

BS
709.4
B26t

A
A
0
0
0
0
6
2
1
5
7
3
5



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

Barnstein
The Targum of Onkelos to Genesis

California
Regional
Library Facility

THE TARGUM
OF
ONKELOS TO GENESIS

A CRITICAL ENQUIRY

INTO THE VALUE OF THE TEXT EXHIBITED BY YEMEN MSS.
COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE EUROPEAN RECENSION

TOGETHER WITH

SOME SPECIMEN CHAPTERS OF THE ORIENTAL TEXT

BY

HENRY BARNSTEIN. PH. D.

LONDON 1896
DAVID NUTT
270-271 STRAND.

W. DRUGULIN
LEIPZIG.

B3
709,4
B263

DEDICATED

TO

MY REVERED TEACHER AND FRIEND

THE REV. DR. M. GASTER

to whom I owe an everlasting debt of gratitude for the
instruction received at his hands and the constant
interest he has shown in my welfare.

1187416

PREFACE.

THE purpose of this enquiry is to critically investigate the recension of the Targum of Onkelos preserved in the Yemen Mss. and to establish a comparison between these Mss. and the Western or European texts, which are at present best represented by Berliner's recent edition. Berliner did not avail himself, however, of these Eastern Mss. and his edition is therefore, to a certain extent, inadequate and can hardly be accepted as final. In order to establish a critical edition this enquiry goes into minute details of grammar, differences of vocalization and orthography, additions and omissions, interchange of particles and variant readings. Part I contains the general outlines of this research and the results arrived at. Part II shows the more detailed comparison and lists of examples, following the text of the Bible, chapter and verse. The investigation concludes with a few specimen chapters of the Targum text, according to the version given by the Yemen Mss. It will probably reflect the original Palestinian form. Instead of making an index I have given a detailed Table of Contents. It is my fervent hope that this humble effort may be appreciated by students of the Bible and may give an incentive to the true appreciation of the work of Onkelos.

H. B.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I. *History of the Text* pp. 1—3.

- 1) Importance of the Translation (1).—2) Where it originated (2).—Travels (2).—3) Effects of travels upon text (2).—Present texts (2).

CHAPTER II. *Onkelos and his Translation* . . pp. 3—5.

- 1) Approximate date of work (3).—2) Character of his Targum (4).—3) Halachic and Haggadic elements (4).—4) Public recital of Targum (5).

CHAPTER III. *Importance of the Yemen Mss.* pp. 6—11.

- 1) Hitherto their linguistic character alone studied (6).—2) Origin of Superlinear vocalization (6).—3) Targum never neglected in Palestine (8).—4) The Babylonian Redaction (9).—5) Differences of Yemen Mss. (10). 6) They represent the original Palestinian version (10).—7) Object of Investigation (10).

CHAPTER IV. *Description of Mss.* pp. 11—13.

CHAPTER V. *Superlinear Vocalization* . . . pp. 13—17.

- 1) Signs employed in this system (13).—2) Appropriate to Aramaic (14).—3) Origin of system (14).—4) Absence of Segol (15; 45).^a—5) Absence of Šewa Compositum (15; 45—46).—6) No sign for Šewa Quiescens (16).—7) No sign for Dageš or Rafe (16).—8) Approach to Biblical Aramaic and Syriac (17).—9) Agreement with Biblical Aramaic (17).

CHAPTER VI. *Differences of Vocalization* . . pp. 18—25.

- 1) Less frequent use of vowel letters (18).—2) Superlinear system etymologically more correct (18).—3) Interchange of vowels. Western texts Pataḥ=Yemen Qameṣ (18—19; 46); *a*. Monosyllabic words and particles.

(*a*) Second number in brackets refers to the pages of the corresponding portion in Part II.

b. 3rd Per. Sin. Pret. Peal of פ"ו. *c.* 3rd Per. Sin. Pret. Peal of Mediae Geminatae. *d.* Present Participle. *e.* 3rd Sin. Pret. Feminine. *f.* Suffix of 2nd Per. Sin. *g.* Miscellaneous words. Western Qameṣ = Yemen Pataḥ (19; 47). *a.* Suffix of 3rd Per. Sin. Fem. *b.* Vowel of 2nd Radical of Verb. *c.* Little change in Pause. *d.* Vowel before Suffixes פ"ו and פ"ו. *e.* Other instances.—4) Western Şere = Yemen Hireq (19; 47), Western Hireq = Yemen Şere (19; 47).—5) Western Şureq = Yemen Hölem (20; 47). Western Hölem = Yemen Şureq (20; 48).—6) The vowel of the Imperfect (20; 48).—7) Various interchanges (21; 48). *a.* West. İjireq = Yemen Pataḥ. *b.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. İjireq. *c.* West. Şere = Yem. Pataḥ. *d.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. Şere. *e.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. Hölem. *f.* West. Hölem = Yem. Şere. *g.* West. Şere = Yem. Hölem. *h.* West. Şureq = Yem. Hireq. *i.* West. Hölem = Yem. Qameṣ. *j.* West. Şureq = Yem. Qameṣ. *k.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. Şere. *l.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. Şureq.—8) Interchange of Vowels and Şewa (22; 48—49). *a.* West. Pataḥ = Yem. Şewa. *b.* West. Qameṣ = Yem. Şewa. *c.* West. Şere = Yem. Şewa. *d.* West. Şewa = Yem. Şere. *e.* West. Hireq = Yem. Şewa.—9) The Yemenite Pronunciation (22).—10) General results (25).

CHAPTER VII. *Variations in orthography.* pp. 25—28;
49—53.

a. Dialectical Variations. *b.* Use of vowel change to distinguish similar words. *c.* 3rd Pers. Plu. of פ"ו in פ. *d.* Interchange of letters. *e.* Other changes. *f.* לשון חז"ל. *g.* קרא וחז"ל. *h.* Marginal readings. *i.* Agreement of Mss. with Nehardean Tradition.

CHAPTER VIII. *Grammatical Variations* . . . pp. 28—35.

1) The Noun (28—33; 53—57). *a.* State. *α.* Absolute and Emphatic. *β.* Absolute and Construct. *b.* Number. *c.* Gender.—2) The Verb (33—35; 57—60). *a.* The Conjugations. *α.* Peal and Pael. *β.* Peal and Afel. *γ.* Peal and Etpeel, Etpaal or Etpafal. *δ.* Pael and Afel. *e.* Etpeel and Etpaal. *b.* The Tenses. *α.* Perfect and Imperfect. *β.* Perfect and (Participle) Present. *γ.* Imperfect and (Participle) Present. *c.* Other Differences.

CHAPTER IX. *Other Variations* pp. 35—39.

1) How additions and omissions may be accounted for (35—36).—2) Additions (36—37; 60—62).—3) Omissions (37—38; 62).—4) Contractions (38).—5) Interchange of Prepositions and other Particles (38—39; 62—65) [Hebraisms 65].—6) Variations in Suffix (39).

CHAPTER X. *Exegetical Variations* pp. 39—42; 66—77.

PART II.

- CHAPTER I. *Remarks upon the words:*
 יה; בל; קרב; קביל; איתיליד . . pp. 43—45.
- CHAPTER II. *Examples of the rules contained in Part I.*
 pp. 45—77.
- CHAPTER III. *Specimen Chapters* pp. 78—end.
 Introductory remarks (78). Genesis XVII (79). XXVI (81).
 XXXI (85). XLI (92).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

- A* = Ms. Codex Montefiore. No. 502.
B = „ „ „ „ 508.
C = „ Brit. Museum. Or. No. 2363.
D = „ Codex Gaster. No. 2.
B. = Berliner's Targum Onkelos (Berlin 1884).
Bbl. = Babylonian.
Bib. Aram. = Biblical Aramaic.
D. = Daggeš.
Hag. = Haggadic.
Hal. = Halachic.
Ḥ. = Ḥireq.
Ḥt. = Ḥatef.
Ḥo. = Ḥolem.
L. = Levy's Chaldäisches Wörterbuch (Leipzig 1866).
Luz. = Luzzatto's Philoxenos (Vienna 1830).
O. = Onkelos.
P. = Patah.
Plst. = Palestinian.
Q. = Qameš.
R. = Kafe.
S. = Segol.
Š. = Šureq.
Ş. = Şere.
Şe. = Şewa.
Spl. = Superlinear.
Sbl. = Sublinear.
Trg. = Targum.

I. HISTORY OF THE TEXT.

1. It is universally acknowledged that of all the Translations of the Bible that bearing the name of Onkelos enjoyed the greatest veneration from very ancient times; because it rests upon the Exegesis of the Tanaim, and is considered to represent the original traditional Interpretation.

Its sanctity was enhanced when the Amoraim invested it with great authority by making it an official decree that it should be publicly read in the Synagogue side by side with the Hebrew original.

The neglect of this Rabbinical decree was in later times greatly blamed by some of the Geonim. This neglect of the Targum was most noticeable among the Jews living in arabic-speaking countries, after the arabic language had supplanted the Aramaic as the Jewish vernacular. Among other authorities who have blamed the Jews for their laxity in carrying out the principle of שנים בקרא יחדו תרגום the names of Jehuda b. Qoreis, Samuel Hanagid and the Geonim Natronai and Hai stand out most prominently.

Their admonitions had a salutary effect for throughout the middle ages and at the present time this precept is strictly adhered to, and this accounts for the veneration in which it is held by the Jews—a veneration which, it may be added, is shared by all students of Holy Writ, on account of the light which this translation throws upon many obscure passages in the Bible, as well as for its intrinsic merits¹.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch „Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie“. Leipzig 1836, pp. 27 and 135.

2. The Targum originated in Palestine, but was subsequently transplanted to Babylon where it enjoyed great esteem, coming, as it did from the Holy Land. Similarly we find the study of the Calendar and the Ritual pursued with great zest in Babylon, both of which are products of Palestinian learning. In Babylon, as we shall see more clearly presently, a fresh redaction of the text was made, which differed in many respects, from the original Plst. Version.

From Babylon the Trg. travelled to Europe, first to Italy and then to Germany and Northern France, and also to Spain and Provence.

3. In the course of its travels, the text of the Trg. became more and more corrupt. Some time¹ after its arrival in Europe the original Spl. vocalization was exchanged for the Sbl. system which was used for the Hebrew language, a change which had the most pernicious effect upon the text. The evil was aggravated by the ignorance of the European scribes who inserted marginal glosses in the text and heaped errors upon errors until the text of the Trg. became in an all-but-hopeless condition.

4. The result of this is seen in the texts which are in common use to-day. These are far from perfect. Various expedients have been tried from time to time to improve the text with but indifferent success, the reason being that all the would-be amenders started from an incorrect standpoint. They all assumed that the European copies were based upon the original text, whereas they originate from the Bbl. Redaction. Buxtorf wished to remodel the text according to Bibl. Aram., quite ignoring the fact that a long time had elapsed between the Aramaic of the Bible and that of the Trg. and that the Trg. was composed under entirely different circumstances, and for an entirely different purpose.

Lagarde thought he would be serving the interests of

¹ At the beginning of the 12th century by Nathan B. Machir of Ancona, according to an epigraph of the Codex 12 of de Rossi (v. Berliner „Targum Onkelos“. Berlin 1884, Vol. II, p. 134).

science in the best way by omitting the vowel-signs and confining his attention to establishing a correct and critical consonantal text, but, it must be remarked, he did not even attain this ideal.

Berliner's edition of the Targum¹, (B.) which is a reprint of the Sabionetta edition of 1554 suffers for the same reason as all other European Editions. His sources are all European MSS. none of which exhibit the original text but the subsequent Babyl. redaction. It is undoubtedly superior to any of its predecessors, besides which the edition is invaluable containing as it does the products of a life-study and embodying the ripe results of all B.'s predecessors in the same branch of learning. Before proceeding to the investigation how our Trg. texts may be improved by reference to MSS. unknown to B. and hitherto all-but-neglected and which will serve as basis for our own investigations it is necessary to know something about O., his time and the general character of his translation of the Pentateuch.

II. ONKELOS AND HIS TRANSLATION.

1. As to the date of this translation much difference of opinion has existed. Frankel² and Geiger³ place its date in the time of the later Talmudists, but by observing certain characteristics of the translation B. has fixed the time as contemporaneous with or immediately following the time of R. 'Aqiba; second half of the second century. He bases this opinion upon the Targumist's consistent avoidance of anthropomorphisms (which is also a characteristic of the LXX), the little necessity felt for aramaicising Greek words—these words being *au courant* in the original Greek in 'Aqiba's time—and the Targumic embodiment of 'Aqiba's hal. and hag. principles⁴.

¹ Berlin: 1884. ² „Zu dem Targum der Propheten“. Breslau 1872, p. 9. ³ Urschrift und die Übersetzungen der Bibel. Breslau 1857, p. 164. ⁴ l. c. pp. 102—108. Cf. also Zunz "Gottesd. Vort." Frankfort 1892, p. 132.

2. As regards the character of this Translation, this is described with great clearness and minuteness by B.¹ Our Trg. is neither too literal nor too free; it shows a remarkable agreement with the Massoretic Text²; it always follows the Qerē leaving the Ketib unnoticed³ a characteristic which is also noticeable in a MS. of Daniel with Spl. vocalization which came under my notice, and the importance of which will be considered in chapter VIII. The Targumist omits certain pleonasmis which are to be found in the Hebrew text⁴, he occasionally endeavours to imitate the sound of the original text⁵, employs a rich store of synonyms, occasionally makes use of circumlocution and simplifies figurative expressions. Both the Tetragrammaton and אלהים are rendered יי⁶, which was written יי (until this was taken as a sign for the Trinity), of which various modifications, such as יי, יי, יי, יי are found. The reason of the Targumist's dislike of the word אלהים is found in the employment of this word for strange gods⁷. When יי אלהים occur together, the Targumist must naturally reproduce them as they occur in the Hebrew text.

3. According to Rapoport⁸, where we have a law which applies to the administration of justice the Targumist renders literally, but where a command occurs which affects each individual member of the community, the traditional explanation is given. But so many exceptions to this rule are to be found, that it must be rejected, and that given by Adler⁹ substituted for it. This rule runs thus—Whenever the Targumist has to meet the contradictory views of Sectarians, or in those cases wherein the people have not yet attained a complete knowledge of

¹ pp. 206—224 l. c. ² l. c. p. 207. ³ l. c. p. 209. ⁴ l. c. p. 210. ⁵ l. c. p. 211. ⁶ l. c. p. 223. ⁷ That this is not always the case may be seen from Exodus 12, 12 where אלהים יחזקיה is rendered יי יחזקיה. ⁸ In Kerem I'emed V, 223 and VI, 220 also in דברי יחזקיה (Prague: 1861) p. 11. ⁹ In the Introduction to his יחזקיה לני Wilna: 1874.

the tradition, or when the Tanaim themselves differ upon the point in question, the Targumist gives the better of the two traditions, but where the tradition is unassailable he renders literally¹. Singer, however, says we can lay down no general rule, but O. employs the Halacha in his translation where a literal rendering would remain obscure².

4. Great care was taken to ensure the correct recital of the Trg., this being especially the case with the Trg. of the Pentateuch³. A verse was given out by the Reader in Hebrew, which was immediately followed by its Aramaic translation rendered by the Meturgeman. More laxity was allowed with the recital of the Prophets, in which three verses were taken together before the Meturgeman recited their translation⁴. Both Reader and Meturgeman had to preserve a reverential demeanour, in virtue of the solemn office which they held⁵. As, however, a standard official translation had not then yet appeared, opportunity was given to the Meturgemanim to insert their own interpretation of the text. This privilege was occasionally abused and we find some of the Meturgemanim blamed by the Rabbis⁶ on this account. The writing down of the Trg.—just as that of the Mišna—was at first prohibited⁷, but this prohibition only applied to the writing down for the purpose of public reading, but private copies could be held by the scribes for their own use.

¹ B. l. c. pp. 224—225. ² Singer: „Onkelos und das Verhältniss seines Targums zur Halacha“. Halle 1881. ³ B. l. c. p. 84.
⁴ Cf. Mišna. Megillah IV, 4 and Talmud. Bab. Tr. Megillah 24a.
⁵ Cf. Tur, Oraḥ Ḥayyim ch. 145 and Maimonides הלכות השלישית XII, 11. In Tal. Bab. Tr. Megillah Cap. III. R. Nissim quotes a Jerusalemite Talmud as the origin of this custom. ⁶ Cf. Talmud of Babylon Tr. Megillah 23b and 24a. ⁷ Cf. Talm. Jer. Tr. Megillah IV, 1 and Talmud Bab. Sabbath 115a. v. Zunz. l. c. p. 65.

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE YEMEN MSS.

1. It is strange that hitherto only European MSS. have been studied in connection with the Trg. Since then however a number of Targum MSS. have come to Europe from South Arabia but have received little attention; scholars having regarded them of linguistic importance only. In this way, one of them (which I shall subsequently call *C*) has been employed by B.¹, Merx² and Margoliouth³.

2. At the outset of our investigation into the importance of these MSS. we must ask ourselves two questions.

Is it correct to call the Spl. system of vocalization the Babyl. system? Does the study of the Trg. in Babylon, or the redaction of a version of the Trg. in that country necessarily imply that its study was neglected in its mother-country, Palestine? Now the Spl. punctuation has been frequently described as the Babyl. system⁴, a nomenclature which

¹ l. c. pp. 159—160. ² "Chrestomathia Targumica", Berlin 1888, pp. 68—103. ³ On the Superlinear vocalization (Transactions of the 9th Congress of Orientalists II, London 1893), pp. 46—56.

⁴ Thus Neubauer connects the Yemen Jews with Babylon in his article on "The Literature of the Jews in Yemen" (Jewish Quarterly Review III, pp. 604—622). Speaking of the epitaphs which have been discovered in Yemen, Neubauer says (p. 608): "These epitaphs, dated according to the era of the contracts point to an acquaintance with the Babylonian schools, for the Italian early epitaphs date from the era of the destruction of the 2nd Temple and later on bear, in addition, the era of the creation. The Jews of Yemen continue up to the present day to date from the era of the contracts, using Aramaic formulae, which point more to Babylonia than to Palestine. Moreover, the use of superlinear vowel-points (usually called Assyrian Punctuation) in the pointed Hebrew Texts written in Yemen would argue their connection with the Eastern Massoretic Schools rather than with the Palestinian one at Tiberias". But Margoliouth is not at all certain of the Bbl. origin of the Spl. vocalization. "The theory which identifies the originators of the superlinear punctuation with the Masoretic Schools of the מִזְרַח־תְּיָמַי or "Easterns" rests partly on an epigraph in the Parmese Codex de Rossi 12 of A. D. 1311, and partly—or rather

is also employed by B., but, as far as can be observed, no proofs have yet been given to show its Bbl. origin¹. B.² says: "it is doubtful when the vowel-signs were first added but probably they were added in Babylon, in which country the peculiar Spl. punctuation was in use". No reason is advanced why we should make this assumption. Then why assume that they were added in Babylon? Is it not just as likely that they were originally written in Palestine and came over to Babylon with the Trg. text?

This seems the more probable after Nöldeke's assertion³ that "the authoritative Targum although redacted in Babylon

chiefly—on the internal evidence afforded by the readings and marginal rubrics of the Codex Babylonicus" (l. c. p. 51). But he proceeds to point out that this is a very flimsy foundation for the origin of the Spl. system. How can we trust a single scribe of the 14th century whilst the contemporaries of the originators of this system are silent on the subject. Margoliouth especially singles out Saadia and points out how inexplicable his silence would be were the superlinear system of Bbl. origin. As for the internal evidence from the Codex Babylonicus it must be remembered that this MS. does not exhibit the primitive Spl. system, but shows the Spl. punctuation in a highly composite and developed form which would naturally approach the Eastern or Bbl. forms of that Masoretic School. Hence it is hardly fair to argue from this MS. to prove the Bbl. origin. Margoliouth also refutes various other theories which have been set up to prove the origin of this system, but his own theory that this system represents a mixed nestorian-jacobite punctuation appears to be very forced, and is more than improbable if we are to admit this system to be of Palestinian origin. Cf. Seligsohn pp. 12, 19, 32.

¹ Likewise Dalman: „Zwar ist die superlineare Vokalisation der von dort neuerlich nach Europa gekommenen Targumhandschriften keineswegs als aramäische Wiedergabe palästinischer Aussprache des Aramäischen anzusehen. Vielmehr wird sie einer in Babylonien gelehrten schulmässigen Behandlung des Onkelostargums entstammen, der gegenüber der Konsonantentext der sog. jerusalemischen Targume öfters eine ältere und urwüchsigere Form des Onkelostextes repräsentiert“ (Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch, Leipzig 1894, I, p. V—VI). ² l. c. p. 131. ³ Th. Nöldeke, Mandäische Grammatik. Halle 1875. Introduction p. V.

exhibits a dialect whose fundamental characteristics are Palestinian.

For the present then, the system should be called the Superlinear (Spl.) system, without defining it further as either Bbl. or Plst. we shall see further on in chapter V how much more appropriate this system is to the Aramaic language than the Sbl. system now in use.

3. B.¹ states that for various reasons but principally through the decay of the Plst. schools, the Trg. left its native country and its study was transferred to Babylon. But are we sure that the Trg. ever left Palestine or that its study was neglected by the Jews of the Holy Land? May it not have travelled to Babylon—just as the Calendar and Ritual did—and yet have been continued in Palestine? It is true that the Jews of Palestine were greatly harassed in their studies by political troubles which interfered with their liberty and yet we know that they were always the great leaders of the study of the Bible, a fact which the Massora—that invaluable guide to the correct Text of our Hebrew Bible—and the various Midrašim bear witness to.

Now we know that both the Massora and the Midrasim hail from Palestine. Again, the Jerusalem Trg. which has come down to us, although differing in character from the Trg. of O., shows at least that the study of the Trg. was pursued in Palestine. Now this Jerusalem Trg. is entirely hagadic in character, may we not then assume that side by side with this hag. Trg. there existed a literal Trg., the same version, in fact, which was transferred to Babylon? Just as Palestine produced two such varied studies as those of the Massora and Midraš, it is probable that the two Recensions of the Trg.—the literal and the hag.—existed in this country side by side. This will perhaps be seen more clearly after it will be shown that Yemen MSS. appear to contain the original Plst. text.

¹ l. c. p. 108.

4. The natural result of the attention bestowed upon the Trg. in Babylon is seen in that redaction of the text which although adhering to the original version to a great extent must have inevitably become somewhat corrupted in its language in course of time, in spite of the efforts of the Rabbis of the time to preserve the text intact by placing the stamp of their authority upon it. As texts became multiplied more mistakes must have gradually crept in. As the words were also, in all probability, differently pronounced in Babylon, their orthography became changed, and the original vocalization must have been at least considerably modified. Another tendency became noticeable in the substitution of hag. explanations in the place of the original literal rendering. In time a reaction set in in favour of the original Plst. Version; and this movement is represented by the so-called Nehardean tradition, in contradistinction to the tradition of Sura, which is substantially represented by the text which we find to-day in our European editions. When the Trg. came to Europe it was then punctuated in the original Spl. vocalization which it had probably received in Palestine. Some time after its arrival¹, this Spl. vocalization was altered in favour of the Sbl. system in use with the Hebrew text. This inevitably led to great confusion², for the Trg. text had already undergone considerable modifications after its arrival in Babylon, and now another alteration taking place which practically involved the rewriting of the text in its entirety the result can easily be imagined. As copies were increased in Europe the evil became magnified and was greatly aggravated by the ignorance shown by the scribes, of the Aramaic language; the result of all this we have already seen in the various devices made by scholars to amend the corrupt text. These were all unsuccessful because the scholars depended upon the Babyl. recension

¹ v. B. l. c. p. 134.

² "Our editions are greatly neglected, whilst old editions and MSS. have superior readings". (A. Geiger: *Nachgelassene Schriften*, Vol. 4, Berlin 1876, p. 104.)

which must have been a considerable modification of the Plst. original.

5. Of late years a rich store of treasure has been brought to light by the discovery of MSS. of the Trg. from Yemen most of which are punctuated with the Spl. vocalization, a fact which in itself invites the student to their study if only from a linguistic point of view. On examining these MSS. more closely most far-reaching and profound differences are to be found. These variations occur not only in the vocalization, pronunciation and orthography but also in the exegesis of the text itself, especially in the interpretation of several important hag. and poetical passages, in which cases the usual hag. interpretation is replaced by a literal translation.¹

What then do all these peculiar facts point to? It is unlikely that the Jews of Yemen had a peculiar tradition of their own although we know that they settled in Southern Arabia at a very early period. "Certain it is that centuries before Mohammed there were powerful Jewish communities in North Arabia as well as in South Arabia or Yemen"².

6. The various differences which are noticeable in these Trg. MSS. induce one to believe that they represent the original Plst. text. The changes in vocalization, pronunciation and orthography remind us—as will be shown in chapters V to VIII—of the Bib. Aram. and Syriac grammatical forms and approximate more closely to the Nehardean tradition, or we may perhaps call it the Nehardean recension. The preference shown for a literal translation may be accounted for by observing that the Plst. Jews had another Trg. which is entirely hag. in tendency.

7. The object, then, of this investigation is to endeavour

¹ Geiger although ascribing a Babylonian origin to the Targum of Onkelos points out that its character is literality, which he regards as a later protest against the fanciful interpretations of the earlier exegetists. l. c. vol. 4, p. 104. ² v. Neubauer l. c. p. 605.

to show the true character of the original Trg. of O. and so pave the way for a critical edition of that Trg. I will now deal separately with each of the points enumerated above, and show in how far these characteristics strengthen our views as to the original and Plst. character of the Trg. of these MSS. But before entering into the examination of these MSS., a short description of those I have made use of, may be now given.

IV. THE YEMEN MSS.

1. Codex Montefiore, No. 502; which I call *A* is peculiar in having a Sublinear vocalization for the Aramaic as well as for the Hebrew text, which may perhaps be regarded as an unsuccessful attempt on the part of the scribe to bring the two systems of vocalization into harmony with each other. It also differs from the other MSS. in having the Hebrew text in large square characters in the middle of the page, whilst the Trg. and Arabic translation are placed on the sides and the commentary of Raši below. It consists of 133 folios and extends till the end of Exodus. The writing is bold, square and pointed; and the paper stout and dark. It is probably of the 18th century and is written throughout in one hand (except the marginal notes). The quires consist of 7 leaves, but nearly every leaf has the custos at the bottom. The number of lines in each page, both in the Hebrew text, and in the Aramaic and Arabic translations at the sides, naturally varies according to the length of the commentary of Raši below, but the average number is 19 lines for the Hebrew text, 30 for the translations and about 8 for the commentary. The Hebrew text has an average of 8 words to the line. There are no masoretic directions except that at the end of every Paraša the number of verses contained in that portion is given with a mnemonic. It is one of the characteristics of Eastern MSS.

that they have little or no illuminations, and all these MSS. (except *C*) have only an ornamental figure on the margin at the end of every Paraša.

