

Review Article

Zdzisław Jan KAPERA

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF REVEREND
JEAN CARMIGNAC

A Review Article of the Mémorial Jean Carmignac. Études Qumrâniennes éditées par Florentino Garcia Martinez et Émile Puech, Paris 1988, Gabalda, 8°, pp. IX, 692. Price: FF 950. (= Revue de Qumrân vol. 13, nos. 49-52, October 1988).

Rev. Prof. Jean Carmignac (1914-1986) was one of the best European Hebrew scholars of the 20th century and one of the giants of qumranology. In July 1958, when the battle of the scrolls of mid-fifties was at its peak he founded the Revue de Qumrân, an international journal of the highest scholarly standard, with himself as sole editor. Nobody ever regretted his editorship. The columns of the journal were always open to anyone interested, but materials published had to be good, either as research or as information. For 30 years through 47 issues Revue de Qumrân under Carmignac's editorship remained the best journal in Qumran research in the world.

The premature death of Jean Carmignac caused deep sorrow to his friends. The people to whom he left the Revue de Qumrân, Mr. F. Garcia Martinez and Mr. E. Puech, have devoted the entire 13th volume of the journal to the memory of J. Carmignac. It is called Mémorial Jean Carmignac, a thick volume of 701 pages (so about 60 pages more than 4 ordinary issues). Its introductory part contains a preface by the new editors, a biography of the late J. Carmignac and his bibliography. The core of the volume consists of forty eight contributions divided into six sections: (I) Publication of texts (4); (II) Studies on texts (21); (III) Subject studies (9); (IV) Linguistic studies (3); (V) Qumran and the text of the Old Testament (5); (VI) Qumran and the New Testament (6). The volume ends with

33 pages of indexes (authors, Biblical references, Qumran references, pseudepigrapha references, references to Josephus Flavius and to Philo of Alexandria) and the list of contributors, with their addresses.

A review of the full contents of the Mémorial is rather beyond me. Too many authors have contributed and too vast a field is covered by their contributions. The editors are right in stressing that the book is a real mine of present Qumran studies, giving a general cross-section of the results of forty years of research in the field (cf. p. IX). I should like to mention only a part of the articles. Let us start with the introductory items.

In the "Avant-Propos" (pp. VII-IX) the editors explain that they originally proposed publication of Mélanges in honor of J. Carmignac for 1989. His premature death in 1986 prevented this and the volume appears as a Mémorial.

The reconstruction of the curriculum vitae of Rev. Jean Carmignac by E. Puech (Jean Carmignac 1914-1986, pp. 1-7) is based mainly on Carmignac's recollections in the Histoire de la Famille Carmignac (vol. 1, Paris 1975 and vol. 2, Paris 1985). Puech adds only a few personal remarks of his own mostly in connection with the Revue de Qumran. He next rightly stresses that during the last twenty years of his life J. Carmignac tried to study the Hebrew background of the Gospels as eye-witnesses, fighting with the "Bultmanisation" of the Gospels, and editing late Hebrew translations of the Gospels. However, personal criticism of E. Puech of these works, even if understandable (I have noticed vivid opposition to Carmignac's views among French Biblical scholars), is rather unexpected. I can only say one thing: very many of Carmignac's observations look right, and rejecting them wholesale is certainly premature and before the publication of Le Magnificat et le Benedictus en hébreu? (last book of J. Carmignac) even disloyal. I would have waited until all the announced translations of The Birth of the Synoptic Gospels as well as of Magnificat and Benedictus in Hebrew? have been made fully available. Recent publications on the Semitic background of the Gospels seem to confirm that Carmignac may have moved a stone that will touch off an avalanche (cf. for example: G. Howard, The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text, Macon, GA-Leuven 1987). Puech also mentions Carmignac's contribution to the French Ecumenic Translation of the Bible, which appeared in 1975 in Editions du Cerf, as well as his honorary doctorate awarded in Bonn in 1968. It is worth remembering that Carmignac received this honorary degree in connection with his studies on the Hebrew background of the Gospels. We can fully agree with the cordial words of Puech concerning the pastoral work of Rev. J. Carmignac. I can add that he left Cracow earlier than expected in 1985 (his only visit here), because there were some urgent needs of his parishioners that he wanted to serve. His loyalty to his flock was exemplary!

