PROVERBS

AN ECLECTIC EDITION WITH
INTRODUCTION AND TEXTUAL COMMENTARY

Michael V. Fox

SBL Press
Atlanta

Contents

Series Foreword

This series, The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition, offers a new model for a critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. The other current scholarly editions are diplomatic editions that present a single manuscript of the Masoretic Text supplemented by one or more text-critical apparatuses. The HBCE is an eclectic edition that combines the best (or earliest) readings from various sources into a critical text, with the data and analyses provided in the accompanying apparatus and text-critical commentary.

The HBCE editions aim to restore, to the extent possible, the manuscript that was the latest common ancestor of all the extant witnesses. This earliest inferable text is called the archetype. The archetype is not identical to the original text (however one defines this elusive term) but is the earliest recoverable text of a particular book. To be more precise, the HBCE will approximate the corrected archetype, since the archetype, like all manuscripts, will have scribal errors that can be remedied.

Many books of the Hebrew Bible circulated in multiple editions in antiquity, and sometimes these editions can be wholly or partially recovered. In such cases, the HBCE text will be plural, approximating the archetypes of each ancient edition. The critical text will consist of two or more parallel columns, which will be aligned to indicate the differences between the editions. In some cases the later editions are not wholly recoverable, and the available evidence is treated extensively in the text-critical commentary. The presentation of multiple ancient editions distinguishes the HBCE from the other critical editions.

Establishing the earliest attainable text and editions of each book is only part of the task. In the extensive text-critical commentary, we lay out the reasons for the preferred readings (including warranted conjectures), and we analyze the scribal and exegetical motives that gave rise to the secondary readings. Although many variants are simply the result of scribal error, others are deliberate revisions, motivated by the desire to explain, update, harmonize, and even expurgate the text. Our critical

edition therefore moves both backward and forward in time—backward to the earliest inferable texts and editions, and forward to the plethora of changes and interpretations that occurred during the textual life of the Hebrew Bible. In other words, the critical text establishes a book's form, and the commentary explores the panorama of inner-biblical interpretations that are embedded in the texts, editions, and early translations.

As a new model, the HBCE raises afresh many fundamental issues in textual criticism. What is a biblical book? Which stage of the biblical text is more authentic? Is the biblical text a unitary object, or is it irreducibly plural, dispersed in time and space? What do we mean by the original text? What were the hermeneutical rules of ancient scribal revisions? How did interpretive tendencies differ among the various scribal/textual traditions? How do we read a plural text of the Hebrew Bible? The HBCE reframes these issues in the light of the new data and methodological refinements of the post-Qumran era.

The HBCE does not claim to be a final or perfect text. It offers a sophisticated and comprehensive presentation of textual data, analyses, and conclusions. It consists of rigorous and innovative scholarship and aims to provide an essential resource for future research. In the light of textual resources undreamt of in previous generations, we propose to renew the pioneering researches of our predecessors and raise to a new level the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.*

Ronald Hendel
General Editor

* For further discussion of the theory and method of HBCE, see the project website at hbceonline.org.

The present volume aims at reconstructing a significant stage in the development of the biblical book of Proverbs.[1] I will later (in §1.2) define this stage, but first I must emphasize that I am not seeking to produce a different Bible or even a different form of the Bible. As Hugh Williamson rightly says (though intending a criticism), the present edition "is not a Bible, new or old" (2009, 175). "Bible" is a socioreligious concept. Whatever a religious community in the Jewish and Christian traditions considers sacred scripture is the Bible for that community, and external scholarly adjudication is irrelevant. A community's canon alone is relevant to the study of its theology, exegesis, and practices. The HBCE text thus can claim to be a Bible only in an extended sense: it aims to uncover an early stage of books that would enter the Hebrew canon.

The heart of this volume is the commentary, which provides an apparatus, then assembles the data, evaluates them, and decides on the correct form, or sometimes the correct forms, of the verse. The critical text assembles the decisions reached in the commentary into a single text. On a fundamental level, this is what critical exegetical commentaries do as well. They must include text-critical decisions, and these decisions together imply a virtual eclectic text. In fact, once a commentator modifies even a single word, she is accepting the validity of the unmodified words, at least by default. An eclectic edition brings together a scholar's critical decisions into a single text.

An eclectic text is a bolder way of displaying emendations because it places the editor's decisions front and center for the reader's critical engagement. This gives the emendations the prominence they deserve, if one is to take them seriously as the basis for interpretation. Moreover,

---

1. The series that includes the present volume was originally slated for publication as the Oxford Hebrew Bible (Oxford University Press). Earlier publications, including some of my own essays, referred to it that way.

they are set in context rather than being put forth singly and marginally. The reader can better judge how well they serve the text that has been constructed.

1. Is Text Criticism Possible?

There can be no edition of the work of a writer of former times which is satisfactory to all readers, though there might, I suppose, be at least half a dozen editions of the works of Shakespeare executed on quite different lines, each of which, to one group of readers, would be the best edition possible. (McKerrow 1939, 1)

As the demand increases for the plays of Shakespeare, so new editors will arise all with notions and new readings of their own,—till it will end perhaps by every intelligent man turning editor for himself. (anonymous reviewer, Athenaeum, 1853)

The editor [of an eclectic text] thus presents to the readers a personal view of the original text of the book of Genesis or Kings. Needless to say, the reconstruction of such an Urtext requires subjective decisions, and if textual scholars indulged their textual acumen, each scholar would create a different Urtext. (Tov 2008b, 246)

1.1. The Challenge

Text criticism of all literature presents severe conundrums to scholars who undertake it. (To those who do not, the problems are still there, just ignored.) The Hebrew Bible, in particular the book of Proverbs, raises a special set of issues. I will discuss them and explain the theoretical basis for my choices, placing them in the context of textual critical theory generally, with examples from editorial practice in other literatures.

The thorniest issue is what the eclectic text will represent, to the degree it succeeds. It cannot be the *Urtext*, the original text of a book, the form it had immediately subsequent to its composition and prior to any corruption. This goal is feasible for some biblical books, at least as a heuristic. But in the case of Proverbs, it is unclear what its *Urtext* could even refer to. Hezekiah's collection? Or the four collections in chapters 10–29 prior to later additions, which in my view include chapters 1–9 and

30–31?[1] Anyway, in a sense the book of Proverbs is *all* additions, since it is, by its own testimony, an anthology of anthologies, themselves agglomerations of proverbs, epigrams, and poems, some deriving from oral literature, others having antecedents in written wisdom, others composed afresh. At what stage do "additions" become "later"? To this complexity we can add the likelihood that proverbs are constantly being reshaped.[2] The border between *Urtext* and additions blurs. The goals have to fit the reality of the text at hand.

1.2. The Goals

The primary goal of The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition (HBCE) is to reconstruct the corrected archetypes of biblical books. I understand "archetype" as the *latest* form ancestral to the extant text-forms. This is not the *Urtext*, the original form the book had. Nor is the textual archetype the particular manuscript that was ancestral to the extant text-forms. The textual archetype is an ideal: the form of the archetype free of the errors that the authors (one surmises) would have wanted fixed. It is the *work*, as defined below. The goal of reconstructing an archetype is a heuristic, and it is unlikely that it can ever be fully attained.

In the case of Proverbs one cannot reasonably aim to recover the full archetype. The book is too multiplex, the resources too scanty, and the translations too polymorphous and ambiguous to make this goal feasible. Still, the archetype is not entirely beyond reach. When the text makes good sense and is witnessed to by the extant versions, the chances are that we have the archetype, and this is true of much of the book of Proverbs. Moreover, I will sometimes reconstruct words and phrases I consider ancestral

---

1. In ABP 1.44–47 and 322–30, and 2.499–500, I trace the development of Proverbs. The earliest level comprises chapters 10–29 as a whole. This stage is, of course, composite. It includes four collections (10:1–22:16; 22:17–24:22; 24:23–34; 25:1–29:27), which are themselves compiled from sayings of an indeterminable array of ages and authors. Later, chapters 1–9 were prefixed as an introduction to the book. Within this introduction I distinguish two stages. The earlier is a cycle of ten poems I call "Lectures": I. 1:8–19; II. 2:1–22; III. 3:1–12; IV. 3:21–35; V. 4:1–9; VI. 4:10–19; VII. 4:20–27; VIII. 5:1–23; IX. 6:20–35; X. 7:1–27. Later, and at different times, five independent poems were interspersed among (but not inside) the Lectures. These I designate "Interludes." They are A. 1:20–33; B. 3:13–20; C. 6:1–19; D. 8:1–36; E. 9:1–18. It is impossible to determine when the four appendices in chapters 30–31 were added.

