

References:

- Adams, D.Q. 1988. *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven.
- Bartholomae, Ch. 1882. *Die arische Vertretung von med. asp. + t und med. asp. + s*, "Arische Forschungen" 1 (1882), pp. 3—24.
- Bartholomae, Ch. 1883. *Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekte*. Leipzig (reprinted in 1968).
- Bartholomae, Ch. 1895. *Vorgeschichte der iranische Sprachen*, [in:] W. Geiger und E. Kuhn (eds.), *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, Band I. Strassburg.
- Bennett, W.H. 1966. *The Germanic evidence for Bartholomae's law*, "Language" 42, (1966), pp. 733—737.
- Collinge, N.E. 1985. *The laws in Indo-European*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1964. *On the methods of internal reconstruction*, [in:] Horace G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Linguists*. Cambridge, Mass. 1962. The Hague, pp. 9—31.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1968. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Band II. Heidelberg.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München.
- Puhvel, J. 1972. 'Bartholomae's Law' in Hittite, "Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung" 86/1 (1972), pp. 111—115.
- Szemerényi, O. 1980. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt.
- Van Windekens, A.J. 1976. *Le tocharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. I. La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain.

¹ Differently Van Windekens [1976:255—256] and Adams [1988:37], who posit the unparalleled protoform **lgh**-tyo-.

² It is usually suggested that the cluster DENTAL plus T gives PT. **tsts* [Van Windekens 1976: 105], but there is no positive evidence for such a treatment. As far as I know, there is only one example which contradicts the development proposed here, namely Adams [1988: 39], following Van Windekens, compares Toch. A *warttsai* 'against' with Lat. *versus* or *vorsus* adv. '(in) towards, into, in the direction of' and consequently he derives both these items from **wrt**to-. The proposed connection, though formally satisfying, is not wholly certain, especially as Toch. A *warttsai* is not attested in any published texts. Conversely there is Toch. B *wratstai* 'against' (J.G. Hilmarsson in his letter of 29th March 1992). In any case, the protoform **wrt**tyo- is possible, but hardly acceptable.

³ Both go back to IE. *-to-. It is obvious that Tocharian suffix -ts(e) was primarily nothing other than a positional variant of -t(e), which developed regularly by its assimilation with preceding sounds (i.e. spirants and laryngeals).

⁴ Toch. ts can be derived from: (1) *dh and *gh in position before front vowels; (2) *dhy or *ty; (3) *st by metathesis; (4) *t by Bartholomae's effect.

BRUNO W.W. DOMBROWSKI

QUMRANOLOGICA I

Provoked by several sensationalist articles and books of latter years, a number of scholars have endeavoured to inform a wider public about fact and fiction regarding the nature and historical position(s) of the Dead Sea Scrolls [= DSS] or Qumran Texts [= QT]

Four of such good-will apologetic studies as issued by Austrian and German publishers primarily for the information of German speaking readers I have chosen for review because they are of significance regarding the standards of "Qumranology" at this time. They are: Johannes B. Bauer, Josef Fink, and Hannes D. Galter (eds.), *Qumran ein Symposium* [= *Grazer Theologische Studien* vol. 15], Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz, Graz 1993, ISBN 3-900797-15-3, 216 pp. [henceforth: *QSympos*]. Otto Betz/Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan: Klarstellungen*, Brunnen Verlag Giessen/Basle and Herder Freiburg-Basle-Vienna, 2nd rev. ed. 1993, ISBN 3-7655-5750-1 and ISBN 3-451-23058-5, 227 pp., 12 photographs [henceforth: *Betz-Riesner JQV*]. Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* [= *Herder/Spektrum* vol. 4249], Herder Freiburg-Basle-Vienna 1993, ISBN 3-451-04128-6, 381 pp. [henceforth: *Stegemann Sachb.*].

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran: Die Antwort. 101 Fragen zu den Schriften vom Toten Meer* [= Stuttgarter Taschenbücher vol. 18], Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, Stuttgart 1993, ISBN 3-460-11018-X, 286 pp. [henceforth: Fitzmyer *QAntwort*]; German rendition of Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls published by Paulist Press Mahwah, N.J. USA (translated by Ulrich Berzbach using for DSS passages the German presentations in Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener* vol. 1, Munich 1994 (= Urban Taschenbuch 224/ I).

While either of the first two books is a product of team-work, the latter two are essentially the results of one-man authorship.

I

Here is a survey of the contents of *QSympos* and of *Betz-Riesner JQV*.

A *QSympos*:

a) In his essay apparently supposed to be introductory to *QSympos*, i.e., "Offenbarungsreligion und Wüste - Gotteserfahrung im Gegenüber zum Kulturland" (pp. 7-28) GEORG SAUER assigns by analogy the phenomenon of the Qumran Association and as a consequence its place in the history of the Near East ("Geschichte des Vorderen Orients" [p. 8]), in particular the experiences of Israel and Judah, to the "Widerstreit zwischen 'Wüste' und 'Kulturland'" (p. 17) resp. "der Stadt" (pp. 16 ff.) which entails "Zerstreuung" bringing the "Keim des Neuanfangs eine <Gruppe> wird ... ausgewählt, die nun sofort wiederum in den Gegensatz eintritt, der

zwischen den beiden kulturgeschichtlichen Grundprinzipien dieser Epoche der Menschheitsgeschichte besteht: zwischen Wanderung und Landbesitz...." (pp. 19 ff.).

Closed is *QSympos* by KLAUS KOCH's reflections on the expectation of salvation and well-being in past and present with emphasis on the Intertestamental period in his "Israelitische Heilserwartungen aus der Zeit zwischen den Testamenten: Die Apokalyptik" (pp. 205-16). Obviously, he wished and tries to produce a sketch of the historical background and the contemporaneous environment of the specific assertions of the Qumran-Association [henceforth also = Association] and of its self-evidence and to provide the participants and audience of the Graz symposium and now his readers with some psychological insight into the Association's motives and ideology.

