

Zdzisław Jan KAPERA

THE PRESENT STATE OF QUMRANOLOGY

The fortieth anniversary of the Dead Sea Scrolls' discoveries seems to me more and more to be a turning point in the history of that new discipline which has been called Qumranology¹. Of course, that is not only my own opinion. The voice expressing urgent need for a quick publication of the remaining scrolls is becoming stronger. Complaints about the delay have become more direct and sometimes even personal. The first generation of qumranologists are now retired, and some have passed away. Except for a few, there are no more giants among us. The last fifteen years have seen the death of J.M. Allegro, J.D. Amusin, W. Brownlee, J. Carmignac, A. Dupont-Sommer, K.G. Kuhn, P. Skehan, R. de Vaux, Y. Yadin and many other people with whom we associate the beginnings and the progress of Qumran research. Young scholars are anxious to put Qumran studies on a firm foundation of published texts. It is said that only 60% of the manuscripts are available at the moment. What about the rest? Shall we still be alive when the last text appears in print?

The new Jerusalem hypothesis of Prof. Norman Golb, even if not yet fully discussed², is a proof that even the general consensus of the late fifties about the Essene origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls is in danger. Both palaeographical and archaeological data are now being questioned³. Full publication of the excavations in Khirbet Qumran is a must⁴. All the recently postulated reconstructions of the history of the Qumran community should be consulted with archaeological data not only of the Judaeian Desert in general and the Qumran plateau in particular, but also of Jerusalem, Masada, Engedi and Jericho. The progress in numismatical research would probably also be very useful in reevaluating the data from the 1950s. As an eminent qumranologist has told me in a taped interview, since the F.M. Cross - J.T. Milik (the late 1950s) consensus "is now falling apart, everywhere". When I stressed several week points in Qumran research in a discussion with Dr. H. Burgmann, he did not hesitate to sum up the situation in these words: "Qumran research is now in crisis".

For the moment I would prefer to avoid the word and I will merely try to describe the real state of present-day Qumranology as a discipline, as much as possible sine ira et studio.

PUBLICATION OF THE TEXTS FROM CAVE 4 FROM QUMRAN: THE PHILOLOGICAL SCANDAL OF THE CENTURY?

For many years, exactly since the publication of vol. 5 of the DJD series, when J.M. Allegro brought out his lot of texts of the Qumran Cave 4 in 1968⁵, we have been heaving murmurings, at the beginning quite rare, but now more and more frequent, that years have passed and very important Qumran documents are not yet available to interested scholars. It will be a truism to say that not only Qumranologists are waiting. Historians of antiquity, religiologists as well as Biblical scholars and theologians would welcome full publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Let us recall briefly the history of the publication of the Dead Sea manuscripts. The first major scrolls such as 1QS, 1QIs^a, 1QpHab of Cave 1 were published quickly, even without translation: just photographs (at that time black and white) by J.C. Trever and a transliteration of decipherable letters by W.H. Brownlee and M. Burrows. The photographs were taken on Febr. 21-22, 1948, and the respective books appeared on the market in March 1950 and in spring 1951⁶. But even earlier, in 1948, E.L. Sukenik published "a more elaborate monograph in Hebrew as a preliminary report on two of the scrolls of the Hebrew University" (i.e. 1QM and 1QH)⁷. To quote J.C. Trever once more, "by the end of 1948 portions of each scroll, except the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^b) which had not yet been opened or identified, had been made available to scholars. With the sample photos before them, the scholars of the world trained their guns of expected criticism upon our conclusions, and the first 'battle of the Scrolls' began in earnest"⁸. From the quotation it is evident that reserving the rights of publication for the American Schools of Oriental Research the American scholars involved wished first of all to present their discovery quickly to those interested. This loyal scholarly policy was pursued at the beginning of the Dead Sea discoveries. Cave 1 was searched by scholars between February 15 and March 5, 1949 and about 70 scrolls (not to mention 50 pottery jars and covers) were found. The publication of that material appeared in spring 1955 in the series DJD as vol. 1. The authors of the volume, D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik, presented their texts on 30 plates. It is worth reminding that the book was ready for print in January 1953 (cf. the foreword by G. Lancaster Harding), and the Oxford University Press needed a full two years for the print⁹.

The next volume of the series was not connected with the Qumran scrolls, as in October 1951 Ta'âmireh Bedouins discovered manuscripts in caves at Wadi Murabba'at, which necessitated an expedition to the caves on January 21 to March 3, 1952. Again J.T. Milik as well as P. Benoit undertook to publish the ancient manuscripts and finished that work with the printing of the DJD vol. 2 (89 plates of ancient texts). The Clarendon Press sent the book to press in August 1958, but released the two volumes only in spring 1961¹⁰.

Then, in February 1952 the indefatigable Ta'âmireh discovered, another cave (known as Cave 2) close to Cave 1, which in effect caused an extensive and systematic exploration of 275 caves in the Qumran area, including Cave 3 with the Copper Scroll. All manuscripts found in the Small Caves (nos. 2-3, 5-10) were divided for publication between J.T. Milik, who took 3Q15 and material from Cave 5, and M. Baillet, who took all the rest. Vol. 3 of the DJD series appeared in 1962, having been ready for print since August 1959. Sixty two more plates of ancient texts became available to the scholarly world¹¹.

Then came the most fascinating discovery. In early September 1952 the Bedouins discovered Cave 4 in a terrace adjacent to the Chirbet Qumran. Four days of excavations made it possible to find fragments of 100 manuscripts. In the end, as is said by some authors, 40 000 pieces of 400 manuscripts (of which 125 were non-Biblical) were recovered from Cave 4. Negotiations with the Bedouins took the next five years. "Considerable sums of money were called for", reminded J.T. Milik in his book. In addition to £ 15 000 contributed by the Government of the Kingdom of Jordan the following institutions supplied the necessary sums: Mc Gill University (Montreal), University of Manchester, University of Heidelberg, McCormick Theological Seminary (Chicago) and the Vatican Library. Except for a few fragments which were bought by private persons, all the material was locked up on the premises of the Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem (then Jordan). It was decided at some moment that publication of the texts should be undertaken by an international and interconfessional team of scholars. Among those chosen to assemble and publish the Qumran Cave 4 manuscripts were the following scholars: Mgr P.W. Skehan (The Catholic University of America, Washington), F.M. Cross Jr. (Harvard Divinity School), J.M. Allegro (University of Manchester), Abbé J. Starcky (CNRS, Paris), J. Strugnell (Jesus College, Oxford), C.H. Hunzinger (University of Göttingen), J.T. Milik (CNRS, Paris)¹².

Let us see what they have done since the mid-1950s. First comes J.T. Milik, not because the present author is also Polish by origin, but because J.T. Milik was a close collaborator of Father R. de Vaux, and received "le plus gros lot des manuscrits non biblique de la grotte 4, apocryphes et écrits de la secte"¹³. His activity

was initially financed by the Centre National de Recherches Scientifiques (France), then by the Catholic University of America (Washington), where he was a Research Professor, and finally (until June 1960) by a special gift from John D. Rockefeller Jr. As far as I know his next years of work were subsidized by the French, again through the CNRS. Now J.T. Milik has been retired for a few years.

There is also another reason that I start with the person of J.T. Milik. He is the only member of de Vaux's team, to have recently been attacked strongly and directly (i.e. personally) by the editor of the Bible Review, Herschel Shanks, and by the editor of *The Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Professor J.H. Charlesworth¹⁴. Before I comment on this unparalleled attack, I should like to make or brief review of J.T. Milik's work on the documents of the Cave 4. As he himself announced at the Strasbourg Congress of Old Testament scholars in 1956, he received for publication 120 manuscripts (135 plates)¹⁵. As far as I know, he has published:

1. Tefilin, Mezuzot and Targums (4Q128-157) on 22 plates (= DJD VI, 2 – published 1977)¹⁶;
2. 8 manuscripts of Enoch, edited in 1976 (outside of the DJD series)¹⁷;
3. numerous minor preliminary publications of about 20 manuscripts, listed by Fitzmyer¹⁸;
4. 4QDanSus (?) published in 1981, which can be added to Fitzmyer's list¹⁹.

