

REVIEWS

THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

Das Buch Henoch. Aethiopischer Text herausgegeben von Dr. JOH. FLEMMING.

Das Buch Henoch. Herausgegeben von Dr. JOH. FLEMMING, Bibliothekar an der Kgl. Universitätsbibliothek zu Bonn, und Dr. L. RADERMACHER.

IN the above two volumes Drs. Flemming and Radermacher have divided amongst them the task of editing the Ethiopic and Greek Versions of the Book of Enoch, and of translating the former version. Such co-operation, if it involves mutual help and mutual criticism, is of the greatest service in the field of scholarship. But, if the element of reciprocity be absent, as in fact it must for the most part be absent when one scholar is a Classic and the other an Orientalist, such division of labour can only tend to lower the quality of both contributions. Indeed Dr. Flemming seems to have confined his attention almost unreservedly to the Ethiopic Version. How otherwise could he have failed to remark so many readings in the great Berlin Ethiopic MS, where that MS stands alone in agreement with the Greek Version? Again, we can hardly be wrong in concluding that Dr. Radermacher is not a Semitic scholar, and yet he has to deal with a text which, in at least a score of passages, is unintelligible to the pure Classic. If we discount these undoubted disadvantages, we must acknowledge that the work of both scholars is excellent in many respects. This judgement, however, is subject to many qualifications in the case of Dr. Flemming.

We shall deal first with the German translation, next with the Greek version, and finally with the Ethiopic. Our criticism here will only deal slightly with these subjects: for a full criticism I must refer the reader to my article in the *American Journal of Theology* for April.

The German translation. The translation is scholarly. In two or more places Flemming has been able to point out errors in the earlier translations (as in lxvii 12, lxxxix 10, &c.). But in a considerable number of passages he has fallen into the errors of his predecessors, and swelled the list by errors of his own. Thus in xlv 3 'jaħarî meġbārîhômû'

cannot be rendered 'wird . . . Auswahl treffen unter ihren Werken,' but only 'will choose their works.' In lviii 6, where he translates 'bis zu einer Grenze der Tage werden sie nicht kommen,' the word 'Grenze' is not a possible equivalent of 'huǎlquǎ.' Again in xiv 25 'ich schlug mein Antlitz zu Boden,' the word 'schlug' is not a possible equivalent of 'ʾēnēṣṣērô' which means simply 'I looked.' In the above cases the text is corrupt and the translator should not attempt to give sense to nonsense. I will now select two other cases where, though the German is a possible rendering of the Ethiopic, it is not the right one as we see from the Greek Version. In viii 1 the phrase 'ʾēbna ʾēmkuǎllû ʾēbēn kēbûra' can be translated 'das allerkostbarste Gestein,' but that is not its meaning here, but 'allerlei kostbare Gesteine'; for the Greek has παντοίους λίθους ἐκλεκτούς. Thus 'ʾēmkuǎllû ʾēbēn' above is a rendering of παντοίους, and not an attempt to render a superlative as linguistically it could. Again in xxi 1 'ôðĕkû' should not be translated 'ich ging umher,' but simply 'ich ging,' as it is a rendering of ἐφώδευσα. Origen has 'ambulavi' here. Despite these and not a few other errors this translation is a very faithful representative of the Ethiopic Version as published by Flemming.

The Greek Version. We have few words of actual censure for Dr. Radermacher's work. It is throughout the work of a scholar, but of a scholar with limitations. His aim in this edition as well as his view of the two preceding English editions is best given in his own words (p. 14): 'Von den beiden Ausgaben, die sich nach Dillmanns Vorarbeiten das grösste Verdienst um die Gestaltung des griechischen Textes erworben haben, hat jede eine durchaus bezeichnende Stellung genommen; Charles hat die äthiopische Uebersetzung in einer meines Erachtens viel zu weit gehenden Weise zur Hilfe gezogen, Swete (*The Psalms of Solomon with the Greek Fragments of the Book of Enoch*, Cambridge, 1899) hat von ihr völlig abgesehen und lieber gelegentlich ziemlichen Unsinn gedruckt. Ich habe einen Mittelweg einzuschlagen gesucht.' This criticism is just.

Amongst Radermacher's emendations we might single out πτήξουσιν for πιστεύουσιν in i 5 and δέσμων for δήλων in x 11. The Greek Fragment in Syncellus, which goes back to an independent version of the original, has in the latter case δήσον. That δήλων was a late corruption is proved by the fact that the MS still testifies to δέσμων or some verb requiring the accusative having been there originally: δηλων . . . τοις λοιποις τοις . . . μγετας (sic). Again Radermacher rightly points out that τρις should be emended into τέσσαρες in xxii 9.