I expected to add a list of obituaries to this curriculum vitae of J. Carmignac¹. I am not au courant of foreign publications, but I hope I will be excused for mentioning two extensive articles about Carmignac in Polish scholarly journals. One is by the undersigned and in Polish: Life and activity of Rev. Jean Carmignac (1914-1986) (Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny 40, 1987, pp. 119-132), the second one is in French by Rev. Prof. Mathias Delcor, In Memoriam Jean Carmignac (Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 233-240).

The list of Carmignac's publications for the Mémorial was prepared by the new secretary of the Revue de Qumran, Dr. Florentino Garcia Martinez (Bibliographie de M. l'Abbé Jean Carmignac, pp. 9-20). It is a detailed compilation put together with some help from E. Puech and J. Trinquet. I would prefer not to comment on it in detail now, but I find it very reliable and useful. It is not quite complete, as some minor publications have escaped the author's attention, and one would expect that reviews of Carmignac's works could be included too, as would be the most important abstracts of his publications. I hope to publish a fuller list of proposed additions (including the completely missing controversy between J. Carmignac and P. Grelot) in the Folia Orientalia. As a marginal note, let me mention that the first Polish translations of works by J. Carmignac (an article on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament and the third chapter from his book on The Birth of the Synoptic Gospels) have appeared recently in the journals Przegląd Powszechny and Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny². Two translations of his books The Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus Christ and The Birth of the Synoptic Gospels are now ready, but not yet printed.

Last but not least, I should like to say that in fact the first bibliography of Jean Carmignac was compiled by Rev. Henri de Villefranche, but I do not know if the author finally prepared it for publication or not (most probably he did not).

Part one of the Mémorial is devoted to publications of new texts. C. Newsom cooperating with J. Strugnell, the present editor of the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, offers an interesting text from the Qumran Cave 4: 4Q370 An Admonition Based on the Flood (pp. 23-43). In this text it seems that the author of 4Q370 quotes the book of Genesis from memory (p. 38). What is strange is that the text "is unlikely to have been composed by the Qumran community" (p. 23). Paleography suggests the late Hasmonean period as the terminus ad quem. In the opinion of C. Newsom the new text "appears to allude to 11QPs^a Hymn to the Creator, a text probably to be dated to the late Persian or Hellenistic period" (*loc. cit.*).

The second new manuscript, previously called 4Q Pseudo-Ezekiel, is now presented as 4Q Second Ezekiel (pp. 45-58) by J. Strugnell and D. Dimant

which is extant in five (or even six) copies (=4Q385-390) of fragmentary condition. In general the fragments are in late Hasmonean or early Herodian script. The Pseudo-Ezekiel seems to have been popular in Qumran, but "it is [...] not easy to decide whether it belongs to the Qumran sect's own compositions or not [...]" Some features [...] resemble sectarian writings, several others have closer parallels in various apocalypses, such as the Animal Apocalypse and especially Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch" (p. 46). The text looks important, as it presents us for the first time "with Hebrew formulations of some typical apocalyptic ideas [...]" The unique combination of features in this book may suggest the need for a re-evaluation of the role, function, and distinctness of the various literary types current in early Jewish literature" (pp. 55 and 57). The problem if the text is of the Qumran literature or not remains an open question.

The subsequent article by E. Puech concerns two columns of the Hodayot and in some way continues the work of J. Carmignac on this scroll (Un Hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes. 1QH V, 12-VI, 18 (= col. XIII-XIV 7) et 4QBéat, pp. 59-88). It offers a new, more detailed and supplemented reconstruction of 1QH V, 12-VI, 18. E. Puech has been working on the Hodayot scrolls for some time and he has even proved that 1Q35 is not a part of 1QH but of some other scroll parallel to it. So there were two Hodayot scrolls from Cave 4 i.e. (4QpapH^f, 4QH^{a-e}). The new contribution of E. Puech gives us a new reconstruction of columns XIII-XIV of E. Sukenik's edition, that means columns V-VI of the original scroll including unpublished small fragments. He presents anew Hebrew text, its French translation and extensive commentary. He stresses numerous parallels (more than eighty words and expressions) with the very well known "Instruction of the Two Spirits" (1QS III, 13-IV). The reconstructed fragment of the 1QH is very important for the study of the Essene theology.

