Access to the Dead Sea Scrolls
by Eugene Ulrich, Department of Theology

The University of Notre Dame has rich resources for studying the Dead Sea Scrolls. With the arrival of Prof. James VanderKam in August 1991, the theology faculty now includes three of the editors of the scrolls, since he joins our new dean, Prof. Harold Attridge, and myself, the chief editor of the Scrolls. Moreover, the Hesburgh Library has primary editions of all the texts that have been published, journals in which most new editions appear, secondary editions as well as translations into the various modern languages, reference tools (concordances, dictionaries, grammars, paleographic studies, etc.) plus the full range of secondary literature on the history, literature and theology of the community. In fact, the famed concordance has been in the Reference Department (BM 487 .P84 1988) for several years.

Two events in September caused international stirs in the normally tranquil world of Dead Sea Scroll scholarship. Prof. Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg published an unauthorized edition of a few of these manuscripts, and the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, announced that it would grant unrestricted access to its set of 3,000 photographic negatives of the scrolls. For all concerned with scholarship, with the custody of academic resource material and with ethical standards of the academic profession, these two events require reflection and response.

On September 4, 1991, Wacholder and his graduate assistant Abegg published a bootleg edition of two groups of scrolls entitled Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. They had used a concordance of the words occurring in the non-biblical scrolls to create their edition. They retroverted short phrases with key words, reconstructing whole passages -- like creating an edition of Shakespeare by pasting together quotes from Bartlett’s Quotations.

But the concordance was the work of other scholars, used without permission. It was compiled by assistants to the international team of editors selected to edit the scrolls. The editors had produced hand-written notes with preliminary transcriptions of the texts of individual fragments; the transcriptions were provisional and by no means intended as definitive. The assistants copied onto small index cards each word of the text as a key word within its phrase; this was a huge project, and understandably some copying errors were made. After the index cards were copied, the editors continued to perfect their work, and many changes were introduced which are not reflected on the cards. For example, the words originally listed for "Line 4" on "Frag. 16" became listed as "Line 5" on one index card after minimally-preserved letters were detected at the top (now
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Funding the Future
by Robert C. Miller

The 1990s are presenting a broad range of challenges and opportunities for university libraries. Space concerns, technology, intellectual property issues, even the very mission of the research library in the 21st century are frequent topics for professional programs, informal discussions and directors’ nightmares. Perhaps the most troublesome issue, and certainly the most basic, is funding: whatever the library’s goals and needs, they will require money.

What are the factors affecting the financial future of research libraries? None is more central than the general condition of higher education. Certainly universities and colleges have had better days in terms of public prestige. Criticism is being directed at virtually all aspects of higher education; admissions, athletics, budgeting, curriculum and faculty responsibilities are among the most prominent. There are widespread calls for greater accountability and very real concerns about poorly understood escalating costs which result from growing service expectations, rapidly changing and expensive technology and the very real, but unappreciated costs of compliance with federal regulations. These concerns are coming in the midst of a rethinking of the federal role in support for higher education. Therefore, institutions are less able to count on federal funding in
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Focus on Grantsmanship

by Katharina Blackstead

Along with other academic libraries throughout the United States, the University Libraries are struggling to build and preserve their collections, keep up with new technologies and increase their services in the face of the information explosion and the expansion of academic programs. It is a struggle most academic libraries have not been able to win without looking beyond their traditional source of support -- the budgetary allocation from their respective college or university administrations. Over the last decade, academic libraries have turned increasingly to donors, friends' groups, corporations, foundations and government agencies. This quest has gradually led librarians to an art practiced for years by teaching and research faculty: grantsmanship.

During the 1990-91 fiscal year, a great deal of hard work and concerted effort on the part of Notre Dame librarians was rewarded. The University Libraries received over one million grant dollars to help support projects of critical importance to information access, preservation and control.

