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Resumo

Neste artigo são apresentadas e analisadas algumas situações de reprodução inexata de anotações massoréticas do Códice de Leningrado B19a (L) na série Biblia Hebraica (a Biblia Hebraica [BHK], a Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia [BHS] e a Biblia Hebraica Quinta [BHQ]), publicada pela Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, de Stuttgart, na Alemanha. Além de tais obras, neste artigo são apresentadas e analisadas, também, situações de reprodução inexata de anotações da masora magna do Códice L na obra Massorah Gedolah iuxta Codicem Leningradensem B19a, publicada pelo Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, de Roma, na Itália. A BHK, a BHS, a BHQ e a Massorah Gedolah são publicações acadêmicas baseadas no Códice L, e cada uma à sua maneira, procura ser fiel ao referido manuscrito massorético. No presente artigo são identificadas situações de inexactidão e são propostas possíveis correções, tendo por base a edição fac-símile do Códice L. Uma das questões abordadas neste artigo é que o estudo da massorá é de fundamental importância para os estudos bíblicos atuais e a reprodução das anotações elaboradas pelos massoretas no período medieval devem ser, na medida do possível, fielmente reproduzidas em edições impressas modernas.
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Abstract

In this article are presented and analyzed some situations of inaccurate realization of masoretic annotations of Leningrad Codex B19a (L) in the Biblia Hebraica series (the Biblia Hebraica [BHK], the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia [BHS] and the Biblia Hebraica Quinta [BHQ]), published by Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany. Besides these works, in this article are presented and analyzed, likewise, situations of inaccurate realization of annotation from masora magna of the Codex L in the Massorah Gedolah iuxta Codicem Leningradensem B19a, published by Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Roma, Italy. The BHK, the BHS, the BHQ and the Massorah Gedolah are academic publications based on the Codex L, and each one aiming at being faithful to the masoretic manuscript. In this article are identified situations of inaccuracy and possible corrections are proposed, based on the facsimile edition of Codex L. One of the issues addressed in this article is that the study of the Masorah is of fundamental importance for the current Bible studies and the reproduction of the notes prepared by the masoretes in the medieval period shall be, insofar as possible, faithfully reproduced in modern printed editions.
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Since the publication of the Biblia Hebraica (BHK) (1929-1937), the annotations of the masora parva (mp) and masora magna (mm) of the Leningrad Codex: Firkowitch I. B19a or Codex EBP. I B19a (L) (c. 1008-1009)³ have been realized, wholly or partially, in the Biblia Hebraica series. The BHK realizes only the masora parva and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) (1967-1977) realizes the masora parva, but in corrected and normalized realization and the masora magna in a separate volume, the Massorah Gedolah iuxta Codicem Lenin-

gradensem B19a, in corrected and normalized realization too. Currently, the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (*BHQ*) (2004-) reproduces both the *masora parva* and the *masora magna* of the Codex L, in an essentially diplomatic representation, aiming at being faithful to its source. However, one can see that not always the Masorah realization of the Codex L has been carried out accurately, and errors, omissions, additions, modifications and erroneous deciphering can be found in the three editions of the *Biblia Hebraica* series and also in the *Massorah Gedolah*. Not always these works reflect what is actually in the Masorah of the Codex L.

This brief study intends to comment and to show, through selected examples, terms, expressions and masoretic notes reproduced erroneously in the *BHK, BHS* and *BHQ*. The lecture will point at the possible causes of such inaccuracies and comment on possible corrections. In addition to the three editions, the lecture will address the *Massorah Gedolah* and several cases of inaccuracies that are found in it too. The lecture completes the topic “Reprodução Inexata de Anotações Massoréticas” (“Inaccurate Realization of Masoretic Annotations”) of the chapter “Códice de Leningrado: Firkowitch I: B19a” (“Leningrad Codex: Firkowitch I: B19a”) from the future publication *Lexicon Masoreticum: Léxico de Terminologia Massorética Tiberiense*. The *Lexicon Masoreticum* is the postdoctoral work by this author to the University of São Paulo (USP), to be published in the future.

Some situations of inaccuracies were chosen to this lecture from *BHK, BHS, BHQ* and also from *Massorah Gedolah*. In this lecture were chosen sixteen situations: four from *BHK*, four from *BHS*, five from *BHQ* and three from *Massorah Gedolah*.

**Biblia Hebraica (BHK)**

1 Chronicles 11:4: annotation in the *masora parva* to the expression          (Hebr. and all Israel).
Codex L: ([the expression appears] thirty-four times in the middle of the verse, and it always has this same form when it stands at the beginning of the verse).  

