The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Charles's Translation of the *Book of Enoch* The *Book of Enoch*, translated from Professor Dillmann's Ethiopic text, emended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin fragments, which are here published in full. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Appendices, and Indices by R. H. Charles, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin, and Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford, the Clarendon Press, 1893. 16.

M. R. James

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 41 - 44

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018730X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018730X

How to cite this article:

M. R. James (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 41-44 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018730X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

contains seven MSS., goes back to a text mutilated of the last fourteen provinces, which was written in the tenth century, while the other, containing four MSS., goes back to a complete original. The latter family in its turn is divided into two groups, which have different forms of epilogue (neither of them written by Hierocles) attached to them; two MSS. of each group are known.

The value of Hierocles's lists of the cities of the Eastern Roman Empire can hardly be exaggerated, at least so far as Asia Minor is concerned. If my work on the geography of that country has proved anything, it is that Hierocles's lists must be made the foundation of all study of the country; and, though I have not succeeded in inducing any of the French and German scholars who have in recent years published anything on the subject to follow this principle, I believe that their comparative failure on the whole (as it appears to me) is due to their following a false method; for the many excellent remarks and discoveries in details which they have made show how much more they would have succeeded in doing had they followed a better method.

What then was Hierocles's work? According to the title, it was a 'traveller's companion,' the 'Murray' of the sixth century. According to the view for which I have argued (which is similar to that of Wesseling, but which is, so far as I know, unanimously rejected by all foreign scholars that have recently written on the subject), Hierocles founded his account of Asia Minor on the ecclesiastical lists of his time. These he modified in various ways to suit his special purpose, and he performed his task with much greater skill and knowledge in

the north-western provinces than in the southern and eastern provinces of Asia Minor. From this it may be argued that he was well acquainted with Bithynia and Hellespontus, and not with the provinces further away from Constantinople. The phenomena of his list seem to me to be inconsistent with the view that he used a political or administrative list of the cities of each province. The errors which he makes are those of a writer who, in ignorance of the geography, tries to compile from the ecclesiastical lists a complete list of the cities of each province. The ecclesiastical list and the political list would of course coincide to a great extent; but there would be certain discrepancies between them, and it is precisely in regard to these discrepant points that Hierocles makes most of his blunders. Against this view almost all recent writers maintain that Hierocles used as his authority a governmental list.

I speak only of Asia Minor in this question. It is not absolutely certain that Hierocles would follow the same method in Europe and in Asia. In regard to Europe, Syria, and Egypt, I am not able to form any opinion; for it needs years of specialized work to know the geography of any of these countries sufficiently well to justify the expression of an opinion against the general consensus.

Dr. Burckhardt's admirable edition is precisely the kind of work for which my studies have made me long; and I only hope that he will supplement it by a short account of the Jerusalem MS., if it prove to be of any interest.

W. M. RAMSAY.

CHARLES'S TRANSLATION OF THE *BOOK OF ENOCH*.

The Book of Enoch, translated from PROFESSOR DILLMANN'S Ethiopic text, emended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin fragments, which are here published in full. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Appendices, and Indices by R. H. CHARLES, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin, and Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1893. 16s.

MR. CHARLES'S work must undoubtedly take its place at once as the authoritative edition

of the *Book of Enoch* for English readers: I see no reason why he should not in future years produce what may be the *final* edition.

In the first place, he has presented us with a translation of the Ethiopic version of the book, made on the authority of manuscripts more in number and better in quality than were accessible to Dillmann. This part of his work deserves, and has met with, a warm welcome from all scholars. It is true that his very high estimate of certain of his new MSS. is not by any means unreservedly accepted by Dillmann,

who states (in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for Sept. 2, 1893) as the result of his own investigation, that the group of MSS. G (G¹M) which Mr. Charles ranks highest cannot claim to be the exclusive preservers of the best text; and who, further, disputes Mr. Charles's contention that the Ethiopic text was transmitted 'with the greatest care and accuracy' through successive copies from the sixth to the sixteenth century. Points of this kind, however, cannot materially detract from the great value of Mr. Charles's main work, his new translation of a decidedly improved Ethiopic text. All students of Jewish literature, and indeed all who approach the study of the 'origins of Christianity,' are very grateful to him.

In the next place, Mr. Charles has proved himself a laborious student of the modern literature dealing with *Enoch*. His *résumés* of the opinions of his predecessors will be exceedingly useful. His bibliography does not profess to be complete: one or two suggestions as to additions will be made when I come to criticize. At present I am trying to reckon up the good points of the book before me.

Thirdly, we have in this volume for the first time a juxtaposition of a revised translation of the Ethiopic and of the text of the Greek fragments. Mr. Charles has been rather unlucky in respect of the principal Greek fragment, that discovered at Akhmîm by M. Bouriant. It was not printed until most of Mr. Charles's work had gone to press, and he has consequently been forced to give it in an Appendix, and has only been able to introduce a few corrections from it into the main part of his book. The result of this is that various points in the early chapters have to stand corrected in the light of Appendix C. It is fortune, and not Mr. Charles, who is to blame for this: perhaps it would not be unfair to add that the curious slowness of the French *Mission Archéologique* in publishing their great find has here again led to most unfortunate results. But I am far from wishing to blame the first editors: we do not know what difficulties they may have had to contend with.