2. See ABP 1.487–93 and the literature cited there.

to both M and G (more precisely, G's Hebrew source text) and thus belonging to their archetype. But I cannot do this with sufficient consistency to compose a continuous reconstruction of the archetype. We cannot reconstruct the hyparchetypes of G, M, and S, merge them into one form, and call this the archetype. In any case, we should not assume that the text lines of M, G, and S were all that ever existed.

Instead of reconstructing the archetype, I define three practical goals for this volume:

1. To reconstruct the corrected hyparchetype of the Masoretic book of Proverbs, or proto-M. This is what the HBCE text aims to represent. I understand "hyparchetype" as Paul Maas defined them in his classic handbook on editing (1956, 6). Hyparchetypes are "reconstructed variant-carriers," that is to say, deviating text-forms that derive from a single non-extant source text (at some remove) but not from each other. Their relation is collateral. I define my goal as the corrected hyparchetype because I want to correct errors even if (as is very likely) many were already in the text that reached G's lineage.

2. To recover ancient Hebrew variants (regardless of their validity) and to evaluate them. To this end I will examine the ancient translations, primarily G, S, and the regrettably few fragments from Qumran. These variants will be available in the apparatus and commentary for the reader's evaluation.

3. To reconstruct non-M hyparchetypes, which in practice means proto-G and, to a lesser extent, proto-S. These are the text-states ancestral to the source text used by the Greek and Syriac translators. If extensive reconstruction of either were possible, it would receive its own column as a parallel edition, but given the uncertainties of retroverting the translations of this book, reconstruction is feasible only sporadically. The results will be given in the apparatus and commentary and used in the critical text only when, in my view, they represent the corrected proto-M.

The basic integrity of the hyparchetypes should be maintained. One hyparchetype should not be imposed on the other, certainly not when the differences arise from deliberate innovations rather than just errors. Respecting the integrity of the hyparchetypes is particularly relevant to Proverbs, in which hyparchetypal proverb forms can be equally valid variant proverbs, such as exist within the Masoretic book of Proverbs itself.[3]

---

3. For example, Prov 13:14 and 14:27. Variant proverbs within M are precisely catalogued and interconnected by Snell 1993; see esp. 35–42.

Nevertheless, the text of one line of the stemma can legitimately be corrected with the help of a reading from a parallel edition.

1.3. Theory and Practice

I follow Thomas Tanselle's distinction among "document," "text," and "work" (1989, 14–18). A document is an artifact—such as a manuscript or a printing—that carries a text. The text may be carried by one document or by many, or by oral performance. The text exists apart from the documents. (Thus if all documents of a certain poem were lost but the poem exactly remembered, its text would still exist.) Behind the text is the *work*, the ideal form of the text.[4] According to Tanselle, "the work is a historical act of intention, an ideal and enduring configuration created by an author but embodied (inevitably) in a flawed form."[5] When a text holds errors, we can aim to correct them only by envisioning the work, which has a sort of platonic existence, abstracted from any of its particular textual instantiations. To take the example of Proverbs: The *documents* I mostly use are my printed copy of BHS and the digitized copy. They (and other copies of BHS) hold the same *text*. That text has errors, as does every text of Proverbs, including the one preserved in the Aleppo Codex. Text criticism aims to reconstruct the text that best embodies the work, or one stage of it.[6]

It is very unlikely that there actually was a document that held the exact text of proto-M. That is because changes, deliberate and unintended, were surely introduced at different times, some even before the later parts of the book were added. I wish to be clear that the text I have produced,

---

4. "Ideal" does not mean perfect. Tanselle (1996b, esp. 12–13) argues against this misconstrual of his views. As he explains, "The only sense in which intentionalist editors construct 'ideal' texts is that those texts may not have existed in physical form before the editors produced them; but such editors do not think of their texts as perfect in any sense, nor do these editors believe that they are uncovering the 'idea of a text' underlying any particular executed text" (13).

5. Tanselle's principles, as summarized by Cohen and Jackson 1991, 106.

6. Hendel (forthcoming) examines these issues in a different conceptual framework, the philosophy of art, but comes to conclusions compatible with the ones described here. Hendel uses a distinction, formulated by Charles Peirce, between "type" and "token." In brief, "A book as a discourse is a type (an abstract semiotic object), and the physical object with its visible symbols is its token" (section I). I understand "type" to be comparable to "work" and "token" to "document." Texts are *instantiated* by tokens but are not identical to them. In Hendel's view, the text also is a type.

however successful, never had physical existence. It is a construct. It can be defined as the proto-M *as it should have* been, the text the authors and editors wanted us to read. This goal is heuristic: approachable but not wholly attainable.

Defining my primary goal as the reconstruction of the corrected Masoretic hyparchetype provides some guidelines for deciding what material to excise as extraneous or to mark as later. I am aiming for a stage that hypothetically existed prior to the text of the proto-MT, without *its* errors and intrusions.

Copyist errors (whether early or late) can certainly be removed. For example, חצבה in Prov 9:1 is (I argue in the commentary) a copyist error, which I emend to הצבה, based on G. Moreover, glosses unrepresented in G can be eliminated as secondary to proto-M and moved to the apparatus (which makes them, in HBCE's format, *marginal* glosses). In Prov 5:22a, for example, the phrase את הרשע is not represented in G or S, and it is not integrated into the Hebrew syntax. In the case of 23:23, an entire verse is eliminated from the HBCE text.

There are a large number of septuagintal pluses, consisting of lines, verses, and even full poems. Some, perhaps most, were composed in Greek; for example, the epigram on the bee in 6:8*a*–8*c* certainly was. But even when I think that an addition had a Hebrew basis and that I can retrovert it (for example, 9:12*a*–12*b*), I will confine it to the commentary. Such additions arose in the proto-G tradition in or prior to translation. In practice, the distinction between originally Hebrew and originally Greek additions is very hard to determine.

There are also septuagintal minuses of stichoi and couplets, which are unlikely to be the translator's deliberate doing. Many of these minuses are accidental omissions, such as Prov 1:16, "for their feet run to harm; they rush to shed blood." (The verse is essential to the context and probably lost in G through parablepsis.) Other minuses are less easily explained, as, for example, several verses in 15:27*a*–16:9 (see the introduction to that section in the commentary); 18:23–19:2; and 20:14–19. It is quite likely that M continued to develop after the G transmission went its own way, but unless there is evidence that they are additions to proto-M, I maintain them in the HBCE text. To be sure, scribes are more likely to add than to deliberately subtract, but for an editor to mechanically insist on the shorter text does an injustice to the diversity and complexity of scribal practice.[7]

---

7. For example, the large plus in 4QSam[a] in 1 Sam 11 (about Nahash's gouging

More problematic are presumptive scribal additions that reached G as well as M and were therefore present in proto-M. These may be short glosses such as נשים in 14:1 or sentences such as 8:13a, "The fear of the Lord means hating evil." I am trying to reproduce not just proto-M but a *better*, more *correct* form of that text, that is, the corrected hyparchetype. I argue that some components in proto-M are extraneous to the literary integrity of *the unit they are in*. These are marked in the HBCE text by parentheses, which I use in a way comparable to the ancient scribal sigla antisigma-sigma. These are almost identical in form to modern parentheses and are found in Qumran texts and even in M itself, where they were thought to be inverted-*nun*s (see Tov 2004, 201–2, and figs. 8.1 and 8.2). These sigla usually marked words as extra, that is to say, words that the scribe knew to be absent from another copy of the work. By identifying some components as additions prior to proto-M, I am able to approximate the earlier work without disrupting proto-M's integrity. The components I identify as secondary are certainly not the only additions embedded in the proverbial collections, but their presence is hard to detect in groups of unorganized or loosely clustered proverbs.