At the end of his article E. Puech offers an unpublished text of 4Q Béatitudes from the lot of the late Rev. J. Starcky (in his translation and with a commentary) in connection with the term 'ASRY. This term is often used both in the reconstructed hymn of 1QS and in 4Q Béatitudes. From this article it is obvious that E. Puech is well prepared for the rearrangement and republication of 1Q Hodayot.

A. S. van der Woude has noticed that a small fragment of Deut. 13,7-11 written identically as 11Q TS^b and transcribed by J. P. van der Ploeg³ in a preliminary way in 1985 is in fact another missing fragment of the Temple Scroll (cf. Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle, pp. 89-92). It fills a gap at the bottom of column LIV. Taking into consideration the enormous number of existing fragments of the Qumran scrolls, especially from Cave 4, this is another proof that photographic collection of all manuscripts should be published as soon as possible. Only in this way can we make better progress in the reconstruction of preserved scrolls.

The second, most extensive part of the Mémorial contains text studies on 1QS, 1QM, 1QapGen, 3Q15 (Copper Scroll), 4Q Enoch, ShirShab, 11Q Temple, CD, on Jubilee and Aramaic Levi. H. Stegemann offers his critical remarks on the Rule of the Community (cf. Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III, 13-IV, 26, pp. 95-131). J. Duhaime compares the War Rule with the contemporary war handbooks of Asclepiodotus, Aelian and Arrian (2nd c. B.C. - 2nd c. A.D.) trying to support Y. Yadin's old hypothesis that this text is an authentic military manual. His results are thin but interesting (The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises, pp. 133-151). C. A. Evans, presents a treatise on The Genesis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible (pp. 153-165). The pseudepigraph represents "early biblical interpretation that is conscious of the canonical status and stabilization of sacred tradition" (p. 165). Al Walters philologically explains and translates much disputed fragment of the Copper Scroll (I, 13) providing it with an archaeological commentary (The Fifth Cache of the Copper Scroll: "The Plastered Cistern of Manos", pp. 167-176). I. Fröhlich discusses "The Book of Watchers" in connection with Qumran tradition (Les enseignements des Veilleurs dans la tradition de Qumrân, pp. 177-187).

Three contributions are devoted to the text of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. D. C. Allison discusses the problem of the silence of Angels (The Silence of Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, pp. 189-197). J. M. Baumgarten evaluates "the potential importance of the Angelic Liturgy from Qumran for the history of Jewish mysticism" (p. 199; cf. The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions, pp. 199-213). S. Segert studies the poetic structures of the Sabbath Songs (Observations on Poetic Structures in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, pp. 215-223).

More contributions are connected with the recently highly debated Temple Scroll. G. J. Brooke draws our attention to The Temple Scroll and the Archaeology of Qumran, 'Ain Feskha and Masada (pp. 225-237). He accepts the opinion that the 11QT dates from the Herodian period. However, it is generally agreed that Khirbet Qumran was abandoned during the reign of Herod the Great. There is some ambiguity: according to R. de Vaux-Ph. R. Davies' theory the Essenes left because they were friendly with the Herod the Great. However, taking into consideration the fact that 11QT seems to attack Herod and his misrule directly, it looks as if the Essenes abandoned Qumran because it was "too critically close to Herod's winter palace at Jericho [...]" «Re-publication» of the Temple Scroll at the turn of the era could be a sign of Essene favour with Herod the Great or of renewed Essene disillusionment with current Temple practice... (p. 226). Commenting on recent attempts to reconstruct the early Essene history in connection with the Temple Scroll, Brooke warns that the document "should not prematurely be labelled

