, in *CSEL* 54:543-44.

119. Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* XX, 29, in *CCSL* 48:752.1-753.43.

120. Considine, "The Two Witnesses: Apoc. 11:3-13," 390-91; see Matthew Black, "The 'Two Witnesses' of Rev. 11:3f. in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Tradition," in E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies, eds., *Donum Gentilicium. New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 227-37; Charles, *ICC* 1:281; Kenneth A. Strand, "The Two Witnesses of Rev 11:3-12," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19 (1981): 127; J. M. Ford, *Revelation*, *AB* (1975), 177-78; Andre Feuillet, "Essai d'Interpretation du Chapitre XI de l'Apocalypse," *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-58):

183-200; and G. B. Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 134-35.

121. The expression is the title of Smalley's chapter 5 (196-263), entitled "Masters of the Sacred Page: The Comestor, The Chanter, Stephen Langton." On pages 196-97 of *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Smalley writes, "The masters who made themselves responsible for continuing the Victorine tradition are the trio we met in the last chapter: Peter Comestor, Peter the Chanter, Stephen Langton. Mgr. Grabmann has grouped them together as the 'biblical moral school'; they have a common interest in biblical studies and in practical moral questions, which distinguishes them from those who were primarily theologians and dialecticians: Peter Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, Adam of the Petit Pont."

122. Peter Cantor, *In Apocalypsim* on Apocalypse 11:3; unpublished text in a manuscript at Brigham Young University, fol. 117<sup>v</sup>. I will publish a critical edition of this important text in CCCM and SC.

123. Black, "The 'Two Witnesses' of Rev. 11:3f.," 231; Guido Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum"*, Publications in Mediaeval Studies, 10 (Paris and Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1949).

124. Allo, *Saint Jean l'Apocalypse*, 131; Considine, "The Two Witnesses: Apoc. 11:3-13," 390.

125. *Descensus Christi ad inferos* 9 (= *Evangelium Nicodemi* or *Acta Pilati*, 25; *Evangelia Apocrypha*, C. von Tischendorff, ed., 2nd ed. [Leipzig, 1876; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966], 404-6).

126. Because of the preponderance of the Latin tradition, I have taken my translation from Tischendorff's Latin text given above, and it represents well the meaning of the Greek, though it adds a few words (as correctly construing the genitive absolute at the beginning of chapter 10: *tauta touton legonton* by "Et cum haec loquerentur sanctis Enoch et Elias" "and while Enoch and Elijah were saying these things to the saints"). Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, tr. R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963), have used the Greek: "While they were saying this . . ." (1:475).

127. *Historia Iosephi* 32 (Tischendorff, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 139).

128. Tertullian, *De Anima* L, 5; see J. H. Waszink, ed., *Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima* (Amsterdam: J. M. Meulenhoff, 1947), 68 and commentary on 525, with reference to W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, 134-39. Bousset's valuable book has been translated into English by A. H. Keane as *The Antichrist Legend: A Chapter in Christian and Jewish Folklore* (London: Hutchinson, 1896; repr. New York: AMS, 1985).

129. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 5, 1, in PG 7:1134B-C; SC 153:62 (with Greek quoted from John of Damascus' *Sacra Parallela*; cf. CPG 3:517-18.8056).

130. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 26, in PG 7:1192B; SC 153:324; V, 28, 2, in PG 7:1198BC; SC 153:350-52; V, 29, 1-2, in PG 7:1201C-1202A; SC 153:364-66.

131. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 30, 1, in PG 7:1203AB; SC 153:370 (with Greek quoted at Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* V, 8, in SC 41:36) and PG 7:1203B; SC 153:372; V, 30, 4, in PG 7:1207B-1208A; SC 153:386.

132. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V, 35, in PG 7:1218B-1219A; SC 153:436-38.

133. Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichristo* 43, in PG 10:761A; GCS 1.2:27-28.

134. Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichristo* 46-47, in PG 10:764C-765A; GCS 1.2:29-30, with some manuscripts quoting an old form of the Septuagint or Greek Old Testament.