Lateness of one literary unit relative to another does not bring it special marking, since this description would fit most of the book. For example, the first part of the book of Proverbs, chapters 1–9, was prefixed to the proverb collections, chapters 10–29, or perhaps 10–31 (see note 1). But prior to these chapters there was no book of Proverbs.

In all this, it must be emphasized, my reconstructions and literary-critical proposals are based on exegesis, which I first provided in ABP and include, in less detail, in the commentary of the present volume. None of them can claim certainty.

1.4. AUTHORS AND EDITORS

As an editor I try to recover the text the authors intended. My goals are in line with the position formulated by Thomas Tanselle, as developed in his

out the right eyes of the men of Reuben and Gad) is original, and its absence in M is accidental (thus Tov 2012, 311–13). In two Esther texts I have worked on, G-Esther and the Alpha Text (Fox 1991), there are demonstrable deliberate omissions. A redactor copied the Septuagintal Additions into an older form of the Alpha Text but omitted some material (listed in Fox 1991, 62–68). That at least some omissions are deliberate is shown by the way that the editor will connect the words just before and after into a new and intact sentence. I call this "cutting-and-splicing" (65–68).

A Rationale of Textual Criticism (1989) and other essays. The editor aims to construct the text that best represents the work. This is not a mechanical task but requires engaged exegesis and literary judgments. "An editor, only through his analysis and understanding of the meaning of the work in the light of his knowledge of the author and his times, will be in a position to use authorial active intention as a basis for editorial choice" (Tanselle 1976, 210).

In the 1980s and 1990s, as the author lost his privileged place in literary theory, editorial theory shifted toward a nonintentionalist paradigm. In this conception, the work as a whole exists in diachronicity, in fluctuating and multiple forms, while each text-form is an autonomous "textual moment." This view of text and editing holds considerable interest for biblical text criticism, because the Bible demonstrably exists in temporal extension, and this fact legitimates the production of different types of editions with different goals. But the diachronic perspective does not exclude the intentionalist paradigm, insofar as this aims at authorial intention.[8] But this is an editorial choice, not an absolute verity. An editor could choose to represent the form of the text known to traditional Jewish scholarship, in which case nothing but inner-Masoretic variants would be relevant. The Masoretic enterprise was a preservationist, not creative, effort. The editing of a Masoretic edition, such as the Jerusalem Crown, is oriented not to the moment (or period) of creation but to the time of textual fixation by the Ben Asher Masoretes. Yet even here intention may be relevant, insofar as an editor seeks to recover the intention not of the creators but of the preservationists. The preservationists' intention is relevant insofar as the editor has to determine the intention of numerous Masoretes whose notes often had to be decoded and evaluated. I choose the kind of intentionalist paradigm that aims at *authorship*, which to my mind makes sense only as an intentional act.

"Author" does not mean only the original author. There can be many authors in the course of a book's development, all of whom had something they wanted to communicate. In the case of Proverbs, authorship

---

8. Tanselle (1996a) surveys the increasing interest in the "collaborative or social aspects of text-production" and the "increased concern with textual instability and the significance of versions" (52). He applauds this broadening of perspective but protests at the reductionist tendency to caricature the concern with authorial intention, as if it insisted on one and only one right text by one and only one author. Intentionalist editing accommodates collaborative authorship and textual instability (54–56 and passim). The HBCE is able to do both.

is extremely diffuse and multiplex, distributed among innumerable and indeterminable individuals—authors of sayings, collectors and editors, and scribes who made *intentional* modifications. We may think of the author as a construct comprising that collectivity. It is a collectivity that promoted a certain worldview and ideology, and it is one with a "memory," in the sense that the later contributors knew their predecessors' work and both emulated it and went beyond it with literary and ideological innovations. The book of Proverbs has literary and conceptual coherence thanks to the cohesive force of tradition in the genre. Sages transmit old wisdom and use it as a model in the shaping of their own. Ideas evolve, expand, and retreat, but never in self-conscious opposition to earlier ones.

The book of Proverbs is not a haphazard assemblage of bits and pieces but a deliberate work whose growth was controlled by composers[9] who shaped the work by *selection*, choosing to incorporate sayings that were pertinent to their ideology; by composition, whether of stichoi, verses, or longer units; and by *placement*, through frequent clustering of sayings on a single topic. Given the complexity of the book's history, this collective authorship cannot be reduced to a "final editor." The collective author (or composer) is a personification of an abstraction. But given the homogeneity of the book's ideology and style, as well as the fact that the successive contributors to the book were aware of and influenced by the earlier compositional levels, collective authorship is a valid way of conceiving how the book communicates meaning.[10]

Proverbs is ultimately the creation of individuals who intended us to understand certain things. I do not know what we can read for—or write for—other than the communication of intention. Indeed, the very existence of speech and writing is a commitment to the recoverability of intention, and this recoverability is constantly confirmed when other people correctly retrieve the intentions we ourselves encode in speech and writing.

The recovery of intention is the essence of interpretation, and interpretation addresses units larger than the variants in question. That is why a careful holistic reading of a document can override typographical errors. If you read a sentence of mine with a meaningless typo (or, worse, a *mean-*

---

9. This term was suggested to me by Bernard Levinson, who suggests it as a way of embracing authors who create by both original composition and active editing, activities that are in practice often indistinguishable.

10. See ABP 1.322–30 for a discussion of part of the process.

ingful one), I hope you will mentally emend the text by reference to the "ideal" of the author's intention that you reconstruct from the wider context.[11] This text may never have existed precisely in a single text-form, but it is correct. Nothing other than the intended text is worth the reader's time. As Tanselle says,

> Of all the historical activities of textual study, the effort to reconstruct the texts of works as intended by their creators takes us deepest into the thinking of interesting minds that preceded us. We must respect the documents that make our insights possible, but we cannot rest there if we wish to experience the works created by those minds. (1989, 92)

1.5. Text and Interpretation

Different eclectic texts can be created, depending on stated goals, and no text is definitive and final. This is because, to a large extent, every edition is produced in tandem with interpretation. That is not to say that the text produced is "just" an interpretation, a "reading" that is idiosyncratic or (according to one notion of authorship) spun off by a social or ideological context. It is, rather, a *truth claim* based on interpretation. Each choice is, at some point, right or wrong, not just more or less interesting. Still, critics, true to the word's etymology in *krinein*, are making judgments, and judges cannot remove themselves from their position between facts and verdict and still render a credible decision.

This is not *all* that text criticism is. There are preparatory steps, namely, the gathering of variants (including ones retroverted from the ancient versions) and consideration of bibliography, the history of physical books. When enough exemplars are available, it is also necessary to establish a stemma to determine the historical sequence of variants and eliminate some demonstrably later ones. Mainly one must eliminate erroneous mutations. This leaves an irreducible set of competing variants for consideration by the critic, who must at this point exercise literary judgment,

---

11. I take a simple illustation of "correct archetype" from my own history of errors. In ABP 1:365, line 1, the "archetype" (i.e., the printed form) reads, "The association of two passages on kingship is more striking and may have played a role in the movement of 31:1–9, but it does explain why chapter 30 also was split in two." The correct archetype is "but it does not explain." The physical archetype of this sentence makes sense superficially but not in context. I hope that the critical reader will reconstruct the correct form.

both exegetical and aesthetic. The following commentary is full of literary judgments. For example, in Prov 26:25 I establish two variants, דולקים ("burning") and חלקים ("smooth"). I prefer the latter on the grounds that "smooth [that is, dishonest] lips" better fits the imagery and the topic of the thematic cluster in 26:20–28, namely, hostile speech. In 18:16, of the two Masoretic variants, צדק ("righteous") and ארץ ("earth"), I prefer the latter, on the grounds that "all the judges of the earth" fits the universalism of this chapter and that the paradigmatic parallelism it provides is more coherent here.