BHK: ([the expression appears] thirty-four times in the middle of the verse, and it always has this same form when it stands at the beginning of the verse).

In the BHK this masoretic annotation is almost identical to its source, but there are some textual differences: in the Codex L the masoretic expression אֲשֵׁר נִשְׁמַת נַפְסִים נַפְסִים (Aram. in the middle of a verse) is abbreviated as בָּנָאֵת נַפְסִים, but in the BHK the same expression is abbreviated as בָּנָאֵת מִסְמָכָה (in the Codex L the dot is above of the letter mēm [מל] of the first term, but is above of the letter ‘ain [אן] in the BHK; in the Codex L the second term is abbreviated as מִסְמָכָה, but is abbreviated as מִסְמָכָה in the BHK). In the Codex L the masoretic expression אֲשֵׁר נִשְׁמַת נַפְסִים נַפְסִים (Aram. the beginning of a verse) is abbreviated as רַע מִסְמָכָה, but in the BHK the same expression is abbreviated as רַע מִסְמָכָה (in the Codex L the letter ‘ālep̄ [ל] of the first term is broken, but the same letter has a dot in the BHK; in the Codex L the second term is abbreviated as מִסְמָכָה and no dot, but the same term is abbreviated as מִסְמָכָה with dot above of the letter qôp̄ [מ] in the BHK).

The BHS has another note with corrections:

BHS: ([the expression appears] thirty-five times).

Job 34:13: note in the masora parva to the expression בְּנֵי (Hebr. and who).

---

Codex L: three verses which have in them, in the first part of the verse, the word "נְכוֹכִים" [Hebr. who], and after there are three words and the forth word is the expression "וַיֶּלֶכֶת וּמְלַיְיוֹן" [Hebr. and who], and the number is eight words [i.e. there are eight words in the verse]).

_BHK_: no annotation.

This extensive masoretic annotation of the Codex L is missing in the _BHK_. However, in the _BHS_ the same annotation is realized, but in altered form to make easy the understanding (in the Codex L the masoretic note has prolix writing):

_BHS_: three times in the first part of the verse appears the word "נְכוֹכִים" [Hebr. who], and after there are three words and the forth word is the expression "וַיֶּלֶכֶת וּמְלַיְיוֹן" [Hebr. and who], and in the whole verse there are eight words).

Daniel 5.1: note in the _masora parva_ to the word הַלְּחָן_ (Aram. feast) vocalized with the vocalic signals šəwâ’ (י) and segŏl (ן) and accentuated with the conjunctive accent munnaḥ (י).  

Codex L: (unique with the vocalic signals šəwâ’ and segŏl and the conjunctive accent munnaḥ).  

_BHK_: (unique with the vocalic signals šəwâ’ and segŏl [?]).

In the Codex L this masoretic note has four components: the term הָלְחָן (Aram. unique [hapax legomenon]) abbreviated as ה, the vocalic signals šəwâ’ (י) and segŏl (ן) and the conjunctive accent munnaḥ (י). In the _BHK_ the annotation has three components: the term הָלְחָן.


(Aram. unique [hapax legomenon]) abbreviated as י and the vocalic signals šwā’ and segōl (the conjunctive accent munnah is missing). Moreover, the same note in the BHK is almost uncleanliness. In the BHS the same annotation is realized, but in simplified form to make easy the understanding:

**BHS**: י (unique).

Daniel 9:17: annotation in the *masora parva* to the expression יָלְנָה מִקְרָשָׁה (Hebr. upon your sanctuary).

**Codex L**: יָלְנָה מִקְרָשָׁה (according to the Babylonian masoretes the expression is written as יָלְנָה מִקְרָשָׁה [Hebr. to the your sanctuary]).

**BHK**: no annotation.

This masoretic annotation of the Codex L is missing in the BHK. Observation: there is a note in the upper critical apparatus of the BHK that refers to the masoretic annotation of the Codex L: **Or יָלְנָה (second to the Eastern [Babylonian] masoretic tradition the word is יָלְנָה [Hebr. to]). However, in the BHS there is a different annotation: **BHS**: י (three times).

Images: Codex L and BHK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex L</th>
<th>BHK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 11:4 (<em>mp</em>)</td>
<td><img src="BHK.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Job 34:13 (*mp*)  
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**Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS)**

Genesis 24:7: note in the *masora parva* to the expression לָכֵן (Hebr. ahead of you).