2. Codex Montefiore, No. 508. I call this MS. *B*. This is a remarkably fine and clear MS. and will be frequently found to be valuable in retaining the original literal rendering, whilst an haggadic interpretation is inserted on the margin. It consists of 159 folios, 4 leaves making a quire; the custos, being given at irregular intervals, an average of 24 lines to a page and 10 words to a line. Thick, oriental paper and the oldest part in bold and round hand. It is unfortunately in a very imperfect condition and is written in no less than four distinct handwritings, of which the third and fourth appear to be quite modern. The oldest hand extends from f. 3—87, 98—102 and 104—110 and is Spl. throughout, both Hebrew and Aramaic, it probably dates from the 16th or 17th century; the second hand (f. 78—79, 103 and 111—155), has the Sbl. vocalization for the Hebrew and the Spl. for the Trg. It is less round and bold; and is perhaps of the 17th or 18th centuries, the third (f. 1—2, 156—159) is much more minute and is Sbl. throughout; probably 18th or 19th century. The fourth hand has added numerous marginal readings as well as Genesis 44, 10—15. Many verses in the second hand are left entirely unpunctuated. Again the only Massoretic note is the number of verses contained in each Paraša. The MS. extends till Exodus 24, 2. Each Hebrew verse is followed first by its Targum. and then by its Arabic translation.

3. *C* is the British Museum MS. Or. 2363 and has been fully described by Dr. Berliner¹.

4. *D* was placed at my disposal by the Rev. Dr. Gaster (Codex Heb. Gaster No. 2) and is the most perfect and reliable of all; scribes' errors being few and far between; and no sign being used either for Dag. or R. The paper is thinner

¹ l. c. pp. 132, 134 (Note 4), 137, 159 and 160.

than that of *A* or *B*, and the writing is beautifully clear and round; probably 17th century. It consists of 159 folios, written throughout in one hand and extends till the end of Exodus. There are about 27 lines to each page and about 14 words to each line. The MS. has been rebound, hence it is impossible to tell the quires, but every page has the *custos*. There are frequent marginal notes by a later hand; the only Massoretic notes being the number of verses at the end of every *Paraša* and the number of פתוחות and סגורות at the end of each Book. A note at the end informs us that the scribe's name was משה בן סגורא בן יהודה; whilst a notice inside the original cover seems to point that the MS. was in somebody's possession in 1809. It runs דתיה הלה ששה וזמן לחושד (לחודש?) אחר ראשון שנת הדין אלפין ומאה (ה) וששון (שטרות) וחד שנין לש(שטרות). This points to the year 2121 of the Seleucidan era, corresponding to 1809 C. E. The last page is adorned with a cabalistic devise with a large figure of the Menorah, each branch of the candlestick having an appropriate scriptural quotation. Each verse is followed by its Trg. and then by its Arabic translation. All the MSS. are Folios and have been very much used.

V. THE SUPERLINEAR VOCALIZATION¹.

1. We will first consider the system of vocalization used in these MSS.

In the Spl. vocalization we have six vowel-signs which are written above the consonants. These are Qameš^ˆ (Q.), Pataḥ^ˆ (P.), Şere^ˆ (Ş.), Hıreq^ˆ (H.), Hōlem^ˆ (Hō.) and Şureq^ˆ (S.). Besides these signs a horizontal line represents the Sēwa

¹ This system has only been lately discovered, being brought to light by the Karaite Rabbi Firkowitsh about 50 years ago. It represents the older system, since it is more simple and primitive than the sub-linear system (cf. also the expression זקיד על) and it is unusual to regress from a well developed to a primitive vocalisation.

4. In the first place we must at once notice that the vowel-sign Segol is unknown in the Spl. system, other vowel-signs being substituted for it. In the Yemenite MSS. which Derenbourg saw and described in his "Manuel du Lecteur" ¹ P. was invariably used for S.; but in the MSS. which I used S. is replaced by P., Š. and even by Ḥ., the particular vowel being in most cases justifiable by reference to the word's etymology or by comparing the word in the cognate Semitic languages. This shows that the scribes must have been very careful in preserving the correct original orthography and is another argument in favour of the greater antiquity and authenticity of the Trg. as exhibited in the texts of the Yemen MSS. ² A few Instances are given here ³, but detailed lists will be found in Part II.

S. is replaced by P. in פִּזְזִי 2, 8, פִּזְזִי 11, 7. S. is replaced by Š. in שִׁשִּׁי 14, 2, שִׁשִּׁי 25, 9. Very rarely by Ḥ.; e. g. in the word חֲדָשִׁי 28, 17 (Greek ἡδαιώτης).

5. Besides having no S., the Spl. system of vocalization has no sign for Šewa Compositum. This sign—as has been previously remarked—is characteristic of the Hebrew and not of the Aramaic language ⁴.—In the MSS. it is usually replaced by Še. Mobile, or more rarely by Še. Quiescens or a Full Vowel. Še. Mobile replaces Ḥt.-P. in הִי 1, 2.—It replaces Ḥt.-Q. in קִי 4, 10 and Ḥt.-S. in שִׁי 36, 11. Še. Quiescens replaces Ḥt.-P. in הִי 2, 10 and Ḥt.-S. in שִׁי 17, 7. A full vowel is found in the MSS. where B. writes a Še. Compositum in such words as שִׁי 29, 34.

Strange to say, Še. Compositum is found in a few isolated examples which have either crept into the MSS. by

¹ Journal Asiatique. Sixième Série. Tome XVI. No. 61. Paris 1870. ² Cf. VI, 2. ³ In all examples which will be quoted,

Berliner's edition of the Targum is the one referred to for the European readings, but the readings quoted are those given by the MSS
⁴ Cf. also the absence of any sign in Christian Palestinian Aramaic for Še. Compositum, Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der aramäischen Dialecte. ZDMG. XXII, p. 507.

By the existence of so many examples in two chapters it might perhaps be thought that the sign was very frequently employed throughout the MS.; but the scribe breaks off suddenly and we find whole series of chapters which do not contain a solitary D.

The following are a few examples from *B*. הָבֵר 1, 11, גִּזְדֵּרִית 1, 11, הַשְּׁמִיָּא 1, 28, הָעֵל 1, 29, הָעֵבֵר 1, 31. *A* has none of these!

In the specimen chapter appended to this investigation I have followed *D* which is the most perfect MS. and has neither D. nor R. sign.

8) The absence of all these signs, shows that the Aramaic of the Yemen MSS. is much more closely akin to the Bb. Aram. and Syriac than is the case with our European editions of the Trg., and it may be seen how appropriate the Spl. vocalization is to the Aramaic language.

9) Our MSS. agree with Bb. Aram. in many grammatical points.

a. 3rd. Pers. Sin. Fem. Suffix ends in הַ. Cf. Daniel 2, 11 הַתִּיבָּה.

b. 1st Pers. Sin. and Pl. Suffixa of Verb are resp. אָנִי and אֲנִי with P. Cf. Dan. 2, 9 הַהוֹרֵקְנִי.

c. 3rd. Pers. Plu. Fem. Perf. of Verb ends in הַ. Cf. Dan. 5, 5 הַבְּקָה¹.

d. 2nd. Pers. Sin. Suffix is punctuated with Q. Cf. Dan. 4, 22 הַדָּרִדִּר.

e. Our MSS. punctuate many words with P. corresponding to the Bb. Aram. form with S. whilst B. punctuates with H. e. g. הַמִּנִּי הַדָּרִדִּר הַשְּׁמִיָּא הַלְבָּא.

f. Miscellaneous words such as אֲנִי אֲלֵמָא שְׂבָאָא agree in the two dialects.

¹ Or. 2374 writes thus, although Merx's edition of Daniel [Leipzig, 1882] has the Ketib אֲנִי but Q'ré אֲנִי.

VI. VOCALIZATION.

1. Before considering the changes which the pronunciation underwent on being transferred from the Spl. to the Sbl. punctuation, it may be remarked that the Yemen MSS. do not show that superfluity of vowel-letters which is found in our Targum editions¹. As B. remarks "this redundancy of vowel-letters points back to a time when no vowels were yet written and when the vowel-signs were subsequently added these letters should have been struck out, their retention giving rise to much confusion"². As instances we may notice such words as **יָצֵף** and **עֵרְצֵלֵי** which B. writes **יַצֵּא** and **עֵרְצֵלֵי** where the **א** merely points out the **ā** sound.

2. In considering the differences shown by the MSS. and the European-Babylonian texts it will be seen by tracing words to their etymologies that the former present a more accurate pronunciation. Now as it is extremely improbable that the scribes were acquainted with the etymologies of the words which they wrote, this shows that they must have been conscientious in preserving the correct original orthography.

3. B.'s edition of the Trg. has many words punctuated with P. which appear in the MSS. with Q. a. Monosyllabic words and Particles: **בֵּט** (Syriac **ܒܝܬ**) 2, 9. **לֵיָה** (Syriac **ܠܝܗ**) 2, 19. **לֵפֵ** (Syriac **ܠܦܝ**) 3, 8.—b. 3rd Person Singular Preterite Peal of the Verbs **עָוִי** **יָח** 2, 3, **יָחֵב** 6, 6. This corresponds to the Syriac Form.—c. On the other hand, the MSS. differ from the Syriac in the 3rd Person Singular Preterite Peal of the Verba Mediae Geminatae³ e. g. **לֵפֵי** 16, 4. Syriac would here punctuate the **פ** with **Petaḥa**. But cf. **דָּקִי** Dan. 2, 35.—d. In the case of the Present Participle the MSS.

¹ Likewise in Christian Palestinian Aramaic the *matres lectionis* are less used. (Cf. Nöldeke l. c. p. 447.) ² Berliner l. c. p. 133.

³ For the contrary process we may compare the Hebrew **זֶכַּר** Zechar. 4, 10 (Pret. of **זָכַר**) as if it were from **זָזַר** and **זָזַר** (for **זָזַר**) Isaiah 44, 18.

again show agreement with the corresponding Syriac form. e. g. דָּרְחָבָר 4, 20, דָּרְחָרְרִי 4, 21, דְּשִׁלְטָן 17, 16.—e. The Q. of the 3rd Person Singular Feminine of the Preterite of Verba א"ל is difficult to explain¹. Cf. הָיָה 3, 20 וְקָרָה 4, 25.—f. The Spl. System is undoubtedly more correct in punctuating the Suffix of the 2nd Pers. Sin. with Q. Cf. דָּרַע 45, 9, שָׁמַךְ 17, 5, נִשְׁכָּךְ 19, 15. So also B. Aram. cf. דָּרַךְ Dan. 6, 13.—g. Miscellaneous words, the majority of which agree with the corresponding Syriac forms. אֲיִנָּךְ 1, 11 (Syriac ܐܝܢܝܟܐ), חֲנִיכָה 8, 9 (Syriac ܚܢܝܟܐ). On the other hand B. has the Q. in many instances in which the MSS. write P.: a. Suffix of the 3rd Person Singular Feminine הָיְלָה 4, 12. This agrees with the B. Aram. form. Cf. גָּלְיָה Daniel 4, 14, יָיִזְנָה Dan. 2, 11².—b. The vowel of the 2nd radical of a verb is frequently P. just as in the corresponding words in Syriac הִחְבִּירָה 1, 29, וְיִרְעֵנִי 3, 7.—c. Since, as will be seen more clearly below, the pause has little influence in the Spl. punctuation herein showing the small influence of the Masorah of the Hebrew text, our MSS. retain the P. in many cases where B. has a pausal Q. חָרַר 1, 5, לִנְשִׂימָר 1, 22.—d. The vowel before the suffixes נָ and יָ is P. in the MSS. בָּצִלְמָא 1, 26, בְּרִקְסָלְלָנִי 4, 14.—e. The absence of Še. Compositum may account for such instances as עֲבָרָה 3, 13, אֲחִנָּא 13, 8.

4. We have now arrived at the second pair of kindred vowels H. and Š. Only a couple of instances are here given of words which are written by B. with Š. but are found in the MSS. with H. and vice versa, but it may be

¹ But Biblical Aramaic likewise חָרַרָה Dan. 7, 19 and חָרַרָה ib. 7, 22.

² Philippi tells us that the original form was probably Qameš in Biblical Aramaic, "Scribitur autem חָרַרָה pro חָרַרָה quia, ut Masora Targumo Onkelosiani ostendit, sermo posterior אֵ et a uti pronuntiatione sic etiam scriptio commiscere consuevit. Vocalem huius terminationis origine longum esse ex חָרַרָה apparet, quod targumice in locum antiquioris ah successit". (v. Libri Danielis, Ezrae et Nehemiae ed. Baer, l. c. p. LVIII.) ³ So also in B. Aram. Cf. יִבְרָכְךָ Daniel 7, 16.

added that in the majority of examples which I have noted the reading of the MSS. may be verified by reference to the etymologies of the words or to their corresponding Syriac forms. B. has Š. with such words as ܐܘܪܝܗ 2, 19, ܐܘܪܝܗ 13, 2. But H. with ܪܘܢܝܝܢ 3, 22, ܪܘܢܝܝܢ 8, 22.

5. The 3rd pair of kindred vowels are Ḥo. and Š. These interchanges appear to depend greatly upon the pronunciation of these sounds. Thus B. writes the words ܫܘܡ 3, 20, ܫܘܡ 4, 21 with Šureq; and the latter punctuation seems, at first sight, more correct, but, it must be borne in mind that Š. and Ḥo. are represented by one sign only in Jacobite Syriac. The Nestorians pronounced ܫܘܡ as if it were written with a Ḥolem¹; whilst, on the other hand, they pronounced ܫܘܡ as the ordinary u sound². Perhaps the Yemenite Jews pronounced the words ܫܘܡ and ܫܘܡ—which are written with ܫܘܡ in Jacobite Syriac—as pōm and šōm, but having a distinct vowel-sign for Ḥo., they punctuated it with Ḥo. For B. Ḥo. and MSS. Š. v. Part II.

6. Before noticing the other numerous interchanges among vowels in the two systems, it must be noticed that the vowel of the Imperfect seems to vary between I. and P. in the MSS. May we not trace the P. to Arabic influence? In that language the vowel of the Servile Prefix is Fathā. We might naturally expect that MSS. hailing from Yemen in South Arabia would present some Arabic characteristics and that this is the case may be seen by the following examples 14, 23 ܐܘܪܝܗ (C ܐܘܪܝܗ), 15, 8 ܐܘܪܝܗ but C ܐܘܪܝܗ. In these instances,

¹ Cf. Duval, Grammaire Syriacque, Paris 1881, pp. 47—48. ² So also Nöldeke in his article on Christian Palestinian Aramaic l. c. p. 456 “The ܫ (ōn) in ܫܘܡܝܢ “you laugh” disagrees with the pronunciation in East Syriac. We should expect ܫ (un)”. Dalman l. c. (p. 63) remarks “The superlinear vocalization of the Targums, and usually also the Tiberian, has in the form of the Masculine a long ō as in ܫܘܡܝܢ which however becomes u in the derived forms. The Tiberian vocalization clearly stands here in closer relation with the old Palestinian usage”.

we see that *C* inclines more to the forms which we find in our Trg. editions, a fact which may be often noticed in the instances which will be quoted later on.

7. Variations in punctuation:

a) B.H.=MSS. P. $\text{חַיִּים בְּחַיִּים}$ ¹ 1, 27, אֶחָד 6, 20.

b) B.P.=MSS. H.; רַבְּהוּן 4, 20 (but *C* רַבְּהוּן), רַבְּהוּן 9, 5 (but *C* and *D* רַבְּהוּן). F. justifiable in both instances².

c) B.S.=MSS. P. אֶחָד 4, 3, רַבְּהוּן 14, 18.

d) B.P.=MSS. S. אֶחָד 15, 10.

e) B.P.=MSS. Hō. רַבְּהוּן 3, 16, רַבְּהוּן 16, 4. Both these are given by Levy.

f) B.Hō.=MSS. S. רַבְּהוּן (*A* רַבְּהוּן) 4, 6. Here again the S. is more correct since רַבְּהוּן is a Noun; Levy also רַבְּהוּן .

g) On the other hand, the MSS. have Hō. where B. reads S. in רַבְּהוּן 2, 24 which is as incorrect as B.'s רַבְּהוּן the correct form being רַבְּהוּן .

h) *A* has the modified ü sound³ which is certainly a vulgarism and which, according to Wright, was heard dialectically in Old Arabic and is found occasionally in the vulgar dialects⁴. For instance, in the word רַבְּהוּן = רַבְּהוּן 19, 34⁵.

i) B. רַבְּהוּן where the MSS. give רַבְּהוּן 4, 21.

j) MSS. רַבְּהוּן . B. רַבְּהוּן 4, 25.

k) MSS. רַבְּהוּן (*C* and *D* more correctly the Pael רַבְּהוּן). B. רַבְּהוּן .

l) Finally, the Yemen MSS. punctuate with Šureq

¹ Cf. רַבְּהוּן Dan. 3, 15. ² v. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch, s. v. Leipzig 1866. ³ Strangely enough the reverse process is mentioned by Nöldeke as taking place in Christian Palestinian Aramaic. "We find u where we should expect i as in רַבְּהוּן (Hebrew רַבְּהוּן)" p. 456. Dalman mentions that Franz Delitzsch asserted that in the time of the Punctatores in Palestine u was pronounced ü (Dalman, l. c. p. 63).
⁴ Wright, "Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages", Cambridge 1890, p. 77. ⁵ Cf. also the writing of the Arabic sound Plural Nominative in īna for ūna which is common in the Yemenite Jewish-Arabic texts. v. also Duval, l. c. p. 47.

where B. has P.¹ in בְּנִישׁוּהָ 1, 10, גִּלְבָּדִים 4, 1. In the latter instance Bevan says the change is due to the following labial²; בְּנִישׁוּבֵל 4, 12, בְּנִישׁוּ 14, 17, בְּנִישׁוּ 41, 40. For the two last examples Levy prefers Pataḥ. It can be seen at a glance that the MSS. readings are superior.

8. The Še.Mobile is much more frequently employed in the Spl. system than is the case in the Sbl., since it is also used with the Gutturals, in which case the Sbl. system replaces it by Še.Compositum. It must now be noticed that interchanges between Še. and the full vowels are frequently met with: a) B. P.: MSS. Še. אֶפְעַל 3, 8, אֶפְעַל 11, 6. The first instance is Etpeel whilst B. reads, perhaps more correctly Etpaal; this will be fully considered when treating of the conjugations. The word אֶפְעַל being Afel of עָפַר has Še. correctly.—b) B. Q.: MSS. Še. אֶפְעַר 3, 17, עָפַר 5, 1. These being Preterites of Verba, have Še. just as we find in Syriac.—c) B. Ṣ.: MSS. Še.; אֶפְעַר 3, 15, אֶפְעַר 3, 20. For the latter cf. B. Aram. אֶפְעַר Dan. 2, 10. The Sbl. vocalization as exhibited in B.'s edition of the Trg., clearly shows the influence of the Hebrew language in these examples.—d) B. Še.: MSS. Ṣ. אֶפְעַר 5, 1. Levy, s. v. allows either form in this instance.—e) B. Ḥ.: MSS. Še. אֶפְעַר 2, 2, אֶפְעַר 4, 1.

9. That the Yemenite Jews were most careful in preserving the correct traditional pronunciation of the Trg. is shown most clearly by Derenbourg in his "Manuel du Lecteur". "They have still preserved the old-fashioned and good custom of translating each verse in public; a little boy nine or ten years of age stands on the platform and recites the Targum of each verse after the Reader has cited the Hebrew". "Further", says M. Derenbourg, „they have preserved a more exact tradition of the Targum, whereas we know of other countries where the Chaldean Version was already neglected in the 11th century"³.

¹ Cf. Chr. Pal. Aram. "u sometimes stands for a as in אֶפְעַל (אֶפְעַר)", p. 455. ² Book of Daniel. Cambridge 1892, p. 81. ³ l. c. p. 509.

The use of Še.Mobile for the semi-vowels shows that this Še. must have had a much more distinct pronunciation than we are accustomed to give it, and it is a fact that oriental Jews sound the Šewa just as the occidental Jews pronounce Segol even at the present day¹.

When the Še.Compositum is represented in the MSS. by Še.Quiescens we may assume that the pronunciation was a more hurried one, whilst the full vowel would indicate a longer or fuller pronunciation. In connection with the pronunciation of Hebrew in use among the Jews of Yemen it is instructive to notice Derenbourg's description of the account given by Jacob Sappir² of the present pronunciation of Hebrew by the Yemenite Jews. "As regards their vowels they pronounce Q. and P. like the Germans, contracting the lips for the former and opening the mouth wide for the latter, the H̄o. they pronounce as the Polish Jews, the Š. like the Spaniards and the S. like a very short P., so as to distinguish it from its original P. The Še.Mobile is pronounced in different ways; before a guttural it takes the vowel which that letter has, before a Yod it has that of H̄., everywhere else it resembles a weak *a*. There are also people at Yemen who speak less correctly, who confound S. and P. and pronounce Še.Mobile with a full vowel and ignorant or neglectful scribes make these errors current in their copies of the Pentateuch or the Prayers"³.

In the segoleted forms we know the 2nd P. is only a help-vowel and it was probably pronounced as we pronounce the S.⁴ That P. was sometimes read as an ě sound may

¹ Cf. The Codd. Gaster No. 146, a 14th century Karaite MS. from Nisibis; Nos. 155, 159, 160 Mahazor Byzant. Rite (XVII and XVIII cent.) and Codd. Montefiore 444, 445 and 446 Mahazor Corfu, which write Še. where we would expect S. and vice versa; employing Š., S. and Še. indiscriminately. Thus we read שְׁעָרָה שְׁעָרָה and שְׁעָרָה שְׁעָרָה immediately followed by שְׁעָרָה. ² In his *אבן עזר* (Lyck 1866). ³ Manuel du Lecteur, l. c., pp. 510—511. ⁴ So also in Christian Palestinian Aramaic in such words as *ܘܫܘܥܐ* (ܘܫܘܥܐ) "Year" *ܘܫܘܥܐ* (ܘܫܘܥܐ) "with" (Nöldeke l. c. p. 454).

perhaps be seen from Proverbs 12, 28 where the Septuagint, Pešitta and Targum all render אֶל-מִצְוֹתָיִךְ as if it were written אֶל-מִצְוֹתָיִךְ. Cf. also Jeremiah 13, 21 יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶיֶה where we should expect יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶיֶה. Dr. Gaster has pointed out that Prayer-Books from Corfu give to the Še. the full vowel-sign ě or ē almost invariably¹. He also points out that the pronunciation of Še. usually heard at the present day is undoubtedly incorrect, according to the opinion of all the old grammarians from the Dikduke ha-te'amim till Kimḥi. The ancient LXX transcriptions of שְׁלֹמֹה and גִּמְוֹרָה as Solomon and Gomorrhah point to a similar conclusion². Cf. also the remarks of Margoliouth on the Spl. vocalization³. b) In connection with the pronunciation it may be noticed that the Yemen scribes made no alteration in the vocalization to indicate the Pause. This pausal influence is a characteristic of the Hebrew and not of the Aramaic language. The rarity of any vocalic alteration under the pausal influence in Bb. Aram. is a sufficient proof of this fact. Even in Bb. Aram. many examples are to be found where Ḥ. is employed where no pause occurs and where we might consequently expect Š. Cf. דָּבַר Daniel 6, 21, מִצְוֹתָיִךְ Dan. 7, 8, בְּבִשְׁתֵּי Ezra 4, 23, שָׁדָן Ezra 6, 12, מִצְוֹתָיִךְ Dan. 4, 11. We may compare its use in our MSS. to that of the Aramaic portions of the Bible⁴. We there notice only a few instances with Silluq and Sof Pasuq where P. is changed into Q. and Š. becomes Ḥ. Berliner says in his Massorah⁵:—"Both schools (*i. e.* the Babylonian and Palestinian) have the use of the Pause with Athnach and Sof-Pasuq, whilst with the Sureans the Pause is also used with Sakef. In the case of Genesis 18, 30 there seems no difference between the two schools, both schools reading a pausal form at this Sakef". The word Berliner refers to in this passage is אֶל-מִצְוֹתָיִךְ and yet all the

¹ M. Gaster "Die Unterschiedlosigkeit zwischen Pathaḥ und Segol" in Stade's Zeitschrift, Giessen 1894, p. 62. ² p. 61. ³ l. c. p. 47.
⁴ v. Kautzsch, "Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen", Leipzig 1884, p. 39. ⁵ Leipzig 1877, Introduction, p. XX.