From the above list it is clear that about half of his texts have already been published at least in preliminary form. We do not know what is in press now at Oxford (my letter to the publishers sent in 1986 was never answered). Father P. Benoit officially announced in 1982 that J.T. Milik had promised him one volume for 1983. It seems that he will definitely finish his new publication quite soon²⁰. When the volume will appear, however, is another problem. It seems that vol. VI of the DJD series appeared with 12 years' delay! Looking at J.T. Milik's work in the last 35 years, it is amazing that he has been able to prepare for publication about 70 manuscripts of Cave 4 plus publications of the texts from Wadi Murabba'at (35 plates), Qumran Cave 1 (20 plates), Cave 5 (7 plates), 3Q15 – Copper Scroll (24 plates) – about 160 plates of Hebrew and Aramaic texts in all. Nobody in the Qumran team has done more, and certainly his work should not be detracted from by journalists (like K. Shanks) or by Prof. J.H. Charlesworth, who has re-published and commented on only one Qumran text of a few lines²¹. The latter, as an experienced editor, should avoid involving himself in polemics of that kind. Shanks's and Charlesworth's laments on the delay in the publication of Enoch texts from Cave 4 are a bit late. Milik's book was published in 1977, ten years before the accusation. Not thirty, but at the most twenty years were needed for Milik to publish the texts in question. His first preliminary articles appeared in 1958 in fact

and he returned to the problem at the beginning of 1970s. The manuscript of Milik's book was ready for print in 1974. So in fact, he wrote the book in 15 years. There is a difference between 30 and 15 years, to be sure. And the hefty book of 700 pages is surely a more than adequate excuse, even if one overlooked what J.T. Milik did in the meantime. And a minor question: I should like to see where Milik promised to "prove that 1Enoch 37-71 is not Jewish, but indeed a Christian composition that considerably postdates the New Testament period (50-150)". No such statement can be found in Milik's works. "A moratorium on any use of this section of Enoch to elucidate Christian origins and Early Judaism" seems to me a hallucination, or misunderstanding of Charlesworth's words by H. Shanks [21a]. Anyone can of course be wrong in his scholarly position, but a "consensus communis" has nothing to do with proving anything. As I have noticed above, the consensus communis of the 1950s concerning Dead Sea Scrolls and the Essenes is now under serious attack. A new one is likely to emerge. It seems that also H. Shanks' other statements are wrong. Neither was the debate on Enoch "stifled for 30 years" nor is it true that only "one scholar studied Dead Sea Scroll fragments", as for example Prof. M. Black cooperated with Milik in the publication of the Enoch manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4²².

A second lot of the Qumran Cave 4 texts was offered for publication (by R. de Vaux in May 1953) to Frank Moore Cross Jr., Annual Professor at ASOR in 1953/4, professor of the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago and later professor at Harvard University. He received 61 manuscripts (80 plates) for publication²³. His full bibliography was printed just recently. Except for several preliminary articles nothing has been definitely published. It seems that some time after writing his book in 1957 and a few general articles he lost interest in quick publication of his material. The lack of any articles of Qumran interest in his *Postscript* looks symbolic, unfortunately²⁴.

The third scholar who had a share of the manuscripts of Cave 4 was J.M. Allegro, the enfant terrible of the discipline. He was delegated to do the job by the University of Manchester at the end of 1953. His work was also subsidized by the British Treasury. He received the para-Biblical texts, commentaries and paraphrases, 24 manuscripts (24 plates) altogether²⁵. He was the only scholar to carry out his work quickly (he had no other duties), and he published 4Q158-186 in 1968, i.e. after 13 years of study. (This is worth stressing, as some scholars hold him up as an example of fast work!). I would prefer not to enter into details concerning his publication. Instead, I will quote Fitzmyer's comment in his Dead Sea Scrolls bibliography: "This publication must be used with caution: some fragments have not been properly identified or joined; many readings are questionable; the numbering of plates is confusing; the secondary literature of the fifteen texts in it that were previously published in partial or preliminary form has normally been neglected"²⁶. J.M. Allegro

had also published a number of articles on the scrolls in question before his definitive publication. Whatever the criticism, Allegro eventually presented his texts to interested scholars.

The fourth scholar, who entered de Vaux's team in June 1954, was Mgr Patrick W. Skehan, professor at the Catholic University of America (Washington), Annual Professor at the ASOR in 1954/5 and Director of ASOR in 1955/6. He received the remaining 32 Biblical manuscripts (51 plates)²⁷. Even if here again we have several preliminary publications of the texts, nothing has appeared in definitive form²⁸. P.W. Skehan died in 1980. According to his wish, his manuscripts were reassigned to Eugene Ulrich of the Notre Dame University, who "is energetically attempting to complete Skehan's work"²⁹. However, it is worth remembering that in 1982 Father P. Benoit was informed that Skehan's work was "practically finished"³⁰. Time is passing quickly; not even one manuscript has been published but there is one optimistic sign; Judith E. Sanderson has defended her Ph. D. dissertation on the Exodus Scroll from Cave 4 in palaeo-Hebrew script³¹.

The fifth scholar from R. de Vaux's team, the Rev. Jean Starcky, started to study his lot in January 1954. His work was subsidized by the CNRS. He received non-Biblical Aramaic manuscripts of about 30 plates, and about a dozen of Hebrew manuscripts (some 20 plates)³². So far he has published several manuscripts in preliminary form. He died in 1988. It is not clear who has taken over his lot.

In June 1954 came John Strugnell from Jesus College, Oxford worked for some time on the basis of Rockefeller's gift. Later on he became professor at Harvard University. He received 80 non-Biblical manuscripts (80 plates)³³. Only preliminary articles concerning his lot have appeared, even if in 1982 Father P. Benoit was convinced that "his work was very advanced" and announced that Strugnell was coming regularly to study the texts in Jerusalem³⁴. Nothing has been published in a definitive form by Strugnell; however, he has allowed his pupils to publish his texts. Some Ph.D. dissertations basing on unpublished manuscripts have been finished under his supervision. Several important texts were eventually presented to the scholarly audience: one in full, by Carol Newsom, who collected all extant copies of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice³⁵; a second in preliminary form by J. Strugnell and E. Qimron, i.e. the Halakhic letter quoted as 4Q394-399 = 4QMMT³⁶; a third again by C. Newsom, who presented first results of her study of 4Q Psalms of Joshua = 4Q378-379³⁷ at the London Symposium in 1987. We could then expect that more would follow and indeed during the Tel Aviv Colloquium in March 1988 J. Strugnell and D. Dimant presented the "Pseudo-Ezekiel" Scroll (4Q385-390)³⁸. Progress in the publication of Strugnell's manuscripts is really visible, but far from a definitive publication.

The last scholar who was sent to help R. de Vaux in the publication of the manuscripts of Cave 4 was Claus-Hunno Hunziger, representative of the Deutsches Evangelisches Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes in Jerusalem sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. He received the manuscripts of the War Scroll (3 plates) and liturgical texts (19 plates)³⁹. He was released of his task rather quickly, but he had published preliminary remarks on his documents. His lot was later taken by Father Maurice Baillet, who was relieved of his duties in 1958, when he had finished his manuscripts from the small caves in the Qumran area. M. Baillet was then given liturgical texts from Cave 4 both on leather and on papyrus. His work was again financed by the CNRS. Several preliminary articles preceded the definitive publication on the 4Q482-520 which was completed on May 6, 1976 and finally printed in 1982 as Vol. VII of the DJD series⁴⁰. It is easy to count that preparing the publication of 80 plates took M. Baillet nearly 18 years. He is the second after Allegro, to have finished his work. Anyhow, the printing ended in 1982, which means that it took an additional six years!

Strikingly different is the situation concerning the publication of manuscripts from the Qumran Cave 11. I would prefer not to repeat the report printed by Father J. van der Ploeg in the June 1985 issue of the *Revue de Qumran*⁴¹. This cave was found in 1956 and the Palestine Archaeological Museum spent a great amount of money to buy the new documents from the hands of the Bedouins. To get the money back the Museum sold the rights of publication to interested scholarly institutions of the world, among others to the Academy of Sciences of the Netherlands, to the ASOR (Elizabeth Bechtel's gift), etc. It is now obvious that even if we do not have the documents published in the DJD series (except for the Psalms Scroll 11Q Ps^a = DJD IV, 1965)⁴² all the big manuscripts (11QJobTg in 1971⁴³; 11Q palaeo-Leviticus in 1985)⁴⁴ are available to the scholarly world and also nearly all the minor fragments have been published in several different journals and *Festschriften* (fragments of the 11Q Midrash of Melchisedeq in 1965 and 1972)⁴⁵. It is also highly probable that the most famous and the longest of the Dead Sea manuscripts, the Temple Scroll belongs in Cave 11. It was acquired by Y. Yadin in 1967 from Kando's hands. Yadin concluded the publication in 1977 (the Hebrew edition) and 1983 (the English edition) before he died⁴⁶. Even if the scroll was longest and best preserved of all the Dead Sea texts (66 columns) it took Yadin ten years of very hard work to present it to the scholarly audience.

