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I. Theory and Terminology

1. Archetype, Book, Editions

For the HBCE, a key distinction is that between the original (*Urtext*) and the archetype. The original is a particular text that existed at the (difficult to define) transitional point at which a writing became a book, indicating that in some manner it has been “published” (made public). The original is the ideal goal of textual criticism, but it is only attainable in some details. The archetype is the latest manuscript ancestral to the existing manuscripts. The aim of a critical text is a corrected archetype, since the archetype will have scribal errors that may be detectable and corrected. The corrected archetype is the “earliest inferable state of the text,” that is, the closest approximation of the original that we can attain, given the limits of our evidence and acumen. The HBCE aims to produce a corrected archetype for each book and its multiple editions. Note that there is an epistemological gap between the corrected archetype and the original. The original is an ideal or theoretical goal, but we may lack the evidence to achieve it. The corrected archetype is the practical goal of textual criticism.

In cases where the book circulated in multiple editions, we aim to produce an archetype for each edition. In cases where one edition derives from the other, the archetype of the first edition is equivalent to the archetype of the book. In some cases the relationship between the editions is obscure or unrecoverable, and hence the archetype of the book is unattainable. In such cases one or more corrected hyparchetypes (the latest manuscript[s] ancestral to a particular textual family or edition) are the practical goal.

The term biblical book refers (in historical retrospect) to a book that became a part of the Hebrew Bible. The term “book” does not designate a particular text-form. (For instance, each edition of *Ulysses* or the Gospel of Mark has a different text, but each is an instantiation of the book.) The aim of producing editions of biblical books does not involve reconstituting previous textual entities, such as the J source or First Isaiah. Our task is a critical edition of the book, not its prior textual components or sources.

---

1 See the characterization of the “original form” of a biblical book by Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 167: “the finished composition [that] stood at the beginning of a process of copying and textual transmission.”


3 For a full discussion of these issues, see R. Hendel, “The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Its Aims and a Response to Criticisms,” *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 2 (2013), 63-99; available on the HBCE website.
Our procedure requires attention to two levels of the text: readings and editions. Most textual decisions concern the criticism and evaluation of individual readings. In these cases, we construct a history of readings. The earliest inferable reading in this historical sequence that corresponds to our concept of “biblical book” is the archetypal reading.

The existence of editions of biblical books is clear, although the borderlines are fuzzy. For the HBCE, an edition is defined as a systematic revision that affects the textual form and content of a book. This includes changes in the sequence of verses or chapters, addition of new pericopes, recalculation of chronologies, etc. Other kinds of revision, such as occur in the customary scribal habits of small-scale harmonization, explication, linguistic updating, etc., are not regarded as constituting a new edition in this sense. The editor will provide the evidence and arguments for the systematic or significant revision that constitute the grounds for a new edition in the introductory chapter of the volume.

Note that the relationship between the editions has no intrinsic bearing on establishing the history of individual readings. For instance, the textual witnesses of an earlier edition may have more corrupt individual readings in aggregate than the witnesses of a later edition. A superior reading in the second edition may well be the archetypal reading for the first edition, where the reading in the first edition was corrupted or revised.

For books that circulated in multiple editions in antiquity, we present the multiple editions in parallel columns. In many of these books, multiple editions only occur in some sections. In these cases, parallel or indented columns will appear only in these sections. In some books where the existence of multiple editions can be inferred, sometimes only small components of a given edition can be reconstituted. In these cases (at the discretion of the editor) the reconstituted components can be reported in the text-critical commentary and not represented in the critical text.

Given of the diversity and complexity of the biblical books and their textual histories, editors will adjust the above definitions and goals as well as the form of presentation to the needs of their particular texts. These theoretical and methodological guidelines are meant to facilitate – not to limit – the best solutions to the exigencies of a particular book.

2. Copy-text

In order to produce a critical text, it is necessary to provide textual features, such as spelling, that are secondary to the text-critical task of ascertaining the best readings. For the Hebrew Bible, it is also desirable to provide vocalization and accentuation, which are guides to the semantics of the text. In order to provide these necessary (spelling) and desirable

---

(vocalization and accentuation) features, we adopt the concept of **copy-text** as formulated by W. W. Greg.⁵ The copy-text is “some particular early text” that the editor chooses as a template for the formal features of the text such as spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, etc. (Greg calls these formal features “accidentals” to distinguish them from the “substantive readings,” i.e. the words.) He argues that that “the copy-text should govern (generally) in the matter of accidentals, but that the choice between substantive readings belongs to the general theory of textual criticism.” These secondary or paratextual features are, for the HBCE, spelling, vocalization, accentuation, and other Masoretic textual phenomena such as *ketiv-qeré*. For these textual features, we will use as our copy-text the Masoretic codex Firkovitch B19a (= L), our oldest complete Masoretic codex, in the edition by Aron Dotan.

Following the copy-text rule, errors in the accidental features of the copy-text will be corrected. We will follow the corrections in Dotan’s edition of L.⁶ (The errata are listed on pp. 1229-37.) As Dotan maintains, “we must not … copy obvious mistakes even if they were clearly produced by the scribe himself.”⁷ We will not include paragraph divisions (*petuhot* and *setumot*), which are idiosyncratic in L.