Codex L: היה לך ידוהי נְקֶךְ בְּמָלֵךְ (five times, and in all book of Ezekiel there is a feminine form, except for six occurrences) (*sic*).  

*BHS*: no annotation.

This masoretic annotation of the Codex L is missing in the *BHS*. However, in the *BHK* the same annotation is reproduced in almost identical form:

*BHK*: היה לך ידוהי נְקֶךְ בְּמָלֵךְ (five times, and in all book of Ezekiel there is a feminine form, except for six occurrences) (*sic*).

1 Chronicles 12:7: note in the *masora parva* to the male name יֶשֶׁחַ (Hebr. and Jesiah).

---

9 This masoretic note is very prolix, confused and, probably, is corrupted. The expression לָכֵן appears in hundred-three verses in the Hebrew Bible and besides, the expression יַלָכֵן (Hebr. ahead of you) (the hipotetical feminine form) is not found in the biblical Hebrew text. EVEN-SHOSHAN, 1997, p. 605.
Codex L: בּ נָפָתְלִי אֶרֶנְהוּ (according to Ben Naphtali tradition the expression is vocalized as נְשַׁרְתָּה [Hebr. and Jesiah]).

**BHS**: בֶּן לָבֶן אֶשְׁרָא (this is written according to Ben Asher tradition).

In the Codex L this masoretic annotation refers to the Ben Naphtali tradition and mentions a vocalization variant between the Ben Asher tradition and the Ben Naphtali tradition. However, the same note in the **BHS** is different and only mentions the Ben Asher tradition, but ignores the Ben Naphtali tradition. In the text of the **BHS** is found the Ben Asher lecture, but, would be very important inform about the Ben Naphtali lecture as seen in the Masorah of the Codex L. Nevertheless, in the **BHK** the same annotation is reproduced in almost identical form:

**BHK**: בּ נָפָתְלִי אֶרֶנְהוּ (according to Ben Naphtali tradition the expression is vocalized as נְשַׁרְתָּה [Hebr. and Jesiah]).

1 Chronicles 27:26: annotation in the *masora parva* to the verbal expression לֵשָׁי (Hebr. them that did).

Codex L: נָנֶּה (sixteen times written with the letter yôḏ).  

**BHS**: נָנֶה (sixteen times written with the letter yôḏ, six times from them appears in this book [i.e. in the 1 Chronicles], and once is a male name).

In the Codex L the masoretic note נָנֶּה refers only to the verbal expression לֵשָׁי (Hebr. them that did). At the same verse the masoretic annotation לֵשָׁי לְשָׁם נֵבֶר refers to the male name נֵבֶר (Hebr. Chelub). In the **BHS** there is an incorrect junction of two different

---

notes and both refer to the verbal expression נֶפֶשׁ (Hebr. them that did): ולָלֶה כַּנֶּר + זֶה כֹּה (†). Possibly, happened confused interpretation: in the Codex L both the notes are writing in a vertical form and both are almost jointed, as one note:

The correct situation is: the note זֶה כֹּה refers only to the verbal expression נֶפֶשׁ (Hebr. them that did) and the note לָלֶה כַּנֶּר refers to the male name קַלְעָב (Hebr. Chelub). Yet, in the BHK the two masoretic annotations are reproduced correctly in almost identical forms and refer to the verbal expression and to the male name:

BHK (note to verbal expression נֶפֶשׁ [Hebr. them that did]): זֶה כֹּה (ר) (sixteen times written with the letter יֹוד). BHK (note to the male name קַלְעָב [Hebr. Chelub]): לָלֶה כַּנֶּר (unique as a male name).

Proverbs 24:29: note in the masora parva to the expression לְאִיא (Hebr. to the man).

Codex L: לְאִיא (thirty-two times vocalized with the vocalic signal qāmēš, and once לְאִיא [Hebr. and to the man]).

BHS: לְאִיא (thirty-two times).

