

SOME THOUGHTS AT THE CLOSE OF THE *DISCOVERIES IN
THE JUDEAN DESERT* PUBLICATION PROJECT

EMANUEL TOV

I would like to devote some thoughts to the publication process of the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially to its completion, and subsequently to some unknown aspects of the published texts. Such thoughts are offered at this juncture when we commemorate the find of the first scrolls sixty years ago.

At this point, we are rounding off a stage in the *life* of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Upon the imminent completion of the publication of these scrolls, the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (hereafter DJD) series will be discontinued. My predecessors had no idea what the final scope of the series would be, since Lankester Harding, when writing to Oxford University Press in 1955, thought in terms of four volumes for the Cave 4 publications. We ended up with twenty-seven volumes dedicated to the findings of that cave. When I started, I devised a master plan for the publications, but it turned out to be too minimalist. In 1991, I thought in terms of a total of thirty volumes for the DJD series, while we ended up with forty. I was asked to complete the publication in a decade, but it has taken us eighteen years, partly because we did more than we were asked to do. For example, we published the Jericho fragments that were found in 1986 and 1993 as well as the Wadi Daliyeh papyri that had nothing to do with the Judean Desert texts (vol. XXXVIII). My present declaration that we are now, in 2008, winding up the publication may sound like a familiar song, one that you heard already seven years ago. The announcement in 2001 was more or less correct, since by that time almost all the scroll fragments could be examined in scholarly editions. Subsequently, we have produced two more text volumes (vol. XVII, vol. XXXVII), an Introduction volume (vol. XXXIX), a Concordance (see n. 4) and two re-editions of Cave 1 scrolls (vol. XXXII, vol. XL). The publication of these re-editions somewhat blurred the nature of our enterprise since we had not been asked to produce such volumes when we started the project. The presence of these re-editions is, of course, a great blessing to scholarship.

The frequent appearance on the market of new scroll fragments likewise put into question the nature of our undertaking. The surfacing of these approximately forty fragments could not have been predicted in 1990, and accordingly they were not part of our original assignment. We published a few of these recently surfaced fragments in the final DJD volumes, but we could not wait for the remainder to be analyzed. In some cases, we merely know of the existence of a fragment, while in other cases photographs are known; in all cases one has to wait until the fragments have landed at a place where scholars have access to them. Most of these fragments are rather minute, while a few are substantial in size. The floating around, so to speak, of these fragments has created the impression that the publication of the scrolls has yet to be completed. However, we would probably have to wait another three to four years for a sufficient number of fragments to be ready to justify a book-size publication. Beyond all this, neither these fragments nor the re-editions of the Cave 1 scrolls were part of our assignment.

Every publication project needs a beginning and an official end. The publication started with DJD I, and ends with the three volumes that are currently in press.

The total number of volumes in the DJD series published by Oxford University Press is forty, to which we need to add Brill's concordance volumes by M. Abegg, one published, and two in preparation. Altogether there are now forty-one volumes, thirty-two of which we ourselves prepared. The last ones are the Stegemann-Schuller re-edition of 1QHodayot^a with parallels from 1QHodayot^b and the Cave 4 *Hodayot* texts (vol. XL), Puech's second Aramaic volume covering 4Q550–587 (vol. XXXVII), and the re-edition of the Cave 1 Isaiah scrolls by Ulrich and Flint (vol. XXXII).

When using these forty-one volumes, it will not be easy to digest, use, and absorb the enormous amount of information included in these sources. The DJD series may well be a treasure trove, but this treasure resembles that described in the Copper Scroll—often elusive. Use of these volumes is as difficult as those of the Oxyrhynchus papyri or any other fragmentary corpus. Each DJD volume contains many different texts, and one needs an index in order to locate the item(s) one is looking for. Many Cave 4 volumes are arranged by literary genre, but they don't contain all the texts belonging to that genre. For example, the contents of the so-called parabiblical volumes are not predictable. Various types of reference tools for locating texts are found in the

DJD introductory volume, vol. XXXIX.¹ One can also use the topical arrangement of the six-volume *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*² or that of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* by Florentino García Martínez.³ Or, when looking for a specific word, the printed concordance by Abegg is very helpful.⁴ When looking for a word, phrase, or grammatical feature, you may also use Abegg's module in the Accordance computer program for the Macintosh and *Logos*, or my own *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* for the PC,⁵ the latter covering only the non-biblical scrolls. That program also allows you to see the PAM images of each fragment together with the texts. The future looks even brighter. The IAA has announced a large photography and inventory project combining new color photographs of all the fragments together with the earlier photographs. The Charlesworth project continues to present new editions,⁶ *Logos* has announced a new electronic edition of the scrolls by Stephen J. Pfann, Qimron has announced his own printed edition of the non-biblical scrolls, and Ulrich plans a printed Qumran Bible in the source languages.⁷

Until now we dealt with the availability of editions and some tools surrounding these editions. Now that the Dead Sea Scrolls have been published and we think we know everything about them, it is time to contemplate on the things we do *not* know regarding the published fragments.