The publication of material from the Qumran Cave 4 is an enormous task. At the beginning of this section, I mentioned the probably exaggerated number of 40 000 fragments, i.e. 400 manuscripts of which 125 are non-Biblical. In 1965 R. de Vaux estimated that 15 000 fragments had been recovered from the soil and from the hands of the Bedouins. It is interesting to quote progress in their identification and colla-

tion. In 1953 70 manuscripts were identified. In August 1955 already 330 manuscripts had been isolated on 420 plates and 80 plates were not yet identified. In summer 1956 the number of identified manuscripts increased to 381 on 477 plates, and there were 29 plates without attribution. Finally, at the end of June 1960 511 manuscripts on 620 plates were ready for study, with only 25 plates of small isolated fragments. At the same time the process of photographic documentation was finished by the staff of the Rockefeller Museum⁴⁷. Very recently Hans Stegemann refrained from giving the exact number of Cave 4 fragments. To quote him: "Estimates vary between tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands". But he said that "about 580 different manuscripts" were identified (out of a total of 800 manuscripts found in all eleven Dead Sea caves"). In H. Stegemann's opinion "about 75 percent of [...] manuscripts from 4Q still remain unpublished and are therefore not yet available to most scholars"⁴⁸. If R. de Vaux counted 620 plates in 1960, that could mean that 12 to 15 volumes of the DJD series are needed for the publication of the material of the Qumran Cave 4. For the moment, only 20 plates of Milik, 80 of Baillet and 24 of Allegro have been published, so certainly at least 10 volumes of the DJD series will follow. But when? Probably one volume, that by Milik, is in press. That is not very much.

In this situation, it is not surprising that for several years now noises have been heard demanding the speeding up of publication of the scrolls from Cave 4. In fact among the first to make this appeal was repeatedly John Marco Allegro. In the American edition of his last book he chided his ex-colleagues for a continuous delay. He wrote:

"I am still the only member of that original team to have published all of his section of the work in definitive form (1968) [...] Despite all the impatient murmurings of fellow-academics over the years, my colleagues have managed to retain their exclusive control over these important manuscripts".

He was certainly right about the remaining members of the scrollerly team "jealously guarding" the manuscripts to the misfortune of their "less fortunate colleagues and the world at large"⁴⁹. However, he was certainly wrong in accusing his colleagues (in a letter to "The Times" of April 17, 1982 /in the words of P. Benoit/) of "un silence volontaire sur les documents qui seraient dangereux pour la foi". He also expressed his "doubts on scholarly integrity". All that was explicitly rejected by the then president of the editorial committee, the Rev. P. Benoit. In his words "rien ne sera caché, et il n'y a rien à cacher"⁵⁰. The view expressed in the July 1982 issue of the Journal of Historical Review that "one of the first things the Jewish authorities did was to take the scrolls and place them all under the highest level of official security [...] No one we know of has been permitted to examine any but a few of the scrolls" was rejected by P. Benoit as absurd. However he accepted publicly that quite apart from the unfavourable and intentional

criticism, there was a feeling of a strange and regrettable delay in publication of the Qumran scrolls. He confirmed that the scholars involved had access to the documents and that they were working, even if more slowly than we could expect⁵¹. But the rumour was repeated and spread by a new journal, the Biblical Archaeology Review very energetically edited by Hershel Shanks. His journal very quickly acquired an enormous number of subscribers (if I am properly informed, more than 100 000 – for comparison The Biblical Archaeologist has several thousand subscribers) and has been gaining a better and better reputation in the scholarly world. He took up the problem of progress in the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls one as of the leitmotifs of his journal⁵². He has come back to the problem several times and even discussed it in an interview with the then Director of the Israeli Department of Antiquities, Dr. A. Eitan⁵³. In the interview, as well as in editorial articles he has suggested serving the scholars responsible for publication with a notice (giving them a few years to finish their projects), whereupon the materials should be taken away from them and published as plates to make the manuscripts available to everyone in the field. As it is evident that only Milik's, Strugnell's and Starcky's lots could be taken into consideration (Allegro's and Baillet's manuscripts have been published and Skehan's work – if we could believe Ulrich – very probably is in the final stage of preparation for print) it is very strange that people should have become so feverish about the problem. J. Strugnell decided to divide his lot with his Ph.D. students and he deserves only praise for that decision. What the decision has been about Starcky's lot is unclear. He has presented very little of his many years' research.

The problem is that J.T. Milik is a lone wolf and I do not believe he can be pressed or made to give up his job. To tell the truth, when I conveyed to him both the greetings of the participants in the Manchester Symposium and their feelings about the publication of the scrolls was quite firm in stressing that scholars were too anxious in expecting one more sensation in the contents of the Scrolls, that the general view could certainly be changed only very little and that the most important value of the scrolls was certainly for Biblical criticism. When I remarked that he was responsible for the publication of among others, a text containing some historical names⁵⁴ and that I had a personal interest in it, he dampened my enthusiasm assuring me that the text was very short, the context unclear and that I would not find any revelations when the text was published. Anyway, the problem remains. How can we speed up the work of one of the last giants of the first generation of Qumran scholars? Certainly better everyday living conditions (he is now retired) and perhaps facilities for travel to Jerusalem could be arranged for J.T. Milik by some scholarly institution.

Whatever our opinion about his delay, it is the simple truth that he has published much more than anyone else and that he has never given up his task. I would

prefer not to say one word about the quality of his works lest I should appear prejudiced.

Uproar about the publication of the remaining Qumran scrolls continues. In April 1986 Father P. Benoit prepared a special report on progress in publication for the Israeli Director of Antiquities and for the Archaeological Council and the Shrine of the Book Foundation. Decisions were promised by A. Eitan on behalf of the Department of Antiquities and Museums, but nothing is known to have happened yet⁵⁵. Unfortunately, Father Benoit died in the spring of 1987 and A. Eitan has left his post.

On Febr. 24, 1987 Professor Geza Vermes, an eminent qumranologist, one of the very few pillars of the first generation, Reader in Jewish Studies at Oxford, gave the Fourth Annual JSOT Lecture at the University of Sheffield. His criticism of the decisions of R. de Vaux concerning the publication of the scrolls was very severe. Let us quote the pertinent passage. R. de Vaux "was also the mastermind responsible for 'editorial policy', if the use of such a grandiose nomenclature is appropriate, for the series, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. He set up an *ad hoc* editorial team in 1953, which was to produce the definitive edition in some twenty large volumes. He retracted his archaeological misjudgment, but today, sixteen years after his death, we still suffer from the consequences of his editorial *faux pas*, for as many of you will know, the majority of the fragments still remains unpublished. Indeed one of the leading members of the team Monsignor Patrick Skehan, has departed from this world, and another, Jean Starcky, has retired, without acquitting themselves of the task entrusted to them"⁵⁶.

In 1986 Fergus Millar, Mark Geller and Geza Vermes "decided [...] to call a meeting at which speakers would be chosen from among scholars actively engaged in editorial work on unpublished Qumran texts or documents from the Bar Kokhba period". They sent out invitations to Israel, the USA and France. The symposium "on the manuscripts from the Judaean Desert" was held on June 11-12, 1987 at the Institute of Jewish Studies of the University College, London⁵⁷. Of the members of the scrollery team only Prof. F.M. Cross and Prof. J. Strugnell came. Some younger qumranologists like Eugene Ulrich, who continues work on Skehan's lot, and C. Newsöm, J. Sanderson, E. Qimron, former Ph.D. students of J. Strugnell, were also present. The symposium unexpectedly got "advanced press publicity". Charles Bremner reported "on an academic rift over the Dead Sea Scrolls" in an interesting article called "After 2000 years, a call for action"⁵⁸. Then the eminent semitologist prof. Edward Ullendorf commented on Bremner's article on the eve of the London conference⁵⁹. Bremner interviewed the academic opponents involved, G. Vermes and J. Strugnell, who succeeds Father de Vaux and Father Benoit in being responsible for editorial policy concerning manuscripts from Cave 4. G. Vermes and J. Strugnell

rejected "the conspiracy theories associated with Allegro". Vermes said it was "clear what should happen now". Prof. Ullendorf agreed with Vermes that "there is nothing more sinister about these delays than a "lack of management — and indeed proper application to the task in hand".

His letter to the Editors of "The Times" ends as follows: "Let us have the raw material, and there will be no shortage of willing hands to attempt a decipherment".

It is hard not to agree with him. There are very many professors and Ph.D. students who would like to study original texts, but have no chance to as they are not students at Harvard. Finally, in the introductory remarks at the London Symposium prof. G. Vermes changed his mind, about creating a new international academic body and proposed instead a full descriptive catalogue of all the unpublished fragments should be issued at once. However, bearing in mind, that "even this would demand more time than is justifiable after twenty-four years of slow notion editing", he finally accepted Ullendorf's proposal that "the plates would come first, followed as soon as possible by the introductions and the rest of the editorial material". He even mentioned a possibility of "certain funding". Accepting his proposals Vermes stressed that "the charge of weakness or procrastination on the part of the editor-in-chief would be lifted from his shoulders, and the other editors also would escape being accused of displaying a kind of proprietary attitude towards an immense culture treasure whose trustees they are, but which in fact belonged to us all". Let us hope that Prof. J. Strugnell will accept the proposals of G. Vermes and the Dead Sea Scrolls studies would no longer be "hampered by further procrastination"⁶⁰.

