Some remarks on textual criticism and the editing of Hebrew texts
by Bruno Chiesa

The aim of the following essay is in the first place to point out certain problems which occur to anyone who is engaged on a scholarly level with Hebrew literature — biblical as well as post-biblical. Following upon this, some methodological considerations will be brought up for discussion.[1]

1. The text of the Hebrew Bible

In his essay 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism'[2], which deservedly gained renown, A.E. Housman wrote in 1922: 'Textual criticism is a science, and, since it comprises recension and emendation, it is also an art. It is the art of discovering *error* in texts and the art of removing it. That is its definition, that is what the name denotes.' Even if Housman's position has been intensively discussed[3] in classical philology, it stands to reason that contemporary biblical textual criticism has gone astray.

One of the most prominent representatives of this discipline, D. Barthélemy, defends in his 'Etudes d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament'[4] the following opinion: a good many corrupt passages in the Bible should actually not be seen as error-ridden; they are only judged as such by us on the basis of our faulty knowledge of the Hebrew of that time. With this the eleventh rule of Houbigant is superseded: *In Grammatica quodcunque peccatum est, etiam si nescitur, quomodo sit castigandum, tamen esse mendum statuetur, & Librario incauto, non Sacro Scriptori, attribuetur.*[5] Then — according to Barthélemy — the critic's job consists in interpreting the texts rather than in emending them, 'en fonction d'un dogmatisme grammatical à courte vue'. Just as Abulwalīd ibn Ğannāḥ was influenced by the theories of Arabic grammarians, who regarded the Koran as the uncreated Word of God and consequently subjected it to a mere descriptive grammar, so did Houbigant live in a cultural period in which the grammar of the Académie française 'soumettait à un contrôle draconien l'usage littéraire fait d'une langue vivante: le français classique.'[6] But can this socio-cultural explanation not also be applied to Barthélemy? With this significant difference certainly, that in the latter case the results of a consoli-

dated text-critical tradition are ignored, at least with respect to the above-mentioned principle of Housman. To rule out the possibility of textual errors in the case of the Bible alone means excluding the application of a general text-critical method to the biblical text. Does this not signify *a priori*, however, the renunciation of the use of common sense?

Just how absurd biblical textual criticism is today can be seen from the following, largely topical subjects: the 'Urtext' or 'original', '*textus receptus*' and '*Codex optimus*', and the plurality of biblical 'textual forms'.

1.1 The issue of the 'original'

According to Barthélemy's *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*[7]: 'La critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament *en tant que Bible*[8] vise à rétablir ce texte en son état authentique, c'est-à-dire en l'état ou il a été *canonisé*, même si cet état n'est pas toujours littérairement original.' Hence the 'original' is to be considered exclusively as a matter for literary criticism, which occupies itself with the pre-canonical stage of the text: 'C'est surtout l'analyse littéraire qui sert à reconstituer ces états textuels qu'on désigne couramment comme les "textes originaux",'[9] the purpose of textual criticism being, on the contrary,[10] to establish the oldest attested textual form of the — canonical! — documents available. And since the conjecture aims at recovering the original text, 'qui ne nous est plus attesté textuellement',[11] the textual reconstruction falls into the realm of literary criticism.[12]

The argument appears indisputable except for one detail. With the inclusion of 'en tant que Bible', the very difference between *Librarius incautus* and 'holy writer', of which Houbigant has spoken and which should be seen as the absolute foundation of biblical textual criticism, was struck out gratuitously. Without this difference, textual criticism is unavoidably reduced to the function of an *ancilla theologiæ*. The only question is: When was the untenability of this difference ever proven? And, one could add: in what sense can one — looking at the Hebrew biblical text — so much as speak of a 'canon'?

The purpose of textual criticism is to get as close as

possible to the original text, and that by way of the following steps: 1) *Recensio* — checking the tradition; 2) *Examinatio* — assessing the originality of the tradition; and 3) *Divinatio* — restoring the original text by means of conjecture, or at least establishing the errors. If one rejects these prerequisites — which are identical with P. Maas' first two principles of textual criticism — then one should not publish a book entitled *Critique textuelle*.