Essene" (p. 227). Passing to particular matters Brooke notices that it is not excluded that the rectangular patterns on the linen wrappings of scrolls may well have mirrored the plan of the scroll's Temple and its courts. Furthermore the date of the wrappings is the same as that of the Temple Scroll itself. In connection with the house of the laver (cf. TS XXXII-XXXIII) Brooke reminds us of the curious niches in some walls of Qumran noticed by R. de Vaux. Brooke connects the so-called "tannery" at 'Ain Feskha with possible transfer of the laundering of priestly clothes to the basins. It is also possible that the rule "for keeping to the left may have been applied to the ritual baths at Qumran which are divided with a small raised plaster strip..." (cf. p. 231 and 11QT XLV,1). Brooke combines the intriguing broken sherds from some graves at Qumran and in 'Ain el-Ghuweir with a text from 11QT L,16-19. It seems that they were "deliberately broken before being put in with the corpse which had caused their permanent contamination" (p. 234). Surprisingly interesting is another connection which Brooke shows, between the general, Levitic tune of the documents from Qumran cave 11 (including 11QT) and these found at Masada. He is perfectly right in saying that "There is certainly some connection between Qumran and Masada, but the make-up of the communities in both places may be more complex than has been supposed hitherto" (p. 236). This remark by Brooke deserves further discussion, especially in view of the authoritative rejection by N. Golb any connection between Masada and the Qumran documents.

The second contribution connected with the Temple Scroll is an article of Rev. Prof. M. Delcor on La description du Temple de Salomon selon Eupolémus et le problème de ses sources (pp. 251-271). He offers his own translation of and commentary to the Greek text of Eupolemos and next he gives an affirmative answer to the question if the Temple Scroll was one of its literary sources. He also accepts dating of the 11QT to the time of John Hyrcanus or a bit later.

The next writer, P. R. Callaway, describes The Temple Scroll and the Canonization of Jewish Law (pp. 239-250). The fourth author, H. A. Mink presents Tempel und Hofanlagen in der Tempelrolle (pp. 273-285). Very convincing seems to be the proposal of J. C. Reeves, that the intriguing Hebrew phrase Moreh Sedeq from the Qumran scrolls means exactly "True Lawgiver", which can be supported by the existence of 11QT, 4QMMT and other legal texts (cf. his The Meaning of Moreh Sedeq in the Light of 11QT, pp. 297-298).

L. H. Schiffman comes back again to the legal interpretation of the 11QT (The Laws of War in the Temple Scroll, pp. 299-311). He stresses that the Temple Scroll is a composite work including the Law of the King. It "calls for a thorough revision of the existing order and in so doing represents a polemic against the Hasmonean rulers". For Schiffman the scroll is "the product of a group

which was either a predecessor or in some way related to the Qumran sect" (p. 311).

Three contributions in the Mémoirial Jean Carmignac are connected with the Damascus Document. Ph. R. Davies investigates the role of the Teacher of Righteousness, "which [...] is intrinsically linked with the expectation of the «end of days»" (cf. p. 313; The Teacher of Righteousness and the "End of Days", pp. 313-317). For Davies the essential clue to the Teacher's role is CD VI,8-11 and especially the expression YWRH HSDQ. In his opinion in CD we have "a credible picture of a community attached to the Teacher, suffering opposition and witnessing the death of the one who was to bring in the «end of days»". It is obvious that the words of the dead Teacher continued to govern the life of the community. "Abandonment of the Temple, living in Qumran and celibacy are three respects in which his community may be marked off from the community as it was before his arrival" (p. 317).

J. C. Greenfield for the first time offers a convincing explanation of the last unclear literary quotations in the text of the CD (The Words of Levi son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV,15-19, pp. 319-322). The very often discussed passage concerning the three nets of Belial come from a work that circulated in certain quarters at the turn of our era; not from the Testament of Levi known to us in Greek, however, but from an Aramaic version known from the Cairo Genizah fragments. The latter text, "as the comparison with fragments from Qumran has shown, is very close to the Aramaic Testament of Levi from Qumran" (p. 321). The quotation in the CD seems to be based on TL 16 (Bodleian B. 11,14-16) where Isaac instructs Levi saying "first of all, beware my son of all fornication, impurity and unchastity" (l. cit.).