Thus the papers properly concerning "Qumran" and its remains are offered within a frame of physical and mental presuppositions which certainly contribute to the understanding of the "Sitz im Leben" of the Qumran Association, yet its main planks or chief motives are missed in Sauer's and Koch's platforms, i.e., by the Association's own evidential bequest, (1) the strife for strict obedience to the "law of Moses" producing at the early stages of the Association as its manifestation *Yahad* and (2) the recognition of God's will as revealed therein in confrontation with the events and calamities of history and human frailness in the face thereof. Here the idea of fate so important for the Hellenistic and Roman periods and the thought of divine interference for salvation have left their mark on the people having felt themselves impelled to join the Qumran Association.

b) Those other papers (read like Sauer's and Koch's on October 17, 18, and 21, 1992, some of them considerably enlarged in their printed form) are:

Ferdinand Dexinger, "Qumran - ein Überblick" (pp. 29-62), Magen Broshi, "Qumran - die archäologische Erforschung. Ein Überblick" (pp. 63-72), Kurt Schubert, "Die Religion der Qumranleute" (pp. 73-85), Norman Golb, "Die Entdeckungen in der Wüste Judäas - neue Erklärungsversuche" (pp. 87-116), Shemaryahu Talmon, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die jüdische Religionsgeschichte" (pp. 117-171), and Walter Kirchschräger, "Qumran und die frühen Christen" (pp. 173-87), Johannes Marböck, "Bibeltexte aus der Wüste. Qumran und das Alte Testament" (pp. 189-204).

c) DEXINGER's paper tries to present what the title in the list of contents, different from its headline suggests: "ein kritischer Forschungsbericht" on forty-five years of scholarly efforts to evaluate the DSS. Moreover, it offers the results thereof, as Dexinger sees them, in a very condensed and yet well digestible form. After a short recollection of the story of the finds and their vicissitudes (pp. 29-34) and a glimpse at the archaeological aspects (pp. 34 f.), Dexinger delivers a survey of the most important scrolls as far as known to him in 1992-93 (pp. 35-52) and, thereafter (on pp. 52 f.), he presents the "Groningen" hypothesis and (on pp. 53 f.) he offers a brief report on the delay in the publication of a great number of texts.

Notwithstanding very different assessments BROSHI reports his observations and conclusions to the effect that "Khirbet Qumran" was "das 'Gemeinschaftszentrum'" (p. 64 f.) and figures (on pp. 68 f.): "So kommen wir auf eine Anzahl von 120-150 Menschen, was un-

serer Meinung nach die Maximalanzahl an Vollmitgliedern bedeutet. Dazu müssen noch drei Altersgruppen von Männern, die einen Bewährungsstatus hatten (und 10-15% der Gemeinde ausmachten), hinzugerechnet werden - in unserem Fall 12-20 Leute ... Alles zusammen gerechnet kann die Gemeinschaft nicht mehr als 150-200 Mitglieder und Anwärter umfasst haben." With reference to Frank Moore Cross, Jr., Broshi feels to have sufficient evidence that Qumran was "Sitz und Zentrum der Essener" (pp. 69 f., 72).

In 11 sections SCHUBERT offers a historical assessment of the Association and its life as well as his reasoning for an identity of the "Qumranier" (pp. 76, 78) [resp. the "Qumran-Gemeinde" (p. 84) and the "Qumran-Gemeinschaft" (p. 83)] having a "priesterlich bestimmte Apokalyptik" as ideology (p. 79) with (the) Essenes, even though he must admit on p. 76 (sect. II) that - not withstanding many terms and expressions the Association used for its self-designation - there is no attestation of this name in any of the DSS. Unfortunately, the contents of his paper does not correspond to its title.

For striking contrast follow, then, the papers of GOLB and TALMON.

GOLB offers on pp. 88-108 in 10 sub-sections observations and reasons to refute the "Qumran-Sekten-Hypothese" which is, of course, chiefly the "Qumran-Essener-Hypothese". While, in this context, I cannot and need not go into the details of his remarkable argumentation (brought forward also elsewhere¹), and while Golb is to be credited to have been one of those who found their way to free themselves from the chains of erroneous prejudice, his "Lösung der Anomalien durch

die Hypothese, dass die Rollen aus Jerusalem stammen" (pp. 108-112, 114-16) = "Resolution of the Anomalies by the Hypothesis of the Jerusalem Origin of the Scrolls"² is no necessary consequence of his observations and reasoning as can be shown.³

Doubtless, one of the high-lights of the Graz collection of essays is TALMON's contribution.

Out of the wealth of his observations and thoughts regarding the Association not necessarily being acceptable in their totality I can merely list what I consider the most important points:

(α) The Yahad "ist ein sozio-religiöses Phänomen sui generis, das mit keiner Strömung im zeitgenössischen Judentum gleichgesetzt werden kann, über die unsere klassischen Quellen berichten. Diese Feststellung betrifft auch den Versuch, den Jachad mit dem frühen Christentum zu identifizieren oder mit der, von Josephus Flavius so benannten 'Philosophie der Essener'." (p. 120: item 5; pp. 128-34: items 10-16; p. 170: item 34).

(β) The "Sondervokabular" (especially of those non-biblical texts relating to the Association) "mutet fast wie ein 'Gruppendialekt' an". "Dazu kommt die ungewöhnliche plene-Schreibung... zur Bezeichnung von langen Vokalen und andere Schreibergepflogenheiten." (pp. 140 f.: items 19a and 19b).

(γ) "Wir können durchaus voraussetzen, dass wer sich dem Jachad anschloss, oder aus einem 'Lager' für eine bestimmte Zeitspanne in die Qumransiedlung kam, Schriften, die er besonders schätzte, mit sich brachte. Diese Annahme bietet eine adäquate und ungezwungene Erklärung der Vielartigkeit des Rollenbestandes in den Höhlen." (p. 142 n. 64). Yet, "der Schriftenfund ist keine völlig zufällige Ansammlung." (p. 143: item

22).⁴

(δ) The Qumran Association belongs to "einer Zeitspanne, in der das Judentum in viele sozio-religiöse Gruppierungen aufgesplittet war", when Pharisaism began to crystallise as the main-stream of Judaism laying claim to the legitimate representation of Israel a status and function that was *mutatis mutandis* assumed by the Yahad for itself: "Die Auffassung der Jachad-Mitglieder, dass ihre Gemeinde die einzig legitime Fortsetzung des biblischen Israel aus der Ersten-Tempel-Periode ist, zeigt sich in prägnanten Fazetten ihrer Theologie und Lebenspraxis." (pp. 146-48, esp. item 26). Consequently, the Yahad "präsentiert sich als das jüngste Glied in der Kette der Bundesschlüssen, von denen die Hebräische Bibel berichtet" and which, on the other hand, is not known from rabbinic sources (pp. 156 f.: items 29.4 and 29.4.1).