There are several extensions and adaptations of the copy-text rule for the HBCE. Where a substantive reading in the critical text differs from the copy-text, the features of spelling and vocalization will be supplied by the editor, following the style of the copy-text. (But we will only supply accents where they are obvious.) not supply accentuation, unless the accent marks are obvious.) The ceiling brackets indicate that these readings diverge from the copy-text, and they may also indicate a hiatus in the accentuation system. Where the substantive reading is identical to the consonantal text of M⁴ but the vocalization has been corrected (see below, III. 2), these readings are also marked by ceiling brackets, indicating that they diverge from the copy-text, even if only in paratextual features. We will also use ceiling brackets for instances of *ketiv-qeré* (see below, III.4).

In cases of multiple editions, the copy-text rule has further extensions. The readings in the proto-G column will be vocalized in the critical text only where the vocalization differs from the corresponding word in the proto-M column. Otherwise, the unique readings in the proto-G column will be vocalized in the apparatus entry (see below, III.2). Ceiling brackets will be used to indicate where readings in the proto-G column diverges from the (reconstructed) parent text of OG. In this respect, the copy-text for the substantive readings in the proto-G column is the parent text of OG (see below, III.8).

---


⁶ *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia*, ed. Aron Dotan (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001). It is not plausible to adopt the photographic edition of M⁴ as the copy-text, due to the many indistinct and overwritten readings.

⁷ Dotan, “Foreword,” xi.
3. Default rule

The copy-text rule also covers instances where there is not a clear text-critical argument for preferring one reading over another. In such instances, the critical text will adopt the reading of the copy-text. We call this the default rule. It provides a sensible procedure where a clear preference cannot be made, and ensures that non-copy-text readings in the critical text are supported by sound argumentation. In cases where the default rule is invoked, the abbreviation in the apparatus is “equal,” meaning “equally plausible as the archetypal reading.” Note that this does not imply two “pristine” archetypal readings (as would be argued by Shemaryahu Talmon); merely that we cannot tell which one it is.

4. Types of text-critical decisions

In the early modern period, the term “emendation” referred to any correction of a vulgate text or textus receptus. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible involved assembling the variant readings and proposing emendations of the textus receptus. In modern text-critical discourse, however, emendation usually has a narrower meaning, referring to the reconstruction or conjecture of a form that is not extant in the manuscripts. The two chief types of decision may be referred to as selection (viz. adjudication among extant variants) and conjecture (viz. conjectural emendation).

Selection
The most frequent type of text-critical decision is selection, by which we mean adjudicating among extant variants. The chief criterion for such decisions is the question: which reading was more liable to become the other? (utrum in alterum abiturum erat) To answer this question, one must imagine and weigh the possible arguments for and against the primacy or secondary origin of each variant. The relationship among the variants – viz. the history of readings – can usually be ascertained by reference to common scribal errors (e.g., graphic error, haplography, homoioteleuton, word misdivision, etc.) or to scribal revisions (e.g. linguistic updating, harmonization, explication, etc.).

Conjecture
A less frequent type of text-critical decision is a conjecture, by which we mean a reconstructed reading that does not exist in the extant manuscripts. The evaluation of a conjecture is also covered by the rule, utrum in alterum abiturum erat, meaning that a conjecture must be the most compelling historical explanation of the extant evidence. In theory conjecture is less reliable than selection, since it is not extant. In practice, however, a careful emendation based on common categories of scribal change may be as compelling as the adjudication among existing
variants and follows the same analytical procedures. In the critical text, a conjecture will be treated as a non-copy-text reading, i.e., marked by ceiling brackets and vocalized. In the apparatus, an emendation is enclosed by angled brackets: <x>. If a portion of a word is emended, only that portion is enclosed in brackets: xy<z>. (See examples below, III.3.)

II. Contents of Volume

1. Introductory chapter

The introductory chapter will address the text-critical character of the biblical book. Topics should include: the translation technique of G and its utility for textual criticism; the nature and affinities of the Qumran MSS; the character and utility of the other versions; the textual history of the book; and special problems (e.g., multiple editions).

The editor may also discuss in this chapter issues or examples that do not belong to the text-critical commentary, such as variants of orthography and paragraphing, a table of the ketiv-geré variants, other inner-MT variants (among early codices, M\textsuperscript{KR}, etc.), and any other relevant or interesting text-critical phenomena.

References should be in footnote format, and a bibliography should follow. Use the format in The SBL Handbook of Style (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999) §7.2-3. The bibliography will include works referred to in the text-critical commentary and appendices (if any).

If there are major issues or technical discussions that require separate treatment, one can include them as excurses or appendices.

2. Critical text

The critical text will consist of the best set of readings, commensurate with our concept of the archetype as the earliest inferable text of the book and its editions. For the details of how to produce the critical text, see below III. “Constructing the Critical Edition.”

For the base text, you may use any Unicode version of M\textsuperscript{L}. The final version will be typeset using fonts designed for HBCE.