The 'original', however, is one of the least tangible and least obvious concepts of textual criticism. As D'A.S. Avalle argued in his *Principi di critica del testo*,[13] it is based on a static, modellistic vision of the literary work, which scarcely ever exists as a perfect text, while the single work of a writer, strictly speaking, constitutes a sometimes casual and provisory section of the process of continuous adaptions and alterations, through which the fundamental tendencies of a literary system are expressed. When applied to the Hebrew Bible, this means that the concept of 'original' apparently has a different connotation for the higher criticism (literary criticism) than for lower, *i.e.* textual, criticism. For the latter, the 'original' text is the text as it came out of the final editing process, or — in other words — the text as it emerges purified of secondary additions and alterations. For the higher criticism, on the other hand, the 'original' is identical with the original layer or the original source.[14]

If one allows, which is highly likely, that there are no textual breaks to be found between the archetype of the Masoretic text and its historical archetype — *i.e.*, the text as established roughly speaking around the time of Esra[15] — then the 'original' which is sought by literary criticism becomes an almost prehistoric phenomenon of practically only archaeological interest.

Claiming the legitimacy of textual conjecture exclusively for this prehistoric phase means that one is unaware of the purpose of textual criticism. One then attaches two clearly distinct phases of a scientific approach to the text. If the Hebrew Bible, however, was passed down to us through the hands of *scribes* who have always done their work within a *historical* context, one has to wonder along with J. Le Clerc: 'Certe cum nec Librarii, nec Massorethae, nec denique interpretes quos habemus, fuerunt spiritu *anamartesias* donati, an non recte fieri potest ut diligentiae nostrae aliquid emendandum reliquerint?'[16]

In any case, Barthélemy's thesis is only the theoretical expression of a lengthy customary *modus operandi*: The Hebrew text remains unaffected, the 'critical edition' consists in the reproduction of *one* manuscript complete with errors — which are corrected in the apparatus; the real critical text, on the other hand, is given in Bible commentaries and translations. It is not out of place here to remark that this practice does not depend on Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, but can be traced back to such a prominent advocate of textual conjecture as Houbigant: 'Emendationes ne inserentur in Contextum Sacrum.'[17]

1.2 *Codex optimus* and *textus receptus*

The preceding issue immediately introduces a further aberration, of which apparently only few are aware. The textual discussion in recent years has been characterized by the necessity of going beyond the Ben-Chayyim text, in other words that of the second *Biblia rabbinica* of Daniel Bomberg. As is well-known, a prominent position was taken in this discussion by Paul Kahle. It is well-known as well that the recovering of a part of the Aleppo codex brought about a revision of the picture of the history of the Masoretic Tiberian text. Nothing stands in the way of the Aleppo codex actually being the best witness of the Masoretic work of the Ben Ashers. It would be absurd, however, to regard this manuscript as the attestation of the *textus receptus* in its purest form.[18] Thus the *textus receptus* would be confirmed by the best manuscript — but just by the one best known mainly on account of its inaccessibility! But is not the *textus receptus* defined as such so far as it is accepted by at least the majority of the communities?[19]

1.3 Textual forms of the Hebrew Bible

E. Tov has attempted to show in a number of studies that the Masoretic text, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, which were generally considered the sole three recensions of the biblical text, are actually only three of the many *textual forms* which existed at the time of Qumran for every biblical book.[20]

The reasoning is as follows:
1. On the basis of thorough research into a biblical Qumran text, 11QpaleoLev, Tov establishes that this scroll can neither be ascribed to the Masoretic texttype nor to that of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 'because the scroll is not exclusively affiliated with either of them.'[21] The scroll not only corresponds sometimes with a textual form and at other times with another textual form, but also contains a number of unique readings: 'As a result, this scroll cannot be grouped with any of the known sources of Leviticus, but must be regarded as a *fourth* source of the book, previously unknown. In this way theoretically we could add a fifth and sixth source, etc.'[22]
2. Thus a general rule was derived from an exception: '... all sources that do not clearly follow the MT, LXX or Sam. Pent. against the other sources should be considered independent.'
3. The discovery obviously requires a new definition of the method of textual analysis, but 'such a methodology has not yet been established.'[23] As a matter of fact, the relationship between two sources is to be established not only on the basis of 'agreements' and 'disagreements', but above all on grounds of the *lectiones singulares*. If one analyses the first Isaiah scroll

(1QIs[a]) according to this method, then one cannot but conclude that the text of the scroll is unique and cannot be grouped with any of the known Isaiah textual sources.[24]

4. *Therefore* the usual division of textual evidence into three recensions should be regarded as obsolete.[25]

