

65, n. 128: the wrong clause from Daniel 7:9 is transcribed; it does not match the translation provided.

John C. Reeves  
Winthrop University  
Rock Hill, S.C.

James H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Vol. 1: *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994. xxiii, 185 pp.

The work under review is the first volume in a series designed to be “the first comprehensive edition of texts, translations, and introductions to all the Dead Sea Scrolls that are not copies of the [biblical] books” (p. xi). Accordingly, we are dealing with a massive project, especially since every fragment, no matter how small in size, is to be included in the series. Project director James H. Charlesworth has assembled a fine and wide array of scholars (the list of contributors to the entire project includes forty-five names) to assist him in this undertaking.

Ten volumes are planned, as follows: (1) *Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (i.e., the present volume); (2) *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*; (3) *Damascus Document Fragments, More Precepts of the Torah, and Related Documents*; (4) *Angelic Liturgy, Prayers, and Psalms*; (5) *Thanksgiving Hymns and Related Documents*; (6) *Targum on Job, Pesharim, and Related Documents*; (7) *Temple Scroll and Related Documents*; (8) *Genesis Apocryphon, New Jerusalem, and Related Documents*; (9) *Copper Scroll, Greek Fragments, and Miscellanea*; and (10) *Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. The division of the texts into these volumes seems generally sound, but one must question why the Cairo Geniza text of the Damascus Document (along with two fragments 5Q12 and 6Q15) will appear in volume 2, while the nine Damascus Document fragments from Cave 4 will appear in volume 3 (this explicit information is supplied on p. 184 in a list of all the texts to be presented in the series).

The main intent of the project is “to present an improved critical text—with an *apparatus criticus* where appropriate and possible—to all the non-biblical documents found in the eleven Qumran caves” (p. xiii). The translations

are secondary, then. They are “dependent on the text” and serve as “an aid to comprehending it” (ibid.). But since so many individuals are working on the texts and translations, various ground rules had to be laid to ensure consistency in this regard. Accordingly, Charlesworth presents a “Consistency Chart” to indicate how various technical terms are rendered throughout the series. For example, היחוד = “the Community”; מבקר = “Examiner”; מורה הצדק = “Righteous Teacher”; משכיל = “Master”; and so on.

The texts treated in this opening volume of the series, and their editors and translators, are as follows: 1QS (E. Qimron and Charlesworth); 1QSa and 1QSB (Charlesworth and L. T. Stuckenbruck); 4Q159 (= 4QOrda), 4Q513 (= 4QOrdb), and 5Q13 (L. H. Schiffman); and 4Q514 (= 4QOrdC) (J. Milgrom).

Each text receives an introduction of several pages (except for the very small texts, whose introductions may be only a page or so in length) treating such issues as the contents of the document, the extant texts, the language, the date, the theology of the document, relation to other writings, and a selected bibliography. Then on facing pages appear the text itself and the English translation; below the Hebrew text (or the Aramaic or Greek in future volumes) is the critical apparatus, and below the translation are notes to the translation justifying the rendering or offering alternative renderings.

The critical apparatus differs depending on the text. In a case such as 1QS, with ten fragments from Cave 4 as a guide, the apparatus offers all the variants from these fragments. In a case such as 1QSa, our only witness to this document, the apparatus presents other suggestions; for example, at 1QSa 1:5 the main text reads ישנו 1 (translated as “they err”), and a note states “Licht: ישנו” (though no additional information is presented, nor is a work by J. Licht listed in the Selected Bibliography to this scroll).

The notes to the translations are both numerous (e.g., there are 307 of them to 1QS) and unusually rich (e.g., there are references to other Qumran texts, biblical texts, bibliographic citations, and so on). Most of the popular one-volume compendiums of the Dead Sea Scrolls in translation do not provide such information, so the reader cannot always determine how a translator arrived at a particular rendering. Not so in this volume, where the notes guide the user through the English translation. So while the final product is not a commentary, it is more than a mere translation. And though the main purpose of this work is to present a critical edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, many users of the series will refer to the translations provided, especially since so much care has gone into them.