The year began with the good news that the Our Sunday Visitor Foundation had awarded the University Libraries a grant of $12,500 to make our collection of 4,000 historically important Catholic pamphlets available for scholarly research. This unique collection, consisting initially of 1,406 pamphlets was received from Our Sunday Visitor in 1986, and includes more than 2,500 additional pamphlets from the estates of Msgr. Raynold Hildebrand and Rev. Hector A. Benoit, among others. The contents represent a wide variety of Catholic social thought and teaching, many of them published by Our Sunday Visitor. Other distinguished authors include Daniel A. Lord, John A. O'Brien and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. The need for assistance was clear; since 1989 only 900 brief records for this material had been entered into the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). Now, thanks to the foundation, access to this outstanding collection of research materials is nearly complete according to Charlotte A. Ames, bibliographer for Catholic American studies and project director.

Next came the news that the University Libraries and the University Archives had become the recipients of $48,706 from the Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329 Title II-C, "Strengthening Research Library Resources Programs." The funding is being used to create machine-readable bibliographic records for all discrete manuscript, archive and ephemeral collections of more than local interest (estimated at approximately 500) in the University Libraries' Department of Special Collections and the University Archives.

Among these materials are the 1576-1897 Archives of the Diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas; the personal papers of Civil War General William Tecumseh Sherman, Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, philosopher Orestes Brownson, early Notre Dame scientists Albert Zahm and Julius Nieuwland, and former Notre Dame President Theodore M. Hesburgh; and manuscript collections of poet Raymond Ellsworth Larson, journalist John T. Frederick, artist Eric Gill and missionary/priest Nicholas Louis Sifferath.

The grant provided for the loading of the bibliographic records for these materials into both the national OCLC database and the local online catalog, UNLOC, in MARC-AMC format, a bibliographic standard established by the Library of Congress some years ago for the national and international transmission of electronic bibliographic records.

The project is being carried out under the direction of Robert C. Miller, Director of Libraries, and Wendy Clausen Schlereth, university archivist. Supervised by Ames and William K. Cawley, associate archivist, the work is progressing well. When completed, it will provide scholars with access to many unique and heretofore inaccessible collections.

In January 1991 the University Libraries were awarded a two-year, $385,000 grant by Lilly Endowment Inc. to enhance cooperation among academic libraries in Indiana. The funding is enabling the following significant technological advances:

* Three additional Indiana private institutions (Bethel, Holy Cross and Saint Mary's Colleges) will have their mainframes linked with Notre Dame and will be able to load their databases into UNLOC, and consequently, into the State University Library Automation Network (SULAN). Thus, the existing resource sharing among the academic libraries of the state will be enhanced and expanded.

* Bibliographic records for United States government documents and certain microform sets, previously inaccessible via UNLOC, will be loaded into the database.

* Local expertise, hardware and software to facilitate the transfer of data into UNLOC will be provided.

* A number of software packages that will significantly enhance the capabilities of the online catalog will be acquired.

* The online catalog's terminals and printers, which are beginning to age and are inadequate for the system's expanding capabilities, will be updated.

* Approximately 45,000 monographic titles and an indeterminate number of "dead" serials will be converted into machine-readable format and loaded into UNLOC, thereby completing the local retrospective conversion of materials in the defunct card catalog. This is especially important for SULAN since these materials, especially the monographs, tend to be older, unique titles owned only by Notre Dame.
The significance of this grant to the progress of the University Libraries and their capabilities to provide access to the wealth of scholarly materials in their collections cannot be overstated.

In June 1991 the Our Sunday Visitor Foundation awarded the University Libraries another modest, but exceedingly important, grant of $3,100. This funding was used to inventory, preserve and make available to scholars the more than 950 Vatican II papers and documents (for the most part unpublished materials) which have over time come to Notre Dame by gift and bequest. The collection is an indispensable source for understanding the significance of the Council and its importance for the ongoing life of the Church. According to Alan D. Krieger, bibliographer for philosophy and theology and project director, the work could not have been undertaken without this grant. It has now been successfully completed.