B. reads אֲשַׁמְטִין 3, 18; the rest have אֲשַׁמְטִין. *L.* confirms *B.* *A.* אֲשַׁמְטִין. *B, C, D* בְּשִׁטְרָא 6, 16. *B.* has בְּשִׁטְרָא. *B. and C* אֲשַׁמְטִין 45, 22, *A* and *B* אֲשַׁמְטִין, *D* אֲשַׁמְטִין. *L.*¹, although noticing the form given by *B.*, gives that of *D* as the best Reading. —b) The MSS. occasionally make use of vowel-change to distinguish the different meanings of a word. Thus אֲשַׁמְטִין = upon, אֲשַׁמְטִין = he went up; אֲשַׁמְטִין = son, אֲשַׁמְטִין = besides; אֲשַׁמְטִין = thou, אֲשַׁמְטִין = a sign.—c) *C* has the 3rd Person Plural of Verba אֲשַׁמְטִין ending in אֲשַׁמְטִין and not in אֲשַׁמְטִין. This peculiarity is pointed out by Berliner in his Massorah (p. 92) as a Syriasm. It is also occasionally found in *B.*, but *A* and *D* never show it. As an instance we may take the word אֲשַׁמְטִין 7, 20. Some variations are also found in Verba אֲשַׁמְטִין. *A, B* and *D* read אֲשַׁמְטִין 19, 14, but *B.* and *C* אֲשַׁמְטִין. Landauer² very appropriately refers us here to the Present Participle of the Verba אֲשַׁמְטִין in Syriac in which language אֲשַׁמְטִין is pronounced ka-yem. Similarly אֲשַׁמְטִין would be pronounced as if it were written אֲשַׁמְטִין and this latter reading may accordingly be regarded as a popular spelling of אֲשַׁמְטִין³.—d) We sometimes find interchanges of letters consistently occurring; thus א is used by the MSS. in cases where *B.* writes ש. The latter is not an Aramaic letter at all, but is imported from the Hebrew. *A* has it incorrectly in two places where a ש is to be read viz. אֲשַׁמְטִין 9, 13 and אֲשַׁמְטִין 19, 17.—מ and נ. *B* and *D* have אֲשַׁמְטִין 31, 42. The Rest אֲשַׁמְטִין. All have אֲשַׁמְטִין 31, 27. *B.* אֲשַׁמְטִין which the author of the Pathšegen⁴ has already pointed out as standing for the more usual אֲשַׁמְטִין, as Landauer remarks s. v. in his Massorah. All MSS. read אֲשַׁמְטִין where *B.* and *L.*⁵

¹ s. v. ² "Massorah zum Onkelos nach neuen Quellen", Letterbode VII &c. ³ In Biblical Aramaic the Ketib is always with א but the Qeré with א. Cf. אֲשַׁמְטִין (Qeré אֲשַׁמְטִין) Daniel 2, 38; 3, 31; 6, 26, אֲשַׁמְטִין (Qeré אֲשַׁמְטִין) Daniel 4, 23, אֲשַׁמְטִין (Qeré אֲשַׁמְטִין) Daniel 3, 3, אֲשַׁמְטִין (Qeré אֲשַׁמְטִין) Ezra 7, 25. Cf. also Dalman's Grammar p. 45 "Aus Schreibungen wie אֲשַׁמְטִין für אֲשַׁמְטִין, אֲשַׁמְטִין für אֲשַׁמְטִין darf geschlossen werden, dass א zwischen zwei Vokalen als stimmhafte Gaumenspirans gesprochen wurde". ⁴ Published in Adler's edition of the Targum L. c. ⁵ s. v.

give יְהוָה 16, 12. *A* and *D* פִּלְגֵּשׁ 40, 18. *B*. *B* and *C* פִּלְגֵּשׁ ¹. The ה is a Hebraism, although *Bb. Aram.* likewise has it. e) *B* writes בְּהַרְלֵנוּבֵי 14, 1. *A*, *C* and *D* divide the word בְּהַרְלֵנוּבֵי and this, at a later time, was looked upon as the correct traditional writing². The MSS. give $\text{פִּלְגֵּשׁ צִפְרִי}$ 3, 16 and בִּפְתִּילֵי 12, 13 in all of which *B*. writes צִפְרִי &c.—f) The Yemen MSS. do not know of the so-called $\text{לְשׁוֹן הַדְּרוּגִים}$ which gives us such forms as קָרָא and אִתְּקַלְדָּה but write these words as they are found in the Hebrew Text.—g) By $\text{קָרָא הַדְּרוּגִים}$ the Massorah meant that several passages should stand in the Trg. just as they occur in the Hebrew. The MSS. however appear to ignore this Rule. Thus they all read אִתְּקַלְדָּה (and not אִתְּקַלְדָּה) 34, 19, הַדְּרוּגִים 27, 46. *A* and *D* read $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּאִתְּקַלְדָּה}$ 27, 2 but here *B* and *C* follow the Hebrew $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל מִדְּרוּגֵי}$. *A* and *C* have עֲלֵהֶם on the margin but עֲלֵהֶם in the Text³ 26, 14. *A* and *D* have יִשְׂרָאֵל but *B* and *C* יִשְׂרָאֵל 23, 6. *A*, *B* and *D* בְּיַד *C* בְּיַד 39, 1. *A* and *B* read $\text{בְּיַד הַדְּרוּגִים}$, *C* and *D* $\text{בְּיַד הַדְּרוּגִים}$ 15, 18 and finally *B* writes the Tetragrammaton instead of אֱלֹהִים ⁴ 9, 6. By these examples it may be at once seen that the scribes could not have recognised these rules of $\text{קָרָא הַדְּרוּגִים}$, or, at any rate, they were only slightly acquainted with them.—h) Marginal Readings have already been pointed out occasionally. These glosses are important since they are all added by a later hand and explain the origin of many words which afterwards became incorporated with the Text itself. These marginal readings also constitute an argument for the greater age and originality of the texts with Superlinear vocalization which have been preserved to us by the Yemenite Jews.—3, 23 *C* has דְּאִתְּקַלְדָּה on the margin, the text of which has been

¹ Cf. Ezra 4, 16 where אִתְּקַלְדָּה stands for the more usual אִתְּקַלְדָּה so Or. 2374 has $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ (Dan. 2, 47) where Baer reads $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ and $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ (Dan. 6, 13) where Baer has $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל}$. ² Cf. Talmud Babli Tr. IJullin 65a. ³ The reading עֲלֵהֶם is quoted by Theodorus Mopsuestenus (v. Part II, Ch. II, J). ⁴ cf. B. l. c. p. 216.

corrected by a later hand to דִּאֲתֶכְסִי; but as the word דִּאֲתֶכְסִי is given by Berliner in his Massorah¹ under the heading of דִּאֲתֶכְסִי which means that it is undoubtedly the correct reading, we must reject the correction דִּאֲתֶכְסִי. 7, 16 *C* has בְּמִרְמָה on the margin to be placed between יִי and עֲלוּהִי. We shall see when speaking of the Additions that *A* and *D* have this word already inserted in the text. 25, 8 *D* has יוֹמִין on the margin to be read after וְלִסְבֵּעַ. *B* has the same word in its text. 27, 22 *C* has יִרְוִהִי on the margin but יָרִי correctly in the text. This has been noticed above under קְרָא וְהִרְגִים. Many more examples of marginal readings will be noticed when we shall treat of the Variant Readings.—i) The Yemen MSS. almost invariably follow the reading given in the Massorah of Berliner under the head of לְנַהֲרֵטָאִי which represents a School in Babyl. in favour of the original Plst. Text and is a great argument for the authenticity of the text which is found in these MSS. To give one instance; *B*. reads גָּנַר and גְּנַר 17, 26 and 27 the MSS. have the Itpeel אֲתַנְרֵר and אֲתַנְרֵרָא. Berliner² places the Peal reading in the column headed לְסוּרָא whilst the Etpeel is placed under לְנַהֲרֵטָאִי. “Perhaps”—adds Berliner—“whether we should take the Peal or Itpeel form depends upon the old grammatical question whether the root of the Hebrew word is נִיר or נִיֵּל”. Baer³, however, is of a different opinion. He says, speaking of certain forms which occur in *B. Aram.* and which he treats as Etpeel “Praeteritum huius conjugationis interdum syllabam praeformativam abjicit velut אֲתַפְרֵס = אֲתַפְרֵס Daniel 5, 28.

VIII. GRAMMATICAL VARIATIONS.

I. THE NOUN.

a) State. There are a few changes in the different states of the Substantives.

¹ l. c. p. 116. ² Massorah p. 62. ³ Daniel etc. p. LIX.

α) In the Absolute and Emphatic States, which in the MSS. appear to be used almost indiscriminately¹. Nöldeke informs us that these two states were entirely confused together in the Mandaic dialect of Aramaic², and from the examples which will be given in Part II, it will be seen that a similar laxness is noticeable in the Targum as represented in the Yemen MSS. *A, B, D* אֲרַבָּ 4, 16, *B.* and *C* אֲרַבָּ. The text is אֲרַבָּ; 6, 21, MSS. אֲרַבָּ, *B.* אֲרַבָּ. The corresponding word in the Hebrew Text is אֲרַבָּ.

β) Absolute and Construct. 15, 19—21, in the Patronymics אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ & c, *B.* believes we have either a shortened form of the absolute Plural or the Construct State used instead of the Absolute³. The first-mentioned explanation is supported by Wright who says final Mim or Nun are apt to fall away in the Absolute Plural of nouns in the Assyrian, Talmudic and Modern Syriac languages⁴. Dalman⁵ assumes that these are shortened forms of the Absolute "Statt der

¹ The same anomaly is also found in Syriac (cf. Duval's Grammar, Paris 1881, p. 249): "L'état emphatique s'est alors généralisé au point de devenir la forme usuelle, et l'état absolu, que l'on ne rencontre plus que dans quelques tournures de phrase, est souvent difficile à constater". ² Mandäische Grammatik, p. 300. Also in the Christian Aramaic dialect of Palestine "We frequently find in the text lying before us the Emphatic State where we should expect the Absolute". He, however, explains these examples as due to later corruption. (Vide ZDMG. XXII, p. 507). Cf. also Berliner l. c. p. 204. But Uhlemann when noticing this apparent confusion in the Samaritan dialect remarks "In haud paucis locis utitur Samaritanus Nominem emph., ubi Hebraeus habet Nomen sine articulo; quae diversitas in eo est querenda, quod Samaritanus forte ibi de re magis definita cogitare". He gives as example 25, 23 אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ of which the Targum is אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ and the Samaritan also writes the Emphatic state with both words viz. אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ ("Insitutiones Linguae Samaritanae" Uhlemann, Leipzig 1837, p. 196). Even in the Biblical Aramaic Text, the British Museum MS. Or. 2374 disagrees with Baer's Edition in reading אֲרַבָּ (Daniel 2, 42) where Baer has אֲרַבָּ. ³ l. c. page 205. ⁴ Cf. Wright: l. c. pp. 67, 146 and 147. ⁵ l. c. p. 151.

¹ The same anomaly is also found in Syriac (cf. Duval's Grammar, Paris 1881, p. 249): "L'état emphatique s'est alors généralisé au point de devenir la forme usuelle, et l'état absolu, que l'on ne rencontre plus que dans quelques tournures de phrase, est souvent difficile à constater". ² Mandäische Grammatik, p. 300. Also in the Christian Aramaic dialect of Palestine "We frequently find in the text lying before us the Emphatic State where we should expect the Absolute". He, however, explains these examples as due to later corruption. (Vide ZDMG. XXII, p. 507). Cf. also Berliner l. c. p. 204. But Uhlemann when noticing this apparent confusion in the Samaritan dialect remarks "In haud paucis locis utitur Samaritanus Nominem emph., ubi Hebraeus habet Nomen sine articulo; quae diversitas in eo est querenda, quod Samaritanus forte ibi de re magis definita cogitare". He gives as example 25, 23 אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ of which the Targum is אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ and the Samaritan also writes the Emphatic state with both words viz. אֲרַבָּ אֲרַבָּ ("Insitutiones Linguae Samaritanae" Uhlemann, Leipzig 1837, p. 196). Even in the Biblical Aramaic Text, the British Museum MS. Or. 2374 disagrees with Baer's Edition in reading אֲרַבָּ (Daniel 2, 42) where Baer has אֲרַבָּ. ³ l. c. page 205. ⁴ Cf. Wright: l. c. pp. 67, 146 and 147. ⁵ l. c. p. 151.

indeterm. Pluralendung in tritt zuweilen ein die Verkürzung e (i)”. In connection with these Patronymics we may also compare רַבֵּי 1, 10 and רַבֵּי־דִבְרֵי 14, 1. The MSS. have רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי 17, 20 whilst B. $\text{רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי}$ which, perhaps, corresponds more closely with the Hebrew original $\text{רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי}$ and which is also given by L. s. v.; 40, 16 *B* רַבֵּי which is probably a Hebraism. B., *A*, *C*, *D*, correctly, רַבֵּי .

b) Number. Turning from the consideration of the differences in States to those observable in Number, it is at once noticeable that these variations are both more numerous and more important. The differences may very frequently be explained as due to the Targumist's desire to give rather the sense of the Hebrew than a mere slavish rendering; whilst some are due to an uncertainty whether a Collective Noun should be treated as Singular or as Plural. B. and *A* רַבֵּי 4, 11. *B* and *C* רַבֵּי , *D* רַבֵּי . The first reading appears to be the best, and is given by L.¹, since we expect here the Plural Construct. *B* and *C* may be true to the Aramaic idiom; but *D* appears, at first sight, to be incorrect. Nevertheless this reading cannot be condemned, since the sense of the passage is certainly singular. B. $\text{רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי}$ MSS. $\text{רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי־רַבֵּי}$ 1, 21. The Subject is רַבֵּי , which, being a Collective Noun may possibly justify either reading. L., however, gives the same as that of the MSS. *C* רַבֵּי B., *A*, *B* and *D* רַבֵּי 14, 22. Luzz. in his 'Philoxenos'² asserts that the Plural is necessary here, since the Targumist refers the passage to Prayer in which both hands are held up, whilst the Hebrew text refers to an oath, for which only one hand is raised.

c) The peculiar use of the Genders in the MSS., and the apparent confusion which exists in the use of Masculine for Feminine presents us with a grammatical problem. Did the primitive Aramaic language have distinct forms for the Masculine and Feminine Genders or was this distinction merely the result of a later development and differentiation

¹ s. v. ² Vienna: 1830, p. 35.

fixed by the Massorites and Grammarians? The written text of the Aramaic of the Bible seems to point to one form for the two Genders; when, however, the suffix refers to a feminine object it was differently punctuated by the Massorites. Bevan, referring to this phenomenon in Bb. Aram. remarks that the written text is grammatically inaccurate: "Sometimes grammatical inaccuracies which probably were found already in the primitive text have been corrected by the later vocalizers; thus הִן the suffix of the 3rd Person Plural was used indifferently for the Masculine or Feminine, but has been marked with the vowel ē whenever it refers to a feminine Noun. Similarly in the 3rd Person Plural of the Perfect of the Verb the termination ך is used for both genders, but has been treated as ā by the vocalizers, when the Subject is Feminine"¹. So also the Yemen MSS. use the termination הִן and כִּן both for Masculine and Feminine and likewise the suffix ך is used as Common Suffix of the 3rd Person Plural of the Imperfect of Verbs where we should expect Mas. ך and Fem. ךָ². I have only noticed a few exceptions to this rule in C and shall later on enumerate these. In my opinion these examples are not due—as Bevan thinks—to grammatical inaccuracies but are really of Common Gender³. We may perhaps find analogous instances in the

¹ Bevan: l. c. p. 39. ² Although the regular fem. forms were mostly used in Christian Palestinian Aramaic still we find examples in which the Masc. endings are used for the Fem. as in **اچف** (ZDMG. XXII. p. 474). ³ The text of Daniel in the British Museum MS. Or. 2374; appears to confirm this assumption. As I have already remarked this MS. pays no attention to the כִּיב but inserts the קִי in its text. In this MS. then the scribe writes **כִּיבִּיב** Dan. 2, 33 when our editions of the Bible say we must read **כִּיבִּיב** on account of the Gender, although the כִּיב is **כִּיבִּיב**. Now had the scribe read **כִּיבִּיב** he would have undoubtedly written the word thus. This proves that in the time and place of the scribe this word was pronounced **כִּיבִּיב** just as it is written and that the reading **כִּיבִּיב** was unknown to the scribe.

Hebrew language in which the word נַגַּר¹ originally meant both 'boy' and 'girl' being spelt without ה when it occurs in the Pentateuch. But a much more striking instance of the same phenomenon is to be found in the Hebrew הוּא which in the Pentateuch is the Ketib both for הוּא and הוּיָא (the latter form occurring but 11 times in the whole Pentateuch, according to the Massorites)². Whether then this peculiarity of the Yemen MSS. is a vulgarism or a classical characteristic of the language remains doubtful, but after observing that a similar phenomenon existed in the primitive Hebrew language, there is no reason why we should not assume that it is likewise characteristic of the primitive Aramaic language. I now enumerate the few exceptions which I have noticed in *C*. This MS. reads אַבְוֹהוֹן 19; 33, 35 and 38 אִישׁ־נַגַּר 27, 29 אַבְוֹהוֹן 31, 5 (although in the very same verse we find *C* giving לַהוֹן and referring the Suffix to the same feminine Subject!) and בְּוִקְוֹן³ 41, 30.

¹ Gesenius points out this peculiarity: "The Pentateuch certainly contains some peculiarities of language which have the appearance of archaisms. When these books were composed the words הוּא 'he' and נַגַּר "young man" were still of common Gender and used also for 'she' and 'young woman'. Vide Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, Translated by Conant, London 1839. §§ 2. 3. ² We find an apparent inconsistency in Ezekiel 23, 45 where אִישׁ־הָאָרָם refers to a Feminine Subject. In Verse 47 the word is written אִישׁ־הָאָרָם. ³ Samaritan (as *A*, *B* and *D*) בְּוִקְוִין. In the following pages some readings from the Samaritan Targum which agree with one or another of the Variant Readings under consideration have been inserted. Since Samaritan has no vowel signs these instances are only of value in confirming the Consonantal Text. Upon the much-vexed question whether the Samaritan Targumist was influenced by the Targum of Onkelos or agreement between the two is due to later interpolations into the Text of the Samaritan Targum I refrain to enter; but bearing in mind that the language of Onkelos and Samaritan are two kindred dialects of Aramaic and that they both represent very ancient Translations of the Hebrew Text, the examples given may be of some value in helping to confirm a reading. The edition of Dr. Adolf Brüll (Frankfort: 1879) has been, in all cases, the text of the Samaritan Targum referred to.

These are evidently mere anomalies, and of no importance. It is unnecessary to give examples here as they occur throughout all the MSS. invariably. Other variations in Gender will be found in Part II.

2. THE VERB.

a) The Conjugations. Very numerous interchanges are to be observed in the Conjugations.

α) Peal and Pael. *B* וְזָכַרְתָּ. *B. A, C, D* וְזָכַרְתָּ 31, 54. Landauer² explains and justifies the latter reading in his Massorah. He says that here only נִכְסָה וְנִכְסָה is mentioned, and hence the Peal is the correct Conjugation. The case is different in Numbers 22, 40 in which example the Pael is necessary, since Balaq offered up a large number of animals (תִּזְבֹּחַת זָבָח). *A, B* and *D* וְשָׂאֵלְתָּה 3. *B.* and *C* וְשָׂאֵלְתָּה 37, 15. *L.* gives no Pael of this root, but it may be observed that in the Syriac language the Pael has the same signification as the Peal.

β) Peal and Afel. *B.* and *C* וְאָרְוִי, *A, B, D* וְאָרְוִי 4, 3. Similarly throughout Genesis. Now, there is no doubt that *A, B* and *D* have the only correct reading of the Afel of אָרַח cf. Syriac ܐܪܚܐ. *B.*'s form is really 1st Per. Sin. Imperf. Peal. *B.* וְשָׁכַחְתָּה MSS. have וְשָׁכַחְתָּה 4, 14. The Afel, is the more convenient form, according to *L.*; this form being preferred to avoid the confusion which might arise in the employment of the Aramaic root שָׁכַח = to find and the Hebrew root שָׁכַח = to forget.

γ) Peal and Etpaal, Etpaal or Ettafal. MSS. וְאָרְוִי (Pael) *B.* וְאָרְוִי (Ettafal) 3, 19. The Hebrew וְאָרְוִי being an Infinitive may be either Active or Passive. Here it seems to bear an active signification, which would confirm the reading of the MSS. *L.*⁴ also gives the Peal form here, but I'ath-šegen⁵ supports *B.*'s reading and explains it reflectively.

¹ Samaritan וְזָכַרְתָּ.

² Massorah s. v.

³ Samaritan וְשָׂאֵלְתָּה.

⁴ s. v. ⁵ To this verse.

B, C and *B*. יולסליק *A* and *D* יאסליק (Etpaal) 26, 23. The Hebrew text being וַיֵּלֶךְ appears to confirm the first-mentioned reading. *A* and *D* דילייה¹ *B, B* and *C* דאיהיליה (Etpael) 46, 22. The Hebrew is יָלַד. The first-mentioned reading, although giving the sense of the original, is less literal than the passive construction.

δ) Pael and Afel. *B*. איהר MSS. 34, 19. Both these forms have the same meaning, but Berliner, in his Massorah³, places the reading איהר among the list of instances included under the head of קרא וחרגום and we have already seen that the MSS. appear to take no notice of this Massoretic rule. *L.* gives איהר as Pael of אהר, but as the Pael of אהר occurs very rarely whilst the Afel is fairly common, the reading of the MSS. appears to be preferable. *B*. אנהיאה MSS. דאנהיאה 38, 14. In Berliner's Massorah⁴ we read לסוראי עדיאה לנהרהנאה ואנהיאה to which the author of the Pathšegen adds "There is some difficulty in understanding what difference the Suraans make between ונהיאה when used as the Trg. of וחסר and when it is the Trg. of ונהר as in 4, 1". This implies that he preferred or expected the reading ואנהיאה. *L.*⁵ also prefers the Afel which means to 'depart', 'go away', 'take off', whilst the Pael means 'to conceive'.⁶

ε) Etpael and Etpaal. MSS. דאנשהיה, *B*. ונהינהיה 3, 10. Merx in his "Chrestomathia Targumica"⁷ pleads for the Etpael reading "Editiones Itpaal saepe praebent, at observa syr. Etpae. esse abscondit se, absconditus est; Etpa. vero inhumatus est. Payne-Smith s. v." Similarly in 4, 14. *A, B, D* יהאשה, *B*. and *C* יהאשה 42, 19. *L.*⁸ here gives the Etpaal, but according to Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum⁹ the Etpael is the conjugation in use in the Syriac language. By the examples given in Part II it will be found that this is very frequently the case.

¹ Samaritan יולסליק. ² Samaritan דיליה. ³ p. 58. ⁴ p. 63.

⁵ s. v. ⁶ But Dalman l. c. p. 39 gives the meaning of

both Pael and Afel "schwanger werden". ⁷ p. 207. ⁸ s. v.

⁹ Berlin 1895, p. 21 a.

b) The Tenses.

α) Perfect and Imperfect. 31, 27; B., C and D אֶשְׁלַח־ךָ, A and B אֶשְׁלַח־יָדְךָ but Berliner¹, Landauer² and Adler³ all support the former reading. C דִּבְרָנִי, B., A, B and D דִּבְרָנִי 49, 22. The latter reading is correct.

β) Perfect and (Participle) Present. More numerous variations are here noticeable. These differences are mainly due—says B.⁴—to the fact that the Hebrew language has no Present Tense, whilst the Aramaic has no Imperfect with ו conversivum. A, B and D יִנְשֵׁק, B. and C יִנְשֵׁק. The Hebrew is יִנְשֵׁק 8, 7. L.⁵ supports the former reading which may be taken as correct. MSS. יִהְיֶה־הָהָה, B. יִהְיֶה־הָהָה. The Hebrew is יִהְיֶה 23, 11. The Hebrew is thus Perfect in form but Present in signification; hence, B.'s reading gives the correct sense but the MSS. have a more literal rendering.

γ) Imperfect and (Participle) Present. B יִנְשֵׁק, C יִנְשֵׁק, D יִנְשֵׁק, A and B. יִנְשֵׁק 24, 13. Pathšegen⁶ reads as B but it may be observed that D corresponds exactly to the Hebrew יִנְשֵׁק. B יִנְשֵׁק 43, 25, B., A, C and D יִנְשֵׁק the latter receiving the support of Pathšegen⁷. B is a literal translation of the Hebrew יִנְשֵׁק.

c) Other Differences. There are one or two other slight variations to be noticed with the Verb. A and D יִנְשֵׁק (Passive), B., B and C יִנְשֵׁק (Active) 34, 22. The Hebrew being יִנְשֵׁק the passive construction is superior. B., A and C יִנְשֵׁק, B and D יִנְשֵׁק 9 13, 16. The latter is the literal translation of the Hebrew יִנְשֵׁק. Similarly in 31, 1, B., C and D have יִנְשֵׁק whilst A and B read יִנְשֵׁק this being a translation of the Hebrew יִנְשֵׁק.

IX. OTHER VARIATIONS.

1) We find a large number of additions, mostly of small words or prepositions in our MSS. Many of these additions

¹ Massorah, p. 98. ² Massorah s. v. ³ לְהַגִּיד לְךָ: to this verse.

⁴ l. c. p. 203. ⁵ s. v. ⁶ To this verse. ⁷ Samaritan has יִנְשֵׁק

⁸ Samaritan likewise יִנְשֵׁק. ⁹ Samaritan יִנְשֵׁק.

make the text clearer; others have Halachic reasons, whilst a few are mistakes. We likewise find omissions, that is to say there are less words given in the MSS. than are to be found in B.'s Edition. Some are omitted to save the scribe the trouble of rewriting a string of Proper Names: the verse, as Berliner points out, being read thrice in Hebrew, instead of being followed by its Targum and then by its Arabic translation. Occasionally these omissions are due to the scribe's carelessness.

2) Additions. All the MSS. insert הוֹאֵה before רב־הוֹן 4, 22. Adler, in his commentary נתינה לגר regards this as an instance of Homoioteleuton, the preceding verse having היה הוֹאֵה in the text. *A* adds לְמַחֲמָה after הוֹדִיִן 4, 23. This may perhaps be a Halachic addition. Vide Adler in נתינה לגר to this verse. 6, 11 *A* and *D* simplify this verse by adding מִן before קָדִים.

Some irregularity is observable in the use of ך to express the construct state and a similar laxity occurs in Syriac. Generally, the construction without ך is the more classical one and the use of ך is the more popular construction. This employment of ך being a much freer and looser construction is preferred by the Aramaic language and is much more frequently used than the other construction.

The MSS. add it in דִּמְקִירָה 2, 11 (Hebrew הַסֹּבֵב) *A*, *B*, *D* וְשִׁבְּם¹ *C* שִׁבְּם 33, 18. According to Berliner's Massorah² the ך is incorrect in verse 18 but necessary in verse 19; since 18 is given as an instance of קרא והרגום. The little word יֵה is sometimes added by *B* and *C*, mostly, however, incorrectly. *C* has יֵה before קליה 21, 17. This יֵה is copied from the אֵה of the Hebrew text; but inasmuch as the Trg. employs a Passive construction here, יֵה is evidently incorrect.

לְצַיֵּר³ is added by *B* in 13, 10, a reading which is rejected by the author of the Pathšegen⁴. ך is added by the

¹ Samaritan שִׁבְּם.