A critical edition is constructed by means of an active engagement with the author's meaning, as transmitted by the text and interpreted by the editor. Hence every edition is an ideal *construction of meaning*, and the editor is a collaborator in its creation. Tanselle writes: "[A]ll editorial work, *including that devoted to documentary editions*, is—like all other acts of reading—a construction of meaning, which may or may not have a historical orientation; when editors publish their work they are simply offering new documents that can serve in their turn as the grounding for further creations of meaning" (2001, 67). Erne, who titles his study *Shakespeare's Modern Collaborators*, writes, "Since every Shakespeare play has been perceived to need emendation in a number of passages, every modern editor can be said to be participating in this authorial reconstruction" (2008, 20). The value of the construction will be judged by its conformity with authorial meaning, as recovered by interpretation. It should be stressed that those who prefer a Masoretic reading or an entire Masoretic edition are in effect participating in this construction of meaning, albeit passively, by aligning themselves with one text-state, a medieval one

1.6. Models of Editorial Practice

Bible scholars are much impressed by the uniqueness of the Hebrew Bible and wonder if editorial practices applied to other texts are valid here as well.[12] The Bible is undoubtedly unique, but other works are unique as well. Biblical text-critical theory and practice must be comparable to what happens in other areas or risk being solipsistic, defensive, and celebratory. The modern editor of a biblical book faces a situation similar to what editors of many other works must deal with, and biblical text critics can ben-

---

12. See, for example, Williamson 2009, 163–64.

efit from attention to the theory and practices of text criticism and editing in other fields, for they often present similar problems and are amenable to similar solutions. The following two examples are intended as models for thinking about editorial practices in biblical text criticism. It goes without saying that no model will completely fit a distant domain of literature.

1.6.1. Shakespeare

Shakespearian editorial practice provides illustrations of well-thought-out approaches to problems familiar to Bible text critics (which is not to say that the Shakespearians have solved *their* problems!). *King Lear* is an interesting example, because it exists in two significantly divergent forms, the Quarto of 1608 (Q1, slightly modified and reprinted in Q2, 1619) and the First Folio of 1623 (F). Scholarly consensus holds that Q was prepared from Shakespeare's holographs or "foul papers" (his working drafts, meant for theater use) in 1608, two years after the completion of the play and while the play was still being performed—and constantly reworked—under Shakespeare's direction. In spite of its proximity to the author, the Q text, especially in its earliest impression, is flawed.[13] F differs from Q in significant ways, including major pluses and minuses that bear strongly on the play's meaning and aesthetics. There are two basic ways to deal with this duality.

Until the 1960s, editors produced eclectic editions. Furness's 1880 Variorum *King Lear* takes F as the copy-text while embedding readings from the Quartos. (Earlier, Q was the copy-text.) Furness regarded Q as by far the inferior. The Variorum's upper apparatus records all variants not in the eclectic text. Subsequent editions as well have typically used F as the copy-text and corrected it by reference to Q, usually with a limited critical apparatus. The important Arden edition (1997, with *Lear* edited by R. A. Foakes) conflates F and Q, embedding in its F copy-text some 300 lines absent from F while retaining some 110 lines absent from Q (and marking all such passages).

Most contemporary Shakespearians, however, oppose conflation. The dominant view now is that Q and F are different recensions, each

---

13. The consistent application of the "lectio difficilior" rule to *Lear* would result in a maximal mess. Albrektson (1981) has shown the failure of this rule in Bible studies. In fact, its original intent was to identify glosses that made a difficult text easier to understand, not to validate whichever variant was the least comprehensible.

with its own integrity.[14] Though the path from Q to F was complex and is in dispute, the consensus is that the latter incorporates some of Shakespeare's own revisions.[15] Hence the Oxford second edition prints the two versions as two distinct plays. Taylor (in Wells and Taylor 1986), recognizing the integrity of Q and F, chose to use Q1 as a copy-text with collations from the "variant states" in other Q printings. Nevertheless, their edition incorporates certain F readings when Q is certainly corrupt. Weis (1993, 41–46) sets Q and F on facing pages but corrects both texts as necessary. Halio, most interestingly, published companion volumes, one (1992) based on F, the other (1994) on Q, each with its own introduction and commentary. Both texts are critical editions and use the other for corrections but are not conflated. Even editors committed to the integrity of each version must sometimes correct Q from F or F from Q (Wells and Taylor 1986, 8).

None of the extant text-states of *Lear* is considered correct, and unless an editor is producing a diplomatic edition, decisions must be made that aim at a better form than any surviving document. Moreover, it is recognized that there is not necessarily a single correct form. All critical editors of *Lear* are producing text-forms that did not exist previously. They all aim at restoring some phase of Shakespeare's intention, which is imperfectly recorded in several text-states. None of the major *critical* editions of Shakespeare merely reproduces a particular printing—Q1b, say—and relegates all variants, even preferred ones, to the apparatus. (That would be the Biblia Hebraica approach.) There are publications that simply reproduce a particular printing for its historical and academic value, but they are not intended to be critical editions. One uncritical edition was produced by G. Holderness (1995), a professor of cultural studies, who is in effect a Q-fundamentalist. He deconstructs the critics (whose preference for F, he explains, entails "a distinct complicity with both authorial intentionality and with a conservative critical agenda that invests its desires in the surviving male protagonists of the tragedy" [41]) and repudiates the practice of emendation as lacking "philosophical justification" and as

---

14. See the comments of Foakes (1997, 110–46), Weis (1993, 34–40); and Taylor (Wells and Taylor, 1986, 81–86). The following account is based primarily on the discussions by Weis (1993, 4–7, 34–40) and Halio (1992, 58–91).

15. The relation between Q and F calls to mind the relation between G-Jeremiah and M-Jeremiah, as described by Tov (1985) and others, though the revisions in the latter were not authorial.

"foreground[ing] the editor at the expense of the text" (9). A similar resistance to emending M is not unknown in Bible studies.

The present volume of HBCE will use the first approach, conflation, taking M^L as its copy-text and correcting from other editions, mainly G-Proverbs, in spite of the priority of the former and the integrity of the other editions. While the HBCE approach is innovative, even radical, in Bible studies, it is the standard practice among serious Shakespearian editors and, I believe, in other fields as well.

The aim of reconstructing a stage prior to any existing documentation legitimates combining elements from different versions or editions—such as Q and F for *Lear* or G and M for the Bible—a procedure that some have objected to.[16] We are using documents and versions not as goals in themselves but as evidence of the work that lies behind them.

1.6.2. Jane Austen

The complexity of the growth and transmission of Shakespearian texts, together with their attendant uncertainties, resembles biblical textual history in significant ways. But we can also find parallels in editorial treatments of works with a very different, simpler kind of history, in which most details of composition, production, and publication are known. R. W. Chapman's 1923 Oxford edition of Jane Austen, recognized as a model of editorial care and brilliance, takes a particular printing as copy-text but make changes as necessary. These are minor, but their presence makes his unquestionably authoritative edition into a "composite." Indeed, the sub-

---

16. G. Brooke objects to eclectic texts of the Bible on the grounds that they "minimize the contribution of individual scribes and the specific creative traditions to which they may severally belong" (2005, 39). But this is precisely what noncritical editions, and even the best diplomatic editions, do by enshrining one text-state as *the* text, giving the impression that any variant from *this* is somehow a divergence from the correct text-form. This, in fact, is precisely the mentality Brooke objects to.

When properly annotated, an eclectic edition, such as the Arden and second Oxford editions of Shakespeare, preserves variants that would otherwise not come to public attention and gives them context in the history of the text. Brooke is certainly right that "each scriptural book has its own complex story to tell" (40). But an eclectic edition, with an apparatus, parallel columns for different editions, and a commentary that inquires into the textual history in all its complexity, is better equipped to tell the "complex story" than a diplomatic text that just lists variants below.

title of Chapman's edition is "the text based on collation of the early editions." It also includes conjectural emendations.[17]

Chapman does not try to reproduce Austen's original orthography, even though we can sometimes be quite sure what it was. (We have the autographs of two "cancelled" chapters from *Persuasion*.) He does not "restore" *friend* to *freind* (which Austen considered correct), *could* to *cd*, *admiral* to *adml*, or *Captain Wentworth* to *Capt. W*. (That would be like returning the Hebrew text to its unvocalized state and removing vowel letters.) Nor does Chapman restore Austen's frequent capitalization of nouns and her extensive use of dashes that appeared as paragraph divisions in printing. My point is that an edition can aspire to represent the most authentic text and to correct errors without attempting to replicate or restore the physical details of the original text-form. If this makes Chapman's edition a hybrid (and it does), it is an honor to have that label attached to HBCE.