The fiscal year ended with our receipt of a three-year, $629,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to preserve the contents of more than 12,000 embrittled scholarly volumes in the library of the University’s Medieval Institute. The volumes, particularly rich for the study of medieval intellectual life (including philosophy, religious studies and education), fall within the "brittle books period" of 1800 to 1950, when book publishers switched from linen and cotton rag paper to wood pulp paper in order to meet the demand of the reading public for more and cheaper books. Now these materials are rapidly deteriorating; without this massive microfilming effort, a one-of-a-kind international resource for research in medieval studies would be seriously diminished. Thanks to the NEH, however, and the good work of Sophia K. Jordan, head of special collections and preservation and project director, preservation efforts are falling into place and the future of the collection looks optimistic.

Despite the successes of the past year, we cannot rest on our laurels. For every project undertaken, there are many more equally important initiatives which must await their turn to be funded. To be up to the task before us, we must continue to refine our skills in this newly-discovered art of grant seeking and writing.

NEH Project Staff

Scrolls continued from page 1
"Line 1") of that fragment; but perhaps "Line 4" on "Frag. 17" (part of the same line but on a different fragment) remained as "Line 4" on its card, because no one had a reason or remembered to change it. Thus, when the computer aligns "Line 4" on "Frag. 16" with "Line 4" on "Frag. 17," the lines become confused. Similarly, fragments identified and numbered early became rearranged and renumbered after subsequent piecing together. Some fragments were even moved to a different manuscript copied by the same scribe, but they remained listed with the wrong work in the concordance.

As anyone can realize who reflects on it, the method by which the edition was produced ensures its unreliability, and even Wacholder admits "its many imperfections" (p. ix). There has been much confusion about the concordance. Neither was it being kept secret, nor was it intended or prepared to be a reliable concordance fit for publication. It was a rough tool to help the editors identify words that were missing or only partly extant on related fragments. Prof. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., the first of the compilers of the concordance, has authored the most widely used bibliography of the scrolls, including a section on concordances. Interestingly, he does not even list his own concordance there, again not because he was "keeping secret" his own work, but because it was not envisioned as a publishable tool. It bears no copyright but the friendly caveat "editorum in usum" -- partly to protect the rights of the team and assistants, but also to avert the incautious use by others. It also bears saying that the team agreed to send the copy of the concordance to Wacholder's institutional library in trust, so that he and other scholars could use it responsibly for their research. We knew of the possibility of abuse but trusted.

On September 22, 1991, Dr. William Moffett, director of the Huntington Library, announced that the library had a full set of the photographic negatives of all the scrolls and would grant 100 percent access to all who asked to use or buy them. Most major newspapers heralded this move as a "liberation" of the scrolls. But several questions need to be raised. First, does the Huntington Library have legitimate title to these photographs? The legal papers I have seen make it clear that the set of negatives they hold were authorized to be produced only for the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center (ABMC) at Claremont, and that they were deflected to the Huntington only when an irate official of the ABMC was removed from authority.

A second question is the context in which the Huntington decision was made. It is important to say that the recent picture of the scrolls publication project fed widely to the American public is seriously misleading. The rhetoric about a small tightly-knit circle of scholars hoarding manuscripts which they stubbornly or slothfully refuse to publish and jealously refuse to let others see makes titillating reading but does not match reality. For
example, although charges are made that only 20 percent of the scrolls are published, the official curator at the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum states that 80 percent are published. If the editors of the scrolls were selfishly hoarding them, foot-dragging instead of publishing them and refusing to let other scholars see them, then one might agree with Prof. Lawrence Schiffman (Washington Post 9/22/91, p. A24) that "those who make this material available are 'Robin Hoods,' stealing from the academically privileged."

But the editors have in fact been publishing a great deal. More than 24 books and 70 articles have been published just since 1980 -- hardly an effective means of keeping it all secret! And, though there have been a number of instances in which access to photographs or information was denied (wrongfully, in my view), most of the editors have been generous and open in sharing, even though at times the recipients have abused the agreements. And I can attest that all the biblical material (the material I know firsthand) has routinely been provided to individuals or groups who needed to work with them. One can check, for example, the New American Bible, published as early as 1970, the New Revised Standard Version, published in 1989, and numerous commentaries and dissertations in the interim.

