

RECONSIDERING THE CAVE 1 TEXTS SIXTY YEARS AFTER
THEIR DISCOVERY: AN OVERVIEW

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ
K. U. Leuven

1. *Introduction*

The topic of my lecture can be presented from many different angles, and it is important that I assert precisely what I intend to do at the start. The topic is formed by three elements, each one quite clear if considered individually: “Reconsidering,” “Cave 1 Texts,” and “Sixty Years.” The last element, the temporal dimension (“Sixty Years After Their Discovery”), is clear in spite of all uncertainties regarding the moment of the very first discovery by the Bedouin Ta’amireh.¹ The second element, “texts from Cave 1,” is also obvious: we will be dealing with the seven great scrolls bought from the Bedouins (the Scrolls published by the Hebrew University and by the American Schools of Oriental Research),² which were the first to be published when Cave 1 was “the Cave” and not yet Cave 1, but also with the materials (for the

¹ There are many, and conflicting, accounts of when exactly Cave 1 was for the first time visited by the Bedouin. The year of 1947 (“early in the summer”) is the one given by Gerald Lankester Harding in DJD 1:5, but it is contradicted by the assertion of Archbishop Samuel who records that in August 1947 he sent two representatives who visited the Cave from which the Scrolls they already had in their possession; see Athanasius Y. Samuel, *The Treasure of Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 150. The interview, taken under oath by Anton Kiraz, from two of the Bedouin involved in the discovery (Muhammed edh-Dhib and Jum’a Muhammed), reported and documented in the Revised Edition of John C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977), 191, gives “one day during November, 1946,” but the endnote of Trever, 235, specifies that “[t]he evidence from the interviews would allow for a date as late as January or February, 1947.” In any case, 1947 is the date kept in all official celebrations of the discovery.

² 1QIsa^a, 1QpHab and 1QS, published in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St Mark’s Monastery*, I and II, edited by Millar Burrows, John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950 and 1951); 1QIsa^b, 1QH and 1QM, published by Eleazer L. Sukenik in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995); and 1QapGen, published by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956).

1 biggest part also was bought from the Bedouins) published in DJD 1³
2 after the excavation of the Cave from 15 February until 5 March 1949.
3 These texts were published as coming from “Cave 1” because this pub-
4 lication was completed after the exploration of the cliffs, where forty
5 caves were excavated, including the caves with manuscripts 2, 3, 6,
6 and again Cave 1; the serial number 1 was given to the cave of the
7 first discoveries.

8 “Reconsidering” is more ambiguous. After sixty years of research
9 on the Scrolls, I cannot look at the texts coming from Cave 1 with the
10 eyes of the scholars who in the fifties had only certain texts at their
11 disposal, for the simple reason that we today have at our disposal the
12 whole DJD Series with its 39 volumes of texts. I intend to “recon-
13 sider” the Cave 1 texts from the perspective of the present, with all
14 the knowledge accumulated during the past sixty years of research on
15 the Scrolls.

16 One possible way (and perhaps the most obvious and fruitful) to
17 “reconsider” the Cave 1 texts sixty years after their discovery would be
18 to present what impact the publication of the texts from the other ten
19 caves has had on the evaluation of the texts from Cave 1. I think this
20 is an important topic that would teach us much and it would be most
21 fitting for the opening of our “reconsideration” of Cave 1. But I have
22 already written this “reconsideration” (last year) at the request of the
23 Spanish Association for Semitic and Judaic Studies (cutting thus the
24 grass under my own feet) and it would be impolite to repeat it here.
25 The paper was in Spanish and it was written too late to be included in
26 English in the *Qumranica minora*.⁴ It has been published recently in
27 the *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos (MEAH)* of the Univer-
28 sity of Granada⁵ and it is available on the web page of the Association.⁶
29 Thus, those of you who are not afraid of the language of Cervantes
30 can easily find this “reconsideration” of Cave 1 on paper or on the
31 screen.

32 ³ Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clar-
33 endon, 1955), to which should be added John C. Trever, “Completion of the Pub-
34 lication of some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1,” *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 323–45, and
35 George J. Brooke, DJD 26:227–32.