Strictly speaking, however, the only thing that can be deduced from the few cases researched by Tov — assuming his analyses to be correct — is that there were not three 'sources' but 3 + n 'sources', in that 3 + 1 makes four and not three plus an *infinite* series. This was already established by Paolo Sacchi in 1965 with completely different methodological premises in a study[26] of which Tov was clearly unaware. In a discussion on P. Kahle and M. Goshen-Gottstein's method of researching 1QIs[a], Sacchi wrote: '... if we wanted to apply it to the first edition of the Psalms, then it would provide evidence for the existence of an infinite number of text-types.'[27]

The same author states furthermore that in order to determine the relationship between two manuscripts, one must take as point of departure the textual corruption, not the investigation into variants. 'If the Qumran manuscript actually agrees with the Masoretic tradition in every corrupted passage, then we have the typical case of agreement in errors (or in *lacunæ*) in front of us, a fact which betrays a certain archetypal common ground. If in such cases, however, the text of 1QIs[a] reads differently, then we could regard it as a witness of that tradition, completely different from the Masoretic one, whose existence scholars are prompt to suppose, but for which, as P. Kahle has already made it certain, there are only indirect indications.'[28]

Now, the investigation into textual corruptions or errors in the Masoretic tradition[29] shows that 'the most difficult passages in the Isaiah text were already corrupted in 1QIs[a]. Historically speaking: the corrupt passages in the Masoretic Isaiah text known to us are older than 200 B.C.; they belong to the archetype which lies at the basis of the Masoretic text and the text of 1QIs[a].'[30]

A method therefore very certainly exists and it is based exactly on the principle of 'error', which a few scholars — probably on the basis of a misunderstood dogmatic prerequisite — simply would prefer to take from the dictionary of biblical scholars.

To state it in other words: it is not so much the number of agreements or disagreements between various textual witnesses in the different textual passages but their nature which carries weight in textual criticism. If one succeeds in showing two textual witnesses having even one single 'monogenetic error' (Bindfehler) in common, then one is allowed to conclude that both textual witnesses have had a common ancestor somewhere in their history. Indeed, the *lectiones singulares* carry no weight in the definition of the relationship between two textual witnesses. They may prove useful only to define the position of the textual witnesses within the history of the text: 'The characteristic reading represents an innovation and is not sufficient in itself to indicate the existence of a textual family, unless it is accompanied by at least one significative error.'[31]

An example: in a recent — and otherwise outstanding — study, S. Soderlund[32] takes into account a variant in 2QJeremiah (DJD III, p. 62-69) of Jeremiah 47 MT (29 LXX),4. Once he established that this fragment 'attest(s) a distinct MT type text', the author remarks about a variant of the Qumran fragment in verse 4 — the variant *whkrtv* (MT: *lhkryt*) — which corresponds to the Greek *kai aphaniō* that in this case 2QJer and the Septuagint do not testify to a better text, for the Qumran reading *whkrtv* breaks the parallelism of the phrase and introduces an abrupt change of subject. 'It would be quite unjustified to place the blame for such an awkward and meaningless interruption on the author of the original composition. Thus, while *kai aphaniō* in this instance probably comes from a textual variant already present in the translator's *Vorlage*, it must be this *Vorlage* rather than the MT that is secondary' (p. 216).

Soderlund's argument may be correct from the viewpoint of literary criticism, but in the preliminary stage of the evaluation of the textual witnesses it does not signify very much whether or not a reading is secondary. It completely escaped the author's attention that this particular agreement between 2QJer and the Septuagint in a reading which he describes as false is a first evidence for the existence of a common ancestor somewhere in the history of these two witnesses. Therefore 2QJer does not testify to 'a distinct MT type text', regardless of all of the other possible agreements with the Masoretic text in the matter of 'correct' readings.

Another example, this time from E. Tov's highly-regarded *lectiones singulares*: a Palestinian biblical fragment, Cambridge T.-S. 16,96 (= P 360,2), edited by P. Kahle,[33] gives for Daniel 11,15 the reading *melek ha-negeb* instead of *melek ha-safon* in MT. B.J. Roberts' opinion on this was: 'Apart from the last substitution there is nothing in the variants which would require the drastic theory of a divergent text to account for them.'[34] This particular variant is, of course, not sufficient to postulate an independent branch within the textual tradition of the Hebrew Old Testament. Rather, we are dealing here with a rare case of modernization of the biblical text. For when one examines the literary sources from the era in question, it seems unlikely that it is a question of a clerical error. Both expressions *melek ha-negeb* and *melek ha-safon* were frequently used in the 9th-10th centuries to designate the Byzantine and Islamic empires. Daniel al-Qūmisī, in his commentary on Zef 2,5-7, for example, identifies the first term with 'Rome'.[35] Furthermore the entire scheme of Daniel 8-11 was also used in an apocalyptic way to describe Umayyad and

