From time to time during the past several years, announcements have appeared to the effect that the new, fourth edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* was in the course of preparation. It is now beginning to come off the press, the first volume to appear being the Book of Isaiah.¹

The text is arranged in hemistichs, after the method of BHK,² with the vocalization and accentuation signs. The massorah parva notes are printed in the margin, while at the foot of the page the two following critical apparatuses are appended: (1) the shorter apparatus, the massorah magna, which consists mainly of references (see below); (2) the regular BH critical apparatus which contains textual variants culled from MSS and the ancient translations, and also suggested emendations. All these variants are now included in a single apparatus, as in BH²; they have not been separated into two as in B.H.K.


A: The editors propose to designate this edition BHS, to distinguish it from the previously published BHK. I have adopted these abbreviations in this paper, and also use the following:

- **L** = MS Leningrad B 19a.
- **C** = MS Cairo.
- **A** = MS Aleppo.
- **BR** = Biblia Rabbinica, editio Bombergiana (Venetia 1524/5).
- **S** = MS Sassoon 1053 (v. ACB, 362–364).
- **mm** = massorah magna.
- **mp** = massorah parva.

² The division into hemistichs generally follows the subject matter and does not always correspond with the accentuation signs. At times, when the page it too narrow for the entire verse to be printed on a single line, the words left over are printed at the end of
The volume opens with introductions by the editors and by G. E. Weil, which are given both in German and English versions, and then the various sigla used in the apparatuses and the abbreviations of the mp are listed and explained.

Over thirty years of scientific scholarship and critical examination of the text of the Bible are purported to be summed up in this edition, and it will presumably replace BHK as the accepted, scientific edition of the text of the Hebrew Bible. However, several problems relating to the various apparatuses accordingly arise. Here I shall survey two topics only: the text itself and the massorah apparatus.

**The Text**

The text itself is printed in new, large and pleasing type differing very little from what was used in BHK. As in the previous edition, the vocalization and accentuation signs have been modelled after the forms appearing in the MSS, with this exception: while in BHK the kametz was designated by a horizontal stroke over a dot as in the ancient MSS, in BHS it has the presently accepted form. The vowel and accentuation signs fit in well with the lettering and the work of alignment is superb. Following the accepted method of the MSS and BHK, the furtive patah is not inserted under the middle of the letter, but slightly in front. A circellus, like that in the MS and in BHK, indicates the massoretic notes in the margin.

In the MSS, this typographical distinction is customary: the dagesh in the shin is inserted between the right and centre arms of the letter, while for the sin it is inserted between the middle and left arms (ACB, 49). This could have been introduced without too much difficulty here too and the possibility of adopting the distinction in the rest of the volumes of this edition should be given earnest consideration.

While the editors have exercised scrupulous care to ensure that the vocalization and accentuation signs appear in their proper places, they were not quite so attentive to the disjunctive yetiv which so closely resembles the conjunctive mahpakh, the only distinction between them being their respective locations, the mahpakh appearing under the middle of the accented letter of the word, the yetiv to the right of the first letter. Particular care had to be paid to such words which have no vowel sign under their first letter. In certain instances the yetiv has been properly marked in BHS, for example: יִתי (1:24) and יִתי (30:11); in others, however, it has been placed directly beneath the either the preceding or the following line and enclosed in a square bracket. This method does not make for easy reading, especially where words remain over in two consecutive lines, as, for example, on p. 68 (43:25–28).
middle of the letter, as if it were indeed a *mahpakh*. This can lead to the confusion of a disjunctive with a conjunctive accent, as in יָשַׁר (18:2); שַׁקָּר (23:18); אָנֵה (25:5); אַשֶׁר (27:5); הַלּוֹ (30:32, before a *pashṭa*!); וַיְרֶד (42:24).

As in BHK the editors have chosen for their text the L version, “as it appears in the latest hand…” (Introduction, p. X). Considering the meticulous care taken by the editors in reproducing this version, we feel it a pity that they did not, in many instances, give the original (first hand) readings, since frequently these are interesting for their own sake or as reflecting the emendation of the reading of the one school by that of another. For example, in הָלֵכָה (51:9), a *hațaf-patah* has been altered to *sheva*; הָיָה (6:13) is evidently an abandonment of the Babylonian for the Palestinian version; in לָקֶר (10:1), a *ga’yah* in the *he* has been erased and inserted in the *het* — a substitution of Ben Asher’s version for that of Ben Naphtali, etc.

