4 fragments. Allegro’s scholarship, his relations with and eventual estrangement from the other scholars and officials in charge of the Dead Sea Scrolls makes for very sad reading.

Fields has performed yeoman’s service for the history of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Now all students and scholars eagerly await the sequel (1961–present), which will contain, among other things, the public outcry in the 1980s for the full publications of the scrolls. The second volume promises to be no less exciting than the first.

STEVEN E. FASSBERG
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM


In the early days of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls, dualism was often said to be the heart of sectarian theology. Now that the full corpus has been published, however, it appears that dualism is only prominent in a small number of texts, primarily the Community Rule (but not in all manuscripts) and the War Rule. Accordingly, this collection of essays is timely. It contains seven essays, with an introduction by the editor. It is not a systematic treatment of the subject, but several of the essays make interesting contributions.

Matt Goff probes the theory that dualism in the Scrolls developed from wisdom literature, and finds it wanting. Charlotte Hempel acknowledges that the Treatise on the Two Spirits seems to have originated as a separate composition, but notes that it has been integrated into the Community Rule in various ways by the redactor. Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer explores the reception of the Treatise in the *yahad*. Her analysis raises some interesting problems. She supposes that the Damascus Document (CD) is influenced by the Treatise, although most scholars think CD reflects an earlier stage of the sectarian movement than the Community Rule. Should we suppose that the Treatise influenced CD before it was incorporated into 1QS? Leonhardt-Balzer also assumes that the Treatise provides the context for understanding 4Q186, which speaks of shares in light and darkness. The following essay, by Mladen Popovic, explicitly questions that assumption, and argues persuasively for an astrological context, although his assertion that light and darkness are not dualistic categories in the latter text is counter-intuitive.

The main shortcoming of this collection of essays is the lack of a competent discussion of the relation of the dualism of the Scrolls to Zoroastrianism. Roughly one third of the volume is taken up with a polemical essay by Paul Heger. For Heger, it is decisive that ‘dualism conflicts with Israelite doctrines’, so the Two Spirits theory must be explained from Scripture. Heger makes no allowance for the possibility that ideas may be adapted, or that there may be influence which does not result in identical positions. Balzer-Leonhardt makes the amazing statement that ‘the contrasted terms light – darkness do not play any part in the Iranian myth.’ (Contrast Plutarch’s summary:
'Horomazes is born from the purest light and Areimanius from darkness' De Iside et Osiride, 47). She notes that 'the lie' is not mentioned in the Treatise, but does note the references to 'the man of the lie' in CD. The editor finds it telling that Goff's article on the wisdom literature does not refer to Persian influence, but why should it? Goff's conclusion, that the dualism of the Scrolls cannot be derived from the wisdom tradition with any clarity, might well be taken to open the door to Persian influence.

Philip Davies' article on dualism in the War texts is mainly a review of scholarship. It is brief and sketchy, but at least Davies recognizes that the manner of formulation in the Treatise suggests some inspiration from Zoroastrianism. Likewise, Emmanuel Tukasi, in his article on 'Dualism and Penitential Prayer', finds it doubtful that dualism can be ascribed to a purely biblical background, free of all foreign influence. Tukasi is mainly concerned with the covenant renewal at the beginning of 1QS, and he emphasizes the covenantal background. He does not, however, deal with the more obvious problem of how penitential prayer should be understood in light of the apparent determinism of the Treatise on the Two Spirits.

In short, the essays in this volume make progress on a few fronts, but major questions remain about the origin and nature of dualism in the Scrolls. But if this slim book succeeds in putting dualism back on the agenda of Scrolls scholarship, it will have achieved a worthy goal.

John J. Collins
Yale University


The Book of Enoch, 1 Enoch in current scientific nomenclature, is a collection of independent compositions attributed to the biblical patriarch Enoch (cf. Gen 5:18–24), assembled sometime during the first centuries of the Common Era. It has been fully preserved only in an Ethiopic (Ge’ez) translation as part of the scriptures of the Ethiopian Church. It came to the attention of the scholarly world when a copy of its Ethiopic version was brought to Europe in the eighteenth century and translated into modern European languages. Nineteenth-century critical analysis of the book concluded that it was a Jewish composition, originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and dated to the Second Temple period. These views, based on literary and thematic analysis, were subsequently confirmed with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Qumran caves in the mid-twentieth century. Twelve fragmentary copies of this book were discovered among the scrolls, all in Aramaic and all dated to the second and first centuries BCE.

Early studies of 1 Enoch treated it as a single work consisting of distinct sections or sources. Accordingly, commentaries on the entire book were published throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and still are. However, in publishing the Aramaic copies from Qumran, Josef Milik, The Books of Enoch (1976), introduced different names for each section of 1 Enoch: I.