

NÓRA DÁVID and ARMIN LANGE (Eds.)

QUMRAN AND THE BIBLE

*Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures
in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*



PEETERS

LEUVEN – PARIS – WALPOLE, MA

2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	v
Emanuel TOV	
Some Academic Memoirs	1
Lika TOV	
Some Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments as a Source of Inspiration for My Art	29
Armin LANGE	
The Textual Plurality of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.	43
Florentino GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ	
The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Joshua	97
Heinz-Josef FABRY	
Die Rezeption biblischer Texte in frühjüdischer Zeit im Licht der Qumrantexte	111
Loren STUCKENBRUCK	
The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament	131
Selected Index of Sources	171

SOME ACADEMIC MEMOIRS

Emanuel Tov

1. Beginnings and High School Years

I have always resisted the suggestion to write my memoirs and it remains a strange idea, not unusual, but simply strange. But now I have no choice, encouraged as I have been by the editor of this volume. The honor shown me makes the writing of a short version of my memoirs a worthy enterprise.

From which point should one start writing one's memoirs? From the day I was born or beforehand, from my elementary or high school years, or from my youth in general? Luckily, I received some instructions, namely that I should provide background information concerning my work on the Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). We can thus skip the first so many years of my life.

My interest in these topics started formally with the beginning of my study at the Hebrew University at the age of 20, but the seeds of these interests were sown at an earlier age. As a child, I first wanted to become a physician, but that wish dissipated rather quickly when I realized that I could not stand the sight of blood. I do not remember the full list of professions that I subsequently wanted to embrace, but among them were archeology (as was the desire of my wife to be, Lika), classics, and sociology. With the latter purpose in mind, I traveled once from Amsterdam to Groningen in my penultimate school year to speak with Prof. J. E. Ellemers of Groningen University, a famous sociologist specializing in the sociology of the *kibbutz*. I do not remember the details of that conversation, but I did not continue with those aspirations. I do know that much later, in the summer of 2003, I addressed the academic community of Groningen University on the occasion of being conferred with the Ubbo Emmius medal by that university. In my speech, I referred to my consultation with Prof. Ellemers in the distant past, some forty-five years earlier. I spoke of him in vague terms, fearing that he may no longer be among us. Great was my surprise when Prof. Ellemers introduced himself to me during the ensuing reception.

In my school years, I was attracted to ancient literatures, greatly enjoying the study of Greek and Latin at the classical gymnasium in Amsterdam,¹ the city of my birth in 1941. I liked the world of the classics, and I was in love with the Latin and Greek languages. I liked to master new fields of knowledge that for us, as children, were a *tabula rasa* when embarking on them. We learned the Latin and Greek paradigms, compared the two languages, and accepted from our teachers the view that the study of the verbal systems of the Latin and Greek languages² would be instrumental in developing our logic. Further, if you have these language systems in your mind, we were told, it is easier to learn other languages even if, like Arabic, they differ completely from the classical languages. At school, I loved to follow the logic of Plato, to walk around the battlefields of Troy with Homer and to follow Odysseus in his travels. I also liked translating (always from the source language to Dutch) the poetry of Virgil and the terse style of Tacitus' *Histories*. Tacitus did not use a single superfluous word and, prone to efficiency myself, that is how I had always wanted to express my own thoughts in other languages. Not in Latin, because we never spoke or wrote in that language, which was a constant complaint of our teachers, referring to our less-knowledgeable generation. They themselves mastered these proficiencies, but were not instructed to pass them on to us. The small group of pupils in our *gymnasium alpha* (in my case, a subdivision of the Spinoza Lyceum) excelled in all these topics, and we were probably raised as little scholars. Indeed, two persons continued in classical languages at Amsterdam University, while others took up the study of other languages; some turned to other free professions.

In many ways, at the university I stayed close to the love of my school years, but added a new dimension to it, that of the study of the Hebrew language. While in high school, alongside my study of classical and modern languages, I took up the study of Hebrew from age 13 onwards. At that age,

¹ We specialized in the *humaniora*, especially the classics and modern languages and literatures. At age 11, I myself chose the type of school I wanted to attend from the age of 12 onwards. The social elite went to a "gymnasium," while the next group went to a "lyceum," where one could choose in grade 2 whether to follow the gymnasium direction or the more general HBS direction. At a later stage, one could choose the *alpha* direction, which involved the specialization in languages and classics, or the *beta* direction with a specialization in the sciences. In the *alpha* direction, which I chose, we only had a token continued education in the sciences; and in the *beta* direction the continued study of the classics was minimal.

² In our final year, we studied nine hours of Greek (Plato, Herodotus, Homer) and an equal number of hours of Latin (Ovidius, Virgil, and Tacitus) together with modern languages (Dutch, English, French, and German).

I became a Jewish “man” (*bar-mitzvah*), and Rabbi Benedikt influenced me to take up Hebrew. The auto-didactic system of learning Hebrew at the private *Talmud Torah* school of Mr. Mundzstuck very much resembled that of the learning procedures followed at my high school.³ The self-study of Hebrew involved the learning of loose-leaf instruction pages, with accompanying paradigms and exercises. Mr. Mundzstuck would move from student to student and older students sometimes helped younger ones. Twice a week, I set out on the 20-minute bicycle ride to this Hebrew school, a rather dilapidated two-room facility on the second floor of the Swammerdam Street synagogue. The study of Hebrew was based on love and self-determination. Most students were religious and were sent by their parents, while I was not religious and not sent by anyone, and therefore probably enjoyed the learning of Hebrew more than others. This was more or less the pattern of my life until the time I finished high school at the age of 17 and a half.

Throughout my high school years I was a member, later a leader, and subsequently *the* leader of a Jewish Zionistic youth movement (*Habonim*, “the builders”) in the Netherlands, and that activity involved further learning of Jewish history, the history of Israel, etc. Upon finishing my high school, this study took place in Jerusalem, where I was sent by my movement in 1959–1960, at the “Institute for Youth Leaders from Abroad.” At that institute I continued to study Hebrew and took my first classes in Hebrew Bible. Not having been brought up in a religious environment, I had never studied Bible. It was there that I decided to enroll later in the Department of Bible at the Hebrew University. At an earlier stage, while still at high school, I had wanted to study classical literatures at the university, and I enrolled for one year at Amsterdam University (1960–1961), but due to my work responsibilities as the leader of the youth movement, I did not study much, and the enrollment was little more than a formality.

In the meantime, I advanced my study of the Hebrew Bible at a low-key level. I took private courses in reading Ezekiel with an Israeli student who happened to be studying in Amsterdam, and I also taught Hebrew.

³ The learning procedure (“Dalton System”) followed at my high school involved both frontal teaching (two-thirds of the time) and the preparation of special assignments completed at school (one-third of the time). This system suited self-disciplined pupils, while others were lost. Each teacher gave us a number of assignments and during designated times we could finish these tasks in the classrooms of the teacher of that subject, under his or her guidance. During these hours, pupils wandered from class to class in order to complete this special type of homework.

In addition, I studied the book of Joshua and wrote educational programs for re-enacting the conquest of Canaan with children aged 9–11 who came to the summer camps of *Habonim*.

2. University Studies

Soon, I was able to combine my two fields of interest. When I immigrated to Israel in 1961 and enrolled in the Bible Department at the Hebrew University, I found out that I could not study merely one subject, so I added Greek to the study of Bible. In my mind, Bible was my main topic for the B.A., but for the university they were equal.

During my study, some topics were easier than others, but I received good grades in them all. I was able to skip the preparatory studies in the Greek language due to my previous studies at high school in Amsterdam, and jumped immediately to the departmental courses. In the Department of Greek, my main interests were closest to those of Prof. Baruch Lifschitz who taught epigraphy, Hellenistic authors, and some tragedies. I could not help noticing that his notes were written in French, while he taught in Hebrew. He must have felt what I was to feel also in my own teaching that for those of us born abroad it takes longer to read Hebrew pages than it does for native Israelis.