36 ⁴ Florentino García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I and II* (ed. Eibert J. C. Tigche-
37 laar; STDJ 63–64; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

38 ⁵ Florentino García Martínez, “Qumrán en el Siglo XXI: Cambios y perspectivas
39 después de 50 años de estudios,” *MEAH* 55 (2006): 309–34.

40 ⁶ <http://www.aehj.org/>

Another possible way to proceed (and the one I will follow here) is to consider Cave 1 as a whole, as a single collection of texts, not only as part of the largest holding of Qumran manuscripts, and to try to pinpoint its peculiar character, its similarities or its differences with the other caves (particularly with Caves 3, 4 and 11), and with the whole collection of Qumran manuscripts. As a matter of fact, this means looking closely at the texts from Cave 1, but also at all other material remains from this Cave, with the additional knowledge provided by the texts and the material remains from all the other caves.

Of course, this exercise is by no means new. As far as I know, at least three other scholars have already attempted the same exercise and have reflected on the character of Cave 1 in light of all other Caves. I will present and discuss their opinions before attempting my own “reconsideration.”

2. Hartmut Stegemann’s Theory of Master Manuscripts

The regretted Harmut Stegemann, who was never short of original ideas, was the first to put forth a comprehensive theory of the holdings found in Cave 1.⁷

For Stegemann, the Cave 1 manuscripts “constituted the portion of the Qumran Library holdings that the Qumran settlers saw as especially worthy of urgent rescue.”⁸ He posited that the majority of the manuscripts from Cave 1 represent “*master manuscripts*, which served principally as models for the preparation of further copies.”⁹ “Master manuscripts such as these were evidently withdrawn for use in the scriptorium but were otherwise treated with the greatest possible care. Scrolls of this kind comprise a substantial part of the material found hidden in Cave 1, where they were carefully covered with linen wrapping and packed in clay jars.”¹⁰ Stegemann describes vividly how this happened:

⁷ Harmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993). Quotes are from the English translation of the fifth German edition: *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

⁸ Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 68.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 80.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 81.

1 Both kind of manuscripts—some rolled up backward, as it were, the other
 2 correctly—were covered with linen, packed in clay jars, and transported
 3 to that rock cave 1.3 kilometers away which in 1947 was the first to be
 4 discovered by the Bedouin and therefore named Cave 1. This careful
 5 procedure was used with less than a hundred scrolls. Finally the entrance
 6 to the cave was painstakingly walled up with stones so that it was unrec-
 7 ognizable from the outside, and it was still closed up when Muhamed
 8 edh-Dhib managed to get into the cave through a shaft in 1947.¹¹

9 A few details of this description do not seem to agree with the descrip-
 10 tion of Lancaster Harding in DJD 1: the location of the cave would be
 11 “about half a kilometre north-north-west of Khirbet Qumrân,” “the
 12 illegal excavators made another entrance at ground-level. Later exca-
 13 vations suggest that there may have been a lower entrance which col-
 14 lapsed anciently, but this is not certain;”¹² nor with the assertions of
 15 De Vaux:

16 Pendant la fouille de la grotte, on a pris soin de recueillir tous les tes-
 17 sons. Beaucoup avaient été fraîchement brisés, au cours du pillage mo-
 18 erne. Beaucoup aussi avaient des cassures anciennes et cela confirme le
 19 témoignage du premier Bédouin qui est entré dans la grotte Mohammed
 20 edh-Dhib: il a vu quelques jarres intactes dressées contre les parois, mais
 21 le sol était jonché de débris de poterie.¹³

22 But in general Stegemann’s explanation is logical and consistent,
 23 although, in my opinion, it falls short of being convincing.