J. Strugnell said in the interview with Ch. Bremner that "the number of volumes published so far ([...] 15 of 30) was not bad going"⁶¹; he thought the job should be finished by the end of the century. As only seven volumes of the DJD series (in 9 parts) have in fact been published, it seems either that Strugnell counts the Ph.D. dissertations published outside the series or that several new volumes (announced as "prepared" by Father P. Benoit in 1982) really are in press at the Clarendon Press. I have pointed out several times how slow the press has been in publishing the series. According to the information of G. Vermes, Mr. John Cordy, who has handled the series since 1955, is now retired. We can only hope that his successor will work so as to give us the promised remaining volumes before the end of the century.

In 1972 I wrote: "Inferring from the rate of publication only some of the investigators living now will see the edition of the last volume of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert"⁶². After 16 years the editors of the Qumran Cave 4 materials have finally promised "speedier progress". As Professor Vermes put his wishes "Let us give them the benefit of the doubt and hope that, come the golden jubilee in 1997 (may we all live to see it!), they will have actually repaid the heavy debt owed for so long to the world of learning"⁶³.

THE QUMRAN TEXTS CONCORDANCES

In connection with editing the material from Qumran Cave 4, on the instruction of Father R. de Vaux a special concordance of every word in the Dead Sea Scrolls was prepared. The reason was obvious. As very many new non-Biblical texts were recovered, the Biblical concordances were not helpful. As Father R. de Vaux remembers: "...la difficulté va en croissant quant il s'agit de textes non bibliques dont il n'y a pas de bons index, ou qui ne sont connus qu'incomplètement, ou indirectement par l'intermédiaire de versions, ou seulement par leur titre, ou qui sont totalement inconnus, comme c'est souvent le cas. Pour aider à identifier ces fragments et à restituer leurs lacunes, un fichier-concordance des textes de Qumrân déjà publiés fut établi, puis on entreprit le même travail pour les textes inédits de Qumrân, à mesure que les éditeurs les déchiffraient et communiquaient leurs transcriptions"⁶⁴.

This unusual task was undertaken by Father Joseph A. Fitzmyer, then professor at Woodstock College (Maryland), Raymond S. Brown, SS, then professor of St. Mary's Seminary (Baltimore) and by Wooland C. Oxtoby, who came from Princeton and then worked at McGill University (Montreal). These two Americans and one Canadian were financed by the ASOR and Rockefeller Foundation until June 1960. If we compare the increasing number of identified manuscripts (70 in 1953 and 511 in 1960) it is obviously proven how useful the concordance could be. This indispensable tool for the study of the Qumran texts is in fact inaccessible to the scholarly world. Even if Dr. Eitan did not refuse to allow people to use it, he stressed that an interested scholar had to obtain "the approval of the chief editor (now Prof. Strugnell!) and the Shrine of Books [...] which is also involved"⁶⁵. It is necessary to add that after 1967, when the Rockefeller Museum was taken over by the Israelis, the concordance was transferred to the Shrine of the Book. H. Shanks, who attacked A. Eitan so vehemently to get permission to use the concordance never even mentioned the lamentable state of this enormous indexing task. Let us quote Father M. Baillet, who later visited Jerusalem in 1970/1 and 1971/2: "Les précieuses concordances, surtout celle des inédits, patiemment élaborées autrefois, étaient jetées en désordre dans des fonds d'armoires. Il n'y avait plus de service photographique. Et le malheur fut à son comble lorsque, en 1971, le P. de Vaux tomba malade et mourut"⁶⁶. It would be good to have more recent information concerning the present state of the concordances. The problem is that very few Qumran concordances have been put together⁶⁷, even to cover the already published texts (except of course the DJD series). I suspect that nobody is ready to undertake the task of preparing a new Qumran concordance, knowing that such work was in fact done, but never published, and is still unavailable to the scholarly world. The persons responsible,

i.e. the Editor in Chief and the Israel authorities, should named an editor (or editors), maybe the person(s) who worked on that concordance in the 1950s, to adapt it for the computer and in this way to make it accessible to scholars. The recently published new, big concordance of the Old Testament Greek pseudepigrapha by Father A.-M. Denis is an example of how a modern concordance to non-Biblical texts can be arranged and published⁶⁸.

There is another concordance in the files of the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg, once headed by Professors K.G. Kuhn and H. Stegemann. This concordance has had its own history. As is well known, in 1957 K.G. Kuhn set up the Qumranforschungsstelle at the University of Heidelberg including himself and his three students; the financial support came from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. In three years they prepared the publication of the Rückläufiges hebräisches Wörterbuch/Retrograde Hebrew Lexicon (1958) and Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten (1960) and in 1960 he started to work on an Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten. In 1963 he edited a supplement to his Qumran concordance in the *Revue de Qumran*⁶⁹. He continued his work on the Qumran dictionary even after his retirement in 1971, until autumn of 1973. Later on his cooperator, Prof. H. Stegemann, transferred his workshop to the Marburg University which had been working on improving both the concordance (in connection with newly published texts) and dictionary then in preparation.

Very unfortunately, since 1963 there has been no progress in the publication of the concordance. This is especially regrettable as work was initially moving on well and in 1977 H. Stegemann announced as many as 2000 corrections to the 1960 edition⁷⁰. This was possible thanks to the progress of the Qumran dictionary and to original analyses of photographs of the Qumran manuscripts. The wrong policy adapted by the new head of the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg, which was that the concordance should not be printed before full publication of all the Qumran texts, is responsible for the intolerable devaluation of the existing Marburg concordance and for the nonexistence of any general Qumran concordance at all (existing partial concordances are not very useful and are scattered in too many publications). We are told that the Marburg Qumran concordance is unavailable to scholars as "it contains words which come from unpublished texts". As one of the leading Qumran scholars has told me plainly it is "another example of the stupidity into which we have got ourselves now with the Qumran business".

THE QUMRAN TEXTS DICTIONARY

I have touched above on the question of the Qumran dictionary. In my opinion it is the most urgently needed tool in Qumran research. Before his departure in 1973, Prof. K.G. Kuhn and his small team had prepared 40% of the dictionary in a form

roughly ready for print. In 1976 his successor, Prof. H. Stegemann, announced that he had four experienced helpers and two bibliographers to continue the work. He even promised that from 1979 the dictionary would be published in fascicles to prove to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the public at large that this was a project not without end. Now we have the year 1989 and not even one fascicle of the dictionary has been published; nor, it seems, is even one fascicle ready for print. The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft stopped subsidizing the project, which really turned out to be "ein Fass ohne Boden"⁷¹. In December 1987 I put some questions to Prof. H. Stegemann and I was told that all the entries of the dictionary needed rewriting in the light of recent scholarship, that he was very much occupied by his university duties and that he had no chance to finish his work quickly. This is not only regrettable, but also unacceptable. It means that nobody (except a very few) could make use of the existing but not yet finished dictionary.

Before I continue my remarks I should like to recall the idea and purpose of the Qumran dictionary. In 1976 Prof. H. Stegemann defined his task as follows: 1. All the words of non-Biblical manuscripts are to be included; 2. The dictionary will be divided into Hebrew and Aramaic parts; 3. Entries will be arranged alphabetically; 4. Every item will be supplemented by the full list of forms in the Qumran texts practically existing; 5. Grammatical and linguistic remarks will be modelled on the best existing Hebrew dictionaries of W. Gesenius, F. Brown-S.R. Driver-Ch.A. Briggs and L. Koehler-W. Baumgartner; 6. The system of presentation of scholarly literature will be similar to the quotations and usage of W. Bauer's New Testament Greek-German dictionary⁷².

This clear scheme did not produce the expected results. It is not easy to answer why. First of all we can look for an explanation in simple human factors. Next, the team of Prof. Stegemann drifted from strictly second-hand lexicographic work into original research and editing anew all existing texts. This is obvious from Prof. Stegemann's own words. Since 1970s he has been reading new photographs of all requested texts on a regular basis⁷³. Instead of deliberately leaving aside unproven versions of words or printing them with question marks, Stegemann's team involved themselves in re-publication of the Qumran texts. As even the best photographs are not the same as many years' experience of working on originals, I am afraid that a lot of the corrections will be invented rather than real ones. Another cause is the continuous deterioration of manuscripts. Of course - I would not like in any way to detract from the results of Stegemann's team, but one can clearly see the danger of his policy. His team's version of the Dead Sea Scrolls (if published), will be as much disputable as original editors', and their dictionary will not be parallel to the published texts.