² P. 58.

³ Likewise Samaritan לְצַיֵּר.

⁴ to this verse.

MSS. in בְּבִנְיָאֵם^1 which is against the Hebrew text and in וַיִּבְנוּהוּן 33, 13 which follows the original. *A* and *B* add it in וְהָם 10, 1 not as Hebr. ו is added by *A* and *D* in בְּבִנְיָהוּם 42, 24 and since the corresponding Hebrew word is בְּבִנְיָהוּם this reading is the correct one.

ו is added by *A*, *B* and *C* in וְעָקָה^2 42, 21 (*B.* and *D* וְעָקָה). The reading with ו appears preferable, since it suits the context so admirably.

3. Omissions. I have noticed some scores of omissions, but shall only mention a few which are not due to any oversight on the part of the scribe. Sometimes verses are omitted in their entirety to save space and the scribe's time; this is particularly noticeable in genealogies. For instance 10, 22 and 23, 27—29.

18, 19 *A* omits וְהָקָם which does not correspond to any word in the Hebrew text but is explained by Adler in his "הוא כמו שדרשו ר"ז"ל "הנהגה לנר".

18, 30 *B* omits וְהָרִיחַ which again has no equivalent in the Hebrew text.

19, 7 *C* omits וְהָרִיחַ and Pathšegen also remarks that there is no occasion for this word in the Targum text since $\text{וְהָרִיחַ} = \text{וְהָרִיחַ}$.

43, 15 *A* and *D* omit וְהָרִיחַ which is again represented by no word in the Hebrew text, but Rašī explains the word as necessary, since, in Aramaic, different Verbs are in use to indicate the seizure of things and the seizure of human beings. וְהָרִיחַ being used of things and וְהָרִיחַ of men. *B.* inserts a ו before the following words which I write as they appear in the MSS. וְהָרִיחַ 3, 9; וְהָרִיחַ 7, 22; וְהָרִיחַ 18, 6; וְהָרִיחַ 19, 16; וְהָרִיחַ 23, 19 (*A* and *D* only); וְהָרִיחַ 41, 39.

An initial ו is omitted by *A* and *B* before וְהָרִיחַ 3, 21. Also before וְהָרִיחַ 6, 20 which corresponds to the Hebrew. The

¹ Samaritan וְהָרִיחַ . ² Samaritan וְהָרִיחַ . ³ Samaritan also וְהָרִיחַ and וְהָרִיחַ but, on the other hand, וְהָרִיחַ .

MSS. omit $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}$ before $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ב}^{\text{ה}}$ 21, 8. In several other passages the omission of this word is due to the scribe's carelessness.

ב is omitted before $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ב}^{\text{ה}}$ 35, 27 by *A*, *B* and *D*; in connection with which we must notice that it does not occur in the Hebrew text. Also before $\text{א}^{\text{י}}\text{ב}^{\text{ו}}\text{ז}^{\text{ו}}$ 43, 27 where it likewise does not appear in the original, although it does in the following verse. Pathšegen says we must insert the ב in both verses, according to the usage of the Aramaic language. The word $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}$ is omitted by *A* in 48, 22 and by *C* in 32, 18; both passages are however faulty in these MSS.

4) Contractions. The scribes regularly contract certain familiar words which constantly recur, especially those in combination with $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}$ and $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$.

A has $\text{ד}^{\text{י}}\text{ד}^{\text{י}}$ 4, 11. *B*, *C*, *D* $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ד}^{\text{י}}$. *A*, *B* and *D* $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ *C* $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 6, 17 and 9, 9. *A* and *D* $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$. *B* and *C* $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 16, 2; 18, 24; 24, 5 &c. *A* and *B* $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$, *C* and *D* $\text{ה}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 20, 3, *C* and *D* $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$, *A* and *B* $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 31, 39. All have $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 40, 7 and $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 47, 1.

5) Interchange of Prepositions and other Particles. In noting these numerous variations we are again struck with the fact that the manuscript readings are usually superior. MSS. $\text{ל}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$, *B*. $\text{ב}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 8, 20. *B*'s reading is a Hebraism. MSS. $\text{ל}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$. *B*. $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ 49, 9. Berliner in his Massorah¹ places the manuscript reading in the column $\text{ל}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ whilst $\text{ז}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$ is under $\text{ל}^{\text{י}}\text{ז}^{\text{י}}$. Besides the examples already quoted of interchanges which take place between different Prepositions, I have to add a number of instances in which different Particles or Prepositions are employed which sometimes completely alter the sense of the passage. I consider it necessary to give these somewhat dry details at length, inasmuch as it is my object to demonstrate the superiority of the Trg. text as exhibited by the MSS. which I have made use of, over the editions which are in current circulation among us at the present day.

¹ p. 63.

B. הָהּ MSS. הָהּ 26, 8. The reading הָהּ is preferable since הָהּ is only used as the sign of the accusative in Aramaic, and not otherwise. Gesenius¹ treats the two Hebrew words הָהּ = sign of the accusative, and הָהּ = with, as entirely distinct and of different etymology. B., C and D הָהּ, A and B הָהּ 29, 26, Hebrew is הָהּ. L. reads הָהּ but according to Bernstein-Kirsch's Chrestomathy² הָהּ = הָהּ + הָהּ and hence either reading may be justified; and this is again the case in 30, 33 where B. reads הָהּ and A, B, D הָהּ, C is missing. The Hebrew text is הָהּ. The Aramaic verb הָהּ may be construed either with הָהּ or הָהּ. B. הָהּ MSS. הָהּ 49, 13. In Berliner's Massorah³ הָהּ is given as the Suraan and הָהּ as the Nehardean reading. L. reads as the MSS. which gives the better sense.

6) We occasionally find variations in the addition of the suffix. B. and C הָהּ, A and D הָהּ, B הָהּ 4, 7. Berliner, in his Massorah⁴, says the suffix is incorrect, but L. reads as the MSS. Likewise, in the variation of the vowel-point L. permits both forms. B. הָהּ, A, C, D הָהּ, B הָהּ 19, 12. The Hebrew is הָהּ. Berliner, in his Massorah,⁵ says the Targumist wished to make this word agree in form with the following words הָהּ both of which have the suffix of the 2nd Person. Pathšegen remarks the same. But this hardly appears to be necessary and the literal translation of the MSS. therefore seems to be superior. B has the word incorrectly punctuated.

X. EXEGETICAL VARIATIONS.

Most of the variations which have been considered hitherto are of importance, showing, as they do, the greater purity of the Aramaic language which the Yemen Trg. Mss. exhibit.

¹ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon translated by S. P. Tregelles London: 1885 s. v. ² s. v. הָהּ (Leipzig 1836). 3 p. 63.

⁴ p. 74. ⁵ p. 75.

These Variations give an incentive to the study of these MSS. if for no other reason than their more accurate retention of pure Aramaic forms and expressions.

The exegetical variations, however, are of far greater importance. They cannot be accounted for on the ground of difference of dialect, nor do they point to any linguistic peculiarities, but give a clear reason for assuming that they represent another distinct recension. The chief characteristic of these differences is the preference frequently shown for a literal translation of passages which are in our texts rendered according to traditional Hagadic translations. It has already been pointed out¹ that the preference for literal translations shown by the Plst. recension may perhaps be accounted for by the existence in Palestine of the other Trg. which is certainly of Hagadic character; I refer, of course, to the Targum Jerushalmi; or it may be accounted for as the outcome of a desire to have a translation which should render the Hebrew text in the most faithful and accurate manner, which is also the tendency of Aquilas and all the old translators, who are severely literal. A few instances are given here, the rest will be found in Part II.

26, 22 B. בְּרַבְרָאֵיִךְ , *C* and *D* בְּרַבְרָאֵיִךְ , *A* and *B* בְּרַבְרָאֵיִךְ . The Hebrew is וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ of which *A* and *B* give a literal rendering "God will magnify us and we will multiply ourselves in the land". That this is the valid reading is further proved by the support it receives from Raši and L. The author of the Pathšegen, however, gives a reading similar to that of B. as the correct text "God will magnify and increase us".

30, 15 B., *B* and *D* וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ ², *A* וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ , *C* is missing. Luzz. in his גַּרְמָה ³ points out that those who corrected the original וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ to וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ made a great mistake, and did not realise the spirit of the Trg. rendering. Onkelos—says Luzz.—undoubtedly wrote וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ but later revisers thought this reading was incorrect since the Infinitive וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ should require the Infinitive

¹ Chap. IV, § 4. ² Samaritan וַיִּבְרַחֵנוּ . ³ p. 25.

לְגַמְלָהּ whilst אֲרִי־סִבִּין would be the Targum of לְגַמְלָהּ—2nd Feminine Preterite. This, however, Luzz. goes on to say, is not the case; since O. wished to amplify the brevity and clear up the obscurity of the Hebrew passage and accordingly paraphrases אֲרִי־סִבִּין. Yet in spite of Luzz.'s arguments, one is again inclined to favour the literal translation לְגַמְלָהּ.

30, 22 *B* reads וְהָיָה יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים, *B*, *A*, *C*, *D* וְהָיָה הָאֱלֹהִים קָדִים יְהוָה which is evidently a Hagadic rendering (v. Rāsi to this verse). *B* gives the literal translation of the Hebrew text viz וְהָיָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת רִחְלָה and therefore appears to be the best rendering. 39, 11 *B* (text) וְלֹא־עָבָר עַבְד־רִיבְיָה, *B* (margin), *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. לֹא־עָבָר עַבְד־יְהוָה חַי־שְׁמֹרָה. Here we have a good instance of the manner in which marginal glosses crept into the Trg. text. The Hebrew original is לֹא־עָבָר עַבְד־יְהוָה of which *B* is a literal translation. 42, 36. In this verse we see another example of the retention of the original text by *B*. The Hebrew is וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין which *B* renders וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין whilst *B*. and the other MSS. give וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין which gives the sense of the original but is not literal. *B*'s translation is also given by *L*.²

43, 2 *B*. and *C* וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין, *A*, *B* (margin) and *D* וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין, *B* (text) erased. Hebrew is וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין. Now the two Aramaic roots סָפַק and סָפַק have the same signification. The authorities differ which word to prefer here. *L*. remarks that סָפַק usually corresponds to the Hebrew וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין³ and Rāsi likewise reads וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין. He goes on to say that סָפַק is an incorrect reading since the root סָפַק is only used when one has eaten to satisfaction although some food may still be left, whilst וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין is used for a man remaining unsatisfied although his supply of food is already exhausted. But Luzz. in his Philoxenos⁴ pleads for the reading וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין saying that this is the verb employed in Aramaic when the text refers to a 'finishing' with eating, drinking or any other bodily requirement. The

¹ Samaritan וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין. ² s. v. ³ Cf. also Ezra 6, 15 וְהָיָה אֲרִי־סִבִּין. "And was finished". ⁴ p. 45.

fact that שִׁיִצִיִּיאִ is given by *B* as a marginal reading seems to support Luzz.'s opinion. It must be noticed, however, that the marginal readings are sometimes preferable and appear to correct a faulty reading which is found in the text. Thus in 45, 11 *B*, *C*, *B* (text) read תִּשְׁחִיִצִיִּיאִ whilst *A*, *B* (margin) and *D* give הִתְחַסְּסָן. The Hebrew text is תִּקְרַשׁ. *A*, *B* (margin) and *D* give the best reading since הִתְחַסְּסָן = be impoverished whilst תִּשְׁחִיִצִיִּיאִ has rather the signification of 'be annihilated', 'be undone', 'die'. Raši and Qimḥi both read הִתְחַסְּסָן but Pathšegen and Luzz.¹ say we must read תִּשְׁחִיִצִיִּיאִ for—say they—how can we speak of all one's possessions i. e. one's cattle &c. coming to poverty? But be this as it may the reading הִתְחַסְּסָן corresponds exactly with the Hebrew תִּקְרַשׁ a word which is correctly rendered "come to poverty" in the Revised Version, although it may be noted that some of the Jewish commentators differ in their translation of this word, thus Ibn Ezra "to perish", R. Samuel b. Meir "to be dispossessed", Mendelssohn "to be ruined".

45, 17 *B* (text) אֲבִילִי², *B* (margin), *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. אֲבִילִי. Hebrew גָּאֵה. The first mentioned reading is preferable since it is quite literal. The reason (says Pathšegen) of the Targumic rendering אוֹבִילִי is to avoid the redundancy of the Hebrew text and thus render εὐσεύεσθε ἀγαθὰ.

46, 1 *B* (text) וְיִזְכֶּה לְכַסְתָּהּ, *B* (margin) and the others וְיִזְכֶּה לְכַסְתָּהּ, Hebrew וְיִזְכֶּה לְכַסְתָּהּ. Although *B* (text) is incorrect it is strange that the Trg. of וְיִזְכֶּה לְכַסְתָּהּ in 31, 54 is as he gives here. 47, 20 *B*. וְיִזְכֶּה, MSS. וְיִזְכֶּה, Hebrew וְיִזְכֶּה. *B*'s reading וְיִזְכֶּה is also quoted by Pathšegen. On the other hand Landauer gives וְיִזְכֶּה in his Massorah.³

Perhaps *B*'s reason is that in this verse Joseph really *bought* the land, whilst in verse 23 he *acquired* the people.

¹ אֲבִילִי. P. 46. ² Samaritan וְיִזְכֶּה. 3 s. v.

P A R T II.

CHAPTER I.

Before commencing the lists of examples which illustrate the preceding rules, certain words which call for some comment may here be treated. I believe that most of these words will be found to be more correctly punctuated in the MSS. than in our editions of the Trg. As these words are of constant recurrence their correct vocalization should be fixed. First we have the little word ܩܘܢܝܢ . This word, although so exceedingly common is of obscure etymology. Our editions punctuate this word with P. and B. invariably writes ܩܘܢܝܢ .

L. also writes the word with P., although he compares the syriac ܩܘܢܝܢ = nature, of which ܩܘܢܝܢ is construct state. The P. is also supported by Nestle¹, Bernstein-Kirsch and Gese-
nius in their dictionaries. Merx in his "Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume"² mentions a curious rule which Mercier wished to establish. Mercier wrote ܩܘܢܝܢ in the Trg. when the corresponding Hebrew is קוּנִיָּן , but קוּנִיָּן when the text has קוּנִיָּן . Merx declares most decisively³ that we are assured that קוּנִיָּן is the correct punctuation by Bar-Ali; ܩܘܢܝܢ , on the other hand, is invariably incorrect.

Bevan also writes ܩܘܢܝܢ ⁴, also Duval⁵. Undoubtedly the greatest authority who supports the Q., is the great Orientalist, W. Wright. He remarks:⁶ "We get in the first place

¹ Syriac Grammar, Berlin: 1889. ² Contained in the "Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses" Berlin 1881. p. 145. ³ p. 185. ⁴ Bevan: The Book of Daniel p. 38. ⁵ Grammaire Syriaque p. 277. ⁶ Wright: Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages p. 112.

יה which was doubtless pronounced in the earlier stages of the language *īyāth* or *īyath*; for otherwise the י would not have been inserted in writing, as is almost invariably the case in the older inscriptions. In the inscriptions of later date, however, we find יא and Plautus heard the word pronounced *yth*. The Aramaic form seems to be shortened from the Phoenician viz Syriac ܝܬܐ, Chaldee ܝܬܐ, less correctly ܝܬܐ.¹ After the opinion of such an authority the punctuation with P. may fairly be assumed to be incorrect, and that with Q., which is invariably used in the MSS., substituted for it.

According to Merx² both the absolute and construct of כב is כב or כב, the use of which depends upon the text of the Hebrew original, which is to be attributed to the Masoretic schools. But this is not the case with our MSS. as may be seen from the following examples. 2, 5 כב, where B. and the Hebrew text both read כב. 2, 16 A כב, the rest have כב. Hebrew is כב. 2, 19 B. and Hebrew כב, MSS. כב. 3, 17 B כב. B., A, C, D and the Hebrew כב. 6, 2 B כב A, C, D and Hebrew כב. These instances suffice to show that no rule can be fixed to indicate the employment of the two forms. I have, however, noticed that C has חו. throughout except in the following instances כב 35, 6 כב 20, 8 and 45, 8 and 9 and כב 47, 17.

Our MSS. always punctuate קרם and this I consider the correct punctuation since the corresponding Syriac word is ܩܪܡܐ. The Bib. Aram. also supports this reading, since it is קרם and not קרם. Berliner, in his Massorah³ has קרם as the reading of the Nehardeans and קרם that of the Suraans, whilst the Massorah to Exodus 6, 5 says that קרם is not the language of the Targum but that of the "Chasdim". In

¹ But Schröder justifies either punctuation "Sie wurde ursprünglich mit lautbarem Jod יא gesprochen, später wurde ijath, woraus sowohl arab. ijā als aramäisch *jath*, *joth* hervorgegangen sind, wie iath, ieth gesprochen und schliesslich mit Unterdrückung auch des a-Lautes, zu ith, yth. Schröder "Die Phönizische Sprache". Halle 1869 p. 213.

² Page 31, Note 3 of "Chrestomathia Targumica". 3 p. 64.

spite of this, however, we may safely reject the reading with a full vowel and read קָרָם, which is of course קָרָם in the MSS. As to the word קביל a difference of punctuation exists which can be best understood by tracing the word to its etymology. B. and C זִקְבִּיל 21, 16, A, B and D have זִקְבִּיל. B. and C לְקָבִיל, A and D לְקָבִיל! B לְקָבִיל 33, 18. All have לְקָבִיל 41, 3. The Syriac forms are ܩܒܝܠܐ, ܩܒܝܠܐ and ܩܒܝܠܐ which may explain the forms לְקָבִיל and לְקָבִיל. Cf. also the Bib. Aram. forms in Daniel 2, 8. קָבִיל and קָבִיל are the usual forms we meet with in the Trg. but the readings of A, B and D appear preferable.

Finally, how are we to read the word אִתְּהִילִיד which occurs so frequently? We may take 4, 26 as a type. Here B. reads אִתְּהִילִיד, A אִתְּהִילִיד B and D אִתְּהִילִיד and C אִתְּהִילִיד. The readings of A, B and D are the usual Targumic forms of the Etpeel of ילד whilst C is a Syriasm. Cf. אִתְּהִילִיד. C invariably has this form.

CHAPTER II.

Examples of the rules contained in the preceding Chapters.

1) Substitution of other vowels for S. (Cf. Chapter V § 4). (a) P. הֵבֵל 4, 2. לָבֵד 4, 19. יָדָר 5, 16. יִעֲסִיחַ 6, 3, גִּבְרִי אֲשֶׁר 10, 2. בְּבֵל יֵאָדָר 10, 10. (b) S. יִיָּחַן 23, 9.

2) Substitutions for Še. Compositum (Cp. V, § 5).

a) Še. mobile.

α. For Hatef P.: יֵהֱשִׁיבָא 1, 2. יֵהֱרָא 1, 4. יֵאָסֵר 1, 6. יֵעֲבֹד 1, 7. יֵהֱשִׁיבָא 1, 28.

β. For Fataf S. הֵיָר 24, 60.

b) Še. Quiescens: רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 1, 25. רֵהֱבֵה 2, 11. זִבְעֵמָה 2, 23. לֵהֱרָא 4, 5 [B incorrectly לֵהֱרָא] רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 4, 9. יֵהֱרָא 8, 13. יֵהֱרָא 8, 22. רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 9, 2. יֵהֱרָא 10, 10. (A and D יֵהֱרָא) רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 12, 1. (C רֵהֱשִׁיבָא) רֵהֱרָא 13, 6, רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 18, 3, (D רֵהֱשִׁיבָא). רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 18, 8. לֵהֱשִׁיבָא 19, 20. (C לֵהֱשִׁיבָא). אֵהֱרָא 21, 16. רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 30, 36. רֵהֱשִׁיבָא 31, 32. אֵהֱרָא 49, 4. B alone has יֵהֱרָא 24, 35.

הָאֲחֵרִין 24, 56. *C* alone has יְהִרָא 42, 1. יְהִרָא 45, 26. *B* and *D* have זְחִרְיָה 42, 27. *B* and *C* have אַחֲוִי 44, 34.

In all these instances *B*. punctuates with Hātef P. He punctuates יְהִי 18, 18 with Fātef S.

c) Full vowel: *C* has אִרְרָן 4, 25 (*A*, *B*, *D* write אִרְרָן!), *B* has אִרְרָא 13, 8 (*A*, *C*, *D* more consistently אִרְרָא) אִרְרָא 19, 2 (*C* אִרְרָבִין) *B* has אִרְרָן 43, 29. אִרְרָא 48, 4. אִרְרָא 49, 12.

d) Še. Compositum is retained in the following solitary examples. *A*, *B* and *D* have אִרְרָן 4, 25, *A* has אִרְרָא 6, 16. אִרְרָא! 28, 20. אִרְרָא 36, 2 (*B* and *D* אִרְרָא, *C* אִרְרָא). אִרְרָא 36, 2 and *D* אִרְרָא 41, 3 and 19.

3) Vowel changes.

a) B. P.: = MSS. Q.¹

α. Monosyllabic Words and Particles (Cf. Cp. VI, § 3a) אִרְרָא 2, 4. אִרְרָא 3, 13 (Syriac ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 13, 3. אִרְרָא 15, 2 (Syriac ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 15, 16 (Syr. ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 17, 7 (Syriac ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 17, 7 (Syr. ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 17, 11 (Syr. ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 18, 9 (Hebrew אִרְרָא). אִרְרָא 19, 8 (Syr. ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 19, 8. אִרְרָא 19, 26. Concerning those words to which the corresponding Hebrew or Syriac forms are not given אִרְרָא and אִרְרָא are incorrect, according to L. s. v. אִרְרָא is a contraction of אִרְרָא and אִרְרָא (time) and this אִרְרָא is really a shortened form of אִרְרָא or, as it is also written אִרְרָא which latter form may perhaps account for the Q.² in the MSS. L. allows אִרְרָא side by side with אִרְרָא; whilst to justify the Q. of אִרְרָא we may compare the Hebrew אִרְרָא (Exodus 22, 5).

β. Miscellaneous words (VI, 3g) אִרְרָא 2, 18. אִרְרָא 3, 18 (Hebrew אִרְרָא). אִרְרָא 3, 21 (Syr.: ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 9, 12 (Syr.: ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 10, 9 (Hebrew אִרְרָא). אִרְרָא 18, 7 (Syr. ܐܪܪܐ). אִרְרָא 27, 23 where, however, L. says we must punctuate אִרְרָא. אִרְרָא 42, 13 and 36 &c. where, according to L., the correct reading is אִרְרָא, but when it is noticed that the

¹ I write the words as they appear in the MSS. ² Cf. Syriac ܐܪܪܐ 'what' which is also written ܐܪܪܐ.

word לִיָּה is merely a contraction of אֵל אִיָּה may this fact not justify the Q. which the MSS. read?

b) B. Q. = MSS. P.

α. Vowel of the 2nd Radical of a Verb (VI, 3b) אֶרְאֶה־לָּהֶם 3, 7. לִשְׁמַעְלֵי 3, 8. דַּבְּרָה־לָּהֶם 4, 11. אֶרְאֶה־לָּהֶם 6, 11. עָשָׂה 8, 19. לִרְדֹּפֵינוּךְ 14, 15.

β. Absence of Pausal Influence (VI, 3c) לִכְתֹּבְכֶם 1, 29. $\text{כִּלְכַּלְשִׁבְתְּךָ}$ 4, 13. דַּחֲרֵי 2, 7. אֵת 3, 9.

γ. Before the suffixes אֵל and יָי (VI, 3d) לָּאֵל 11, 4. יָי־הַמְּרִינָא 5, 29.

δ. Absence of Še. Compositum (VI, 3e) לִכְתֹּבְכֶם 2, 3. אֶרְאֶה־לָּהֶם 3, 12. אֶשְׁמַעְלֵי 3, 13.

c) B. Š.: = MSS. H. (VI, 4) לִכְתֹּבְכֶם 3, 22. בְּקָרָם 9, 9. אֶשְׁמַעְלֵי 9, 20. בְּמִי־לִמְחֹךְ 11, 2. שְׁלֵים 15, 16. לִכְתֹּבְכֶם 17, 7. קָבִי־לָּת 18, 20. אֶסְגִּירֵי 18, 27. In each of these examples (taken from the first 20 Chapters) I have compared the punctuation of the MSS. with that of L. with which it always agrees except קָבִי־לָּת which L. prefers with a Š.

d) B. H. = MSS. Š. לִשְׁמַעְלֵי 2, 6. הַיְי־לֵךְ 3, 14. הַיְי־לֵךְ 5, 22. אֶתְחַפֵּי 6, 14. אִי־סִיָּה 8, 21. לִתְהֵי 9, 13. יֶאֱחֻזְרָה 9, 16. אֶתְפַּלְגֵּת 10, 25. לִכְתֹּבְכֶם 11, 3. לִתְהֵלֵי 11, 7. אֶמְרֵי 12, 13. דַּחֲלִיד 15, 4. דַּחֲקֹן 16, 6. עֵינָא 16, 7. אֶסְגִּיר 16, 10. אֶלֵךְ 18, 13 (*A* and *C* here אֶלֵיךְ). לִכְבִּיד 18, 17. גִּלְפִי־הָא 19, 24. הַחֲבֵר 19, 25. לִשְׁמַעְלֵי 19, 33. לִשְׁקִינֵיהָ 19, 34.

All these agree with L., with the exception of אֶסְגִּיר and יֶשְׁמַעְלֵי which L. punctuates with H. He admits either vowel with לִכְתֹּבְכֶם and גִּלְפִי־הָא but prefers H. אֶלֵךְ is as incorrect as B.'s אֶלֵיךְ since the Imperfect Peal of לָּךְ is אֶלֵיךְ and the Imperfect Afel is אֶלֵיךְ which *A* and *C* read. *A* has some errors, punctuating the following words with Š. instead of H. שִׁינְיָה 2, 21. הַתְּקִלְתֵּךְ 6, 15. הַחֲבֵר 8, 11 and הַיְי־לֵךְ 18, 19.

e) B. Š. = MSS. Ho. (VI, 5) הַיְי־לֵךְ 2, 16. הַיְי־לֵךְ 3, 19. תִּלְדָּת 5, 1. קָרֵי 8, 4. עֵינָא 8, 7. יֶאֱסְגִּיר 8, 17.

