

## The Book of the Calendar Controversy: Critical Edition

The only previous attempt to compile a comprehensive edition of this work was made by Bornstein (1904: 58–67), under the title of *Sefer ha-Mo'adim*. He did not have all the fragments that we now have; and perhaps more significantly, he made no recourse at all to the original manuscripts, relying entirely on earlier scholarly editions.

In his edition, Bornstein refrained from integrating the fragments into a single sequence, instead presenting the work in three separate sections. Because he was unaware that ENA 2556.1 belonged to the same manuscript as ENA 2555.1 and T-S 10K3 (manuscript BCC2), he published this fragment separately from the work he called *Sefer ha-Mo'adim* (ibid. 99–102). This present edition is based on a much larger number of text witnesses, and offers a fairly complete text of the work, in sequence.

Wherever the text is attested in more than one manuscript, I offer a composite text with critical apparatus. The composite text is based on readings that are preferable in spelling or grammatical construction, or that appear closer to the original text on the basis of contents or of general principles of text edition. Sometimes I have made my own conjectures, or followed those of earlier editors. I have made minor corrections where I felt that readability required it. I have omitted many of the editorial annotations that appear in the diplomatic transcriptions (e.g. that indicate deletions and interlinear insertions in the manuscripts). Vocalization and cantillation, likewise, are not included in this critical edition; for that, the reader is referred to the diplomatic editions (Chapter 8).

Rather than applying a continuous line numbering to the whole text, I have divided the text into thirty small sections, whose lines I have separately numbered. These small sections, of various length, are based on their attestation in the different manuscripts—which means, very importantly, that in terms of contents, they do not represent logical divisions. The line division in the sections of composite text (i.e. which are represented in more than one manuscript) are mine. In the sections where the text is attested in only one manuscript, the original line division has been maintained. The only exception to this is BCC 27, which is based on fragments of BCC2 and BCC5: because the *lacunae* in both fragments cover similar areas, it made more sense to follow

roughly the line division of BCC<sub>2</sub>, with the *lacunae* laid out mostly at the ends of the lines.

The *variae lectiones* and *lacunae* have been listed in two separate apparatus. In the first apparatus, the first variant reading provided is the one that has been preferred and used in my edited text. In the second apparatus, I list the *lacunae* of which the missing text is known from parallel manuscripts. Obviously, this possibility only arises in BCC sections that are attested in more than one manuscript. *Lacunae* are defined here as text or letters that are illegible or missing because of damage or poor preservation of the support or ink (as opposed to letters or words omitted by the scribe). It will be noted that in the latter part of the Book, the manuscript most affected by *lacunae* is BCC<sub>5</sub>, as it is particularly damaged. The *lacunae* are indicated in the apparatus, as usual, with square brackets and turquoise colour. For further clarification, the reader is referred again to the diplomatic editions.

In the notes on the text, I refer to biblical source passages wherever they are needed to make sense of the Hebrew. Additional references to biblical sources can be found in the diplomatic editions.