It is in that spirit that I offer here extended discussions of the translations

of two Qumran passages. The first is 1QS, 7:15 which has elicited much discussion over the years. About a dozen different interpretations have been given to the word לִשׁוּחַ. Qimron and Charlesworth translate it as “to recline” and the whole passage as “Whoever stretches out his left hand in order to recline on it shall be punished (for) ten days” (p. 33). Oddly, there is no note on the rendering “to recline,” though on “left hand” the authors state, “‘Left hand’ is apparently chosen to distinguish from the euphemistic use of *yd* in line 13” (p. 33, n. 188). Indeed two lines earlier יד is used for “penis,” and Qimron and Charlesworth justify this meaning with a very long note. But given the diverse attempts by scholars throughout the years to understand לִשׁוּחַ, it is striking that no comment is added to their rendering “to recline.” My own approach is to translate this crucial word as “to defecate,” based on biblical usage and an Arabic cognate, and thus to explain the “left hand” which in various rabbinic texts (and indeed in many cultures worldwide) is the preferred hand for defecation.<sup>1</sup> But whether my approach is accepted or not, Qimron and Charlesworth should have included a note at this point.

More crucial for our understanding of the Qumran sect is 1QS 9:12–21, delineating the duties of the Master. The word הַעֲתָ appears three times in this section. Qimron and Charlesworth elect to render it as “the Endtime,” so that the pericope refers to an eschatological era. But others have translated הַעֲתָ simply as “the time,” and this yields an altogether different interpretation. Contrast the following two renderings of 1QS 9:17–18, וְלִהְיוּכִיחַ דַּעַת אִמְתָּ וּמִשְׁפָּט, צִדְקָ לְבִיחָרֵי דֶרֶךְ אִישׁ כְּרוּחוֹ כְּתֻכּוֹן הַעֲתָ לְהַנְחוּתָם בְּדַעָה: “One must argue with true knowledge and righteous judgment (only with) the chosen of the Way, each according to his spirit and according to the norm of the Endtime” (Qimron and Charlesworth, p. 41), with the last two words attached to the next sentence; and “He shall guide them all in knowledge according to the spirit of each and according to the rule of the age,”<sup>2</sup> with the first seven words attached to the previous sentence. Here there is a major difference not only as to where to divide the sentences, but also as to the intent and meaning of the crucial word הַעֲתָ. As stated above, the former rendering points to an eschatological intention. But the latter suggests something very similar to the Pharisaic position that Torah was to be interpreted “according to the rule of the age.” And while there is no doubt, especially after the publication of 4QMMT, that

1. See G. A. Rendsburg, “לִשׁוּחַ in 1QS 7.15,” *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* (1989): 83–94.

2. G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4th ed. (London, 1995), p. 83.

the law at Qumran followed Sadducean practice, this may have been in a practical sense only. But in a theoretical sense, the Qumran sect, which I and most others consider to have been Essene, agreed with the Pharisaic approach (a) that there existed law beyond the written Torah of Moses (for the Pharisees this would be the Mishnah; for the Qumran group, witness texts such as 1QS, CD, and 11QT), and (b) that the law could be interpreted "according to the rule of the age." Again, I understand that Charlesworth's main vision in this series is a critical edition of the texts, and not a translation to replace all other translations. But because so much work has gone into producing the translations, I have taken the time to highlight these two specific passages, the former of little importance, and the latter of great significance.

There can be no doubt that for years to come this series will be the starting point for many scholars researching the Qumran texts. Charlesworth has put us all in his debt for this undertaking, and we wish him and his colleagues all success in bringing the project to completion.

Gary A. Rendsburg  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, N.Y.

Bilhah Nitzan. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 12. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994. xxi, 415 pp.

This revised and translated 1989 dissertation from Tel Aviv University (directed by J. Licht) is a comprehensive form-critical study of the prayers found at Qumran. Bilhah Nitzan's book is divided into three parts: In part I, the development from occasional prayers in the Bible to fixed prayers in rabbinic literature is described. In part II, Nitzan studies the unique prayers of the Qumran sect. In part III the prayers found at Qumran are contrasted with the Hodayot hymns.

In part I Nitzan demonstrates that the Qumran prayers exhibit a transitional stage between the occasional spontaneous prayers found in the Bible and the worship through fixed prayers established by the rabbis. Nitzan describes prayers found in the Bible, Apocrypha, and rabbinic sources in chapter 1. In chapter 2 she shows that the people at Qumran used regular public prayers at fixed times. In chapter 3 she compares 4QDivrei ha-Me'orot (which she calls Tehinnot) with the fixed rabbinic prayers (Shemoneh Esreh) and finds striking parallels between them.