¹ Emanuel Tov, *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002).

² Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).

³ Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁴ Martin G. Abegg, Jr., with James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook, in consultation with Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance I. The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁵ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition 2006, part of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library of Brill Publishers* (Leiden: Brill, 2006). This contains “All the texts and images of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, in the original languages and in translation, with morphological analysis and search programs.”

⁶ James H. Charlesworth et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (PTSDSSP; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994–).

⁷ See now Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTS 143; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

1. *Reconstruction of the Segments That Have Been Lost.* Scholars are used to working with the preserved fragments, but they also attempt to reconstruct the missing material. In multiple copies of the same composition, such as the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*, and all the biblical scrolls, the overlapping texts are of great help for such reconstructions.

There are no objective criteria for such reconstructions. For example, Qimron and Puech reconstructed 4Q522 in a completely different way from one another. The left column of the largest fragment, frg. 9 ii, was published preliminarily by Puech in 1992 and described by him as dealing with “David and his son as well as the temple and tabernacle.”⁸ This topic was, according to Puech, the reason for the inclusion of the “Jerusalem Psalm,” Psalm 122, in that composition. The 1992 study by Puech also contains a long exposition on the Rock of Zion and the place of the altar. Reacting to this publication, Qimron republished frg. 9 ii with several new readings and reconstructions, based on the photograph published by Puech.⁹ Qimron proposed a completely different interpretation of this column, describing it as a fragment of what he named the “Joshua Cycles.”¹⁰ In the final publication of this text in DJD, Puech reflects this understanding when naming the text “Prophétie de Josué (4QApocrJosué?).”¹¹ A comparison of the publications by Puech and Qimron is a veritable exercise in the method of comparing the exegesis of Qumran fragments in which scholars necessarily read much into the lacunae.

A *cause célèbre* in this regard is 4Q341 that came into this world as 4QTherapeia in Allegro’s analysis in 1979. At that point, the text was taken as a transliteration in Hebrew of a Greek medical document containing such words as *Magnus* (line 4) and *Horqanus* (line 7). According to Allegro, its “language is an extraordinary mixture of transliterated Greek, Aramaic, and a grammatically irregular Hebrew,

⁸ Émile Puech, “La pierre de Sion et l’autel des holocaustes d’après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522),” *RB* 99 (1992): 676–96.

⁹ Elisha Qimron, “Concerning ‘Joshua Cycles’ from Qumran,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1995): 503–8 (Hebrew with English summary).

¹⁰ In this interpretation, Qimron was actually preceded by Robert H. Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992), 89–93, who were probably the first to recognize the true meaning of this document.

¹¹ Émile Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 39–74.

giving the inescapable impression of deliberate obscurantism, not entirely unfamiliar in medical writing.”¹² This idea was taken up by J. H. Charlesworth who essentially accepted Allegro’s transcription.¹³ This interpretation gave rise to new theories concerning the nature of the Qumran community. However, not much later the real nature of this document was discovered by Naveh who demonstrated that this is a Hebrew writing exercise by a fairly skilled person, perhaps a scribe. This scribe used a small left-over piece of leather in order to write some meaningless words and letters while accustoming his hand to the pen and ink and to the writing material before beginning to write in earnest.¹⁴

In these two cases, the reconstruction pertained to the understanding of the scroll as a whole. On a smaller scale, should we indulge in reconstructing the missing material in 4QSam^a and, if so, in which way? The lacunae in this scroll should clearly not be reconstructed on the basis of MT since the preserved parts of that scroll do not reflect MT. Should they be reconstructed on the basis of the LXX since the Samuel scroll is often very close to the LXX? This was the practice of the DJD editors of that volume,¹⁵ and that procedure is probably correct in several cases, but not all reconstructions in the lacunae in the scroll should be based on retroversion from Greek into Hebrew.