1.7. In Conclusion

The following principles hold true of all critical texts, whether or not they are presented in eclectic form:

1. Every critical edition is a construction of meaning.
2. Every critical edition is an attempt to recreate the *work*, which is an ideal verbal construction.
3. The primary goal of textual criticism is representation of authorial intent, even when the author is an anonymous collectivity.
4. Different valid critical texts can be created, depending on stated goals and the nature of the text under study.
5. Every critical edition is an innovation.
6. A critical text (whether eclectic or diplomatic) is a hypothesis, which, however uncertain, is still a truth claim, one based on data and its interpretation and falsifiable by arguments in the same mode.

---

17. My favorite emendation: "p. 240, l. 30: *for it* A.C. Bradley: *it for* 1818 This elegant correction is perhaps not absolutely certain, but I have not been able to resist it" (Chapman's note in *Persuasion*, 295).

Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, of which an eclectic edition is just a structured manifestation, proceeds in spite of contradictions and insoluble dilemmas. But this is true of text criticism in other literatures too. In "The Monsters and the Textual Critics," T. Davis states three propositions:

> 1. Textual criticism is necessary.
> 2. Textual criticism is impossible.
> 3. Textual criticism is universal.
> In other words, we must go on, we can't go on, we go on. (1998, 95)

In this spirit I will go on.

The *Athenaeum* reviewer's observation about the plethora of editions appearing in 1853 (see the epigraph), foreseeing "every intelligent man turning editor for himself," is, in a modified sense, my goal. It is true that every trained critical reader of the Bible is his or her own editor. When I undertake a serious reading of, say, Isaiah, I use the various tools available, especially the commentaries, to get ideas for variants. Some I accept, others I reject. In the process I form my own virtual critical edition, which is the "book" of Isaiah I read. It does not, and will not, appear in print, but it is still an "edition," and it is my own. I would like every intelligent reader of the book of Proverbs to be able to use the present edition and textual commentary in a similar way: to construct a virtual edition—a text-form that will include some of the variants I propose—and, undoubtedly, others I reject, and others I never thought of. This reader's virtual edition is the one that he or she considers most effective in understanding and appreciating the book of Proverbs in its formative stages. Producing this edition is truly collaborative work, the kind that sustains all scientific efforts.

1:1 מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה בֶן־דָּוִד מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

2 לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר לְהָבִין אִמְרֵי בִינָה׃ 3 לָקַחַת מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל צֶדֶק וּמִשְׁפָּט וּמֵישָׁרִים׃ 4 לָתֵת לִפְתָאיִם עָרְמָה לְנַעַר דַּעַת וּמְזִמָּה׃ 5 יִשְׁמַע חָכָם וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח וְנָבוֹן תַּחְבֻּלוֹת יִקְנֶה׃ 6 לְהָבִין מָשָׁל וּמְלִיצָה דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים וְחִידֹתָם׃ 7 יִרְאַת יְהוָה רֵאשִׁית דָּעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר אֱוִילִים בָּזוּ׃ פ 8 שְׁמַע בְּנִי מוּסַר אָבִיךָ וְאַל־תִּטֹּשׁ

1:1

G translates מלך ישראל as ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ισραηλ ("who ruled in Israel"). Compare the rendering of מלכי יהודה by a relative clause in Isa 1:1 and 1 Kgs 4:1. G does not represent *בישראל (מֶלֶךְ =) אשר מלך.

1:3

G: (a) δέξασθαί τε στροφὰς λόγων, (b) νοῆσαί τε δικαιοσύνην ἀληθῆ (c) καὶ κρίμα κατευθύνειν. "(a) To receive twistings of words, (b) to under-stand true righteousness, (c) and to guide justice straight." G creates three stichoi from M's two.

G 1:3a: στροφὰς λόγων ("twistings of words," i.e., convoluted say-ings) is a puzzling translation of מוסר, which is otherwise rendered by παιδεία, σοφία, and synonyms. In both Sir 39:2–3 (no Hebrew preserved) and Wis 8:8, στροφή is associated with αἰνίγματα ("enigmas"). Sir 6:22 (Hebrew) reveals an "etymological" interpretation of מוסר in the sense of twisted and difficult, probably associating it with סור ("turn aside") (CSP 50). G may also be playing on השכל and the homonymous שכל "cross"; cf. Gen 48:14 (Kuhn).

G 1:3b: G adds ἀληθῆ, an adjectival elaboration of "righteousness" for moral emphasis. CSP (64) notes that G often adds adjectives for explica-tion, e.g., (παιδὶ +) νέῳ in 1:4 and (κλοιὸν +) χρύσεον in 1:9.

G 1:3c: G translates ומישרים as an infinitive, possibly thinking of an Aramaic infinitive. De Lagarde retroverts κατευθύνειν to למישר, an Ara-maizing infinitive, but this is distant graphically. G shows considerable flexibility in the treatment of grammatical forms.

S has ܬܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܘܕܚܠܬܐ ("instruction and fear") for מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל. Since S is flexible in its treatment of the *waw*-conjunctive, this is not evidence for מוסר והשכל (contra BHS), especially since S's idea that השכל means "fear" is peculiar and unparalleled in its other occurrences in Proverbs.

1:4

G translates פתאים as ἀκάκοις "innocent." In contexts where the פתי has not yet sinned, G uses ἄκακος (1:22; 8:5; 14:15; 21:11). If one has sinned, he is an ἄφρων (7:7; 9:4, 16; 14:18; 19:25; 22:3; 27:12). (ἄκακος is also used for forms of תמ"ם in 2:21 [some G MSS] and 13:6.) In this way the translator reinforces moral polarities by dividing an ambiguous class into two morally antithetical groups (see Giese 1990, §2.11–13). For M's נער G 1:4b has παιδὶ δὲ νέῳ ("the young youth"), adding an adjective to emphasize that the verse refers to the earliest stage of instruction and more clearly distinguishing the elementary stage of education in 1:2–4 from the advanced stage in 1:5–6.

1:7   init + 2 stichoi G (7ab) (> M S) (anaph)

G: (a) ἀρχὴ [G^BS; var ἀρετή G^A] σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ, (b) σύνεσις δὲ ἀγαθὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν. (c) εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως, (d) σοφίαν δὲ καὶ παιδείαν ἀσεβεῖς ἐξουθενήσουσιν. "(a) The beginning [var 'best'] of wisdom is the fear of God, (b) and (it is) a good understanding for those who perform it. (c) And piety toward God is the beginning of knowledge, (d) but the wicked hold wisdom and instruction in contempt." Fritsch (1953, 170) regards 1:7ab as OG and 1:7cd as Hexaplaric (but unmarked). Within 1:7a, the variant ἀρετή is an alternative interpretation of ראשית and not a permutation of the majority reading ἀρχή (see ABP 1.67). Whether ראשית means "first" or "best" is still a matter of dispute.

The prefixed couplet, 1:7ab, is taken from Ps 111[110]:10: רֵאשִׁית חָכְמָה יִרְאַת יְהוָה שֵׂכֶל טוֹב לְכָל־עֹשֵׂיהֶם. (For the phenomenon of anaphora, the transfer of material from another part of G, see Heater 1982, 6 and passim.) CSP considers all four stichoi to be OG, with the translator responsible for the quotation from Psalms. However, since the addition in G 1:7a differs somewhat from the Greek of Ps 111[110]:10a (which reads ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου), as well as from G-Prov 9:10, it was likely transferred in the Hebrew transmission and present in G's source text.

