

Sarianna Metso, *The Community Rule: A Critical Edition with Translation*. EJL 51.

Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2019. Paperback. Pp. x + 59. \$29. ISBN 9780884140566.

This edition and translation comes a little more than twenty years after Sarianna Metso's initial publication of the Community Rule texts in her monograph *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Far from being simply a reprint of what was included in that volume, this new edition and translation updates many of Metso's previous readings on the basis of the high-resolution photographs provided by The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library. Many of the readings given in the edition are new, as is part of the translation: the translation of cols. 1–9 is adapted from Michael Knibb's *The Qumran Community*, and the translation of cols. 10–11 is new (8).

The book begins with an introduction that discusses its rationale, method, and layout, and that provides a useful overview of each of the S manuscripts (1–8). This is followed by a bibliography focused “on questions pertaining to textual criticism and the literary history of the Community Rule” (9). The text (with apparatus) and translation takes up the majority of the volume, with the Hebrew text on the left side and the English translation on the right side of each pair of facing pages.

Metso's approach in this edition is informed explicitly by the Hebrew Bible Critical Edition (HBCE) Project (vii, 1, 6), and while it is not published officially in that series, it stands as the first edition of a non-canonical text that aligns with the project's editorial principles. The central defining characteristic of the HBCE project is its commitment to the production of critical rather than diplomatic editions. This affects Metso's presentation of the text of the Community Rule in a number of ways, and what follows here will focus on this approach to the text.

Perhaps most noticeable is the volume's use of separate columns for the proposed “variant editions” (7) of parts of 1QS 5–10 and its parallels in the other witnesses. 1QS 5:1–6:18 and 8:7–10:12 are presented on the left half of the page while the corresponding material from either 4QS^d or 4QS^b (which alternate as the copy-text for this edition) is presented on the right half of the page. This division of the central columns in the Community Rule into variant editions is not without good reason, as 1QS in many instances has a longer text than 4QS^d and 4QS^b, which agree with one another for the most part. Metso acknowledges that this approach does not attempt to represent the full range of diversity among the witnesses, writing that “[c]learly, the material of 4QS^e qualifies as [another] variant edition” (7). The same applies to 4QS^g, whose “affiliation is not certain” (7). These witnesses—along with the others from Cave 4—are addressed in the apparatus rather than being given a position in the main text.

Beyond the parallel columns for variant editions, there are some editorial decisions that are more surprising to encounter together in a critical—as opposed to a diplomatic—edition. More specifically, the volume reflects a set of assumptions and choices that sometimes adhere to the editorial principles of the HBCE, while at other times seem to lean more toward a concern for the scribal and material aspects of manuscripts, an approach associated more often with New Philology.

In line with an HBCE approach, the volume presents a large set of emendations made for a variety of reasons. Metso states in the introduction that “emendations have been suggested only in cases of a clear scribal error or grammatical mistake” (7). Perhaps the clearest examples of this are the deletions of dittography. At 1QS 3:26 and 6:5, phrases that are erroneously written twice in the manuscript are printed only once in the edition, with half-brackets marking their absence and an explanation given in the apparatus. In addition, there are many instances of half-brackets that mark the insertion of spaces between words that appear close together in the manuscript. 1QS 2:4–6 has four instances of this kind of emendation, a move that reads somewhat strangely in a critical text: given that the edition is meant to present “the archetype of the work” (6), it is not clear why there is such close attention to the features of the manuscript, such as spacing. Most diplomatic editions of 1QS do not mark the fact that many words appear close together in this manuscript.

On the other hand, there are many decisions that seem to reflect a desire to preserve what is written in the manuscript of 1QS rather than to present a true critical text. Most noticeable is the reproduction in the edition of the *paragraphos* and other scribal signs in the margins of 1QS (40 and *passim*). Furthermore, as Metso notes in the introduction, “[e]rasures and superlinears in the copy-texts have been maintained in the critical text for the purpose of illustrating the scribal process” (8), and they appear throughout the edition (see, e.g., 1QS 5:24, 26).

This emphasis on scribal process, however, does not apply in the edition to what may be considered etymological or orthographic variants. Most common is the interchange between *aleph* and *he*. At 1QS 10:6, Metso emends הברכנו in the manuscript to אברכנו and says the reading “is in error” (52). Similarly at 1QS 10:12, הבהרה in the manuscript is emended to אבהרה in the edition. These readings in the manuscript may indeed be in error, yet the volume does not make clear why the confusion of gutturals is any less related to the scribal process or less worth preserving than superlinear letters or erasures. The same goes for the emendation of באמרות to בהמרות at 1QS 6:26. The form in the manuscript may reflect an Aramaism, which seems pertinent to the scribal process. (On these examples, see Eric Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew*, 103–5)

Orthography is emended, too, but not consistently. For example, at 1QS 7:1 קורה in the manuscript is emended to קורא in the edition, but חטתו at 1QS 3:8 is only addressed in the apparatus: “Read חטתו as חטאתו” (20). There are also some instances where clear errors are left in the main text: there is a stray *nun* in the manuscript at 1QS 10:4 that is left in the main text, but is marked in the apparatus as being “written by the scribe of 1QS by mistake or perhaps because of an unreadable *Vorlage*” (50). The volume does not make clear why a letter written by mistake would be left in a critical text while orthography would be emended.

This inconsistency between editorial approaches makes for a somewhat disorienting presentation of the text. This does not mean, however, that the edition is without merit. There are many readings that are new or improved on the basis of the most recent evidence, and the new translation of cols. 10 and 11 is beautifully done. Metso expresses in the acknowledgments a hope “that this volume is an early effort toward new editorial exploration of ancient Jewish scribalism” (vii), and in this respect the volume has certainly succeeded.

James Nati

Jesuit School of Theology, Santa Clara University, Berkeley, CA, USA

jnati@scu.edu