Obviously, the understanding of important details often depends on the reading of single letters, which equally often are contested. Thus, as one of the proofs for the gradual development of the tripartite canon in the second century B.C.E., one always quotes 4QMMT C lines 10–11, “[...And] we have [written] to you so that you may study (carefully) the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David” [כתב]נו אליכה שתבין בספר מושה [ו]בספר [י]הנביאים ובדויד [ד].¹⁶

¹² John M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (London: Prometheus, 1979), 235–40, pls. 16–17. The quote is from p. 235.

¹³ James H. Charlesworth, *The Discovery of a Dead Sea Scroll (4Q Therapeia): Its Importance in the History of Medicine and Jesus Research* (Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech University, 1985).

¹⁴ Joseph Naveh, “A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-called 4QTherapeia,” *IEJ* 36 (1986): 52–5, pl. II. This understanding was later accepted in Naveh’s edition in Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 291–93.

¹⁵ Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 1–216.

¹⁶ Restoration and translation according to Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 59.

The reading of the key words, based on the combination of three separate fragments on pl. VI, is very tentative. However, in a 2003 paper Ulrich suggested that these words should be read differently.¹⁷ According to him, the juxtaposition of the three fragments 18, 17, and 15 is far from certain, and the reading of the remnants of the preserved letters is likewise questionable. He shows that possibly Moses is not mentioned in this context, and that there was no phrase “books of the Prophets.”

Scholars approach these reconstructions in different ways. Also in DJD there have been different approaches towards the inclusion of reconstructions in DJD over the course of the years. In recent years, we have become accustomed to the inclusion of reconstructions, while the earlier volumes had no fixed system. This uncertainty is clearly visible in the different approaches of Barthélemy and Milik in DJD I (1955). Barthélemy hardly included any reconstructions of missing words, while Milik incorporated lengthy and often questionable reconstructions. Thus *1QDibre Moshe* (1Q22), a composition for which no parallels are known, has been reconstructed very generously.¹⁸

2. *Percentage of Scrolls Preserved.* How fragmentary the scrolls are can be determined only when we are aware of their complete text as in the case of the biblical scrolls and some other works. The scrolls are actually much more fragmentary than we realize. The great majority of the biblical fragments do not exceed more than 5 percent of the complete books. For example, the Genesis scrolls cover only between 0.2 and 3% of the book. In Exodus, most scrolls cover between 0.1 and 5%, while 4QExod^c covers 13.5% of the book, and 4QpaleoExod^m covers 36%.¹⁹ In the long book of Isaiah, most scrolls from Cave 4 cover between 0.1 and 7.0%, while 4QIsa^b and 4QIsa^c cover 17% and 5% respectively. Of course, the large Isaiah scroll from Cave 1 is complete. In the case of the non-biblical scrolls, it is difficult to ascertain the

¹⁷ “The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14.

¹⁸ By the same token, some published texts do not indicate exactly where in the column the fragments were placed, while others are very specific. Thus in some publications, the structure of individual text columns within a given composition, extant or reconstructed, is often based on physically unconnected fragments placed in an extant or reconstructed column sequence. Some scholars were more insistent than others regarding the reconstruction of the column structure of the scroll made on the basis of the preserved fragments.

¹⁹ The actual coverage of the words of the book is smaller, since I also counted single letters preserved as representing a complete verse.

percentage preserved because several ancient scrolls of what looks like the same composition contained different literary editions. A comparison of the scrolls of the *Damascus Covenant* with the medieval text of CD is therefore of limited value only. Three Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Covenant* (4QD^{a,b,c}) contain respectively 38%, 13% and 3% of the coverage of CD. The little fragment of the Targum of Leviticus, 4QtgLev (4Q156), contains no more than 1% of the whole book. Likewise, 4QLXXLev^a and 4QLXXLev^b covered 1% and 5% respectively of the Greek translation, while 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXDeut covered 2.0% and 0.1% respectively. These small percentages should lead to some modesty with regard to our statements on the scrolls. At the same time, for the non-biblical scrolls we often have no clue as to how much of the original composition has been preserved. Thus, in the case of the parabiblical texts relating to Jeremiah and Ezekiel published by Dimant in DJD XXX, we do not know whether these texts present for example 5%, 10%, or 30% of the complete compositions.