Abbasid rule.[36] In other sources, this text was interpreted by Karaite exegetes from the viewpoint of contemporary history, namely, as pointing to the invasion of the Qarmatians.[37]

There is no doubt that the reading of the Palestinian fragment constitutes a *lectio singularis*. But before it can be used at the text-critical level it should be examined within the context of textual history[38] — an additional principle, which is too often neglected. The reading of the Palestinian fragment should serve as a useful point of departure for a chronological and historico-cultural classification of the fragment itself (9th/10th centuries, Oriental, possibly Karaite, milieu). This means a great deal, because only the historical classification of the document can supply the criterion for a subsequent text-critical evaluation of the variants. The above-mentioned examples of the use of the same biblical expressions to refer to facts from contemporary history point unanimously to the reading of the fragment as an *ideologically* conditioned variant, important for the history of the use of the biblical text but of little significance for its text-critical treatment. This reading is not reason enough to add a new 'textual form' in the sense given by E. Tov to the Palestinian branch of the Hebrew biblical textual transmission. The fragment is simply a witness of the Palestinian tradition — with one exceptional feature.

1.4 Conclusion

From what has been said above, the following consequences ensue for biblical textual criticism:

1. The text of the Hebrew Bible must not be deprived of a critical treatment. In the light of past scholarly results, it is particularly absurd for this principle to have to be reconfirmed today. The necessity of this indicates the alarming nature of the present level of research.
2. The history of the text of the Hebrew Bible must form the basis for every text-critical discussion. But it must really concern history and not confessional prejudices — as, for instance, those[39] which lead to the definition of the Aleppo Codex as being the best representation of the *textus receptus*. If one wants to work historically, then it is, for example, not legitimate for the classification of the text from Qumran simply to put it next to the Masoretic text. After all, the Masoretic text — by definition — is medieval, and consequently it should be judged in a medieval context.[40] For the classification of the Qumran textual witnesses, the following should be consulted: a) the Greek translations, b) the rabbinical quotations, c) the evidence of ancient Bible exegesis (both Jewish and Christian) and the use of the biblical text by authors such as Josephus or Justin, etc.
3. Textual criticism must not ignore either the history of the research up to now — recently assessed commendably in Barthélemy's *Critique textuelle* — or the results of present research.

2. On the text-critical significance of medieval Hebrew translations and on the first edition of texts

For the second part of this discussion, we refer back to J. Le Clerc,[41] who advanced six precepts at the beginning of his *Quaestiones Hieronymianae*,[42] which should be kept in mind by everyone who is applying himself to a text edition:[43]

1) The editor should not allow the love he feels for the author whose writings he is treating to take precedence over his love for the truth (*Non tam Hieronymi, quam Veri amans sit ejus Operum Editor*).
2) He must know the language of the author and the ancient text so well that he can understand him correctly (*sat eruditus Latine sit, satisque exercitatus in lectione Veterum, ut eum Scriptorem probe intelligere possit*).
3-4) He must also know very well the language from which the author translated, in order thus to compare the translated passages with the original (3. *sit Graece doctus, ita ut facile adsequatur Graeca admista Operibus Hieronymi, & quae ex ea Lingua transtulit cum Graecis exemplaribus, si necesse sit, contendat*; 4. *Hebraicam linguam teneat, sine cujus cognitione judicium nullum ferre potest de iis quae de ea Lingua passim habet Hieronymus*).
5) He must compare the translation offered by his author systematically with other translations and with the original (*ejus translationem, & LXX Viralem Graecarumque aliarum recentiorum fragmenta, cum Hebraico Codice non oscitanter contulerit*).
6) He must know how to use the manuscripts and have experience with the critical method (*tractandis Manuscriptis sit adsuetus, exercendisque omnibus periti Critici muneribus longo usu tritus*).

These lines are very much in keeping with healthy common sense, but are nevertheless not always followed by modern editors of medieval Hebrew texts. Here follow some concrete examples.

