



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(7.) The selling of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii.).—This chapter is one of the best to illustrate the success of the analytical process, and is very carefully done in all three books. The argument seems to reach demonstration here.

In Exodus and the following books we part company with F. and B., though for the story of the plagues we have B.'s excellent monograph in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1890). And we must express our regret that A. does not seem to have seen this, and only echoes the verdict of most critics that the two sources are so fused as to be indistinguishable. On the contrary, when the right clues are followed, they fall apart with startling clearness, and leave two narratives marked respectively by abundant features of individuality.

And so throughout the rest of the Hexateuch we do not find Mr. Addis venturing upon any new suggestion for fresh analysis; in deed he rather shrinks from a decision where the great German and Dutch critics are at variance amongst themselves. Usually, however, the materials for a judgment are briefly given in a note. In Joshua he is as modest in his conclusions as elsewhere, but he has made good use of previous work, finding the essay of Albers (*Quellen-bericht in Jos.* i.-xii., 1890) particularly serviceable. As regards the difficult problem of the Sinaitic legislation, it may be interesting to note that this latest enquirer is a fresh upholder of Kuenen's view that the "Book of the Covenant" originally occupied the place of Deuteronomy, and was only put back to its present position to make way for the intruded Deuteronomic legislation.

G. HARFORD-BATTERSBY.

### The Recent Translations and the Ethiopic Text of the Book of Enoch.

#### I.

THE recent translations which we propose to review briefly here are to be found in Dillmann's *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt*, 1853; Schodde's *The Book of Enoch translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes*, 1882; and Goldschmidt's *Das Buch Henoch aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich hebräische Abfassungssprache zurückübersetzt; mit einer Einleitung und Noten versehen*, 1892.

These translations are all professedly founded on the Ethiopic text of Enoch, published by Dillmann in 1851. To the criticism of this text we hope to address ourselves in the next number of the QUARTERLY.

In the present review we must limit our consideration to the

translations, and ignore as far as possible the introductions and notes which accompany them.

The first of these translations, *i.e.*, that of Professor Dillmann, is a masterly piece of interpretation, such as might reasonably be expected from the foremost Ethiopic scholar of the age. As a matter of course it at once superseded the translations of Lawrence and Hoffmann, corrected their many ungrammatical renderings, and furnished an exact and trustworthy translation of the Ethiopic text which he had edited two years previously, based on five MSS. This translation, however, is by no means free from blemishes and imperfections—a fact which no one would be more ready to acknowledge than Dillmann himself; for it is manifest from his Ethiopic *Lexicon*, published twelve years later, that he has revised and corrected his German translation in many places. Compare, for instance, his translation of Enoch viii. 1 with his *Lexicon*, Col. 823; of Enoch xxxvii. 2, 5, with his *Lexicon*, Col. 637; of xxxviii. 2 with his *Lexicon*, Col. 351, etc. In xcix. 5 the sense is altered materially. Instead of “wird die Frucht des Mutterleibes abgehen,” we should, as Dillmann (*Lex.*, Col. 1286, 1332) points out, translate, “those who are destitute will go forth.” Again, in xli. 5, he returns (*Lex.*, Col. 528) to the translation of Lawrence and Hoffmann, which he had condemned in his Commentary (p. 150) as unmeaning and impossible; and in lx. 6 he goes back (*Lex.*, Col. 156) to the rendering of his two predecessors, which he criticises in his commentary (page 188) as improbable.

This does not exhaust, however, the list of passages which call for correction in Dillmann's translation. Of these we will give the two most remarkable. The second, in cvi. 13, is clearly an oversight. He there renders *wadâ<sup>h</sup>kû warekû*, “ich weiss und habe gesehen,” as if the first word were *jadâakû* (= ידעתי). But this latter form is not found, and, moreover, the text as it stands presents us with a familiar Ethiopic idiom = “I have already seen.” The other, in lxxxix. 7, is a more serious mistake. He renders *negata medr araja*, “die Quellen der Erde versiegten.” We have here a twofold mistranslation: *negata* is confounded with *ang<sup>a</sup>ta*, and a meaning has been forced on *araja* which it cannot bear. We should translate, “the chasms of the earth were levelled up,” *i.e.*, filled or closed.

It is thus clear that this translation is by no means a faultless one; yet, despite every defect, it will maintain a unique position in the Enoch literature, and likewise serve as a guide to future translators.

The next translation with which we have to deal is that of Dr. Schodde. It does not lie within our province to review here the very

helpful bibliography and useful introduction and notes which accompany this translation. To the latter only we must direct our attention.

The result of a thorough examination of Dr. Schodde's version is, we fear, far from satisfactory. This translation is made professedly from Dillmann's Ethiopic text, but, as a matter of fact, such is not always the case; for the translator has but too often put aside the Ethiopic version, and turned to the more easy (though more perilous) task of rendering Dillmann's German into English. This is clear and undeniable, from the fact that Schodde is guilty of certain mistakes which are explicable only as renderings of Dillmann's German translation, and that, further, he has repeated nearly all the slips and inaccuracies in that translation, even those which were afterwards corrected in his Ethiopic lexicon. To the slips and inaccuracies of Dillmann, Schodde has added a goodly list of his own. In xxxvi. 3 we have "every evening," instead of "towards the west," the former being no doubt due to Dillmann's "gegen abend," which might loosely be translated either way. In lii. 8 we have "zinc will not be beaten out," instead of "zinc will not be esteemed." As the Ethiopic verb has not the remotest connection with the meaning here assigned by Schodde, the explanation will be found in his misreading Dillmann's "Zinn wird nicht *angeschlagen* werden" as "*ausgeschlagen* werden."

In lxxxvi. 10, "After these northerly winds from the seventh portal," instead of, "After these the north winds : from the seventh portal," etc.