24 It is clear that, somehow, the interpretation of the remains found
 25 in Cave 1 as “master manuscripts” by Stegemann is linked with his
 26 general understanding of Qumran as a sort of printing house where
 27 manuscripts were produced for the benefit of the largest Essene move-
 28 ment, and placed for sale to the outside world. This understanding has
 29 failed to carry the day, but only on these grounds. His interpretation
 30 of Cave 1 should not be dismissed. This interpretation has the advan-
 31 tage that Stegemann (who knew better than anybody the manuscripts
 32 as material artifacts) tries to explain the different ways in which the
 33 manuscripts were stocked, well wrapped in linen and deposited in
 34 jars, which was untrue of the manuscripts of other caves, like Cave
 35 4. However, it was true of other manuscripts, like the Temple Scroll,
 36 apparently found in Cave 11. This different way of stocking is not

37 ¹¹ Ibid., 61.

38 ¹² DJD 1:6.

39 ¹³ Ibid., 8.

1 simply deduced from the large amount of linen found in Cave 1,¹⁴ 1
 2 but it is directly proved by the scroll, petrified but still wrapped in 2
 3 linen and attached to the neck of a jar, reproduced on Plate I of 3
 4 DJD 1.¹⁵ Stegemann's theory would explain why a certain number of 4
 5 these manuscripts were not rolled correctly, but rather with the begin- 5
 6 ning on the innermost part. It would also make comprehensible the fact 6
 7 that from several biblical manuscripts as well as from other composi- 7
 8 tions (1QSerek, 1QMilḥama, 1QHodayot, 1QJubilees, 1QGiants ar?, 8
 9 1QTLevi ar, 1QMysteries, 1QInstruction, 1QGiants, 1QapocrMoses?, 9
 10 1QNew Jerusalem), ~~that~~ other copies have been found in other caves. 10

11 But this interpretation of the character of the texts of Cave 1 cannot 11
 12 account for several characteristics of the collection from Cave 1 as a 12
 13 whole, or for some of the archaeological finds in this cave. It cannot 13
 14 account for the very large number of jars and covers found in Cave 1 14
 15 (more than fifty found by the excavators,¹⁶ plus the whole jars of the 15
 16 Hebrew University and the one of the University of Madrid). It cannot 16
 17 account for the two phylactery cases with four compartments, the four 17
 18 phylactery cases with one compartment, or the wooden comb found in 18
 19 Cave 1;¹⁷ nor for bowls, cooking pots, or the four oil lamps recovered 19
 20 by the archaeologists.¹⁸ 20

21 Even more important, I think, this theory of *master manuscripts* 21
 22 cannot explain the presence in this Cave of unique manuscripts that 22
 23 have no correspondence to the holdings of the other caves. It is true 23
 24 that from many of these manuscripts so little has been preserved that 24
 25 one can hardly conclude anything (include in this category 1Q14, 25
 26 1Q15, 1Q16 [three pesharim], 1Q19, 1Q25, 1Q26, 1Q36 and 1Q37– 26
 27 1Q70); but other compositions, like 1Qpeshher Habakkuk, 1QapGen, 27
 28 1QSa and 1QSB, are rather well preserved but without any parallel to 28
 29 other caves (with the exception of 1QSa, if one accepts the identifica- 29
 30 tion by Stephen Pfann of the Cryptic remains with no less than nine 30
 31 copies of 1QSa,¹⁹ which I very strongly doubt). 31

14 See Grace M. Crowfoot, "The Linen Textiles," in DJD 1:18–38, and more recently 32
 Mireille B elis, "Des textiles, catalogues et commentaires," in *Khirbet Qumr n et 'Ain* 33
Feshkha II:  tudes d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie (ed. Jean-Baptiste Hum- 34
 bert and Jan Gunneweg; NTOASA 3; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006), 207–76. 35

15 DJD 1:7 and pl. I, 8–10. 36

16 According to Roland de Vaux, DJD 1:8. 37

17 According to Lankester Harding, DJD 1:7 and pl. I. 38

18 According to de Vaux, DJD 1:10–11 and Fig. 3. 39

19 Stephen J. Pfann in DJD 36:547–74, pl. XXXV–XXXVII. 40

1 The example of the scroll that contained 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB
 2 seems to me to contradict this theory of *master manuscripts*. If this
 3 scroll was used to prepare other copies of the composition, how can
 4 it be explained that whereas from the *Serek* there have been found so
 5 many copies in Cave 4,²⁰ no copy of 1QSa and 1QSB has been found
 6 in the other caves?