135. Hippolytus, *Capita contra Gaium* (Latin translation of Syriac I. Sedlacek, in CSCO 60:13-14).

136. Hippolytus, *In Danielelem*, on Daniel 4:35, in PG 10:656D; GCS 1.1:278-80; SC 14:201.

137. In a sixteenth-century manuscript, Munich Staatsbibliothek gr. 53, fol. 271r, but in no other manuscript copy of this text, there is a passage – perhaps inserted from a gloss – that reads:

Ἐνὼχ δὲ καὶ Ἠλίας οἱ προφῆται κηρύξουσιν  
[κηρύξουσιν *ed.*] τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου  
περιβεβλημένοι σάκκουσ ὡς γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου

“Enoch and Elijah, the two prophets, will proclaim [*or*, let them proclaim] the second coming of the Lord while wearing sackcloth, as it has been written through the prophet” (GCS 1.1:314.14, critical apparatus).

138. Hippolytus, *In Danielelem*, on Daniel 4:49-50, in PG 10:665A-B; GCS 1.1:314-16; SC 14:215-17; the text is somewhat more extensive for this passage than I have quoted.

139. Pseudo-Methodios 14.11, ed. 1 (Lolos 1976, 138.49-50).

140. Pseudo-Methodios 14.11, ed. 2 (Lolos 1976, 139.37-39).

141. Pseudo-Methodios 14.11, ed. 3 (Lolos 1978, 73.46-47).

142. Commodian, *De Duobus Populis* 833-44, in CCSL 128:103-4.

143. Editio Victorini 8.3, on Apocalypse 8:13, in CSEL 49:86; PLS 1:140.

144. Recensio Hieronymi 8.3, on Apocalypse 8:13, in CSEL 49:87; PLS1:140.

145. Editio Victorini 11.3, on Apocalypse 11:3, in CSEL 49:98; PLS 1:146.

146. Recensio Hieronymi 11.3, on Apocalypse 11:3, in CSEL 49:99; PLS 1:146.

147. Editio Victorini 12.6, on Apocalypse 12:7-9, in CSEL 49:114; PLS 1:153-54.

148. Recensio Hieronymi 12.6, on Apocalypse 12:7-9, in CSEL 49:115; PLS 1:153-54. The quotation in square brackets is the Vulgate; the repetition with its variants (n.b. *nuntii* for *angeli*, *anguis* for *serpens*, etc.) is the Old Latin biblical text known to Victorinus and other early Latin writers.

149. (Tyconius) Turin Fragments 332-41, in Lo Bue, 142-44; PLS 1:643.

150. (Tyconius) Turin Fragments 342-47 in Lo Bue, 145-46; PLS 1:643-44.

151. Ambrose, *Commentarii in Epistolam I ad Corinthios* 4:8, in PL 17:216A.

152. Didymus Caecus Alexandrinus (Didymos the Blind), *In Genesim* GnT 148.1-149.18 (actual quotes come from 148.6-7, 15-17, 23-27 and 149.5-8) on Genesis 5:21-24, in Pierre Nautin and Louis Doutreleau, eds., *Didyme l'Aveugle sur la Genese* [SC 233, 244], SC 244:14-18.

153. Didymus Caecus Alexandrinus, *In Zachariam* 1.277 = ZaT 63.12-14, in SC 83:336-38.

154. Didymus Caecus Alexandrinus, *In Zachariam* 1.334-42 = ZaT 75.16-77.24, in SC 83:370-76.

155. Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam* I, on Zechariah 4:2-7, in CCSL 76A:778.54-779.70.

156. Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam* I, on Zechariah 4:2-7, in CCSL 76A:780.93-94, 780.106-782.170.

157. Jerome, *Commentarii in Zachariam* I, on Zechariah 4:11-14, in CCSL 76A:784.246-785.294.

158. Jerome, *Commentarii in Amos* III, on Amos 9:2-5, in CCSL 76:337.79-82.

159. Jerome, *Epistula* LIX, 3, in CSEL 54:543-44.

160. Augustine, *Epistula* CXCIII, 3, 5, in CSEL 57:170.

161. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, in CSEL 28:271-72, later quoted by Bede in his *In Genesim* I, 2, 18, in CCSL 118A:53-54; see below. To judge from the variants in the critical apparatus, Bede's textual source must have been a manuscript closely akin to Rome Biblioteca Vittorio Emmanuele 2094 (*olim* Sessorianus XIII) and Saint Gall 161 since, for example, they both give *in terra*, as does Bede at

118A:53.1681 while other manuscripts of Augustine omit *in*; but for Bede 118A:54.1702 *corporalium* vs. *corporalibus* in Augustine, in CSEL 28:272.11, the closest manuscript is that underlying the 1689 St. Maur edition of Augustine.