1:8

G: (a) ἄκουε, υἱέ, παιδείαν [G^B; var νόμους G^ASc] πατρός σου (b) καὶ μὴ ἀπώσῃ θεσμοὺς μητρός σου. "(a) Hear, son, the instruction [var 'laws'] of your father, (b) and do not reject the rules of your mother."

υἱέ: In accordance with Greek style, G-Proverbs never represents the semantically superfluous possessive suffix of the vocative בְּנִי. This and

דַרְכָּ֗ם וּמִמֹּעֲצֹ֖תֵיהֶ֣ם יִשְׂבָּֽעוּ׃ 32 כִּ֤י מְשׁוּבַ֣ת פְּתָיִ֣ם תַּֽהַרְגֵ֑ם וְשַׁלְוַ֖ת
כְּסִילִ֣ים תְּאַבְּדֵֽם׃ 33 וְשֹׁמֵ֣עַֽ לִ֭י יִשְׁכָּן־בֶּ֑טַח וְֽ֝שַׁאֲנַ֗ן מִפַּ֥חַד
רָעָֽה׃ פ 2:1 בְּ֭נִי אִם־תִּקַּ֣ח אֲמָרָ֑י וּ֝מִצְוֺתַ֗י תִּצְפֹּ֥ן אִתָּֽךְ׃
2 לְהַקְשִׁ֣יב לַֽחָכְמָ֣ה אָזְנֶ֑ךָ תַּטֶּ֥ה לִ֝בְּךָ֗ לַתְּבוּנָֽה׃ 3 כִּ֤י אִ֣ם לַבִּינָ֣ה
תִקְרָ֑א לַ֝תְּבוּנָ֗ה תִּתֵּ֥ן קוֹלֶֽךָ׃ 4 אִם־תְּבַקְשֶׁ֥נָּה כַכָּ֑סֶף וְֽכַמַּטְמוֹנִ֥ים
תַּחְפְּשֶֽׂנָּה׃ 5 אָ֗ז תָּ֭בִין יִרְאַ֣ת יְהוָ֑ה וְדַ֖עַת אֱלֹהִ֣ים תִּמְצָֽא׃ 6 כִּֽי־יְהוָ֥ה
יִתֵּ֣ן חָכְמָ֑ה מִ֝פִּ֗יו דַּ֣עַת וּתְבוּנָֽה׃ 7 וְצָפַ֣ן לַ֭יְשָׁרִים תּוּשִׁיָּ֑ה מָ֝גֵ֗ן לְהֹ֣לְכֵי

1:32 משובת M G (ἀνθ' ὧν γὰρ ἠδίκουν) S (ܡܬ̄ܦܚܕܐ)] מושכת 4QProvᵃ (graph ב → כ, metath וש שו →)

4Q102 מושבת ("is made to stop"?) makes no sense and is clearly a mechanical error.

G: (a) ἀνθ' ὧν γὰρ ἠδίκουν νηπίους, φονευθήσονται, (b) καὶ ἐξετασμὸς ἀσεβεῖς ὀλεῖ. "(a) For inasmuch as they wronged the innocent, they shall be murdered, (b) and interrogation will destroy the wicked." As in G 1:17, the translator regards naive youths—such as the son being addressed—as potentially the direct victims of the wicked. ἐξετασμός associates שלות with שאלה ("question," etc.) and pictures judicial interrogation. ἐξετασμός in Wis 4:6 is part of the final judgment of the sinner.

2:1 אמרי ומצותי M S (ܟܠ ܡܦܩܕܢ)] *אמרי מצותי G (ῥῆσιν ἐμῆς ἐντολῆς) (near haplog יי → י)

G reads אמרי מצות, implicitly vocalized as אִמְרֵי מִצְוֹתַי. ῥῆσις = אֵמֶר. ῥῆσιν singular = plural אמרי in 4:5 and 7:24 (Gᴬ).

2:2 לבך M S (ܠܒܟ)] *לבנך G (τῷ υἱῷ σου) (near dittog בנ → ב)

G: (a)(b) = M; (c) παραβαλεῖς δὲ αὐτὴν ἐπὶ νουθέτησιν τῷ υἱῷ σου. "(c) and you will direct it to admonition for your son." τῷ υἱῷ σου = לִבְנֶךָ. This arose by near dittography of the similar-looking ב and נ (for the phenomenon, see Kennedy 1928, 44). This stich has the obelus in SyrH and is OG. However, both the verb παραβαλεῖς and the direct object αὐτήν in 2:2c presuppose καρδίαν in 2:2b, and that stich too must be original. This implies that the translator is accommodating two variants he is aware of: לבנך and לבך. Though arising from scribal error, G's "to your son" introduces the interesting idea of the listener's gaining wisdom to teach his own son; see ABP 1.81.

G 2:2 is best read as consequent upon verse 1, since verse 2 does not start with καί. In this way G turns the understanding of wisdom into a *reward* for accepting the father's precepts. (For a similar notion in Egyptian wisdom, see ABP 1.76–77.)

2:3

G: (a) ἐὰν γὰρ τὴν σοφίαν ἐπικαλέσῃ (b) καὶ τῇ συνέσει δῷς φωνήν σου, (c) τὴν δὲ αἴσθησιν ζητήσῃς μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ. "(a) For if you call to wisdom, (b) and to understanding give your voice, (c) and seek knowledge in a great voice." בינה is here translated σοφία (elsewhere in the HB only in Prov 3:5). This rendering is perhaps under the influence of 1:20, where the figure that calls out is called σοφία. (בינה is usually translated φρόνησις or σύνεσις.) σοφία = בינה. Though 2:3c is lacking in G^BS and given an asterisk (incorrectly) in SyrH, it is OG. The more literal 2:3b is Hexaplaric and missing from important MSS (Fritsch 1953, 178; CSP). G 2:3c is a second translation of 2:2b.

V has *cor tuum* ("your heart") for M G "your voice," to supplement the demand to *call* to wisdom by the injunction to *pay attention* to it as well.

T translates אֵם as אִימָא ("mother") = אֵם, though it was certainly using a vocalized Hebrew text. This is a midrashic parsing found in b. Ber. 57a and elsewhere. It is unusual for T to diverge from both M and S.

2:6 מפיו M S (ܡܢ ܦܘܡܗ) [מפניו* G (ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ) (syn)

G's "presence/face" for M's "mouth" suggests to Toy that G is avoiding the notion of verbal inspiration of wisdom. But theological inhibitions about such an idea would not have been necessary at a time when wisdom could easily be identified with Torah. מפיו and מפניו both mean, approximately, "from him," and the latter could appear as an accidental synonym variant of the former. On this synonym pair, and this verse in particular, see Talmon 1975, 350 and n. 109.

2:7 וצפן M^K] יִצְפֹּן M^Q (gram, equal)

להליכתם M S (ܠܗܠܝܟܬܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܨܡܚ) [להלכי תם* G (τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν) (div, metath כי → יכ)

The *qere* and the *ketiv* are both future tense.

G's לְהֲלִיכָתָם ("for their going") arose by graphic error and does not make good sense.