2.1 Shem Tob ibn Falaquera, an unknown and under-estimated author

An example of too little familiarity with the manuscript tradition is shown by the newest edition of the well-known work of al-Fārābī, *Fī mabādi' ārā' ahl al-madīna al-fāḍila*, by R. Walzer, which was published in 1985 after years of research.[44] What is surprising is that the author failed to notice, despite the advice of experts such as Baneth, Pines and Schwartz, that roughly half of the text exists in a Hebrew version: in the (unpublished) *Sefer de'ot ha-philosophim* and in the (published) *Sefer ha-ma'alot* of Falaquera. In view of the poor direct attestation of al-Fārābī's work for the time before Falaquera, the Hebrew version is of decisive consequence for the choice of readings in the Arabic, or at least for the establishment of the age of certain readings.[45]

2.2 In 1988 R. Jospe published an edition of *Sefer sheʾlemut ha-maʿaśim* by Shem Tob ibn Falaquera.[46] This medieval author has recently attracted the attention of scholars, although his masterwork ('The Views of the Philosophers') is still unedited.[47] He lived sometime between 1223/28 and 1295, probably in Spain or the south of France. He applied himself to poetry intensively in his youth, only moving towards philosophy later on. He showed a clear preference for the ethical and psychological tendencies of the great Islamic thinkers al-Fārābī, Avicenna, Averroes and Ibn Bājja (Avempace). His extensive knowledge of philosophical literature lends significance to his work as a treasury for the Arabic history of ideas, all the more considering he attached great value to a coherent and precise Hebrew technical vocabulary. What is more, he often shows himself to be the sole source of lost writings, e.g. in the case of *Meqor Hayyim* by Shelomoh ibn Gabirol, and not least in the case of certain fragments of works by al-Fārābī,[48] which are otherwise either unknown or only partly known in a Hebrew translation. An example of this is the text of *Sefer sheʾlemut ha-maʿaśim*, which Jospe has now edited,[49] which contains in chapters one to six the only known Hebrew witness of the so-called *Summa Alexandrinorum*, a compendium of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, which had an almost unique fate in the Middle Ages, but which until now was not known to exist in a Hebrew translation.[50] The modern editor, however, did not have the slightest idea of this — although the nature of the text alone should have pointed his research in this direction, if not the fact that the recent discovery of a manuscript of the Arabic version of the *Nichomachean Ethics* has spawned a considerable literature on the medieval history of this Aristotelian work.[51]

The editor limited himself to the observation that 'the first six chapters are based on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*' (p. 412), adding that — in the opinion of an expert such as L.V. Berman — a comparison of the text in question makes one suspect that Falaquera used an Arabic version of the *Nichomachean Ethics* for this work instead of the so-called intermediate commentary by Averroes. In fact, Jospe continues (p. 413), 'Falaquera's text bears no relation to any known text, either in content or in language.'

The editor — and surprisingly Berman also — completely missed the actual character of Falaquera's main source for his first six chapters. A glance at the text and at the parallels in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, which Jospe himself lists in the appendix to the text, is enough to realize that the *Nichomachean Ethics* cannot be the direct source of Falaquera's work. And that it also does not point to a personal revision by Falaquera is obvious from a comparison with the Latin text of the *Summa Alexandrinorum* or with its Arabic fragments.[52] The *Summa Alexandrinorum* is quite certainly Falaquera's direct source, even if the *Sefer*

sheʾlemut ha-maʿaśim is not an integral and exact translation of the *Summa* but simply a selection of excerpts, at times arranged differently when compared with the textual order in the Latin version. By not having recognized these facts — in other words, by having neglected the *recensio* and a verification of the textual history — Jospe's edition is deprived of virtually all critical value. But he did not intend to offer a critical edition. He was content with a diplomatic reproduction of a textual witness with the variants of the second manuscript in the apparatus.[53] Nevertheless, with the knowledge of Falaquera's true source, it would have been possible — without too much trouble — at least to correct the biggest textual errors. Some examples:

In I, 6 (p. 417) the edited text shows itself to be definitely corrupt. The reading of the Paris MS, given in the apparatus, has no doubt to be integrated into the text, since the Vatican MS unquestionably has an omission in the text due to *homoioteleuton*.

In I, 10 (p. 417) a comparison with the Latin text allows the Hebrew *ki ʿe(y)nam* to be corrected to *ki ʿe(y)nam [yodeʿim]* — Lat.: *isti ambo sunt ignari*.

In I, 16-17 (p. 418) there is an interesting example of two manuscripts giving the same error, which can legitimately be taken as a first basis for the descending of both manuscripts from a common ancestor. The reading *rwʿym* (*rwʿym ky* in MS Vat.) is obviously a corrupt rendering of *rwsym*, i.e.: 'we should/would like (MSS: we see) the ultimate felicity for itself' (Lat. *nos autem beatitudinem ultimam propter se volumus*).