In the Codex L the masoretic annotation has more information: the note refers to the quantity, to the vocalic signal qāmēš (ר) and also refers to the same expression with the con-

---

junction $\text{wāw} (\text{?})$. In the \textit{BHS} the same note is short and only refers to the quantity. The same masoretic note is found in the \textit{BHK} too, but is almost uncleanliness:

\textit{BHK}: $\text{ךָלֶּב} \text{ וָדֶּר} \text{ הָלָאָש} \text{ (thirty-two times vocalized with the vocalic signal qāmēṣ, and once [Hebr. and to the man]).}$

Images: Codex L and \textit{BHS}
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\textit{Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ)}

Deuteronomy 8:7: note in the \textit{masora magna} to the word $\text{ךָלֶּב} \text{ ולֶב} \text{ (Hebr. water) vocalized with the vocalic signal qāmēṣ (\text{?}) and accentuated with the disjunctive accent zāqēp qātān (\text{?}).}$

Codex L: $\text{ךָלֶּּב} \text{ וָדֶּּר} \text{ הָלָאָש} \text{ ( […] the wilderness of Gehinnom).}^{13}$

\textit{BHQ}: $\text{ךָלֶּּב} \text{ וָדֶּּר} \text{ הָלָאָש} \text{ ( […] the wilderness of Gehinnom).}$

---

In the Codex L and in the BHQ (fascicle 5: Deuteronomy) the masoretic annotation is almost identical. The difference is found in the Aramaic mnemonic expression אִירֹן אֱלֹהִים (Aram. of Gehinnom): in the Codex L is written as דיֵל, גימל, יוֹד, הֵא’, יוֹד and final מֵאָם, but in the BHQ is written as דיֵל, גימל, יוֹד, הֵא’ and final מֵאָם (in the BHQ the second letter יוֹד is missing). The correct spelling would be דיֵל, גימל, יוֹד, הֵא’, יוֹד and final מֵאָם) and it is found in the Aramaic mnemonic in the masora magna at Joel 1:20 in the Codex L and also in the BHQ (fascicle 13: The Twelve Minor Prophets).

Judges 9:18: note in the masora magna to the expression אָדְךָ (Hebr. and you) accentuated with the disjunctive accent גֵּרְשַׁיָּמ (ג). Codex L: (…) אָדְךָ דָּמוֹן (the expression אָדְךָ [Hebr. and you] is accentuated four times with this accent, and their Aramaic mnemonic is […]).14

BHQ: (…) אָדְךָ דָּמוֹן (the expression אָדְךָ [Hebr. and you] is accentuated four times with this accent, and their Aramaic mnemonic is […]).

In the BHQ this masoretic annotation is almost identical to its source, but there are some textual differences: in the Codex L the expression אָדְךָ (Hebr. and you) is written as אָדְךָ with the disjunctive accent גֵּרְשַׁיָּמ (ג) above the letter תָו (ג), but in the BHQ this accent is missing. In the Codex L the masoretic term כְּסִיסָה (Aram. with this cantillation accent) is abbreviated as כְּסִיסָה with dot above of the letter ’אָין (אַ), but in the BHQ the same term is abbreviated as כְּסִיסֶה, but no dot.

Judges 14:10: note in the masora magna to the expression הָאֲבָרָיִה (Hebr. his father).

Codex L: (...) (a woman [angrily rushed] from her house the king [...]).

BHQ: (...) (a woman got up from her house the king [...]).

The question is about the second term of this Aramaic mnemonic. In the BHQ the second term is reproduced as קְפַה (qôp̄, mēm and tāw) (Aram. כְּפַה, got up). However, in the Codex L this term is very difficult to be read and the letters are almost unreadable. So, is the reproduction in the BHQ correct? This case is very difficult to be solved. In the Massorah Gedolah the same term is reproduced as רֵית (rēš, gîmel, zaîn and tāw) (Aram. רֵית, angrily rushed). In the Lexicon Masoreticum the term is reproduced too as רֵית, but with doubt. In this lexicon, the term is reproduced with brackets around the three first letters (ד[ם]ה רֵית). When the image of the term is much increased is possible to see that the letters would be, possibly, rēš, gîmel, zaîn and tāw. The unique letter readable is the last, the letter tāw, but the three first letters are very difficult to be distinguished. This author did a comparison between this masoretic term and others masoretic terms with these same letters (rēš, gîmel, zaîn and tāw) in the Codex L facsimile and this author viewed with a critical eye the calligraphy by Samuel ben Jacob and the conclusion on this case is: the letters are, very probably, rēš, gîmel, zaîn and tāw and the term is, very probably, רֵית. Below the image in increase size:

In the Codex L the same Aramaic mnemonic is found too in the masora magna at Zachariah 13:3 and in this biblical text the term is, very clear, רֵית (rēš, gîmel, zaîn and tāw).

16 WEIL, 2001, § 1483, p. 175.
17 FRANCISCO, future publication, § 18C, p. 287.
Hosea 11:6: note in the masora parva to the expression מְנַעְרֵי הָאֵשׁ (Hebr. because of their own counsels) accentuated with the disjunctive accents תִּפְּחָה’ (ַּח’) and sillûq (ַּח’).