7 Stegemann's theory cannot provide an explanation for the pres-
 8 ence in Cave 1 of a series of manuscripts in more than one copy, like
 9 the two copies of Isaiah, two copies of Deuteronomy, three copies of
 10 Psalms, two copies of *Jubilees*, two copies of Daniel, and two copies
 11 of the *Hodayot*. And, of course, it cannot explain why many of the
 12 copies found in Cave 4 of the compositions contained in these *mas-*
 13 *ter manuscripts* are paleographically older than the assumed "*master*
 14 *manuscripts* which served principally as models for the preparation of
 15 further copies" (I am thinking of the *Serek*,²¹ *Hodayot*,²² *Millhama*,²³ or
 16 the *Festival Prayers*,²⁴ for example). I think that we can conclude that
 17 the explanation of the character of Cave 1 as the repository of *master*
 18 *manuscripts* does not give us a satisfactory answer.

19 ²⁰ Edited by Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes in DJD 26.

20 ²¹ Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:20 and 29, describe the hand of 4Q255 (4QpapS^a)
 21 as "Early Hasmonean cursive" and date it (with Cross) to 125–100 B.C.E.; hence older
 22 than 1QS, which is generally dated to 100–75 B.C.E.

23 ²² Eileen Schuller, DJD 29:129–30, describes 4Q428 as a "semi-formal Hasmonean
 24 script," and dates it "in the first half of the first Century B.C.E., 100–50 B.C.E.," hence
 25 older than 1QH^a, whose clearly Herodian hand is generally dated to the last quarter
 26 of the first c. B.C.E. or to the beginning of our era. Emile Puech expresses this point
 27 strongly: "While 1QHodayot^{ab}, with its beautiful calligraphy, largely dates from the
 28 beginning of our era or shortly before, the manuscripts from Cave 4 are certainly
 29 older: 4QHodayot^{d-f}, the most recent, would date from the third quarter of the first
 30 century B.C.E. (early Herodian), 4QHodayot^a and 4QHodayot^c from the middle of
 31 the first century B.C.E. (late Hasmonean-early Herodian), and 4QHodayot^b, the most
 32 ancient, from the first quarter of the first century B.C.E., shortly after 100 B.C.E. (mid-
 33 dle Hasmonean)," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman
 34 and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford, 2000), 1:366.

35 ²³ The hand of the scribe of 4Q493 (4QM^c) is described by Maurice Baillet as "a
 36 calligraphie légèrement antérieur à la période hérodiennne et pourrait se situer dans la
 37 première moitié du 1er siècle avant J.-C.," DJD 7:50, and the hand of 4Q496 (4QM^d)
 38 as "une main pré-hérodiennne difficile à dater, mais qui doit être peu antérieure à 50
 39 avant J.-C.," DJD 7:58, while the Herodian script of 1QM is generally dated to the last
 40 quarter of the first century B.C.E.

41 ²⁴ The third copy, 4Q509 (4QPrFêtes^c), is dated by Baillet "de la fin de la période
 42 asmonéenne, environ 70–60 avant J.-C.," DJD 7:184, while 1Q34–34-bis is a clearly
 43 Herodian hand, very similar to the first hand of 1QH^a as noted by Trever, "Comple-
 44 tion of the Publication," 333.

Stegemann's category of "master manuscripts" may be related to, but is clearly different from, the category of *de luxe editions* described by Emanuel Tov.²⁵ Using as criterion the *large top/bottom margins* of more than 3.0 cm, of all the scrolls from Cave 1 only 1QM and 1Qap-Gen would belong to this category; using the criterion of a *very large* writing block, 1QSa and 1QIsa^b could be added, as well as 1QH^a which is missing on the list of Tov, and 1QS and 1QIsa^a if we include the manuscripts with a *large* writing block.²⁶ Thus, a total of only five to seven manuscripts would belong to the category of *de luxe* editions, not enough to explain the character of the Cave as such.