---

\textsuperscript{8} See Kenney, “Textual Criticism,” 192: “The outcome of the process, the emendation itself, can and must be controlled and tested by precisely the same criteria as are used in deciding between variants. This is essentially an exercise in balancing probabilities. These probabilities are historical.”
We will not use a different layout (viz. stichometry) for poetic texts. This adds a layer of literary judgment that may distract the reader from our text-critical aims, and it is arguably a matter of presentation that comes under the concept of copy-text. Moreover, the determination of poetic lines is often ambiguous, even where the text is clearly poetry.

3. Text-critical commentary

The text-critical commentary consists of a case-by-case analysis of significant or characteristic textual problems. The chief goals of the commentary are (1) to justify decisions made in the critical text, and (2) to address interesting or complicated instances and issues. Every divergence from the copy-text will be listed, but minor cases need not be discussed (e.g. conjunctions and definite articles and other such minor bits). Differences between readings in multiple editions will also be discussed. In addition, interesting variants should be discussed, even if they are not adopted in the critical text. Other matters should also be addressed here, such as interesting non-variants in G (i.e. translational phenomena), particularly where they have been taken as true variants by previous scholars.

The format of the commentary consists of apparatus entry and comment. Where there are variant readings, the editor will construct an apparatus entry (see details in III.3), followed by the commentary proper. Where the issue addressed does not involve authentic variants, but concerns other text-critical matters (translational phenomena, exegesis, interesting non-variants, etc.), the commentary begins as a new paragraph without an apparatus entry.

The editor should exercise broad discretion on what issues and details to treat in the commentary. Keep it succinct but thorough (cf. the samples on the HBCE website), but don’t hesitate to be expansive in complex or interesting cases.

If there are issues that require detailed treatment, particularly if they concern more than one reading, you may do this as a section of the introduction or a separate appendix, to which the commentary should point.

In this section, references should be in Social Sciences style (i.e. parenthetical), using the format in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999) §7.4.

4. Indices

Each volume will have several indices:

A. Types of textual phenomena
B. Interchange of Hebrew letters
B. Words given special attention (Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, etc.)
C. Index of citations from the Hebrew Bible and other early sources
D. General index  
E. Author index

The arrangement and subdivisions of the indices can vary according to the discretion of the editor. The initial volume (HBCE Proverbs) will serve as a template for indices and other features of the contents.

5. Web version

The web version will include all the features of the printed volume, but will have the advantage of being revisable. It will also have many other features, which are still being imagined. See the demo version at: http://vimeo.com/63116507.
III. Constructing the Critical Edition

The critical edition will consist of the critical text surrounded by the text-critical commentary. In books or sections of books where there are multiple editions, the critical text will consist of parallel columns. Where there are more than two editions, you may use more than two columns. The second (third, etc.) column(s) can appear and disappear as needed.

The editors will prepare the critical edition in two files: (1) critical text; (2) text-critical commentary.

1. Sigla in the critical text

Where the reading in the critical text differs from the copy-text (M₁), that reading will be marked by ceiling brackets: ⌈⌉ (superscripted left ceiling and right ceiling symbols). These sigla indicate that the substantive reading (the word) or its secondary paratextual features (vocalization) differs from M₁. At the same time, these sigla indicate a hiatus in the accentual chain (see below, III.2, on vocalization and accentuation).

In Windows, the left ceiling and right ceiling symbols are found in Word under “Insert – Symbol.” You must specify the “Font” as Arial Unicode MS. The character codes are 2308 and 2309. In Mellel (for Mac), these symbols are found at “Edit” – “Special Characters” – “Technical Symbols,” and the font is Arial Unicode MS. These symbols must be superscripted. If they flip their orientation when inserted into Hebrew text, they must be inserted backwards (so that they flip to the correct orientation). If you cannot control the flips, please make a marginal comment (using the comment balloon or any other method.)

The ceiling brackets are the only sigla in the critical text.

The following are examples of readings in the critical text that differ from the copy-text: a word, a letter, a long sequence, and a minus:

אֶל־מִקְוֶה

אֶחָ֔ד

וְ⌈עֵ֣ץ

וַֽיְהִי־כֵֽן

וַיִּקָּווּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מִקְוֵיהֶם וַתֵּרָא הַיַּבָּשָׁה

⌈׃

פְּרִי

⌈⌉

אֲשֶׁ֥ר
In cases of multiple editions, the ceiling brackets will be used in the critical text of the proto-G column only where a reading diverges from the (reconstructed) parent text of OG (see above, I.2).

Note that the ceiling brackets in the critical text do not differentiate among different types of preferred readings: those from Hebrew sources, those retroverted from translation documents, and emendations (i.e. unattested readings). These types are differentiated in the apparatus entry, where retroversions are marked by an asterisk, and emendations marked by angled brackets (see examples below).

2. Spelling, vocalization, and accentuation

Readings in the critical text that diverge from the copy-text will be spelled and vocalized in the style of the copy-text (M¹). These readings will be accented only where the accent marks are obvious or necessary (as in the case of atnah). An exception is the case of proto-G editions, where vocalization will mostly be confined to the apparatus entries (see below).

Conventions of spelling (orthography) should be drawn from the normal practice in that book. For instance, in Samuel-Kings the name “David” should be spelled defective (דוד), whereas in Chronicles it should be spelled plene (דוד).