B. Z. Wacholder gives his own, very distinctive and original answer to one of the highly debated problems of the 1950s concerning the Teacher of Righteousness. He inquires: Does Qumran Record the Death of the Moreh? The Meaning of he'asep in Damascus Document XIX,35 XX,14 (pp. 323-330). As is commonly accepted in the literature on Qumran the word he'asep at these places signifies "ingathering" or "death". Strict analysis of the usage of the word in the Biblical, extra-Biblical and Qumranic literature "does not support the meaning «death» besides exceptional causes where the context such a rendering". In CD XIX,35 and XX,14 "death is in no way suggested by or suitable to the contexts". Wacholder sees the Teacher of Righteousness as not being dead or gathered, but as the "gatherer", i.e. the one who proclaims the assembly. And what is more, for Wacholder "the Moreh is the initiator of the gathering and thus has assumed a role comparable to Moses" (p. 330). If his opinion is generally accepted, it will have an important influence not only on the reconstruction of the Teacher's life, but

also on the early history of the Qumran community. In my opinion, at least one of the myths created by A. Dupont-Sommer in 1950s, i.e. that about the Teacher's martyrdom⁴, is finally exploded, as has in fact been evident since the evaluation of the problem by J. T. Milik, who favoured a natural death interpretation⁵.

H. Lignée, one of the close collaborators of Jean Carmignac in 1960s, offers in memory of his friend an interesting essay on the origin of the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees (La place du Livre des Jubilés et du Rouleau du Temple dans l'histoire du mouvement essénien. Ces deux ouvrages on-ils été écrits par le Maître de Justice?, pp. 331-345). In his opinion both texts were written by the Teacher of Righteousness in the period of John Hyrcanus, before the foundation of the Qumran community. He agrees with the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness by Jean Carmignac, who points to Judas the Essene (BJ I § 80) as the Teacher. If an allusion in the Book of Jubilees (47,1) can be taken to refer to the Teacher, he could have been born in 164 B.C. and have been about sixty during the reign of Aristobulos I (cf. gérôn, in Josephus Flavius, l.cit.).

The only Polish contribution to the Mémorial Jean Carmignac is an article by W. Tyioch (Warsaw University) concerning some aspects of the Book of Jubilees (Quelques remarques sur la provenance essénienne du Livre des Jubilés, pp. 347-352). He evaluates the attitude of the author of the text to wealth and to rich people and compares some passages with the Qumran texts. In his opinion this motif is treated similarly to many others, such as justice, alliance, commandments, solar calendar, etc. It seems that the Book of Jubilees is of Essene milieu and was composed and written by an Essene.

The last contribution concerning the Books of Jubilees is presented by J. VanderKam, an eminent specialist working on the text for more than a decade. He investigates the problem of Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran (pp. 353-365). He tries to answer the problem of which Biblical texts could have underlain the unusual idea of an anointed priest in the final days besides a davidic messiah. The Book of Jubilees was written before the migration to Qumran. It also never speaks of a messiah, nor does it present Levi in an eschatological setting. However in VanderKam's opinion "the point is that the remarkable transformation of Levi in this book reveals a prior stage in the theological evolution which culminated in the Qumran belief in sacerdotal messiah" (p. 359). His analysis finds that Num 25,1-13; Mal 2,4-6,8; Deut 33,9-11 and Gen 14,18-20 undergrid the Qumran notion of a priestly messiah. It seems that contrary to the widely accepted view of scholars, Joshua and Zerubbabel were not a model for "the belief that a priestly messiah would appear with the davidic ruler of the future" (p. 365).

The last contribution of the second part of the Mémorial is by M. de Jonge and concerns The Testament of Levi and "Aramaic Levi" (pp. 367-385).

Part three of the Mémorial Jean Carmignac is devoted to subject studies. The contribution of R. T. Beckwith concerns the problem of The Vegetarianism of the Therapeutae, and the Motives for Vegetarianism in Early Jewish and Christian Circles (pp. 407-410). He recognizes several examples of this unusual ascetic practice among Jews were usually related to wine rather than flesh. Some group were vegetarian, because of extreme caution in an idolatrous environment, sometimes it was connected with an ascetic way of life (like among the Therapeutae), sometime with non-violence, sometimes in mourning for the Temple, sometimes it appeared as a result of a break between church and synagogue (Ebionites).