Incidentally, Jospe finds himself in good company, as the following example shows. A passage of Falaquera's *Sefer ha-maʿalot* as edited by L. Venetianer[54] reads: 'Just as it does not become a craftsman to be content with the fact that his tools are ready for use, so man should not be content with practising ethical virtues. Just as one who applies his strength (only) to preserve his own tools and limbs troubles himself about things, which are distinct from him, even if he is not conscious of this, so does anyone who contents himself with ethical values, contents himself with the fact that his end (*swpw*) lies in flesh (*b'l bśr*) and a good appearance.' It is obvious that the last expression does not make any sense, and it should be mentioned that one manuscript of the work[55] even contains the variant *swpr*. The correct reading comes from a comparison with the Arabic original of the text, which Falaquera paraphrased here, namely, the so-called *Farewell letter* (*Risālat al-widāʿ*) of Ibn Bājja (Avempace): *swsw* (his horse) (Ar. *farasuhu*)![56]

3. Concluding remarks

To conclude, we quote once again from the same article[57] of Housman which was referred to above: 'It is supposed that there has been progress in the science of textual criticism, and the most frivolous pretender

has learnt to talk superciliously about "the old unscientific days". The old unscientific days are everlasting; they are here and now; they are renewed perennially by the ear which takes formulas in, and the tongue which gives them out again, and the mind which meanwhile is empty of reflexion and stuffed with self-complacency ... Such a man as Scaliger, living in our time, would be a better critic than Scaliger was; but we shall not be better critics than Scaliger by the simple act of living in our own time.'

We will not allow Housman, who concludes with a rather arrogant assertion ('Textual criticism, like most other sciences, is an aristocratic affair, not communicable to all men, nor to most men'[58]) to have the last word, however. Instead we choose Giorgio Pasquali, a master of the same stature, but more neutral and optimistic: 'I would be content if the reader of this book [*i.e.*: *Storia della tradizione* ...] were convinced of the fact that, from the beginning, decisions must be made in order to reconstruct an original text by an ancient author and that the ability to do that cannot be replaced by all kinds of mechanical rules. And I would be content if he doesn't believe anyone anymore who wants to make him believe — more or less in good faith — that the critical editor's job is a mechanical one. It is not; it is a methodical one, which is as it were the opposite. On the most impressive (because most historical) page of his book (*Textual Criticism*), Maas compared the tradition with a watercourse which gradually picks up more and more streams and flows through all kinds of soil-types, thereby carrying their traces with it and losing its original colour. In order to get rid of this, one must know the chemical composition of the waters of the streams and the geological composition of the soil-types. Unmetaphorically speaking: One should know the cultures which have left their traces in each tradition. One should know history.'[59]

NOTES

[1] This article is based on a guest lecture at the Martin-Buber-Institut für Judaistik of the University of Cologne in January 1990. The lecture was held in German and then translated into English for the purpose of publication in this journal.

[2] *PCA* 18, 1922, 67-84 = *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, vol. III, Cambridge 1972, 1058-1069. See on the author D.R. Shakleton Bailey, 'A.E. Housman as Textual Critic,' in: *La critica del testo. Atti del secondo congresso della società italiana di storia del Diritto*, Florence 1971, I, pp. 739-748; S. Timpanaro, *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, Padua 1981[2] (1st ed. Florence 1963), pp. 95-97; A. Momigliano, in: *Athenaeum* 52, 1974, 368-370.

[3] Cf. A. Stussi (ed.), *La critica del testo*, Bologna 1985, p. 29 (with additional bibliographical references).

[4] Freiburg-Göttingen 1978, pp. 373ff.

[5] Caroli Francisci Houbigantii *Notæ criticæ in universos Veteris Testament libros cum hebraice, tum graece scrip-*

tos..., I, Frankfurt/M. 1772, cxx. The reference to the *Notæ criticæ* is also found in Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, p. 375, n. 11 (cf. pp. 375f.).

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 375.

[7] Freiburg-Göttingen 1982, 77*; cf. idem, *Études* ..., p. 139.

[8] The italics are mine.

[9] *Critique textuelle* ..., p. 69*.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

[11] *Études* ..., pp. 368f.

[12] *Critique textuelle* ..., p. 77*; cf. pp. 80* and 81*.