For Prof. Lifschitz, we had to prepare readings from some fifteen classical authors for proficiency examinations, and for each of these we had to read major sections and show expertise in an oral exam. I prepared most of these texts together with Judith, the daughter of my Bible professor, Isac Leo Seeligmann. Judith reminded me recently that I once said to Prof. Lifschitz that I read Herodotus like the *Yediot Aharonot* newspaper. At the end of my study, I had to take a B.A. examination, for which I chose Homer as my field of specialization. Together with Judith, I read all the books of the Iliad and Odyssey, greatly enjoying this reading experience. While at high school, I had to translate Greek into Dutch, but I now had to translate Greek into Hebrew, which took some time to get used to. Raanana (later Prof.) Meridor taught Greek syntax to a small group of 6–7 students, and this was the backbone of our language studies. With unequalled determination and thoroughness, she wrote her corrections in red in our Greek writing exercises.

During the first two years, some of my studies in Bible were a little more difficult for me than those in Greek because I was disadvantaged in comparison with my native-Israeli fellow students. They had learned Tanakh at elementary and high school, and some of them knew great

parts of the Bible by heart. On the other hand, my own high school studies probably prepared me better than them for a critical and philological reading of the text, since my fellow students, religious and secular, often explained the Biblical Hebrew in accord with the meaning of the words in modern Hebrew.

When I started to study, at the beginning of the 1960s, there was great interest in the study of the Bible in Israel, where that literature was and is conceived as national literature that has cultural, historical, and even political significance for the country. Each year, some 100 new students flocked to the department, focusing on Bible as one of their two “majors”. When I arrived at the department, Prof. Seeligmann was the only professor, along with several lecturers. He taught the major courses on Bible, each year focusing on one literary genre (wisdom literature, prophecy, historiography, etc.). All the B.A. students took part in these courses, some 250 of them in Mazer Lecture Room 1. They were the centerpiece of the study in the department because of Seeligmann’s high intellectual standards, wide knowledge, and acumen. These courses were the talk of the day also because of Seeligmann’s peculiar character. He used to write Hebrew backwards on the blackboard, and often finished a session in the middle of a sentence, keeping sharply to time, and continued from exactly that point in the sentence the week thereafter. In a class of some 250 students, he often addressed students personally, a source of embarrassment for some.

In my second year of B.A. studies, I was allowed to participate in Seeligmann’s M.A. course on the Septuagint (LXX). These weekly meetings became the highlight of my studies, and I followed these courses for four years. It is there that I learned my methodological approach towards the LXX, and my own LXX classes delivered over the course of forty years (from which sabbaticals need to be deducted) followed the pattern of my teacher’s system. I provide little introduction to the LXX (students had to fill in the background information themselves), and the focus of the course was an intimate knowledge of a single biblical book in the LXX. Such a book was not exhausted, since we did not succeed in reading more than 4–5 chapters. The analysis in the class was very thorough, much more than that covered by the professional literature on any given book. There are very few commentaries on the LXX, and in Seeligmann’s day there were even fewer; the analysis in the class is much more profound than in the few LXX commentaries that have been written in the meantime. From Seeligmann I learned the core of the philological approach, which involves the intimate study of all the details relating to the LXX.

At the first stage, this involves the understanding of the meaning, text, grammar and background of the LXX of a given book, its exegesis and the reconstruction of elements in its parent text, then the same regarding the Hebrew book, its ancient versions, and the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts. As a consequence the Alexandrian-Greek translators came to life in his class. At a second stage, the details in the LXX are compared with those in the MT (Masoretic Text), conclusions are drawn and preferences on the readings of the MT or the LXX are expressed. Seeligmann was a master in the methodological background of such reasoning, using the whole gamut of his expertise in all these areas, and many more. He frequently drew on his vast knowledge of biblical exegesis, classical Greek and ancient cultures. He excelled in assuming stages in the transmission of the Greek and Hebrew texts that have now been lost. The technical process of assuming scribal errors was always in his mind, but he was prone to assuming theological developments either in the translator's mind or in the Hebrew readings in earlier stages in the development of the text.⁴

My interest in the texts and versions of the Bible was further kindled and developed by Prof. Shemaryahu Talmon, with whom I served as an assistant for several years. He included the newly discovered Qumran scrolls in the study of the text more often than other scholars, and he also was an expert on the Samaritan (Hebrew) version of the Torah. He developed a literary approach to textual criticism, and he had the gift of outlining the overall development of all the ancient versions. With his brilliant ideas on these and other topics (I recall especially his seminar on the Oracles against the Foreign Nations), he enthused the whole class and whetted their appetite for further independent study.

I learned much from the analyses of Profs. Haran and Loewenstamm and enjoyed their critical acumen. I vividly remember the courses given by Prof. Meir Weiss. His thoroughness, candor, and intellectual integrity had no equal. To give just one example, it took him four academic hours to analyze with the class the first verse of the book of Job. He could convincingly present a specific view of a *crux* in the text, and then, with a good sense of humor, he would proceed to oppose that view even more convincingly.

Having studied with these professors at an early stage in my education opened the way for classes with Prof. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein in my

⁴ For an excellent example, see Seeligmann's study "δεῖξαι ἀντὶ φῶς," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 127–41 (Heb.).

M.A. studies. I would not have been ready for his approach at an earlier stage in my study. First of all, I did not know enough but, equally important, I would not have been ready to absorb his demanding requests and his irony. Goshen left a profound impression on me in his courses on Syriac and Aramaic, biblical philology in general, and the history of Semitic scholarship.

I continued to be influenced by Prof. Goshen within the framework of the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP), a project that aimed at producing a critical edition of the Bible. In order to produce such an edition based on the text of the Aleppo Codex, specialists collected data within the project relating to the ancient witnesses. I learned much from the cooperation with Profs. Talmon and Rabin in our joint editing of the Jeremiah volume.⁵ At an earlier stage, I was involved in the formulation of the principles of editing and of the description of the individual translation phenomena. Sarah Ory, David (later Prof.) Weissert and I discussed the principles among us and later with Prof. Goshen. Goshen's organizational skills and insights were the key to the success of this operation. I learned much from the formulation of these principles as is visible in my book on the LXX.⁶

3. Beginnings of an Academic Career

While still an M.A. student, I did limited teaching. I gave a course that we called *Bibliographia*, which offered an introduction to all the tools a student needs to master such as the *Biblia Hebraica*, dictionaries, bibliographical tools, etc. The teaching of this, my first course entailed much preparation and called on considerable mental resources. In the beginning, after lectures, I was worn out and literally had to rest for three hours. I was especially impressed by the fact that older people, in one case a man in his mid-forties, took a 25-year-old teacher, still a student, seriously.

My academic career started upon my return from Harvard University, where I had expanded my education in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures as it was then called (see below, §7). I served as an "assistant," the lowest teaching level, both at the Hebrew University and at the developing Haifa University, hoping that continued employment would come from one of these places. The next appointments followed at the Hebrew University, first as instructor, then as senior lecturer, asso-

⁵ *The Hebrew University Bible. The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1997).

⁶ *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d rev. and enl. ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).

ciate professor and professor, all received at a fairly young age, something that would be more difficult today. For each appointment, I had to submit a list of publications that were evaluated by experts at the Hebrew University and elsewhere. The criteria were stringent, but are even stricter today. My appointment was in the Department of Bible, where I taught the introductory course (twice), exegesis of specific books, and a number of courses on the LXX, Qumran, and textual criticism.

4. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible

The deliberations within the HUBP helped me to crystallize my own views on many aspects of the text-critical procedure, though not on all stages of that procedure. The culmination of that procedure is the evaluation of the textual evidence, which is the expression of a view on the question as to which of two or more readings is the better one. In this area, I could not learn from the HUBP for the simple reason that that project does not engage in textual comparison. I developed my views in that area at an abstract level, and subsequently wrote a theoretical paper on this area,⁷ which formed the basis for a chapter in my Hebrew handbook on textual criticism.⁸ Looking back at the way in which that book developed, at first in Hebrew, then in other languages, I advanced my thinking by systematically writing *Vorstudien* on the various areas of textual criticism. My principle was and, remains, if you don't know an area well, write a paper on it! Of course, there were experts in several areas of textual criticism who mastered those fields better than me, such as Prof. Yeivin on the Masorah and Prof. Maori on the Peshitta, etc. My first inclination was to ask them to write chapters in my book, but I then realized that I would have to explain to them at length my guiding principles and they might have disagreed with them. Realizing the difficult procedure involved, I decided that it would be more meaningful for me, and ultimately also for the readers, to present my own views on all aspects of textual criticism. The editions of *TCHB* developed in this sequence: Hebrew, English (first edition), German,⁹ English (second edition),¹⁰ and

⁷ "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," *HTR* 75 (1982): 429–48.

⁸ *Textual Criticism of the Bible: An Introduction* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1989).

⁹ *Der Text der Hebräischen Bibel: Handbuch der Textkritik* (trans. H.-J. Fabry; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997).

¹⁰ *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis and Assen: Fortress Press and Royal Van Gorcum, 2001) [below: *TCHB*].

Russian.¹¹ Technical limitations prevented the second English edition from being a full-fledged revision; in making changes, I was limited to the borders of each printed page since the edition was printed from camera-ready pages. If I wanted to add something important on a given page I had to omit something else on that or the next page.¹²

My thinking on textual criticism is influenced by the reading in detail of many manuscripts and ancient translations, and less so by abstract theories. I always had in mind the many different texts of the Bible that were circulating, for example at Qumran. All these manuscripts differed from one another, but within that plurality one may recognize some groups (families). I brought some stability to the description of this plurality, I hope, by providing a statistical description of the different types of Qumran scrolls.¹³ Further, I suggested that the scriptural Judean Desert scrolls (except for those from Qumran) reflect the Jerusalem Temple text that was later to become the MT, while the Qumran scrolls reflected many different text forms.¹⁴

My studies on the LXX and, more recently, on 4QReworked Pentateuch¹⁵ led me to new thoughts regarding the development of the final stages of the authoring of the biblical books and the first stages of their transmission. The reconstructed Hebrew texts underlying the LXX of 1 Samuel, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel show that the formulation of these books developed stage by stage, and this reconstructed development makes it difficult to posit a single original text of these books. In my view, there was not one original text, but a series of “original texts.”

¹¹ *Tekstologiya Vetchoga Zaveta* (trans. K. Burmistrov and G. Jastrebov; Moscow: Biblisko-Bagaslovski Institut Sv. Apostola Andrijeja [St. Andrews Theological Seminary], 2001).

¹² On the other hand, the third edition of my *TCHB* will not be bound by technical considerations. The new edition, which is now [2009] in its planning stages, will be completely novel in many ways. I will be free to completely deviate from the previous editions by adding and omitting long sections and even chapters. I will allow myself to shorten the complicated chapter 3 on the original text, to expand the discussion of textual criticism and exegesis and/or theology, to greatly expand the chapter on text editions, to add chapters or segments on “a didactic approach to textual criticism,” and computer-assisted research of textual criticism, etc.

¹³ For the latest formulation, see my collected papers: *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran – Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 128–54.

¹⁴ See Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*, 171–88.

¹⁵ I published that text together with S. A. White as: “4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e} and 4QTemple?” in H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–351, 459–63. Ten years afterwards, I realized that these texts do not reflect a non-biblical rewritten composition, but biblical texts that included many exegetical elements.

5. The CATSS Project and Septuagint Lexicography

Those who consult the CATSS database comparing the LXX and MT will be surprised to find out that it originated in LXX lexicography. Its beginnings were in the summer of 1974 when John W. Wevers and I were strolling alongside the walls of the Old City of Jerusalem. I was then 33 years old, and John knew my work on the LXX. I had just completed my dissertation on the LXX of Jeremiah and was about to leave for my first research leave, now called a “post-doc,” at Oxford without a specific research assignment or project. Prof. Goshen had linked me up with a well-known New Testament scholar, George D. Kilpatrick, with whom I was to take some courses and to discuss my ideas on LXX research. The plans were to take an unexpected turn when John Wevers convinced me to embark on the creation of a LXX lexicon. John was the president of the newly established IOSCS (International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies), and in that capacity he considered it his task to develop new research tools. I accepted the challenge and was expected to advance my thinking at Oxford, which was an ideal place for this purpose. Among other things, I consulted with Prof. Peter Glare who was in the middle of the revision of the large Liddell and Scott lexicon of the Greek language. I vividly recall him sitting in his room in the Ashmolean Museum (or another office in St. Giles) surrounded by large wooden boxes containing many compartments filled with small entry-slips. I also consulted with other lexicographers and I read general books and studies on lexicography. Only a few studies on LXX lexicography existed, although there were many studies on individual words or semantic fields, some even book length. I collected the bibliographical data in a little brochure,¹⁶ and compiled card indexes of individual words.¹⁷ I also developed my views on the special nature of LXX words and LXX lexicography deriving from the unnatural character of these words in the Greek language as reflections of their Hebrew counterparts.¹⁸ I summarized my views in a document sent to Professors Wevers, Goshen, and Hanhart, who then reacted. I also published my thoughts in 1976.¹⁹

¹⁶ *A Classified Bibliography of Lexical and Grammatical Studies on the Language of the Septuagint and Its Revisions* (3d ed.; Jerusalem: Academ, 1982).

¹⁷ In December 2008, I discarded these index cards since their contents are now all covered by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, I–II* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996).

¹⁸ See my study contained in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible – Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 109–28.

¹⁹ See Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 95–108.

Two developments led me away from my plan to create a LXX lexicon:

- 1) I became increasingly aware of our lack of knowledge in the area of papyrology relating to the LXX. These were not only my own personal shortcomings, but also those of my colleagues. In order to present an adequate lexicographical description of the LXX words, we need to be able to present the contemporary vocabulary, possibly from the same locale as that of the translators, definitely that of Egypt. The older lexicon of Moulton-Milligan²⁰ provided some references, but presently much more material is available. In the 1980s, such evidence was available in scattered publications that I found difficult to keep track of. During a research stay at Macquarie University, Sydney in 1989, I realized how much more these scholars (Edwin Judge, John Lee, Greg Horsley) knew than me about the papyri, and even they could not fully cope with the material. Their project was meant to find parallels for New Testament words,²¹ but much of the evidence they had gathered could also be used for LXX lexicography. All this happened before the computer age made vast quantities of papyri accessible on line,²² and at the time I was frustrated that major papyrological sources were not easily available.
- 2) The budding lexicon project created an important by-product to which most of my attention was directed. In 1980, before spending a year at the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, I asked my host, R. A. (Bob) Kraft, whether he would be willing to join forces in creating Stage 1 of the lexicon project, viz., a computerized comparison of the words of the MT and LXX. I had become increasingly aware that the meaning of many LXX words is determined by that of their Hebrew counterpart so that the awareness of Greek-Hebrew equivalents would provide important background information for LXX lexicography. For example, the use of *eirene* runs parallel to that of *shalom*, which it represents in almost all of its occurrences, that of *diatheke* runs parallel to that of *berit*, etc. In order to provide this background material for the lexicon, I planned an electronic tool presenting the words of MT and LXX in parallel columns. The concept of such a word-by-word comparison stemmed from the

²⁰ J. P. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930).

²¹ See: *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vols. 1–9 (North Ryde, N.S.W.: The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981–2002).