Vocalization should also be drawn from normal practice in the copy-text. Readings are vocalized in order to indicate the editor’s grammatical construal, e.g., ↰ as a participle, finite verb, infinitive, etc.

Where a reading does not diverge from the copy-text, but the vocalization is incorrect, the editor should correct the vocalization if and only if it affects the meaning of the word. Where the semantics is not affected, e.g., in many cases of linguistic modernization, the vocalization of the copy-text will not be changed. For instance, the modernized vocalization of an old Qal passive as a different passive form (Niphal, Pual, or Hophal) will not be changed. Similarly, distinctions of vowel quality (e.g., ṣere and seghol) often do not affect the meaning of the word, and should not be changed.

The same procedure applies for accentuation. If the reading does not diverge from the copy-text, but the phrasing marked by the accents is incorrect and affects the meaning of the phrase, the editor may revise the accents. The affected text should be marked with ceiling brackets and the details discussed in the commentary.

The following are two examples where the copy-text vocalization has been corrected in the critical text. In the first case the preferred vocalization is inferred from G. In the second, the M¹ vocalization is corrected by the editor without supporting textual evidence.
Note that in the apparatus entries, both readings are vocalized, since the difference among variants depends solely on vocalization.

The vocalization of readings in the apparatus also applies to instances where the copy-text vocalization is unchanged in the critical text:

| critical text: | אֹהֵב |
| apparatus entry: | בְּהֵב* G (פִּיוֹלֶוָגְיוּנָיוֹז) ] M בְּהֵב (gram) |

This practice highlights the fact that variant vocalization is the issue in the apparatus and allows for the easy comparison of forms.

Most of the time, textual variants concern consonantal differences. In these cases, the readings in the apparatus are not vocalized, since the difference among the variants does not concern vocalization. For example:

| critical text: | אֲדֹ֣מִ֯יֹּ֔ת |
| apparatus entry: | אדמית M ] אֲדֹ֣מִ֯יֹּ֔ת* G (Σύρας) (graph ר→ד) |

A special case is multiple editions where one column represents the proto-G archetype. In this case, the retroverted text will not be vocalized or accented in the critical text except where a reading differs from its counterpart in the parallel column solely by a variant vocalization. In such cases the proto-G reading will be vocalized in the critical text, to allow for easy comparison with the parallel reading. Proto-G readings will be vocalized in the apparatus where they differ from the copy-text (M'). This rule ensures that the apparatus conveys the editor’s grammatical construal of all readings in proto-G edition. Note that unvocalized proto-G readings in the apparatus indicate that these readings are identical to their (vocalized) counterparts in the proto-M edition.

### 3. Format of apparatus entry

The apparatus entry will contain all the evidence for textual variants and emendations and a brief notation of the explanation for the secondary reading(s). Except in simple cases of scribal change, where the brief notation is sufficient, the entry will be followed by a fuller text-critical commentary.
The only exception to the inclusion of all textual variants in the apparatus entry is variant spellings (from SP, Qumran, or Mmass), which are “accidentals,” not substantive features (see above, I.2). An analytical chart of orthographic variants will be included in the Introductory chapter. Hence there is no need to burden the critical edition with every variation of, e.g., כל vs. כל.

Readings from translation documents that, in the editor’s judgment, do not represent Hebrew variants do not belong in an apparatus entry. However, such readings that have been taken by others as textual variants, or interesting cases of G’s translation technique, including misconstruals of the Hebrew, are worthy of comment. Such comments begin not with an apparatus entry, but with a new paragraph (e.g., G translates …).

All variants from translation documents that are included in the apparatus are to be retroverted into Hebrew. If the retroversion is not seconded by an extant Hebrew reading, the retroversion is marked with an asterisk to indicate that it is a reconstruction, followed by the siglum for the source and the text in parentheses, as follows:

חרית + ואמריית* G (καὶ Αμορραίας) (> M) (exeg)

(Note in this instance that the lemma from the critical text is a text-marker and not a variant itself, and so is not annotated by its textual source(s). Only variants are annotated by their textual sources.)

The Greek in the apparatus is accented, as in the current Göttingen editions and in the Cambridge LXX. Where a Greek citation ends with a grave accent (´), the editor will change it to an acute (´).

In the apparatus entry, a different rule applies to the testimony of the major versions (M, SP, G, and Q) versus the minor versions (T, S, and V). The extant testimony of all the major versions are all included in apparatus. The extant testimony of the minor versions are cited in the apparatus only where they differ from M. In these cases, siglum for the source is followed by the Aramaic/Syriac/Latin text in parentheses, as in the following example.

יום 1 M SP G (ἡμέραν) ] + יומם 4QGen (אֲלָלַמָה) S (אֲלִילָה) (mod LBH “daytime”)

This rule for the citation of the minor versions may be altered where appropriate, e.g., in a book where S is particularly important it can be cited consistently. Since the minor versions generally follow M, this rule allows for a streamlined apparatus with no appreciable loss of information.

The normal order of listing in the apparatus entry is: M SP xQxx G T S V. The order can vary where appropriate, e.g., in some books S is earlier or more important and should precede T. Where desired, the apparatus can include testimony of other textual evidence, e.g.,
OL, Smss, T<sup>N</sup>(mg), M<sup>K319</sup>. One should, as appropriate, also include non-biblical textual evidence, e.g. Jubilees, Qumran texts, Josephus, rabbinic citations, etc.