(ε) On pp. 164-69 Talmon emphasises the peculiar and liberal approach of the "Jachad-Autoren" to writings, those of their own and such of others, biblical and non-biblical - *inter alia s^opārīm ḥiṣōnīm* - and explains this by the fact "dass sie <the authors> und ihre Gemeinde das 'biblische Israel' repräsentieren" (p. 168: item 33.1). So one gains "einen Einblick in ein formatives Entwicklungsstadium der biblischen Literatur, das vor der Herauskristallisierung eines hebräischen Bibelkanons in der jüdisch-rabbinischen und der christlichen Tradition liegt." (p. 169).⁵

However, MARBÖCK has referred to the fact that for the Association "eine neue Kultur der Interpretation festzustellen ist" (pp. 194 f.), and this means that the then traditional biblical writings lay before commentators and interpreters of the Association as (approximately) closed documents which, as was obviously

felt, needed their explanation. To this extent, at least, one may question Talmon's assessment as pointed to under foregoing sub-section (§).⁶

While one should not concur with all details in Marböck's paper - see, e.g., his claim of "einer stark von priesterlich-kultischen Idealen bestimmten Gemeinschaft" (p. 200) -, it should be emphasised that on his 15 pages (the first 2 1/2 thereof being unnecessarily repetitive) he has provided his readers with a very concise introduction to the position and attitude of the Association regarding traditional writings as part of or in the nature of biblical literature.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said with regard to KIRCHSCHLÄGER's handling of his admittedly difficult topic. Surely, as the Qumran Association, Jesus and his disciples and adherents of various kinds, and other genuinely or supposedly spiritually gifted leaders and their followers lived altogether within the same span of time usually called the New Testament period, it is only natural that similarities are noticeable regarding their appearance within their somewhat similar environments. This may pertain to the styles of life of such leaders and their groups, their attitudes to others, their teachings and receptive bearing, their positions and references to traditions, and other phenomena, in particular, once such nascent or advanced socio-religious bodies were to grow fully or to a very large extent (early Christians) out of the same cultural background or related ethnic groups.

Without going into details of Kirchschläger's essay - he points himself to the developments and changes of views in matters "einer Beziehung zwischen Jesus von Nazaret und Qumran" (throughout, esp. p. 175) and, similarly, between the Association and the "Nachöster-

liche Christentum" (see esp. pp. 182 f.: item 3.2) -, it should suffice to note that considerably more depth of insight into the "Inneres Leben" of the Association must be gained, before this still relatively unknown group can be credibly put in some form of relation to the still enigmatic life of Jesus the Christos and the effects of his work.

B Betz-Riesner JQV:

Much more aggressive than QSympos is Betz-Riesner JQV as is obvious already from the first sentences of its opening section of chapter 1, i.e., "Verschluss-sache Jesus" (pp. 13-16). While QSympos appears to be directed to inform an audience resp. readers with an academic background, or has, at least, this effect, BETZ and RIESNER have come, so to say, out of the confines of the academic arena and seized the bull by its horns in the open fields of the literary profession taking Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, authors of a gravely distorting best-seller⁷ to task before a wider public. While they are to be congratulated for their well-intended counter-attack designed to set a number of matters straight, their book has two sides: the one is its journalistic style, presumably inevitable, at least in part, to be of interest for most of our contemporaries with their longing for literature with the taste of "boulevard" or "rainbow coloured" newspapers, the other is an obvious familiarity of its authors with their subject.

It is this latter aspect which - regarding its quality - is of major concern to this article.

α) In chapters 1 (= pp. 13-37) and 2 (pp. 38-51) they introduce to the history of the finds and the interest

of scholars and others in the scrolls, especially such who insinuate implicitly or directly that the Vatican and Israel as well as Christian and Jewish scholars had common cause or even conspired to prevent the publication of scrolls, esp. of Cave 4, for the sake of doctrines and hitherto cherished traditions.

While one cannot but concur, by and large, with the refutation of such accusations, one must deplore, at the same time, Betz's and Riesner's silence on cases of sometimes direct, at other occasions indirect suppression of scholarly activities and their products inside the academic community and/or through editors and/or publishers in order to protect vested interests at the expense of the promotion of research and knowledge. Provided and presumed they are willing to put their fingers in this wound, maybe through another study particularly dealing with this matter of momentous consequence, Betz and Riesner have correctly concluded, that "Bei einem solchen Mangel an Information weiter Kreise über ein wichtiges Thema der Bibelwissenschaft wie die Qumran-Funde muss es nicht wundern, dass ein Werk wie die 'Verschlussache Jesus' ebenso kritiklos wie begierig aufgenommen wird." (p. 51).

β) One can well understand that Betz and Riesner attempt, therefore, to help this ignorance of large segments of the populace through their chapters 3 to 7 (= pp. 52-138) turning in ch. 3 (pp. 52-66) to the question whether the members of the Association lived by the presumed rules of the Sadokite priests (in German "Zadoqiden" [= Hebrew *bēnê šādōq*]) different from Sadducees (in German "Sadduzäer" [= Hebrew *šōdūqīm*, Greek *Saddoykaíoi*]).⁸ Setting out from the thoroughly misunderstood 4QMMT as a letter of the so-called "Teacher of Righteousness" [of Betz's and Riesner's Zadoqiden who "wurden... auch zu einer Art von echten 'Pharisä-

ern'" (p. 57)] to the High Priest and his colleagues in Jerusalem (pp. 52-55), Betz [foremost⁹] and Riesner come to the conclusion that the "ideal" which those rules of the Sadokite priests show, as they were discovered in caves by the Dead Sea, is also found in the image of "the" Essenes sketched by Philo, Pliny the Elder, and Josephus. "Deshalb ist es immer noch das beste, diese beiden Gruppen <sc. the Association (alias Sadokites) and the Essenes> gleichzusetzen, woran auch kleine Unterschiede zwischen den Quellen nichts ändern können." (p. 66).

Thus, the members of the Association as part of the separatist "circles" of Jewry in the New Testament era "entwickelten die priesterlichen Grundsätze des heiligen Dienstes zum Ideal eines asketischen, anachoretischen oder klösterlich-gemeinschaftlichen und engelgleichen Lebens, das im Judentum einzigartig war, aber eine Vorstufe des christlichen Mönchtums darstellt." (ibid.).