²² Perseus Digital Library: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>.

days of my work in the HUBP. Bob Kraft was far ahead of me in everything relating to computers, and it was he who developed the ideas for the electronic creation of the database (along with the project's programmer, the late J. Abercrombie), while I developed the concept of comparing the details in the Hebrew and Greek texts. For this purpose we needed to write a grant proposal and Bob had the gift of providing a detailed description of a project that did not yet exist – something I learned from him – and together we turned to the NEH. We received major funding (\$300,000), most of which went into the buying of an Ibcus computer system and overhead costs to the University of Pennsylvania. From 1981 onwards, we started to create a large electronic database that automatically created the equivalences between the LXX and MT, lexeme by lexeme (such as W/B/BYT/Y = KAN E)N TW=| OI)/KW| AU)TOU=), to be corrected manually. The manual correction of the computer results,²³ together with the addition of notes on translation technique (all in “col. a”) and the creation of the reconstructed Hebrew source of the LXX (“col. b”) was my responsibility, while Bob started to insert variants for the Greek texts. My part of the job was executed mainly in Jerusalem with a team of five assistants and a programmer, funded by the Israel Academy of Sciences. The result was a database of Greek-Hebrew equivalents to be joined by separate Greek and Hebrew morphological lexica for all the text words enabling the search of any word or form in the Hebrew and Greek Bible.

This database, named CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) was meant to be Stage 1 of the lexicon project. It was used by several scholars, most notably by Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie in their brief lexicon of the LXX.²⁴ Otherwise, the text was not easily accessible to other scholars because of its uneasy ASCII transcription format as exemplified in the previous paragraph.

A major step forward for the CATSS project took place when our data were made accessible within the Accordance program for the Macintosh, and later for the P.C. with screen emulation. Because of the advanced search possibilities enabled by Accordance,²⁵ this program now provides sophisticated software for the research on MT, LXX, and a comparison

²³ That is, the determining of the exact equivalence of the Greek and Hebrew words, based on insights in translation technique, exegesis, and textual relations.

²⁴ See n. 17. For other studies based on the CATSS database and for a more detailed description of the project, see Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 31–51.

²⁵ For details, see <http://www.accordancebible.com/>

of the two texts. The CATSS project provides data for the comparison of all LXX texts for which a Hebrew/Aramaic parallel text is either available or has been reconstructed (Psalm 151, Baruch, Sirach). I am very proud of this tool, although I realize that many details need to be improved. F. Polak of Tel Aviv University prepared a revised version of CATSS named “Tov-Polak.” This database is now available (Accordance, Bible Works, Logos), and is being constantly improved. I now use the program much more than paper sources when preparing for my LXX classes, and in recent years I have even been able to prepare my classes on my laptop while in an airplane.

6. Septuagint Research

My LXX research was advanced by my appointment as Grinfield lecturer on the Septuagint at Oxford University. That university holds on to all kinds of scholarships and fellowships that would have been diverted at other universities to more urgent needs, but not so at Oxford. This two-year appointment is for one week of three lectures. One needs to apply for this position, but as I had never heard of its existence, I was encouraged by Oxford University to apply and, upon acceptance, successfully completed a tenureship of two years in 1980–1982. Subsequently, the university extended this appointment for two additional terms of two years (1982–1986). I used this opportunity to advance my ideas on the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever, inner-translational relations and the contribution of the LXX to the literary analysis of Hebrew Scripture. Fifteen to twenty persons, not including my driver,²⁶ attended the lectures. As the Grinfield lecturer, my name was once mentioned in the Manchester Evening News of 1 April as a member of the Oxford Eight in the Oxford and Cambridge Boat Race, a rowing competition, when the journalist searched for the most obscure names of appointments at Oxford.

My studies on the LXX focused first on inner-translational developments and gradually moved to the relevance of this translation for the study of the Bible. My initial publications dealt with that translation’s early revisions that were intended to approximate the Greek text to the Hebrew text current in Israel from the first century B.C.E. until the second

²⁶ There is a story, no doubt apocryphal, about a well-known Oxford professor who gave his first lecture in the Grinfield series in the 1950s or 1960s with one person in attendance. At the end of the lecture, when the lecturer abundantly thanked that person for his interest and commitment, he replied: “Don’t bother, Sir, I’m your driver.”

century C.E. For that purpose, I established principles for the criteria defining and characterizing the revisions. My preoccupation with matters of translation technique and the reconstruction of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX were influenced by the practical work in the HUBP described in §2.

Subsequently, the focus of my interest moved to the relevance of the LXX for biblical scholarship, both for textual and literary criticism. In several books, the LXX reflects a Hebrew basis that needs to be taken into consideration in the exegesis of those books, both when the Hebrew parent text of the LXX presumably preceded the MT (Joshua, 1 Samuel 16–18, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc.) and when it contains an exegetical layer reacting to the forerunner of the MT (1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel). In all these books, it would be advantageous for the exegete of the Hebrew books to take the Greek translation into consideration. A precondition for this procedure is that the analysis of the translation technique as described in §5 will have established that the LXX is a good source for establishing the text that lay in front of the translator.

7. Qumran Scrolls

Most of my publications until 1990 pertained to textual criticism, especially the LXX. A second line of investigation began with my deeper involvement with the Dead Sea scrolls from 1990 onwards. Prior to that time, I also was much involved with the scrolls, but not in an official way. I might say that I was already interested in the scrolls at age 14 when I bought a little monograph in Dutch in the AO (Algemene Ontwikkeling [general knowledge]) series by A. S. van der Woude (1955), which I still have. In the following year (1956), when in England, I bought John Allegro's introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Only later, from 1961 onwards, upon my enrollment in the Bible Department at the Hebrew University was I able to take courses in that area. I studied the paleography of the scrolls with N. Avigad, the ideas of the scrolls with D. Flusser, the language of the Isaiah Scroll with Y. Kutscher, and exegesis and textual criticism in the scrolls with S. Talmon. I was to receive more serious and practical instruction in the scrolls during my two years of study at Harvard University (1967–1969). I studied there with Prof. John Strugnell who was to be appointed as editor-in-chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls Publication Project in 1984, but also before that time he was one of the leading members of the Cave 4 team. I took John's course on the scrolls, which included the writing of seminar papers on one of the texts that had been

assigned to our teacher. Students who knew little about the scrolls before their participation in the course wrote seminar papers on the basis of the PAM photographs, while another member of the seminar critiqued the paper. The level of these discussions was extremely high and we all enjoyed John's enthusiastic guidance.

This course, as well as a private tutorial with Prof. F. M. Cross, prepared me well for the task of editor-in-chief that I did not yet know about. With Cross, I read the unpublished 4QSam^b scroll (published, after much delay, in 2005) in a private tutorial. I still treasure Cross's careful hand-written transcription of the scroll, his notes and my own preparations for that tutorial. In due course, F. M. Cross was to accept some of my suggestions for readings and analysis. The tutorial was given in the library building (Widener I) in a greatly inspiring study.²⁷ Cross served as the second advisor of my dissertation on the LXX of Jeremiah and Baruch, together with S. Talmon, which was accepted by the Hebrew University in 1974.²⁸

Upon my return to Israel in 1969, after my Harvard years, I wrote studies on various topics in the area of textual criticism. The study of the scrolls was to regain a central place in my work when in 1985 I was asked by Père Benoit, editor-in-chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls Publication Project, to publish the extensive remains of the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever in a separate volume in the *DJD* series. The request came from Benoit, but originated with D. Barthélemy who had already published a preliminary edition of most of the fragments in his epoch-making monograph *Les devanciers d'Aquila*.²⁹ My work entailed five years

²⁷ FMC tells the story that one day he spread out on the ground of that room the revised pages of his *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Great was his surprise when he found out that the cleaning lady had discarded those pages, thus "killing" the idea of a revised edition.