[13] Padua 1972, pp. 33f.

[14] Cf. for this *Henoch* 5, 1983, p. 261 and in particular P.G. Borbone, 'La critica del testo e l'Antico Testamento ebraico,' in: *Riv. St. Lett. Rel.* 30, 1984, pp. 251-274 (p. 272f.).

[15] Cf. P. Sacchi. *Op. cit.* (below, note 26) p. 106.

[16] *Défense des Sentiments De quelques Théologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament. Contre la réponse du Prieur de Bolleville*, Amsterdam 1686, p. 428.

[17] *Notæ criticæ* .... I, cj; cf. J. Le Clerc, *Ars critica*, p. 398, referred to in G.L. Bauer, *Salomonis Glassii Philologia Sacra his temporibus accomodata*, II, Leipzig 1795, p. 450 (regarding the ascription of this volume to Bauer, cf. p. vii).

[18] Cf. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, 'The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text,' in: A. Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*, Cambridge, Mass. 1963, pp. 80, 89, 106 n. 91.

[19] Cf. B. Chiesa, *L'Antico Testamento ebraico secondo la tradizione palestinese*, Torino 1978, pp. 271-272.

[20] Cf. especially E. Tov, 'A Modern Textual Outlook on the Qumran Scrolls,' in: *HUCA* 1982, 11-27 (p. 26).

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

[22] *Op. cit.*, pp. 19f.

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

[24] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

[25] *Op. cit.*, p. 22. Cf. also idem, 'Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert. Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,' *JJS* 39, 1988, 5-37 (p. 35): 'We now know that the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and the *Vorlage* of the LXX do not constitute the three pillars of the biblical text, or main representatives of three imaginary textual recensions of that text, as was claimed until then [*i.e.*, before 1947] by most scholars. The myth of this tripartite division of the textual witnesses now belongs to the past for the simple reason that in each book of the Bible evidenced in Qumran we are now faced with many more than three textual entities... The magical number of three archetypal sources has thus been broken. Broken, too, is the terminology used in scholarship for the textual sources: the three "main" entities have usually been named *recensions* or *text-types*. However, in our view, a recension or text-type should contain typological characteristics (e.g. such as short, long, full of glosses) which can only be substantiated for the proto-Samaritan texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch. In consequence, this terminology is inappropriate. Instead, it is preferable to use an uncompromising term for the textual witnesses: they should be called texts. Even if this suggestion sounds simple, within the research it is a novelty.' If the evidence for this assertion is limited to that mentioned above, then it can only be hoped that this revolution which was announced as practically 'Copernican' will remain 'a novelty'.

[26] P. Sacchi, 'Il rotolo *A* di Isaia. Problemi di storia del testo,' in: *Acc. Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'* 30, 1965, 31-111 (especially pp. 47 and 89).

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

[28] *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

[29] *Op. cit.*, pp. 90-105.

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

[31] D'A.S. Avalle, *Principi di critica testuale*, Padua 1972, p. 44.

[32] *The Greek Text of Jeremiah*, Sheffield 1985, pp. 214f.

[33] *Masoreten des Westens* II, Stuttgart 1930 (New edition, Hildesheim 1967), pp. 72-77.

[34] 'The Divergencies in the Pre-Tiberian Massoretic Text,' in: *JJS* 1, 1949, p. 151.

[35] Ed. D. Markon, Jerusalem 1957, p. 58.

[36] Cf. C.H. Becker, 'Das Reich der Ismaeliten im koptischen Danielbuch,' in: *NGWG* 1916, 1-57, p. 31. 54; A. Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch* III, Leipzig 1855, pp. 78ff.; B. Lewis, 'An Apocalyptic Vision of Islamic History,' in: *BSOAS* 13, 1950, pp. 308ff.

[37] Cf. the texts in N. Wieder, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls Type of Biblical Exegesis among the Karaites,' in: *Between East and West. Essays dedicated to the memory of Béla Horovitz*, London 1958, 75-106, pp. 103ff.

[38] Cf. for the difference between textual history and textual criticism the remarks in Timpanaro, *op. cit.*, (see above n. 2), under 'Storia del testo' in the Index; in particular pp. 101-103, on the position of G. Pasquali (cf. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence 1952², new edition Milan 1974).

[39] One cannot avoid citing B. Albrektson's remark in this connection: '... exegetical devices of learned and pious rabbinical minds, whether Jews or Christian.' In: 'Difficilior lectio probabilior,' in: *OTS* 16, 1981, 5-18.