The editors have painstakingly proof-read their edition to ensure its complete agreement with the MS and have succeeded well in their efforts. Scores, if not hundreds, of errors that crept into BHK have been rectified. Some of these were the erroneous designation or omission of a *ga’yah* or trivial mistakes in the accentuation signs. Yet the previous edition contained some gross errors as well which have now been corrected, as יָדֵּחַ (35:1, in BHK *yâdêkh*); המעריד (36:10, BHK *mârêd*); ויאֶשֶׁר (33:2, in BHK the *shin* has no *dagesh*); יָשֶׁר (47:13, in BHK the *ayin* is marked with a *qadma*); אַתָּרָה (19:2, BHK having יָתָרָה אֶשֶׁר בְּאָשֶׁר); יֹהָנָא (22:9, BHK having יֹהָנָא אֶשֶׁר בְּאָשֶׁר); פָּהְרוּ (26:20, the *ga’yah* having been omitted in BHK); ומַצָּרִים (45:14, BHK having מַצָּרִים אָשָׁר רַּמְיָה) (50:2; in BHK the *merkha* is missing) and there are many more such instances.

Yet precisely because this edition is so free of typographical errors, I shall list a number which have still been allowed to remain, either having been carried over, uncorrected, from BHK or else have occurred here for the first time. If these are corrected in the coming editions, then, it seems to me, almost perfect accuracy will be attained. Here they are: יָכַף (6:6) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (3:24) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (3:24) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (6:6) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (3:24) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (6:6) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (3:24) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (6:6) should be יָכַף; יָכַף (3:24) should be יָכַף.

Possibly the sign under the *resh* was intended to be a vertical line, as a *ga’yah*, to designate the place of the stress, since *zarqa* is postpositive. Cf. ACB, 234, line 1.
(37:4) should be נוהי; the *maqqef* in יִרְשָׁו (37:12) is superfluous (BHK has the *maqqef* but omits the *munah*); יִרְשָׁו (37:30) should have יִרְשָׁו (40:18) should be יִרְשָׁו (the MS has יִרְשָׁו, like BHS, with the *maqqef* erased, and the sign under the *tav* is thus changed from ga’yah to merkha, the two being similar in shape; on this point there is a congruence between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, see Lipschütz, p. 32, n. 6, and his introduction, *ibid.* p. 5); דַּעַת (40:31) should be דַּעַת (so in BHK; see ACB, 67); in לֵוֶּר (45:1) the *paseq* is superfluous (it is erased in the MS); בְּכֵלֶמ (45:16) should have בְּכֵלֶמ; בְּכֵלֶמ (54:17) should have בְּכֵלֶמ; בְּכֵלֶמ (57:9) should be בְּכֵלֶמ (the *yod* is erased in the MS); in יִרְשָׁו (57:12) the *maqqef* is superfluous; the *daled* in יִרְשָׁו (57:14) should have no *dagesh*; בְּכֵלֶמ (59:16) should have בְּכֵלֶמ with a ga’yah (so in BHS, 63:5); בְּכֵלֶמ (65:5, and so in BHK) should have בְּכֵלֶמ (65:11) should be בְּכֵלֶמ; בְּכֵלֶמ (65:13) should be בְּכֵלֶמ with *munah*; בְּכֵלֶמ (30:29) should be בְּכֵלֶמ.

This edition clearly reflects the earnest effort taken to reproduce the MS accurately and without any emendation whatever. Such an approach seems to be justifiable in the editing of inscriptions, the Judaean Desert Scrolls and similar writings, but not for a MS of the nature of L which dates back to 1009. After all, other contemporaneous MSS are extant and these are no less accurate than L where instances of carelessness in marking signs and even actual errors are encountered, which no scribe can possibly avoid altogether. Yet, so faithfully have the editors of BHS adhered to this MS as their text, that even where the carelessness or error is quite patent they have left these unchanged. They have made no attempt, by comparing this version with other MSS, to establish the proper readings. Where the text as given by L seems at all feasible they have left it without making any notation; if the reading appears strange, they have inserted their observations in the critical apparatus.