Another idea (wonderful in itself), that of including words from all yet unpublished texts, effectively ruled out the possibility of any dictionary being published. According to Prof. Stegemann, all entries are prepared, including those from unpublished texts, and it is impossible to separate what can now be published and what still cannot. As publication of the remaining Qumran texts is seriously delayed, we all have to suffer by not having a dictionary in even a preliminary form after 30 years of serious and expensive research.

Prof. H. Stegemann was afraid of such a trap when he spoken in Leuven in 1976 about the necessity to use the Jerusalem concordance of the Scrollery Team discussed above. It seems that he has not avoided the trap and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft will not see the first fascicle of the Qumran dictionary before the end of the century. But who will pay for corrections of entries written (by then) 15-25 years earlier? The scrupulous and acerbic policy of the editor of the dictionary should be rejected, a new team quickly organized and preliminary versions of items mimeographed as soon as possible, not even in alphabetical sequence, but immediately that any letter is ready.

THE QUMRAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Besides concordance and dictionary, a new Qumran bibliography is needed. This work, so meritoriously begun by Chr. Burchard and W.S. LaSor in 1950s, is unfortunately interrupted. As we remember, Chr. Burchard described 4459 items in the two volume Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer (vol. I - 1957; vol. II - 1965) arranging them under the names of authors. Neither he nor anyone else has followed this system. Of course the late Rev. Prof. J. Carmignac did his best to inform the scholarly world about new publications and finished dissertations in his journal *Revue de Qumran*, twelve volumes of which contain the descriptions of another 10 000 items⁷⁴. However Carmignac's task was never fully achieved. It seems impossible now to find a library which collects all necessary journals, series and books. In my estimate, about 10 to 20 per cent of items go missing every year because of enormous scattering of publications. Usually they are of lesser value; however sometimes they are pearls and should be included in the general bibliography on the subject. A continuation of Burchard's bibliography (maybe under his editorial supervision) should be undertaken by some other, perhaps younger but competent scholar.

What we need besides is a continuation of W.S. LaSor's Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1957 (1958) arranged by subjects. It was very unfortunate that B. Jongeling did not follow LaSor's ideas consistently and the usefulness of his compilation is much reduced. B. Jongeling's A Classified Bibliography of the

Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-1969 appeared in 1971 and was never supplemented. The bibliographical compilations by J.A. Fitzmyer⁷⁵ and C. Koester⁷⁶ are the only exceptions; however, the first offers a list of major publications and tools, while the second an annotated selection of about 300 items for the years 1974-1984 arranged by topics and cross-indexed. In connection with the presentation of the Polish contribution to the Dead Sea Scrolls research at the Jerusalem Congress of Old Testament scholars in 1986 (by Rev. Prof. S. Mędala), the undersigned prepared a selective Polish bibliography on the subject enumerating 362 items⁷⁷. Some bibliographies specifically connected with some scrolls are now published (like F. Garcia Martinez's bibliography on the Temple Scrolls)⁷⁸ or in press (like P. Muchowski's bibliography on the Copper Scroll)⁷⁹. The undersigned has started the publication of personal bibliographies of Soviet scholars. J.D. Amusin's list is in press⁸⁰ and K.B. Starkova's list will appear soon⁸¹. The remaining part of Soviet items will be ready for publication next year. A list of Hungarian publication on the Dead Sea Scrolls prepared by I. Fröhlich appeared in Volume 25 of the *Folia Orientalia* containing materials from the First International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls held in Mogilany near Cracow, in 1987⁸². Another Polish Qumran bibliography, a supplement to my own authors' compilation originally prepared in 1968⁸³, will soon appear in the *Euhemer* quarterly. As secretary of the *Folia Orientalia* I will try to publish all the remaining East-European bibliographies on the Dead Sea Scrolls in a short time.

In 1967 and 1973 the first lists of the loci of the editiones principales of the Qumran documents were presented by J.A. Sanders⁸⁴. J.A. Fitzmyer's index to the literature on published texts appeared twice: in 1975, and in a slightly supplemented version in 1977. Both compilations are now outdated. F. Garcia Martinez collected a list of texts published between the Leuven Congress and the Colloquium in Mogilany. It will appear as an appendix to the lecture of Rev. Prof. M. Delcor in which the speaker presented a review of the Qumran literature for the last ten years⁸⁵.

As we see, there is an urgent need for a fairly complete Qumran bibliography, both authors' list (following Burchard's epoch making compilation) and a subject one. According to the best of my knowledge, three people are currently involved in the preparation of Qumran bibliographies. One is Prof. F.E. Young from the Kansas City Seminary. He has amassed an enormous collection of Qumran prints in original, about 5000 items⁸⁶. It is certainly the best Qumran collection in the New World. It should be the basis for the preparation of an American first hand bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Next, Dr. F. Garcia Martinez of the Groningen Qumran Institute has for a long time been collecting his own files for publication as a sequel to Jongeling's work⁸⁷. If I might make a suggestion, it would be best for him to concentrate on collecting all materials except American items. And finally, may I point my own involvement in the preparation of the East-European Qumran bibliography, of

the need of for which I have been gently persuaded for many years by Dr. S. Szyszman from Paris. As I have mentioned above, there has been some real progress in that project in the last few years. In this way the three sequels of authors' lists would be the basis for the next subject bibliography of Russian research on the Dead Sea Scrolls. A new computerized system of storing data would make it possible to prepare new bibliographies for publication quite quickly as soon as direct and close cooperation is established.

In his last report on the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg in 1977 Prof. H. Stegemann stressed that a by-product of the research center was the creation of a "full Qumran bibliography". The center had been trying to collect all publications in original copies, off-prints or photocopies⁸⁸. One would like to believe that the bibliography preserved in Marburg is complete, and then to see it printed in any form. However as the scattering of publications is enormous (even H. Stegemann mentioned 400 different periodicals with pertinent material) I would instead suggest cooperation of all the scholarly centers mentioned above and checking items unavailable in their libraries in the collections of respective national libraries. I hope that such cooperation will finally be agreed by the people concerned during the IInd International Colloquium in Mogilany in 1989.

RECENT PROJECTS FOR RE-EDITING QUMRAN TEXTS

In the preceding pages I have tried to present the current state of publication of texts from Qumran Cave 4, which as far as I know contains 60 per cent of the whole volume of scrolls. Very many of the published manuscripts appeared in print in the 1950s. Now they need re-editing. First of all, from time to time we are able to add missing lines from other copies of the same text. Next, the arrangement of texts is sometimes disputable and new, more convincing proposals need to be accepted. Sometime very small fragments of the same scroll, so far useless for any general presentation, have become more legible thanks to the discovery of their proper arrangement. Quite recently interesting observations on the subject were presented several times by the former head of the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg, Prof. H. Stegemann. As he said "in reconstructions of the original scrolls[...] the main problem is the total lack of any well-established method" aside of the method of "material joints", i.e. "finding pieces that join". He invented and developed a new method for the reconstruction of scrolls from scattered fragments independent of their textual findings or parallel texts. The new method of Prof. Stegemann, which could be named the method of "corresponding joints of damage" looks very promising. It has helped Carol Newsom to establish the sequence of columns 10 to 17 of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice scroll, and Stegemann himself was able to properly

arrange 215 fragments of the Songs of the Sage from Cave 4 previously published by M. Baillet⁸⁹.

In general we can say that there are good reasons for re-editing the already published scrolls from Qumran. It seems that three such projects exist now:

1. The Dead Sea Scrolls Project by J.H. Charlesworth is not yet officially announced, but there are rumours about it in specialist circles. As far as can tell, it looks like full re-editing, a kind of "definitive text of scrolls". This project looks very expensive involves many people, will take a long time, to finish. As a leading Qumran scholar told me in 1987: "Wouldn't it be better for people who are paying for this edition to spend the time publishing two new scrolls?" He was perfectly right. It is certainly too early to start another expensive series at a moment when we do not have money for the first official, i.e. DJD, series which is in progress.

2. The second project seems to have been discontinued but should be mentioned. In 1977 Prof. H. Stegemann announced new, critical Neubearbeitungen aller editierten Qumrantexte⁹⁰. As he explained, work on the Qumran dictionary also gave as a partial result corrected editions of well known Qumran texts. As members of his Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg always used the editio princeps and were able to check text in the light of subsequent literature and new photographs of manuscripts, sometimes really better than those known from the official series, it is not surprising that often they were able to produce new, better editions. Some of them were published. It is to be regretted that the project was never finished.

