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ABSTRACT. This article details the challenges faced by the author in producing a scripture index to Charlesworth’s Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. After reflections on what one expects from a scripture index, he catalogues eleven sets of ambiguities surrounding the indexing task for which answers had to be provided. Finally, he provides a few suggestions to assist future editors whose works need to be indexed.
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INTRODUCTION

Ambiguity is the enemy of controlled vocabulary. Perhaps it is more apt to say that ambiguity is the primary pest that a controlled vocabulary seeks to exterminate.

When I set out to produce A Scripture Index to Charlesworth’s Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (SIOTP), I had no idea of how many levels of ambiguity would plague my job. Cross-references to scripture in
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Charlesworth’s *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (OTP)* are strewn throughout the two volumes in footnotes, marginal notations, and introductory matter to individual texts. Initially, I thought that indexing this material would be a matter of tedious and scrupulous collating, but little more. What I discovered was that the task necessitated much more than just collation; it also involved selection, correction, organization, and a host of other processes. And these processes, I soon learned, were directly related to my assumptions about what a scripture index should be and do. The cross-reference data defined the task, but the definition of the task also determined how to organize that data and even what data to be treated. I discovered that I had to stop at every turn and make crucial decisions about how to proceed.

The index has been completed and published but what remains is to put down what I learned about the task of making a scripture index. In this article I shall attempt to map some of those areas in which ambiguity forced me to make decisions. But it will be helpful first to reflect a bit on what it is that we expect of a scripture index.

**WHAT WE EXPECT FROM A SCRIPTURE INDEX**

We expect several things from a scripture index on a work like the OTP. In the first place we expect it to be accurate; to reflect fairly the work of the contributors and editors; and that the informed decisions of the scholars be conveyed to us—the users, without interference, distortion, or loss of information.

Second, we expect the scripture index to be comprehensive, and that on several levels. The scholarship involved in producing the edition was comprehensive. In producing their translations, scholars studied all aspects of the text—literary, linguistic, historical, etc. They noted connections with biblical texts in all of these aspects. They registered these connections in introductions, footnotes and in marginal notations. A scripture index should reflect both the breadth and depth of their scholarship on the books. Only in this way will the scholarship of the contributors be available to the full spectrum of users who will want to study these works and their connections to scripture. These days many are interested in gauging the use of the Hebrew scriptures by the Pseudepigrapha writers. They want not only to understand the message of the pseudepigraphal work, but also how the writers drew on the resources, characters and themes of the Hebrew scriptures to make their points. The field of comparative Midrash in modern scholarship is driven by this concern. These
scholars seek, among other things, to understand the exegetical tech-
niques and hermeneutical moves brought to bear on the Hebrew text by
the members of the various believing communities that looked to the
Hebrew Bible to define their identity and ethos. Such users will want a
scripture index to provide them with as many points of access as possi-
ble to texts in the Pseudepigrapha that draw on materials from the Hebrew
Bible. Likewise, New Testament scholars are interested in knowing how
the thinking of Pseudepigrapha writers—or thinking similar to theirs—has
made its way into the theologies expressed by different New Testament
communities and writers. These interests and concerns argue for a
scripture index that is comprehensive in scope.

On the other hand, a scripture index that has become gigantic in its
proportions may induce users to wish for a degree of conciseness or se-
lectivity. If the index is too extensive, it will take an enormous amount
of time to sift through all of the entries just to find those that are rele-
vant. Information is lost in a mountain of data. One has only to think of
the example of the ubiquitous *Treasury of Scripture Knowledge* which
boasts “nearly 500,000 entries” to understand the problem.

Conciseness and selectivity carry a price. In the first place someone has
to sort through the data and make a series of judgment calls as to which data
are “the most relevant.” But this leaves the user at the mercy of the one
making the judgment calls. The criteria for judging “most relevant” may be
left unstated or, even worse, the process may have eliminated many or most
of the cross-references in which that user was interested.

To avoid these problems we are back to where we started, offering the
full data set to the user. But if we hope to provide a way for the user to
identify quickly the relevance of the material for themselves, then the
data have to be offered to the user in some sort of processed state. One
way to do this would be with a tagging system that accompanies the data.
The tags represent a first level of processing of the data. This is done by
employing a set of tags which are at least elaborate enough to make it pos-
sible for the user to identify easily the general nature of the data—whether
literary, linguistic, historical, etc.—without having to sort through for them-
selves all the possible connections between the two texts.