²⁸ When I went to Harvard in 1967, I was to write the mentioned dissertation on Jeremiah, as agreed upon with Prof. S. Talmon, but that did not prevent F. M. Cross from suggesting other topics to me. I recall how he pulled out a yellow sheet of paper from the bottom right drawer of his desk and started reading out to me a list of dissertation topics. They all pertained to areas in textual criticism that were worthy of further investigation in light of recent developments in research. For example, with the publication of Barthélemy's studies on Aquila and Theodotion, F. M. Cross thought that the time was ripe for a dissertation about Symmachus, which ultimately was written at Oxford University by Alison Salvesen. In any event, I politely declined and told F. M. Cross that I wished to adhere to my chosen dissertation topic about the LXX of Jeremiah.

²⁹ D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). That monograph totally changed the perceptions of many aspects of LXX research, as it described the Naḥal Ḥever scroll as an early revision of Greek Scripture (named *kaige*-Theodotion), segments of which were transmitted as "Theodotion" and even as "LXX". The text published by Barthélemy hardly deserved the name "edition," and the philological work towards such an edition still needed to be executed.

of analyzing the readings of the manuscripts, providing philological details, and preparing a commentary on the nature of the revision of Greek Scripture included in this scroll. I was much helped by R. A. Kraft who was to write the codicological description of this manuscript and who critically reviewed everything I wrote when I taught for a year at the University of Pennsylvania as his guest in 1985–1986. Most instrumental in advancing this edition was a seminar on this scroll that Bob and I offered to the students.

This volume, including a detailed computer-assisted reconstruction of the scroll, prepared with Kraft's guidance, was the first manuscript in the *DJD* series to be presented electronically to OUP. The computer version went through various stages, from the University of Pennsylvania's Ibycus system to my PC, and then to OUP's system, so that careful proof-reading was needed at every stage.

In retrospect, another preparation for my work as editor-in-chief was my first experience with the publication of Hebrew scrolls beyond my Harvard seminar papers. In 1987, Gene Ulrich, chief editor of the Cave 4 biblical volumes, asked me to prepare the Jeremiah texts for publication.³⁰ In the course of that work, I learned much about fragments, reconstruction, PAM photographs, electronic submission of text editions, the ever-misleading scales of photographs, etc. Gene and his staff edited my editions in an exemplary way.

From 1990 onwards, my involvement with the scrolls would be more extensive. In the year 1989–1990, Moshe Weinfeld and I convened a research group on Qumran studies at the Institute for Advanced Studies at the Hebrew University, which was very intensive and beneficial for the research of us all.

In the course of my study of the scrolls, I focused much on the Qumran scribes. In 2004, I published a detailed monograph on these scribes, suggesting that the study of scribal habits allows us to obtain a better understanding of the scrolls and scribes.³¹ This monograph describes the technical aspects of all the Judean Desert texts, such as the measurements of the sheets, columns and margins, the beginnings and ends of scrolls, systems of correcting mistakes, orthography systems, and scribes. My division of the Qumran scrolls into two groups distinguished by external

³⁰ In his cover letter, Gene stressed that the texts would be taken away from me if I did not finish my task within three years. I stayed within those boundaries, but the volume was not published until 2000 (*DJD XVI*).

³¹ *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

features was first proposed in a study I published in 1986³² and further elaborated in my book *Scribal Practices* (2004).

8. Editor-in-Chief

In the course of 1990, the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) dethroned Strugnell as editor-in-chief and in the late summer I was asked to replace him. The timing was not very good for me as I was about to leave in September for a year's participation at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS). The IAA was looking for an Israeli scholar to reorganize the work and enlarge the team so as to speed up the publication of the scrolls, which was lagging behind greatly.³³ It was not ideal to start this assignment during the period of tension surrounding John Strugnell, but I accepted the call because of a feeling of responsibility.³⁴ I knew I had the oversight committee of the IAA behind me (Professors J. Greenfield and S. Talmon as well as M. Broshi), but I presumed that the general press would be critical of the publication team during the first years, which indeed turned out to be the case.

I was to work with the IAA and its Dead Sea Scrolls oversight committee; as time went on and we became better acquainted, I built up confidence and when results were forthcoming, I was given more freedom. Ayala Sussmann, the IAA contact person for this purpose, with whom I was to work on a daily basis, was especially helpful.

I was actually appointed not only by the IAA, but also by the International Publication Team. Since these were the scholars with whom I had

³² One group of texts is written in a special spelling (forms like *ki'*), morphology (e.g., *malkehemah*, *me'odah*), and scribal habits (writing the divine name in the old Hebrew script, erasing elements with lines and dots above and below words and letters, placing dots in the margins guiding the drawing of the lines). The great majority of the Qumran sectarian scrolls belong to this group; hence my suggestion that these scrolls were written by sectarian scribes, possibly at Qumran. These scribes copied biblical as well as non-biblical scrolls, altogether one-third of the Qumran scrolls, while the other scrolls were brought to Qumran from outside.

³³ In the first forty years of the publication efforts, only eight *DJD* volumes had been published, the last of which, described above, was my own (*DJD* VIII).

³⁴ There were no real negotiations with the IAA, since neither they nor I myself were able to define the job. I only had two conditions: that I would be able to run the operation from my university office and not from the Rockefeller Museum, and that my teaching load would be reduced to one-half by having the IAA pay the Hebrew University one-half of my salary. Amir Drori, the director of the IAA, was very determined to get the job finished, and he therefore saw to it that the latter condition was met, even during the most difficult financial times for the IAA, when workers were laid off.

to work, I stipulated to the IAA that the members of the team would appoint me as editor-in-chief as well.³⁵

The first year of our work was one of general organizational activity. While at NIAS, I prepared myself for the job in different ways. In my mind, the most important aspects were the establishment of a financial support system for the publication efforts, organization of the team, and standardization of the publication conventions. I vaguely knew that my predecessor received an annual contribution from the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies for various aspects of the production. That support, ultimately coming from an “anonymous” source in England, continued to be given to us as well.³⁶ I anticipated that this money would not suffice, since we needed funds for an increasing number of goals: computers and printers for the production, assistance for team members who could not secure such help from their own sources, and an occasional trip to Jerusalem for team members who needed to see “their” fragments. Dr. Weston Fields suggested to me in 1990 that we start a fundraising agency precisely for that purpose, the Dead Sea Scrolls Foundation (DSSF). He was to be the managing director who would do the active search for funds, and I was to be the director of the DSSF, whose task it would be to oversee the operation together with the boards of directors and advisors.³⁷

The second task I set myself in 1990 was the enlargement, reorganization and stabilization of the team. I had no authority to make any changes in

³⁵ In turn, some of the team members stipulated that the operation would be run by a triumvirate consisting of Émile Puech, Gene Ulrich, and myself, with the understanding that I would be responsible for the daily activities. This suggestion was accepted, and it worked. Gene Ulrich, serving as chief editor of the biblical manuscripts, was a source of support and advice throughout all these years. I also had a good working relationship with Émile Puech.

³⁶ Every year I reported to the director of the Oxford Centre and to the “anonymous” donor, usually together with Prof. Alan Crown, administrator of the Qumran project of the Oxford Centre. The donor wanted to know how the money had been spent and what the plans were for the future. Newly published volumes were always rushed to the Oxford Centre and the donor. The money, given to us through the IAA, was spent on the salaries of my secretary/producer of the project and that of the other workers.