Codex L: תִּפְּחָה’ (twice accentuated with the disjunctive accent sôp pâsûq [i.e. sillûq]).

BHQ: תִּפְּחָה’ (twice accentuated with the disjunctive accent sôp pâsûq [i.e. sillûq]).

In the BHQ this masoretic annotation is almost identical to its source, but, again, there are some textual differences: in the Codex L the masoretic expression חַלְפֶּשֶׁה (Aram. the end of a verse) is abbreviated as חָפֵשֶׁה and in the BHQ is abbreviated as חָפֵשֶׁה. In the Codex L the first term has the letter wâw (י), but in the BHQ the same term has not it.

Qoheleth 2:12: note in the masora parva to the word הֶפְּלֶג (Hebr. what) vocalized with the vocalic signal segôl (ַל).  

Codex L: הֶפְּלֶג (twenty-four times vocalized with the vocalic signal segôl).

BHQ: הֶפְּלֶג (twenty-four times).

In the Codex L the masoretic annotation has more information: the note refers to the quantity and also to the vocalic signal. In the BHQ the same note only refers to the quantity.

Images: Codex L and BHQ
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---

18 This masoretic annotation is incorrect and the two occurrences refer only to the exact form of the expression: Hos 11:6; Ps 5:11. WEIL, 2001, § 3028, p. 336; EVEN-SHOSHAN, 1997, p. 632.

Massorah Gedolah iuxta Codicem Leningradensem B19a

Psalm 119:122: note in the masora magna to the expression הֵרִיבּ שֵׁבְרָה (Hebr. be surety for your servant).

Codex L: (…) אַמּוֹנָה רַמִּי לְפֶשֶׁת הְרֵבָּרִים (…) ([…] and the faith, allusion, to do, the words […]).

Massorah Gedolah: (…) אַמּוֹנָה לְפֶשֶׁת הְרֵבָּרִים (…) ([…] and the faith, lmn [sic], to do, the words […]).²⁰

The question is about a term in the masora magna at Psalm 119:122. In the Massorah Gedolah the term is reproduced as לְמַנּ (lāmed, mēm and final nūn) (sic) (meaning?).²¹ However, in the Codex L is found the term רֶשּׁ (rēš, mēm and zaîn) (Hebr. רֶשֶׁ, allusion). This term is found in the Aleppo Codex (A) and also in the Miqra’ot Gedolot by Jacob ben Ḥayyim in the masora magna at the same biblical text. There is a possible explanation about this mistake: the top of the letter rēš (ך) is almost stuck to the base of the letter final kāp̄ (ך) of the biblical reference (siman) מִילֵךְ מִמֵּיקַל (Hebr. מִילֵךְ מִמֵּיקַל מַמֵּילֵךְ מִמֵּיקַל, from you) (cf. Exod 33.5) in the upper line, looking like the letter lāmed (ל); the letter mēm (ם) does not present problems and the letter zaîn (ז) was confused with the letter final nūn (ן). Below the image in increase size:

So, the correct writing is the term נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (rēš, mēm and zaïn) and this interpretation is supported by the Codex A and also by the Miqra’ot Gedolot.

Daniel 1:18: note in the masora magna to the male name נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Hebr. Nebuchadnezzar).

Codex L: (...) [Hebr. Nebuchadnezzar]: one from four orphans and their biblical references are [...]).

Massorah Gedolah: ?[ytmy? [sic] [and two words]?].

The question is about the third term of the masoretic annotation. In the Massorah Gedolah the term is reproduced with hesitation as ?[ytmy? [sic] [and two words]?]. However, probably, the term is הָיִים (yôḏ, tāw, mēm and yôḏ) (Aram. יָהִים, orphans). There is an explanation and also a justification about this case: the male name נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Hebr. Nebuchadnezzar) appears in the Hebrew Bible ninety-one times. Normally, this male name appears together with others words and expressions in the middle of a verse, for example: (...) נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Hebr. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon [...] ), (... ) נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Hebr. [...] the king Nebuchadnezzar [...] ), (... ) נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Aram. [...] and Nebuchadnezzar, the king [...] ) and so on. But, there are only four texts which this male name appears quite alone and at the end of a verse, for example: נֶבֶכֶרֶשׂ (Hebr. Nebuchadnezzar.): Jer 32:1; 1 Chr 5:41; Dan 1:18 and 3:3. These only four times are יָהִים (Aram. orphans). This masoretic term of Aramaic origin belongs to

---


the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic and it is registered by Marcus Jastrow and also by Michael Sokoloff.\textsuperscript{24} A few years ago this author sent this explanation to David Marcus\textsuperscript{25} and it will be in the future fascicle of Daniel of the \textit{BHQ}.