3. George Brooke and the Genizah Hypothesis 11

In a recent booklet,²⁷ George J. Brooke asserts again the old hypothesis of Sukenik as an explanation of the Cave 1 collection. He says: 12

The manuscripts in Cave 1 were discovered wrapped in linen and carefully placed in jars. It was as if they had been buried and it is indeed likely that the Cave is best understood as a *genizah*, a burial place for manuscripts, which reflects customary Jewish practice for manuscripts no longer in use. In other words, those manuscripts in Cave 1, which include for us some of the best preserved, were probably the most damaged in antiquity and had been deposited, probably well before the end of the first century B.C., because they could not longer be used.²⁸

In Brooke's explanation two factors are given for understanding Cave 1: the cave would have been a repository of discarded manuscripts, a *genizah*, and the deposit into the cave would have happened well before the end of the first century B.C.E. With due respect for our Manchester colleague, I think that neither of these two elements hold.

Leaving aside the fact that we do not know when the "customary Jewish practice," regulated in the Talmud for scrolls used in the cult, began to be used (the best know examples are from the middle ages, though two scrolls at Masada, one of Deuteronomy and another of Ezekiel, were buried under the synagogue floor), wrapping the

²⁵ Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–29. 32

²⁶ See tables 15, 27 and 28 in *ibid.*, 84–89, 126–27 and 129. 33

²⁷ George J. Brooke, *Qumran and the Jewish Jesus: Reading the New Testament in the Light of the Scrolls* (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2005). 34

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 9. 35

1 manuscripts in linen and putting them in jars (both biblical and non-
 2 biblical manuscripts) does not seem to be the most logical way to dis-
 3 pose of them when they are not longer in use. Besides, although less
 4 amply attested than in the case of Caves 4 and 11, we do have in Cave 1
 5 some evidence of repair of damaged manuscripts with stitching,²⁹ and
 6 at least one *opistograph*³⁰ on which the writing of the recto and verso
 7 are clearly of two different periods. All these elements make it, in my
 8 view, highly unlikely that Cave 1 should be considered as a *genizah*.
 9 After surveying the evidence, Tov concludes: “There is no evidence for
 10 such *genizot* at Qumran, even though during the first generation of
 11 scroll research the Qumran caves were often described as such storage
 12 places for discarded scrolls.”³¹

13 The second element of Brooke’s hypothesis (that the remains of
 14 Cave 1 were deposited long before the end of the first century) is also
 15 highly questionable, independent of the question whether the manu-
 16 scripts deposited there were usable or useless. It recalls to my mind
 17 (in spite of the clear differences that there are among the two theo-
 18 ries) both the theory of the “single generation hypothesis” put forth by
 19 Greg Doudna,³² and the theory of the “Old Caves and Young Caves” of
 20 Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra.³³ Doudna considers that “almost all scribal cop-
 21 ies of Qumran texts come from a single generation” and, though older
 22 texts may exist, “there will be no texts later than the date of the single
 23 generation,” and consequently, “the first century C.E. disappears from
 24 Qumran’s textual horizon.”³⁴ Stökl Ben Ezra asserts that the materials
 25 of Cave 1 (which like Cave 4 is an “old” cave as distinct from Caves
 26 2, 3, 5, 6, and 11, the “young” ones) would contain the remains of the
 27 library of Qumran brought to safety and hidden “around the turn of
 28 the era when Qumran was destroyed by a fire after an attack,” and

29 ²⁹ The most clear example is 1QIsa^a XII. For other examples, see Tov, *Scribal Prac-*
 30 *tices*, 122–25 and the corresponding illustrations.

31 ³⁰ 1Q70 and 1Q70bis, DJD 1:148–49 and 145, pl. XXXVII and Trever, “Comple-
 32 tion of the Publication,” pl. VII. For a complete list, see Appendix 3 of Tov, *Scribal*
 33 *Practices*, 295–97 and its discussion on pages 68–73.

34 ³¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 123.

35 ³² Greg Doudna, “Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis,” in *The*
 36 *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.;
 37 Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:430–65.