[40] E. Tov recently alluded to this, see *op. cit. (JJS* 39, above n. 25), p. 7, apparently unaware that some remarks on the same subject are to be found in B. Chiesa, *L'Antico Testamento ebraico secondo la tradizione palestinese*, Torino 1978, in particular p. 281.

[41] See on him H. Graf Reventlow, 'Bibelexegese als Aufklärung. Die Bibel im Denken des Johannes Clericus (1657-1736),' in: idem et al. (eds.), *Historische Kritik und biblischer Kanon in der deutschen Aufklärung*, Wiesbaden 1988, 1-19; for a more general assessment see Timpanaro, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 19-22.

[42] '... in quibus expenditur Hieronymi Nupera Editio Parisina, multaque ad Criticam sacram & Profanam pertinentia agitantur,' Amsterdam 1700, pp. 2-3.

[43] Cf. H. Graf Reventlow, *op. cit.* (n. 41), pp. 9-10.

[44] *Al-Farabi on the Perfect State*, Oxford 1985 (see on this: *Henoch* 8, 1986, pp. 79-83).

[45] Cf. B. Chiesa, in: *Henoch* 8, 1986, pp. 79-83.

[46] In: *Torah and Sophia. The Life and Thought of Shem Tov Ibn Falaquera*, Cincinnati 1988.

[47] On his person and work see R. Jospe, *op. cit.* (n. 46); C. Sirat, *La filosofia ebraica medievale*, Brescia 1990, pp. 300-305, 569 (Bibliography) = *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge-Paris 1985, pp. 234-238. An edition of *Sefer de'ot ha-philosophim* is being prepared by R. Jospe on the basis of the following manuscripts: Leiden Univ. Libr., Warn. 20 = Or. 4758 and Parma Bibl. Palatina, De Rossi 164 = Parmense 3156; cf. R. Jospe, *op. cit.* (n. 46), p. 48. An abstract can be found in: B. Chiesa, 'Shem Tob Ibn Falaquera, traduttore di al-Fārābī e di Averroè,' in: *Sefarad* 49, 1989, 21-35.

[48] Cf. M. Mahdi (ed.), *Kitāb al-ḥurūf. Book of Letters*, Beirut 1968, pp. 135-138, 142-145, 150-153.

[49] *Op. cit.* (n. 46), pp. 417-438.

[50] For a proof of the dependency of Falaquera's work on the Alexandrinian compendium see B. Chiesa, 'Una fonte sconosciuta dell'Etica di Falaquera: la *Summa Alexandrinorum*,' in: A. Vivian (ed.), *Biblische und judaistische Studien, Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi*, Frankfurt/M.-Bern 1990, 583-612.

[51] A number of titles could be cited: D.M. Dunlop, 'Observations on the Medieval Arabic Version of Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*,' in: *Atti del Convegno internazionale 9-15 aprile 1969, Oriente e Occidente nel Medioevo: filosofia e scienze*, Fondazione A. Volta—Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome 1971, 229-250; idem, 'The Arabic Tradition of the *Summa Alexandrinorum*,' in: *AHDLMA* 49, 1982, 229-263; M.-Th. d'Alverny, 'Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite de la "Summa Alexandrinorum",' in: *AHDLMA* 49, 1982, pp. 265-272; and cf. *ibid*, pp. 195-252 for G.B. Fowler's publication of the text of the *Summa* according to MS Admont. Stiftsbibl. 608, ff. 43v-60v (from the thirteenth century).

[52] Cf. D.M. Dunlop in: *Arabica* 21, 1974, pp. 252-263; 23, 1976, pp. 313f.

[53] The manuscripts are: MS Vat., ebr. 391, ff. 89v-105r (sixteenth century) and MS Paris, BN hébr. 700, ff. 166v-171r. Jospe gave preference — without any special reason — to the Vatican manuscript.

[54] Berlin 1894, p. 39, 12-18.

[55] The copy which L. Zunz made of the manuscript, which was supposed to be in Buxtorf's possession and which is now in: Oxford, Bodleian Library [*Cat.* II, p. 2543].

[56] M. Asín Palacios, 'La "Carta de Adiós" de Avempace,' in: *Al-Andalus* 8, 1943, p. 26, last line, and p. 63 (translation).

[57] *Op. cit.* (n. 2), vol. III, Cambridge 1972, p. 1069.

[58] *Loc. cit.*

[59] *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence 1952, pp. xi-xii.