Back they are now, i.e. on pp. 67-80 (= first part of ch. 4 [pp. 67-87]), on the down-trodden path of the hypothesis of the identity of the Association and the Essenes to defend it - not withstanding the different results of closer investigations regarding its tenability - versus Baigent, Leigh, Golb, Karl Heinrich Rengstorf [a somewhat unfair association of the latter two and others with the former!]: "Man muss James C. Vanderkam¹⁰ recht geben, wenn er sogar die Bezeichnung von Qumran als essener-ähnlich eine Ausflucht nennt und Qumran schlicht und einfach als Essener-Kloster bezeichnet." (p. 80).¹¹ This return to an outdated characterisation, identification and connection ventured by Eliezer L. Sukenik André Dupont-Sommer, Karl Georg Kuhn, Joachim Jeremias, Friedrich Nötscher, and a number of others is unsuitable to refute Leigh,

Baigent, and Robert H. Eisenman.¹²

γ) Different is Betz's and Riesner's argumentation versus Gerald Messadié's *L'homme qui devint Dieu*,¹³ Holger Kersten's and Elmar R. Gruber's *Das Jesus Komplotz*,¹⁴ and the like in the remainder of their ch. 4 and in ch. 5 (pp. 88-102). Their treatment of Pinchas Lapide's mistaken suggestion regarding the conversion of Paul (pp. 86 f.) is lop-sided, however,¹⁵ while Betz and Riesner show their competence in the field of New Testament studies versus Eisenman's grave errors concerning James, Jesus's brother, and Paul, a result of his and others' exaggeration in the assessment of the importance of the *Môreh hassedeq* ("the Teacher of Beneficence") for the Association.¹⁶

To this type of reading materials, by far too extensively treated in Betz-Riesner *JQV* (chiefly in ch. 7 [= pp. 121-38]) belong also Barbara Thierings writings - the more recent they are the more ill-considered are her use of facts and fiction.¹⁷

δ) Of more interest and more informative are chapters 6 (pp. 103-20), 8 (pp. 139-50), 9 (pp. 151-68), and 10 (pp. 169-85):

1. In chapter 6 Betz (foremost) and Riesner discuss the relevance of 4Q285, 4Q521, 4Q246 for the Messianic expectations of Jewry during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, especially in relation to the gospels. Since the interpretation of said fragmentary passages and their positions in relation to DSS evidently bearing witness to the Association will be discussed in the forthcoming Part 2 of my *ISD*, and more is expected on this matter from Otto Betz,¹⁸ it would seemingly not make much sense and be unfair to comment on it now.

2. A very objective survey regarding the Greek fragments of Cave 7 is offered in chapter 8. For an explanation of their presence in that cave other interpre-

tations than Betz's and Riesner's quasi-"Giftschrank" suggestion or Hans Burgmann's reference to the possibility of the existence of a Genizah are feasible, however.¹⁹

3. Again premature, yet, in the light of the exploitation of the high contemporaneity of the relations on Jesus, the Christos, and texts from the vicinity of Hirbet Qumran by sensationalists, believed to be inevitable by Betz and Riesner is their question "Was bedeuten die Qumran-Texte für das Verständnis Jesu von Nazaret?" (= ch. 9). As was already noted regarding Kirchschläger's essay (in A [subsection c]), mere formalities must not induce to draw conclusions, especially this is out of place before the contents of the scrolls will have been painstakingly evaluated to the extent utmost possible. In particular, in the processes of rendering and explanation, one must avoid to interpret writings of the DSS through references to non-Qumranic sources. There are sufficient materials available, at least in their major scrolls.²⁰ Like many others, Betz and Riesner have not followed this basic principle of philology and historiography.²¹ This may be explained by their background as experts in the fields of New Testament studies. The writings of the New Testament - like other corpora, such as most works of rabbinic literature - are very well known and their scholarly study mainly strives for precision and improvement for further clarification and better understanding. As yet, this level has not been reached in the nascent discipline of Qumranology which is due, in part, to the situation of the *QT* and partly to methodic deficiencies.

Also Betz and Riesner recognise: "Seit der Veröffentlichung der 4Q-Fragmente wird zunehmend von einer Vielfalt und auch Verschiedenheit der Qumran-Texte ge-

sprochen und die einheitlich essenische Herkunft in Frage gestellt. Eine endgültige Entscheidung ist so lange nicht möglich, als nicht alle Fragmente in lesbarer Form veröffentlicht und erschöpfend diskutiert sind. Gewisse Unterschiede wären aber auch dann durchaus möglich, wenn alle diese Dokumente aus der gleichen Religionspartei hervorgegangen, also essenisch sein sollten. Immerhin ist ein Zeitraum von 200-250 Jahren anzunehmen, in dem sie entstanden sind. Auch eine 'Einung', wie sie die Qumran-Gemeinde darstellen will, kann in solch langen Jahren eine Entwicklung durchmachen und Veränderungen erleben." (pp. 153 f.).

None the less, on p. 155 as more often in their book they still put so much weight on the exaggerated importance of the *Môreh hassedeq* - a designation they still translate by "Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" (= "Teacher of Righteousness") that, if their concurrence with others would be correct, he "must have been over long periods of time, truly a 'super-man' or a mythical figure".²² To discuss even a mere comparison of this²³ "Teacher of Beneficence" with Jesus of Nazareth is illegitimate as long as we do not know more of the *Môreh hassedeq* than the scarce sources relate.²⁴

While Betz and Riesner have joined the chorus of those speculating on the functions and life of the *Môreh hassedeq*, they are certainly entitled to consider the multiplicity of layers of relations in the New Testament as *analogue* to explain differences in the traditions on Essene groups. (p. 154). For the time being more spade-work has to be done, however, leading to ascertainment of what the individual DSS contain and mean. Such analogue may also serve to consider difficulties regarding claimed or real interrelationships such as between DSS and CD, yet no more.