G. W. Buchanan deals with Some Unfinished Business with the Dead Sea Scrolls (pp. 411-420). In the first part he speaks about the destruction of Qumran (pp. 411-413) and in the second he discusses the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton (pp. 413-420). Concerning the latter problem his solution is as follows: "When the name was pronounced with three syllables, it was Yahowah or Yahuwah. When abbreviated to two syllables, it was probably Yahô, as the Dead Sea fragment indicates. When reduced to one syllable, it would have been Yâh or Yo" (p. 419).

Coming back to the first part of Buchanan's article I must start with some personal recollections. In 1987, during the 1st International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Mogilany, in connection with N. Golb's Jerusalem theory of origins of the Qumran manuscripts, we discussed among other problems reasons why scrolls had been placed in the caves. I suggested a solution very close to Buchanan's new proposal. Analysing the way of storing texts, different in Cave 1 and 4 I presented a view that the Qumran people had tried to prepare for the dangerous times which were coming when the anti-Roman uprising started. But they were shocked that the real danger came not from the North but from the South, not from the Romans but from the Sicarii, who took Masada in 66 A.D. They hid their precious scrolls in Cave 1 carefully and with adequate protection, but dumped the remaining scrolls into the Cave 4 in a hurry and never come back. The very well known but never discussed passage of Josephus Flavius (War 4,399-408) concerning frequent raids of the Sicarii from Masada on neighbouring areas to obtain necessary supplies for maintaining their troops is now taken into consideration by Buchanan. I can agree with him in the view that Khirbet Qumran was really destroyed not by the Romans, but by the Sicarii. During the Mogilany discussion Prof. N. Golb insisted on a Roman army attack on Qumran, because otherwise he would have had to accept Y. Yadin's view that the Essenes had come to Masada with some of their books. If we took the present tense in the description of the Essenes by Pliny the Elder seriously, not as a praesens historicus, we could say that the Roman army did not destroy Khirbet Qumran and did not even know about the Sicarii raid

against them. And this may also be the reason that neither Flavius nor Pliny mention the fate of the Essenes in the Qumran area. Pliny seems to suggest that the group is still in existence at the Dead Sea shore. For Buchanan there is an important argument which confirms his new proposal. The Copper Scrolls were found in the Cave 3, a mile to the North from the Khirbet Qumran. "Why, he questions, would members from Qumran, fleeing from the Romans, run north? [...] If the Romans had come from the River Jordan to Qumran, they would have been directly in the path of those trying to escape their confrontation. It seems much more likely that this flight was made while the community members were escaping an impending danger from the south, and there was such a danger as this just a short time later" (p. 412). It was connected with a raid of the Sicarii. It was really astonishing that the proposal of Buchanan, which arose in 1957 at the seminar of Dr. W. R. Farmer (then in Drew University), and was afterwards discussed several times between them, was never published. I think that now we have to discuss the problem of who took Qumran and when once again. A new cleaning of Cave 3 which was done in 1985 should be published urgently just as full results of excavations in Khirbet Qumran and 'Ain Feskha should be published as soon as possible. I agree with Ph. R. Davies that the scandal with delayed publication of R. de Vaux's results is a good example "how not to do archaeology". The synthesis of R. de Vaux even if very detailed is not a full publication whose results can be accepted without discussion. The full publication of all archaeological data will be certainly cause a re-thinking of commonly accepted results. G. W. Buchanan is right in saying that "there is very little among the archaeological findings to indicate that Romans ever occupied Qumran. The few arrow heads found may have been owned by the inhabitants, or they may have been shot by Sicarii. There was no trade mark on them showing that they belonged to Romans and were shot by Romans. The Roman coins and the coin stamped with the sign of the tenth legion were all coins of the realm and would have been the kind of legal tender the inhabitants of Qumran would have possessed if they had never been driven from their quarters" (p. 413). Buchanan concludes "If De Vaux had not known that the Romans were at the Dead Sea north of Qumran about A.D. 68 or 69, he would not have conjectured from the archaeological evidence alone that Qumran had been destroyed by the Romans and occupied afterwards by the Romans" (*l.cit.*). For the first time, since C. Roth's rejection of the taking of Qumran by the Romans in A.D. 68⁶, a new point of view on the end of Qumran is presented in such a short but fresh way. I expect to present my own point of view in a more detailed way soon.