Here are some examples of various manifestations in the system of L. The editors have marked יִרְשָׁו (10:17) and יִרְשָׁו (23:17) with ga’yah and tevir as does the MS, and correctly so. They should, however, have noted that the massoretic here intended to insert merkha and tevir, as we know from comparisons with other MSS. In L the *metiga* appearing together with *zaqef* is frequently omitted (ACB, 209–210), as in יִרְשָׁו (40:16), יִרְשָׁו (51:4), and the editors have so transcribed without remarking that these words bear a *metiga* together with the *zaqef* in the standard version. At times L omits the *mappiq* from the consonantal *he* as in יִרְשָׁו (2:15; 30:25; 40:9; yet that same word has the *mappiq* in 57:7), and the words were transcribed exactly so in BHS, with the additional note that most MSS and printed editions contain a *mappiq*. At times L omits the *dagesh* from the first letter of the
word following immediately after הָכָּה (ACB, 58), such as מְשֹׁלֵל (21:11), and so the words have been copied down in BHS without any note being appended that most MSS contain a dagesh in that letter. In L, patah and segol are sometimes interchanged (ACB, 70), as in מְשֹׁלֵל (22:21). It has been transcribed thus in BHS and BHK as well, although in the latter it is noted that C has ש, while in BHS nothing has been observed. L gives sheva under the tav in מְשֹׁלֵל (62:3; perhaps the vowel originally inscribed was a qametz which was subsequently corrected) and the sheva was copied down in BHS, with the remark that this sign is not found in most MSS and printed editions (and also not elsewhere in L); in מְשֹׁלֵל (46:5) the mem contains no dagesh, but in 40:25 it does; so it appears in the MS and so in BHS as well without any observation being inserted in the notes. In both places, mp L gives ב. It may be assumed that this reference means identical vocalization (for any variation would have been explicitly noted in the massorah). The mem has the dagesh in both instances in AC and other MSS. What view can the researcher gain by examining the vocalization of this edition?

In all these instances, the editors did well in reproducing the L version. It was their duty to do so. Yet it would have been better for them to have used the standard version in these instances and to mention the reading found in L in the notes. This exaggerated veneration of L only has the effect of increasing the number of exceptions and of instances of strange vocalization and accentuation which are not supported by any authentic massorah and stem only from carelessness in marking the vowels and accents in L.

On the other hand, for example, the editors failed to note another vocalization procedure which is found in L and more or less contemporaneous MSS, viz. the insertion of a shureq in a consonantal vav coming before a u vowel (ACB, 64–66): והשֹׁלֵל (45:14; 46:6; 49:7); in BHS ו only appears.

The same approach is also discernible in noting the copyist’s errors in L; the editors have generally taken account of these and remarked in the notes, as, for instance: דָּבָּר (46:4), where the shin appears without its diacritical point; הָנָּשָּׁב (65:6) has sin (in the MS, in actual fact, the point appears in about the middle of the letter); in תָּתִית (32:9) the bet has no sheva; in נֵכַּרְבּוֹ (27:1) the second bet has no dagesh; in both נֵכַּרְבּוֹ (20:1) and מְשֹׁלֵל (11:14), the furtive patah is missing; in מְשֹׁלֵל (23:8), the he has no qametz; in לֶבַּב (47:8) the accent appears on the first bet (a type of mistake frequently found in L; see ACB, 358); מִשְׁפָּרָה (66:22) has haṭaf-qametz instead of haṭaf-patah. The following have not elicited any remark at all: קֵינָה (36:9) — the qof having no dagesh; קֵינָה (57:16) — the qof having a dagesh. All these are obviously transcription errors made by the scribe in copying his MS, as a
comparison with C and other MSS would have proved. The best procedure
would have been to incorporate the accepted version in the text and quote
the erroneous L version in the notes. To retain the erroneous readings in the
text, with or without some note, only accords them an exaggerated and unde-
served importance.

Nor is this all. Anyone scrupulously examining the photocopies of L will
discover many more copyist’s errors, such as the omission of signs etc., than
the editors have recorded. Here is a random collection of obvious errors in
the MS which have not been recorded in BHS: the bet in רביעי (23:8) has
no *dagesh*, neither does the *mem* in בַּשָּׂעַ (28:20), nor does the *tet* in (36:4), but this last instance is noted in the BHK apparatus. The *samekh*
in בֵּית (66:20) is punctuated with a *tzere!* In מְשֶר (52:2), the *samekh* has
no *sheva*; in יְשֵׁר (28:24) the *yod* is punctuated with a *patah*. Both לא
(8:6) and לא (52:5) have *aleph* with *dagesh*; in יִבְּשֶׁנ (11:13b) the *yod* has
*sheva*; יִבְּשֶׁנ has first *samekh* with *dagesh* (noted in BHK apparatus).
Undoubtedly, a closer examination will reveal many more slips of the
pen of this type. Yet is it really worthwhile to record all of them in the text
itself and so to preserve them?