From what has been said, I wish the conclusion to be drawn that Mr. Charles's work has very considerable value: but I have faults to find with it. I am not competent to criticize that part of it which deals with the Ethiopic text; nor, in any case, would this *Review* be an appropriate vehicle for such criticism. I shall concern

myself with the introductory matter, and with the Greek and other fragments.

On the first page of his Introduction, Mr. Charles postulates the existence of a large literature connected with the name of Enoch, of which we possess fragments in the present Book, and in the Slavonic *Enoch*. The hypothesis receives a certain confirmation from the existence of this latter text; but, until we know more of that (and I own to a wish that Mr. Charles had given some slight abstract of its contents), we cannot pronounce on its relation to the main book. As regards the general question, I should like to enter a humble protest against the sweeping assertions which are current that a very large number of Jewish Apocalypses existed, of which neither *uola* nor *uestigium* remains. The more I see of the literature the less am I inclined to believe that any considerable proportion of it has disappeared and left no record of its existence. This is by the way: in the case of the *Book of Enoch*, is it so certain that the various portions of that book were current separately? It seems fairly clear that there must have been an *Apocalypse of Noah* which has been broken up and interspersed over the *Book of Enoch*: but will not the hypothesis that the Enochian portions were written to occupy their present position by successive authors meet the case?

On p. 5 we encounter for the first time the curious variant of Hallévi for Halévy, which, as Dillmann (*l. c.*) notes, is a frequent feature. On the same footing with this I would place a number of rather uncouth names and words which do not seem to be either necessary or expedient: 'J. Hyrcanus' (p. 7), 'Judas Maccabee' (p. 9), 'the Book of Enoch was made' (=translated: p. 22), 'Apocalyptic' as a substantive (p. 27), 'schema' (p. 28).

On p. 47 is a very odd note, which runs thus: '*Epistle to the Hebrews*. This Epistle was probably written by Barnabas. As we have seen above (p. 38) this writer cites Enoch as Scripture in the Epistle which goes by his name.' It would be cruel to suppose that Mr. Charles thinks that one and the same man could possibly have written both the Epistles alluded to: but I really cannot make anything else of the note. Πολλὰ πταίμεν ἅπαντες 'we are all of us weak at times,' and if I cite some more slips it is because I hope that Mr. Charles will correct them in a future edition, which his book certainly deserves to reach. In dealing with the ancient

testimonies and fragments he has made some omissions. I cannot find anywhere in his book a full reprint of Jude 15, a passage to which, of course, he repeatedly alludes. It is unfortunate, also, that he did not know of the Latin version of the same passage which Zahn (*NTlichen Kanon*, ii. 2, 798) quotes from the *Anonymus contra Novatianum* 16.¹ The testimony of Priscillian (*De fide et apocryphis*: ed. Schepss, p. 44) should have been cited; and there is no allusion in the Introduction to a possible influence of Enoch upon Hermas.

The Greek fragment lxxxix. 42—49 is here simply said to have been 'published by Mai from a Vatican MS. and deciphered by Gildemeister.' We ought, I think, to have been told what the MS. was, what it contained, and why a Greek MS. required to be 'deciphered.' The fact is that the fragment is written in tachygraphic characters. In a note on p. 238 we hear of the 'glosser of the Greek fragment': but we are not told what his glosses consist of.

I have more serious complaints of the treatment of the Gizeh fragment: I cannot agree with Mr. Charles (Pref. p. viii.) that his edition of it is altogether 'free from the serious blemishes of M. Bouriant's edition.' No doubt the words and clauses omitted by the first editor appear here: but on the other hand it seems to me quite impracticable to gather from Mr. Charles's text and *apparatus criticus* exactly what the text of the MS. is. This is a grave fault. Moreover, in c. xx.—xxi. 9, we are suddenly confronted with a double Greek text, of the existence of which no explanation is to be found. Those who have examined the facsimile of the Gizeh MS. will have discovered (probably with considerable difficulty) that the MS. begins with the text of xx.—xxi. 9, and then, in the middle of a line, goes back to i. 1, and that the second text of xx.—xxi. 9, recurs in its proper place. But Mr. Charles ought to have stated this quite clearly in his book.

With reference to the Latin fragment which I was so fortunate as to find in a British Museum MS., I have two corrections to make: first, the press mark of the volume is 5. E. xiii. not S. E. xiii.; for this my own handwriting may probably be to blame; next, I hope and believe that I did not say that the fragment 'follows a peni-

tential edict of S. Boniface and is preceded by' another document.