But the most extraordinary misconception of all is to be found in lxii. 4, where we read "when the son enters the mouth of the mother," instead of "when the child enters the mouth of the womb." Here again Dillmann's "Wann sein Sohn in den Muttermund tritt," explains this curious instance of blameworthy carelessness.

In the face of such a list as the above—and it is far from exhaustive—it is hard to congratulate Dr. Schodde, for he has been most reprehensibly careless and inexact; and yet as students of Apocryphal literature we are grateful to him for re-introducing the knowledge of Enoch to the English speaking world.

The third translation—that of Goldschmidt—is really an attempt to reproduce Enoch in Hebrew, the language in which it was originally written.

This retranslation is the work of a very young scholar, and being so, it is a praiseworthy performance, and full of promise as to his future. But though we must regard this young writer, who is barely more than twenty-one, as worthy of all encouragement, we

must deal with his work on its own merits, and assign it its position accordingly.

A translator of the Book of Enoch into Hebrew may have one of two aims: either he seeks to produce a readable and intelligible version of the book for Jewish readers mainly, or else he may aim at a scientific reconstruction of the original Hebrew text—an achievement which, if at all adequately realised, would prove an invaluable gift to students of Apocalyptic literature. In the former case minute accuracy and extensive knowledge of this class of literature are not absolutely necessary; in the latter both of these are absolutely indispensable. The latter, therefore, demands a breadth of knowledge, a largeness of experience, and a fineness of linguistic perception which we cannot expect to find in so young a scholar as our author, be he never so brilliant and able.

Herr Goldschmidt's book belongs in the main to the former class; and, judged from the standpoint of that class, it is a commendable and interesting work. It is possible, indeed, that this writer was ambitious of having his work ranked in the latter class, as one would naturally conclude from the learned character of many of his notes. Now, though it is hardly fair so to classify this book, we shall proceed to deal with it as a work of severe and exact scholarship.

We might remark at the outset that Goldschmidt has occasionally had recourse to later Hebrew where perfectly adequate expression was possible in Biblical Hebrew.

Goldschmidt's retranslation is professedly from the Ethiopic text of Dillmann, yet, like Schodde, he translates at times directly from the German. Thus he falls into the same mistake as Schodde, in xxxvi. 3 (see above). He reproduces Dillmann's inaccuracies in xxxvii. 2; xxxviii. 2; lxxxix. 7; xcix. 5; cvi. 13; though three of them are corrected in Dillmann's *Lexicon*. In xli. 5, he adduces Dillmann's authority for translating *beúl* by קבויע; but, as we have shown above, Dillmann has abandoned this rendering of the word in his *Lexicon*. Still more strangely, in lx. 6 he justifies, against Lawrence and Hoffmann, his translation of *Mahalá* by an appeal to Dillmann's *Commentary and Lexicon*. The *Commentary*, indeed, supports him, but the *Lexicon* sets aside the view advocated in the *Commentary*.

Let us now turn to another class of inaccuracies, for which this writer is solely responsible. In xxxii. 2, *báhra értra* cannot be rendered by הנחל שיכור, but by ים־סוף; *értra* is only a transliteration of *ἐρυθρά*; in xxx. 1, *quólátá* should be rendered by נאיות and not נהרות; in xxviii. 3, ירדו should be יעלו, the opposite; in xxvi. 1, תציינה should be תשב, as a rendering of *jenaber*; in xxii. 12, ראו

should be הראו ; in xviii. 2, עפודי should be רקיע, as a rendering of *tsena*=σπερώμα ; in x. 18 תמלא should be תעבד (*tetgabar*) "wird bebaut werden" ; in x. 13, it is most misleading to render the place of the fallen watchers' imprisonment שאול.

In verses xv. 11—xvi. 1, the Hebrew is not a rendering of the Ethiopic text. This text is, it is true, corrupt, but that is not enough to justify the addition of some words, and the change of others into exactly the opposite meaning, unless we are duly notified of such additions and changes.

Again we have noticed among others the omission of the following phrases "all the children of men" (x. 7), "will make war" (xv. 11), "on which they shall be judged" (xix. 1), "to the end of it" (xxvi. 2), "which he saw" (xxxvii. 1).

Again in xiv. 5 ; xvii. 3 ; xxvi. 4, 5 ; xxxiv. 3, there are needless transpositions of words and clauses. We have remarked many errata ; one appears even on the illuminated title page in the Ethiopic.

Finally, conjecture is introduced in xvii. 7 without any attempted justification in the notes. The Ethiopic gives "the mountains of the darkness (or dark clouds) of winter," which this translator gratuitously changes into מפלשי עבי, from Job xxxvii. 16.

The Ethiopic no doubt is corrupt, but this change is not one for the better.

Our author tries to emend the well-known passage in xc. 38. He thinks the text originally stood והראשון בהם היה טלה ויהי הטלה יהיה להווא לחיה גדולה, but that טלה got corrupted into טלה ; but Goldschmidt has failed to see that only in the preceding verse the Messiah is symbolised by a white bull, and could hardly, therefore, be spoken of in this verse as a lamb.

On the other hand he very rightly regards the words "the Son of the woman," lxii. 5, as a late corruption.

Though the above errors—and the list is far from complete—would constitute an unanswerable indictment against this Hebrew retranslation if regarded as a scientific reproduction of the text, they do not seriously affect its value if it claims to be merely the book of Enoch in a Hebrew dress for Jewish and other readers, who, like the present reviewer, are interested in this literature, and therefore welcome the appearance of Herr Goldschmidt's work. But the scientific reconstruction of the Hebrew text is still a desideratum. Hence we look forward with growing interest to the long-promised work of M. Halévi.