

tional equivalent or rendering, on the one hand, and the function of the tautological infinitive, on the other. The translational issue often seems to drive the discussion, as when K. says that lack of consistent rendering signals lack of understanding of its function (pp. 8-17), or that “[t]he infinitive absolute sometimes functions very similarly to the imperative form as a directive, as the English translation of [Exo 20:8] shows” (p. 81; emphasis added). Either this should be a secondary consideration (at best), or K. needs to explain how variety in rendering the infinitive absolute differs from variety in rendering other aspects of the language (e.g., morphology, syntax, lexicon).

This work should indeed “stimulate more research into the other uses of the infinitive,” as its author hopes (p. 134), and it would be a good methodological starting point for the study of any aspect of morphosyntax. K. is to be commended, in hope that we will hear further from him.

*Frederic Clarke Putnam, Philadelphia Biblical University, Langhorne, PA 19047*

MICHAËL LANGLOIS, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân* (LD; Paris: Cerf, 2008). Pp. 605. Paper €44.

Thirteen Aramaic manuscripts dealing with the OT figure of Enoch were found in the caves of Qumran. Of these, seven belong to the text variously referred to as the *Book of Enoch*, *1 Enoch*, or the Ethiopic *Book of Enoch* (4Q201-2, 204-7, 212); two belong to the *Book of Giants* (4Q203, 206a); and four more to the *Astronomical Book of Enoch* (4Q208-9, 210-11), which corresponds roughly to the *Book of Luminaries* found in the third part of *1 Enoch* (72-82). Józef T. Milik, with the collaboration of Matthew Black, published most of these manuscripts in a monumental edition (*The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1976]). The present publication is devoted to a single one of these manuscripts, 4Q201, which consists of twenty-three fragments, sixteen of which were previously published by Milik and seven by Loren Stuckenbruck (in S. J. Pfann, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts. Miscellanea, Part 1* [ed. P. S. Alexander et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000]). While the fragments published by Milik provide portions of the text preserved between *1 Enoch* 1:1 and 12:6, Stuckenbruck's fragments do not seem to correspond to any of the known recensions of *1 Enoch*.

Submitted as a doctoral dissertation in 2007 at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* in Paris, Langlois' study, carried out under the direction of André Lemaire, is essentially a new paleographical and philological examination of the fragments of 4Q201 (also designated as 4QEn<sup>a</sup> ar). The first part of the book offers a clear and well-documented overview of the figure of Enoch in the Hebrew Bible, in Jewish writings, and in early Christian literature. This survey is followed by an inventory of the entirety of the Enoch fragments discovered at Qumran. This introductory part closes with a presentation of the methodology adopted for the study of the fragments. The first step consisted of a strictly paleographical analysis of the fragments, using the available photographic documentation obtained from the (then) *Paléstinien Archaeological Museum (PAM)* or, in certain more problematic cases,

by performing an autopsy on the original manuscript. The photographs were digitized and electronically processed in order to enhance contrast and legibility. The second step consisted of the identification of the fragments, that is, situating them in *1 Enoch*, by means of comparison of the extant—Ethiopic, Greek, and, to a lesser extent, Syriac—versions of the work. The third and final step involved the detailed analysis of the fragments, line by line, word by word, and even letter by letter. For each fragment considered, a new transcription and a fresh translation were proposed.

The main part of the book is devoted to the application of this methodology to the twenty-nine fragments of 4Q201 (1a-b, c i-ii, d-f, t, g-u, 2-8) that L. has identified or isolated. Before introducing the first fragment, L. gives a short account of the paleography of each of the letters of the Hebrew/Aramaic alphabet as they appear in 4Q201. Throughout the book, the paleographical analysis of the fragments is conducted in a very detailed and minute way, with the help of the photographs, or parts of photographs, often enlarged. The fact that the photographic documentation is given directly in the text, rather than on separate plates at the end, helps the reader follow the discussion. For the identification and analysis, L. has recourse to all the comparative material available, including the Ethiopic and Greek versions of *1 Enoch* and the relevant biblical and Qumran data. All these parallels are presented both in the original language and in translation. The parallels from the Ethiopic version of *1 Enoch* are given in the Ge'ez syllabary and in transliteration, a welcome addition for anyone wanting quickly to compare the Ethiopic version of *1 Enoch* and its Aramaic counterpart.

The sections devoted to the individual fragments are followed by a presentation of the main characteristics of the Aramaic of 4Q201—phonological, lexicographical, morpho-syntactical. On the basis of this linguistic analysis, L. dates the text preserved on the manuscript to the third century B.C.E. A final chapter proposes a synopsis of 4Q201 and the versions of *1 Enoch* (1:1–9:9), along with a short characterization of the Greek, Ethiopic, and Syriac witnesses of *1 Enoch* in the light of Qumran fragments. It appears, from the stemma of p. 486, that L. agrees with the consensus that the *Book of Enoch*, originally composed in Aramaic, was translated into Greek; before the Greek translation was lost, it gave rise to a number of intermediaries, which eventually gave birth to the versions that have come down to us. Following the selected bibliography, the interested reader will find a concordance of the Aramaic, Greek, Ethiopic, and Syriac versions.

The importance of L.'s book for *Enoch* studies cannot be overstated. It is the first exhaustive paleographical study of the most important Qumran manuscript of *1 Enoch*. Considering the fact that there are more than one hundred differences between the editions of Milik and L., each of L.'s propositions and conjectures must be assessed in the light of available evidence. But the fact that L., for each of the reedited fragments, refers to only the PAM photographs, without cross-referencing either Milik's or Stuckenbruck's editions or the study edition of Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2 vols.; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997, 1998]), does nothing to facilitate the comparison. Nevertheless, this book will stand as a highly significant contribution to the philological study of the *Book of Enoch*.