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

40 ³⁴ Doudna, “Dating the Scrolls,” 463–64.

would have remained there undisturbed and forgotten during the new occupation of the Khirbet after the reconstruction of the building.³⁵

Leaving aside the difficulties that both theories create, I think that an analysis of the dating of the manuscripts of Cave 1 disproves both theories, at least if one considers (as I do) that the date of latest manuscript provides a *terminus a quo* for the deposit. This means that the date of the manuscript will not give us the date of the deposit, but that the deposit should be necessarily posterior to the latest manuscript. Now, dating the manuscripts is a notoriously tricky matter, but I think there is general agreement that the many analyses done using the Carbon-14 method have proved the general reliability of the paleographical analysis.

Although only a few manuscripts from Cave 1 have been dated using the C-14 method (1QH^a, 1QS, 1QapGen by the Zurich laboratory,³⁶ 1QpHab by the NSF Arizona Accelerator Mass Spectrometer Facility of the University of Arizona, Tucson,³⁷ and 1QIsa^a which has been tested twice at both institutions),³⁸ three of them are dated later than the one period assumed by Doudna, even with the 1997 decadal calibration he uses.³⁹ To 1QpHab a date between 88–2 B.C.E. is given, to 1QapGen a date between 47 B.C.E. and 48 C.E., and to 1QH^a a date between 37 B.C.E. and 68 C.E.

If we look at the chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,⁴⁰ at least four manuscripts are listed in a range of dates that are incompatible not only with Doudna assumptions but also with Stökl Ben Ezra's supposition of a deposit on the Cave in 9 or 4 B.C.E.:

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------|------|
| 1QInstruction | 30 B.C.E.–30 C.E. | b 1 |
| 1QapGen | 30 B.C.E.–68 C.E. | c 20 |

³⁵ Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves," 327.

³⁶ Georges Bonani, Susan Ivy, Willy Wölfli, Magen Broshi, Israel Carmi, and John Strugnell, "Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls," *Radiocarbon* 34 (1992): 843–49.

³⁷ A. J. Timothy Jull, Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi, and Emanuel Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19.

³⁸ 1QIsa^a has been tested both in Zurich and in Tucson with an excellent agreement in the values obtained. See Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls," 15.

³⁹ Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls," 468–71.

⁴⁰ Prepared by Brian Webster on the basis of the DJD editions and published in DJD 39:351–446.

| | | | |
|---|----------|-------------------|------|
| 1 | 1QJN? ar | 30 B.C.E.–69 C.E. | c 20 |
| 2 | 1QpHab | 1–50 C.E. | c 25 |

3

4 This list indexes only the twenty-three compositions better preserved,
 5 but a look at the plates of DJD 1 shows that the number of late Herodian
 6 writings is much larger. Without going into a detailed paleographical
 7 analysis, I would not hesitate to place into the first century C.E. the
 8 following manuscripts: 1Q1 (Genesis) and 1Q27 (Mysteries) that, as
 9 Milik indicates, seems to be written by the same hand,⁴¹ 1Q12 (Psalm
 10 44), 1Q14 and 1Q16 (two of the pesharim; from the third too little is
 11 preserved to form an opinion), 1Q34 (1QLiturgical prayers), 1Q37 and
 12 1Q39 (Hymnic compositions), as well as 1QH^a and 1QH^b. This would
 13 place at least fifteen compositions out of the range needed to confirm
 14 the hypothesis.

15 I think I can safely conclude that neither of the two elements of
 16 Brooke's explanation of the character of Cave 1 can be considered
 17 proved.