The excessive veneration of L and the failure to examine similar MSS are
evident in other instances as well. For example: כָּה לָּל (52:5), כָּה לָּל — here
the editors have given the version in L without noting that this is confined
to L only, and does not appear in any similar MS; it is not found in BR;
nor is it listed at all in Ginsburg’s edition of the Bible. In יִבְּשֶׁנ (40:13),
the sign in L under the first word is almost vertical — it migh be either *tifha*
or *ga’yah*. The sign under the second word seems definitely to be a *tifha*.
The editors, however, have accented the two words with *merkha* *tifha* —
while ACS have *tifha* *merkha*. The copyist seems to have had this in mind
and inserted the appropriate sign under the first word but the wrong one under
the second. 14:27b in L יְרֵב — under the *vav* there was perhaps written errone-
ously a *sheva* (such erroneous punctuation comes also in another place in
L — ACB, 358) and not corrected by the scribe who added the *shureq*. BHS:
יבֵּש, with *ga’yah*, which never appears in such circumstances nor is in ACS.
In L, the twenty-fourth *Seder* is marked in the space between the two columns,
the one side having 61:1 the other 61:9. In BHK the *Seder* marking appears
in both places, and, obviously, only one can be correct. BHS gives only 61:1
as the beginning of the *Seder* — but a comparison with other MSS (ACS)
reveals that the pericope begins at v. 9. יִבְּשֶׁנ (26:14) — under the first *yod*
in L only a *hirig* is visible, under the *het* there is a *sheva* written over an erasure.
The editors printed *yod* with *hirig* only, without noting that in all other MSS
and so BR and Ginsburg, the *yod* has also a *munah*. יִבְּשֶׁנ (33:23), in L
יִבְּש, there is a strange line under י, but it is no *ga’yah* under י; there is no
*ga’yah* in this letter in any MS.
From the foregoing it follows, that a systematic comparison of L with similar MSS would have placed this MS and its errors in proper perspective, and would also have cleared up doubtful readings in the MS. At least, the presentation of L's version with all its peculiarities and errors as if it were the only version would have been obviated.

THE MASSORAH

In preparing the massorah for BHS, G. E. Weil followed the method approved by P. Kahle in his time. The massorah itself is recorded in two critical apparatuses: the mp or small massorah which is printed in the margin of the page and which contains short notes, sometimes with reference numbers to the notes in the second apparatus; and the mm or large massorah which is printed at the bottom of the page and follows the reference numbers given in the mp, and also contains another series of reference numbers to the notes in the Massorah Gedolah (massorah magna) iuxta codicem Leningradensem B 19a, vol. I, where the mm notes in L are elaborated with the addition of place references listed in the order of their appearance in the MS. This work is to appear soon as the second volume in the BHS series, and is also to be published simultaneously by the Pontificium Institutum Biblicum in Rome. Several other volumes containing studies, indices, etc. are to form part of this same edition. Since the book has not yet come off the press, the BHS massorah notes cannot be reviewed exhaustively. Here, however, is an example of the method used in the presentation of the massorah: For the word וַעֲבָדַת (1:9) mp has the note 7, and here the editor adds the designation: Mm 2208, indicating that the details of the four instances where the word וַעֲבָדַת occurs are given in n. 2208 in the book to be published. Such an arrangement is convenient. Once the book is available the researcher will be able to look up the four quotations and their place-references without any difficulty. Furthermore the connection between the mp and mm is thereby clearly and conspicuously brought out.