If the preferred reading is a conjecture, it is marked by small angled brackets ‹ › in the apparatus. Where there are two or more different secondary variants, they are separated by a semicolon, and their respective explanations are separated by a semicolon.

The format of apparatus entries is illustrated in the following examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{מ נב שומע} + \text{מ נב שומע} \quad \text{M SP G (kai eideve o theos is kalon) (harm \& SP k Verb 10, 12)} \\
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{לaniah} \quad \text{G (\text{συναχθήτω}) (4QGena - crrp)} \\
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{לaniah} \quad \text{G (\text{υιείς}} (\text{S: crrp}) (G: \text{raph} \qquad \text{S: metath} \quad \text{3r}) \\
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{לaniah} \quad \text{G (homoioteleuton)} (\text{S: metath} \quad \text{3r}) \\
\end{align*}
\]

In previous entry, note that the wicket indicates the loss of text from homoioteleuton.

The Hebrew words read from right to left.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{לaniah} \quad \text{M SP G (hec스חא) (haplo \text{3r})} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the previous and following entries, the preferred reading is (or includes) an emendation, marked by small angled brackets.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{םננה} & \quad \text{לaniah} \quad \text{M SP G (crrp, cf ... \text{S: metath} \quad \text{3r})} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the previous entry, the siglum indicates a plus before the lemma. This format allows for clarity when this part of the context is important, as in this case of dittography.

Here are some types of explanation that include Hebrew text within the explanation:

(\text{graph} \quad \text{3r})
(\text{metath} \quad \text{אבת} \quad \text{3r})
(\text{dittog} \quad \text{סנפ} \quad \text{3r})
(\text{near-dittog} \quad \text{ככ} \quad \text{ככ} \quad \text{3r})
(\text{harm} \quad \text{שני מים} \quad \text{7:9,15})
(\text{antic} \quad \text{פרי עץ} \quad \text{3:2})
(\text{homioteleuton} \quad \text{צלם} \quad \text{3r})
In the case of multiple editions, the apparatus will do all the above and distinguish between the readings of the editions by using the abbreviations (ed A) and (ed B), as follows:

אֶלְהִים אֲחֵרִים (ed A) M ] (ed B) G (θεῶν αὐτῶν) (exeg)

The lemma (the reading to the left of the bracket) is the reading of the earlier edition, indicating that the reading in edition B derives from the reading in edition A.

This notation, ed A and ed B, indicates in which column of the critical text that reading is located. It also serves to distinguish these readings from variants that are in neither critical text, as in the following:

עָמַנִים (eds AB) M ] בני עמון* S (ܒܢܝ ܥܡܘܢ) Gmss (υἱῶν Αμμων) (exeg)

Hence the single apparatus for multiple editions distinguishes readings among the different editions and readings that are secondary to both editions.

Where there is no compelling argument to prefer one variant over another, we will use the explanation “(equal),” indicating that the variants are “equally plausible as the archetype,” and use the default rule (see above, I.3), which specifies that copy-text reading is the default value in cases where one cannot clearly adjudicate between variants. This is a practical expedient, which is provided by the concept of copy-text.

4. Ketiv-qere and other Masoretic phenomena

Cases of ketiv-qere are treated as variants, in which one should be the preferred reading. In cases where one cannot clearly adjudicate between them, the ketiv is treated as the copy-text reading. The instances of ketiv-qere should be drawn from Aron Dotan’s edition of M^I, since BHS is sometimes mistaken and the photographic facsimile is often difficult to decipher.

Where the ketiv is the reading in the critical text (either as the preferred or default reading), the word must be vocalized. If the vocalization differs from the copy-text (i.e. the qere vocalization), then ceiling brackets are required and the word is not accented. If the vocalization is the same as the copy-text (i.e. the qere vocalization), then no ceiling brackets are used, and the accents from the copy-text are inserted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Text</th>
<th>Apparatus Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[אַלְוֶדֶל]</td>
<td>אֶלְוֶדֶל M^K ] נֻקֵי נְלי M^O (graph ַ→י)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Text</th>
<th>Apparatus Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אַלְוֶדֶל</td>
<td>אֶלְוֶדֶל M^K ] יָלִיל N M^O (m. l. mod)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the *qere* is the preferred reading, the word is vocalized normally, and ceiling brackets are used in order to indicate that this reading differs from the *ketiv* (= the copy-text). Because ceiling brackets are used, there are no accents.

**critical text:** \[ יּוּשָׂמָה \]

**apparatus entry:** וּיְשֹׁמְעָה \[ מ"ו ] M\(^Q\) \[ מ"ע ] M\(^K\)

In the apparatus, use the sigla M\(^K\) and M\(^Q\). In the commentary proper, you may use these sigla or the simplified transcription, *ketiv* and *qere*. Similarly, one can use the siglum K-Q or the term *ketiv-qere*. To refer to Kennicott-Rossi mss (which often replicate variations of the *ketiv-qere*), one can use sigla such as M\(^K314\). To refer to the collection as a whole, one can say KR or Kennicott-Rossi.