4. At any rate, the "Vielfalt der neutestamentlichen

Schriften" must not be used to swipe the peculiarities of the Association and of the archaeological situation away in order to hold on to the Essene hypothesis as alleged "Essener These" (p. 152), even though "das interkonfessionelle wissenschaftliche Herausgaberteam, das <according to Betz and Riesner> alle Texte kannte, nie auf den Gedanken kam, die Essener-These zugunsten der Hypothese aufzugeben, die Qumran-Höhlen hätten als Deponie für verschiedenartige Schriften aus Jerusalemer Bibliotheken gedient..." etc. etc. (p. 152). *Et concilia errare possunt* - like individual scholars. Consequently, this argument of their's is of no value, once others collapse.

5. This is a fact also with regard to Betz and Riesner in their acts of reshaping the Association into a "priesterlich reine<s> Gottesvolk" which "in der Wüste Juda, abgeschieden von Jerusalem, bildete ... nach der Gemeinderegel <IQS> als 'Königtum von Priestern' ein lebendiges Heiligtum" to achieve by its "königliche<s> Priestertum" what the priests in the Jerusalem temple did not effect by their sacrifice. They refer to IQS VIII 6 and 8 f., yet neither these passages nor any other attest to the Association as a "Königtum von Priestern" or a "königliches Priestertum" nor did the Association consider itself "priesterlich rein". Nor may one infer from said passages and their context and /or IQS as a whole or other related texts²⁵ that the "atonement" for "the country" was considered a specifically priestly function.²⁶

In other words, before Betz and/or Riesner compare assertions, facts and figures of the scrolls with such of the New Testament they better improve their knowledge of and care for the contents of DSS as potential reference materials.

Rather than going in these circumstances into the remainder of Betz-Riesner JQV offering, though, interesting observations on details of the New Testament under the headings "Der 'Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit' und Jesus" (pp. 155 f.), "Die Sinai-Überlieferung, Qumran und die Bergpredigt" (pp. 156-59), "Der grosse Unterschied: Jesu Zuwendung zu den Sündern" (pp. 159-62), "Qumran und die Lebensform des Jüngerkreises Jesu" (pp. 162-64), "Qumran und der sogenannte 'historische Jesus'" (pp. 165-68), and in chapter 10 "Haben sich Essener zu Jesus als dem Messias bekehrt?" (with several subsections), it appears sufficient to close this part I B with a general observation.

It is futile to try fending off sensationalists by arguments and constructions resting on speculation of the critical authors and/or having been drawn from their chosen background materials. Such efforts as much learning as they may show cannot convince persons with a like critical mind among the average readers, not to mention others who had the chance to penetrate into the self-evidence of the Association regarding its admittedly difficult ideology and social structures.²⁷

II

A Concerning Stegemann Sachb.:

In note 9 of ISD part 1, I have taken issue with HARTMUT STEGEMANN's venture to invent a High Priest position of the Mōreh hassedeq and his speculations on the teacher's person and activities, especially, regarding the establishment of the Association ("Die

Gründung der essenischen Union innerhalb Judäas durch den Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" [p. 211]) as well as with Stegemann's misuse of CD as product of historiography.

While Stegemann now tries to reconcile the dates of origin of the older copies of CD (75-50 B.C.) with the alleged date of the Mōreh hassedeq's death (about 110 B.C.) (p. 166), he considers CD - supposedly with its author(s?)²⁸ - "die letztgültige Fassung" of "aller nachbiblisch formulierten gesetzlichen Regelungen der Essener" (p. 165), "nach der es keine anderen mehr geben könne"... "Das offiziell anerkannte Werk, das allgemein studiert wurde und als Grundlage gerichtlicher Entscheidungen der Essener diente, blieb für alle Zukunft die Damaskusschrift." (p. 166).

1QS he splits in five "Einzeltexte" (not parts, as one might be inclined to do) of the 2nd half of the 2nd century B.C. and declares these as "also <why?> noch vor der Gründung der Qumran-Siedlung, entstanden. Sie beziehen sich durchweg auf die Essener im allgemeinen, nicht auf irgendwelche Besonderheiten Qumrans" (p. 153). None the less, he offers "Die Gemeinschaftsordnung (1QS I,1-III,12)" as "Agende", "Die Zwei-Geister-Lehre (1QS III,13-IV,26)" as of pre-Essene origin and influenced by Babylonian Jewry, and "Die Disziplinarordnung (1QS V,1-XI,22)". (pp. 153-59).

Stegemann emphasises that - in addition to the authors' or editors' restructuring processes which are already noticeable from the Manual of Discipline's copy of cave 1, i.e., 1QS²⁹ - other additions have been made successively. Obviously he considers now 1QS older than CD. Having changed his opinion, he has stealthily withdrawn from the position he had taken with great fervour in his Dr. theol. dissertation of 1965³⁰

which - combined with other thoughts of his - has misled so many scholars in the fields of Biblical Studies.

Obviously, in ostensible support of his deliberate and entirely unsubstantiated preference of CD as "Gesamtdarbietung aller nachbiblisch formulierten gesetzlichen Regelungen der Essener" (p. 165), Stegemann notes in his *Sachbuch*, however: "So gewährt die Disziplinarordnung mit den hierin geregelten organisatorischen Problemen und mit der deutlichen Genese ihrer literarischen Gestaltung wünschenswert konkrete Einblicke in das frühe Gemeinschaftsleben der Essener, noch bevor es die Qumran-Siedlung gab. Eine regelrechte 'Gemeindeordnung' ist dieses Werk freilich nie geworden, so sehr auch die späteren Zufügungen zu der ursprünglichen Disziplinarordnung die Tendenz zeigen, sie zu einer umfassenden Gemeindeordnung auszugestalten." (p. 159).

On pp. 220 f. of said thesis, Stegemann had claimed: "Ein Vergleich der Damaskusschrift mit IQS zeigt, dass CD - wie wohl erst nach der Gemeindespaltung in der 'Lehrer'-Gemeinde entstanden - im wesentlichen noch die alten Ordnungen aus der Zeit vor dem 'Lehrer' erhalten hat, während IQS eine Weiterbildung darstellt und stärker Eigenarten der 'Lehrer'-Gemeinde zum Ausdruck bringt", and Yahad "tritt hier als neuer Gemeindebegriff auf."