וְאֶת־בְּרִ֖ית אֱלֹהֶ֣יהָ שָׁכֵֽחָה: 18 כִּ֤י שָׁ֣חָה אֶל־מָ֣וֶת ᵓנְתִיבָתָ֑הּ﹂ וְאֶל־
רְפָאִ֥ים מַעְגְּלֹתֶֽיהָ: 19 כָּל־בָּאֶ֥יהָ לֹ֣א יְשׁוּב֑וּן וְלֹֽא־יַשִּׂ֗יגוּ אָרְח֥וֹת
חַיִּֽים: 20 לְמַ֗עַן תֵּ֭לֵךְ בְּדֶ֣רֶךְ טוֹבִ֑ים וְאָרְח֖וֹת צַדִּיקִ֣ים תִּשְׁמֹֽר: 21 כִּֽי־
יְשָׁרִ֥ים יִשְׁכְּנוּ־אָ֑רֶץ וּ֝תְמִימִ֗ים יִוָּ֥תְרוּ בָֽהּ: 22 וּרְשָׁעִים֙ מֵאֶ֣רֶץ יִכָּרֵ֑תוּ
וּבוֹגְדִ֗ים ᵓיִסְּח֥וּ﹂ מִמֶּֽנָּה: פ   3:1 בְּ֭נִי תּוֹרָתִ֣י אַל־תִּשְׁכָּ֑ח
וּ֝מִצְוֺתַ֗י יִצֹּ֥ר לִבֶּֽךָ: 2 כִּ֤י אֹ֣רֶךְ יָ֭מִים וּשְׁנ֣וֹת חַיִּ֑ים וְ֝שָׁל֗וֹם יוֹסִ֥יפוּ לָֽךְ: 3
(חֶ֥סֶד וֶאֱמֶ֗ת אַֽל־יַֽעַזְבֻ֫ךָ) קָשְׁרֵ֥ם עַל־גַּרְגְּרוֹתֶ֑יךָ כָּ֝תְבֵ֗ם עַל־ל֥וּחַ לִבֶּֽךָ:
4 וּמְצָא־חֵ֖ן וְשֵֽׂכֶל־ט֑וֹב בְּעֵינֵ֖י אֱלֹהִ֣ים וְאָדָֽם: פ   5 בְּטַ֣ח אֶל־
יְ֭הוָה בְּכָל־לִבֶּ֑ךָ וְאֶל־בִּֽ֝ינָ֗תְךָ אַל־תִּשָּׁעֵֽן: 6 בְּכָל־דְּרָכֶ֥יךָ דָעֵ֑הוּ וְ֝ה֗וּא
יְיַשֵּׁ֥ר אֹֽרְחֹתֶֽיךָ: 7 אַל־תְּהִ֣י חָכָ֣ם בְּעֵינֶ֑יךָ יְרָ֥א אֶת־יְ֝הוָ֗ה וְס֣וּר מֵרָֽע:
8 רִ֭פְאוּת תְּהִ֣י ᵓלְשָׁרֶּ֑ךָ﹂ וְ֝שִׁקּ֗וּי לְעַצְמוֹתֶֽיךָ: 9 כַּבֵּ֣ד אֶת־יְ֭הוָה מֵהוֹנֶ֑ךָ
וּ֝מֵרֵאשִׁ֗ית כָּל־תְּבוּאָתֶֽךָ: 10 וְיִמָּלְא֣וּ אֲסָמֶ֣יךָ שָׂבָ֑ע וְ֝תִיר֗וֹשׁ יְקָבֶ֥יךָ
יִפְרֹֽצוּ:   פ   11 מוּסַ֣ר יְ֭הוָה בְּנִ֣י אַל־תִּמְאָ֑ס וְאַל־תָּ֝קֹ֗ץ
בְּתוֹכַחְתּֽוֹ: 12 כִּ֤י אֶ֥ת אֲשֶׁ֣ר יֶאֱהַ֣ב יְהוָ֣ה יוֹכִ֑יחַ וּ֝כְאָ֗ב אֶת־בֵּ֥ן יִרְצֶֽה:
13 אַשְׁרֵ֣י אָ֭דָם מָצָ֣א חָכְמָ֑ה וְ֝אָדָ֗ם יָפִ֥יק תְּבוּנָֽה: 14 כִּ֤י ט֣וֹב סַ֭חְרָהּ
מִסְּחַר־כָּ֑סֶף וּ֝מֵחָר֗וּץ תְּבוּאָתָֽהּ: 15 יְקָ֣רָה הִ֭יא ᵓמִפְּנִינִ֑ים﹂ וְכָל־
ᵓחֲפָצֶ֗יךָ﹂ לֹ֣א יִֽשְׁווּ־בָֽהּ: 16 אֹ֣רֶךְ יָ֭מִים בִּֽימִינָ֑הּ בִּ֝שְׂמֹאולָ֗הּ עֹ֣שֶׁר

2:18 שחה M] *שתה G (ἔθετο) σ′ (ὥρισεν) (graph ת → ח) || ‹נתיבתה› [נְתִיבָתָהּ] M G (τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς) S (ܒܝܬܗ) (near haplog נת → מות מות, metath בֵּיתָהּ || **2:19** ארחות חיים M ≈ S (ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܚܝܐ)] *שנות חיים G (ἐνιαυτῶν ζωῆς) (assim) (בי → יב) || **2:22** יִסְּחוּ M] יְסַּחוּ CG, Bab MS Ba (vocal, gram) || **3:3** חסד … יעזבך M G S (add) || כתבם על־לוח לבך M S > G (homoi ד⌢ד) || **3:6** דעהו M (ܘܗܘ ܢܬܪܘܨ ܠܟ ܐܘܪܚܬܟ) S > G (homoi] *הדעהו G (γνώρισε αὐτήν) (near dittog הד → ד || 1 + [fin (ܚܕܐ,) S, **3:8** *לְשָׁרֶּ֑ךָ G (τῷ σώματί σου) S (ܠܒܣܪܟ)] לשָׁרֶ֑ךָ M stichos G (elab) || **3:15** מפנינים MK (homoi יⁱ→י) || מפנינים MQ] מפנינים + 2 (vocal) || stichoi G (15bc) || *חפצים G (τίμιον) ≈ S (ܪܓܬܟ) V (quae desiderantur) T הֲפָצֶ֗יךָ M (graph מ → כ) (מדעם)

25 וַתִּפְרְע֥וּ כָל־עֲצָתִ֑י וְ֝תוֹכַחְתִּ֗י לֹ֣א אֲבִיתֶֽם: 26 גַּם־אֲנִ֭י בְּאֵידְכֶ֣ם
אֶשְׂחָ֑ק אֶ֝לְעַ֗ג בְּבֹ֣א פַחְדְּכֶֽם: 27 בְּבֹ֤א ׳כְשׁוֹאָה֙ ׀ פַּחְדְּכֶ֗ם וְֽאֵידְכֶ֗ם
כְּסוּפָ֥ה יֶאֱתֶ֑ה בְּבֹ֥א עֲלֵיכֶ֗ם צָרָ֥ה וְצוּקָֽה: 28 אָ֣ז יִ֭קְרָאֻנְנִי וְלֹ֣א אֶעֱנֶ֑ה
יְ֝שַׁחֲרֻ֗נְנִי וְלֹ֣א יִמְצָאֻֽנְנִי: 29 תַּ֭חַת כִּי־שָׂ֣נְאוּ דָ֑עַת וְיִרְאַ֥ת יְ֝הוָ֗ה לֹ֣א
בָחָֽרוּ: 30 לֹא־אָב֥וּ לַעֲצָתִ֑י נָ֝אֲצ֗וּ כָּל־תּוֹכַחְתִּֽי: 31 וְֽיֹאכְל֗וּ מִפְּרִ֥י
דַרְכָּ֑ם וּֽמִמֹּעֲצֹ֖תֵיהֶ֣ם יִשְׂבָּֽעוּ: 32 כִּ֤י מְשׁוּבַ֣ת פְּתָיִ֣ם תַּֽהַרְגֵ֑ם וְשַׁלְוַ֖ת
כְּסִילִ֣ים תְּאַבְּדֵֽם: 33 וְשֹׁמֵ֣עַֽ לִ֭י יִשְׁכָּן־בֶּ֑טַח וְ֝שַׁאֲנַ֗ן מִפַּ֥חַד
רָעָֽה: פ   2:1 בְּ֭נִי אִם־תִּקַּ֣ח אֲמָרָ֑י וּ֝מִצְוֺתַ֗י תִּצְפֹּ֥ן אִתָּֽךְ:
2 לְהַקְשִׁ֣יב לַֽחָכְמָ֣ה אָזְנֶ֑ךָ תַּטֶּ֥ה לִ֝בְּךָ֗ לַתְּבוּנָֽה: 3 כִּ֤י אִ֣ם לַבִּינָ֣ה
תִקְרָ֑א לַ֝תְּבוּנָ֗ה תִּתֵּ֥ן קוֹלֶֽךָ: 4 אִם־תְּבַקְשֶׁ֥נָּה כַכָּ֑סֶף וְֽכַמַּטְמוֹנִ֥ים
תַּחְפְּשֶֽׂנָּה: 5 אָ֗ז תָּ֭בִין יִרְאַ֣ת יְהוָ֑ה וְדַ֖עַת אֱלֹהִ֣ים תִּמְצָֽא: 6 כִּֽי־יְ֭הוָה
יִתֵּ֣ן חָכְמָ֑ה מִ֝פִּ֗יו דַּ֣עַת וּתְבוּנָֽה: 7 ׳וְצָפַן֙ לַ֭יְשָׁרִים תּוּשִׁיָּ֑ה מָ֝גֵ֗ן לְהֹ֣לְכֵי
תֹֽם: 8 לִ֭נְצֹר אָרְח֣וֹת מִשְׁפָּ֑ט וְדֶ֖רֶךְ חֲסִידָ֣ו יִשְׁמֹֽר: 9 אָ֗ז תָּ֭בִין צֶ֣דֶק
וּמִשְׁפָּ֑ט וּ֝מֵישָׁרִ֗ים כָּל־מַעְגַּל־טֽוֹב: 10 כִּֽי־תָב֣וֹא חָכְמָ֣ה בְלִבֶּ֑ךָ וְ֝דַ֗עַת
לְֽנַפְשְׁךָ֥ יִנְעָֽם: 11 מְ֭זִמָּה תִּשְׁמֹ֥ר עָלֶ֑יךָ תְּבוּנָ֥ה תִנְצְרֶֽכָּה: 12 לְ֭הַצִּ֣ילְךָ
מִדֶּ֣רֶךְ רָ֑ע מֵ֝אִ֗ישׁ מְדַבֵּ֥ר תַּהְפֻּכֽוֹת: 13 הַ֭עֹזְבִים אָרְח֣וֹת יֹ֑שֶׁר לָ֝לֶ֗כֶת
בְּדַרְכֵי־חֹֽשֶׁךְ: 14 הַ֭שְּׂמֵחִים לַעֲשׂ֣וֹת רָ֑ע יָ֝גִ֗ילוּ בְּתַהְפֻּכ֥וֹת רָֽע:
15 אֲשֶׁ֣ר אָרְחֹתֵיהֶ֣ם עִקְּשִׁ֑ים וּ֝נְלוֹזִ֗ים בְּמַעְגְּלוֹתָֽם: 16 לְ֭הַצִּ֣ילְךָ
מֵאִשָּׁ֣ה זָרָ֑ה מִ֝נָּכְרִיָּ֗ה אֲמָרֶ֥יהָ הֶחֱלִֽיקָה: 17 הַ֭עֹזֶבֶת אַלּ֣וּף נְעוּרֶ֑יהָ

