**Analysis of reversification data 19-Dec-23**

I think the documentation for reversification may no longer accurately reflect the way we want to use it; and possibly there may be oddities in the data which need attention. To this end I thought it would be useful to analyse the existing data, and to highlight places where I myself think there may be issues.

Note that I may not be right that there are issues, but if I believe incorrectly that there are issues, it may well imply that I’ve misunderstood the data and am mis-applying it. And of course there may be issues which you can identify from the analysis which I am simply not seeing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EmptyVerse** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Mixture. Always same book, but sometimes the same, sometimes different chapters, sometimes different verses. |
| Source includes subverses? | No |
| Standard includes subverses? | No |
| AllBibles rows? | A few. |
| NoteLevel | Opt |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Most do not. Three do (all of them AllBibles rows). |
| HasAncientVersion | All bar 3 rows (all of them AllBibles rows). |
| HasRule | All bar 3 rows (all of them AllBibles rows). |
| Issues / Notes | Not sure why source and standard would ever differ. (And if in fact, they shouldn’t, perhaps we should get rid of one or the other.)  There may be an inconsistency here. Notes are applied only on Opt (=Acd) runs, which means on non-Acd runs we’ll have empty verses with no notes. However, I think we have said previously that all empty verses have to have a footnote, to make it clear that the verse is intentionally empty? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EmptyVerse\*** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Mixture. Always same book, but sometimes the same, sometimes different chapters, sometimes different verses. |
| Source includes subverses? | No |
| Standard includes subverses? | No |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Opt |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | None |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | Not sure why these are marked with asterisks.  Not sure why source and standard would ever differ. (And if in fact, they shouldn’t, perhaps we should get rid of one or the other.)  There may be an inconsistency here. Notes are applied only on Opt (=Acd) runs, which means on non-Acd runs we’ll have empty verses with no notes. However, I think we have said previously that all empty verses have to have a footnote, to make it clear that the verse is intentionally empty? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KeepVerse** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | In general, the two are equal. Where they differ, it is only because one is given as subverse zero and the other as the verse, and that’s fine. |
| Source includes subverses? | Yes |
| Standard includes subverses? | Yes |
| AllBibles rows? | A lot. |
| NoteLevel | Nec / Opt / Acd |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Not all. |
| HasAncientVersion | Everywhere except AllBibles rows. |
| HasRule | Everywhere except AllBibles rows. |
| Issues / Notes | – |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KeepVerse\*** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Equal |
| Source includes subverses? | Not really – the only example is where we have subverse zero. |
| Standard includes subverses? | Not really – the only example is where we have subverse zero. |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Opt / Acd |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | No |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | Suspect these shouldn’t have an asterisk. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MergedVerse** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Mixture. Some same verse, some different verses, some different chapters. (Always same book.) |
| Source includes subverses? | Yes |
| Standard includes subverses? | Yes |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Opt / Acd, with just one Nec row. |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Some |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | Suspect the one Nec row is probably wrong.  Not sure why source and standard would ever differ. (And if in fact, they shouldn’t, perhaps we should get rid of one or the other.) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MergedVerse\*** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Mixture. Never equal. Some same chapter, some different chapter; some same book, some different book. |
| Source includes subverses? | Yes |
| Standard includes subverses? | Yes |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Opt |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Just one. |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | Is the one versification note right?  Not sure why source and standard would ever differ. (And if in fact, they shouldn’t, perhaps we should get rid of one or the other.) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RenumberVerse** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Never. Sometimes same chapter, but not always. |
| Source includes subverses? | Yes |
| Standard includes subverses? | Yes |
| AllBibles rows? | No. |
| NoteLevel | Mainly Nec, a few Opt. |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Most, but not all. |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | Does it matter that not all have Versification notes? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RenumberVerse\*** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | One row has same source and standard, which I suspect is wrong. Other than that, source ≠ standard: some in same chapter, some in different chapters, some in different books. |
| Source includes subverses? | Yes |
| Standard includes subverses? | Yes |
| AllBibles rows? | No. |
| NoteLevel | Mixture of Nec and Opt. |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | Most, but not all. |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | The one row where source = standard; and does it matter than not all have versification notes? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RenumberTitle** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Never |
| Source includes subverses? | No |
| Standard includes subverses? | No |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Opt |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | All |
| HasAncientVersion | All |
| HasRule | All |
| Issues / Notes | – |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IfAbsent** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Always |
| Source includes subverses? | No |
| Standard includes subverses? | No |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Acd |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | All (identical to ReversificationNote). |
| HasAncientVersion | None |
| HasRule | None |
| Issues / Notes | Presently IfAbsent appears in the SourceType field. I think, in fact, it would be more consistent with the rest of the data if it were moved to the Action field, and the SourceType were set to AllBibles. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IfEmpty** | |
| SourceVerse =? StandardVerse | Always |
| Source includes subverses? | No |
| Standard includes subverses? | No |
| AllBibles rows? | No |
| NoteLevel | Acd |
| HasReversificationNote | All |
| HasVersificationNote | All (identical to ReversificationNote). |
| HasAncientVersion | None |
| HasRule | None |
| Issues / Notes | Presently IfEmpty appears in the SourceType field. I think, in fact, it would be more consistent with the rest of the data if it were moved to the Action field, and the SourceType were set to AllBibles.  There may be an inconsistency here. Notes are applied only on Acd runs, which means on non-Acd runs we’ll have empty verses with no notes. However, I think we have said previously that all empty verses have to have a footnote, to make it clear that the verse is intentionally empty? |