¹ Likewise Nestorian Syriac has the ō sound with Verba ܐܘܢܐ e. g. ܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ .

דְּקִירָא 8, 22. דְּהִירָא 8, 22. דְּרִישִׁיר 9, 5. יִבְאִיר 15, 17. דְּנִשְׁטִיב 19, 32. Of these L. admits either vowel in the case of קורא עורבא חילדה הומא but prefers Š. with קררו התוב דוישוב קררו.

f) B. Ho. = MSS. Š. עִוְבְרִךְ 4, 7. אֶרְוֹנָא 8, 22. טִיר 10, 30. יִסְבִּיךְ. Of these L. only punctuates עִוְבְרִךְ with Ho.

g) B. H. = MSS. P. (VI, 7a) בְּכִרָא 6, 12. רִגְלָה 8, 9. טְגִלִין 15, 9. *A* has עִמְהוֹן 7, 13. For the latter we may compare Syriac ܨܡ = with. Of the others L. justifies only בגלגלא and רגלה.

h) B. P. = MSS. H. (VI, 7b) כְּשִׁבְטָא 4, 15. שְׁבִיבָה is the Bib. Aram. form. (Dan. 4, 13).

i) B. S. = MSS. P. (VI, 7c) אֲבִיח 6, 7. בְּצִלָם 9, 6. מִיָּדָה 12, 6. קָרִב 19, 9 (*D* קָרִב 19, 31. לְמִיִּשְׁלַל 19, 31. אֶרְוִיא 21, 6). Of these קרב alone appears to be incorrect, since intransitive Verbs usually have Š.¹

j) B. P. = MSS. Š. (VI, 7d). *A* has קִינִין 16, 2 and קִינִי 18, 19 both of which are wrong.

k) B. Ho. = MSS. Š. (VI, 7f.) בְּמִיִּשְׁלַל 25, 31. תִּירְסִפִּין 44, 23 (*C* תִּירְסִפִּין). *A* has תִּירִי 47, 17 instead of תִּירְסִפִּין. is confirmed by L.; and all of the examples may tend to confirm Derenbourg's statement² about the Yemenite Jews viz. that they pronounce the Ho. in the same manner as the Polish Jews.

4) The Vowel of the Imperfect (VI, 6) דְּרִשְׁכְּחִירִיח 4, 15. אֶמְחִי 6, 7. אֶרְבֵּעַ 14, 23 (*C* אֶרְבֵּעָה). אֶרְוִיחָה 13, 15. אֶרְבֵּי 16, 2 (*C* אֶרְבֵּי). יֶאֱחִי 17, 8 (*C* יֶאֱחִי). אֶשְׁחֹב 19, 20 (*B* אֶשְׁחֹב). In those examples with initial א the P. stands for S. which would be the Sbl. punctuation.

5) Interchange of Še. and full Vowel.

a) MSS. Še. = B. P. (VI, 8a) דְּשְׁעִינִיר 12, 5. אֶחִין 13, 8. אֶרְיִמָה 14, 22. אֶבְאֶשִׁין 19, 7.

b) MSS. Še. = B. Q. עֶחֶד 4, 7. אֶחִי 4, 9. קֶרְבִּי 4, 10. יֶדְעִלִין 6, 20. חֶד 9, 23. לֶחֶבֶא 10, 13. אֶרְוִיא 10, 18.

¹ This is however not always the case "Non solum intransitiva velut קרב sed etiam transitiva velut שְׁאֵל Dan. 2, 10, שְׁלַט Dan. 3, 27 in Zere terminari possunt" Baer: (l. c.) P. LIX. ² Manuel du Lecteur p. 511.

אָקִיב 14, 16. עָרָא 15, 17. מְלַאכָא 16, 7. עִיקָא 16, 8. אָקִיב 17, 21. (*D* אָקִיב). Of these הוּוּ and עָרָא being Preterites Peal of Verbs have Še. correctly. In מְלַאכָא קְדַמִּי עָרָר and אָחִין the Še. mobile corresponds to the Še. compositum with which these words may be punctuated in the Sbl. system; but the Afel forms אָחִיב and אָקִיב seem to be incorrect with Še.

c) B. = Š.; MSS. = Še. (VI, 8c) אֲמַרְרָא 18, 16. לְלִישְׁתֵּיהֶן 10, 20. אֲלוּט 12, 3. אֲלֵהֶן 15, 4. אֲחֵבִיל 18, 31. All these are truer to the character of the Aramaic language whilst B.'s forms are Hebraisms. אֲלֵהֶן alone appears rather doubtful, but, according to Merx¹, the Še. is justified by Buxtorf in his Dictionary.

6) Orthographical Variations (VII, 1e) *C* has גִּפְרָה (without final א) 19, 24. Occasionally the punctuation of the MSS. seems to be in an unsettled state. Thus in 13, 12 *B* has אָחִיב and אָחִיב in the same verse; whilst *D* has אָחִיב and אָחִיב. The correct reading is אָחִיב. Elsewhere, *C* appearing to be in doubt which is the correct punctuation writes אָחִיב! L.² admits either vowel but prefers H.

The same MS. has אָחִיב immediately followed by אָחִיב in 30, 31, but the P. is here correct since it stands for S. in the Sbl. system. We occasionally meet with forms which remind us of the Sbl. vocalization. Thus *B* has אָחִיב 24, 50 and אָחִיב 27, 25. *A*, *B* and *C* write אָחִיבִינֶךְ 28, 15 (but *D* אָחִיבִינֶךְ) *A* and *D* have אָחִיבִי 3, 19 which we may take as a Hebraism; the others more correctly אָחִיבִי. The MSS. read אָחִיבִי and אָחִיבִי but אָחִיבִי and אָחִיבִי would be more correct forms since in Syriac these words are written with ܐܚܝܒܝܢܝܟܝܘܢ. MSS. read אָחִיבִי 23, 15. *B*. has אָחִיבִי. L. says that in this word and in אָחִיב the suffix of the 1st Person Singular is wanting³. In 14, 10 the MSS. imitate

¹ l. c. s. v. ² l. c. s. v.

³ So also in Christian Palestinian Aramaic the suffix of the First Person Singular is wanting in the word אָחִיב which = אָחִיב "my father" (cf. Nöldeke's Article in the ZDMG. l. c. p. 514).

the Hebrew original reading בִּירֵן בִּירֵן but Pathšegen reads as B. viz בִּירֵן and this is also L.'s reading. The word being of common Gender may perhaps assume either the Masculine or Feminine ending in its plural. *A*, *B*, *C* read כִּסְפָא but *D* has כִּסְפָךְ which is closer to the Hebrew original. *B*, *C*, *D* read אִיחָא 18, 6 but *A* אִיחָי which latter reading is preferred by Berliner¹, Landauer², Levy³, Pathšegen⁴ but Adler⁵ prefers אִיחָא as *B*, *C* and *D* have. In the same verse *A* has סַאן, *B* and *D* סַאן, *C* סַאן whilst B. writes סַאן which, says L.⁶ is the correct form. 18, 15 *A* has תַּרְיבַּת, *B*, *C* and *D* תַּרְיבַּת. *A*'s reading, says the author of the Pathšegen is the Trg. of צַחֲקָה. 18, 21, *C* אֲרִין, *B*, *A* and *D* אֲרִין. Both forms אֲרִין and אֲרִין are allowed by L. but the latter corresponds to the Syriac form. 19, 9 *A*, *B*, *C* קָרִב, *B*. and *D* קָרִב. L.⁷ gives the latter form, but Merx⁸ the former. (V. Pt. II, II, 31, note). Bib. Aram. קָרַב Dan. 3, 26. 19, 13. In this verse B. gives the better reading, having קְבִירָתְהוֹן which is likewise given by L. All the MSS. read קְבִירָתְהוֹן here. *B*. and *C* read הַשִּׁבְתִּין 50, 20 whilst *A*, *B* and *D* have הַשִּׁבְתִּין. L. has the former reading. We may compare the Arabic in which حَسَبَ = to number and حَسِبَ = to think. אֲרִין 19, 15 which is the reading given by the MSS. is more correct than B.'s text אֲרִין when compared with the Syriac אֲרִין, although L. s. v. mentions both forms. In 42, 23 *A*, *B* and *D* write שִׁמֵּי whilst *C* and *B*. give שִׁמֵּי. We may perhaps compare the former reading with the Arabic verb سَمِعَ. Likewise the P. in the word אֲשֶׁהֱבִיב 19, 20 is a better reading than B.'s אֲשֶׁהֱבִיב although L. gives this form. We may compare the Syriac אֲשֶׁהֱבִיב although I am informed that here we have a word borrowed from the Assyrian which has uš'tizib or uš'têzib. MSS. אֲשֶׁהֱבִיב 19, 21 which both Landauer

¹ l. c. p. 7. ² Massorah s. v. ³ s. v. ⁴ To this verse.
⁵ א. l. נִזְיָנָה לְנִי. ⁶ s. v. ⁷ s. v. ⁸ "Chrestomathia Targumica". s. v.

and Berliner give as a Nehardean reading in their Massorahs, and which is evidently intended to imitate the Hebrew original which has הַקָּדָשׁ . B. reads הַקָּדָשָׁה . 9, 22 B. הַקָּדָשָׁה , *A*, *B* and *D* הַקָּדָשָׁה , *C* הַקָּדָשָׁה . The correct reading, according to L. is הַקָּדָשׁ . B. adds the final א in his notes. 20, 4, B. וְנִשְׂאָר . *B.* וְנִשְׂאָר , *A*, *C* and *D* וְנִשְׂאָר . Perhaps the best reading is וְנִשְׂאָר . Cf. Syriac ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . 20, 7 B. וְנִשְׂאָר *A*, *C* and *D* וְנִשְׂאָר and *B* has וְנִשְׂאָר! of course *B.*'s reading is absurd. Of the others *A*, *C* and *D* retain the more classical form of which וְנִשְׂאָר is merely a contraction. Cf. Syriac ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . On the other hand *B.*'s reading וְנִשְׂאָר in 20, 10 appears preferable to וְנִשְׂאָר which the MSS. give, although L. also gives a final א^2 (s. v.). But the reading of the MSS. is again preferable in וְנִשְׂאָר 24, 2 and not as *B.* reads וְנִשְׂאָר and again in וְנִשְׂאָר 24, 14 and in וְנִשְׂאָר 24, 43; *B.*'s readings being וְנִשְׂאָר and וְנִשְׂאָר . In 24, 60 *B.* has וְנִשְׂאָר , *A* וְנִשְׂאָר , *B* וְנִשְׂאָר , *C* וְנִשְׂאָר and *D* וְנִשְׂאָר of which *D* is the most correct, although the א is superfluous. Cf. the Syriac form ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . 25, 25 *B.* וְנִשְׂאָר . *A*, *B* and *D* וְנִשְׂאָר , *C* וְנִשְׂאָר . L. confirms the first-mentioned reading. *B.* is again more correct in reading וְנִשְׂאָר 26, 3. MSS. read וְנִשְׂאָר . *C* invariably reads וְנִשְׂאָר . The other MSS., more correctly, וְנִשְׂאָר . Cf. the Bib. Aram. ܘܢܝܫܐܪ Daniel 5, 10 and the corresponding Syriac forms ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . *A* has the uncontracted form וְנִשְׂאָר 27, 32. Cf. Syriac ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . *B.* וְנִשְׂאָר 27, 40. MSS. וְנִשְׂאָר which L. gives as the correct Imperfect of וְנִשְׂאָר .

The MSS. are again preferable in the same verse, giving וְנִשְׂאָר , whilst *B.* has וְנִשְׂאָר , although the latter form is given by L. The MSS. again have the more correct form in

¹ And also Biblical Aramaic ܘܢܝܫܐܪ Ezra 2, 9. ² But the Q. is justifiable according to Bib. Aram. cf. Daniel 5, 22 ܘܢܝܫܐܪ . ³ But Baer in his Paradigms of Biblical Aramaic forms gives a similar form to that of Berliner (l. c.) p. XXII. ⁴ Dalman asserts that short ܝ , occasionally occurs where we should expect ܝܥ , and he instances the word ܝܩܝܡ and compares Hieronymus' transcription of ܝܩܝܡ to *biom* (p. 62 of his Grammar). Cf. also *C.*'s readings of ܘܢܝܫܐܪ 19, 20 and ܘܢܝܫܐܪ 12, 1 and *B.*'s reading וְנִשְׂאָר 24, 60.

סִיחִי. 30, 27 and not as B. נִסְחִי which is a Hebraism. *B* and *B*. have וִירָדָא 30, 39 but *A*, *D* and *C* וִירָדִין. The Hebrew is וִירָדָן. *A*, *B* and *D* have עִירִינִין 31, 2 whilst *B*. and *C* give לִירָנִין. The correct form, according to *L*., is לִירָנִין. *B*, *C*, *D* כְּשִׁבְיָא 31, 26, *A* כְּשִׁבְיָא, *B*. כְּשִׁבְיָא. The first mentioned reading appears preferable since *L*. punctuates the word with *H*. and it is in the construct state. *A* and *B* חִייה 31, 27, *C* and *D* חִייה. *B*. חִייה. *L*. writes חִייה¹. *B*. and *B* are correct in reading יִסְךְ 31, 49 which reading is also supported by *L*., although Pathšegen prefers יִסְךְ which *C* reads. *A* and *D* (incorrectly) יִסְךְ. *A* is again at fault in בִּינִין 32, 14, the fuller form בִּיאִין being preferable. Cf. the Syriac ܡܢܠܢܐ. 33, 12 *A*, *B* ܡܢܠܢܐ, *B*., *C* and *D* ܡܢܠܢܐ. Pathšegen also ܡܢܠܢܐ. Our Editions of Rašī's Commentary to the Pentateuch give his reading of this passage as ܡܢܠܢܐ, but according to *Luz*. 'Oheb Ger' and *L*. Rašī also gave the correct reading ܡܢܠܢܐ which was only altered by ignorant copyists who strove to bring the Trg. into harmony with Rašī's interpretation of the word ܡܢܠܢܐ. 33, 14 *B*. ܡܢܠܢܐ, MSS. ܡܢܠܢܐ. Pathšegen and *L*. read as *B*. but it may be remarked that the words are synonyms, and hence either reading is allowable. *C*'s reading ܡܢܠܢܐ 'my grief' 35, 18 is a more literal rendering of the Hebrew אֲוִי than is that of *B*. *A*, *B* and *D* who write רִי 'grief'. 35, 17. The MSS. reading ܡܢܠܢܐ is more correct than that of *B*. who has ܡܢܠܢܐ. *L*. gives the same form as that of the MSS. 37, 23 *B*. ܡܢܠܢܐ, MSS. ܡܢܠܢܐ. The Hebrew text is ܡܢܠܢܐ. *B*. seems to be a Hebraism. *L*. gives a similar reading to that of the MSS.

39, 23 *B*. ܡܢܠܢܐ, MSS. ܡܢܠܢܐ. The latter reading is again preferable and is given by *L*. We may compare the Syriac form ܡܢܠܢܐ. 41, 25 *A* (incorrectly) ܡܢܠܢܐ, *B*, *C* and *D* ܡܢܠܢܐ. *B*. ܡܢܠܢܐ which is a Hebraism. Cf. Syriac ܡܢܠܢܐ. 43, 33 MSS. ܡܢܠܢܐ which Berliner, in his Massorah², following *Luz*. Lan-

¹ We may also compare the form with final ה which occasionally occurs in Biblical Aramaic. Cf. ܡܢܠܢܐ Dan. 2, 41. ² p. 117.

dauer and the *יבסורה התרגום* all declare a false reading. B. *קָרְבָנוּ*. 45, 4 *A, B, C* קָרְבָנוּ, *D* קָרְבָנוּ. *D*'s reading is here the best, and is confirmed by reference to the *Chrestomathies* of Merx and Levy². 46, 29. The MSS. give the curious reading *הַחַיִּים* but since the Hebrew has the Singular form *הַחַיִּים* the reading of B. who gives *הַחַיִּים* appears preferable. 49, 12 B., *A, B* and *D* *הַחַיִּים*, *C* *הַחַיִּים*. Both L. and Merx prefer the reading of C.

7) Grammatical Variations. A. The Nominal States.

α) Absolute and Emphatic (VIII, 1a, α). *C, D* and B. *לִיהוּדֵי דְבִר* 7, 2, *A* and *B* *דְבִיר*. Hebrew is *בְּהוֹדֵיהֶם*. *A* reads *אֲרַב* 8, 3; 12, 6; 13, 6. The rest *אֲרַב*. The Hebrew in each case has *הַאֲרָבִי*. B., *C* and *D* *בְּנִהְרָא*, *A* and *B* *בְּנִהְרָא* 15, 18. Text is *מְנַסֵּר*. 18, 14, MSS. *לִוְנִין*. B. *לִוְנִין*. The Hebrew is *לְמַעַד*. 20, 4 B. and *C* *גָּבֵר* (*גָּבֵר*), *A, B, D* *גָּבֵר*. Hebrew *הָאִישׁ*. 21, 2 *A* *לִוְנִין*. B., *B, C* and *D* *לִוְנִין*. Hebrew *לְמַעַד*. 19, 26 B., *B* and *C* *רַב־לָה*, *A* and *D* *רַב־לָה*. Hebrew *מְלַח*. 28, 17 B. *אֲתָרָא*, MSS. *אֲתָר*. Hebrew *הַמְקִיבִים*. 31, 39 *B* *דְּהַבְרָא* B., *A, D* and *C* *דְּהַבְרָא*. Hebrew *מְרַבָּה*. 33, 20 *C* *מְרַבָּה*. B., *A, B* and *D* *מְרַבָּה*. Hebrew *מְרַבָּה*. 34, 10 B. and *C* *סְהוֹרָא* (*Pathsegen* likewise). *A, B* and *D* *סְהוֹרָא*. 37, 31 B. and *C* *עֲשִׂירָא*. *A, B* and *D* *עֲשִׂיר*. Hebrew *שְׁעִיר*. 38, 2 B. and *C* *בְּנִשְׁרֵי*, *A* and *D* *בְּנִשְׁרֵי*, *B* *בְּנִשְׁרֵי*. Hebrew *בְּנִשְׁרֵי*. (For variant reading, see Part II; II, 7j).

β) Absolute and Construct (VIII, 1a, β). 2, 9 and 17 *A* and *B* *דְּאֲבָלִין*. *D* and B. *דְּאֲבָלִי* (L., likewise). *C* missing.

(B) Number (VIII, 1b). Several variations are noticeable with the verb *הוּהוּ*. In 1, 14 *A* has *הוּהוּ הַחַיִּים* whilst B., *B, C* and *D* give *הוּהוּ הַחַיִּים*. *A*'s reading is probably based upon the reading of the Hebrew text *הוּהוּ הַחַיִּים* but it must be remarked as Luz. has already pointed out in his

¹ Contained in Adler's Edition of the Targum.

² Cf. also Daniel 3, 26 *קָהָה*.

גֵּר that it is contrary to the custom of the Aramaic language to place a verb in the Singular whose subject is in the Plural, even though the Verb precedes the Subject. In the Hebrew and Arabic languages this construction is permissible and is frequently employed. MSS. יהוּן B. יהוּן 1, 29; 9, 15 and 47, 24. In each of these cases the Hebrew is יהוּה. In 47, 24 B.'s reading is the only correct one, but the reading given by the MSS., may perhaps be justified in the other two examples, through the subjects being collective; indeed בִּשְׁמֵא 9, 15 may be taken as Singular. B. יהוּן לְמֵא MSS. לְמֵא 9, 26. The Hebrew is לוּ. B.'s reading is given in Berliner's Massorah Parva but the other reading is more literal. Some confusion appears to exist whether to use an adjective or the Plural of a noun when describing nations. Thus *A, B, D* בִּשְׁמֵא 10, 18 (B. and *C* בִּשְׁמֵא). *A, B* and *C* בִּשְׁמֵא 24, 3 (B. and *D* בִּשְׁמֵא) B., *A, C* and *D* בִּשְׁמֵא 24, 37 (B. בִּשְׁמֵא). B., *A, C* and *D* בִּשְׁמֵא 34, 30 (B. בִּשְׁמֵא). B., *A, C* and *D* חוּדְמֵא 30, 21 (B. חוּדְמֵא). In 16, 12. *A, D* and *C* (text) have the incorrect reading יהוּן צְרִיבֵן B and *C* (margin) יהוּן צְרִיבֵן which is also given by B. and confirmed by L. 17, 13, *A* יהוּן וּצְרִיבֵן. B, *C, D* and B. יהוּן וּצְרִיבֵן. Now, although the sense of the whole passage might justify a plural here, still the form of the original being Singular confirms the latter reading, which is likewise given by L. 21, 12 *A* יהוּן, B, *C, D* יהוּן. The Hebrew text יהוּן is Singular the Subject of the Verb being וּצְרִיבֵן but we require a Plural in the Trg. since the Subject is בִּשְׁמֵא. 25, 26 B (incorrectly) יהוּן *A, C, D* and B. יהוּן. The original is יהוּן. B is again incorrect in reading בִּשְׁמֵא 26, 15 which should be בִּשְׁמֵא as the other MSS. and B. give. 27, 15 *A* (incorrectly) בִּשְׁמֵא. B, *C, D* and B. בִּשְׁמֵא which L. confirms. 27, 27 B. יהוּן MSS. יהוּן. 27, 36 *A, B* בִּשְׁמֵא, *C, D* and B. בִּשְׁמֵא. The latter is likewise given both by L. and the author of the Pathšegen; still it is strange why we should read בִּשְׁמֵא in 27, 12 the Hebrew of both passages being

בְּרִבְקָה. 27, 39 B. בְּרִבְקָה which is also given by the Pathšegen. MSS. have בְּרִבְשֶׁךְ. Hebrew is בְּרִבְשֶׁקָה. Berliner mentions the Variant reading in his Massorah, but offers no comment upon it. 30, 39 B. and C וְיִצְחָק־אֵל. A, B and D וְיִצְחָק־יְיָ. We require the Plur. Fem. here, hence וְיִצְחָק־יְיָ is more correct. 31, 26, 43 and 50. B. בְּקָהָי, MSS. בְּקָהָי. Hebrew בְּקָהָי; hence the reading given by the MSS. is correct. 31, 43 B., B and D בְּנֵי. A and C בְּנֵי. The Hebrew being בְּנֵי, the first reading is preferable. 34, 5. B. בְּרִיבְהֵינָן. MSS. בְּרִיבְהֵינָן, Pathšegen supports the reading given by B., but since the Hebrew is בְּרִיבְהֵינָנו we should expect בְּרִיבְהֵינָנו as the MSS. 34, 24 B (incorrectly) בְּרִיבְהֵינָן which appears to refer the suffix both to Šehem and Hamor. The other MSS. have בְּרִיבְהֵינָן which corresponds to the Hebrew בְּרִיבְהֵינָנו. 37, 4 A (incorrectly) אֲבֹהָי. The other MSS. אֲבֹהָינָן which corresponds to the Hebrew אֲבֹהָינָנו. The correct Trg. of בְּרִבְקָה 39, 5 is בְּרִבְשֶׁקָה which all the MSS. have. B. reads בְּרִבְשֶׁךְ (plural) which is incorrect. 41, 36 B וְיִשְׁחָצֵינָן, A, C, D and B. וְיִשְׁחָצֵינָן. Either reading may perhaps be justified since שְׁחָצֵינָן is a collective Noun, but the Singular is preferable. 46, 20 B. and B וְאִי־לֵלֵנוּ. C וְאִי־לֵלֵנוּ. A and D וְאִי־לֵלֵנוּ. Hebrew וְאִי־לֵלֵנוּ. A and D are correct וְאִי־לֵלֵנוּ. C is wrong. Landauer supports B.'s reading in his Massorah. 47, 30. B., B and C (incorrectly) אֲבֹהָי. A and D אֲבֹהָי which is also given by L. The Hebrew text has אֲבֹהָי. 50, 9 B., B (original reading) and C וְסִבְיָנָי. A, D and B (corrected reading) וְסִבְיָנָי. Hebrew is וְסִבְיָנָי.

(C) Gender (VIII, 1c). A and B וְהִתְשֵׁבָה B. and D וְהִתְשֵׁבָה 1, 26. The subject is וְהִתְשֵׁבָה which being of common gender, perhaps admits of either form; but L. reads as B.

B. וְקָבְלֵנוּ, MSS. וְקָבְלֵנוּ 4, 10. Hebrew is וְקָבְלֵנוּ which however refers to וְקָבְלֵנוּ whilst the Trg. refers to וְקָבְלֵנוּ which is feminine and hence the reading of the MSS. is more correct. Pathšegen notices this variant reading and seems to expect that of the MSS. B. וְקָבְלֵנוּ, A, B, D וְקָבְלֵנוּ, C (incorrectly) וְקָבְלֵנוּ 14, 7. The Hebrew is וְקָבְלֵנוּ which agrees with וְקָבְלֵנוּ but וְקָבְלֵנוּ

is masculine in Aramaic and hence B.'s reading is the correct one.

A, *B* and *D* תֵּלֵהָ, *B*. and *C* תֵּלָה 15, 9. *L*. has the latter reading but points out that the Pešitta of this passage is ܬܠܗܘܠܘܬܗ.

