COLLINS, JOHN J. and JAMES NATI, *The Rule of the Association and Related Texts. Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024). Pp. xiv + 292. £90.00.

The importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of both the Hebrew Bible and the early Jesus movement can scarcely be overstated. The Scrolls offer unparalleled windows into the formation and reception of the emergent scriptural tradition and the processes through which it took shape in the late Second Temple period. Yet the weight of nearly eighty years' worth of scholarship, a complex and fragmentary manuscript tradition, and dramatically changing paradigms in recent decades can make scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls a daunting field to penetrate. Therein lies the value of the Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls series, which "seeks to provide scholarship at the highest level on the most important non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls that is accessible to non-specialists" (from the Oxford University Press series website). *The Rule of the Association* is the third instalment in the series. As with the preceding volume on the Damascus Document, prepared by Steven Fraade, this commentary takes the best-preserved manuscript as its central focus, in this case 1QS (=1Q28), conventionally known as the *Serekh ha-Yaḥad* or the Community Rule.

According to the preface, the commentary on 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSb was prepared by Collins, with input from Nati, and the commentary on the other fragmentary texts was prepared by Nati, with input from Collins (v). The characteristic clarity and precision of Collins and Nati's writing, their sensible translations, a detailed general introduction, and the thoroughness of their commentary—including comprehensive engagement with scholarship spanning from the first photographic reproductions and transcriptions of 1QS by Trever, Brownlee, and Burrows in 1951, to the recent commentaries by Charlotte Hempel (2021) and Takamitsu Muraoka (2022)—make this volume a convenient and trustworthy guide.

There is much about 1QS and the related texts which continues to be debated, and both Collins and Nati have made important contributions to those debates. They make it clear throughout the commentary where they depart from the positions of other scholars and state their own preferences with considerable rhetorical force, but the discussion is always even handed, allowing readers to evaluate the arguments and formulate their own conclusions.

The merits and value of Collins and Nati's commentary are significant, so I will dedicate the remainder of this review to a few brief remarks that are intended to help readers of *ABR* situate some nuances of the commentary within the current state of scholarship on the *Serekh* (S) tradition.

First, for scholars who are primarily interested in the value of the Dead Sea Scrolls for biblical studies, the S manuscripts shed important light on the uses of the emergent scriptural tradition. Prominent examples include the adaptation of the covenant renewal ceremony (Deut 27; Josh 8:30–35) in 1QS 1:16–3:12,

and the citation of Isa 40:3 in 1QS 8:14 (notably omitted from the parallel passage in 4QS^{d} 6:7 but present in 4QS^{e} 3:4–5). Collins and Nati include rich discussions of such intertextual relationships, including cautioning against inferring intertextuality that is unjustified (e.g., 112, where Collins cautions against reading the scapegoat ritual into the references to wilderness in 1QS 8:14). But it should be remembered that the orientation of the commentary and, correspondingly, its engagement with secondary literature, is toward the *Serekh* manuscripts and the social history of the *Yaḥad*, not the biblical tradition. Even so, readers hoping to mine the commentary for insights about the history of the Bible will be aided by an ample *Index of Ancient Sources*, covering the Hebrew Bible, New Testament, Apocrypha, and other Second Temple Jewish writings (279–88).

For biblical scholars, the greater value of the commentary is its contextualisation of the uses of scripture within the historical development and social situation(s) of the movement(s) from which the S manuscripts materialised. Notably, Collins gives particular attention to the comparison of communal organisation in 1QS and the Damascus Document. But here it is important to bear in mind that since the publication of the Cave 4 material (including the 4QS fragments in DJD 26) it is no longer possible to speak straightforwardly of the *Yaḥad* as a monolithic community or the Scrolls as the library of a single group. Indeed, Collins's dispersed settlements theory has been one of the most influential revisions of the old sectarian hypothesis (see especially *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009)). This re-evaluation has, in turn, given way to approaches that emphasise the role of the *Serekh* in constructing an ideal (and idealised) community (30). Collins and Nati discuss these developments in depth (e.g., 30), but the tendency of the commentary is to treat the Serekh texts as though a concrete social reality lies not very far beneath the literary superstructure, and to present 1QS as the best window into that social reality (so, for example, the discussion of an elite community, 112).

Second, any edition of a text that exists in multiple (variant) manuscripts must enact choices about the prioritisation of witnesses and the ordering of material. In this case, as was noted above, *The Rule of the Association* is in effect a commentary on 1QS—one of the initial set of seven scrolls associated with Cave 1—which is supplemented by 1QSa ("The Rule of the Congregation"), 1QSb (the "Blessings"), and the other manuscripts from Caves 1, 4, 5, and 11. This approach is valid and appropriate but, much like the tendency to privilege the Masoretic text in studies of the Hebrew Bible, it risks perpetuating a distorted (and distorting) view of the centrality and normative value of 1QS. The reader would do well to remember Jutta Jokiranta's caution that the designation *Serekh ha-Yaḥad* (S) is a "scholarly construct for labeling the material remains of a handful of manuscripts," and that "the use of the S-label indeed often misleads us to think of something similar to or as 'complete' as 1QS, and draws

unwarranted distinctions between those S and non-S manuscripts that might otherwise be seen on the same continuum or at least on overlapping or tangential paths" (Jutta Jokiranta, "What is "Serekh ha-Yahad (S)"? Thinking About Ancient Manuscripts as Information Processing," in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, edited by Joel Baden, et al., (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 631–32). Compare Collins and Nati's observation that "it is not the case that any one manuscript of the Serekh tradition is simply a revision or updating of another one" (5).