It is interesting to see that archaeological questions are posed now, when a serious effort is being taken by the French School of Archaeology in Jerusalem to prepare for print the work of the late Father R. de Vaux concerning Khirbet

Qumran. R. Donceel is⁷, working hard on publication of de Vaux's unfinished notes and promises to present his results before the publication of the remaining Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4, i.e. by the end of this century⁸. This is understandable, but inexcusable. As I have suggested elsewhere, the volumes or the chapters which are ready should be printed quickly, not waiting for remaining texts and verifications⁹. As discussion around the history of the Qumran community is developing again now¹⁰, such contributions published in the *Revue Biblique* or the *Revue de Qumrân* would be most welcome by interested scholars. We now need discussions on archaeological research in Qumran, as some of the scholars who took part in it are still alive to correct our new hypotheses and proposals. But the data must be available quickly. Khirbet Qumran cannot be an example of "how not to do archaeology".

E. M. Laperrousaz comes back again to the "final" and "later judgments", which he previously discussed in the volume in honor of A. Dupont-Sommer¹¹. This time his remarks are connected with internal datation of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In his opinion the "later judgments" from the Damascus Document should be discussed in comparison with the "former judgments" of the Rule of the Community. The latter should not be compared with the first, as they were in the case of the rule for Messianic era. The "later judgments" were written by the Teacher of Righteousness, in the New Covenant of Damascus, to replace the "former judgments". In Laperrousaz's eyes the sequence of important Qumran documents could be as follows: 4QS^e, 1QS^b (Blessings), 1QS^a, Damascus Document (cf. *Critères internes de datation des manuscrits de la mer Morte: "ordonnances premières" et "ordonnances dernières"*, pp. 453-464).

The third part of the *Mémorial* contains many more contributions which I am unable to present here in detail. However I should like at least to mention them. They are as follows: H. W. Basser, *Pesher Hadavar: The Truth of the Matter*, pp. 389-405; A. Caquot *La service des anges*, pp. 421-429; E. Cothenet, *L'influence d'Ézéchiel sur la spiritualité de Qumrân*, pp. 431-439; F. Garcia Martinez, *L'interprétation de la Torah d'Ézéchiel dans les mss. de Qumrân*, pp. 441-452; J. Maier, *Auslegungsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Psalm 37.1.7.8*, pp. 465-479; M. Weinfeld, *The Morning Prayers (Birkhoth Hashachar) in Qumran and in the Conventional Jewish Liturgy*, pp. 481-494.

The fourth part of the *Mémorial* is devoted to linguistic studies. They are very few: L. Diez Merino, *Diacronía de la particula aramea Yât*, pp. 497-512; J. C. Kesterson, *The Indication of the Genitive Relationship in 1QS*, pp. 513-524; J. Margain, *11Q¹ Job et la langue targumique. À propos de la particule BDYL*, pp. 525-528.

Part five of the Mémorial offers detailed remarks concerning some texts of the Old Testament in the light of the Qumran manuscripts: M. Baillet, Les divers états du Pentateuque Samaritain, pp. 531-545; J. E. Sanderson, The Contribution of 4QPaleoExod^m to Textual Criticism, pp. 547-560; J. Treboille, Le texte de 2 Rois 7,20-8,5 à la lumière des découvertes de Qumrân (6Q4 15), pp. 561-568; A. van der Kooij, 1QIs^a col. VIII,4-11 (Isa 8, 11-18): A Contextual Approach of its Variants, pp. 569-581; J. C. Lübbe, Describing the Translation Process of 11QJob: A Question of Method, pp. 583-593.