16, 2 *A* (incorrectly) ܡܢܝܗ, the rest have ܡܢָה. 19, 8 *B*., *A* and *C* ܕܕܥܝܢܝܢ, *B* ܕܕܥܝܢܝܢ, *D* ܕܕܥܝܢܝܢ. The subject being ܡܢܝܗ *D* is of course a mistake. 20, 9 *A* (incorrectly) ܡܢܝܗ; the rest have ܡܢܝܗ. *A*, *B* and *D* are incorrect in having ܡܢܝܗ 20, 13 since ܡܢܝܗ is feminine. *B*. and *C* read ܡܢܝܗ. *B* is incorrect in reading ܡܢܝܗ 19, 13 since ܡܢܝܗ is masculine. Rest have ܡܢܝܗ. The Hebrew in each case is ܡܢܝܗ and this may perhaps account for the error of *A*, *B* and *D* in 20, 13. 21, 30 *B*. and *C* ܡܢܝܗ, *A*, *B* and *D* ܡܢܝܗ. Since ܡܢܝܗ is given by *L*. as of common gender either reading may be justified; but *B*'s reading ܡܢܝܗ in 24, 58 and *A*'s ܡܢܝܗ in 25, 30 are both evidently incorrect. The fact of ܡܢܝܗ being of common gender may again justify both readings in 26, 20 in which verse *A* reads ܡܢܝܗ whilst *B*., *B*, *C* and *D* give ܡܢܝܗ. 27, 42 *A* and *C* (incorrectly) ܡܢܝܗ, *B*., *B* and *D* ܡܢܝܗ. 29, 3 *B*. ܡܢܝܗ, which *L*. also reads. MSS. ܡܢܝܗ. Pathšegen also as *B*. who gives the proper gender, the subject being the shepherds. 30, 37 *A* and *D* ܡܢܝܗ, *B*, *C* and *B*. ܡܢܝܗ. So also *L*. and Pathšegen, but since ܡܢܝܗ is of common gender we may take either reading as correct. 30, 40 all the MSS. have ܡܢܝܗ which is the proper reading, *B*. has ܡܢܝܗ which is certainly incorrect. 30, 43 ܡܢܝܗ, *B*., *B*, *C* and *D* ܡܢܝܗ. *A*'s reading is more correct, ܡܢܝܗ being masculine. 31, 10 *B*., *C* and *D* ܡܢܝܗ, *A* and *B* ܡܢܝܗ which is a mistake since ܡܢܝܗ is masculine. *A* is again incorrect in reading ܡܢܝܗ 37, 7 and ܡܢܝܗ 41, 3. In both instances we require the feminine. 39, 5 *B* ܡܢܝܗ, *B*., *A*, *C*, *D* ܡܢܝܗ. *B* is the correct reading; the other imitates the Hebrew Idiom. 41, 20 *B* and *C* read ܡܢܝܗ but the 2nd time the word occurs in the verse ܡܢܝܗ. *B*., *A* and *D* have both times ܡܢܝܗ which is correct since the first one refers to ܡܢܝܗ and the second

one to שְׁבַלִּיא and both these words are feminine. 48, 4 All the MSS. read אַחֲבִיבִינִין here, whilst B. has אַחֲבִיבִינִין which reading is defended in Berliner's Massorah¹ referring, as it does, to the feminine לְיִרְדָּה. Landauer writes to the same effect in his Massorah². But, it may be remarked, that יָר is also sometimes masculine. Cf. Targum Jonathan to Isaiah 13, 7 בַּל יִרְאָה יְהוָה שְׁלִין.

(D) The Conjugations of the Verb.

α. Peal and Pael (VIII, 2a, α). *A* וַנְּחָה, B., *B*, *C* and *D* וַנְּחָה 8, 4. B. וַנְּשִׂיק, MSS. וַנְּשִׂיק 27, 27; 29, 13; 50, 1. *A* וַדְּבַרְתָּ, B., *B*, *C*, *D* וַדְּבַרְתָּ 31, 20. *B* וַיִּבְשֹׁשׁ, B., *A*, *C*, *D* וַיִּבְשֹׁשׁ 31, 34. *A*, *B*, *C* וַיִּנְחָה, *D* וַיִּנְחָה, B. וַיִּנְחָה 31, 40. B. וַיִּשְׁמַר, MSS. וַיִּשְׁמַר 35, 4. *A* and *B* שְׁלַחְתָּ, B. and *C* שְׁלַחְתָּ, *D* שְׁלַחְתָּ 42, 16. Aramaic requires a Pael here. *A* and *B* perhaps a Hebraism. 43, 4 *B* (incorrectly) וַנְּזַבֵּין = we shall sell, it should be וַנְּזַבֵּין we shall buy, which is given by *A*, *C*, *D* and B. 43, 7 MSS. שְׁאֵיל. B. שְׁאֵיל just like the Hebrew text. L. has the same orthography as the MSS, but I think שְׁאֵיל would be a preferable punctuation, since L. gives no Pael of this root. 45, 24 *A* (incorrectly) וַשְׁלַחְתָּ. B., *B*, *C* and *D* וַשְׁלַחְתָּ. 50, 21 B. וַנְּחָה, MSS. וַנְּחָה. Although L. mentions both these forms as Pael of נָחַ still the only correct Aramaic form of the Pael is that given by the MSS.

β. Peal and Afel (VIII, 2a, β). *B* (incorrectly) וַיִּיִּשֶׁב 12, 13, *A*, *C* and *D* וַיִּיִּשֶׁב, B. וַיִּיִּשֶׁב. The latter reading is supported by the authority of L. B. וַיִּלְחֵד, *B*, *D* וַיִּלְחֵד, *A*, *C* וַיִּלְחֵד 18, 13. Of these three readings the Afel is certainly incorrect. Of the two other forms given B.'s is preferable, although the correct form is וַיִּלְחֵד. *B* וַיִּשְׁמַר, B., *A*, *C* and *D* וַיִּשְׁמַר 32, 23. L. as B.

γ. Peal and Etpeel, Etpaal or Ettafal (VIII, 2a, γ). B. וַנְּזַר and וַנְּזַר. MSS. וַאֲתַעֲזֵר and וַאֲתַעֲזֵר 17, 26 and 27. (Vide VII, 11). B. וַיִּתְּקֵס, 25, 23 (Peal) whilst the MSS. read

¹ l. c. p. 78. ² s. v.

וְהָתְתִיקָה (Etpaal). In this instance, we may perhaps take either reading, since both give good sense, the Etpaal having a reflective sense.

δ) Pael and Afel (VIII, 2a, δ). *A, B* הַצִּבֵּחַ. *B., C* and *D* הַצִּבֵּחַ 3, 18. The latter reading is also given by L. *B.* וְאַשְׁרֵי, *A, C, D* וְאַשְׁרֵי, *B* וְאַשְׁרֵי 13, 16. Both the Pael and Afel forms give sense here. Pael=I have made numerous, Afel=I have made equally numerous. *B.* has an inferior Aramaic form.

ε) Etpeel and Etpaal (VIII, 2a, ε). 7, 11 *A, D* אֲתַעֲלֵהָ, *B., C* אֲרַעֲלֵהָ. L. also reads Etpaal, but in the Syriac language the Etpeel (and not Etpaal) is the conjugation in use¹. 8, 2 MSS. וְאַסְתַּבְּרוּ, *B.* וְאַסְתַּבְּרוּ. L. again has Etpaal but according to Bernstein-Kirsch, the Etpeel is the usual Syriac conjugation. 10, 9 and 27, 13 MSS. וְהִתְאַמַּר, *B.* וְהִתְאַמַּר. Although L. again has the Etpaal here, he gives Etpeel=Etpaal, so that MSS. may again be justified. 14, 15 *A, D* וְאַתְפַּלֵּג, *B* וְאַתְפַּלֵּג, *C* וְאַתְפַּלֵּג, *B.* וְאַתְפַּלֵּג. L. here reads as *A* and *D* but again notices Etpeel=Etpaal. *C* has an impossible form. 29, 26 *B., C* וְהִתְעַבְּרוּ, *A* and *D* וְהִתְעַבְּרוּ. The Hebrew is וְהִתְעַבְּרוּ. Berliner, in his Massorah² says that the Hebrew Imperfect is here to be rendered by the Aramaic Participle, but L. gives the same reading as *A* and *D* which thus appear to give the most correct reading. 31, 24 and 29 and 42, 24. *A, B* and *D* אֲסַבְּרֵם. *C* and *B.* אֲסַבְּרֵם. L. has the Etpaal form. 34, 7 *A, B* and *D* וְאַתְוַסְּרוּ. *B.* וְאַתְוַסְּרוּ. *C* וְאַתְוַסְּרוּ. The latter reading will be considered when the *Variae Lectiones* will be treated of. Of the other two readings, the Etpaal appears to be more correct, since this form is given by L. 45, 1, On the other hand L. confirms the MSS. reading of Etpeel here. *B.* has אֲתִקְוֶה, MSS. אֲתִקְוֶה.

(E) The Tenses of the Verb (VIII, 2 b, α).

α) Perfect and Imperfect *B.* וְהִתְעַבְּרוּ 4, 14, *B, C* and *D*

¹ v. Bernstein-Kirsch l. c. s. v. ² l. c. p. 25.

רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *A* has רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. Of these *A* is incorrect since the Hebrew מִצָּאָה could not be translated by a Perfect. Of the other forms given *L.* prefers the Afel (Cf. VIII, 2a, β). *A* וְהִתְחַהּ, *B*, *B*, *C*, *D* יִהְיֶה 9, 14. *A* is here incorrect.

β) Perfect and Present (VIII, 2b, β). *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי 4, 9. The Hebrew is רִשְׁטִיִּינִי to which *B* agrees in form; but the Massorahs of both Berliner and Landauer give רִשְׁטִיִּינִי as the correct form here. MSS. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי 23, 13. There is no corresponding word in the Hebrew text, but the sense seems to be present and hence *B.* is perhaps preferable. Landauer notices this variant reading. 27, 14 MSS. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. Text is רִשְׁטִיִּינִי and therefore the MSS. give the better text. 29, 5 *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, MSS. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. The Hebrew is רִשְׁטִיִּינִי which is again Perfect in form but Present in meaning. Pathšegen reads Participle which he says the Aramaic idiom requires. So *L.* although he also mentions the reading of the MSS. similarly in 44, 27. 29, 26 see above under Etpaal and Etpeel. 30, 39 *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *A* and *C* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B* and *D* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. The Hebrew is רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. *B.* has the correct reading although some confusion exists here between the Perfect and Participle. In 30, 31 and 41 and in 31, 8 the Participle is used; but in 31, 10 again Perfect. 30, 41 *B* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B*, *A*, *C*, *D* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. *L.* reads רִשְׁטִיִּינִי according to the Aramaic idiom, although looking at the Hebrew רִשְׁטִיִּינִי we might perhaps have expected the Preterite. 31, 6 MSS. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. Merx, in the Dictionary to his Chrestomathia Targumica regards the manuscript reading as a vulgarism, and *Luz.* in his Oheb Ger also gives the participial form as correct. 31, 8 *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, MSS. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. The Hebrew is again Perfect. 41, 1 *A*, *D* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *B*, *B* and *C* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. The Hebrew text is רִשְׁטִיִּינִי but *L.* has the reading רִשְׁטִיִּינִי which is also supported by Pathšegen, according to the use of the Aramaic language. 41. 45 *B*. רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *A*, *B* and *D* רִשְׁטִיִּינִי, *C* (just as the Hebrew) רִשְׁטִיִּינִי. *L.* reads as *B.* "a man who reveals secrets". The best reading appears to be that of *C*, who does not attempt

to give a rendering of the name. Besides it is by no means certain that these two Egyptian words mean “revealer of secrets” (as the Trg. and Pešitta). Gesenius¹ explains the title to signify “saviour of the age” in the Egyptian language². 44, 15 B. and C תְּדַבְּרֵהוּן, A, B and D תְּדַבְּרֵהוּן. Here the Hebrew תְּדַבְּרֵהוּן has the sense of a Perfect and hence the reading of A, B and D is better. 47, 22 A וְאֶבְלֵי, B., B, C and D וְאֶבְלֵי. The Hebrew text is וְאֶבְלֵי and the sense of the passage appears to require a Past Tense and therefore the reading of A is preferable. It may be noticed that in the instances quoted above the MSS. follow the Hebrew text literally, but B. gives us the sense of the Hebrew text.

γ) Imperfect and Present (VIII, 2b, γ) A, B and D יִבְרָא (Imperfect), B. and C יִבְרָא (Present) 48, 10. The latter reading is perhaps better. The Hebrew is יִבְרָא.

(F) Additions (IX, 2). A and D read בְּמִי־רִיחָה before עֲלֹהֵי 7, 16. C inserts the same word on the margin. This version represents the opinion of those who wish to interpret the words בְּבִקְרָן יְיָ וְנִסְגָּרֵי יְיָ figuratively, to denote generally that the Divine protection encompassed and preserved him. 14, 12 C has לֵב before קִי־יִיחָה probably confusing this verse with the preceding. 18, 25 A, B, D have הִרְרֵיךְ which is pointed out by B.³ as an incorrect reading and so also the insertion of לֵב before בְּרָא which A has in the same verse. Adler and Pathšegen also both object to this reading since the Targumist always avoids irreverent language when speaking of the

¹ l. c. s. v. ² The LXX has ψολυσομανηγ, Siegfried and Stade in their “Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testamente (Leipzig, 1893) give מַשְׁחֵה יְשׁוּעָה “Egyptian title of Joseph. According to G. Steindorff, Zeitschr. f. ägypt. Sprache u. Altertumskunde XXVII, 41 f. — es spricht der Gott und er lebt”. Jerome renders “salvator mundi” but according to Rosellini the name means sustentator vitae, support or sustainer of life. The Targum version seems to be the popular Jewish interpretation. Cf. Josephus Ant. II, 6. V. Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary to the Pentateuch, Vol. I, p. 35. Translated by Martin. (Edinburgh 1874). ³ l. c. p. 221.

Deity. But, since it is a more literal translation of the original Hebrew the manuscript reading seems preferable. 19, 34 B. **רַחֲמָנָא**, *A*, *B* and *D* **רַחֲמָנִי**, *C* **בְּרַחֲמֵי**. The Hebrew is **אֲרַחֵם**. L. seems to know of no reading **רַחֲמָנִי** but Landauer in his *Massorah*¹ gives both readings and also explains the **נ** of **בְּרַחֲמֵי** as standing for an accusative of time. The best reading would then be **בְּרַחֲמָנָא**. I do not know why the suffix of the 1st Person Singular is affixed to this word. 23, 8. The MSS. insert **אִיה** before **רַחֲמָנִי** which improves the sense and follows the original. 24, 67 *C* has **דְּרַחֲמָנִי אִיה** before **וְהוּא** thus first giving the literal translation before proceeding to the Hag. rendering which follows and which may perhaps with advantage be deleted. 25, 8 *B* has **לְכַבֵּד** after **יִיבֹן**. Since *D* has the same word on the margin, we may perhaps take this word as a gloss which has crept into the text of *B*. 26, 26 *B*, *C* and *D* **בְּרַחֲמֵיהִי**, *A* and *B* **בְּרַחֲמֵיהִי**. L. rejects the latter reading which is against the spirit of the Aramaic idiom. We must then read, either **בְּרַחֲמֵיהִי** or **בְּרַחֲמֵיהִי** which have exactly the same significations, the **נ** being part of the word and not a preposition. 31, 13 MSS. **בְּרִית**. *B*. **בְּרִית**. Hebrew **בְּרִית**. The sense justifies the reading of the MSS. and although Pathšegen also reads **בְּרִית** he seemed to have expected the reading **בְּבְרִית** and hence we may take the reading of the MSS. as correct. 31, 48 *B* incorrectly inserts **לִיה** before **לְבָנִין**. 42, 28 *A* has **בְּפִי** before **בְּרַחֲמֵי** but the scribe was probably looking at the preceding verse. 34, 14 *B* has **יה** before **בְּרַחֲמָנָא**. 39, 6 *B* and *C* insert **יה** before **בְּל**. 43, 29 *B* has **יה** before **שְׂמִינֵיהִי**. It may be noticed that these insertions, the majority of which appear to be incorrect are confined to *B* and *C*. Finally, I have to mention a few Prepositions which are here and there added.

ל is added by *C* in **לְאַב** 17, 5 and **לְמַגְדִּי** 17, 10, *A*, *C* and *D* have **לְרַחֲמֵי** 29, 3. *A* has **לְאַבָּא** and **לְרַחֲמֵי** 45, 8 which reading is rejected by Pathšegen. *A*, *B* and *D* **לְרַחֲמֵי** 49, 8

¹ l. c. s. v.

which Merx also reads. γ is added by the MSS. לְבַבְנִירָא 9, 10 which is against the Hebrew text and in יִרְמְלוּהוֹן 33, 13 which follows the Hebrew original. ב is added in $\text{מִדְּהַמְלוּהוֹרִי}$ 26, 26 by *A* and *B* but this has already been noticed as a faulty reading. *A, D* add אֲנִשׁ before בִּיְהִיָּה 45, 8 and this is really the sense of the passage. The same reading is given in Adler's edition of the Trg. The MSS. add an initial γ in רִמְצִירָיִם 15, 18 which *A* and *C* read. *A* has רְאָתָה 20, 5 and again רְדִהָב 24, 22. *B* (incorrectly) רֶאֶתְיִנְהוֹן 35, 5. All the MSS. read רִמְלָנָא 40, 1. *A* has רְשָׁלִיט 42, 6. *C* and *D* have רִמְצִירָיִם 45, 13. All MSS. read רֶאֶבְלוּהוֹרִי 46, 1. *B* and *C* give רִשָּׁל 50, 13. ב is added by *A, B* and *D* in the word בְּבִירָה 31, 13.

(G) Omissions (IX, 3). An initial γ is omitted¹ by *C* before כָּא 8, 21 but this alters the sense of the passage. By *A* before רְהִי 20, 13 which makes this remarkable Hag. passage run much more smoothly. By all MSS. before אִם 44, 27 where again an initial γ hardly seems necessary.

(H) Interchange of Prepositions and other Particles. (IX, 5) *B* (incorrectly) בְּלִישְׁנֵהוֹן *A, C, D* and *B*. לְלִישְׁנֵהוֹן 10, 20. *C* (incorrectly) עָלֵ אֲרִפָּא 44, 11. *B, A, B* and *D* לֹאֲרִפָּא . Hebrew אָרַפָּה . In connection with this instance and the following we may compare Nehemiah 3, 37 where according to the occidentales (Palaestinenses) we should read עַל and according to the orientales² (Babylonii) אֵל . 20, 2 *B* and *D* כִּשְׂרִיה , *A, C* and *B*. עַל שְׂרִיה . Hebrew is אֶל to which ל corresponds in Aramaic. 22, 12 MSS.

¹ Or 2374 sometimes omits γ where it is inserted in Baer's Edition of the Aramaic portions of the Bible. Cf. רְהִי Daniel 2, 43, רִמְצִירָיִם Daniel 3, 21, רִמְצִירָיִם Daniel 4, 9 in all of which the MS. omits the initial γ . The Scribe however inserted this γ in רִמְצִירָיִם Daniel 4, 13 in which case it is omitted in Baer's Edition. ² Vide Baer,

(l. c.), p. 125. ³ "There is a tendency in Hebr. esp. in S, K, Je, Ez, to use אֶל in the sense of עַל (and vice versa) sometimes אֵל being used quite exceptionally in a phrase or construction which regularly and in acc. with analogy has עַל , sometimes the 2 preps.

בְּעַל־לִיבָא, B. לְעַל־לִיבָא. L. allows either reading here. 22, 18
 לְעַל־לִיבָא which the MSS. have is a better reading than that
 given by B. who has בְּעַל־לִיבָא which appears to be a Hebraism,
 corresponding to the Hebrew בְּקֵלִי 31, 21. Unlike the Hebrew
 text which simply gives הָר, the Aramaic language requires a
 Preposition to point out the direction. A, B, D and B. give
 לְעַל־לִיבָא whilst C has בְּעַל־לִיבָא, one reading being as correct as
 the other. Either reading is again allowable in 37, 22 where
 B has עַל־לִיבָא whilst A, C, D and B. give לְעַל־לִיבָא. Hebrew
 אֶל הַבּוּר 41, 55 A, D לְעַל־לִיבָא; B, C and B. עַל־לִיבָא which
 appears more correct. The Hebrew text is לְקָחָם. 3, 12
 B לִי A, C, D and B. עַל־לִי. B's reading is inferior, al-
 though it gives sense. 3, 17 B הָא. The rest, more cor-
 rectly אֶרֶץ. The Hebrew is בָּר. 3, 23 B., A, C, D בְּעַל־לִיבָא,
 B הָא אֶרֶץ. The text being אֶרֶץ הָא אֶרֶץ I prefer B's reading
 and the Path^vegen also seems to expect B's reading.
 4, 8 B and B. כִּי־הָבֵל, A and C בְּהָבֵל, D לִי־הָבֵל. Adler
 in נהינה לגר justifies the reading of A and C; he says we
 never find the Verb קם construed with אל but with = or על.
 B. and B's reading would then be a Hebraism; whilst D's
 reading is inferior, inasmuch as it indicates a slower move-
 ment than that shown by the Hebrew text. 6, 13 B., A,
 C, D מִן, B מִן. Hebrew is מִן = with. The sense of B's
 reading is "from off the face of the earth" but this idea is
 not contained in the Hebrew מִן and hence B's reading is
 again incorrect. 14, 7 B. הוּא, C מִן, A, B and D הוּא. C's
 reading is incorrect; (as regards the difference of Gender,
 v. Pt. II, II, 7c). 15, 16 B., A, B, D הוּא־לִיבָא, C הוּא־לִיבָא. Hebrew
 is הוּא־לִיבָא. Both readings are correct; both are composed of
 the words הוּא and לִיבָא but הוּא־לִיבָא has a liquid ל inserted. Cf.

interchanging apparently without discrimination in the same or parallel
 sentences. It is prob. that this interchange, at least in many cases,
 is not original but due to transcribers" (Heb. and Eng. Lexicon of
 O. Test. by Brown, Briggs & Driver, Oxford 1892. s. v. אֶל) cf. also
 Jeremiah 27, 19.

Syriac ܘܢܝܘܢ. 18, 19 *B* (incorrectly) ܘܢܝܘܢ, *B*., *A*, *C* and *D* ܘܢܝܘܢ but, on the other hand, *B*'s reading ܘܢܝܘܢ is preferable to that of the remaining MSS. and *B*. viz ܘܢܝܘܢ 18, 29. The Hebrew is ܘܢܝܘܢ. Perhaps קדמוהי was used to avoid the anthropomorphism "in His presence" and not "with Him". 19, 34 *A* (incorrectly) ܘܢܝܘܢ, *B*., *B*, *C*, *D* ܘܢܝܘܢ. Hebrew is ܘܢܝܘܢ = with. 24, 7 *B* ܘܢܝܘܢ, *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. ܘܢܝܘܢ. Hebrew ܘܢܝܘܢ. *B*'s reading appears to be preferable since ܘܢܝܘܢ is usually construed with ܘܢܝܘܢ in Aramaic. 20, 40 *A*, *B* and *C* ܘܢܝܘܢ. *D* and *B*. ܘܢܝܘܢ. This latter reading is the correct one, the text being ܘܢܝܘܢ, although the other reading may perhaps be justified. 27, 6 *B* ܘܢܝܘܢ, *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. ܘܢܝܘܢ. Although Landauer justifies the latter reading in his Massorah, still we must notice that the Hebrew ܘܢܝܘܢ is here merely the sign of the Accusative, which would justify *B*'s reading. 27, 37 *B* ܘܢܝܘܢ, *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. ܘܢܝܘܢ. Since it is rather time than place that is here indicated by ܘܢܝܘܢ, *B*'s reading seems faulty. *A* ܘܢܝܘܢ, *B*, *C*, *D* and *B*. ܘܢܝܘܢ 28, 15. The Hebrew is ܘܢܝܘܢ and *A* gives the sense of this relative more clearly. *B* (incorrectly) ܘܢܝܘܢ 31, 5, *B*., *A*, *C*, *D* ܘܢܝܘܢ. Hebrew is ܘܢܝܘܢ. *B* (incorrectly) ܘܢܝܘܢ. Rest ܘܢܝܘܢ 31, 37. The latter reading corresponds to the Hebrew ܘܢܝܘܢ = here. *B* is again wrong in 31, 43 where he reads ܘܢܝܘܢ exactly as the Hebrew text, but the Aramaic idiom here requires a ܘܢܝܘܢ and hence the reading of *B*., *A*, *C* and *D* viz ܘܢܝܘܢ is correct. *B* is again wrong in 35, 1 where he has ܘܢܝܘܢ corresponding to the Hebrew ܘܢܝܘܢ. The other MSS. have ܘܢܝܘܢ and ܘܢܝܘܢ is usually construed with ܘܢܝܘܢ.

The less emphatic Particles are the correct ones in 19, 38 viz ܘܢܝܘܢ (and not as *B* ܘܢܝܘܢ) and in 35, 17 and 20 ܘܢܝܘܢ (and not ܘܢܝܘܢ as *A* and *C* have). 37, 35 *B* (text) ܘܢܝܘܢ. *B* (margin), *A*, *C*, *D* ܘܢܝܘܢ. Hebrew is ܘܢܝܘܢ. Raši says that here ܘܢܝܘܢ = ܘܢܝܘܢ¹ which would justify *B*'s original reading, but ܘܢܝܘܢ is certainly more literal. 38, 12 *B*. has ܘܢܝܘܢ; all the MSS. read

¹ V. Note to 20, 2 above.

לֵב. The unknown author of the Pathšegen also reads as B. לֵב is usually the Trg. for לֵב whilst the Preposition לֵב is identical in both languages. Hence the text of the MSS. is superior here. 39, 7 B. and C לֵב־סֶה, B לֵב־סֶה, A and D לֵב־סֶה. The Hebrew is לֵב. Although the MSS. readings may be defended still that of B. and C is here the best. So also Pathšegen. וְזָקָה is usually construed with ב. Cf. Trg. to Deut. 32, 4. 42, 28 C has וְזָקָה הִיא which is not such a good rendering of the Hebrew וְזָקָה הִיא as the other MSS. and B. have, these give וְזָקָה הִיא. I do not know why B. has וְזָקָה as the Trg. of וְזָקָה in 43, 9. All four MSS. read וְזָקָה. 43, 11 B., B (text), C and D have וְזָקָה whilst A and B (margin) read וְזָקָה. The Hebrew text is וְזָקָה to which word וְזָקָה usually corresponds, but in this particular verse וְזָקָה is merely an emphatic particle. 43, 23. The Hebrew text being וְזָקָה the reading of the MSS. וְזָקָה appears to be superior to that of B. which has לֵב. On the other hand B.'s reading is preferable in 45, 10 where he reads וְזָקָה and the MSS. לֵב. The Hebrew is again וְזָקָה. 44, 4. In this verse we have another special use of the Hebrew word וְזָקָה, the sense of which is 'from' and hence the MSS. render לֵב. B. (incorrectly) וְזָקָה. For a similar use of וְזָקָה cf. וְזָקָה הִיא הַיָּמִים (Exodus 9, 29) where, however, all the MSS. have וְזָקָה. 47, 10 B (incorrectly) וְזָקָה, A, C, D and B. וְזָקָה. The Hebrew text is וְזָקָה.