18 4. *Devorah Dimant and the Character of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH^a*

19 Even more recently than Brooke, Devorah Dimant has dedicated a
 20 whole article to the question.⁴² She concentrates only on 1QS, 1QM,
 21 and 1QH^a and notes that these three manuscripts represent the fullest
 22 and most elaborate text when compared with the copies found in Cave
 23 4; but she does not hesitate to extend her conclusion to all the holdings
 24 of Cave 1. Dimant says in the Abstract of her article:

25 All three works were copied on manuscripts of large format, and 1QH^a
 26 and 1QM were carefully executed. These data suggest that cave 1 copies
 27 were particularly respected by the Qumranites and may have served as
 28 model copies for the major sectarian works. This explains why they were
 29 carefully placed in jars and hidden in cave 1.⁴³

30 And within the body of her article, after asserting that 1QS, 1QM, and
 31 1QH^a, compared with the copies from Cave 4, are the fullest and most

32 ⁴¹ DJD 1:49 and 103.

33 ⁴² Devorah Dimant, "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature
 34 as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance," *RevQ* 22/88 (2006): 615–30.

35 ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 615.

textually developed representatives of the works contained in those manuscripts, she says:

What clearly emerges from such separate studies is that the full and elaborate character is shared by all three Cave 1 copies. This cannot be through mere chance but must point to a phenomenon which goes beyond the individual cases.⁴⁴

This shows that Dimant's interpretation has also two distinct elements: the character of the three manuscripts on which she concentrates her analysis, and the extension of her conclusion to the other manuscripts from Cave 1. And, I think, Dimant's conclusions can be disputed on both counts.

There is no doubt that 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH are composite manuscripts. That 1QS preserves the oldest version of the *Rule*, because it is penned on the oldest manuscript, as Dimant assumes, is a matter of dispute. Dimant sides squarely with Philip Alexander on this matter,⁴⁵ which is perfectly legitimate; but by this she does not reduce the force of the arguments of the opposing party, represented by Sarianna Metso, for example.⁴⁶ My simple conclusion is that on a disputed premise you cannot build a strong edifice.⁴⁷

Dimant's analysis of 1QH^a is less straightforward. She is forced to deal with the late date of the manuscript and makes much of 4QH^b (4Q428) in order to arrive at the same conclusion as with 1QS:

However, the oldest *Hodayot* copy, 4QH^b (4Q428), is identical to 1QH^a in content and order of the psalmodic units. Dated to the first half of the first century B.C.E. as it is, 4QH^b attests to the early origin of the collection copied in the Herodian manuscript of 1QH^a.⁴⁸

This could be true, but the editor of 4QH^b is certainly more reserved: "4QH^b may be our earliest copy of the *Hodayot*; it was copied earlier than 1QH^a, and perhaps earlier than, *or about the same time as*,

⁴⁴ Ibid., 617.

⁴⁵ Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of the *Serek HaYahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17/65–69 (1996): 437–56.

⁴⁶ Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997) and, more recently, eadem, *Serekh Texts* (CQS 9; LSTS 62; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁴⁷ For a sober evaluation of the two conflicting positions, see Markus Bockmuehl, "Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS)," *RevQ* 18/72 (1998): 541–60 and Michael A. Knibb, "Rule of the Community," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:793–97.

⁴⁸ Dimant, "The Composite Character," 623–34.

1 the very different collection in 4QH^a (4Q427),” says Eileen Schuller.⁴⁹
 2 And when one considers the evidence really preserved (a look at the
 3 foldouts of DJD is enough to prove my point), one is tempted to give
 4 the full value to the expression used by Schuller when presenting the
 5 evidence: “If 4QH^b contained the same collection of Psalms as 1QH^a
 6 and in the same order...”⁵⁰ The fact is that only in one case (frg. 10
 7 11) do we have the transition between two Psalms, a very small basis
 8 indeed to extract far-reaching conclusions.

9 Dimant’s section on 1QM has even bigger problems, since she
 10 accepts Roni Yishai’s conclusion that none of the compositions related
 11 to the eschatological war from Cave 4 is a precise copy of 1QM, and in
 12 this way she is deprived of the possibility of using them as proof that
 13 the later manuscript reflects the oldest and most complete text of the
 14 composition (as she does with the *Hodayot*). Thus, she is left only with
 15 the analogy to the assumed case of 1QS and 1QH^a.