3. The third project for a new publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls was presented during the London Colloquium in June 1987 by Prof. Ph.R. Davies, director of the Sheffield University Press. He had in mind a new study edition⁹¹. The texts are to be presented in their original language with facing English translation. In other words, more or less an "English Lohse". There are five editors: G. Vermes and R. White from Oxford, J. Hayes and Ph. Callaway from Atlanta, and Ph.R. Davies from Sheffield. Numerous texts also been "commissioned from other scholars who have worked with the texts in question". The final result is to appear in a one-volume collection of Qumran texts in 1989. Fascicles will be edited for classroom use of individual texts. The main aim of the new text edition is presentation of the Qumran Cave Scrolls (not the Dead Sea Scrolls). Included will be "continuous text", that means "original continuous text, not conjectural restorations". The new edition will present "no restoration beyond the fairly certain completion of a word". Only non-Biblical texts will be presented and what is more important the text will be exactly that of manuscripts, not the reconstructed "best version" of a document⁹². All these are really responsible decisions, since usually we have to use reconstructed documents, not original texts. Such an edition will certainly be welcome. The main editor is promising that all new texts will be included in reprints

of the original edition, to appear every few years. If necessary, supplements will be released as soon as possible, not even waiting for a new reprint. In other words, a basic, study edition of the Qumran caves texts will be available soon. But, what is perhaps necessary to add, we still need a new series of commentaries to the texts. Such a series was opened by E.J. Brill in 1957 and edited by J. van der Ploeg⁹³. Commentaries on 1QS, 1QM and 1QH were presented in the series at its beginning. Later on, five additional studies were presented, but then, since 1961, not even one commentary on any text! It is disappointing that now the series looks like an abandoned one. The last, eighth volume appeared in 1975, i.e. 14 years ago⁹⁴. Who is responsible for the decease of the series, the publishers or the Editor? The series should be revived by new commentaries to be ordered from responsible scholars as soon as possible. New commentaries are a must for the present time. Hundreds of commentaries on Biblical books are published every year, so I do not see why intertestamental texts from Qumran caves should not be presented in a similar form. Both possible authors (the younger generation of Qumran scholars) and potential buyers are awaiting proper decisions.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The fortieth anniversary of the Dead Sea discoveries should be a turning point in the history of Qumran research. I have said several times how important it is that so many different international colloquia were organized in 1986-1989 in various countries to match the feeling that something has to be done urgently to speed up progress in the discipline⁹⁵. All that means that the interest which exploded in the mid 1950s and caused about one thousand scholars and other interested individuals to take part in international disputes, while now certainly reduced, still exists. Even if the last twenty years have not presented the ordinary person with any sensational event (the last being the recovery of the famous Temple Scroll in 1967), there is a permanent interest in the field. G. Vermes' Dead Sea Scrolls in English has gone through three editions and twenty reprints⁹⁶. Both his book and T.H. Gaster's The Dead Sea Scriptures have sold well over a quarter million copies⁹⁷. More and more young scholars have been choosing Qumran research as their subject, even though — we must add — they are fewer in number than would be necessary. Qumranology has become more and more of an international discipline, and international cooperation is more needed now than ever before. I have mentioned several projects which should be subsidized by international scholarly institutions. There is a need of a permanent forum, where the "Rishonim" (as pillars of the first generation of Qumran scholars were called by Prof. G. Vermes)⁹⁸ could meet with representatives of the second and third generations. It is unfortunate that the first

generation will practically be gone by the turn of century, the second are totally frustrated and the third lack necessary preparation, equipment and tools. The situation is critical, and necessary steps should be taken. To point out the most urgent problems:

1. The Groningen Qumran Institute should concentrate on quick preparation of the Qumran bibliography and present it as soon as possible on computer discs before publishing it with full copyright.

2. The archives of the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg should be transferred to some other German university or institute which would provide the funding or with a view to quick preparation of the Qumran concordance in a form accessible to everyone even before it can be printed; the concordance should eventually be printed of course.

3. The ready (and paid for) entries of the Qumran dictionary which were prepared by members of the Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg and other people should be pre-printed in mimeographed form as they are without any editorial delay. It is up to Prof. H. Stegemann to prepare a "final edition" of the Qumran dictionary; however, the items should become accessible quickly.

4. In view of the fact that the Clarendon Press are working quite slowly proper steps should be taken to ensure quick publication in two or three years at most of the subsequent volumes of the DJD series. As all volumes but one of the DJD series were sold, I do not believe the series brings no profit or prestige. Otherwise E.J. Brill, Peeters and Sheffield University Press should cooperate in the matter to prove that internationally respected publishers are also reliable sponsors of scholarship. The investment will certainly pay, and all the texts published in the series are of extremely high scholarly value.

5. The new editorial project of J.H. Charlesworth should be modified in such a way that his team should first concentrate on re-publication of all materials from Cave 11 in a form appropriate to the DJD series, cooperating with the publishers of the preserved scrolls and using the same plates but adding the fragments so far unpublished. We are all interested in the publication of material from Qumran Cave 4, but to complete the DJD series, the scattered material of Cave 11 should be re-printed according to the principles of the existing series.

6. Some effort should be made to translate the best books from Eastern Europe and so make them available to the scholarly audience. For example, recent monographs by J.D. Amusin⁹⁹, K.B. Starkova¹⁰⁰ and E.M. Elizarova¹⁰¹ should be translated quickly into English before time devalues them.

7. Regular meetings with broader audiences should be organized regularly. Apart from colloquia on specific subjects, like the one at Mogilany in 1987 when the origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls were extensively discussed, more general meetings

should be arranged. The Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow Branch, and more specifically its Oriental Committee, will organize the next colloquium in 1989, with two topics: the Teacher of Righteousness and his role in the Qumran texts and The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity. It is hoped that this will be continued on a regular basis every two years. The gap between the Qumran scholars and everybody else, including Biblical scholars, is widening and should be narrowed. Of course we do not insist on future meetings to be held exclusively in Cracow.

8. Publications of new, short texts (only such as are not yet published) should be easily available. It is immoral that the first edition should be so scattered, that they should appear not only in the (very expensive) DJD series but in a variety of (also very expensive) Festschriften and in numerous, sometimes rare, journals. It is curious that Qumran texts should often be presented for the first time in a Festschrift honouring some eminent Biblical scholar not involved in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, while not even one new text appeared in the volume commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of one of the most prolific members of the Scrollery team, Prof. F.M. Cross. That sort of thing may occasionally be unavoidable, but in fact it is a question of editorial discipline. I do not insist that all new texts should be presented on the pages of the leading journal in the field, *Revue de Qumran*, but I would be very happy if more than the current 10 per cent of texts were presented in this specialized periodical which is open to every scholar. Prof. Ph.R. Davies promises us to print old texts again in pamphlets. Maybe he should receive a permanent permission from all interested scholars annually to reprint newly published texts in a special pamphlet available to everybody at a cheaper rate. I have in mind a simple photo-reprint of scattered articles without any change or comment.

9. I support with all my heart the idea of quick publication of all remaining Qumran Cave 4 material in the form of plates. Professors J.T. Milik, J. Strugnell, E. Ulrich and J. Starcky's successor should submit their lots to the publisher(s) by the end of 1990 to make the texts available some years before the fiftieth anniversary of the Dead Sea discoveries. For some (strictly limited) time they should keep the rights to publish transliterations, translations and commentaries in the DJD series.

10. International symposia, like the London meeting of 1987, should end by formulating some postulates, which should be morally binding on the scholars involved. Interested institutions should be named to get money to finance concrete proposals and projects.

11. To evaluate the Qumran scrolls properly, we should have excavations at Khirbet Qumran quickly and properly published. As is evident from the announcement in the latest issue of the *Revue de Qumran*, the manuscript of the final publication of archaeological data is not yet ready for publication. There is an urgent need for money to pay for competent and expensive analyses to complete the picture of the

excavations. Let us remember that the documentation contains 3000 objects. Still, the publication of Khirbet Qumran excavations should be divided so that a descriptive and summary volume should appear first, not waiting for all necessary analyses. The manuscript of Father R. de Vaux is now old and becoming older every day. Not only the excavations at Khirbet Qumran but also those at Ain Feshkha and at Tell el Guweir, and the remaining small settlements near the Dead Sea must be published in a definitive form, as they provide the background to the Qumran caves discoveries.

12. Friendly cooperation instead of the present animosity and envy is a must. The third generation of Qumran scholars should be supported in their task of re-evaluating the Qumran texts and fighting for a new scholarly consensus. We should educate not only philologists, but also linguists translators, historians and archaeologists for the next century's research in the field.

Very few people had touched on the present state of the Qumran research recently. I hope I am expressing not only my own opinions and not only my personal requests. Qumranology is going through a bad moral crisis and international discussion concerning necessary steps is not to be avoided. That is the only reason for my paper. Far from wanting to criticize or offend anyone. I felt I had to say what I thought was needed to strengthen our favorite discipline.

Doing what is within my own possibilities I will try to prepare for publication an annotated East European bibliography of the Dead Sea discoveries, to give scholars access to research which is unknown (or relatively little known) because of existing language barrier. That publication will be our Polish contribution to the international effort in the advancement of Qumran studies.