(I) Hebraisms (VII, 1g). Of actual Hebraisms C presents the most instances. I have previously remarked that this MS. does not differ so greatly from the Trg. text of B. as the other MSS. do. Yet B reads וְזָקָה 27, 17. C has וְזָקָה 27, 34 and 38 and שֶׁם 11, 29; 21, 3 whilst B reads the same word in 41, 45. B has בֵּן (for בֵּן) 21, 9. All the MSS. read וְזָקָה 27, 9, when we should expect וְזָקָה as B. A has וְזָקָה 41, 55 and 47, 15. C and D וְזָקָה 4, 15. The rest read וְזָקָה. C has וְזָקָה 37, 18. It should be וְזָקָה. All have וְזָקָה 35, 21 &c. B and D וְזָקָה 26, 33. B's Hebraism וְזָקָה 38, 1 and that of all the MSS. וְזָקָה 43, 6 have

already been noticed above, when speaking of the variations in the use of the Particles.

(J) Variant readings (X). *A* and *D* אֲרֵאִיתָ (so also *B*). 1, 11. *B* תִּבְרֵק. As a mere translation of the Hebrew words תְּבַרְשֵׁן הָאָרֶץ הַיְשָׁנָה the version of *B* would suffice "Let the earth bring forth green". But as the Trg., in most cases, not only tries to translate the original but actually goes out of its way to obtain an identical form, the reading of *A*, *D* and *B*. seems superior.

2, 8 *A* וַיֵּשְׁבֵי, *B* and *D* וַאֲשַׁרֵי. *B*. וַאֲשַׁרֵי. Pathšegen objects to *A*'s reading "ואשרי תרגם ולא ושיי" Nevertheless *A* gives a more literal rendering of the Hebrew וַיֵּשְׁבֵם than does the word וַאֲשַׁרֵי—which means "And he made to dwell". 2, 14 *A* תְּרַבְלָה, *B*, *D* and *B*. רַגְלָה. *A* is probably a Hebraism, the Aramaic name of the Tigris being רַגְלָה. Syriac ܪܓܠܐ. Assyrian Tiglat². Arabic رَجْلَة. *L*. says the Hebrew form of the word has a prosthetic ה just as תְּבַרְשֵׁן from בַּצַּל. 2, 24 *B*, *A* and *D* have here בֵּית מִשְׁכְּבֵי אֲבוֹתָי אֲמִיָּה but *B* בֵּית אֲמִיָּה יֵהָ אֲבִיָּה³. The latter reading being quite literal is superior to the former. The Hebrew text is אָתָּה אָבִיָּה אָבִי. The other version has reference to a traditional translation of these words by the Rabbis Eliézer and Akiba⁴. 3, 1 *B*. חָרִים, MSS. חָרִים. To understand the reading of the MSS., we may compare 27, 35 where בְּחָרְמָה is rendered בְּחִכְמָה⁵ in the Trg.; but according to the Pathšegen חָרִים is only applied to men. The Syriac ܪܘܡܐ is also used for cunning. 3, 22 *B* (incorrectly) גְּנֵהָ. The rest have חָרִים. Heb. חָרִים. 4, 3 *B*. and *D* קַרְבָּנָה, *A* קַרְבָּנָה, *B* קַרְבָּנָה, *C* מְנֵהָ. Which is correct? The

¹ Samaritan רשיה. ² Or Dignat, Tignat, Diqlat (?). Cf. also LXX. Τίγλις. ³ So Samaritan בית אביה ויה אמה. ⁴ V. Ber. Mas-sorah p. 117 and Adler נחמנה לני to this verse. ⁵ According to Dalman Jewish Aramaic does not emply the root חרם in the simple signification of "to know", this use being confined to Galilean Aramaic. The corresponding Jewish Aramaic root is ירע (l. c. p. 38).

Hebrew is *טִנְחָה*¹. L. and Pathšegen both give *קִרְבָּנָא*, and if the word *טִנְחָה* here means 'offering' this is the only correct translation. But it must be borne in mind that the word can also mean a present (Arabic *مَنَعَ* = to give) and this would justify both *A* and *C*'s reading. *B* is wrong. Luz. says the reading *תְּקַרְבָּהָא* is bad, as this word is only used when speaking of persons making presents to each other and never in connection with God². 4, 21 B. *רִדְדִין*, *A* *רִבְנִין*, *B* *רִבְנִין*, *C* *רִבְנִין*, *D* *רִבְנִין*. As if we have not already sufficient variations, Pathšegen wishes to read *רִדְדִין* or *רִבְנִין*. The Hebrew is *הַפֶּשֶׁשׁ*. Pathšegen goes on to say that the reading *רִבְנִין* is a mistake, and I can find no sense in B., *D*, *B* or *C*, the readings of the two last-mentioned MSS. not being even correct Aramaic forms (but cf. Berliner p. 128 who justifies his reading). Yet *D*'s reading seems to be the original one since *A* had this word in the text, but it was afterwards erased and *רִבְנִין* placed on the margin in its place. Probably the whole phrase *עַל פִּי רִבְנִין* should be deleted from the Trg. text as superfluous. For similar double translations cf. 3, 21; 4, 21; 24, 21; 30, 8; 40, 10; 49, 4 and 49, 8 in the latter we have even a treble rendering.

5, 3 B. *רִדְדִין לִיה*, *A, C, D* *רִדְדִין לִיה*, *B* *רִבְנִין לִיה*. The Hebrew is *כָּצְלָמוֹ* and hence *B*'s reading is the most literal. Of course the other readings give the sense of the Hebrew passage. Pathšegen reads as *A, C, D*. 5, 24 B. has *אֲחִיה* *רִיח*, *A* has *אֲחִיה רִיח* whilst *B, C, D* insert *לֹא* on the margin. This great difference probably has its origin in some Hag. point. Luz. in Philoxenos³ remarks "he (Enoch) is still living for God did not kill him". In Tosafoth to Yebamoth 166 s. v. *פְּסוּק* we read of a difference among Hagadoth one tradition being that Enoch died whilst another records that

¹ It is noteworthy that a similar variant reading occurs in the different Editions of the Samaritan Targum, the Editions of Brüll and Uhlemann both giving *שְׁלִיחָה* whilst that of Petermann reads *הַנְּחָה*.

² Philoxenos p. 31. 3 p. 32.

he entered Paradise whilst still alive¹. The Trg. text is there quoted without ולא and without troubling ourselves about the different traditions, we can see by the original Hebrew text that כֵּן is out of place here, but we can understand and notice how it crept into the text.

9, 2 אַרְיָא, B., B, C, D אֲרִיָא which is of course the correct Trg. of הָאֲרָרְךָ. A means 'wild beasts' which gives sense but is not the correct translation of the Hebrew. 10, 30 B. מוֹתְבִהוֹן, B, C, D מוֹתְבִהוֹן, A מוֹת בְּנִהוֹן! A's reading is an absurdity². 11, 3 B., A, C, D כְּחַבְרִיהַ, B לְאֶחָדֵי. Hebrew חֲבִיבֵי. The readings are here equally good. 11, 3 B יִשְׁתָּרֵץ, B., A, C, D יִשְׁתָּרֵץ. Hebrew יִשְׁתָּרֵץ. B. is incorrect since יקר is (according to L.) Intransitive. Similarly Luz. says in his גר אהב⁴ that יקר is only used for entirely consuming and not for merely drying. Pathšegen also justifies the reading ונשריפון. 11, 6 C דְּשִׂיאֵי B., A, B, D דְּאֲשִׁרְיֵי. C has simply confused the end of the verse with the first דְּשִׂיאֵי. 11, 31 B., B and C לְדַבָּר, A, D לְנִסְיֵי. The first-mentioned reading is more correct⁵. There are two Aramaic Verbs corresponding to the Hebrew root לקח (1) רבר when speaking of to lead from one place to another (2) ניסב simply to take, or with אֶתְהָא = to marry. But some confusion is noticeable in the use of these two Aramaic roots. B. has רבר 14, 21 but all the MSS. here סב⁶. L. here again reads רבר. Again in 24, 67 B has לְדַבָּר, A, C, D and B. לְנִסְיֵי. Here it means to marry, hence B is wrong. Finally in 30, 9 B ניסב⁸, B., A, C, D לְדַבָּר in which case B is again incorrect. 13, 9 B. and C כְּצִיפֵי לָא, A, B, C (margin) and D כְּצִיפֵי. Hebrew וְאֲשִׁרְיֵי. The Trg. here renders

1) Cf. Bezold's "Schatzhöhle" Leipzig 1888, II, p. VI, also Qoran, Sura 19, 57 and 58 where Edris is identified by Abulfeda with Enoch (Cf. Abulfedae Historia Anteislamica: Ed. Fleischer, Leipzig 1831, p. 13).

2) But מוֹתְבִהוֹן (in one word) = "their seats" and would therefore be correct. 3) Likewise the Samaritan has לְהַבִּיהַ. 4) l. c. p. 33.

5) Although the Samaritan has ניסב, cf. also Singer l. c. p. 21.

6) Samaritan סב. 7) Samaritan ניסב. 8) Samaritan ניסבה.

the Hebrew text ad sensum. The manuscript reading comes nearer to the Hebrew in form, whilst B. and C (text) make the verse run more smoothly in Aramaic. L. appears to read as B. since he gives no verbal root בִּצַן in his Dictionary. 15, 11 B., B (text), D יֵאָרִיב , C יֵאָרִיב , A, B (margin) יֵאָרִיב . The difference in vocalization has already been treated of above. L. reads as A and B (margin) "he drove them away". On the other hand Luz.¹ takes the reading וַאֲפִיחַ as a marginal gloss, which, although incorrect, subsequently crept into the text. Path^{legen}² says the traditional Trg. is וַאֲרִיב and this reading appears preferable, although so great an authority as L. reads otherwise. 15, 18 B. and C יֵהָבִיר 3 A, B, D אֶרְיִן . Hebrew יִהְיֶה . B.'s reading is preferable, but the sense of the passage is Future, and therefore the manuscript reading, though inferior, may perhaps be justified. As regards the different roots used, L. solves our difficulty by telling us that the only parts of יִרַן in use in Aramaic are the Future and Infinitive. 17, 2 B., A, C, D בִּין בִּיִּרִי , B בִּינִא . 4 Hebrew בִּינִי . Path^{legen} supports the former version. This expression is another instance of the Targumist's constant endeavour to avoid anthropomorphic expressions; whilst B translates literally. The suffix of the 1st Person Singular is wanting in this word and in אֲבִא according to L.⁵ Hence $\text{בִּינִא} = \text{בִּינִי}$. 18, 21 B. and C (text) have $\text{אֲם הִיבִין יֵאֵם לֵא}$ אֲם לֵא הִיבִין יֵאֵם הִיבִין אֲתַפְּרֵעַ , A, B, C (margin) and D read $\text{אֲם לֵא הִיבִין יֵאֵם לֵא אֲתַפְּרֵעַ}$. The Hebrew text is simply $\text{וְאֵם לֵא אֲקַדֶּה}$. All the commentators have remarks to make on this peculiarly difficult passage. Luz., Path^{legen} and Adler all justify B.'s Text "I will (make an end with you, come to terms with

¹ l. c. p. 35. ² To this verse. ³ Samaritan יֵהָבִיר . ⁴ Samaritan בִּינִי . ⁵ Dalman likewise mentions the avoidance of this suffix in his grammar p. 162 "Die Form des Suff. der 1 Pers. Sing. nach vokal. Auslaut sollte wohl י sein. Sie wird aber geflissentlich vermieden und bei אב (und אם) durch die det. Form ersetzt". But he places בִּינִא under those words in which the diphthong ai became weakened to a. Thus $\text{בִּינִא} = \text{בִּינִי}$ cf. also $\text{בִּעֲרִינִי} = \text{בִּעֲרִינִי}$ &c.

you) forgive you, if you repent but if not, I shall punish you". The corrected (MS.) reading runs "I shall (make an end with you) destroy you, if you do not repent, but if you repent, I shall not punish you." Both readings, are, however, very obscure and it is very doubtful whether either is correct. 19, 33 B., *B* and *C* יִשָּׁנָה, *A* and *D* וְקָמָה. The text is וְקָמָה. *A* and *D* are both wrong, they probably wrote וְקָמָה through confusion with verse 35 of which the Hebrew is וְקָמָה. 19, 33 and 35 *C* (margin) וְקָמָה וְבָקִימָה¹. *B*., *A*., *B*., *C* (text) and *D* וְקָמָה וְבָקִימָה, *C*'s marginal (corrected?) readings merely appear to be Hebraisms.

21, 33 *C* אֵי-לֵנָה, *B*., *A*., *B* and *D* וְיִשָּׁנָה. The Hebrew original is אֵשׁ. *L.* reads as *B*. The reading אֵי-לֵנָה is probably a marginal note which crept into the text, and in some MSS. supplanted the more correct reading. In *A* a later hand has already inserted אֵי-לֵנָה on the margin. 22, 12 *B* (text) שְׁבַקְתָּהּ, *B*., *A*., *B* (margin), *C*., *D* שְׁבַקְתָּהּ² which is undoubtedly the proper text; so *L.* שבקתה = "Thou hast forsaken" and not "thou hast withheld" which the Hebrew הִשְׁתַּחֲתָהּ means. 22, 18 *B* is again incorrect in this verse in which we find בְּרִיל בֶּנֶךְ written instead of בְּרִיל בֶּנֶךְ which is the correct *Trg.* of בְּרִיל בֶּנֶךְ. 23, 6 *B* and *C* יִבְלִי, *B* יִבְלִי, *A*., *D* יִבְלִי³. The only noticeable difference between *C* and *B* is the fact that *C* (as usual) has a form exactly like that of *B*. whilst *B* preserves the punctuation of the Superlinear system more distinctly. The Hebrew is יִבְלִי. Both Berliner and Landauer in their Massorahs give this word as an instance of קרא וחרגום. Similarly, the author of the Pathšegen. According to these authorities, the first-mentioned reading is the correct one. But it has already been noticed that our MSS. do not follow these Massoretic rules of קרא וחרגום. At the same time יִבְלִי conveys the sense of the original and both Rašî⁴ and Ibn Ezra explain יִבְלִי = יִבְלִי. 24, 10 *B*

¹ Likewise the Samaritan has וְקָמָה וְבָקִימָה.

² Samaritan מנעה.

³ Samaritan יִבְלִי. 4 a. l.

טָעַר. B., A, C and D טָעַר which is the same word as that given in the Hebrew text, and hence, perhaps, a Hebraism. 24, 19 B (incorrectly) כְּשֶׁמֶלֶךְ, A, B (margin), C, D and B. לְנִשְׁטָר. 24, 21 B., A, D שֶׁהִי בָהּ, B שֶׁהִי לְבָהּ, C שֶׁהִי בָהּ. Pathšegen accepts the latter reading, but L. writes as B. and as early as Raš'i's time the reading of C was already pointed out as incorrect. The Hebrew text is שֶׁשָּׂרָאָה לָּהּ. Berliner in his Massorah places שֶׁהִי בָהּ as a Suraa reading whilst שֶׁהִי וּבָהּ falls under the head of the Nehardean readings. 24, 38 B (text) לְנִשְׁטָר לְנִשְׁטָרֵי B (margin) and the remaining texts לְבָהּ אֲבָא לְנִשְׁטָרֵי. Since the corresponding Hebrew is אָל בַּיָּהּ אָבִי אָל בְּשֶׁפְתָי the last-mentioned text is more literal and hence, perhaps, preferable¹. 24, 44 B. אֲשֶׁרֶלֶי, A and B (margin) אֲשֶׁלֶי, B (text) אֲשֶׁקֶר, C אֲשֶׁלֶי, D אֲשֶׁלֶי. The Hebrew is אֲשָׁאָב "I shall draw". Although none of the readings here mentioned give us a literal translation of the Hebrew still אֲשֶׁקֶר is undoubtedly incorrect. (for the differences of vocalization see above).

24, 59 B. and C גְּבוּרָהִי, B and D גְּבוּרָהִי, A גְּבוּרָהִי. A appears to have taken the Hebrew אֲנָשִׁי in the sense of 'warriors' but there is nothing in the context which admits of such an interpretation. The vowel-changes have already been noticed. 24, 62. The Hebrew text runs אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי of which the Targum is—according to B אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי whilst the other versions give אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי. We can reject both these versions and follow that given by Nachmanides² אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי which is more literal. 25, 6 B., C and D have אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי, A אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי whilst B has אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי. The Hebrew text is אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי אֲנָשִׁי. A is the best and most literal translation and is supported by the authority of L. and Pathšegen. 25, 25 B., B, C בְּבִנְיָן, A בְּבִנְיָן, D בְּבִנְיָן. The Hebrew text is בְּבִנְיָן. L. explains all these words to be of similar signification and

¹ Cf. LXX ἄλλ' εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου πορεύσῃ καὶ εἰς τὴν φυλὴν μου. ² To this verse q. v.

all mean 'cloak' or 'mantle'. B.'s reading being derived from *καυλάς* sc. *ἔσθῆς*, that of *A* from the Persian *کلیم* and that of *D* from the Greek *γλαῖνα*. Pathšegen also reads כִּבְכֵן and explains that a כ comparisonis is omitted because the word is used adjectively and not substantively. 26, 14 *C* (margin) פְּלִיִּיָּה, *C* (text) and remainder עֲבוֹדָה just as the Hebrew. This instance is also mentioned in Berliner's Massorah under קרא ותרגום. Pathšegen also gives עבודרה. It is, however, remarkable that in the quotation of this verse by Theodorus Mopsuestenus¹, who lived at the beginning of the 5th century, he uses the word *سوسلس*, although the Pešitta which he usually quotes has here *ܫܘܫܠܫܘܬܐ*. Mopsuestenus is, however, by no means exact in his quotations from the Pešitta, his rendering of Biblical passages frequently differs both from Trg. and Pešitta. 26, 18 *C* (text) דִּקְרִי. *C* (margin), *A*, *B*, *D* and B. דִּהִיָּה קְרִי. Hebrew is קָרָא for which we might expect the Trg. to be דִּקְרָא. 27, 3 *B* after omitting דִּרְוֹמֵתֶךָ in its text, gives the incorrect marginal reading דִּרְוֹמֵתֶךָ. 27, 31 B. וְאֶעֱיֵל, *B* and *D* וְאֶעֱיֵל, *C* וְאֶעֱיֵל, *A* וְאֶעֱיֵר. Of these readings only that of *C* is incorrect. Although the Targumic form usually corresponding with the Hiphil of בוא in Hebrew is the Aphel of עָלַל, still we also occasionally find the Aphel of אָחַז thus employed. (Cf. 27, 7). 27, 34 *B* אֲנִי². The rest have לִי. Hebrew is אָנִי. *B* imitates the peculiar construction of the Hebrew original; but לִי is the correct Trg. Luz.³ remarks "Those who would read אֲנִי forget that it is not the object of the Targumist to retain the Hebrew obscurities, but rather to clear them up". 29, 8 B. and *C* וַיִּגְדְּרוּן, *A*, *D* וַיִּגְדְּרוּן, *B* וַיִּגְדְּרוּן. The Hebrew is וַיִּגְלְלוּ. L. permits either reading, taking the reading of *A* and *D* as a "Gafel" form of נָדַר. Raš'i also reads the word with a prosthetic ג. *B* has a mistake in the Gender. 30, 6 *B* has קָבִיל לְבַעֲזוֹתֵי יָדֵי יֵאָהָה קָבִיל צְלִיחוֹתֵי. B., *A*, *C* and *D* simply

¹ Edit. Sachau, Leipzig 1879 (page 50).

² Samaritan אֲנִי.

³ l. c. p. 41.

read יֵאָדָה קָבִיל צְלוּתֵי which corresponds literally to the Hebrew יָגֵם שְׂמִיעַ בְּקוֹלֵי. The first part of *B*'s rendering is perhaps a marginal gloss which was afterwards inserted in the text by an ignorant scribe. 30, 15 *B*., *D* and *B* (margin) לָהּ, *A* and *B* (text) לָאָה¹. *C* is missing. Since the Hebrew text reads לָהּ, the reading לָאָה although giving the sense of the passage appears to be incorrect. 31, 2 *B*., *A* and *C* (text) לְהַחֲנוֹן², *C* (margin), לְהַחֲנוֹן, *B* לְהַחֲנוֹן, *D* לְהַחֲנוֹן. The Hebrew is אֲרִיגָה. The forms given by *B* and *D* are incorrect. As the suffix refers to אָפַי and not to לִבִּי *C*'s marginal correction is worthless. But לְהַחֲנוֹן would be a more correct Aramaic form. 31, 13 *C* (incorrectly) אֲרִיגָה הָרִיךְ. The other MSS. read אֲרִיגָה הָרִיךְ which corresponds to the Hebrew הָרִיךְ הָאָדָם. 31, 16. In this verse *B*'s reading דְּשִׁירֹב appears to be preferable to the text given by *B*., *A*., *C* and *D* which give דִּשְׁפָרִישׁ "who separated". The Hebrew text is אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל. 31, 21 *B* לָהּ רִפְיָה. The rest have עָרִיחַ. Neither are literal since the Hebrew is simply תִּקְוָה. Path'segen similar to *B*., *A*., *C* and *D*. It is difficult to say which reading is preferable, but perhaps *B* is, since it preserves the word of the Hebrew text נָהַר. 31, 29 *C* (text) רִלְפָא הַשְּׁלִיל, *C* (margin) and the others מְלִלָא³. The Hebrew being דִּבְבַר the latter reading is correct. *C* (text) gives the sense of the original but is not literal. 34, 7 *B* אֲרִיגָה יִסְיָא, *A*., *B*., *D* יִסְיָא, *C* יִסְיָא. The meaning of the former reading is "And the men were tried" which gives no sense here. On the other hand the reading of *C*—which is also given by *L*.—gives us the correct sense "And the men were grieved" which exactly corresponds to the Hebrew נִקְוָה צָבָה. In this verse then I think we should reject the reading given by *B*. in favour of that shown by *C*. 34, 7 *B* (text) אֲרִיגָה, *B* (margin) and the rest לְכָל⁴. Hebrew בָּאָה. Which is the better reading? In verse 27 of this chapter all render בָּאָה by לְכָל so that

¹ LXX also Λεία.

² Samaritan לְהַחֲנוֹן.

³ Samaritan מְלִילָא.

⁴ Samaritan עָלֵי.

perhaps this reading should be preferred. But there are many passages in the Trg. in which the Aramaic Verbal Root which corresponds to the Hebrew בוא is אהא. We may perhaps then accept either of the above-mentioned readings. 35, 3 *B* בַּעֲדֵן נִקְרָי. The rest have בְּרִימָא רֵעִיקָרִי¹ which is the correct Trg. of the Hebrew בְּיוֹם צָרָתִי. It is true that *B* gives us the exact sense of the original, but yet the reading is faulty. 35, 8 *B* בְּהַחֲזִית. Rest have בְּגִלְדָּע². Hebrew מִתְחַח. As an instance of the close connection between these two Aramaic words compare מְלִרַע לְרִקְרַע 1, 7 and again מִתְחַח שְׂמִיא 1, 9. The words are really synonyms but Pathšegen³ tries to make a distinction between them by saying that one refers to a greater depth than the other and that a fine distinction does exist in the use of the two words may be seen by comparing the Heb. of 1, 7 and 1, 9. 1, 7 has בְּתַחַת ל while 1, 9 has only מִתְחַח, the Trg. for 1, 7 being מְלִרַע ל and for 1, 9 מִתְחַח. As the ל is also used here מְלִרַע seems preferable. 35, 18 *D* (incorrectly) בַּעֲדֵן. The other MSS. and *B*. read בַּמְפָּק which is the correct Trg. of the Hebrew בְּצֵאת. 36, 35 *B*, *C* and *D* בְּהַקְלֵי מְאָב, *A* בְּתַקְלֵא מְאָב, *B* בְּאֲרַע מְאָב. The original has בְּשִׁדְדָה מְאָב of which *A* gives the most literal Aramaic. *B* is decidedly incorrect. 37, 2 *A* דְּבִהוֹן. The other MSS. and *B*. read טְרִיבְהוֹן. Authorities differ which of these readings we should prefer. Berliner in his Massorah⁴ remarks "Many copies have the incorrect reading דְּבִהוֹן which imitates the word given in the Hebrew text; the Aramaic word טְרִיב first bore the meaning of calumniating when joined with בִּישָׁא". Similarly Luz.⁵ after citing many passages in which the Hebrew רִיבָה = the Aramaic טְרִיב adds that the reading רִיבָה is nothing more nor less than a mistake. On the other hand L.⁶ remarks; "Since our root (טְרִיב) hardly ever occurs in the Babylonian Trg. in this signification (viz. that of calumination) therefore the reading

¹ Samaritan עקרי. ² Samaritan מְלִרַע. ³ To this verse.

⁴ p. 78. ⁵ Philoxenos p. 43. ⁶ s. v.

הַיְהוָה is superior." We may therefore accept *A*'s reading as the correct one. 37, 23 *B* (margin) בֵּל¹, *B* (text), *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. אֶלֶּא. Hebrew אֶלֶּא (see above 34, 7). 37, 35 *B* (text) בֵּלֶּאֱלֹהִים, *D* and *B* (margin) אֶלֶּאֱלֹהִים, *B*, *A* and *C* אֶלֶּאֱלֹהִים. *L.* although mentioning the latter reading gives as correct the text given by *D* and *B* (margin). But how is the version of *B* (text) to be explained? It appears to be an allusion to the Jewish doctrine of the Immortality of the soul, but is, of course, an interpolation. The Hebrew original is simply אֶלֶּא. 37, 2 *B*. בְּנֵי־בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל², *A*, *D* בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, *B* בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, *C* בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל. The Hebrew has בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל. *L.* and Pathšegen both give the correct reading as אֶלֶּאֱלֹהִים although *L.* also mentions the other rendering. But before we are able to give an opinion which reading is preferable, it is necessary to be quite clear about the signification of the Hebrew original and here the authorities differ. Rasi, R. Samuel b. Meir, Nachmanides, Gersonides and Mendelssohn render "merchant" whilst the Revised English Version, Ibn Ezra, the LXX and Peshitta translate "Canaanite". Adler aptly remarks in his בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל³ that the rendering "merchant" is given to spare Judah's honour, he also quotes Talmud and Midraš in support of this translation. But after all I think the most correct reading is that given by *L.* which is literal. 38, 17 *B*. אֶשְׁלַח, *A*, *C* and *D* אֶשְׁלַח, *B* אֶשְׁלַח⁴. Hebrew אֶשְׁלַח. The readings given by *B.* and *B* are equally good, since the Afel of אֶשְׁלַח is merely a little stronger than the Peal, but the reading אֶשְׁלַח is wrong according to *L.* who quotes Levita to prove that the root שָׁלַח only occurs in 38, 20 and 23 where, according to the author of the Pathšegen, it has the signification of 'giving' merely, and not as here giving with the idea of repayment *i. e.* as a loan. 41, 5 *A* בְּלִיָּה. The other MSS. have בְּלִיָּה which is the correct reading, according to *L.*, although בְּלִיָּה has precisely the same meaning as בְּלִיָּה. 41, 30

¹ Samaritan אֶלֶּא.