While, on the other hand, Stegemann - by his emphasis on the importance of CD - tries in his *Sachbuch* to salvage his concept of the "Teacher of Righteousness" and the teacher's role as High Priest in exile, so to speak, the core or "heart" of his dissertation,³¹ he attempts also, to make his readers believe in an incredible story: now IQS is admitted to have been older than CD, yet it was "never a regular code" of the doc-

trines and discipline "for the Association".³² This were, according to Stegemann, the Cairo Document and its forerunners and virtually related pieces of writings found in caves 4-6.³³ Why, then, would such authoritative document as IQS have been drawn up, in the first place, and why would it have been worked over, revised, and corrected as painstakingly as this scroll was, as a matter of fact?³⁴ Why would it have been copied and why were so many copies preserved?³⁵

Still worse, for Stegemann "die älteste wirkliche Gemeindeordnung der Essener" was IQSa. (p. 159). This puts matters really upside down. Surely, the image of the Association on the mind of the author(s?) of this two column document reflects not only reality, but likewise or more the conditions expected when a Messiah will appear, it is a very precise concept of eschatological conditions.³⁶ Stegemann knows this, yet, in order to protect his misinterpretation of CD as a piece of historiography allegedly a major plank for his strange ideas regarding the so-called "Teacher of Righteousness", for him, it simply has to be this way: IQSa "ist von unschätzbarem Wert, weil hier erstmals in konzentrierter Form zusammengefasst ist, welche Ideen den Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit geleitet haben, was er organisatorisch für vordringlich hielt und welche Zukunftserwartungen er über die von ihm selbst verfassten Hymnen der Hodajot-Sammlung hinaus noch hatte". (p. 160). The importance of the eschatological character of IQSa, even expressis verbis declared in the beginning of this text's col. I and, surely, to be seen also against other eschatological references in other writings of the Association, he belittles by the platitude "Tatsächlich aber haben die Essener sich von vornherein als in der letzten Epoche der Geschichte vor Endgericht und Heilszeit lebend betrachtet und

diese ganze Epoche - mochte sie auch ein volles Jahrhundert oder noch länger währen - als die 'Endzeit' bezeichnet." (p. 160). Supposed the Yahad was "the Essenes", did they alone hedge Messianic resp. eschatological expectations? - As a Professor for New Testament Studies, Stegemann knows that history was different. In other words such argument does not help his assessment of 1QS_a at all.

Obviously, there is no value in Stegemann's attempts of historical reconstruction. While there are many more shortcomings in his way of historiography, the style and background information on archaeological matters are - leaving out of consideration his strong prejudices involving his adherence to the Essene hypothesis and other thoughts - reasonably sober and more acceptable than Betz-Riesner JQV. This may be seen, for instance, from his discussion of Leigh's and Baigent's Verschlussache Jesus. (pp. 24-46).

By and large reasonable is what Stegemann has to say in his ch. 5 on Golb's results of his observance of "anomalies" (pp. 94 f.) and the "Kulthöhlen-Theorie" (pp. 95-7), as well as the "Villenhypothese" of Dres. Robert and Pauline Donceel. (pp. 97 f.).

Like his refutations, *cum grano salis* legible and digestible are chapters 4 (: regarding the excavations) and 5 (: on caves 1-11), and of chapter 6 the sections to and including the Apocalypse of Henoch "Book of the Giants" (pp. 135 f.). In these Stegemann could and did rest on the results of others. As soon as he switches to the works listed on pp. 136-190, his presentation betrays his bias and the reader ought be cautioned, lest he takes fiction for fact. For example: the so-called "Temple Scroll" (11QT_{Temple}) he declares to have been "vor-essenisch" and dates it "al-

ler Wahrscheinlichkeit nach" as "bereits in der ersten Hälfte des 4. Jh. v. Chr. verfasst". (p. 137). How can he take such a preposterous position at the present stage of investigations with respect to authorship and date of origin for this difficult document?³⁷

Likewise chapter 7 on the Essenes rests on the mistaken premise Stegemann once created in his Dr. theol. thesis, yet not, as is particularly necessary for a Sachbuch merely on secured fact. Assertions, such as the thread of narrative beginning with "Bis in die Anfänge des 2. Jh. v. Chr. hinein war das Judentum Palästinas eine recht homogene Grösse. Seine Mitte war der Tempel zu Jerusalem...." (p. 198) are plainly incorrect and serve merely as a platform for Stegemann's message "Die Essener haben genau diese traditionellen Vorstellungen eines hierarchisch wohlgeordneten Israels im Heiligen Lande aufgenommen...." (p. 199).

Regarding chapters 8-10 in Stegemann Sachb. the same holds true what has been said on similar efforts above in part I: As long as there is no sufficient clarity with respect to the ideological, theological, and anthropological assertions of the Association it does not make sense to compare this group and its "Inneres" and "Äusseres Leben" with the relations on Jesus, his followers, and early Christianity.³⁸

B On Fitzmyer QAntwort:

Unfortunately, the title of the German translation of JOSEPH A. FITZMYER's Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls, i.e. Qumran: Die Antwort with the sub-title 101 Fragen zu den Schriften vom Toten Meer, provokes the expectation of another sensationalistic piece of unsubstantiated work. Even though Fitzmyer occasionally uses strong words to disparage

studies of others when their method and results are contrary to such of his own, the German title should not be held against him, since he may have merely consented to what others proposed.

At any rate, while "Die Antwort" grasps by far too high, and, naturally, his answers to some of the many questions he apparently took as notes once he came to face them, are erroneously mistaken. Most of them are as well answered as far as Fitzmyer could do this at the present state of affairs, however, and it is a pleasure and rewarding to read his book for his sober approach to their subjects.

To go *medias in res*, I refer the benevolent reader to questions 35 (pp. 71-3), 41-3 (pp. 83-93), 45 (pp. 94-8), 65-67 (pp. 152-160) to see for himself.

Indeed, in this book Fitzmyer has been circumspect in many directions to do justice to topics and views advanced by others, at least of those whom he mentions, even with respect to such as Edmund Wilson's somewhat slanted, yet not completely erroneous suggestion that Jewish and Christian scholars, in particular such working in the field of New Testament studies have considerably contributed to the obfuscation of the contents and meaning of DSS (question 100 = pp. 251-5).

Again, it is not feasible and rather impossible to enter into a discussion of Fitzmyer's questions 68-84 (pp. 160-216), before the Internal History of the Association (whose existence Fitzmyer does assume³⁹) will have been clarified, the sequence of events and development of ideas will have been established in its main features,⁴⁰ and the "Teacher of Beneficence" and his role for and in the Association will have become

known.⁴¹ What Fitzmyer said on p. 99 regarding the latter point with respect to Ben-Zion Wacholder's "sealed book of the Torah" he could have directed, likewise, against Stegemann's idea of CD: "Es wurde schliesslich der Text, von dem alle weiteren Sekten-schriften vom Toten Meer abhängen".