³⁷ The two boards of the DSSF met annually at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature (Sundays and Mondays between 7 and 8.30 a.m.). The fundraising was successful, and we raised reasonably large sums of money that were immediately spent on the aforementioned needs. Although most of the work was executed by Dr. Fields, this task became too heavy for me alongside my responsibilities as editor-in-chief, and we therefore asked Prof. S. Paul, my colleague in the Bible Department of the Hebrew University, to accept the position in 2000. He has continued to execute this task with great loyalty and insight.

personnel myself, and everything went through the oversight committee of the IAA, to which I made my recommendations. These assignments were made on the basis of an inventory of the available fragments that I started to compile with the aid of S. Pfann and that was published in conjunction with the microfiche edition of all the fragments.³⁸ The principle was to assign to scholars texts that could realistically be completed by them within a few years.³⁹ Unfortunately, this process was not painless. We were not able to come to an understanding with Milik, not even when others and I had called on him in Paris. Milik had in fact ceased to actively prepare manuscripts for publication in the *DJD* series, and even though he had prepared for publication several manuscripts of partial publications, for example the Tobit fragments, he did not complete these assignments, and they had to be re-assigned. F. M. Cross readily agreed to limit his efforts to certain biblical texts, which he did, in fact, finish fifteen years later.⁴⁰ Strugnell was happy to continue working on 4QInstruction. I had asked my Harvard classmate, Daniel Harrington, likewise a student of John Strugnell, to work alongside him and this cooperation worked out very well, resulting in the publication of the lengthy volume XXXIV in 1999.⁴¹

As part of these organizational activities, a large number of scroll fragments were assigned or reassigned to scholars who would prepare them for publication within a reasonable amount of time.⁴² The oversight committee imposed no limitations on who could receive an assignment; the decisions depended purely on whether we considered the scholars to be up to the task, with no regard to their country of origin, religion, institutional affiliation or stage in their academic career.⁴³ Many new

³⁸ *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*, with a *Companion Volume* (Leiden: Brill/IDC, 1993).

³⁹ It was soon realized that the texts that had been assigned to J. T. Milik and F. M. Cross could never be finished within a decade, probably not even within a century. The oversight committee of the IAA thus decided to leave these scholars with a reasonable workload and to redistribute the remainder of their assignments to other scholars.

⁴⁰ The major publication was to be F. M. Cross, D. W. Parry, R. Saley, E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

⁴¹ J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, S.J., and T. Elgvin, in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar leMevîn): 4Q415 ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

⁴² I always reminded and prodded the editors, mostly in a friendly way, but some had to be reminded by official letters sent by Amir Drori or myself. A few editors returned their assignments, for reassignment to others. At the end of the day, all editors were grateful that they were reminded and prodded, even the ones who received official letters. Many realized that without a push, friendly or not, they would never have reached the end of their publication.

⁴³ By 1990, nineteen scholars had completed their assignments and twenty-six of the earlier editors remained on the team. With the appointment of fifty-three new scholars,

team members were Israelis, who had previously been barred from the publication enterprise.

From the beginning of our enterprise, I took care of the standardization of the publication conventions. I discussed these issues in March 1991 with the team members who participated in the Madrid Qumran conference. The details of this, my first, organizational activity with the team were written up and circulated among the team members.

At the same time, I had to decide in which electronic format the editions would be prepared. The computerized preparations of the volumes, including the standardization of the details relating to the publication, turned out to be one of the key elements in the success of our enterprise.⁴⁴ Our office worked in different ways with the various editors. One author continued to submit hand-written pages, numbering in the hundreds, until the very end of the publication process. Others submitted their texts in PC format, which required a good amount of formatting by us, especially since the Hebrew needed to be retyped, left to right! However, most editors presented us with Macintosh-formatted files, which made it very easy for us to adapt to our *DJD* style.⁴⁵

the overall number of editors who worked on the project totaled ninety-eight. Some of the new editors focused almost exclusively on the texts from the Judean Desert, but since there is no clearly defined discipline of Scrolls research, most scholars came from a variety of backgrounds, focusing on either the textual criticism or exegesis of Hebrew Scripture, intertestamental literature, Apocrypha, Septuagint, or New Testament.

⁴⁴ At that time, I had less experience than Gene Ulrich, and therefore I simply followed his lead. Gene convinced me to use the Macintosh platform, which we did to our great satisfaction. Then, and in my view still today in 2009, Macintosh provided overall the best and most user-friendly platform for the preparation of our volumes, using a program that could be handled well by experienced computer users and novices alike. It was clear to me that the only chance of completing the publication was to prepare the camera-ready pages ourselves. It worked so beautifully that even with the passing of the years, when more advanced versions than Microsoft Word 5.1 became available, I decided not to employ them; “if it works, stick with it,” and for the coordination of an international project a step forward is sometimes a step backwards. Our standardization allowed the editors to submit their work electronically, and, indeed, during the last years of the project almost every editor prepared the first drafts on his or her own Mac.

⁴⁵ As our own systems improved, and our confidence in E-mail grew, we increasingly used that medium for receiving and returning files. We were at the height of our expertise in the preparation of vol. XVII (Samuel) and the files of that edition must have crossed in cyberspace hundreds of times before they were actually published. Our system was to indicate with colors the different editorial activities: Red for elements omitted, green for elements added or changed, and blue for remarks. In this way, we interacted beautifully with our editors without the necessity to send long lists of corrections and changes referring to page so and so. We never had any problem with details going wrong when sent via E-mail, except for, perhaps, in the beginning.

The publication process of the Qumran scrolls has taken some time, possibly a little too long but, in actual fact, not overly long for forty volumes,⁴⁶ together with all the inventories and supporting publications, such as the Brill microfiche edition (see n. 38). Nevertheless, had the initial team in the 1950s consisted of twenty, thirty, or even fifty scholars, and not just of nine, the publication *could* have been completed some time ago.⁴⁷

By the time I became editor-in-chief, the fragments had been cleaned, sorted, photographed, as well as identified and partially inventoried. The claim has often been made that this important work was completed in the mid-1950s, but the identification, photographing, and inventorying continued to take much of our time and energy. Initial identifications and the grouping of fragments turned out to be very helpful, but opinions changed and regrouping and re-identification became necessary in several instances.

We also had to give names to the compositions. The story of the name giving warrants a novel in its own right. Once included in the official edition, a name can no longer be changed. Some of these names are utterly subjective; for example, we are still haunted by the so-called ‘Wiles of the Wicked Woman’ (4Q184), so named by John Allegro. According to many, even the name ‘Temple Scroll’ is a misnomer, and in my view, 11QPsalms^a is *not* a biblical scroll.

I was involved also in Carbon-14 examinations of some twenty documents.⁴⁸ The choice of the manuscripts and the sampling of the few square millimeters of the documents was a painstaking and instructive process. I will never forget the tears in the eyes of Lena, the conservator at the

⁴⁶ John Strugnell used to remind us that the preparation of the *DJD* series did not take as long as the publication of similar corpora. The greater part of the Cairo Genizah fragments is still awaiting redemption after more than a century. By the same token, the Greek Oxyrhynchus papyri are far from being published after one century. The British Academy has voted to support this enterprise for a second century. Strugnell made the point that the publication of one volume in the papyrus collections of Rylands, Berlin, Tebtunis, Michigan, and Oxyrhynchus took an average of 7.2 years.

⁴⁷ If more funds had been available from the beginning, greater progress could have been made, but I don’t think that insufficient financial support was the major reason for the delay. The major reasons for the delay were probably the limited size of the initial team, lack of organization of the publication procedure, a lack of experience, and certain prejudices. Even if de Vaux had had the benefit of ample funds, computers, and E-mail, the volumes would not have rolled off the press, since the organization lacked the necessary insights. All the same, *we* would not have succeeded in our task without the valuable input of our predecessors, especially John Strugnell and Józef Milik, the master of masters.

⁴⁸ See A. J. T. Jull, D. J. Donahue, M. Broshi, and E. Tov, “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert,” *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19.

Rockefeller Museum, when she had to cut out a few square millimeters of surface for these Carbon-14 tests.