This leads to a related observation that 1QS is itself a composite text. This point is fully discussed in the introduction (1, 5–8) and in the commentary. It is notable, however, that in this edition the associated texts 1QSa and 1QSb are separated from 1QS by means of discrete introductions.

Already in DJD 1 (1955), Józef Milik presented a strong case for viewing 1QSa and 1QSb—which were purchased separately from 1QS in 1950 (DJD 1, 107)—as part of a single scroll together with 1QS; however, the nature of the relationship has been debated. More recently, the tide has been turning in favour of viewing the three compositions together as a redacted and coordinated whole. The arguments are discussed by Collins (1–2), but his preference, nonetheless, is to emphasise the blank spaces at the bottom of 1QS 11 and 1QSa col. 2. In Collins's view "the scribe perceived a greater disjunction between 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSb than between the various sections of 1QS, which are indicated only by indentation or a single blank line," adding "The scribe or editor clearly wished to associate 1QSa with 1QS, but the association is looser than is the case with the hymn at the end of 1QS, or the Treatise on the Two Spirits, which may also have originated as distinct units" (137). This is a valid inference, but the point remains that the disjunction introduced by the formatting of the commentary represents an influential choice which could be weighted differently and should not be skipped over uncritically by readers. The same obtains for the choice not to reproduce the calendrical material (*Otot* = 4Q319) in 4QS^{e}.

Third, the most conspicuous innovation of Collins and Nati's commentary is their decision to translate the title *Serekh ha-Yaḥad* as "The Rule of the Association," rather than "The Rule of the Community," as is more usual. This point might be of particular interest for scholars of the New Testament, since Greco-Roman voluntary associations have long been recognised as being helpful for understanding the social formation of the early Christian movement. Dead Sea Scrolls scholars have similarly recognised voluntary associations to be potentially analogous to the structure of the *Yaḥad* and it is in this light that Collins and Nati opt to use the term (9). To be sure, the label "voluntary association" can be applied to the *Yaḥad* in the sense that the community was an association of members to which admission was voluntary. But, while Collins and Nati note formal similarities between the rules of the Yaḥad and those of other voluntary associations in passing (e.g., 90, 113), they do little to explain the value of the comparison for understanding either the structure of the Rules or the nature of

the community (but see the analogy of *politeiai* which is mentioned on 153). Moreover, although Weinfeld, Gillihan, and others have identified noteworthy structural similarities between the *Serekh* and voluntary associations (10), Collins and Nati do not engage with critiques that they privilege superficial similarities and downplay differences in the social organisation and function of the different groups. As such, the persistent translation of יחד (*yaḥad*) as "association" throughout the commentary is gratuitous.

None of this is intended as a criticism. Collins and Nati's commentary is a masterful synthesis of a large and complex field of scholarship, which succeeds in breaking down barriers to an important text. It deserves to be read by scholars of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament and it will richly reward users; however, the nuanced and dynamic state of play in the field means the commentary is better suited as a point of departure than a final word on 1QS and the related S manuscripts.

GARETH WEARNE
Australian Catholic University

DERRENBACKER, ROBERT A. JR., DOROTHY A LEE and MURIEL PORTER, eds. *The Enduring Impact of the Gospel of John: Interdisciplinary Studies.* Forward by Francis J. Moloney, SDB. Eugene, OR., Wipf & Stock, 2022. Pp. xxviii + 290. Paperback AU$42.00.

This book consists of sixteen chapters related to the Gospel of John, written by Australian scholars associated with Trinity College Theological School and the University of Divinity, Melbourne. The scholars concerned are Johannine scholars, researchers in adjacent areas or academics from other disciplines who share an interest in the Gospel of John and who bring insights from their own fields of study to bear on the Gospel. The essays are grouped into three parts: studies on the text of the Gospel of John, historical interpretations, and finally contemporary contextual, theological or practical readings of the Gospel.

Part 1 contains five studies examining the Johannine text. Robert Derrenbacker in "Echoes of Luke in John 20–21" argues for the nuanced view that there are echoes of Luke 24 and Luke 5:1–11 in John 20–21, and hence that the writer of John's Gospel was familiar with Luke's Gospel and used it as he wrote his own Gospel. Fergus King in "Friends, Foes, or Rivals? John Among the Philosophers" compares the Gospel of John with Greco-Roman philosophical schools in relation to their understanding of "god." He identifies both points of contact and significant differences between John's Gospel and the philosophical schools in their understanding of "god," but in each case King illustrates the value of his comparative methodology for illuminating John's Gospel. In his discussion, King provides a very accessible overview of the various philosophical schools.