That through his survey - not withstanding a few "egg-shells" of the past in his bag - Fitzmyer has helped to represent the young discipline of Qumranology to a wider public is highly appreciated and the Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH as well as his translator, Herr Ulrich Berzbach are to be congratulated for their swift and well priced publication of Fitzmyer's work.

III

To sum up: While in the reviewed works a lot of valuable information is offered, they should have been published after more thorough investigations into the meaning, significance, and interrelationship(s) of the individual Qumran texts will have been undertaken and results will have become reliable so that a realistic image of the Qumran Association in its centre and its branches as well as in the course of its developments is gained. What we need now is no more reports on the finds and their whereabouts and/or their discoverers and editors or non-editors successes or failures, and how they were purchased, and the like - everything of these matters that is of relevance for the interpretation of the finds, in particular, the scrolls is known for long and has been narrated dozens of times. For the advancement of learning, we do need substantiated

and systematic presentations of what the *QT* say, not merely the tips of the icebergs, but the gigantic masses of information under the surface of the currents of their linguistic intricacies, their fate, and their environment.

Notes:

1. Since 1979. See by Norman Golb: "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls" = *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (Philadelphia [Pa.] 1980) pp. 1-24; "Who hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" = *The Biblical Archaeologist* [= BA] 48 (1985) pp. 68-82. More recently: "The Freeing of the Scrolls and its Aftermath" = *The Qumran Chronicle* [= QChr] 2,1 (Dec. 1992) pp. 3-25, "The Qumran-Essene Hypothesis: A Fiction of Scholarship" = *The Christian Century* 109 (Dec. 9, 1992) pp. 1138-43, and "The Major Anomalies in the Qumran-Sectarian Theory and their Resolution" [= MajAnom] = *QCh* 2,3 (June 1993) pp. 161-82. For more articles of Golb and the ensuing discussion (as known until 1990) see Z. J. Kapera, "Bibliography of Norman Golb's Hypothesis of the Jerusalem Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls" = *Folia Orientalia* 27 (1990) pp. 217-221.
2. MajAnom pp. 180-82.
3. See Stegemann Sachb. ch. 5, Fitzmyer QAntwort Question 12, in particular p. 37, and B. W.W. Dombrowski, *Ideological and Socio-structural Developments of the Qumran Association as Suggested by Internal Evidence of Dead Sea Scrolls* part I = *Qumranica Mogilanensia* 12A (Cracow 1994: in the press) and part II (forthcoming) [= ISD 1 & 2].
4. For further discussion see ISD 2 chapters A and B.
5. Cf. on this matter Talmon's outstanding article of 1988 "Between the Bible and the Mishna" on pp. 11-52 of his *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* [= BBM] (Jerusalem - Leiden 1989).
6. See ISD 1 ch. A.
7. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London 1991). On particulars (regarding the sales of the German translation *Verschlusssache Jesus. Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* [Munich 1991]) see Betz-Riesner JQV pp. 13-16.
8. (1) Not *ṣadduqim* (i.e. an unattested *ṣadūqīm*) as Betz-Riesner JQV pp. 55, 57, et al. has it. The Hebrew forerunner of Greek *Saddoykai-oi* was *ṣadūqīm*. Its singular is attested as *ṣadūqi*. See dictionaries.

(2) While *b'nê šādōq* referred exclusively to the priests as a group within the Association with specific functions (see, e.g., IQS V 9) and *b'nê hassādōq* (i.e. the same entity with the article preceding the n.pr. *šādōq*) to the individual priests within this group (e.g., in IQS IX 14), *b'nê sedeq* as designation of the Association per se could be replaced by *šaddīqīm* (so at the levels of IQH I 36 and - in the singular *šaddīq* [not *š'dūqī!*] - of IQH XV 15; see on this matter ISD I through index s.v. *šaddīq/-īm*). Obviously, we have here a precise interpretative self-identification of *b'nê sedeq* by members of the Association at a very early stage of its history which does not allow its equation with the *š'dūqīm*.

9. See their preface p. 12.
10. "Implications for the History of Judaism and Christianity" = H. Shanks (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years* (Washington D.C. 1991) pp. 19-36, here 26.
11. Cf. VanderKam's "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Essenes or Sadducees? = *Bible Review* 7,2 (April 1991) pp. 42-47 and its reprint with minor changes under the title "The Qumran Residents: Essenes not Sadducees!" in *QChr* 1,2/3 pp. 105-08.
12. Eisenman noted in his article "A Response to Schiffman on MMT" *QChr* 1,2/3 (pp. 95-104) on p. 99: "Picking up quasi-Essene theorizing again, Schiffman for one, in his new 'B.A.' article, continues along these lines, claiming that, though the documents are Sadducean (he means by this, that they exhibit 'Sadducean' positions as per Talmudic delineations), they are anti-Maccabean, i.e. written to complain to or about a Maccabean priest-king. This is all sophistry meant to resuscitate a neo-'Essene' hypothesis, as there is nowhere any proof of all this." This must have irritated Betz and Riesner and they must have considered Eisenman's view an obstacle to their twisting both the *Yahad* and the *š'dūqīm* together into Essenes, as their *JQV* reads on p. 56: "Dennoch hat Schiffman recht, wenn er den Ursprung der Qumran-Bewegung in priesterlichen Kreisen sucht; nur muss die Bezeichnung 'Sadduzäer' differenzierter gebraucht werden". Whatever Eisenman may have said otherwise, especially in his and Michael Wise's controversial and, yet, meritorious book *The Dead Sea*

Scrolls Uncovered (Dorset, England 1992) resp. its rendition into German by the title *Jesus und die Urchristen: Die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (Munich 1993) [referred to in Betz-Riesner *JQV*], Eisenman's comment on Schiffman's cited claims and, thus, directly or implicitly similar views advanced by others holds definitely true.