Anyone studying the massoretic notes knows only too well how many obscure statements are contained in this apparatus, the notes being vague or even contradictory and erroneous. Such an investigator will be most grateful to Prof. Weil for his prodigious effort in preparing, examining and explaining the L massorah and making it an effective and easily used instrument in dealing with this edition. Any comparison of the massorah recorded here with that of BHK will reveal the crudity of the earlier as compared with the present edition, and even more so since the L massorah notes abound with mistakes, all of which have been emended and reconstituted into a corrected version
by Weil. One has merely to open the volume anywhere at random to find such errors corrected, as, for example: מִסְפָּר הָגוֹיֵים (23:17). Here mp L has ב while BHS gives ע. Reference to a concordance proves that here an error has been corrected. In גם (24:2) mp L has ב where BHS gives ע — another corrected error. For הַכּוּנָה (24:6) mp L gives ע. BHS יִכְוָנֶה ע, another correction of an error, since the word is found in other books of the Bible, and may easily be established as a hapax legomenon only in the Book of Isaiah. For בֵּנוֹדִים (24:16), mp L has לָלֶו ע, but the circulus has been inserted above the first word (where the spelling is defective!). In BHS, however, the circulus has been correctly placed above the second word. On 13:20, mp L observes: בּ וַשְׁמַע מֵעַל לְאֹל רַחֲלָם. BHS rightly gives the last ק without the ו conjunctive. And there are hundreds of such corrections.

In stark contrast to the almost exaggerated puristic approach to the text itself, which led even to the reproduction of the copyist’s errors, as stated before, an attitude of complete freedom has been adopted towards the transmission of the massorah. Weil wrote in his introduction (p. XII): “I have placed a completed and normalised commentary in the margin of the BHS which however is based exclusively on the small Masora of the manuscript L. By ‘normalised’ I mean simply that the commentary strives to use consistently the same expressions and abbreviations; and by ‘completed’, that it is supplemented by pertinent notes, where they are to be expected in the manuscript L, according to its own Masora in parallel passages, but for some reasons are missing. This supplementation has made the marginal commentary nearly three times as extensive...” This indicates that the massorah printed in BHS is based on the massorah of L, elaborates on it, explains its difficult passages, corrects its errors and supplies its deficiencies. Since the massorah of BHS is merely based on the L massorah, the apparatus understandably fails to reveal to the reader what was originally contained in, and what is merely based on, L. Weil himself asserts that the mp printed in BHS is almost three times as extensive as the L massorah itself. The additional notes have been culled from other places in L, from mm notes, etc. The reader can fully rely on the BHS notes faithfully adhering to the spirit of L, but he cannot discover whether they really are to be found at that particular location in L or not. The researcher who would want to know, for instance, how many times the massorah actually does record ע for the four instances where מַכְפֶּלֶת occurs in the Bible and how many times it has been omitted (in other words, he would want to know how complete the massoretic notes are), would not be able to elicit this information from the apparatus in BHS, since it has ע in both instances where the word occurs in Isaiah (1:9; 3:9). In L itself, however, the note is only inserted in reference to 1:9; for 3:9 there is no note at all. On the word לֵירוֹת
(3:8) a notation of \( \tilde{x} \) is to be found in BHS. The apparatus at the foot of the page reads: יְהִי יְרֵא שָׁם יַעֲשֶׂה (Ps. 78:17). In Isaiah (ibid.), L has no note at all, while in the Psalms (ibid.), this note appears in L: יְהִי יְרֵא שָׁם. The editor, then, seems to have taken his note on Isaiah in BHS from the L massorah on the Psalms.

Again, should the scholar be interested in discovering whether the L massorah contains contradictions (and at times, though rarely, such contradictions may indicate different sources), he would not be able to derive any information whatever from the massorah in BHS, since the editor has corrected all errors and eliminated all contradictions from his notes. Indeed, his emendations are generally sound, yet there must be instances where the original L note reflects a variant reading or conception. For example: בְּרֵא בֶּן (27:1); here mp L has בְּרֵא בֶּן, while BHS gives בְּרֵא בֶּן. In the other location, in L (Job 26:13), the word is, in fact, written pleine, with a yod, and mp L notes there ב. Evidently, then, the L text had a pleine reading in Job — while the L massorah (which may have originated in another school) had a defective reading (as is found in some MSS). This information can be elicited from the L massorah, but not from the BHS which has obscured all such contradictions.

יסָנָה (23:17) — here mp L reads: בֶּן תַּמָּא, while BHS has בֶּן, i.e. it has corrected the ב to ב. Indeed, the word יְשָׁנה is only twice accented on the ultima; but the massorah also includes יְשָׁנה, without the yad, as being accented on the ultima (Esther 2:14), and so also does Ginsburg (letter י, 170): יְשָׁנה בֶּן תַּמָּא... יְשָׁנה בֶּן תַּמָּא. Including both in the total number of instances is quite characteristic of the massorah method.