Moreover, the photographs are not "raw data," but the product of eight to ten years of intellectual work that was creative and time-consuming. The "raw data" are the jumbled fragments in the museum; what the photographs show is the result of piecing together up to 30 tiny jigsaw scraps into a now coherent pattern. An analogy would be that every newspaper or TV network has the right to cover a given story. But once a reporter has collected interviews, notes, photographs and background data and woven it all together, no other reporter should be allowed simply to take and publish the first reporter's intellectual work.

My colleagues and I fully support other scholars' rights of access to the scrolls. But there must be a balance between the rights of scholars to access and the rights of editors to the fruits of their labors. Both recent developments seriously upset that balance and jeopardized the tradition of honor and ethics in the academic profession. The unilateral taking of the law into their own hands by Wacholder and Moffett is a desperate grasping at one "freedom" by trampling innocent editors' rights. Remember that the current editors have not had the material "40 years," but usually only from two to five years. What we need is neither the denial by a few editors of scholars' right of access nor the denial by self-proclaimed "liberators" of the current editors' rights. What we need is an honorable compromise between efficient editors and temperate scholars.

As this article was being written, a new and more important development has been announced. The Israel Antiquities Authority has in fact declared that all materials are now open to all scholars for their study and even for use in their publications. That move ensures scholars' rights of access. What must be ensured now is that those scholars honor the single proviso that -- although they may have "fair use" in quoting the material in their publications -- they will not produce editions of those texts within the next few years while the younger editors' rights of edition remain in force.

University Libraries Involved in a Little "Wrestling"

Klare Onderrichtinge der Voortreffelijke Worstel-Konst (Clear Tutorial in the Most Admirable Art of Wrestling), published in 1674 by professional wrestler Nicolaas Petter, has been given to the University Libraries by Howard A. Healey of Muscatine, Iowa.

The little "handbook" proclaims to be "very useful and advantageous against all rough fighters and in defense against those who threaten or outrage by carrying knives." Considered to be the first urban self-defense manual, the title was issued by Petter's pupil, Robbert Cors, at a time in Amsterdam's social development when a professional police force was still very rudimentary.

The text, the glosses and the techniques of Petter, who ran a fighting academy for "gentlemen," are spectacularly rendered by the famous illustrator, Romeyn de Hooghe. The plates which grace the pages carefully illustrate everything from fist work, parries to the face and body, foot and leg fighting to every kind of two-handed offense and defense against knife attack.

This early imprint, housed in the Rare Book Room of the Hesburgh Library, is a unique and important addition to the history of sport and sports illustration, as well as a glimpse at the perils of city living in 17th century Amsterdam.
a number of critical areas. This situation is compounded by the fact that the economy is weak and public revenues are declining even as social costs are increasing. As a consequence, the majority of states have reduced funding for higher education. At the same time, the public is increasingly restive over rising tuition rates, a consideration which affects private as well as public institutions. Finally, private foundations, a traditional source of additional funding for higher education, have begun to redirect their foci, shifting in type if not level of support available for academic institutions. The financial prospects for universities generally are rather gloomy, and are likely to remain so through much of the current decade. That is not good news for research libraries, which are affected by the same cost factors as their parent institutions. In addition, libraries are faced with rising expectations from users, the specter of inflation levels considerably higher than elsewhere in our society, the recently recognized need for and cost of preservation efforts and the impact of shifting academic programs. A closer look at some of these cost factors in the Notre Dame environment may be helpful in understanding the larger picture.

There is no doubt that students and faculty are expecting more from the Libraries than they did 10 years ago. There are regular requests, sometimes bordering on demands, for longer service hours for both the Hesburgh Library and the branch facilities. There are also calls for additional service points, as in the case of the new buildings for the College of Business and the DeBartolo Performing Arts Center. Faculty and students are looking for more and improved instruction in the use of the library and particularly of the newer technologies. More fundamentally, the range of information resources necessary for the work of the University is expanding rapidly and the community is appropriately expecting access to these resources: larger book collections, new journals, audio and video resources, electronic databases (bibliographic, statistical and full text in several different formats).