Beyond the preparatory activities for the publication and organization of the team, the editor-in-chief organized the assignments, provided scholars with photographs through the good services of the IAA, and guided his colleagues as much as he could. I was in touch with all the editors on a constant basis⁴⁹ and that's why, at the peak of our activities, I met with 20–30 colleagues at the yearly SBL meetings as well as at other conferences.⁵⁰ As my own experience and confidence grew, I was increasingly able to advise the editors with regard to their difficult task in preparing text editions.⁵¹ Obviously, they all knew their fragments better than me. But I advised as to how to present the fragments; I also remarked on the style of writing, length of the commentary, introductory remarks, preparation of the plates, etc.

In 1990, we were thinking in terms of the complete *DJD* series containing 30 volumes, but eighteen years later, at the completion of the

⁴⁹ Editors of editions, more than other scholars, work in isolation without much feedback, and they therefore need the interaction with others. Rather than waiting for the completed manuscripts, I therefore asked for parts, enabling us to make progress on the edition, and thus providing the editor with the necessary interaction. We often aided editors in organizing their thoughts, both before they submitted their manuscripts and afterwards. In this way, several mistakes were caught at the eleventh hour by a member of our staff, even at the preparation stage of the concordances of the individual volumes.

⁵⁰ If some colleagues praised my persistence and even tact, the flipside of that virtue was being a *nudnik*, constantly inquiring into the progress being made on editions. When I went to scholarly meetings, as a traveling agent for the project, I always came home with manuscripts or proofs.

⁵¹ It really is not easy to prepare a *DJD* edition because a heavy burden of responsibility lies on the shoulders of each editor. It would take a long time before the texts would be re-edited, if at all. The editors felt the burden of responsibility knowing that their understanding of the fragments would guide scholarship for a long time. The editors realized this responsibility in deciphering the fragments, making connections between the fragments assigned to them as well as other fragments already published and yet to be published. For example, is the fragment to be published a biblical fragment or a fragment of a biblical commentary? Editors naturally wanted to ensure that they offered the best and most trustworthy proposal for all aspects of their editions. Most of all, they feared the idea that on the day after the release of the volume a colleague would read a few key letters in the fragment differently, or that someone would reach a better understanding of the fragment. Because of this fear, some editors delayed handing in their texts. In some cases, I had to be stern and disallow further alterations after we went through successive series of corrections. On one occasion, an editor gave me the final manuscript with tears in his eyes. I remember that on another occasion an editor sent in corrections when the camera-ready manuscript had already gone off to OUP. In one case, I sent corrections to OUP when they already had the camera-ready copy, but immediately realized that this is a recipe for disaster (the correction was inserted, but something else went wrong).

project, we ended up with 40 large-sized volumes or 12,947 pages and 1,394 plates. We prepared thirty-two of these volumes in Jerusalem and Notre Dame, in addition to a Concordance volume.⁵² Two enterprises, not connected to the *DJD* series, involved the publication of all the scrolls in a six-volume popular edition based on *DJD* and other sources, the *DSSR*,⁵³ and an electronic edition of the same, *DSSEL*.⁵⁴

During the first six years, I was very ably assisted in Jerusalem by Claire Pfann, and during the following fourteen years by Janice Karnis. They both served as my secretary, production manager, main copy-editor, and main typist. They developed the system of editing, nomenclature, computer encoding, and printing. I was lucky to have such good helpers. While I was very proficient in all these areas myself, and became very experienced in computers, they were better, and that's an ideal situation.⁵⁵

A large project like this succeeded due to the assistance of many persons, foremost among them being our colleagues at Notre Dame University in the USA: Gene Ulrich, chief editor of the biblical volumes, all produced at that university (after 1992), and Jim VanderKam, who served as the consulting editor of many volumes, often together with M. Brady.

We prepared camera-ready printouts of all the pages of the *DJD* editions, and the publisher, Oxford University Press, reproduced our manuscripts photo-mechanically. You could say that we carried out all the functions traditionally taken care of by publishers (copy-editing, printing, proof-reading). Our publisher multiplied the pages we produced, redid the title pages, and produced the plates. These aspects are no small contribution to the editorial process, and OUP performed these tasks very well. The editions had a beautiful and uniform appearance, the bindings were very professional, and the plates were usually excellent. In several cases, the

⁵² M. G. Abegg, Jr., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Vol. 1. The Non-biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁵³ D. W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Parts 1–6* (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).

⁵⁴ E. Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition 2006, part of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* of E. J. Brill Publishers (Leiden: Brill, 2006) <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>.

⁵⁵ Over the course of the years, we had several people working for the project in the room adjacent to my own at the Hebrew University. Eva Ben David and Valerie Zakovitch served for the longest period. Others were Nehemia Gordon, Simi Chavel, Shmuel Ben Or, and Miriam Berg. We were also assisted by several volunteers: Sarah Present, Søren Holst, Ingrid Hjelm, as well as some proofreaders.

plates had more contrast than the photographic material we submitted. That is, by manipulating every single photograph, the firm that handled the plates for OUP (in Oxford, in the region of Oxford, and for the last three volumes, in India!) was able to improve the contrast of the photographic images. At times, OUP caught some of our mistakes at the last moment, such as discrepancies between the table of contents and the actual pages, and at times they introduced new mistakes by printing different details on the book jacket than those appearing on the title page, or by imprinting the wrong details on the spine of the book.

On the whole, OUP contributed much to our enterprise by way of the high quality of their products, but this cooperation also involved much investment on my part in maintaining good communication with the various departments at OUP. Had I not done this, the production would have been delayed. The production was not uneventful. One time, the delivery of the proofs was delayed by a week because there was snow in or around Oxford, and the truck needed to be repaired. On another occasion, the camera-ready manuscripts of two complete volumes were lost at OUP's printers. There were mishaps in the production of two sets of plates caused by the printer using too much ink, resulting in several overly dark plates. But these were isolated instances. During the whole period I worked with the same editorial assistant (Jenny Wagstaffe), with whom we have excellent relations.

Politics. Soon enough, I realized that the job that I was to perform was not only scholarly and editorial, for which tasks I was prepared, but also political in all senses of the word. The political aspects of guiding the project pertained to the relations between the project and the outside world, including publishers, possible donors, journalists, and universities. I was also involved in two news conferences, at the beginning and the end of the project, and once I had to appear before a committee of the Israeli parliament.

I became aware of these political aspects already in the fall of 1991. I was painting the outside of my house, when my wife handed me the phone. Jim Sanders from Claremont was on the other end of the line describing a situation that I understood only partially since I had not yet had time to go through the papers left by John Strugnell. In short, Sanders said that the photographs of the scrolls that had been deposited in the Huntington Library in Pasadena, CA had been opened up to the public.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ This action was related to the heart of a public controversy surrounding the scrolls. From the beginning of the publication activities in 1950, access to the photographs of the scrolls had been limited to the very few members of the publication team. Over the

The director of the Huntington Library, William A. Moffett, sidestepped earlier arrangements by announcing that anyone entering the library would be allowed to see the photographs. The actions of the Huntington Library and the subsequent publication of a *Facsimile Edition* of all the scroll fragments⁵⁷ probably had only marginal influence on the publication, that is, scholars hardly, if ever, used the documents “freed” by the Huntington Library or the *Facsimile Edition*. However, most of the influence may have been at the psychological level.⁵⁸

When was the project begun and completed? On both ends, there was a lack of clarity. I was appointed in August 1990, and while based at NIAS (see above), made many preparatory steps between then and September 1991, but began the real work after that date. I therefore sometimes said that we started in 1990 and sometimes that we got underway in 1991.

It is much more difficult to say when the project ended. There were actually several acts of closing the project; while some parties were interested in having the project closed officially, others wanted to have it prolonged. In the fall of 2001, the great majority of our work had been completed, and we were not sure how long it would take to complete the remainder. The IAA arranged for a press conference in the New York Public Library, in which the completion of the project was announced.⁵⁹

years, major criticism was voiced against this monopoly of the international team, which, it was claimed, harmed the progress of research, and gave the members of the team an unfair advantage over outsiders. The originals and photographs were located in Jerusalem, but it was a comforting feeling to know that one set of photographs was found in a safe place in the USA. These photographs had never been used and, in accord with the agreements, they were not to be used.