162. Theodoret of Cyr (Pseudo-Justin Martyr), *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos* 85, in PG 6:1328A.

163. Quoduultdeus, *Liber Promissionum* I, VI, 9 "Praedictio Figurata Duorum Scilicet Populorum," in CCSL 60:18.35-40; SC 101:170-72.

164. Quoduultdeus, *Dimidium Temporis in Signis Antichristi* XIII, 22 "Promissio Implenda in Missione Heliae et Enoch," in CCSL 60:206.11-207.24; SC 102:632.

165. Quoduultdeus, *Dimidium Temporis in Signis Antichristi* XV, 24 "Praedictio Implenda in passione Heliae et Enoch" and XVI, 25 "Promissio (implenda) in eorum resurrectione Heliae et Enoch," in CCSL 60:208-9; SC 102:636-38.

166. Procopius of Gaza, *Commentarii in Genesin* IV, 91, in PG 87:260C-D.

167. Caesarius, *Expositio in Apocalypsim* 8, in Morin, *Opera Omnia*, 2:239.

168. Primasius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* III, 11:3, in CCSL 92:166.28-34; PL 68:866C.

169. Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, *Complexiones in Apocalypsin* 15, in PL 70:1411.

170. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelam prophetam* I, Homilia XII, 8-9, in CCSL 142:187-88; SC 327:500.

171. Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 14.(xxiii) 27 on Job 18:20, in CCSL 143A:714; PL 75:1053D.

172. Isidore of Seville, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum* 3, in PL 83:131-32.

173. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana* V, 140, in PG 88:260AB; SC 159:205.

174. *Tractatus Hilarii in Septem Epistolas Canonicas*, Robert E. McNally, ed., in CCSL 108B:75 on James 5:17; RBMA 3:93-94.3525-31; cf. Bischoff, "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Irish Church: A.D. 650-800," 141-43.

175. Anonymous Irish, *Rapisarda*, ed., 94, in PLS 4:1858.

176. Anonymous Irish, *Rapisarda*, ed., 94, in PLS 4:1859.

177. Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin* 30, "De Enocho et Elia," in PG 106:312B-C.

178. *Chronicon Paschale*, "De Prophetia Enoch," in PG 92:105A; cf. G. Mercati, "A Study of the Paschal Chronicle," *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1906): 397-412; CPG 3:496.7960.

179. John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4, in PG 94:1217B-C; CPG 3:512.8043.

180. John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthodoxa* 4, in PG 94:1218B-C.

181. Oecumenius, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, in Hoskier, *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*, 128-29, on Apocalypse 11:1-7.

182. Andreas of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* 30: [Concerning Enoch and Elijah who are going to refute and expose the Antichrist] in Cramer, *Catena*, 8:339-40, commentary on Apocalypse 11:3-6, based on Oecumenius.

183. Arethas, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* 30, in PG 106:648C-689B, abbreviating Andreas of Caesarea on Apocalypse 11:3-6.

184. Beda, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* II, 11:3, in PL 93:162C.

185. Beda, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* II, 11:4, in PL 93:162D.

186. Beda, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* II, 11:6, in PL 93:163A.

187. Beda, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* II, 11:13e, in PL 93:164C-D, with the expression *hucusque recapitulatio* taken from the early manuscripts of Bede.

188. Beda, *De Temporum Ratione* LXIX, 600-601 'De Temporibus Antichristi,' in CCSL 123B:538.1-539.27.

189. Beda, *In Genesim* I, 1703-9, on Genesis 2:18, in CCSL 118A:54.

190. Beatus of Liebana V, *Explanatio* 11, 1-5, in Sanders, *Beati in Apocalypsim Libri XII*, 445; Romero-Pose, *Sancti Beati A Liebana Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, 2:67-68.

191. Beatus of Liebana V, *Explanatio* 11, 8, 10, 13, in Sanders, *Beati in Apocalypsim Libri XII*, 446-47; Romero-Pose, *Sancti Beati A Liebana Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, 2:69-70.