As noted above, an analytical list of the K-Q variants may be included in the Introductory chapter.

The procedure for *ketiv-qere* will apply to comparable Masoretic phenomena. These include perpetual *qere*; *qere we-la ketiv*; and Tiqqune Soferim. The one exception, from the category of perpetual *qere*, is the Tetragrammaton. We will write the consonants of the *ketiv*, יהוה, with the copy-text vocalization.

Other Masoretic phenomena, like suspended ֻ and dotted or enlarged letters, will not be included in the critical text but should be discussed in the text-critical commentary.

5. **On G**

The siglum G represents, in the editor’s judgment, the closest approximation of the Old Greek. Where it serves to disambiguate (as in some situations treated below), you can use the siglum OG. Where the Göttingen LXX exists, use it as G. If you differ from Göttingen in a particular reading, you should use the siglum OG and defend your choice in the text-critical commentary. Where there is no Göttingen LXX, you should either use Rahlfs as G (with the same method for registering different judgments) or define G in the introduction, for instance, G = the agreement of A B L.

In cases of multiple editions in parallel columns where there is no Göttingen LXX, the citation of G can become complicated. In the following (relatively simple) case of multiple editions, there is an agreement of the major LXX versions, so the Greek reading is simply labeled G:

* לַלָּל* (ed A) G (πορεύῃ) ] לַלָּל (ed B) M (rem לַלָּל)
The following entry distinguishes among different LXX readings and defines the Lucianic reading as the OG:

\[ \text{GL} = \text{OG} (\text{ἐπερωτῆσαι}) S \text{ (Δ הטיפול)} \]

The above case specifies the GL reading as the OG, and indicates the secondary nature of the G\textsuperscript{AB} reading (which is a correction towards M).

Where a major G ms has a double reading reflecting two different textual histories (again, as sometimes in Samuel-Kings), use the superscript siglum (dbl) for each double reading, as in the following:

\[ M \text{ GL(dbl)} = \text{OG} (\text{διὰ τοῦτο}) \]
\[ \text{GABL(dbl)} (\text{οὐχ οὕτως}) \text{(aur? exeg?)} \]

Note that here one of the double readings in GL is the OG, and the other agrees with G\textsuperscript{AB} in a secondary reading revised toward M.

As noted above, the testimony of G is recorded with a Hebrew retroversion, and where it is not seconded by a Hebrew text, the retroversion is marked with an * in the apparatus. Where a Hebrew retroversion is not relatively certain, append a question mark after the retroversion, and/or include various Hebrew possibilities. Note that G is only cited in an apparatus entry where it plausibly represents, in the editor’s judgment, a reading of a Hebrew Vorlage. Instances of G readings that are most plausibly translation phenomena should be presented and discussed in the text-critical commentary, but they are not listed in an apparatus entry.

An exception to this rule is where a plus in G arguably represents an expanded edition, even if it is most plausibly an inner-Greek edition. (This occurs, e.g., in Proverbs, Esther, and Daniel.) In such a case, one should list this variant in the apparatus, for example, fin ] + stich G. This variant will then be unpacked in the text-critical commentary.

When referring to verse-long G pluses that are not in M, we will adopt Rahlfs’ numbering system but will italicize the English letters. For example, the four extra Greek verses after 2 Kgs 1:18 are 1:18\textit{a}, 18\textit{b}, 18\textit{c}, and 18\textit{d}. This enables us to retain the non-italicized letters to refer to the subsections of a verse, e.g. 18\textit{a} = the first half of 1:18 (M = G), versus 18\textit{a} = the entirety of the extra Greek verse after 1:18.

As noted above, the Greek in the apparatus will be accented (as in the current Götttingen editions and in the Cambridge LXX), which is best done by cutting and pasting from a Greek OT file in any Greek Unicode font. The only change necessary is when the citation ends with a grave accent (‘), you should change it to an acute (‘). The testimony of the G daughter versions,
e.g., OL, need only be cited where you deem it necessary for establishing the reading of G where the OG reading is not extant in Greek or the testimony is obscure.

In the case of multiple editions in parallel columns, the critical text of the proto-G edition will be vocalized in the critical text only where the vocalization differs from the corresponding word in the parallel column (see above, III.2). Otherwise, readings in the proto-G column that differ from the parallel column will be vocalized in the apparatus entry. This ensures that the editor’s grammatical construal of the word is clear. Note that unvocalized proto-G readings in the apparatus indicate that these readings are identical to their (vocalized) counterparts in the parallel edition.

Where the critical text of the proto-G column diverges from the Hebrew parent text of G (due to scribal error or change), use the ceiling brackets (see above, III.2). For such columns, the parent text of G serves as the “virtual” copy-text for substantives, while M still serves as the copy-text for accidentals and paratextual features (spelling and vocalization).

6. On T, S, V

As noted above (III.3), the testimonies of the minor versions (T, S, V) are included only where they vary from M. This rule reduces clutter without loss of information. Some books may hold to a different rule for citing the minor versions, at the editor’s discretion, e.g., when S is particularly important. The rule for treating the minor versions in the apparatus should be stated clearly in the introduction. Where the testimony of a minor version is judged to preserve an independent Hebrew variant (i.e., one not found in any of the major versions), the style follows the same format as G readings, Hebrew retroversion followed by the Aramaic/Syriac/Latin text in parenthesis. For clarity, citation of Latin readings from V should be italicized. At the editor’s discretion, testimony of the minor versions can be listed more fully and discussed as desired in the text-critical commentary.