⁵⁷ H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991). These two actions were considered a major victory for those fighting the monopoly of the International Team. H. Shanks was behind the publication of the photographs of the scrolls that was considered illegal by the International Team.

⁵⁸ Scholars involved realized that the quality of the images in that edition is so substandard that they cannot be used for any research. For me, the edition served a practical purpose since I was able to use it as one of the bookkeeping resources in the project. In my office copy of the *Facsimile Edition*, we denoted the PAM number, museum plate, name, and place of publication of every fragment and in this way were able to continue the work of identification. In recent years, we lent our copy to E. J. C. Tigchelaar who was able to make some further discoveries of unpublished fragments, although he also had his own sources.

⁵⁹ At that point, two other series had also been completed. Several volumes of texts had appeared in the *Judean Desert Series*: Y. Yadin, *The Finds from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of the Letters* (JDS 1; Jerusalem: IES, 1963); N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar-Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters: Greek Papyri* (JDS 2; Jerusalem: IES, Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1989). The Masada series was also completed: Y. Yadin and J. Naveh, *Masada I. The*

The press was not well represented, but the New York Times was there as well as some other leading newspapers. Amir Drori and I spoke, and later, while watching television in my hotel room, I saw my name appearing on the banner of CNN. This was a brief moment of glory, but the work continued. We announced that all the scrolls were published, and that work was continuing on three additional volumes. That announcement was nevertheless correct, since the few texts that were to be included in *DJD* volumes had already appeared elsewhere, though not with the same level of perfection as in *DJD*.

From New York I continued to Denver, CO, where the SBL meeting was to take place. We were to make a similar announcement at the SBL and, in fact, Esther Chazon, chairperson of the Qumran unit, had arranged for a plenary session at the congress where I was to speak. At the beginning of the session, I was pleasantly surprised when my chairman, Jim VanderKam, presented me with a small *Festschrift*, an issue of *Dead Sea Discoveries* (*DSD*). I was completely taken by surprise. There followed some moments of emotion and silence from my side, but the show had to go on. Reacting to my speech,⁶⁰ some people said that they never knew me to be a stand-up comedian.

After these public events, work on *DJD* continued, and in fact one volume was added to our enterprise that had not been planned previously, vol. XL presenting a re-edition of 1QH^a. While not much was left for publication in *DJD*, there was an interest in including some *re-editions* of older volumes, but most of these plans did not get off the ground, or advanced very slowly. Earlier attempts to pull together a supplement volume with corrections by the original editors did not get off the ground because of lack of interest by the editors. It therefore became increasingly clear to me that I needed to announce an official closing date for our publication enterprise. It would not be good for the series to linger on indefinitely, because the public needs an official statement that our mission has been completed. The first date planned for this

Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions (Jerusalem: IES and Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1989); H. M. Cotton and J. Geiger, *Masada II, The Yigal Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: The Latin and Greek Documents* (Jerusalem: IES, 1989); S. Talmon and Y. Yadin, *Masada VI, The Yigal Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem: IES and Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999). Furthermore, most cave 1 texts had appeared in stand-alone editions.

⁶⁰ The speech was published in a catalogue of the Grand Rapids Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit: “Celebrating the Completion of the Publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Middlebrook Herron; Grand Rapids: Public Museum and Eerdmans, 2003), 33–45.

closing act was February 2008, the second was July 2008, but the actual announcement came on 1 February 2009. The announcement went to my fellow editors, OUP, IAA, the Hebrew University and our financial supporters (in historical sequence: the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies and the DSSF). In my letter, I wrote to my fellow editors that I had been longing for some time to carry the title “the former editor-in-chief”.

As I write these lines in May 2009, I am no longer editor-in-chief, but as happens with large projects such as ours, it is difficult to indicate an exact date for closing a project.⁶¹ My revised inventory of all the fragments from the Judean Desert, now completed, is to be published by Brill Publishers in 2010.⁶²

There is no morale from embarking on and completing a large project. I started the project because of a feeling of responsibility, and I simply did the work because it needed to be done. The first few years were the most difficult because I needed to establish myself among my peers and the authorities, and I needed to build up experience and confidence when speaking with my fellow editors. In those years, I sometimes regretted taking on such an enormous task. I was not working two half-jobs (one-half on the scrolls and one-half as a professor), but I was actually working one-and-a-half jobs since the editorial work alone involved a full job.⁶³ Of course, I had my free moments, but I was thinking all the time about work going on at the office.

I learned an enormous amount at the scholarly level. When working with my colleagues, I learned about their texts. When reading manuscripts, proofs, and plates of others, I made it a point to think also about scribal aspects of the texts. I have been interested in the Qumran scribes for a long time, and while working with colleagues I started to make notes for myself, to be worked out later. These notes enriched my monograph *Scribal Practices*.

Dealing with my colleagues, the editors, was probably the most difficult aspect of my work. Some scholars worked very speedily; one editor, for example, finished 80 pages of text in one year. Natural procrastinators are the weak spot of any project. Intuitively, I have tried to adapt

⁶¹ The very last volume, a re-edition of IQIsa^{a,b}, never published in *DJD*, is scheduled to be released in the fall of 2010. The printing of the volume in February 2010 (in China) was found to be substandard and had to be redone.

⁶² *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁶³ From 2001 onwards, when my working load in the project became less heavy, I worked on a voluntary basis in addition to a full teaching load at the Hebrew University.

myself to each person's *modus operandi* by being sweeter to some, harsher to others, and occasionally trying both approaches. I have always tried to convince colleagues that there's life after *DJD*, but have not always succeeded in this. So, in the course of working with colleagues, you also learn a lot about personalities. I made many friends. And it is unavoidable that as well as making new friends you also create a few non-friends.

I also learned how to deal with the press. Although some journalists are better than others, they all ask the same questions, and their main information comes from popular books written *against* the scrolls,⁶⁴ not *about* the scrolls. In fact, if a journalist did *not* ask me which fragments were confiscated and burned by the Vatican, I would be surprised. I would be equally surprised if a journalist did not ask me where Jesus of Nazareth is mentioned in the scrolls, why the monks of Qumran had some ladies buried in their cemetery, and when we intend to finish the translation (they never used the word 'publication') of the scrolls.

While the first years were difficult, when the first volumes started rolling off the press, I drew satisfaction from our work. It did not become less difficult, but the satisfaction was a good antidote for the tribulations.

Towards the end of my tenure, there were several honors that came my way. It was extremely rewarding to be given a *Festschrift*.⁶⁵ Fifty-four colleagues wrote valuable studies. I read them all, and then reacted. At a different level, I now know what it feels like to be awarded an honorary doctorate, from the University of Vienna, home of Armin Lange.⁶⁶ At again a different level, there were prizes that came as welcome surprises.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Especially M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Arrow, 1991); *idem*, *Die Verschlussache Jesus—Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit, über das frühe Christentum* (Munich: Droemer Knauer, 1991).

⁶⁵ *Emanuel, Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, and W. W. Fields, with the assistance of E. Ben-David; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁶⁶ In an extremely impressive ceremony, before the dignitaries of that university, all in traditional dress, I gave a semi-scholarly lecture with a PowerPoint presentation on the Scribes of Qumran (in English) and I described my feelings and work (in German). At that time I was also given a surprise Vrennese birthday present: *From Qumran to Aleppo: it Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (ed. A. Lange, M. Weigold and J. Zsengellér; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

⁶⁷ The Humboldt Research Prize (suggested by Professors Lichtenberg and Hengel) in the years 1999-2004, the Emet Prize for Bible Studies received from the prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, in 2004, the Ubbo Emmius Medal given by Groningen University in 2003, and the Israel Prize for Bible Studies, received in April 2009 from the heads of state of Israel.