16 It should be clear at this point that I do not consider proved Dimant’s
 17 assertion that the “elaborate and developed character” of these
 18 three manuscripts indicates that they are at/near the beginning of the
 19 creative process as opposed to the end of recensional process. But even
 20 if ~~the~~ Dimant’s assertion concerning these three manuscripts were true
 21 (which I do not think it is), we would still need other proofs in order
 22 to extend her conclusions to the rest of the holdings of Cave 1.

23 At first sight, Dimant’s interpretation echoes Stegemann’s proposal,
 24 and thus the basic objections I have put forth against Stegemann’s
 25 interpretation would hold also for Dimant. But in a footnote at the end
 26 of her article, Dimant explains how she differs from Stegemann:

27 Hartmut Stegemann suggested that these scrolls themselves served as
 28 esteemed models for other copies. However, penned in the last part of
 29 the first quarter of the first century B.C.E., 1QH^a and 1QM could not
 30 have served as models for earlier texts. They must have been copies of
 31 earlier models already in existence.⁵¹

32 But I fail to see what this tells us about the specific character of
 33 the Cave.
 34

35 ⁴⁹ DJD 29:131.

36 ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 126.

37 ⁵¹ Dimant, “The Composite Character,” 630.

5. *Conclusion*

1

I do not know whether our Executive Secretary, in asking me to present this “overview,” was expecting me to come up with an opinion of my own. After examining the three interpretations proposed and having found them insufficient, I have nothing really new to propose to you. All things considered, the traditional opinion, which sees Cave 1 as the repository of part of the treasures of the Library of Qumran in order to hide and protect them from impending danger, when presented in an orderly and thoughtful manner, seems still the best explanation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

If we take seriously the high number of jars, already broken in antiquity, and the high number of linen textiles found in the Cave, we may conclude that the orderly hiding of the manuscripts was interrupted and never completed, or that Cave 1 was emptied of part of its treasures before modern times as Stegemann concluded for Cave 3. We will never know. What we do know is what we have: a few well-preserved manuscripts and many more small remains of other compositions. And when we consider all of them, we have a perfect sample of the library of which the holdings of Cave 1 were once a part—a cross section, as it were, of the Qumran collection as a whole.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

In the article I mentioned at the beginning (see nn. 5–6), where I compared the contents of Cave 1 with all the other known materials from Qumran, I concluded that the most interesting element brought forth by the completion of the publication was the change offered in the proportions between biblical, parabiblical, and sectarian manuscripts, and the increased importance of non sectarian parabiblical materials as compared with the two other categories.⁵² And when one takes into account not only the seven big manuscripts published outside DJD but the forty manuscripts included in DJD 1 (leaving out of consideration the thirty other manuscripts non classified or reproduced on plates XXXIII–XXXVII), the profile of the contents of Cave 1 is rather similar to the profile of the collection as a whole: fifteen “biblical” manuscripts, nine “sectarian” compositions, and twenty-two “parabiblical” non sectarian compositions.⁵³

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

⁵² García Martínez, “Qumrán en el Siglo XXI,” 314–15.

35

⁵³ Correction of the English by Kirk Essary, graduate student at FSU.

36

The discovery that fingerprints are unique to each individual, are left behind on objects a person touches and can be lifted off those items is nothing short of miraculous. This discovery completely changed the way that law enforcement conducted investigations. In today's modern age, Jack the Ripper would eventually be caught. Even though it was 1823 when Jan Evangelista Purkinje noticed how unique our fingerprints are, it took some time for law enforcement to figure out ways to use this knowledge. Today, this discovery is used in everyday police work.

1 2. Related Posts. After her husband had gone to work, Mrs Richards sent her children to school and went upstairs to her bedroom. She was too excited to do any 1 _ that morning, because in the evening she would be going to a fancy dress party with her husband. She intended to dress up as a ghost and she had 2 _ her costume the night before. Now she was 3 _ to try it on. Though the costume consisted only of a sheet, it was very effective. Mrs Richards put it 4 _, looked in the mirror, smiled and went downstairs. She wanted to find out whether it would be 5 _ to wear. A great genius discovered the meaning of seeds. He may have noticed that where some seeds had fallen on the ground, new plants grew.