3. *Find-sites of the Scrolls.* Scholars worked out a detailed inventory system of the scrolls, but it is mostly based on information volunteered by the Bedouin and only very partially on controlled excavations. It is essential to know from which site and cave the documents derived, because several aspects of our analysis are based on such information. Cave 4 probably housed the community's central depository of scrolls, but we are not certain as to exactly which scrolls were found there. Thus 4QGen^b, a presumed Qumran scroll that is very close to the medieval MT, was suspected by its editor, Davila, to have derived from Murabba'at. Its script is late and among the Qumran scrolls this text, though fragmentary, is closer to the medieval text than the other scrolls.²⁰ The decision as to whether or not this text derives from Qumran is thus rather central to our study of the biblical text, since all the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (57 texts)²¹ are somewhat removed from the medieval text, while those from the other find-sites in the Judean Desert are identical to the medieval text. This evidence leads to certain conclusions regarding Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, and Murabba'at, while 4QGen^b forms an exception. On the other hand, if this text indeed derived from Murabba'at, there is no case for its being

²⁰ James R. Davila in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and Frank M. Cross; DJD XII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994 [repr. 1999]), 31 ("late Herodian, or perhaps even post-Herodian").

²¹ 57 out of 127 texts that are sufficiently extensive for textual analysis.

a Qumran exception. It is not impossible that the Bedouin claimed that this text derived from Qumran in the hopes of receiving a better financial reward.

The same issue comes up with regard to the documentary texts 4Q342–348, 351–361 that are also rather exceptional among the Qumran texts. These texts contain deeds, letters, and accounts, types of documents rarely found at Qumran.²² Indeed, the collection of Qumran texts is exceptional among the corpora found in the Judean Desert, since all other Judean Desert corpora contain only or almost only documentary texts, while the Qumran corpus contains almost only literary texts. If some or all of 4Q342–361 derived from other sites in the Judean Desert, the Qumran collection would be more uniform. Indeed, 4Q347 and XHev/Se 32 (XHev/Se papDeed F) have been proven to be part of the same document deriving from Naḥal Ḥever. Further doubts on the alleged Qumran origin of these texts were raised by Cotton and Yardeni.²³ These and additional doubts on the origin of the scrolls were summarized in a valuable study by S. Reed in 2007.²⁴ For example, Reed pointed out that no more than ninety-four of the approximately 600 texts from Cave 4 derived from controlled excavations.²⁵ The original international team believed what was told them by the Bedouin, but it slowly dawned on scholars that this source of information was very questionable. After all, the Bedouin obtained a higher price for documents that were presented as “Qumran” or even Naḥal Ḥever. Likewise, most of the texts named Seiyal (Jordan) probably derived from Naḥal Ḥever (Israel), because the Bedouin did not want to admit in the 1950s that they had crossed the border into Israel and retrieved these texts from Naḥal Ḥever.²⁶

²² For a list, see Armin Lange in Tov, *The Texts*, 143–4.

²³ Ada Yardeni in Hannah M. Cotton and Ada Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyâl Collection II)* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 283–84.

²⁴ Stephen A. Reed, “Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 199–221. Among other things, Reed tabulated the finds in controlled archeological digs and by Bedouin, using the earlier analysis by Stephen J. Pfann in the *Companion Volume* to Emanuel Tov with the collaboration of Stephen J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill/IDC, 1993).

²⁵ Reed, “Find-Sites,” 206.

²⁶ See Emanuel Tov with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIgr)* (*The Seiyâl Collection I*) (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 1: “At first the exact location of the find was unknown, but subsequent excavations in the ‘Cave of Horror’ in Naḥal Ḥever (Wādi Ḥabra) brought

4. *Position of the Fragments in the Caves.* Very little is known about the placement of the fragments in the caves at the time of their discovery. In most cases, the Bedouin were the first to enter the caves, where they collected some fragments and brought them to antiquity dealers. Thus, the Bedouin are the sole source of the information that the Cave 1 scrolls were found in jars.²⁷ In his sworn statement, Muhammed ed-Deeb said that one of the two jars found in Cave 1 contained three scrolls, two of which were covered with cloth, but we do not know which scrolls they were. Furthermore, we have no information at all regarding the placement of fragments in relation to each other. This lack of information greatly complicated the work of reconstruction. For one thing, the years-long identification work in the “scrollerly” in the Rockefeller Museum would have been greatly facilitated had this and similar information been available.

5. *Relation Between the Contents of the Individual Caves.* If we were to understand the relation between the contents of the individual caves we possibly would be in a better position to evaluate the writings found there. From a quantitative point of view, Cave 4 housed the central depository, including multiple copies of the same works. The other caves contained at least one copy of every composition represented by multiple copies in Cave 4, as noted by Devorah Dimant.²⁸ Addressing the relation between the caves from a different angle, Stökl Ben Ezra distinguished between Caves 1 and 4 that contained an older stage of the manuscript collection and Caves 2, 3, 5, 6, 11 that represented more recent stages.²⁹ According to him, “[i]n one hypothetical scenario, the scrolls from Cave 1 were hidden there long before 68 C.E., around the

to light a few scraps of the same scroll, together with other documents and artifacts, so that the place of origin of the scroll is now known.”