Unfortunately, scholarship seems to lack any set of standards for defin-
ing even a modestly elaborate system of tagging cross-references. Unless
the cross-reference is embedded in a footnote that specifies the sort of con-
nection being indicated, users are left to decide the nature of the connec-
tion for themselves. The inadequacy in this situation is obvious. The user
is left to re-discover the point of connection between the two texts when
the contributing scholar has already indicated the fact of the connection.
Unless required to do otherwise, scholars will pursue their work according to their own interests and specialization. One may be quite interested in form-critical matters, another in matters historical. Yet another may be interested in the influence of the Hebrew Bible on the Pseudepigrapha but not in the influence of the Pseudepigrapha on the New Testament and vice versa. As long as scholar X’s list of references are kept separate from scholar Y’s list, one will be able to guess the sort of information likely to be found. But when these scholars’ references are collated, that entire layer of information is lost to the user, buried and mixed in with a mountain of other data. The indexing process has, at this point, failed both the scholar and the reader. This problem—the collation of very different sorts of references without any system of tagging—constitutes a serious lack in indices related to biblical studies.

Inevitably, scripture indices end up being the result of a series of trade-offs between comprehensiveness on the one hand, and relevance, precision and conciseness on the other. Many scripture indices tend toward one extreme or the other. The overly comprehensive index lumps all sorts of connections together, and the user often has a hard time sorting out the aspect of the text being signaled by any particular entry. The overly selective index has suffered a culling process in which much of potential interest has been thrown out.

This leads to what is probably the central problem with scripture indices, a problem that has to do, first and foremost, not with the index or with the work being indexed, but with users of a scripture index themselves. When readers approach a work via a scripture index, their relationship to the text is different than when they are reading the text through. Readers approaching a text via a scripture index may not know anything at all about the text they are entering—nothing about manuscript history, recensions, scholarship, similarity to other works, etc. They enter the text without introduction or context. They simply plunge into the middle of it. If they want either introduction or context, they have to “back up,” as it were, and get a “running start” on the text they have discovered via the scripture index. Sometimes, just finding the text or footnote referred to in the scripture index presupposes some knowledge of the book, such as the fact that a text exists in multiple recensions (as with The Questions of Ezra or 3 Baruch), or exists only in fragments extant in works of others (as is the case, for instance, with all of the texts published in the “Supplement” in volume 2, pp. 775-920). When it comes to helping this sort of reader, the less that is presumed about their prior knowledge of the text, the better—even something as basic as the fact that The Questions of Ezra, for instance, only purports to be written by the biblical Ezra. Readers who
read the table of contents will probably pick this up; but the one who enters only via the scripture index will miss this point completely unless there is some indication in the scripture index that will lead them to this conclusion.

**CONFRONTING LEVELS OF AMBIGUITY**

With this brief introduction to the challenges inherent in the task of producing an index from the combined work of multiple authors, let us move to a discussion of the levels of ambiguity involved in the process. In what follows I shall list and discuss the various questions that arose during the task and give some idea of how I chose to address them.

**Whose Writings Should Be Indexed?**

The present work calls itself a “scripture” index. Thus, by definition, the index excludes references to Old Testament Apocrypha, Philo, Josephus, Classical and Hellenistic Greek literature, and much of the early rabbinic literature although the contributors to *OTP* included an abundance of cross-references to these writings. Including these cross-references in the index would have easily doubled its size. But whose “scriptures” do we index? The short answer is “those of Protestant Christianity.” In limiting the index in this way, we hope that many of the needs of the Jewish community and Roman and Orthodox Christian communities have been filled at the same time. But we realize that they are not totally met by the current work.

**Which of the Sets of Cross-References Do We Index?**

Readers of *OTP* will find scripture cross-references in three places: In introductory articles, footnotes, and marginal notations. First, we are told in the introductions to each volume (p. xvi in both volumes) that all contributors were asked to include a section in the introductions to their respective texts titled “relation to canonical books.” The reader attempting to study the relationship of the Pseudepigrapha to canonical books will find these discussions very illuminating, but they are written in prose and do not lend themselves as readily to scripture indexing as do the footnotes and marginal notations. Second, contributors have included scripture references in the footnotes. Judging by the editor’s note (“Explanation of Typographical and Reference Systems” on pp. xxxv-xxxvi of both volumes) and by the finished product, it would seem that
what sorts and how many references to include in the footnotes was more or less left to the judgment of the individual contributor. Third, scripture references are located in the margins. In the “Explanation of Typographical and Reference Systems,” the editor indicates, “Marginal references are kept to a minimum and except in rare occasions are limited to significant parallels in biblical and apocryphal writings.” I take this to mean that those cross-references placed in the margins received special attention that went even beyond that given to cross-references in the introductions and footnotes (see Appendices A and B).

The published index collates cross-references given in the footnotes and in the marginal notes, but not those in the introductory articles. As I shall explain, there is an overlap of about 10% between cross-references in the footnotes and those in the marginal notes. I decided to include all of the cross-references in the footnotes except for those that also received a marginal cross-reference. This was only the case when the two cross-references are to the same verse. If the marginal cross-reference was to another verse than the cross-reference in the footnote, we included both. Omitting duplications made the index more concise without losing any information for the user. In practice this means that when users find a marginal cross-reference, they will also want to glance at footnotes related to the same text to see if they include any further relevant information.