Ezra 2:64: note in the \textit{masora magna} to the expression רֶבֶן הֹלֶל הָא רָדְבוֹן קְפַף (Hebr. as one).

Codex L: (…) דְבֵן הֹלֶל הָא רָדְבוֹן קְפַף (Aram. the wolf and all the congregation were purified, rose up […]).

\textit{Massorah Gedolah}: (…) רֶבֶן הֹלֶל הָא רָדְבוֹן קְפַף [sic], rose up […]).

The question is about the third and fourth terms of this Aramaic mnemonic. In the \textit{Massorah Gedolah} the third term is realized as רֶבֶן הֹלֶל הָא רָדְבוֹן קְפַף (qôp̄, hē’, lâmed, ’ālep̄, ’ālep̄ and yôd̄) \textit{(sic)} (meaning?) and the fourth term is reproduced as רֶבֶן הֹלֶל הָא רָדְבוֹן קְפַף (dâle, kâp̄, yôd̄ and final nûn) \textit{(sic)} (meaning?).\textsuperscript{26} However, in the Codex L the two words קְפַף (Aram. the congregation were purified). There is a possible explanation about this mistake: the two first letters of the term קְפַף, the letters ’ālep̄ (א) and yôd̄ (ו), are very close to the term קְפַף (dâle, kâp̄, yôd̄ and final nûn) \textit{(sic)} almost separated. In this situation happened an incorrect separation of words and without meaning.

Images: Codex L and \textit{Massorah Gedolah}
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\textsuperscript{25} Professor of Bible, Ancient Semitics and Masorah at the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS) and editor of \textit{Ezra-Nehemiah} fascicle of the \textit{BHQ} (Stuttgart, 2006).
\textsuperscript{26} WEIL, 2001, § 3888, p. 422.
General remarks about the inaccuracies and the differences

There are situations of inaccuracies in the BHK and also in the BHS, and there are incorrect notes in the both editions. However, occasionally there are situations of any correct annotation in the BHK, but the same annotation is incorrect in the BHS and vice versa. In the BHK some notes are not found and in the BHS several notes are modified. In some cases, probably, Paul E. Kahle (1875-1965) (the Masorah editor to the BHK) and Gérard E. Weil (1926-1986) (the Masorah editor to the BHS) did not understand some masoretic annotations when they prepared the BHK and the BHS. In some situations, the mistakes are simple confusion of letters or unreliable transcriptions of abbreviations. This author would like to know why the situations of omission in the BHK and in the BHS. But, unfortunately, he don’t has any answer. The editors have forgotten some masoretic notes? In reprints of both editions this situation has not been corrected.

There are few differences between the BHQ and the Codex L and this edition reproduces very accurateness its source and the realization is very suitable. This edition shows important progress in the realization of masoretic annotations from Codex L to the Biblia Hebraica series. Occasionally there are some inaccuracies in transcriptions. Almost all the cases the inaccuracies are simple and generally are related to the transcriptions of terms, expressions, letters and dots. In 2012, this author prepared a extensive list (“Corrections, Suggestions and Observations to the Biblia Hebraica Quinta”) with corrections, suggestions and observations on the six published fascicles until today of the BHQ (from Megilloth [2004] to Judges [2011]) and this author sent it to the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and also to the president of
the editorial committee, Adrian Schenker. That this list be useful to them one day in the future, when this edition be concluded.

There are in the Massorah Gedolah several mistakes in transcriptions of letters, terms and notes. Sometimes, is possibly that Weil did not understand some annotations. Maybe, the microfilm prepared by Russian National Library of Saint Petersburg (former Leningrad Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library), in Russia was not so fine and sometimes was difficult to read the masoretic annotations from microfilm. But this is simply conjecture. In the reprint of this publication made some years ago cases of mistakes were not corrected.

This briefly lecture emphasizes that it is important that the terms, expressions and annotations of the Masorah of the Codex L should be realized correctly, for two important reasons: 1. to be an important testimony of the ample activity of the masoretes, as seen in the Codex L and 2. the usefulness of the Masorah for modern biblical research. That the BHQ, the new edition of the Biblia Hebraica series, based on Codex L, can be an important and reliable academic reference for future generations of scholars of the Masorah.
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