²⁷ See Anton Kiraz's *Archive on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. George A. Kiraz; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2005), 91 (undated statement relating to 1960–1965). See also Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Short History* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 109. The Cave 1 scrolls covered with cloth and placed in jars were probably considered especially precious. Thus Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus—Ein Sachbuch* (9th ed.; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1993) 90 = idem, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1998), 81.

²⁸ Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *A Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58, at 30.

²⁹ Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves—A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–33, at 315–16.

turn of the era when Qumran was destroyed by a fire after an attack. Cave 4 might have been used as an emergency hiding place, library, or as a depository already around the same time, though some manuscripts were added later.”³⁰

Most caves contain similar proportions of the various literary genres, biblical manuscripts, community compositions, and non-community compositions.³¹ The only features characterizing the individual caves seem to be: (1) Cave 7 contains only Greek papyrus fragments (19 items), probably mainly biblical texts. (2) Most of the texts from Cave 6 are Hebrew papyri (21 papyri out of a total of 31 items), including a few biblical papyri. This collection of texts must have derived from a special source, different from that of the main depository of texts in Cave 4.³² (3) A large percentage of the identifiable texts from Cave 11 reflect the Qumran scribal system, or are sectarian, or are of interest to the Qumran community.³³

6. *Number of Scrolls Preserved.* We usually calculate the number of preserved Qumran scrolls as 930 items in our inventory, but we have no certainty at all that this number is even close to the truth. There are simply too many uncertainties relating to small fragments and scribal hands. It could be one hundred more or one hundred less. Obviously we do not know how many scrolls were originally deposited in the caves. Stegemann calculates the number of scrolls deposited in the caves at 1000, but we have no criteria for any type of calculation.³⁴

7. *Relation Between Multiple Copies.* There is no standard formula for evaluating the relationship between multiple copies of the same composition. For example, if we approach the 36 copies now named “Psalms” as copies of the biblical book of Psalms, we may be very far from the truth. All these copies indeed contain psalms, but not all of them are biblical psalms. Only one Qumran copy reflects the Maso-

³⁰ Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves,” 316.

³¹ Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 35.

³² According to Michael O. Wise, *Thunder in Gemini* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 130–32, this cave housed a collection of private study copies.

³³ See my paper “The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11,” in *Things Revealed. Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. Esther G. Chazon et al.; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 187–96. On the other hand, García Martínez, “The Study of the Texts from Qumran: A Groningen Perspective,” in his *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 297–310, at 306–9, believes that Cave 11 is as “sectarian” as Cave 1.

³⁴ *The Library of Qumran*, 79.

retic book of Psalms, 4QPs^c, while the other copies contain different collections of psalms. At least seven psalm collections from Caves 4 and 11 contain psalms in a different sequence from that in MT, sometimes with additional psalms to those in the canon. If the view suggested by Sanders, Wilson, and Flint carries the day,³⁵ according to which these scrolls reflect alternative biblical Psalters, it implies that the psalm texts from Caves 4 and 11 constitute the group of Qumran evidence that deviates most from MT. However, the arguments adduced in the past in favor of the assumption that 11QPs^a reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from Cave 4,³⁶ and this view seems preferable to us. The deviations from MT pertain to both the sequence of the individual psalms and the addition and omission of psalms, among them non-canonical psalms.

Consequently, a common name for compositions is not always meaningful, since the scrolls may represent different editions of the same or similar compositions. Likewise, the different Jeremiah texts reflect two different editions of the book, a long one (4QJer^{a,c}) and a short one (4QJer^{b,d}), differing greatly in scope and sequence. The various copies of the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll* also show evidence of different editorial versions of these compositions. As a result, the naming by modern editors of all the texts of S, D, M, or of the Psalms texts or those of Jeremiah with a single name is convenient, but may be misleading for some. Nevertheless, it is a correct procedure since books that developed in such a fashion in antiquity may have existed in various forms.

I have been asked to share with you some of my thoughts at the close of the DJD Publication Project. I have used this occasion not only to describe all the positive things that have been achieved, but also to elaborate on some of the areas where our information is greatly deficient. Sometimes we need to stress how little we know, especially at this juncture of pride in our achievements of the past sixty years.

³⁵ James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965); Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985); Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

³⁶ 11QPs^a contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the psalms (Psalm 145), the scroll added liturgical antiphonal additions.