How Shall We Deal with the At-Times Ambiguous Placement of Marginal References?

On page xxxvi of both volumes we find this paragraph describing marginal references:

Care has been taken to assure that each marginal reference begins on the line to which it refers. However, in some cases this is not possible because of the length of necessary marginal references. In these cases, the marginal reference is preceded by a verse reference (i.e., the letter $v$ plus the number of the verse) so the reader can attach the marginal references to the correct verses.\(^4\)

The editors indicate that each marginal reference begins “on the line to which it refers” and not “on the first line of the verse to which it refers,” unless, of course, the cross-reference is intended for the first line of the verse. Cross-references often are placed in the middle of a verse next to the line within the verse to which the cross-reference refers. The ambiguity in this system shows up in those cases where one verse ends and
another verse begins in the same line. New verses are clearly marked with a dot between verses in the text. What is not clear is whether the marginal note is referring to the end of the previous verse in that line or to the beginning of the new verse. Since the system in OTP does not make explicit which of these two possibilities was the case, we decided that where a marginal note stands next to a line containing the start of a new verse, the marginal note should be referenced to the new verse only.

**How Shall We Distinguish Between Scripture References in the Footnotes and Those in the Margins?**

The answer to this question was actually rather simple, though the reason for it may not be self-evident. In the index, cross-references taken from footnotes all indicate the chapter and verse of the Pseudepigraphon followed by a comma, the abbreviation “ftnt” and the letter of the appropriate footnote. This will prove to be a time-saving device for the user since footnotes in OTP are listed sequentially in the body of the text, but the sigla used in the footnotes do not identify which verse in the text it is related to. Had we listed only the Pseudepigraphon chapter and verse and not the footnote letter in the index, the user would have to look up the verse, identify which footnote or footnotes it contained (sometimes several) then inspect each one to see which one contained the cross-reference.

**How Shall We Handle What Appear to Be Errors?**

Although the OTP is the product of monumental scholarly and editorial effort, there are a few cases where both the indexer and the user confront what appear to be errors. These can cause no small amount of confusion and lost time. We corrected what appeared to be obvious mistakes. For instance, *3 Enoch* 46 contains four verses listed in OTP as 1, 2, 13, and 14. *2 Baruch* 24:1 contains a cross-reference to “1 Dan 7:10.” And *Testament of Abraham* (recension A) 10:14 contains a reference to Ezekiel 53:11. Obviously there is no “First Daniel” and *Ezekiel* has only 48 chapters. In these cases, the reference was entered in the index at a corrected location but with the incorrect listing followed by “*sic.*” This allows the user to track the correct reference but still find the point in the text where it appears in OTP. One can also find cases where the information in the footnotes does not match that in the margins. For instance, footnote *a* to *2 Baruch* 27:2 refers to *Matthew* 24:71 (the chapter has only 51 verses) while the marginal note refers to *Matthew* 24:7 (the correct reference).
How Do We Handle the Inconsistency in the Use of Nomenclature and Sigla?

Perhaps the most vexing issue to contend with for both the would-be indexer and for the end user is the inconsistent use of the semicolon in OTP. On page xxxvi in both volumes we are given an explanation of the punctuation of biblical references.

Chapter and verse are separated by a colon, for example, Ex. 20:7. A subsequent verse in the same chapter is separated from the preceding by a comma. Subsequent citations in other biblical or apocryphal writings are separated by semicolons: for example, Ex 20:17, 20; Lev 9:15. Citations which are not preceded by an abbreviation refer to the respective passage in a document being footnoted.