I have now to note some omissions in the survey of the more modern literature about the *Book of Enoch*, which seem to me unfortunate. Grabe's edition of the Syncellus-fragments (*Spicil. Sacr.* i. 344 sqq.), Fabricius's reprint and additional remarks (*Cod. Pseud. V. T.* i. 160), De Sacy's translation of a few chapters of the Ethiopic, Gröner's Latin version of Laurence's translation in the *Prophetæ Pseudepigraphi*, and the curious *Enoch restitutus* of Murray, should, I think, all have been mentioned, but in particular the first three: De Sacy's extracts I believe preceded Laurence's translation. Probably the first appearance of the Syncellus-fragments in English was in an appendix to a translation of the Letter of Aristæas. I will transcribe the title-page. 'The History of the Angels and their Gallantry with the Daughters of Men. Written by Enoch the Patriarch. Publish'd in Greek by Dr. Grabe. Made English by Mr. Lewis of Corpus Christi College in Oxford. London: printed for J. Hooke and T. Caldecott, against St Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet. MDCCXV.'

The references to Enoch in Rabbinic Literature (mentioned on p. 38) ought also to have been quoted: English readers would have been grateful for a full treatment of them.

I have some fault to find with the arrangement of the book. The critical and the exegetical notes are separated: but it seems to me that not unfrequently matter appears in the former which is more appropriate to the latter. The relegation of the Gizeh text to an appendix has been already explained: there can be no doubt that it is productive of considerable inconvenience to the reader. The system of special introductions to the various sections of the book is theoretically good, but here again I find in practice that it is difficult to tell whether particular points will be found treated in the general or in the special introductions.

With Mr. Charles's views of the relation of *Enoch* to other canonical or apocryphal books one must agree to a large extent, though many of the individual passages which he adduces I for one should strike out. That is natural. But with his 'Essay on the Meaning of the Term "the Son of Man"' (appendix B, p. 312) I have this quarrel, that I cannot understand it. After having read it I must confess that I doubted, and still doubt, whether the writer

¹ I should here like to note that both in this fragment and in the longer Latin fragment recently found by me in the British Museum *nuntius* is used as an equivalent of ἄγγελος.

had an absolutely clear conception before him of what he wished to say. The subject is of course a very difficult and thorny one : but it cannot be impossible to treat it simply and clearly. Such an expression as this, 'to subsume the complete connotation' of a name, is really not necessary : one would welcome even a dozen lines of English paraphrase as a substitute.

I have said frankly what I think of Mr. Charles's work. The faults are all of them such as can easily be eliminated in a future edition of the book. To that edition we shall look forward eagerly. In the meantime we can heartily thank Mr. Charles

for what he has given us. The work has been extremely difficult, and in the main it has been very well done.

It is good news that Mr. Morfill's translation of the Slavonic *Enoch*, and Mr. Charles's introduction and notes thereto are likely to appear in a few months' time. The sooner the better. There is a very wide field of apocryphal and legendary literature now in process of being opened up in Slavonic : and it is very pleasant to see that English scholars are entering upon the exploration of it.

M. R. JAMES.

THIELE ON HERMAGORAS.

Hermagoras : ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik, von GEORG THIELE. Strassburg : K. J. Trübner. 1893. 8vo. pp. 202. Price 6 Mk.

THE brief and scanty notices of Hermagoras given by Cicero, Quintilian, and later writers on rhetoric suffice to show that he held a position of considerable importance in the development of the subject, but leave many points in need of further elucidation. One of the earliest efforts of a scholar who did much useful work in his time, Dr. K. W. Piderit, was a 'programm' *De Hermagora rhetore* (1839) ; and since that date more than one meritorious attempt has been made to discuss his system and the nature of his influence. But even Volkman's valuable treatise left much to be desired, especially from the historical point of view ; for he made no serious endeavour to place him in his true relation to his predecessors and his successors. Dr. Thiele has therefore done good service to a study, which, whatever we may think of its intrinsic value, has an important place in the history of human thought, by taking up the question afresh, and submitting it to a very careful re-examination. He has done so in one of the daintiest little volumes which have ever come from the press, an almost startling contrast in its thick smooth paper and exquisite type, Greek Roman and Italic alike, to the eye-ruining abominations which used to be considered good enough for German disquisitions on the classics. Neither the Clarendon nor the Pitt Press has ever

turned out more artistic work than that which the University Press at Bonn has done for Mr. Trübner. It is something of a shock to find this 'lepidus novus libellus' not containing a translation of Catullus, or a revised text of Horace, but an elaborate discussion of the precise significance of some of the technicalities of an obsolete and artificial system of rhetoric. But the work was worth doing, and it has been done very well.

Dr Thiele begins by collecting the *testimonia* and fragments of Hermagoras, from which it comes out clearly that his influence, great as it was for a time, by degrees waned and became finally extinct. In Cicero's time the system of Hermagoras was still an object of lively discussion : but Quintilian has very vague notions about it ; and the Byzantine scholiasts give only a few traditional catch-words, though Augustine gives some valuable information as to his system. The necessity of a careful determination of his date is evident from the very unsatisfactory and largely erroneous article upon him in Sir W. Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*. It seems to be clearly made out that Hermagoras of Temnos flourished not less than 150 years B.C., and it is probable that he was to some extent indebted to the school of Stoic rhetoricians at Pergamum, on whose activity so much light has been thrown by recent researches. But Dr. Thiele argues with considerable force that the extent of this debt has been exaggerated, and that it was only some portions of the Stoic terminology which had become current coin, and