the story overall, not just at specific points. An interesting follow-up study to Hicks-Keeton’s work would be to ask whether, in the Christian context of all the known transmission of the story, the title ‘living God’ is as significant as Hicks-Keeton argues for at its earliest point. My suspicion is that it is not.

JONATHON WRIGHT
BENEFICE OF SWANSEA ST PETER,
COCKETT, UK


These two volumes both treat texts that we would tend to classify as legal; for example, in his English translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Geza Vermes placed them in his ‘Rules’ section, and stated that ‘The Community Rule legislates for a group of ascetics living in a kind of “monastic” society, the statutes of the Damascus Document for an ordinary lay existence’ (G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [Penguin, London, 1997], p. 26). While such a distinction is open to question, one thing is clear: the two sets of texts bear more than a passing resemblance to each other, especially in their respective Penal Codes sections. In her discussion of the relationship between the Community Rules and the Damascus Document, Charlotte Hempel recalls her earlier identification of a ‘widespread “textual intimacy” between both works’, with significant literary and structural similarities (p. 52).

As Steven Fraade’s scholarship has ably demonstrated, both in respect of the Damascus Document and in a broader sense, ‘Ancient Jewish law (and Jewish law overall) can no longer be viewed as representing a branch of Judaism distinct from its spirituality and eschatology, but rather their dialogical and dialectical complement’ (p. 17). Fraade’s commentary, therefore, brings out what he describes as the ‘deep interconnections between law and eschatology’ for a ‘community whose study and observance of the law … is deeply rooted in and associated with messianic expectations of an imminent eschaton’ (p. 18). Similarly, in her commentary on the Community Rules, Hempel also removes the distinction between the day-to-day study and observance of laws, on the one hand, and more spiritual concerns, on the other, in her discussion of what she describes as an ‘apotropaic safety net’ (e.g. pp. 3–7). With demons representing an imminent personal threat, in terms of both deception and physical attack, ‘the Community Rules present the emerging
community ... as a safe haven’ (p. 6); ‘In an audacious move those behind a number of Rule manuscripts put those apotropaic fears in the service of maintaining communal discipline and boundaries while also offering an explanation for apostasy from within’ (p. 7). In their own way, therefore, both Fraade and Hempel move beyond simply analysing two important legal corpora, and consider those who produced and used the texts in question as real people with real hopes and fears.

Each volume broadly follows the same structure, with a comparatively brief introduction followed by a large section comprising text and commentary (pp. 23–155 in Fraade’s volume, pp. 57–300 in Hempel’s). It appears that, in both volumes, there is no assumption that the reader will know Hebrew (something made explicit by Fraade on p. 20). But this does not mean that the analyses offered are superficial; on the contrary, both authors present detailed treatments of their respective texts.

In Fraade’s volume, the main section treats successive topical units by giving, for each unit, the Hebrew text, an English translation, guidance for further reading, textual notes and a commentary. The division of the text into 54 topical units works well: Introduction and Admonitions according to the Cave Four texts (units 1–3), CD’s Admonitions (4–5), historical reflections in CD (6–9), warnings in CD (10–16), laws in CD (17–37) ending with the Penal Code (38), more from the Penal Code according to the Cave Four texts (39–40), the Cave Four conclusion (41), and finally a selection of legal fragments from Cave Four (42–54). The emphasis appears to be on providing a practical commentary in a small and uncomplicated volume. Thus the Hebrew text is not a critical edition, and variants are noted only when significant for issues of interpretation. Most of the heavy lifting is accomplished in the notes sections, which are very detailed and generous in terms of further references. The final commentary sections are comparatively brief, giving a summary of the topical unit (often with reference to the wider legal and literary context). Fraade’s volume is published in the Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls series, and, as is typical of such series, certain decisions about content and format will have been predetermined. As such, the success of each individual volume will very much depend on the choice of contributor and the qualities each one brings to their assigned volume. For the volume under review, the result is a most pleasing volume that demonstrates clarity, erudition and discernment throughout.

In comparison to Fraade’s volume, Hempel’s is much more complex. There are probably two main reasons for this. First, in being published in a different series, Hempel’s volume was most likely not subject to the same sort of predeterminations in respect of content and format as Fraade’s; and, second, the textual situation we encounter with the Community Rule is more complicated. This distinction between the Damascus Document and
the Community Rule is highlighted by Fraade, who notes: ‘the variations between the CD and the 4QD manuscripts, as well as the variations among the 4QD manuscripts themselves are relatively minor and usually inconsequential for significant textual meaning (when compared, for example to 1QS and 4QS fragments)’ (p. 20). It was almost inevitable, therefore, that Hempel’s commentary was going to be much more complex than Fraade’s.

For each of her 79 topical units, Hempel provides an introduction, an English translation, textual notes and commentary. Unlike Fraade’s commentary, there is no Hebrew text, but Hempel does provide a synoptic English translation that enables the reader ‘to read the texts as they are preserved across the twelve manuscripts of Community Rules with ease’ (p. 54). At first, I was not convinced by Hempel’s use of the phrase ‘with ease’; after all, she uses various means (italics, small caps, single and double underlining etc.) to present the various types of divergencies between the manuscripts – something that initially feels a bit overwhelming. But, with just a little perseverance, Hempel’s choices make sense and really do facilitate access to the textual evidence.

More to the point, it is difficult to imagine a better way of doing this without compromising Hempel’s aims, most importantly ‘to make the fullness of the evidence accessible to a broad readership’ (p. 55). In Hempel’s volume, the heavy lifting is shared across all four elements: the introductions are detailed and fully integrate prior scholarship, including ample discussions of related texts; the synoptic translations are based on a thorough analysis of the manuscripts and are carefully presented; the textual notes show an intimate knowledge of the manuscripts and what the scribes were doing, as well as an appreciation for grammatical intricacies; and the accompanying commentaries display a complete command of the material.

It is gratifying that research into the Dead Sea Scrolls has progressed sufficiently that we are now at the stage where commentaries like the two volumes under review can usefully be produced; this is also demonstrated by the fact that two excellent scholars would devote the necessary time and energy to such an endeavour. In addition to representing the very best in scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls, the volumes under review treat their respective texts with a genuine humanity (ironically, something often missing in the humanities). Both authors bring to the fore the people who would have read and adhered to the text in antiquity, something we should all try to do.

SIAM BHAYRO
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER, UK