192. The manuscript reads mille ·CC· ·XL· perhaps by misreading Ambrosius Autpertus or Victorinus with reference to *MCCLX dies, id est XLII menses*, thus causing a confusion in the number.

193. Alcuin, *Commentarii in Apocalypsin* V, 11:3-4; Mai, *Alcuini Commentariorum in Apocalypsin Libri Quinque*, 328-29; PL 100:1147C-1148A); cf. Ambrosius Autpertus, *Expositio in Apocalypsin* V, 11:3-4, in CCCM 27:413.1-416.33. Alcuin draws upon Ambrosius but plainly shows the radical compression of his exegetical source in his paraphrasing. For example, whereas Ambrosius has eighty-six lines of printed commentary on Apocalypse 11:3, Alcuin has scarcely the equivalent of ten or eleven printed lines. Nevertheless, Alcuin still tends to use significant words and phrases that can be directly traced to Ambrosius. Also, Alcuin proceeds in the same order as Ambrosius, and so the summary must be deliberate, intentionally based upon his immediate literary and exegetical source.

194. Photius, *Bibliotheca* 229, in PG 103:985AB, D; ed. R. Henry, 4 (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1965): 139-40 in the series 'Collection Byzantine' of the Association Guillaume Bude. This section comprises some of his notes from reading works by Ephraem the Syrian, a prominent fourth-century church writer mentioned above. The quotation is from his summary of a treatise in reply to the attorney Anatolius, and Ephraem apparently quoted from various authorities, but especially from the Cappadocian Fathers. So this quotation is a ninth-century statement of fourth-century theological views.

195. Luis Revenga, ed., *Los Beatos: Europalia 85 España*, 26 September-30 November 1985, Chapelle de Nassau, Bibliothèque royale Albert I<sup>er</sup>, Brussels (Madrid: Graficen, 1985), 102-35 for a brief description of each manuscript and a collation of illustrations.

196. Gerona Cathedral MS 7, written in A.D. 975 at the monastery of San Salvador, Zamora, by the priest Senior at the request of Abbot Dominicus, and decorated with 114 full-page miniatures by the monk Emeterius and the lady En; manuscript published in facsimile and with analyses in J. M. Casanovas, C. E. Dubler, W. Neuss, J. Marqués, eds., *Sancti Beati a Liebana in Apocalypsin Codex Gerundensis* (Olten and Lausanne: Urs Graf, 1962), and also G. Sanders, ed., with J. Camon, T. Marn, and J. Marqués, *Beati in Apocalipsin libri duodecim, Codex Gerundensis* (Madrid: Ediln, 1975).

197. Kurt Weitzmann, *Ancient Book Illumination*, Martin Classical Lectures 16 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959). The Homer manuscript is the *Ilias Ambrosiana*, Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F 205 inf. Only some of the miniatures and a bit of text remain: see the reproductions and descriptive analyses in Ranuccio Bianchi-Bandinelli, *Hellenistic-Byzantine Miniatures of the Iliad (Ilias Ambrosiana)* (Bern and Olten: Urs Graf, 1955). For Vergil, see L. D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 433-36; the great manuscript, frequently studied, is Vat. lat. 3867, the *Vergilius Romanus*. See Erwin Rosenthal, *The Illuminations of the Vergilius Romanus (Cod. Vat. Lat. 3867): A Stylistic and Iconographical Analysis* (Dietikon and Zurich: Urs Graf, 1972). For Terence, see Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission*, 412-20, and also L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930-31). "Someone soon after A.D. 400, to judge from the style of the illustrations, illustrated the text in accordance with the scene-headings of his manuscript, and these illustrations survive in descendants of (manuscript family) Γ." Reynolds, *Texts*

and *Transmission*, 413, citing A. W. Byvanck, "Antike Malerei, II: Das Vorbild der Terenzillustrationen," *Mnemosyne* 3rd series, 7 (1939): 115-35. The manuscripts include Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus lat. 3868 (ca. 820-30, Corvey; written by Hrodgarius, illustrated by Adelricus; facsimile ed. Gunther Jachmann, *Terentius: Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3868 picturis insignis* [Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1929]); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7899 (s. ix<sup>2</sup> from near Reims); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7900 (s. ix<sup>3/4</sup> from Corbie); and Lyon, Bibliothèque de la ville, MS 788 (s. ix<sup>3/4</sup> from near Paris).

