
The core of this book (pp. 46-226) consists of textual work on 1 En. 6-11. Bhayro briefly introduces the textual material, presents the Ethiopic, Greek, Aramaic and Syriac textual evidence for 1 En. 6-11, offers a translation with notes on the textual evidence, and concludes with a textual analysis. The framework around this core consists of literary and historical analyses of the narrative of 1 En. 6-11. The two parts do not interrelate closely, and I will discuss these two parts separately, focusing on the textual work.

None of the existing text editions of 1 Enoch is entirely satisfactory. Milik's edition of the Aramaic Enoch fragments is maximalistic, reconstructing large portions of the text, even where only a few letters and traces are actually preserved. Knibb's edition of the Geez text is based on an Eth. II manuscript, did not yet assess the importance of the Tana 9 ms, and could not incorporate the readings of a series of EMML mss, including the very old EMML 2080. We still do not have a critical text of the Geez. Also, no edition presents all the different data synoptically. For 1 En. 6-11, Bhayro arranges, for the first time, all the materials synoptically, takes a more cautious view on the Aramaic evidence, and presents some Geez manuscripts that were not included by Knibb. All this seems very helpful, but one must give some comments. First, the presentation and analysis of the Qumran Aramaic evidence is hopelessly inadequate and useless, since Bhayro not only dismisses most of Milik's reconstructions, but also tens and tens of perfectly legible letters by not transcribing them at all. For example, in 4Q201 1 iv 5-6 Milik's diplomatic transcription gives the following remnants of 1 En. 8:4 לאבל מקד מן [נ רבא מקד מן]. The dots and circlets on some letters indicate they are uncertain to different degrees, and Milik's מקד should actually be מקד. Of all this textual evidence only ארבא מקד מן remains in Bhayro's synopsis. Sometimes, he gives other reconstructions than Milik, e.g. on p. 178 representing the reading of 1 En. 9:1 in 4QEn', Bhayro reads מקד מן קדוש where Milik reconstructed מקדוש מן קדוש. However, on p. 224, he represents the Aramaic evidence as מקדוש without stating that this is largely reconstructed. In short, Bhayro's presentation of the Aramaic is eclectic and inconsistent, and therefore not reliable. The Geez is an entirely different matter. B. presents the readings of seven hitherto unpublished mss, aiming “to add to the body of evidence” (47). This is undoubtedly useful, but how does it add to our overall understanding of the Ethiopic text? First, Bhayro does not relate the mss to the commonly held distinction between Eth I and II mss. It is unfortunate that, like Knibb, he again takes an Eth II mss as his basetext. Though it is acknowledged that the Eth II revision sometimes has better readings than the Eth I mss, the latter are generally
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older, and more often agree with the Greek. Second, we are still far from a critical
text of the Ethiopic Enoch, but at the least we would wish to classify the Eth
I manuscripts. I get, for example, the impression that the EMML 1768 often
sides with Abb 55. Whether or not that impression is correct, an analysis and
classification would have been preferable above this mere listing of readings.
Three, it is time to shed clarity on the dating of EMML 2080. Either it is really
12th-13th c., and then by far the oldest ms we have, or it is 15th, and still one of
the oldest. One needs also to get clarity on the relation of both Tana 9 and
EMML 2080 to the Eth I mss. Fourth, the collation of readings is far from com-
plete or correct. A random comparison of Bhayro’s notes on EMML 1768 and
2080 with the prints of the ms shows a series of (non-orthographic) differences
which he does not include. E.g. in 6:6 EMML 1768 omits the first la-debra, in
6:8 it reads wa-bāʾd instead of wa-bāʾdān; in 10:11 meslēhoma instead of meslēhā;
in 10:14 the ms does not read taafsāmēr, with t for τ; in 10:15 it reads nafēsta
instead of nafāsta; for EMML 2080 I only checked 6:8, where he omits the figure
“10” before ziʾahomu. Bhayro’s Greek text is virtually identical with Black’s
one, including Black’s emendations and mistakes (e.g. 10:18 φυτευθήσεται for
καταφυτευθήσεται), and with only very rarely a different reading (e.g. 8:3 σεληναγωγί for Black’s σεληναγωγίας; 10:14 ὅταν for Black’s ὃς ἄν). Like most
scholars of 1 Enoch, he is not aware that G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, Greek
Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period, A.D. 300-800, discuss the date of the
Panopolitanus Codex. For Syncellus, Bhayro uses Black, instead of Mossham-
mer’s critical edition.

The translation and notes discuss the textual evidence. To some extent the
above mentioned problems influence this part. The base text of the Eth II group
of mss is generally called “the Ethiopic,” and only rarely B. looks at the other
Ethiopic evidence. For example on p. 126 it would have been useful to refer to
the Tana 9 ms. The notes generally offer a straightforward discussion of his tex-
tual evidence, but in some cases his own suggestions are more problematic than
those which he attacks. For example, in 10:17 Greek and Ethiopic have “and
they shall complete their sabbaths,” but 4Q202 ⴳ｡杄 _$ \text{ necessário}[^1] \text{, “and your old age,”}
confirming the old suggestion that the translator misread the Aramaic. B. thinks
“sabbaths” makes more sense, and therefore reads ⴳ｡杄 _$ \text{ necessário}[^1] \text{, “and your sabbaths,”}
which “is equally possible and is confirmed by the subsequent translations.”
However, he does not explain why Sabbath is written with a waw. In the next
verse, he reads ⴳ｡杄 _$ against Milik’s ⴳ｡杄 . Only the heads of the first letters
remain, but that does not mean that all readings are “equally possible.” Every
scholar with palaeographical experience will see that ⴳ｡杄 does not go. Also,
normally “upon it,” would be ⴳ｡杄 , not ⴳ｡杄 . The one case which B. finds, in
Mur 25 1 3 is very damaged and in an uncertain context, and Yardeni in her
Textbook of Documentary Texts only reads the he.