For בַּרְפָּא (26:1), the circellus is printed above the word בַּרְפָּא in mp L and the note states: בַּרְפָּא; but BHS places the circellus between the two words, and notes: בַּרְפָּא יְרֵא בַּרְפָּא יְרֵא בַּרְפָּא. Here, however, the word בַּרְפָּא is attached by a maqeqf to another word, and the circellus is without the yad, as being accented with zafeg. In the L massorah and in Ginsburg (letter י, no. 244), the note is worded: בַּרְפָּא יְרֵא בַּרְפָּא... יְרֵא בַּרְפָּא, i.e. the word בַּרְפָּא is twice times vocalized with qamez (not necessarily when accented with zafeg) and so it is vocalized also when accented with etnafata and sof pasuaq.

Not only has the numbering of the notes in L not been preserved, but the exact wording, too, has not been retained. Generally, the editor endeavoured to formulate his notes in the style of L, but there are many minor variations, and these are, indeed, sometimes most interesting. For example: on יָהָה (24:19), mp L gives: יָהָה; BHS, however, has יָהָה (the yad being inserted after the ֹי, and so in the note on 26:11). On 28:22, mp L observes יְרֵא יָהָה, but BHS has without the יָהָה (31:9) — here mp L has
and BHS (the circulus being printed above the verse): לִבְנָה (32:12) mp L gives לִבְנָה, while BHS has לַבְנָה; On לִבְנָה (26:15), mp L has בָּנָה, BHS gives the note as ב on both words; On 5:25, mp L has אֵאָו מְסַקְּלָדֵי נָשִּׁים מֵאָבָי, while BHS states: דֶּרֶךְ מְסַקְּלָדֵי נָשִּׁים מֵאָבָי.

Many notes have been given more fully in BHS. On הרובע (26:21), mp L has ב and BHS states: מַגָּלָה בְּהַר הָרְבעָה מַגָּלָה ב. For נַעֲרָה (24:15), mp L has מַגָּלָה בְּהַר הָרְבעָה מַגָּלָה ב and BHS states: מַגָּלָה בְּהַר הָרְבעָה מַגָּלָה ב. On the other hand, the L massorah often includes vowel signs, but BHS does not (perhaps for technical reasons). Sometimes the vocalization of L has been omitted, as for instance, in reference to נַעֲרָה (32:19) where mp L gives מַגָּלָה, and BHS only מַגָּלָה; and also מַּקְרֵיסָה (33:17) where mp L has מַגָּלָה and BHS מַגָּלָה. Upon occasion BHS states in words instead of the vocalization marks in mp L, as in נַעֲרָה (33:5), where mp L has מַגָּלָה and BHS מַגָּלָה. Many other similar instances can be cited. Generally the editor has successfully preserved the spirit of the original; even where he has not reproduced the massorah text verbatim, his formulation adopts the linguistic style of the original. Only rarely did I discover massoretic notes in BHS which contain combinations alien to the massorah, as, for instance, מַגָּלָה (1:18; 5:5).

To cite further examples here is quite unnecessary. When this edition will finally be completed, we shall have in our possession the entire small and large massorah of the L manuscript, together with its cross references, explained, arranged in order, and emended. It will be a no less effective and immensely valuable instrument for studying the massorah than the standard massorah of BR, and even more so. It is only a pity that no method was found whereby the editor’s comments, emendations and supplements could have been included without obscuring what was contained in the MS itself — i.e., to present the original L massorah intact and only afterwards to emend and expound it. Then we would have had both a dual purpose: edition of the massorah, and also its emendation and explanation. This would enable researchers not only to grapple with the massorah as such, but with its terminology and method as well, and also allow them to determine the various approaches reflected in its notes.

5 The note מַגָּלָה cannot apply to the word מַגָּלָה which occurs twice more in the Bible. On the other hand, it does not seem to refer to any other word, firstly because מַגָּלָה can be mistaken for מַגָּלָה (with dated), and secondly, because the dated has been altered to a resh in the MS, and scribes often recorded a massoretic note when introducing corrections in the text.

6 As this article goes to press I have been informed that vol. III of the Massorah Gedolah, together with an inclusive discussion of the massoretic notes, their sources will also be specified according to whether or not they appear in L or are supplemented by the editor.