Notes

¹ Cf. the list of Qumran colloquia on that occasion listed by F. Garcia Martinez (*Informations Qumraniennes*, Revue de Qumran 12,4 /Nov. 1987/, pp. 603-607) and occasional articles like G. Vermes, *Biblical Studies and the Dead Sea Scrolls 1947-1987: Retrospects and Prospects*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 39, 1987, pp. 113-128; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible: After Forty Years*, America 157, 1987, pp. 300-303; W. Chrostowski, *Qumran - 40 lat później* (Qumran - 40 ans après), Przegląd Powszechny (Warsaw) 1987, no 11, pp. 195-211 and no 12, pp. 377-396.

² Besides first comments in French journals (cf. E.-M. Laperrousaz, Note sur l'origine des manuscrits de la Mer Morte, Annales. Économies. Sociétés. Civilisations 1987, no 6, pp. 1305-1312; C. Aziza, Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte: une hypothèse non conformiste, Histoire no 79, 1985, pp. 81-83) serious discussion was undertaken during the First International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Mogilany near Cracow, in 1987. Cf. W. Chrostowski, *op. cit.*, pp.

392-396; J. Chmiel, *Międzynarodowe Kolokwium nt. Qumran* (Kraków-Mogilany 1987), (An International Colloquium on Qumran, Kraków-Mogilany 1987), Ruch Bibliijny i Liturgiczny 30, 1987, pp. 231-233; Z.J. Kąpera, *I Międzynarodowe Kolokwium Qumranologiczne w Polsce* (The First International Qumran Colloquium in Poland), Przegląd Orientalistyczny 1988, no 2, pp. 78-85; idem, *An International Colloquium on the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Mogilany near Cracow: May 31-June 2, 1987), Folia Orientalia 24, 1987, pp. 299-301; idem, *[Międzynarodowe Kolokwium Qumranologiczne w Mogilanach]* (An International Qumran Colloquium in Mogilany), Euhemer 33, 1989, no 2 (in press); S. Mędala, *Nowa hipoteza na temat pochodzenia pism znad Morza Martwego* (Nouvelle hypothèse concernant l'origine des manuscrits de la région de la Mer Morte), Studia Theologica Varsaviensia 26, 1988, no 1, pp. 117-136.

³ Cf. recent opinions by R. Eisenman (*Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran*, Leiden 1983, esp. chapters: VII "Palaeographic Problems", pp. 28-31, and VIII "Archaeological Problems", pp. 32-34; James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet, Leiden 1986, chapter III "The Archaeological Evidence", pp. 75-86).

⁴ Results of excavations by Father R. de Vaux and his team in 1953-1958 at the Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshkha are not yet ready for print. The final publication is now in financial trouble (cf. announcement in the Revue de Qumran no 48, Nov. 1987, back cover).

⁵ Cf. J.M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I* (4Q158-4Q186), Oxford 1968 (=Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V).

⁶ M. Burrows et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. I, New Haven 1950 and vol. II, fasc. 2, New Haven 1951.

⁷ E.L. Sukenik, *mgylwt gnwzw*, Jerusalem 1948-1950.

⁸ J.C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A Personal Account*, Grand Rapids 1977, p. 116.

⁹ J.D. Barthélemy, J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, Oxford 1955 (= DJD I).

¹⁰ P. Benoit, J.T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*, Oxford 1961 (= DJD II).

¹¹ M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q a 10Q. Le Rouleau de Cuivre*, Oxford 1962.

¹² J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London 1963², p. 18.

¹³ Cf. R. de Vaux [in:] R. de Vaux, J.T. Milik, *Qumran Grotte 4.II* (= DJD VI), Oxford 1977, p. 6.

¹⁴ H. S(hanks), *Debate on Enoch Stifled For 30 Years While One Scholar Studied Dead Sea Scroll Fragments*, Bible Review 3,2(1987), p. 34.

¹⁵ J.T. Milik, *Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Désert de Juda* [in:] Volume du Congrès. Strasbourg 1956, Leiden 1957, (= Supplements to Vetus Testamentum IV), pp. 17-26; idem [in:] P. Benoit et al., *Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran*, The Biblical Archaeologist 19, 1956, pp. 88-90 (Cave 4) and pp. 82-83 (Cave 5).

¹⁶ J.T. Milik, *Tefilin, Mezuzot et Targums* (4Q128-4Q157) [in:] DJD VI, pp. 31-93 and pls. IV-XXVIII.

¹⁷ J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran, Cave 4*, Oxford 1976.

¹⁸ J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major publications and Tools for Study*, Missoula, Montana 1977, pp. 30-32.

¹⁹ J.T. Milik, Daniel et Susanne à Qumrân [in:] M. Carrez, J. Doré, P. Grelot, eds., De la Torâh au Messie, études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles..., Paris 1981, pp. 337-359.

²⁰ Cf. P. Benoit, review of: J.C. Trever, The Dead Sea Scrolls. A Personal Account in the Revue Biblique 90, 1983, p. 100.

²¹ This text was originally published by J.M. Allegro in his last book: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth, Newton Abbot 1979, Appendix: 4Q Therapeia, pp. 235-240, pls. 16-17. Subsequent edition and commentary by J.H. Charlesworth (The Discovery of a Dead Sea Scroll (4Q Therapeia): Its Importance in the History of Medicine and Jesus Research, Lubbock, Texas 1985) was severely criticized and decipherment by both scholars finally rejected (cf. M. Delcor, La recherche qumrânienne pendant la dernière décennie, 1976-1987, Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, p. 16).

²² All quotations from H. S(hanks), I. cit. Nota bene Prof. M. Black is explicitly mentioned on the title page of Milik's book as a co-publisher of the Enoch texts!

²³ F.M. Cross Jr. [in:] P. Benoit et al., Editing..., pp. 83-86 and [in:] Travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân, Revue Biblique 63, 1956, pp. 56-58.

²⁴ Cf. P.D. Miller Jr., P.D. Hanson, S. Dean McBride, eds., Ancient Israelite Religion. Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross, Philadelphia 1987. Bibliography of the works of F.M. Cross, cf. pp. 645-656.

²⁵ Cf. J.M. Allegro [in:] P. Benoit et al., Editing..., pp. 90-92 and [in:] Travail d'édition..., pp. 62-64.

²⁶ Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 26.

²⁷ Cf. P.W. Skehan [in:] P. Benoit et al., Editing..., pp. 86-88 and [in:] Travail d'édition..., pp. 58-60.

²⁸ I feel free of having to enumerate preliminary publications of texts from Qumran Cave 4, as nearly all of them are mentioned in Fitzmyer's bibliography, pp. 23-34.

²⁹ Cf. H. S(hanks), Failure to Publish Dead Sea Scrolls Is Leitmotif of New York University Scroll Conference, Biblical Archaeology Review 11, 1985, n° 5, p. 58.

³⁰ Cf. P. Benoit, review of: J. Trever, I. cit.

³¹ J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran. 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition, Atlanta, GA 1986.

³² Cf. J. Starcky [in:] P. Benoit, Editing..., pp. 94-96 and [in:] Travail d'édition..., pp. 66-67. [Rev. J. Starcky died in Paris on Oct. 9, 1988. It is expected that Prof. É. Puech will be responsible for publication of his lot].

³³ J. Strugnell [in:] P. Benoit, Editing..., pp. 92-94 and [in:] Travail d'édition..., pp. 64-66.

³⁴ P. Benoit, review of: J. Trever, I. cit.

³⁵ C. Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition, Atlanta, GA 1985.

³⁶ Cf. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran [in:] J. Aviram et al., eds., Biblical Archaeology Today Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984, Jerusalem 1985, pp. 400-407 and Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran, The Israel Museum Journal 4, 1985, pp. 9-12.

³⁷ Cf. C. Newsom, The "Psalms of Joshua" from Qumran Cave 4, Journal of Jewish Studies 39, 1988, pp. 56-73 and The Psalms of Joshua from Qumran Cave 4, the Rewritten Bible and the Qumran Canon [in:] Abstracts of a Symposium "Forty Years of Research in the Dead Sea Scrolls", Haifa-Tel Aviv-Jerusalem 1988, p. 9.

³⁸ Cf. J. Strugnell, D. Dimant, Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385-390) [in:] Abstracts..., p. 8.

³⁹ Cf. C.-H. Hunzinger [in:] P. Benoit et al., Editing..., p. 96 and [in:] Travail d'édition..., p. 67.

⁴⁰ Cf. M. Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4. III. (4Q482-4Q520), Oxford 1982, (= DJD VII).

⁴¹ J.P.M. van der Ploeg, Les manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân, Revue de Qumran 12,1 (1985), pp. 3-15 quotes all pertinent bibliographical data concerning Qumran Cave 11.