13. Paris 1988. German translation: *Ein Mensch namens Jesus* (Munich 1989). Followed by Messadié's *L'Incendiaire. Vie de Saül, apôtre* (Paris 1991), in German: *Ein Mann namens Saulus* (Munich 1992). In both instances Betz and Riesner have referred to the German edition.
14. With the subtitle *Die Wahrheit über das 'Turiner Grabtuch'* (Munich 1992).
15. In as much as Saulus qui et Paulus in his views on salvation *sola gratia* has a good deal in common with the theology of IQS and other writings from Qumran. See (after his intensive and extensive investigation of the Association according to IQS [cf. below n. 20]) B. W. W. Dombrowski "The Idea of God in I Q Serek" [= *Idea*] = *Revue de Qumran* vol. 7 (1971) pp. 515-31.
16. Cf. already B. W. W. Dombrowski "A Few Remarks on Recent Papers Concerning the Mōreh hassedeq in Dead Sea Scrolls" [= *Dombrowski:Mōreh*] *QChr* 3,1-3 (1993) pp. 155-68, esp. 161 f.
17. I note, especially, D. M. Paton's paper read at the 4th Mogilany colloquium (through *QChr* 3,1-3 p. 8) the printed form of which I have not seen as yet.
18. See O. Betz's paper "The New Messianic Texts of Cave 4 and the Historical Jesus" read at the 4th Mogilany conference (cf. *QChr* 3,1-3 p. 8) and expected to be in print for the near future.
19. O.c. pp. 148 f. - See ISD 2 ch. B.
20. This was recognised by commentators such as M. Mansoor, S. Holm-Nielsen, B. W. W. Dombrowski; see, in particular, on the most important of the major DSS the latter's *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline"* (IQS) 3 vols. (PhD Thesis Basle 1962-63) [a revised edition is to appear under the title *Wider die Hellenisierung jüdischer Religion durch Hellenisierung jüdischen Erbes* in 4 vols. (1995)].
21. More on this principle regarding its application to DSS in *Idea* pp.

- 515-18.
22. Dombrowski: *Môreh* p. 168 n. 27.
 23. L.c. n. 25.
 24. L.c. pp. 161 f.
 25. On the Hodayoth see *ISD* I ch. C.
 26. This was observed also by Paul Garnet in his *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls = Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2nd series vol. 3 (Tubingen 1977) throughout. Regarding *IQS* VIII 6 see through its index and, specifically, p. 134. Different is the eschatological passage in *IQM* II 5 (in its context) referring to the atonement for the *ʿēdâ* which does not mean, however, that the original and proper functions of the Association in its entirety had been replaced. Regarding the relationship of *IQS* and *IQM* as well as the remnants of scrolls usually called *4QM* see *ISD* I ch. E.
 27. Whatsoever thereof is offered in *Betz-Riesner JQV* is barely the minimum of aspects of the essentials. This impression on the careful reader's mind is confirmed by its indices on persons and matters, such on passages of the *DSS* not being offered at all.
 28. O.c. pp. 165 f. - While Stegemann is aware of the compilatory character of CD he speaks on p. 165 of one author: "beansprucht der Verfasser".
 29. While some scholars disagree on the ways and order of sequence in the arrangements of *IQS* due to its compilation, there is now consensus on the fact of the occurrence of such.
 30. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn 1971). Discussed in *ISD* I ch. A n. 9.
 31. See *ISD* I *ibid.*
 32. See above the quotation from *Stegemann Sachb.* p. 159.
 33. O.c. p. 165.
 34. See, in particular, the notes on the Hebrew text in Dombrowski's commentary (via n. 20).
 35. Dexinger in *QSympos* pp. 35, 56 n. 13, Fitzmyer *QAntwort* p. 58, Stegemann *Sachb.* pp. 152 f.
 36. See *ISD* I ch. D, Fitzmyer *QAntwort* p. 94, and others.

Aleksander Dubiński, Tadeusz Majda [ed.], *Caraimica. Prace karaimoznawcze* [= Caraimica. The Karaim studies works], Wydawnictwo Akademickie "Dialog", Warszawa 1994, pp. 290, 17 photographs, one colour portrait, ISBN 83-86 483-15-6.

Caraimica. Prace karaimoznawcze [= Caraimica. The Karaim studies works] has been published to honour one of the outstanding Polish turkologists Dr. Aleksander Dubiński on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of his birth, which was celebrated in 1994.

Dr. Aleksander Dubiński was born in 1924 in Troki. He descends from a Karaim family. One of the photographs included in the reviewed book presents Aleksander Dubiński's birth-certificate. In 1953 he graduated from the Oriental Institute of Warsaw University and in the same year he was engaged at the Chair of Turkology. In 1965 he obtained the degree of doctor (PhD) and was appointed to the post of adjunct. In 1970 he became a senior lecturer and in 1989 he retired from the university (compare p. 21).

Dr. Aleksander Dubiński was a student of the most outstanding Polish orientalist Prof. Ananiasz Zajaczkowski and Prof. Marian Lewicki. The main range of his research work is the language, literature, culture and ethnography of the Karaims, compare the list of Dr. Aleksander Dubiński's publications, pp. 23-34. It is proper to add that Dr. Aleksander Dubiński is the author of more than 150 publications. In co-operation with N. A. Baskakov, Kh. F. Iskhakova, R. M. İzbulatova, K. Musaev, S.M. Szapszał, A. Zajaczkowski and W. Zajaczkowski he edited the Karaim-Russian-Polish Dictionary, published in Moscow in 1974.

From among 28 papers which are included in the reviewed book the greater part make the reprints; only one paper has been published in *Caraimica* for the first time (*Основы караимской религии*, compare below). All reprinted papers have been set and not photocopied. The numbers of pages in the originally published papers and the numbers of pages in *Caraimica* are not the same. "All publications contained within the covers of this Book were printed with no changes as to their language or editorial forms except for some minor corrections that proved necessary in a few cases." (Tadeusz Majda's *Foreword* to the reviewed book, p. 10).

The papers included in the book present knowledge from various areas of Dr. Aleksander Dubiński's Karaim studies. They have been divided into seven parts, and the titles of these parts indicate the below mentioned areas: history of Karaim studies, the Karaim language, vocabulary, literature, Karaims' social and cultural life. The paper *Batı Karaim dilinde bazı leksik farkları* (pp. 201-128) is found in the part *Język karaimski (Karaim Language)*, and should have been included in the part *Ślownictwo języka karaimskiego (Karaim Vocabulary)*.

There are sixteen photographs at the end of the book, a colour portrait of Dr. Aleksander Dubiński and a photograph of his birth-certificate in the fore-part of it.