7. On M

The testimony of medieval Masoretic manuscripts should be limited to readings or manuscripts of particular interest, such as where a medieval reading agrees with a non-M reading at a level above the ordinary “noise” of scribal accident (e.g., plus or minus waw, graphic confusion, haplography – the common mistakes that happen perpetually, which Goshen-Gottstein calls “the rule of scribes”). Only occasionally will variants from these sources rise to the level where they should be included. In these cases, citations in the apparatus should be in the form M or M. Particular medieval mss with authentic ancient variants should be discussed in the introductory chapter.
8. On multiple editions

Most of the format issues for multiple editions are addressed above (esp. III.2-3, “Spelling, vocalization, and accentuation” and “Format of apparatus entry”). The concept of an addition is described above (I.1):

For the HBCE, an edition is defined as a systematic revision that affects the textual form and content of a book. This includes changes in the sequence of verses or chapters, addition of new pericopes, recalculation of chronologies, etc. Other kinds of revision, such as occur in the customary scribal habits of small-scale harmonization, explication, linguistic updating, etc., are not regarded as constituting a new edition in this sense. The editor will provide the evidence and arguments for the systematic or significant revision that constitute the grounds for a new edition in the introductory chapter of the volume.

A further issue is the layout of the parallel columns. We will adopt the format devised by Zipora Talshir (I Esdras: A Text-Critical Commentary):

1. Divide the text into syntactic units lined up parallel to one another.
2. Use a tilde to indicate that a line is in a different location than its parallel text. In parentheses, list the verse number of the different location.
3. Use three dashes to indicate that there is no equivalent.

The editor should do this in the Word file and append any comments necessary to clarify the details of the layout.

As noted above (3.5), when referring to verse(s)-long G pluses that are not in M, we will adopt Rahlfs’ numbering system but will italicize the English letters, hence the four G verses after 2 Kgs 1:18 are 1:18a, 18b, 18c, and 18d.
IV. Abbreviations and Sigla

[()] indication of non-copy-text reading, or (in proto-G editions) a non-G-Vorlage reading

[ ] separator in apparatus entry: primary reading to left, secondary reading(s) with comment to the right

+ plus

pre a plus preceding the lemma

> omission

* retroversion from Greek, Aramaic, etc., where there is no equivalent Hebrew text

◊ conjectural emendation

♀ uncertain letter

# fragmentary reading in Qumran text

1 first (second, etc.) occurrence in a verse

± conj a conjunction added or subtracted in copying or translation.

// parallel

∩ omitted text in cases of homoi

→ changes to

↔ change is possible in either direction

≠ not equal; substantively not the same

≈ approximately equal; close enough so as not to indicate a different text

… ellipsis

" in Hebrew letters, indicates lexical root (e.g., ר"ש)

Hexaplaric abbreviations

α′ Aquila
αλ′ ὁ α λλος, οἱ α λλοι (An unidentified marginal reading in the Septuagint tradition; taken from Field, Hexapla.)

γ′ The Three
ε′ Quinta
εβρ′ ὁ ἐβραιος
ετ′ οἱ ε τοι
θ′ Theodotion
λ′ ὁ λουποι
ο′ ὁι ἐβδομηκοντα
σ′ Symmachus

abs absolute
add addition
anaph anaphora (transfer of material from passages elsewhere)
antic anticipation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assim</td>
<td>assimilation (bringing one passage into conformity with a frequent usage elsewhere; no contradiction is necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc</td>
<td>association (the association of two words in a semantic field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aur</td>
<td>aural variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew, including the language of Ben Sira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHQ</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>correction in manuscript, e.g. G^Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATSS</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study (<a href="http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/text/religion/biblical/lxxmorph/">http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/text/religion/biblical/lxxmorph/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBH</td>
<td>Classical Biblical Hebrew (preexilic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Cairo Geniza Biblical mss (cited from the BHS apparatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cj</td>
<td>conjecture (emendation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context</td>
<td>influence of context on translator or copyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conv</td>
<td>converse translation (creating synonymy by negation of its opposite, viz. A → not not-A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr</td>
<td>correction (proposed correction in a version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crrp</td>
<td>corrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>reference to the exegesis in the Commentary to this volume, chapter II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cst</td>
<td>construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-stem</td>
<td>Piel (Aram. Pael)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbl</td>
<td>double translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial</td>
<td>dialectal variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diath</td>
<td>diathesis (change of passive to active or active to passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant ditto</td>
<td>distant ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div</td>
<td>word misdivision or misdivision of letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dp-stem</td>
<td>D passive stem, Pual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr-stem</td>
<td>D reduplicated stem, Polel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt-stem</td>
<td>Dt-stem, Hitpael (Aram. &lt;Etpaal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed(d)</td>
<td>edition(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elab</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal</td>
<td>equally plausible as primary reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etym</td>
<td>etymological (translation based on the etymology, or pseudo-etymology, of a...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hebrew word