Part six contains five detailed contributions on the New Testament and the Qumran scrolls and one more synthetic one by J. A. Fitzmyer. The former are as follows: J. D. M. Derret, New Creation: Qumran, Paul, the Church, and Jesus, pp. 597-608; P. Grelot, Jean 8,56 et Jubilés 15,16-29, pp. 621-628; G. W. Nebe, 7Q - Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation, pp. 629-633; D. R. Schwartz, On Quirinius, John the Baptist, the Benedictus, Melchizedek, Qumran and Ephesus, pp. 635-646; M. Wilcox, According to the Pattern (tbnyt)...: Exodus 25,40 in the New Testament and early Jewish Thought, pp. 647-656. The article by J. A. Fitzmyer (The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after Forty Years, pp. 609-620) is extremely interesting as it presents his just comments on several major questions that have arisen, i.e. on (1) The New Testament at Qumran? (a problem of 7Q New Testament papyri), on (2) Qumran literature and the uncontested letters of Paul, on (3) Qumran literature and Deutero-Pauline writings, on (4) Qumran literature and the Synoptic Gospels, on (5) Qumran literature and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on (6) Qumran literature and the Johannine writings.

The special volume of the Revue de Qumrân ends (as such volumes usually do) with every extensive (and extremely useful) indexes prepared by indefatigable F. Garcia Martinez (Tables du Tome XIII, pp. 657-689). We must praise him as both he and the Printing Office of A. Bontemps of Limoges (France) made a splendid job. The volume is set perfectly, with good quality photos of new texts and on splendid paper. Only the price of the volume (FF 950) looks exorbitant at the beginning. To anyone in the field, the book is certainly worth the price. We should praise M. Tabalda for the publication and the CNRS for supporting it financially. It will certainly be one of the most quoted recent Festschriften and memorial volumes. Both the scope of the panorama and the pleiade of well known names in the field guarantee high quality. It is also worth stressing the excellent job the editors have done in bringing the volume out so quickly: the request for contributions was announced in late 1986, and the volume appeared at the end of 1988. We have to praise F. Garcia Martinez and E. Puech, because bis dat qui cito dat, and they have really offered us a lot.

Notes

¹ Cf. for example E.-M. Laperrousaz, Hommage à la mémoire de l'abbé Jean Carmignac (1914-1986), Revue des Études Juives CXLVI, No 3/4, 1987, pp. 494-495.

² Nowy Testament w świetle dokumentów znad Morza Martwego, Przegląd Powszechny No 1(809), January 1989, pp. 50-66; Problem semityzmów w ewangelich synoptycznych, Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny XL, 1987, pp. 516-534.

³ Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumrân, Revue de Qumrân 12,1 (No 45) June 1985, p. 10.

⁴ Le Maître de Justice fut-il mis à mort?, Vetus Testamentum 1, 1951, pp. 200-215.

⁵ Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London 1963 (=1959), pp. 79-80.

⁶ Did Vespasian Capture Qumrân?, Palestine Exploration Quarterly 91, 1959, pp. 122-128.

⁷ Cf. Ph. R. Davies, How Not To Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran, Biblical Archaeologist 51, 1988, pp. 203-207 and an announcement in the Revue de Qumrân No 48/Nov. 1987, back cover.

⁸ Cf. Z. J. Kapera, The Present State of Qumranology, Folia Orientalia 26, 1989; H. S(hanks), At Least Publish the Dead Sea Scrolls Timetable, Biblical Archaeology Review 15,3 (May-June 1989), pp. 56-58 and L. Robertson, The Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. A crippling loss of knowledge, (Kansas 1988), pp. 1-9 (privately mimeographed and released).

⁹ Z. J. Kapera, art. cit.

¹⁰ R. Eisenman, Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran. A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins, Leiden 1983; Ph. R. Davies, Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Atlanta, GA 1987; F. Garcia Martinez, Qumran Origins and Early History (A Groningen Hypothesis), Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 113-136.

¹¹ Cf. E.-M. Laperrousaz, Les "ordonnances premières" et les "ordonnances dernières" dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte [in:] Hommages à Andre Dupont-Sommer, Paris 1971, pp. 405-419.