Changing technology is having a particularly dramatic impact on library costs in terms of the growing number of staff workstations, public terminals and related printers, mainframe computers and storage devices, CD-ROM workstations and the networks linking all these together. Moreover, this type of equipment becomes quickly obsolete: the state of the art personal computer of five years ago is of questionable value for many types of activity, even if it is either operable or repairable for a reasonable cost. The original UNLOC terminals should be upgraded to PC's to permit downloading and the development of personalized interfaces for both staff and library users. The staffing implications of the technology are also significant in terms of training for both users and the library staff and the troubleshooting and maintenance of systems. Finally, in many cases the media have become, at least for the present, significantly more expensive. Thus, Reader's Guide costs X in print, Y on CD-ROM and Z on magnetic tape for use with MDAS in UNLOC. One could argue for ignoring the newer technologies, but users expect the improved access these technologies make possible.

As elsewhere in the University, indeed in society, the costs of library compliance with federal regulations are significant. We spend increasing amounts for reporting, grant administration, student employment, recruiting and hiring procedures and safe workplace equipment.

Much has been written in these pages and elsewhere on the impact of inflation, price escalation and dollar devaluation on library acquisitions budgets. At Notre Dame the experience of two fairly recent serial cancellation projects is fresh in people's minds as dramatic evidence of these factors. While developments in recent months suggest that the situation is improving, conditions are volatile and the "triple threat" could well return to haunt libraries and their host institutions.

A final major cost issue for research libraries, that has not yet been adequately addressed at Notre Dame, is preservation. Current standards suggest that at least 10 percent of total acquisitions funding should be available for the preservation of existing resources. Notre Dame's recent expenditures have been considerably less than half that. The recently received NEH grant (See "Focus on Grantsmanship") will for the short run improve the situation dramatically, but our local infrastructure and funding are still grossly inadequate.

Given this rather grim overall picture, what can research libraries and in particular the University Libraries of Notre Dame do? Clearly we must do all that we can to ensure that existing operations are as efficient as possible without endangering their overall effectiveness in serving the University. Beyond that we need to develop a community consensus on what the Libraries should be in terms of both resources and services and a consequent community commitment to funding levels necessary to support that consensus. Essentially, the real as opposed to rhetorical priority of the Libraries within the University must be defined and actively pursued.

An important element in that process must be the consideration of what circumstances, if any, justify charging for specific library services. Developing that kind of consensus is never an easy task in a large organization. The great diversity of needs and opinions within the University community make it especially difficult, but it must be done. Without that happening, the effectiveness of the Libraries will be seriously jeopardized and this in turn can only undermine the very mission of the University. Whatever the specifics of any consensus reached, the decision-making role of the Libraries in the University at all levels must improve. This is especially important as the Libraries seek to implement any reallocations of resources that may be suggested by any consensus. Changes in academic programs, new buildings, even the academic calendar have library implications in
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terms of both service and cost. These factors need to be understood as decisions are made at all levels.

The Libraries for their part must more aggressively pursue non-budgeted funding both within the University and externally through gifts, grants, endowment and the Friends of the Library. However, this will require an adequate infrastructure with staffing and funding for programmatic expenses such as printing and publicity.

The opportunities before the University for expanding the information resources available to faculty, staff and students and for improving related services are exciting. If those opportunities are to be realized, the major challenge will be to obtain the necessary financial resources from whatever source and to do this in the face of daunting odds.

UNLOC Quick Reference Guide

Included with this issue of Access is the third edition of the "UNLOC Quick Reference Guide." It summarizes all of the additions and changes made to UNLOC since last summer. We hope you will find it helpful. If you have questions, please call the reference desk at (219) 239-6258 or the appropriate branch library.
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An Omission

The following information was inadvertently omitted from the list of Bibliographers and Liaison Officers, 1991-92, in the last issue of Access:

Peace Studies
Rafael Tarrago 239-6587