exeg exegetical
expan expansion in translation
explic expliciation: an addition controlling the sense of the text to exclude alternative (and presumed erroneous) readings
fem feminine
fin final
G Greek version. (Göttingen where available, otherwise Rahlfs.) Unless otherwise indicated, this is assumed to be original, or differing from the original only inconsequentially. See OG. “G” is used in reference to both the translation and the translator.
G\textsuperscript{A}: Codex Alexandrinus
G\textsuperscript{B}: Codex Vaticanus
G\textsuperscript{S}: Codex Sinaiticus
G-stem, G-stem, Qal
Gp-stem G passive stem
graph graphic error
gram change of grammatical feature
H-stem Hiphil
haplo haplography (loss of one of two identical letters or words that are in sequence)
harm harmonization (eliminating a tension or contradiction between two passages)
HB Hebrew Bible (including Aramaic portions)
homoi homoiarkton, homoioteleuton, homoiomeson, or homoiologon (the ocular leap between similar beginnings, ends, middles, or whole words, and the omission of text between)
H-P Holmes-Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus."
Hp-stem H passive stem, Hophal
impf imperfect
impv imperative
indep independently (when two versions attest independently to a variant)
inf infinitive
init initial
interp interpretation
All translation is interpretation, so the term “interp” is not an evaluator. It is used, rather, of an element added to a translation to explain the verse or a component thereof, that is to say, a gloss.
juss jussive
K B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (1776-80).
E.g. ms K95.

K-Q  *ketiv-geré*

KR  B. Kennicott *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (1776-80), and
    J. B. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Vetus Testamentum* (1784)

l., ll. line, lines

LBH  Late Biblical Hebrew

lig  ligature

LSF  F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im AT* (1920)

LSJ  Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*

M  Masoretic text (edition used: BHS)

  M^A  Aleppo Codex
  M^K  *ketiv*, cited from Dotan’s edition of M^L
  M^K95  a KR ms
  M^L  St. Petersburg (Leningradensis) Codex B19a
  M^mss  medieval or early modern ms or editions from KR, Geniza, etc.
  M^Q  *qeré* cited from Dotan’s edition of M^L

m.  Mishna

masc  masculine

metath  metathesis (reversal or transposition of letters or words, AB→BA)

mg  marginal reading


Mid.  Midrash

m.l.  mater lectionis

mod  linguistic modernization

moral  moralization

Mp  Masorah parva

ms, mss  manuscript(s)

mult  multiple occurrences

N-stem  Niphal

near-dittog  dittography of graphically similar letters

near-haplo  haplography of graphically similar letters

near-syn  near synonymy, sharing the same general sense for practical purposes.


norm  normalization (producing the more expected form; ≠ harm(onization), which is
    the adjustment of one passage to make it agree with another)

num  change of grammatical number

Ost  ostracon

Oc  Occidental: the reading of the Palestinian Masoretes

OG  Old (original) Greek (if unmarked, G = Göttingen or Rahlfs and is assumed to be
    original, or differing from the original only inconsequentially).

OL  Old Latin (Vetus Latina) translation

om  omission
Or Orientalis: the reading of the Babylonian Masoretes

orth change (or misconstrual) of orthography

OS Old (original) Peshitta. Unmarked “S” = the Leiden text and is assumed to be original.

Pap Papyrus

paleo paleo-Hebrew script

parab parablepsis (= eyeskip), skipping over letters or words, regardless of the cause

pass passive

per person

pf perfect

phon phonetic

A variant induced by a phonetic similarity, but not necessarily because the word was actually heard differently; that would be “aur(al).” The similarity may be heard by the “inner ear.”

pl plural

pm first hand (prima manus)

poss possessive

proto-G textual family or group that is the stemmatic precursor of G

proto-M textual family or group that is the stemmatic precursor of M

ptcp participle

xQxx Qumran text; cited from DJD

rab Rabbinic citation


re regarding

ref. referenced by; with reference to

reform reformulation

A secondary reading created by modification of an older one.

rel reliqui, all mss besides the ones cited

rep repetition of non-contiguous word or phrase

RH Rabbinic (Mishnaic) Hebrew

S Syriac: the Peshitta translation (Leiden edition). “S” is used in reference to both the translation and the translator.

s supplementation in manuscript, e.g. $G^A$

sep separation of one letter into two (cf. lig)

sfx suffix

sg singular

sim similarly

Sir Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)

smooth smoothing (improving the flow of a passage by grammatical changes)


syn substitution of synonym

SyrH Syro-Hexapla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Targum, the Aramaic translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Targum Onqelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Targum Jonathan, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theol</td>
<td>theologically motivated change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transf</td>
<td>transfer of a phrase or sentence from another verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transp</td>
<td>transposition (change in sequence of letters, words, or verses, e.g. ABC→BAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unc</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vso</td>
<td>verso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Vulgate Codex Amiatinus, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v(v)</td>
<td>verse(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(s)</td>
<td>variant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vid</td>
<td>seemingly (videtur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocal</td>
<td>difference of vocalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y.</td>
<td>Talmud Yerushalmi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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