As precise as this statement seems, it contains certain ambiguities which become clear in tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reference</th>
<th>Type of Indicator Used in OTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single reference:</td>
<td>Abbreviation of title, followed by chapter, colon, verse and no period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to a biblical or apocryphal [or any other] book</td>
<td>No title needed: List chapter, colon, verse and no period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to another passage in the current Pseudepigraphon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A subsequent reference to the same point in the Pseudepigraphon:</td>
<td>Comma separates the reference from the previous one. The second entry does not contain a(nother) reference to the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• referring to a text in the same chapter as the previous citation</td>
<td>Semicolon separates the reference from the previous. The second entry does not contain a(nother) reference to the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• referring to a text in the same book as the previous citation but not the same chapter</td>
<td>Semi colon separates the reference from the previous. The second entry does not contain a(nother) reference to the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• referring to a text in another passage in the current Pseudepigraphon</td>
<td>Begins on the next line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next reference or list of references to a subsequent point in the Pseudepigraphon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few examples will demonstrate the possibility of confusion with this system. At 2 Baruch 5:2 there is a series of cross-references in the margins: “Pss 135:13; 48:27; 85:9; 6:4ff.” Since the abbreviation is Pss (psalms) we expect references to more than one psalm since the standard abbreviation to a single Psalm is “Ps.” This assumption is strengthened when we see that 2 Baruch employs the abbreviation “Ps” at 14:10
and 17:4 and elsewhere when cross-referencing to a single Psalm. So we start by assuming that the second reference to 48:27 is also to the book of *Psalms*. However, *Psalm* 48 has only 14 verses in the English (15 in Hebrew). In fact, the second cross-reference is to *2 Baruch*. By way of contrast, at *2 Baruch* 6:7 (the very next page in *OTP*) when we confront the list of cross-references “Exod 26:31; 29:5; 25:17,” the second reference is, indeed, a reference to the book of *Exodus* 29:5 and not to *2 Baruch* 29:5.

It is clear that the same system of referencing can be used to indicate two completely different things: When one encounters a reference followed by semicolon followed by another reference without a title, the second reference could be to a text in the same biblical or apocryphal book as the previous reference or it could be to a text in the current Pseudepigraphon. The correct alternative usually comes clear in one of two ways. Either you find that a book does not have enough chapters or a chapter does not contain enough verses or (if the cross-reference fits more than one text) you find that one passage seems to contain a point of connection while the other does not. But surely neither the contributors nor the editors intended this process of second-guessing. The contributors had one particular cross-reference in mind. The sigla system adopted for the work should have been precise enough to remove ambiguity. Since it was not, however, the reader must be aware of these ambiguities.

3 *Enoch* contains the following cross-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples where the second reference seems to be a reference to another text in the same book as the first reference</th>
<th>Examples where the second reference seems to be a reference to another text in current Pseudepigraphon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3En 2:2 “Job 15:14; 25:4”</td>
<td>3En 19:2 “Ezek 10:3; 6:2; 15:1; 41:2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 6:2 “Job 14:1; 15:14”</td>
<td>3En 44:3 “Mk 9:45; 28:10”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 44:7 “Isa 42:5; 48:13; Ezek 1:22; Jer 10:12”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 45:3 “Gen 10:8; 11:9”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 45:5 “Ezek 38:2; 39:6”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 48D:8 “Gen 3:22; 1:26”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 48D:8 “Job 40:15; 41:4”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note the variation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3En 42:2 “Ex. 15:2. 3:14”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since there appears to be no way to distinguish between the two columns in terms the meaning of the semicolon, the user is forced to check virtually every occurrence of a second reference to see if it refers to a text in the same book as the first reference or to another text in the current Pseudepigraphon.

In the *Life of Adam and Eve [Apocalypse]* 33:1 we have this list of cross-references: “Acts 7:55; 1:10.” Since the second reference is a lower number than the first, we might be tempted to think that the reference is to LAE 1:10. In fact, though, LAE [Apocalypse] has only three verses in chapter one; the reference is to Acts 1:10.

*Odes of Solomon* 7:15 has this list of cross-references: “Mk 1:11; 3:7; 19:2-8; 23:18, 22; 41:13, 15.” In these cases the second and following references refer to other places in the *Odes of Solomon.* But at *OdesSol* 6:18, where the list of references is to “Jn 7:37f.; 4:10, 14,” the second and third references are to the gospel of *John.*

There were literally hundreds of such lists of cross-references with ambiguous second and following references. These ambiguities necessitated judgment calls as to what was being cross-referenced. Because of the ambiguity of the system, users of both the index and OTP have to proceed with caution.

The use of the abbreviation “Eccl.” is another example of inconsistency. It can refer both to canonical *Ecclesiastes* (*Qohelet*) and to deuterocanonical/apocryphal *Ecclesiasticus* (*Sirach*) in spite of the fact that the list of abbreviations in both OTP volumes indicates that “Eccl (Qoh) = Ecclesiastes” (I:xiv; II:xiv). However, this guideline is not always observed. In *OdesSol* 16:13, footnote g, we read this comment: “Parallels to this concept [that ‘created things run according to their courses and work their works and they are not able to cease and be idle’] are abundant; cf. *1En* 2:1-5:2; 69:20f.; *PssSol* 18:12-14; *2 Bar* 48:9; *Eccl* 16:26-28.” Since the biblical book of Ecclesiastes has only 12 chapters, we are left wondering if this reference is not to the apocryphal book of *Sirach.* Indeed, in *Sirach* 16:26-28 we read,

> When the Lord created his works from the beginning, and, in making them, determined their boundaries, he arranged his works in an eternal order, and their dominion for all generations. They neither hunger nor grow weary, and they do not abandon their tasks. They do not crowd one another, and they never disobey his word.