1:27 מְשׁוּבַת M G (ἀντ᾽ 1:32 || (אז → וא) Mᴷ וא כשואה] כְשׁוֹאָה Mᴷᵁ כשואה
ὦν γὰρ ἠδίκουν) S (ܡܬܚܒܠܐ) מושכת 4QProvᵃ (graph ב ← כ, metath
τὰ ἐμῆς G ׳אמרי מצותי] אמרי ומצותי M S (ܕܝܠܝ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ) 2:1 || (וש → שו)
ἐμῆς ἐντολῆς) G (τῷ) ׳לבנד] לבך M S (ܠܒܟ) 2:2 || (י → יו) || (לבנד → לבך)
υἱῷ σου) (near dittog) || (בנ ← ב) 2:6 מפיו M S (ܡܢ ܦܘܡܗ) ׳מפניו] G
(ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ) (syn) || 2:7 וצפן Mᵁ יָצְפָּן Mᴷ (gram, equal) ||
2:8 חסידו Mᴷ] חֲסִידָיו Mᵁ G (εὐλαβουμένων αὐτόν) S (ܕܢܣܒܝܢ,) ≈ V (sanc-
torum) ≈ T (צדיקין) (orth)

מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה בֶן־דָּוִד מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל: 1:1

2 לָדַעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר לְהָבִין אִמְרֵי בִינָה: 3 לָקַחַת מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל צֶדֶק וּמִשְׁפָּט וּמֵישָׁרִים: 4 לָתֵת לִפְתָאיִם עָרְמָה לְנַעַר דַּעַת וּמְזִמָּה: 5 יִשְׁמַע חָכָם וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח וְנָבוֹן תַּחְבֻּלוֹת יִקְנֶה: 6 לְהָבִין מָשָׁל וּמְלִיצָה דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים וְחִידֹתָם: 7 יִרְאַת יְהוָה רֵאשִׁית דָּעַת חָכְמָה וּמוּסָר אֱוִילִים בָּזוּ: פ 8 שְׁמַע בְּנִי מוּסַר אָבִיךָ וְאַל־תִּטֹּשׁ תּוֹרַת אִמֶּךָ: 9 כִּי | לִוְיַת חֵן הֵם לְרֹאשֶׁךָ וַעֲנָקִים לְגַרְגְּרֹתֶיךָ: 10 בְּנִי אִם־יְפַתּוּךָ חַטָּאִים אַל־תֹּבֵא: 11 אִם־יֹאמְרוּ לְכָה אִתָּנוּ נֶאֶרְבָה לְדָם נִצְפְּנָה לְנָקִי חִנָּם: 12 נִבְלָעֵם כִּשְׁאוֹל חַיִּים וּתְמִימִים כְּיוֹרְדֵי בוֹר: 13 כָּל־הוֹן יָקָר נִמְצָא נְמַלֵּא בָתֵּינוּ שָׁלָל: 14 גּוֹרָלְךָ תַּפִּיל בְּתוֹכֵנוּ כִּיס אֶחָד יִהְיֶה לְכֻלָּנוּ: 15 בְּנִי אַל־תֵּלֵךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ אִתָּם מְנַע רַגְלְךָ מִנְּתִיבָתָם: 16 כִּי רַגְלֵיהֶם לָרַע יָרוּצוּ וִימַהֲרוּ לִשְׁפָּךְ־דָּם: 17 כִּי־חִנָּם מְזֹרָה הָרָשֶׁת בְּעֵינֵי כָל־בַּעַל כָּנָף: 18 וְהֵם לְדָמָם יֶאֱרֹבוּ יִצְפְּנוּ לְנַפְשֹׁתָם: 19 כֵּן אָרְחוֹת כָּל־בֹּצֵעַ בָּצַע אֶת־נֶפֶשׁ בְּעָלָיו יִקָּח: פ 20 חָכְמוֹת בַּחוּץ תָּרֹנָּה בָּרְחֹבוֹת תִּתֵּן קוֹלָהּ: 21 בְּרֹאשׁ הֹמִיּוֹת תִּקְרָא בְּפִתְחֵי שְׁעָרִים בָּעִיר אֲמָרֶיהָ תֹאמֵר: 22 עַד־מָתַי | פְּתָיִם תְּאֵהֲבוּ פֶתִי וְלֵצִים לָצוֹן חָמְדוּ לָהֶם וּכְסִילִים יִשְׂנְאוּ־דָעַת: 23 תָּשׁוּבוּ לְתוֹכַחְתִּי הִנֵּה אַבִּיעָה לָכֶם רוּחִי אוֹדִיעָה דְבָרַי אֶתְכֶם: 24 יַעַן קָרָאתִי וַתְּמָאֵנוּ נָטִיתִי יָדִי וְאֵין מַקְשִׁיב:

1:7 init + 2 stichoi G (7ab) (> M S) (anaph) ‖ 1:12 ותמימים כיורדי בור M S (וֹ,)] > G (unc) ‖ 1:15 בני M S (וֹ,)] > G (unc) ‖ וּנכרית מארץ זכרו G* (ܐܢܘܢ ܢܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘܘ ܢܟܪܝܬ, ܚܡܟܐ) M S καὶ ἄρωμεν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ γῆς μνημόσυνον ἐκ γῆς (anaph) ‖ 1:16 M S G^A MSS] > G^BS* = OG (homoi) ‖ 1:21 המיות M S (כיᵔכי) ‖ הֹמִיּוֹת*] G (τειχέων) (graph ה → ח) (ܟܘܢܐ)

SBL PRESS