⁴² Cf. J.A. Sanders, The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP^a), Oxford 1965 (= DJD IV).

⁴³ Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumran. Édité et traduit par J.P.M. van der Ploeg et A.S. van der Woude. Avec la collaboration de B. Jongeling, Leiden 1971.

⁴⁴ D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev), Winona Lake 1985.

⁴⁵ Cf. A.S. van der Woude, Melchisedech als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefunden midraschim aus Höhle XI, Oudtestamentliche Studien 14, 1965, pp. 354-373, 2 pls; idem, 11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament, New Testament Studies 12, 1965/66, pp. 301-326 and J.T. Milik, Milk¹-sedeq et Milk¹-reša^c dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens, Journal of Jewish Studies 23, 1972, pp. 95-144.

⁴⁶ Cf. Y. Yadin, Megillat Ham-Migdal, Jerusalem 1977, vols. I-IIIa and English translation: The Temple Scroll, Jerusalem 1983. Polish translation of the Temple Scroll with an extensive commentary, cf. W. Tyloch, Zwój Świątynny (The Temple Scroll), Euhemer 27, 1983, n° 3 (129), pp. 3-20; 28, 1984, n° 1 (131), pp. 3-20; n° 2 (132), pp. 11-36; n° 3 (133), pp. 9-27.

⁴⁷ R. de Vaux, Archéologie [in:] DJD VI, p. 8.

⁴⁸ Cf. H. Stegemann, How to Connect Dead Sea Scroll Fragments, Bible Review, 4, 1988, n° 1, p. 25.

⁴⁹ J.M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth, p. 6 of the first American edition. Cf. H. S(hanks), Failure..., p. 66.

⁵⁰ P. Benoit, review of: Trever, p. 99.

⁵¹ As quoted by P. Benoit, I. cit.

⁵² Cf. D.N. Freedman, Leading Scholar Calls for Prompt Publication, Biblical Archaeology Review 4, 1978, n° 1, pp. 2-3; H. S(hanks), Jerusalem Rolls out Red Carpet for Biblical Archaeology Congress. Serious Issues Raised Concerning Nature of Biblical Archaeology as well as Publication of Dead Sea Scrolls, BAR 10, 1984, n° 4, pp. 12-18 (esp. pp. 17 f); Ed. (=H S(hanks)), No Theological Reasons for Failing to Publish Dead Sea Scrolls, BAR 11, 1985, n° 1, p. 10; New Call for Publication of Dead Sea Scrolls, BAR 11, 1985, n° 3, p. 10; H. S(hanks), Failure..., BAR 11, 1985, n° 5, pp. 4, 6, 66, 68, 70; H. S(hanks), Israeli Authorities Now Responsible for Delay in Publication of Dead Sea Scrolls, BAR 11, 1985, n° 5, pp. 71-72.

⁵³ Cf. BAR Interviews Avraham Eitan. Antiquities Director Confronts Problems and Controversies, BAR 12, 1986, n° 4, pp. 30-38 (esp. pp. 37 f).

⁵⁴ Cf. J.T. Milik, Le travail d'édition..., SVT 4, p. 26; idem, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London 1963², p. 73 (concerning an Essene calendar).

⁵⁵ Cf. the quoted interview, p. 38.

⁵⁶ Cf. G. Vermes, Biblical Studies..., p. 117.

⁵⁷ First part of London lectures was published in the Journal of Jewish Studies 39, 1988, n° 1, pp. 1-79.

⁵⁸ Cf. "The Times" June 6, 1987, p. 10.

⁵⁹ Cf. E. Ullendorf, Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls, "The Times" June 11, 1987, p. 15.

⁶⁰ Cf. G. Vermes, Introductory Remarks [in:] Symposium on the Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert, Journal of Jewish Studies 39, 1988, n° 1, p. 4.

⁶¹ Ch. Bremner, op. cit.

⁶² Cf. Z.(J.) Kapera, A Project of an International Centre of Qumran Studies Documentation, Revue de Qumran 8,1 (June 1972), p. 3.

⁶³ G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 3rd ed., London 1987, p. XII.

⁶⁴ Cf. R. de Vaux, Archeologie [in:] DJD VI, p. 7.

⁶⁵ Cf. footnote 58.

⁶⁶ Cf. M. Baillet, op. cit., p. XII.

⁶⁷ Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, op. cit., p. 69.

⁶⁸ A.-M. Denis, Concordance grecque des pseudepigraphes d'Ancien Testament, Louvain-la-Neuve 1987.

⁶⁹ Cf. K.G. Kuhn, Nachträge zur "Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten", Revue de Qumran 4,2 (May 1963), pp. 163-234.

⁷⁰ Cf. H. Stegemann, Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg und ihre Aufgabenstellung. Ein Bericht [in:] M. Delcor, ed., Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu, Paris-Leuven 1978, p. 49.

⁷¹ Ibidem, p. 50.

⁷² Ibidem, p. 47-48.

⁷³ Ibidem, p. 48.

⁷⁴ Z.(J.) Kapera, A Project..., p. 5.

⁷⁵ J.A. Fitzmyer, op. cit. (cf. note 18).

⁷⁶ C. Koester, A Qumran Bibliography 1974-1984, Biblical Theology Bulletin 15, 1985, n° 3, pp. 110-119.

⁷⁷ Cf. Z.J. Kapera, Selected Polish Subject Bibliography of the Dead Sea Discoveries, Folia Orientalia 23, 1985-1986, pp. 269-338 (index of names on pp. 332-335).

⁷⁸ Cf. F. Garcia Martinez, El Rollo del Templo (11Q Temple): Bibliografía sistematica, Revue de Qumran 12,3 (Dec. 1986), pp. 425-440.

⁷⁹ Folia Orientalia 26, 1989.

⁸⁰ Z.J. Kapera, (Soviet Bibliography on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Part One: Contributions by J.D. Amusin), Revue de Qumran 14,1 (1989), n° 53, pp. 117-122.

⁸¹ Z.J. Kapera, Soviet Bibliography on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Part Two: Contributions by K.B. Starkova (in preparation).

⁸² I. Fröhlich, Bibliographie des recherches hongroises sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte, Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 79-83.

⁸³ Z.J. Kapera, Polska bibliografia rękopisów znad Morza Martwego (Polish Bibliography of the Manuscripts from the Dead Sea), Euhemer 12, 1968, n° 2(68), pp. 129-140.

⁸⁴ Cf. J.A. Sanders, Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1957, Journal of Biblical Literature 86, 1967, pp. 431-434; idem, Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1972, Journal of Jewish Studies 24, 1973, pp. 74-83.

⁸⁵ To be published soon in the Folia Orientalia.

⁸⁶ Information of Prof. G. Young in his letter to the author of May 13, 1987.

⁸⁷ Private information.

⁸⁸ H. Stegemann, Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg, p. 49.

⁸⁹ H. Stegemann, How to Connect..., pp. 24-29, 43; esp. p. 27 and an example on pp. 28-29 concerning columns X-XVII of the 4Q Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.

⁹⁰ H. Stegemann, Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg, p. 48.

⁹¹ P.R. Davies, The Qumran Texts: A New Study Edition, Journal of Jewish Studies 39, 1988, pp. 74-79.

⁹² Ibidem, p. 76.

⁹³ Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vols. 1-8, Leiden 1957-1975.

⁹⁴ E.H. Merrill, Qumran and Predestinations. A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns, Leiden 1975.

⁹⁵ Cf. Z.J. Kapera, The Manchester Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 241-246. It is worth mentioning that two colloquia on the Dead Sea Scrolls are scheduled for 1989: in Groningen and in Mogilany, near Cracow.

⁹⁶ Cf. my review in the Folia Orientalia, 26, 1989.

⁹⁷ Cf. a note on back cover of the 3rd edition of T.H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scripture, Garden City, N.Y. 1976.

⁹⁸ G. Vermes, Introductory Remarks, p. 2.

⁹⁹ J.D. Amusin, Kumranskaja Obsčina (The Qumran Community), Moskva 1983.

¹⁰⁰ K.B. Starkova, Literaturnye pamiatniki kumranskoj obsčiny (The Literary Monuments of the Qumran Community), Leningrad 1973.

¹⁰¹ M.M. Elizarova, Obsčina Terapevtov (The Community of Therapeutes), Moskva 1972.

P.S. 21a [Writing the above words in the summer of 1988 I was convinced that I was quoting the opinion of Mr. Shanks. However, in Sept. 1989, he showed me that his words were an exact quotation from J. H. Charlesworth's book: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament, Cambridge 1985, p. 89. I understand that the "Bible Review" is only a popular scholarly bimonthly but I think proper footnoting procedures would be in order to avoid similar misunderstandings in the future. Coming back our topic I was pleased that at that particular point Prof. Charlesworth was unable to give any reference for Milik's promise. I am afraid that Charlesworth's accusations of Milik are simply baseless].