Clearly, the reference in footnote g is to the apocryphal book of *Sirach,* which the list of abbreviations tells us will be indicated with “Sir.”
The use of the colon provides an example of inconsistent punctuation. Chapter and verse in Bible references are usually separated with a colon. This convention is often used with non-biblical books as well, but not always. Sometimes a period is used to separate chapter and verse. In a couple of instances OTP vacillates back and forth between two systems. For instance, a period is used to separate chapter and verse in the body of the text of the Sibylline Oracles (i.e., SibOr x.xxx), but in the page header, the colon is used (i.e., x:xxx). Similarly, at Ascension of Isaiah (4:3) there is a cross-reference to the Qumran Manual of Discipline (CD) with the format x:xxx (e.g., 1:7), while the book of Jubilees refers to CD in the format x.xxx.

Occasionally one will find the comma used in unanticipated ways. For instance, at Apocalypse of Elijah 1:1 the following list of cross-references is given: “Ezek 33:1f., 6:1, 12:1, 13:1, 14:2.” According to the description given for the use of the comma, we would have expected to see semicolons used in the place of each of these commas. In fact, one finds this use of the comma frequently in the Apocalypse of Elijah (see in volume one, pp. 736, 737, 738, 750). Ezekiel the Tragedian, Exagoge: 189 refers to “Ex 12:15, 13:3.” One would have expected a semicolon.

How Shall We Handle the Complexity of the Sigla System?

There seems to be no way around the fact that the sigla used in Pseudepigrapha scholarship can be very complicated. The complexity of the system is due to the need for precision, but it still represents a significant barrier both to the would-be scripture indexer and to the prospective user of an index. Simple references in the scripture index become complex ciphers: e.g.,

- Matthew 7:13f. TAb rec. B 8:16 ftnt e
- Acts 3:10 3Bar, Introduction 2 (Gk.) ftnt h
- 1 Corinthians 2:6 SibOr 2.219 ftnt q2
- Ephesians 4:26 3En 48A:3 ftnt h
- Colossians 1:16 ApZeph A ftnt c
- 2 Thessalonians 2:8 TSol 1:00 ftnt e

The need for such a complex system is due to several factors. For example, several texts exist in multiple versions or recensions. 3 Baruch is preserved in two versions, Slavonic and Greek. The Testament of Abraham
and the *Questions of Ezra* likewise exist in two recensions (Greek for the *Testament*, Armenian for the Questions) labeled A and B. We might point to the myriad problems posed by the need to label “fragments.” The *OTP* contains a “supplement” in volume two: “Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works.” Each work in this section is extant only because a portion of it was preserved in the work of a later writer. For instance, a Jewish writer from the third or second century BCE named Philo is quoted a half dozen times in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica* (fourth century CE). The surviving fragments, thus, have two sources, so to speak: The work in its original form (which is not extant) and some still existing source in which a fragment from the earlier work is quoted. This rather complicated literary history contributes to the various ways of citing a work. Thus, Philo the Epic Poet’s works are cited, for instance, as *PhE*Poet Frags 1-2, without reference to Eusebius’s *Praeparatio Evangelica* in which they were preserved. Similarly, the five fragments of Eupolemus’ historical work are referred to as *Eup* 30:1, that is, without reference to the works in which they are quoted. On the other hand, Artipanus’ three fragments are preserved in three chapters in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*. *OTP* seems to propose two systems. One of them cites the fragment with primary reference to the location in Eusebius, e.g., *Art Frag* 3 (**PrEv** 9.27.23), that is “Artimus’ Fragment 3, (which is preserved in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica* book 9, chapter 27, verse 23).” The other system (the one used in the header of each page in *OTP*) substitutes Eusebius’ book number with Artipanus’ fragment number and comes up with a hybrid numbering system, for example, *Art Frag* 3.27.23, in which “3” stands for “fragment 3” and 27.23 stands for the chapter and verse in Eusebius work. A similar phenomenon exists with reference to the *Prayer of Joseph*, but there the fragments are simply designated A, B, and C. These examples will suffice to let the user know that when it comes to works that exist as fragments quoted in the works of others, the sigla employed to designate the location of the text can take several forms.

**How Shall We Handle Multiple Versification Systems?**

The book of *Joseph and Aseneth* is published with two versification systems. C. Burchard, the contributor, explains the complex publication history of the book (*OTP*, vol. 2, p. 200) and whence the two systems have come. The later system, devised by Philonenko, supplements the earlier system of Riessler who, Burchard contends, “obviously could not
make up his mind between short verses, as in the Bible, and longer paragraphs, as, for example, in Josephus.” Philonenko subdivides Riessler’s bigger verses into smaller ones, so that all the verses have a fairly consistent length. Burchard declines to produce another system since he is still “working with a provisional text.” Philonenko’s work on the book is apparently significant enough that, in a footnote on page 202, Charlesworth explains that

Two verse systems are provided . . . Bullets denote the primary system of verses; marginal parentheses specify Philonenko’s system. The beginning of a verse according to the secondary system is not indicated if the punctuation points to it unequivocally; when it is not obvious, the sign ‘has been inserted in the text.