We shall now point out some passages where the editor has been less happy. In vi 8 he emends οἱ τοῖ εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν οἱ δέκα into οἱ τοῖ εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν, οἱ (ἐπὶ) δέκα. But this would mean: 'these are their leaders,

those who are over ten.' But what we require is, 'those who are over tens' or 'dekarchs.' In xiv 8 he retains the impossible *ἀνεμοί . . . ἐξεπέρασάν με* in the sense of 'the winds caused me to fly.' This verb cannot possibly be translated here. It is a corruption for *ἐξεπέρασαν*. Hence we have 'the winds carried me off.' The same corruption in the same connexion is found in one of the LXX MSS in Num. xi 31. Again in v 8 he accepts Dillmann's emendation of *καταληθειαν* into *κατὰ λήθην*. But since his Ethiopic (*barasī'ē*) here = *κατ' ἀσέβειαν*, and in x 20 we have the same word in the Ethiopic corresponding to *ἀσεβείας* in the Greek, it seems conclusive that we should read *κατ' ἀσέβειαν* here¹.

There are many unintelligible passages which Radermacher leaves without remark in the text, such as xv 4, xvii 7, xxv 5. But no attempt towards their emendation could be made save through Semitic. Most of the idiosyncrasies of the Greek to which he calls attention in an admirable appendix could be explained from the Semitic background, though this idea does not seem to have occurred to the editor.

The Ethiopic Text. Dr. Flemming had a great opportunity of giving the world a definitive Ethiopic Text of the Book of Enoch, but he did not avail himself of it. He was the first to make known the readings of three hitherto uncollated MSS of the first class as well as some others of the second. But he has not risen to his opportunities. His failure appears to be due to overhastiness to be first in the field. This overhaste has prevented him from making an accurate study of the MSS, and acquainting himself with the subject-matter of the text he was engaged on. The following remark of Dr. Geffcken (p. liii) in relation to the Sibylline Oracles applies just as strongly to the Book of Enoch: '... die Kritik der Handschriften und die historische Kritik des Sibyllenstoffes zusammenhängen aufs innigste, untrennbar.' But again the problems of the Ethiopic text involve a painstaking study of the Greek Version and of the Semitic original presupposed by both. To this last province of his work Dr. Flemming has given but little attention. At all events he has made no fresh contributions in it.

We shall now proceed to justify some of the above criticisms by a few examples. The true reading is to be found not infrequently in the notes and not in the text. Thus in vii 1, with four of the best MSS (Dr. Flemming mentions only one)² out of five, 'ἔδῶα' (so Greek *τὰς*

¹ Radermacher rightly objects to the emendation *ἀναμάρτητοι* in v 6 in the previous editions of Dillmann, Charles, and Swete, and to Bouriant's false transcription of the text *αμαρτητοι* on which the emendation was based. According to Radermacher the MS reads *αματοι*, which he emends into *ἀμίαντοι*. But the MS does not read *αματοι* but *αμαρτοι*. Though part of the *ρ* is obliterated, it is unmistakable. This reading is corrupt for *ἀμαρτωλοί*.

² The five best MSS are *g m q t u*.

Βοράνας) and not 'ḫdaw.' Flemming thinks that the Ethiopic here cannot be a translation of the Greek. If he consults the Ethiopic Version of Wisdom xvi 12 he will find the same rendering as here. See also Jub. x 12 and the Hebrew Book of Noah in loc. Again in vii 4 the reading of *q* should have been given in the text and not in the notes as it is supported by *G* (=the Greek Version). In x 12 omit "'ēm bef kuëllû rēkuēs' with the four of the five best MSS, and so bring the text into line with *G*. In xiv 1 read 'maṣḥafa' with *q* and *G*. In xiv 8 read 'râ'ēj kamaz' with all the best MSS and *G* instead of 'kamaz râ'ēj.' Next we shall give some passages where the true readings appear neither in the text nor in the notes. In vi 7 we should read zentû for za with four of the five best MSS and *G* (*οἰτρος*). In x 2 we should follow *m* which is supported by *G* against all the rest. In xx 3 the order of words in *mqu* should have been adopted as it has the support of *G*, and in xxv 7 the order of *g* for the same reason.

Throughout the entire book the evidence of the MSS is defectively cited; but these are not the most blameworthy shortcomings of the book. The evidence is not only defective but frequently misleading. Thus on p. 8, note 2, *m* is said to omit 'mahara,' and on p. 13, note 1, to read 'wajëgaber.' In neither case is this so. On the latter page *q* is wrongly cited in note 3, and *m* in note 15. On p. 14, note 3, *gq* are wrongly cited, and *m* in note 15 on the same page. On p. 33, note 2, *m* is wrongly cited: in note 9 *q*, in note 10 *m*, in note 13 *g*, in note 15 *gu*. On p. 64, notes 3, 10 *m* is wrongly cited, in notes 11, 13 *g*. Similar inaccuracies are found on every page of the *Apparatus Criticus*.

Not infrequently Dr. Flemming follows the second class MSS against the first without any valid reason, and sometimes even a few MSS of the second class against all the first class and the majority of the second class. We must, however, concede that in most of these cases the sense is not affected, only the form or the order of the Ethiopic words. That both these matters, however, are important, scholars will readily acknowledge.

This review has grown beyond the intended limits and must now come to a close.

Notwithstanding its very many grave shortcomings Dr. Flemming's text is a meritorious achievement, and the present reviewer hopes to meet his contributions on kindred subjects in the coming years.

R. H. CHARLES.