198. Specifically in manuscript family  $\Gamma$  and its antecedent,  $\Sigma$ ; see John N. Grant, "The Miniatures and the Date of  $\Sigma$ ," *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 18-59.

199. For other examples of the persistence of Enoch and Elijah in the artistic tradition even in the Greek world, see Harold R. Willoughby, *The Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse*, vol. 1: *A Greek Corpus of Revelation Iconography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940).

194. Photius, *Bibliotheca* 229, in *PG* 103:985AB, D; ed. R. Henry, 4 (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1965): 139-40 in the series 'Collection Byzantine' of the Association Guillaume Budé. This section comprises some of his notes from reading works by Ephraem the Syrian, a prominent fourth-century church writer mentioned above. The quotation is from his summary of a treatise in reply to the attorney Anatolius, and Ephraem apparently quoted from various authorities, but especially from the Cappadocian Fathers. So this quotation is a ninth-century statement of fourth-century theological views.

195. Luis Revenga, ed., *Los Beatos: Europalia 85 España*, 26 September-30 November 1985, Chapelle de Nassau, Bibliotheque royale Albert I<sup>er</sup>, Brussels (Madrid: Graficen, 1985), 102-35 for a brief description of each manuscript and a collation of illustrations.

196. Gerona Cathedral MS 7, written in A.D. 975 at the monastery of San Salvador, Zamora, by the priest Senior at the request of Abbot Dominicus, and decorated with 114 full-page miniatures by the monk Emeterius and the lady En; manuscript published in facsimile and with analyses in J. M. Casanovas, C. E. Dubler, W. Neuss, J. Marqués, eds., *Sancti Beati a Liebana in Apocalypsin Codex Gerundensis* (Olten and Lausanne: Urs Graf, 1962), and also G. Sanders, ed., with J. Camon, T. Marn, and J. Marques, *Beati in Apocalipsin libri duodecim, Codex Gerundensis* (Madrid: Ediln, 1975).

197. Kurt Weitzmann, *Ancient Book Illumination*, Martin Classical Lectures 16 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959). The Homer manuscript is the *Ilias Ambrosiana*, Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F 205 inf. Only some of the miniatures and a bit of text remain: see the reproductions and descriptive analyses in Ranuccio Bianchi-Bandinelli, *Hellenistic-Byzantine Miniatures of the Iliad (Ilias Ambrosiana)* (Bern and Olten: Urs Graf, 1955). For Vergil, see L. D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 433-36; the great manuscript, frequently studied, is Vat. lat. 3867, the *Vergilius Romanus*. See Erwin Rosenthal, *The Illuminations of the Vergilius Romanus (Cod. Vat. Lat. 3867): A Stylistic and Iconographical Analysis* (Dietikon and Zürich: Urs Graf, 1972). For Terence, see Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission*, 412-20, and also L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930-31). "Someone soon after A.D. 400, to judge from the style of the illustrations, illustrated the text in accordance with the scene-headings of his manuscript, and these illustrations survive in descendants of (manuscript family) Γ." Reynolds, *Texts*

*and Transmission*, 413, citing A. W. Byvanck, "Antike Malerei, II: Das Vorbild der Terenzillustrationen," *Mnemosyne* 3rd series, 7 (1939): 115-35. The manuscripts include Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus lat. 3868 (ca. 820-30, Corvey; written by Hrodgarius, illustrated by Adelricus; facsimile ed. Gunther Jachmann, *Terentius: Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3868 picturis insignis* [Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1929]); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7899 (s. ix<sup>2</sup> from near Reims); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7900 (s. ix<sup>3/4</sup> from Corbie); and Lyon, Bibliothèque de la ville, MS 788 (s. ix<sup>3/4</sup> from near Paris).

198. Specifically in manuscript family  $\Gamma$  and its antecedent,  $\Sigma$ ; see John N. Grant, "The Miniatures and the Date of  $\Sigma$ ," *Studies in the Textual Tradition of Terence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 18-59.

199. For other examples of the persistence of Enoch and Elijah in the artistic tradition even in the Greek world, see Harold R. Willoughby, *The Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse*, vol. 1: A Greek Corpus of Revelation Iconography (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940).