Since footnotes are in abundance throughout the text, I had to decide which versification system to use to index the cross-references. In this case it was fairly easy to ignore Philonenko’s parenthetical system. This decision follows that of the editors of OTP whose versification dots are based only on Riessler’s system. (In what was apparently a typesetting oversight, both versification systems are left off of page 214.) The basic versification (Riessler’s) is simple to reconstruct since the versification dots are present in the text. However, one suspects that Philonenko supplies chapter 9 with five verses to Riessler’s two.

How Shall We Handle Sigla That Do Not Appear in the List of Abbreviations?

For instance, in a reference to Theodotian’s version of the book of Daniel the Greek symbol theta (q) appears in footnote e to 3 Baruch 1:3. This is a common enough convention to biblical scholars, but the uninitiated will look in vain in the list of abbreviations to find the definition of the symbol.

How Do We Handle References Linked to Un-Numbered Portions of the Text?

The versification system in 2 Enoch does not take into account the chapter headers contained in the longer recension [J]. Consequently the placement of the letter indicating verse 1 comes after the header. However, these headers are footnoted; these footnotes, in turn, contain scripture references. I had to decide how to index cross-references in the
footnotes to these unnumbered text portions. The best option seemed to be to treat them as though they are part of verse one in each case. Admittedly, confusion is possible with such a system.

**How Do We Give the User an Accurate Picture of the Unevenness of the Work from Book to Book?**

The reader needs to be aware that the footnotes are very uneven from book to book and reflect little uniformity of system. Some contributors concentrate on linguistic issues in footnotes and make cross-references to similar linguistic features in other works—canonical and otherwise. Others use the footnotes primarily to indicate matters of textual criticism. Some use footnotes to cite the work of other scholars, while others are virtually devoid of references to secondary literature in the footnotes.

Readers should also know that there is a great deal of variation among the contributors when it comes to internal versus external referencing. In the first place, the unevenness of the references should be clear from the fact that cross-references between books are not reciprocal. Theoretically, if there were a point of connection from one text to another, that same point of connection would exist from the other to the one. But one should not expect to find that kind of overlap in *OTP*. No attempt was made to bring an overall consistency to references. Some contributors paid special attention to internal cross-references. For instance the function of footnotes in *1 Enoch*, *2 Enoch*, *3 Enoch*, and *Ascension of Isaiah* is primarily for the purpose of indicating internal cross-references. But in other books, like *Jubilees*, there are no internal cross-references at all.

There is a great deal of variation among the contributors when it comes to indicating scripture references whether in the footnotes or in the margins. Some appear to ignore almost completely scripture cross-references. For instance, the *Letter of Aristeas* contains no marginal cross-references to canonical works and only one footnote with a scripture cross-reference. *Joseph and Aseneth* contains no marginal cross-references; all cross-references are contained in footnotes. In the section of the introduction called “Relation to canonical books” the editor of the fragment of *Jannes and Jambres* tells us:

As indicated at least as early as the Pseudo-Jonathan tradition, the Jannes and Jambres tale takes its point of departure from the biblical account of the contest between Moses and Pharaoh’s court
magicians in the plague narrative of Exodus 7 and 8. Later elaboration, though not present in our fragmentary text, links these two magicians to the birth of Moses (Ex 1-2), the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 14), the golden calf incident (Ex 32), and the oracles of Balaam (Num 22-24). Jannes and Jambres are not named in the biblical story, nor are they ever referred to anywhere else in the Old Testament.

Not until the New Testament do we again meet any reference to these two antagonists of Moses. In the often quoted verses 2 Timothy 3:8f., the author of the epistle compares false Christian teachers to Jannes and Jambres. As the latter defied truth when they opposed Moses, so the former defy truth when they champion a pattern of behavior contrary to accepted Christian standards. The end result for them will be the same as that of Jannes and Jambres. Knowledge of the tradition is assumed, but no information apart from their names is provided. (OTP, vol. 2, p. 434f)

Unfortunately, there are neither marginal notes nor footnotes in the OTP edition, undoubtedly because of the very fragmentary nature of the preserved text. As a consequence, though, there are no scripture references to index. The reader interested in pseudepigraphical embellishments on Exodus 7 and 8 will not be helped by the scripture index; they would have to read the introduction to Jannes and Jambres to be made aware of the connection. The Questions of Ezra is ostensibly composed by the biblical Ezra. However, neither the margins nor footnotes in OTP contain any references to the biblical book of Ezra. In addition, the introduction to this work does not contain the section entitled “relation to canonical books.” Something similar happens with the Revelation of Ezra. The OTP contains no scripture references indicating that it is related to the biblical book of Ezra. In contrast to these, the Testament of Job is cross-referenced to the biblical book of Job 141 times. 1 Enoch 32 describes a vision of the “tree of wisdom.” The angel Raphael tells the visitant,

This very thing is the tree of wisdom from which your old father and aged mother, they who are your precursors, ate and came to know wisdom; and (consequently) their eyes were opened and they realized that they were naked and (so) they were expelled from the garden.
Clearly this is an allusion to the content of the story in Genesis 3. The OTP contains no note in the margin or in any of the footnotes that makes this connection clear. Likewise, the Treatise of Shem is attributed to Noah’s son, Shem, mentioned 13 times between Genesis 5:32 and 11:11 and again three times in 1 Chronicles chapter 1. Yet the Treatise of Shem in OTP contains no scripture references in the margins at all and virtually none in the footnotes. 4 Ezra 5:35f. says: “And I said, ‘Why not, my lord? Why then was I born? Or why did not my mother’s womb become my grave, that I might not see the travail of Jacob and the exhaustion of the people of Israel?’” The editor notes the relationship with two passages in Job.

Let the stars of its dawn be dark; let it hope for light, but have none; may it not see the eyelids of the morning—10 because it did not shut the doors of my mother’s womb, and hide trouble from my eyes. 11 “Why did I not die at birth, come forth from the womb and expire? 12 Why were there knees to receive me, or breasts for me to suck?” Job 3:9

Why did you bring me forth from the womb? Would that I had died before any eye had seen me, (19) and were as though I had not been, carried from the womb to the grave. Job 10:18

However, the editor does not note the relationship with a corresponding passage in Jeremiah.

Let that man be like the cities that the LORD overthrew without pity; let him hear a cry in the morning and an alarm at noon, (17) because he did not kill me in the womb; so my mother would have been my grave, and her womb forever great. (18) Why did I come forth from the womb to see toil and sorrow, and spend my days in shame? Jeremiah 20:16

One could make a case that the passage in Jeremiah is a better parallel since it contains not only the idea of dying in the womb, but also not having to “See toil and sorrow” which parallels “That I might not see the travail of Jacob and the exhaustion of the people of Israel.”

Some works in OTP seem to include in marginal notations only cross-references to works which are cited in them, that is to works coming chronologically before them (e.g., the Old Testament), and not to works which cite them, e.g. the New Testament. The margins of the Lives of the Prophets are conspicuous for very few references to the New Testament. An obvious opportunity to include this type of reference would
have been at LivPro 2:8 where the text says, “Through a savior, a child born of a virgin in a manger.” This text clearly relates to Luke 2:12 in some way or another, but one finds a note to this effect only in the footnote. There are only a few exceptions to this tendency in Lives of the Prophets: for example, Mt. 23:35 at LivPro 23:1 and Rev. 12:9, 17 at LivPro 12:13.

The user must be aware that there is quite a difference from book to book regarding the overlap between the scripture references in the margin and those in the footnotes. I quoted above the editor’s decision to limit the marginal notations to “Significant parallels in biblical and apocryphal writings.” However, neither the editor’s general introduction nor the contributor’s introductions make clear the relationship between the references in the footnotes and those in the margins. Sometimes, as in the Life of Adam and Eve, for instance, the latter seem to be merely a subset of the former; the marginal notes seem to replicate precisely the cross-references contained in the footnotes.\(^7\) 4 Maccabees contains something approaching parity on this point. Most of the scripture references in the margins also appear in the footnotes. But in other books there is virtually no overlap between the two—the margins contain cross-references not included anywhere in the footnotes—and one is left to wonder whether significant parallels to biblical and apocryphal writings are supposed to be limited to marginal notations or whether the footnotes can contain “significant parallels” as well.

The reader must be aware that similar phenomena are handled differently from book to book. For instance, the Testament of Abraham is extant in two recensions. Both are printed, recension B following recension A, in volume 1 of OTP. Each recension has its own set of footnotes, but there is little comment in the footnotes about the relationship between the recensions. 3 Baruch exists in two versions, Slavonic and Greek, but in this case were published side by side to allow for easy comparison. Both recensions are footnoted although the footnoting system can be a bit confusing. The footnotes are numbered consecutively back and forth between the two recensions in a manner that could be construed at first glance to suggest that the texts should be read sequentially in the same manner, verse one in the Slavonic version and then verse one in the Greek version and so on. Closer examination shows that this is clearly not the case. The Questions of Ezra is likewise preserved in two recensions, and, like the Testament of Abraham, these were published sequentially (the Venice text first, followed by the Menologium text). But in this case the majority of attention was given to the former recension that received all but one of the 20 footnotes.
There is a lesson here for the reader, for the editor and for the indexer. Clearly, the reader who is aware of these features of the *OTP* and of the challenges of indexing will be in the best position to use both works intelligently. The collected cross-references from the *OTP* represent a veritable mine of data from which the informed user can extract an extraordinary amount of information on a wide variety of topics.

To future editors I would say that the lessons learned in this project could be of use for the next generation of large-scale works such as the *OTP*. There is a lot at stake in having clear editorial protocols. This is the front line in the war against ambiguity. Clear editorial protocols can also ensure a minimum loss of information from the scholar to the reader.

Perhaps the greatest lesson that I learned as an indexer was that ambiguity could serve a very useful function. Like the canary in the coalmine, it provided the first warning that something needed to be done. I learned that instead of dreading or ignoring ambiguity, I could use it as a prompt to identify an aspect of the work before me that needed clarification. So, in an ironic way, ambiguity can mark the first step on the pathway toward clarity.

What specifically can be done to improve the usefulness of scripture indices? It is not the intent of this article to propose a highly polished system. Nevertheless, we can make a few suggestions.

At some point it seems advisable to devise a cross-reference system that can tag cross-references by type. The challenge, of course, is to come up with a set of categories that cover the full range of possible types of connections that scholars perceive to exist between two texts. Any scholar worth their salt could come up with dozens of categories, but I suspect that any system with dozens of categories would defeat the clarity and usefulness of the system. I suspect that a system with some number of categories between half a dozen and ten would be ideal. Let me propose a sample system with just a few categories that I think would be helpful to those working in biblical studies, for instance.

First among the categories that should be tagged, in my view, would be quotations (Q) and allusions (A). Beyond these would be categories that indicate connections between texts that are linguistic (and/or literary) in kind (L), historical in kind (H) and ideational in kind (i.e., theological, philosophical, ideological, [T]). A few other obvious categories could be added. And there can always be a category to cover all the remaining categories (O for “other”) or for cross-references that do not seem to fit into any of the pre-defined categories. I know of no reason
why it should not be possible for the same cross-reference to be tagged
with more than one category type if necessary.

I see several benefits to such a system. If the scholar suggesting the
cross-reference were the one to tag the type of the cross-reference, this
would immediately solve the first problem of the user or an editor having
to reconstruct the nature of the cross-reference signaled by the scholar.
For the user who is looking for something that fits neatly into one of the
categories, a system with ten tags could cut the user’s time by nine-tenths.

These are just a few ideas to get the conversation started. I hope that
this contribution can serve to sensitize editors of future projects to the
issues involved in indexing their works.

NOTES


2. John Canne, Puritan publisher and pamphleteer working in Amsterdam in the
1640s, produced “Cannes Marginal Notes and References.” These were published in
several bible editions in the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. The work
was revised and expanded by R. A. Torrey (1856-1928) to become the Treasury of
Scripture Knowledge. In its modern, electronic form it is included in various bible soft-
ware programs like BibleWorks and Logos.

3. James Sanders recently provided a good overview of the content differences between
the canons of various believing communities: ‘‘Spinning’’ the Bible: How Judaism and

4. We could not verify that the practice of placing “the letter v plus the number of the
verse” was ever actually employed in OTP.

5. But why does the cross-reference at 2 Baruch 16:1 refer to “Pss 90:9-10” and that
at 2 Baruch 14:16 to “Pss 33:6?” There are, in fact, other examples of the occasional
inconsistent use of “Pss” to refer an individual psalm. At 16:1 in the book of 2 Baruch,
for instance, we find the reference “Pss 90:9-10;” but at 2 Baruch 46:3 we find “Ps

6. Further examples can be found in the following: 2 Enoch 24:5, footnote h, refers
to “Eccl 24:7.” This must be Sirach 24:7. Again, 2 Enoch 30:17, footnote r, refers to
“Eccl 25:23;” 2 Enoch 51:1, footnote a, refers to “Eccl 29:10.” These references are to
the book of Sirach. The Testament of Job 33:3, footnote g, refers to “Eccl 23:4.” Again,
TJob 38:1, footnote a, refers to “Eccl 36:7.” Both of these must refer to Sirach.

7. Though occasionally something new is added, following are the few footnotes that
contain Scripture references that are in addition to those in the margins: Vita 6:3, ftnt b;
Vita 14:1, ftnt a; Vita 21:1, ftnt a; Vita 25:3, ftnt a; Vita 36:2, ftnt a; Apoc 12:2, ftnt a.