² Samaritan בְּנֵי־בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל

³ To this verse.

⁴ Samaritan אֶשְׁלַח.

B (text) כָּמָא דְאֲרִיבָא, *B* (margin), *A*, *C*, *D* and *B*. כָּמָא דְאֲרִיבָא. One would only expect כָּמָא דְאֲרִיבָא¹ but as Adler points out in his *תרינה לגר* a. l. the root כלה is more applicable to the ruin of the inhabitants of a country than to the ruin of the country itself. We must therefore either assume that both versions are faulty or that both are equally good. 42, 10 *A* (incorrectly) הוּי, *B*. אָהוּ. *B*, *C* and *D*. אָהוּ. The Hebrew is בָּאוּ. 42, 38 *A* בְּבִישְׁתָּא. *B*, *C*, *D* בְּדוּוֹנָא. The Hebrew is בְּדוּגוֹן. *A* gives the correct sense but is an inferior reading. *L*. also has בְּדוּוֹנָא. On the other hand *B* is incorrect in giving בְּדוּוֹנָא as the Trg. for the Hebrew בְּרָעָה in 44, 29. The other MSS. and *B*. here give בְּבִישְׁתָּא which is correct. 43, 5 *B* (text) אֲסֵהִיד לָנָא כְּמִרְמִר, *B* (margin) and the rest אֲמֵר לָנָא. *B*'s mistake is one of homoiteleton. cf. v. 3. 43, 18 *A* (incorrectly) דְּאֲתָגֵב. The others have דְּאֲתָרֵב which is the correct Trg. of הָשֵׁב. 44, 2 *A* דְּבִנְיָמִן, rest דְּבִנְיָמִן. Hebrew הַקָּטָן hence *A* is wrong although, of course, the verse refers to Benjamin. 44, 14 *B* כָּל אֲשֵׁיהּוֹן, rest קָרְמוּהי. The Hebrew is לְפָזְיוֹ and hence *B* (which would be the Trg. of גַּל בְּנֵיהֶם) is a mistake. 48, 19 *A* דְּבִנְיָמִן מְנִיחָא דְּפָקוֹן. *B*, *C* and *D* give דְּבִנְיָמִן שְׁלֵטִין. So *B*. who employs שְׁלֵטִין instead of שְׁלֵטִין. The Hebrew original is שְׁלֵטִין. Both renderings are equally free and hence hardly satisfactory, although we must bear in mind that in some of the poetical and prophetic passages of the Pentateuch, O. doubtless allowed himself great freedom in giving the sense of the original, besides which our texts of the Trg. are frequently hopelessly corrupt. Of the two renderings here given *A*'s is historically inaccurate, as the great Hebrew kings who ruled over other nations sprang from the tribe of Judah and not from that of Ephraim. But the tribe of Ephraim was the most powerful of the kingdom of Israel and hence the other rendering is at least historically true. The Hebrew text is very obscure, but whatever it does

¹ As the Samaritan Trg. gives.

mean is not represented by either of the Targumic versions here quoted. A "fullness of nations" probably means "exceedingly numerous". 48, 22 B. and C (text) *בְּאַרְבַּע יְבִקְטִיָּהּ*, C (margin), A, B and D *בְּאַרְבַּע יְבִקְטִיָּהּ* which is a Hag. rendering. V. Raši and Adler in his *גִּזְרֵיהֶם לְגַר* on this verse. The Targumist strives to soften the apparent harshness of Jacob's language. B.'s reading is quite literal. 49, 27 B., B, C *קִרְבָּנָא*, A *קִרְבָּנָא*, D *קִרְבָּנָא*. Although the Hebrew original is amplified in this verse to such an extent that it becomes all but unrecognisable in the Aramaic translation, still of the renderings here given the first mentioned is the only one that gives the correct Aramaic word and therefore the only reading we can here adopt.

This is a complete list of the *Variae lectiones* and it may be seen by a perusal of these together with the vowel changes and grammatical irregularities which we have already noticed how very far we are from having a correct critical text of the Trg. Undoubtedly B.'s edition is a vast improvement upon the texts which preceded his, but we have seen how very often it may be improved upon. I am afraid it is too much for us to expect the Trg. text to be perfectly accurate since many later scribes have tampered with the text to such an extent that in many places we cannot recognise the Hebrew original at all in the Targumic translation. But what we may reasonably hope for is a gradual improvement until we shall have obtained a text which is as critical as we can possibly expect under the many disadvantageous conditions which surround the editing of such a text. As a first step in this direction I now give a few specimen chapters of the Trg. of O. with Superlinear vocalization, which, besides showing an improvement in language probably represents the original Palestinian Version.

III.

In the following chapters I have followed the MS. *D* which has already been noticed to give the best and clearest text. Occasionally I have inserted a reading which appears to be more correct in the foot-notes. My reasons for doing so may be found explained in the body of this work.

I also give the readings which are given by the Editio Bomberg (Venice, 1517) the text of which varies very considerably from the text of B.'s Edition. I have inserted every word in regard to which this Edition differs from that of B., although the reading may coincide with that of the MSS. The MSS. *C* and *D* invariably write the Tetragrammaton thus יידי whilst the Editio Bomberg writes יי. *A* יידי and *B* יידי¹. The dot over the Šin is not written, Sin is written thus ש² but is usually replaced by ס. The word קָרָם is usually abbreviated in the MSS., which simply write ק. In such cases the missing letters have been added in brackets. Numerous emendations appear to be necessary in the consonantal text, which should be purged from its numerous superfluous elements, but such corrections should be postponed until we have attained a more accurate vocalization².

Different chapters to those given by Merx in his "Chrestomathia Targumica" have purposely been chosen.

¹ Cf. Part I, Cp. II, 2. ² Merx considers it necessary to apply both systems of vocalization to arrive at a correct and critical vocalized text, but it has been shown that this is possible by means of the Superlinear vocalization alone (cf. Merx "Bemerkungen", p. 188).

CHAPTER XVII.

- (1) וְהָיָה אַבְרָם בֶּרַח תְּשׁוּבָה וְחָשַׁע שָׁנוֹן וְאַתְּנֹלוּ הָיָה לְאַבְרָם
וְאָמַר לֵיהָ אֵלֹהִים אֵל שְׁדֵי פֶלַח קָדְמָי וְהָיָה שְׁלוֹם
- (2) דְּאֵתִיק^b קָדְמֵי בֵּין מֵימְרֵי^c וְבִינְךָ דְּאֵסְנֵי רִתְךָ לְחֵדָא^d לְחֵדָא
(3) וְנִפְלְ אַבְרָם עַל אֶפְרָחֵי וְמַלְיֵל עֲמִיחָה הָיָה לְמֵימַר
(4) אֵלֹהִים הָאֵל נִזְרָה קָדְמֵי^e עֲמֵךְ וְחֵדָי^f לְאַב סְנֵי^g עֲמִמִּין
(5) יִלְא וְתִקְרֵי עוֹד רִת שְׂמֵךְ אַבְרָם וְיִהְיֶה שְׂמֵךְ אַבְרָהָם אֲרִי
לְאַב סְנֵי^h עֲמִמִּין דְּהַבְיָךְ^k
- (6) דְּאֵפְשִׁי^l רִתְךָ לְחֵדָא לְחֵדָא דְּאַתְּנִיכְךָ^m לְכַנְשֵׁןⁿ וְמַלְכִין
דְּשִׁלְטִין^o בְּעַמְמֵיָא מִנְךָ וּפְקוֹן
- (7) וְאֵקִים^p רִת קָדְמֵי בֵּין מֵימְרֵי וְבִינְךָ וּבִין בְּנֵךְ בְּחֵדְךָ
דְּדִיִּיהֶן לְקִים עַלְמֵי^q נְךָ לְאַלְהָהּ^r וְלִבְנֵךְ בְּחֵדְךָ
- (8) דְּאֵתִיק^s נְךָ וְלִבְנֵךְ בְּחֵדְךָ רִת אֲרַע תּוֹתְבוֹתְךָ רִת כֹּל אֲרַע
דְּכַנְשֵׁן לְאַחְסֵי עַלְמֵי דְּאֵתִיק^t לְהֶן לְאַלְהָהּ
- (9) וְאָמַר^u הָיָה לְאַבְרָהָם וְאַתְּ רִת קָדְמֵי תִשָּׂר אֶת וּבְנֵךְ בְּחֵדְךָ
לְדִיִּיהֶן
- (10) דִּיק^v קָדְמֵי דְּתִשָּׂרוֹן^w בֵּין מֵימְרֵי וּבִינִיכֶן וּבִין בְּנֵךְ
בְּחֵדְךָ מִגְזֵר^{aa} לְכִין כֹּל דְּכֹלְרָא
- (11) וְתִגְזֹרוֹן רִת בְּסֹרָא דְּעַלְלַתְבוֹן וְיִהְיֶי^{bb} לְאַת קִים בֵּין
מֵימְרֵי וּבִינִיכֶן

a Edit. Bom. וְחֵדָי. *b* Bom. וְאֵתִיק. *c *B* בֵּינֵי instead of מֵימְרֵי. *d* *B* לְחֵדָא. *e* Bom. omits. *f *C* קָדְמֵי. *g* Bom. וְחֵדָי. *h* Bom. and *A* סְנֵי. *i* Bom. and *A* סְנֵי, *B* סְנֵי. *k* Bom. תִּקְרֵי. *l* Bom. וְאֵפְשִׁי. *m* *C* דְּאַתְּנִיכְךָ. *n* Bom. לְכַנְשֵׁן. *o* Bom. דְּשִׁלְטִין. *p* Bom. וְאֵקִים. The best form would be וְאֵקִים. *q* Bom. לְקִים. *r* Bom. לְאַלְהָהּ, *B* לְאַלְהָהּ. *s* Bom. וְאֵתִיק. *t* Bom. עַלְמֵי. *u* Bom. וְאָמַר, *C* וְאָמַר. *x* Bom. וְאָמַר. *y* Bom. וְאָמַר. *z* Bom. וְאָמַר. *aa* Bom. וְאָמַר, *C* וְאָמַר. *bb* Bom. וְחֵדָי, *C* וְחֵדָי.**

- (12) וְבַר תַּמְנָא יוֹמִין וּגְזַר לַכּוֹן כָּל דְּכוּרָא לְדַרְיוֹכוֹן יִלִּיד
 בִּיתָא וְזִבִּין כִּסְפָא מְכָל בַּר עֲמִמִּין דְּלֵא מִבְּנֵךְ הוּא
- (13) מְגַזֵּר יִגְזֵר יִלִּיד^a בִּיתָךְ וְזִבִּין^b כִּסְפֵךְ^c וְיִהְיִי^d קַיְמִי
 בְּבִסְרוֹכוֹן^e לְקַיִם^f עֲלַם^g
- (14) וְעָרַל דְּכוּרָא דְּלֵא יִגְזֵר יָת בְּסֵרָא דְּעַרְלָתִיהָ^h וְיִשְׁתַּיְצִי
 אֲנִישָׁאⁱ הֵהוּא מְעַמִּיהָ יָת קַיְמִי^k אֲשַׁנִּי^l
- (15) וְאֲמַר הִי לְאַבְרָהָם שְׂרִי אֲתָתְךְ לֵא תַקְרִי יָת שְׁמָהּ^m שְׂרִי
 אֲרִי שְׂרָה שְׁמָהּ
- (16) וְאֲבָרִיךְⁿ יָתָה^o וְאֵה אֲתִינּוּ^p מִנָּה^q לָךְ בַּר וְאֲבָרְכֵנָהּ^r
 וְתִהְיֶה^s לְכַנְשֵׁן^t וְלְמַלְכוּן^u דְּשַׁלְטִין בְּעַמְמִיָּא מִנָּה יְהוּן
- (17) וְנִפְלַל אֲבָרָהָם עַל אֲפוּהִי וְהִי^x וְאֲמַר בְּלִבִּיהָ הִלְבֵּר
 מֵאָה שְׁנִין יְהִי^y וְלֵד^z וְאִם שְׂרָה הִבֵּת תְּשַׁעֲוִן שְׁנִין תִּלְוִיד^{aa}
- (18) וְאֲמַר אֲבָרָהָם קְ(דָם) הִי לְוִי^{bb} דִּישְׁמַעְאֵל^{cc} וְתַקְרִים^{dd}
 קְדָמְךְ^{ee}
- (19) וְאֲמַר^{ff} הִי בְּקִשְׁתָּא שְׂרָה אֲתָתְךְ תִּלְוִיד לָךְ בַּר וְתַקְרִי יָת
 שְׁמִיהָ יִצְחָק וְאֲקִים^{gg} יָת קַיְמִי^{hh} עֲמִיהָ לְקַיִם עֲלַםⁱⁱ לְבִנּוּהִי בְּתַרְוָהִי
- (20) וְעַל יִשְׁמַעְאֵל קְבִילִית עֲלוּתְךְ הֵא בְּרִיכִית יִתִּיהָ
 וְאֲפִישִׁית^{kk} יִתִּיהָ וְאֲסַגִּיתִי^{ll} יִתִּיהָ לְהוּדָא תְרִי^{mm} עֶסֶר רְבַרְבִּי
 יוֹלִיד וְאֲתַנְּוִיהָⁿⁿ לְעָם סַגִּי

a A וְלִיְרִי. *b* A וּזְבִינִי. *c* B, C כִּסְפָא, A כִּסְפָא. *d* Bom. וְיִהְיִי.
e Bom. בְּבִסְרוֹכוֹן. *f Bom. לְקַיִם. *g* Bom. עֲלַם.
h Bom. וְיִשְׁתַּיְצִי. *i* Bom. אֲנִישָׁא. *k* B קַיְמִי. *l* Bom. אֲשַׁנִּי.
m Bom. שְׁמָהּ. *n* Bom. וְאֲבָרִיךְ. *o* Bom. יָתָה. *p* Bom. אֲתִינּוּ,
B and omits יִתִּיהָ. *q* Bom. מִנָּה. The 3rd Sin. Fem. Suffix is always punctuated with Q. in this Edition, so this variation will not be noticed again. *r* Bom. וְאֲבָרְכֵנָהּ.
s Bom. וְתִהְיֶה. *t Bom. לְכַנְשֵׁן. *u* Bom. וְלְמַלְכוּן. *x* Bom. וְהִי.
y Bom. יְהִי. *z* Bom. וְלֵד. *aa* B תִּלְוִיד. *bb* לְוִי is a more correct form. *cc* A, B יִשְׁמַעְאֵל. *dd* Bom. וְתַקְרִים. *ee* Bom. קְדָמְךְ.
ff Bom. וְאֲמַר. *gg* Bom. וְאֲקִים. *hh* C קַיְמִי. *ii* Bom. עֲלַם.
kk Bom. וְאֲפִישִׁית. *ll* Bom. וְאֲסַגִּיתִי. *mm* B's reading תְרִי appears preferable when compared with the Hebrew וְתִשְׁרֵה. *nn* Bom. וְאֲתַנְּוִיהָ.**

(21) הָיָה קָרָמִי אֶקִים^a לָם וְעָהָק דַּתְלוּד^b לְךָ שָׂרָה לְזַמְנָא
הִדְדִין^c בְּשָׂרָא אֶהֱרִיחָא^d

(22) וְשִׁיבִי^e מִלְמַלְלָא^f עֲמִיחָא וְאֶסְתַּלַּק יִקְרָא דְהִי מַעְלוּזְהִי^g
דְאֶבְרָהִם

(23) וְדַבֵּר אֶבְרָהִם יָת וְשִׁמְעֵאל בְּרִיחָא הָיָה לָל יִלְיָדִי בִיתִיחָא
הָיָה לָל זְבוּנִי כְסָפִיחָא לָל דְכוּרָא בְאֲנָשִׁי^h בֵּית אֶבְרָהִם וְגֹזֵר יָת

בְּסָרָא דְעֶרְלַתְהוֹןⁱ בְּכִיךְ יוֹמָא הִדְדִין בְּמָא דְמַלְלִי^k עֲמִיחָא הִי
(24) וְאֶבְרָהִם בֵּר תַּשְׁעִין וְחֹשְׁעִי שְׁנוֹן כִּד גֹּזֵר בְּסָרָא

דְעֶרְלַתִּיחָא^m
(25) וְשִׁמְעֵאל בְּרִיחָא בֵּר תַּלְתַּת עֶסְרֵי שְׁנוֹן כִּד גֹּזֵר יָת בְּסָרָא

דְעֶרְלַתִּיחָא^m
(26) בְּכִיךְ יוֹמָא הִדְדִין אֶתְגֹּזֵרⁿ אֶבְרָהִם וְשִׁמְעֵאל בְּרִיחָא

(27) וְכָל אֲנָשִׁי^o בִּוְתִיחָא יִלְיָדִי בִוְתָא וְזְבוּנִי כְסָפָא מִן בְּרִי
בְּמַמְיָא אֶתְגֹּזֵר^p עֲמִיחָא

CHAPTER XXVI.

- (1) הָיָה כְפָנָא בְּאַרְעָא בֵּר^q מִכְפָּנָא קְדַמְאָח^r דְהָיָה בְרוּמִי
אֶבְרָהִם וְאֶלֶל^s יַעֲהָק לָיָת אֶבְרָמֶלֶךְ מִלְכָא דַפְלִשְׁתִּיחָא לְגֹזֵר
- (2) וְאֶתְלַלִי לִיחָא הִי וְאֶמְרִי לֹא תִוְחַת לְמַעֲרִים^t שְׁרִי^x
בְּאַרְעָא דְאִיִּבְרִי^y לְךָ

a B, C אֶקִים, A אֶקִים. The best form would be אֶקִים.
b Bom. דְיִ קְלִיד. *c* Bom. הִקָא, B הִאָרָא. *d* Bom. אִיִּתְהִקָא, A
אִיִּתְהִקָא, B אִהִרְחִיחָא, C אִהִרְחִיחָא. *e* Bom. וְשִׁיבִי. *f* B מִלְמַלְלָא,
Ber. לְמַלְלָא. *g* Bom. מַעְלוּזְהִי. *h* Bom. בְּאֲנָשִׁי, A בְּאֲנָשִׁי.
i A דְעֶרְלַתְהוֹן, Bom. דְעֶרְלַתְהוֹן. *k* Bom. דְיִ קְלִיד. *l* Bom.
וְחֹשְׁעִי. *m* דְעֶרְלַתִּיחָא. *n* אֶתְגֹּזֵר (B. on the other hand has גֹּזֵר
and also גֹּזֵר for אֶתְגֹּזֵר in verse 27). *o* Bom. אֲנָשִׁי. *p* Bom.
אֶתְגֹּזֵר. *q* בֵּר would be a better punctuation. *r* Bom.
הִקָא. *s* Bom. וְאֶלֶל. *t* Bom. וְאֶמְרִי. *u* B בְּמַמְיָא. *x* Bom.
שְׁרִי. *y* A דְאִיִּבְרִי (!)

- (3) רוֹר בְּאַרְעָא הָיָא וְיָהוּ^a מְיִמְרוּ בְּסַעֲדָךְ^b וְאַבְרָכְנִךְ^c אֲרוּ
 לָךְ וְלִבְנֵךְ אֲתִין^d יָת כָּל אַרְעֵתָא^e הָאֵלִין וְאֵקִים^f יָת קַיְמָא^g
 דְּקַיְמִית לְאַבְרָהָם אַבּוּךְ
- (4) וְאַסְגֵי יָת בְּנֵךְ^h כְּכֹכְבֵי שְׁמַיָא וְאֲתִיןⁱ לִבְנֵךְ^k יָת כָּל
 אַרְעֵתָא^l הָאֵלִין וְיַתְבְּרִכּוּן בְּדִיל בְּנֵךְ כָּל עַמְמֵי^m אַרְעָא
- (5) הֵלֶךְ דְּקָבִילⁿ אַבְרָהָם לְמִימְרוּ וְנִסְר מִסְרַת^o מְיִמְרוּ
 פְּקוּדֵי^p קַיְמֵי^q וְאוּרִיתֵי^r
- (6) וְיִתִּיב^s וְצִהֵק בְּגֵרֵר
- (7) וְשִׂאִלוּ אֲנָשֵׁי אֵתְרָא עַל עֵינֵסְךְ^t אֵתְרִיהּ וְאָמַר אֵתְרָא^x
 הוּא אֲרוּ דְהֵיל^y לְמִימַר אֵתְרֵי דְלִמָּא וְקִסְלוּנֵי אֲנָשֵׁי^z אֵתְרָא
 עַל רִבְקָה^{aa} אֲרוּ שְׁפִירַת הַיְזוּ הוּא
- (8) וְהָוָה כַּד סָנְיָאוּ^{bb} לֵיהּ תִמְן וְיִמְיָא דְאַסְתְּלוּ^{cc} אַבְימֶלֶךְ
 מְלִכָא דְפְלַשְׁתִּינֵי מִן הַרְכָא וְהָוָה וְהָא וְצִהֵק מִחֵיךְ^{dd} עִם^{ee}
 רִבְקָה אֵתְרִיהּ
- (9) וְקִרָא אַבְימֶלֶךְ לְצִהֵק וְאָמַר^{ff} בָּרַם הָא אֵתְרֵךְ הוּא
 וְאַיְכְּדִין אֲמַרַת^{gg} אֵתְרָא^{hh} הוּא וְאָמַר^{ff} לֵיהּ וְצִהֵק אֲרוּ אֲמַרִיתⁱⁱ
 דְלִמָּא אֲתַקְטִיל^{kk} עִלָּה
- (10) וְאָמַר^{ff} אַבְימֶלֶךְ מֵאֲדָא^{ll} עַבְדַּת^{mm} לָנָא כְּזַעִיר פּוֹן
 שְׂרִיבⁿⁿ דְּמִיחֵךְ בְּעֵמָא^{oo} יָת^{pp} אֵתְרֵךְ וְאַיְרִיהָא^{qq} עִלָּנָא תּוֹבָא

a Bom. וְיָהוּ. *b* Bom. בְּסַעֲדָךְ. *c* Bom. וְאַבְרָכְנִיךְ. *d* Bom. אֲתִין. *e* Bom. אַרְעֵתָא. *f* Bom. וְאַקִּים (correctly). *g* C קַיְמֵי. *h* Bom. בְּנֵךְ. *i* Bom. וְאַתִּין. *k* Bom. לִבְנֵךְ. *l* Bom. אַרְעֵתָא. *m* Bom. עַמְמֵי. *n* Bom. דִּי קָבִיל. *o* Bom. מִסְרַת. *p* Bom. פְּקוּדֵי. *q* B קַיְמֵי. *r* Bom. וְאוּרִיתֵי, B וְאוּרִיתֵי. *s* Bom. וְיִתִּיב. *t Bom. אֵתְרֵי. *u* Bom. עֵינֵסְךְ. *x* Bom. אֵתְרָא. *y* Bom. דְהֵיל. *z* Bom. אֲנָשֵׁי. *aa* Bom. רִבְקָה (and not רִבְקָה as B.). *bb* Bom. וְהָוָה. *cc* Bom. וְאַסְתְּלוּ would be a better reading. *dd* Bom. מִחֵיךְ, C מִחֵיךְ. *ee* Bom. עִם (B. has יָת). *ff* Bom. וְאַמַר. *gg* Bom. אֲמַרַת, A אֲמַרַת. *hh* Bom. אֵתְרָא. *ii* Bom. אֲמַרִית. *kk* Bom. אֲתַקְטִיל correctly; also C אֲתַקְטִיל. *ll* Bom. מֵאֲדָא. *mm* Bom. עַבְדַּת. *nn* Bom. שְׂרִיב. *oo* Cf. LXX which has ἐκ τῆς εἰς. *pp* Bom. יָת. *qq* Bom. וְאַיְרִיהָא. The best reading would be וְאַיְרִיהָא.*

- (11) אֶפְרַיִם אֲבוֹתֶיךָ יְהִי לָל עָמָּא לְמִימְרֵי דְרַבִּינָא ^a לְנַבְרָא ^b
הִדְקִי לְזַלְתֵּיהּ ^c אֶהְקִטְלָא נְהִקְטִיל ^d
- (12) * זָרַע וְצִהָק בְּאַרְעָא הָיוּ וְאִשְׁכַּח בְּשֵׁתָא הָיוּ עַל
הַד ^e בְּאַחַּ בְּדִשְׁרֵיהּ ^f וְלִבְרִינָה ^g
- (13) יִרְבָּא זְבִירָא אֲזִיל ^h אֲזִיל ⁱ סְנִי יִרְבִּי עַד חֲרַבָּא ^k לְחַדָּא
(14) יִהְיֶה ^l לִיהּ בְּיַהּ ^m עָמָּא וְגִיְהִי ⁿ תּוֹרִי וְפִלְחָא ^o סְנִי
יִקְיָאוּ בִיהּ פִּלְשְׁתָּא ^p
- (15) יִכַּל בְּרִי ^q דְּחִפְרָא ^r עֲבָדִי אֲבוּהִי ^s בְּרִוְמִי אֲבִרְהִם
אֲבוּהִי שְׂמִילִין ^t פִּלְשְׁתָּאֵי וְמִלְוִין ^u עֲפִרָא
- (16) יִאֲמֹר ^x אֲבוֹתֶיךָ לְצִהָק אֲזִיל ^y מִעָמָּא אֲרִי תְקִיפֵת ^z
זִילָא לְחַדָּא ^{aa}
- (17) אֲזִיל מִחֲמִין ^{bb} וְצִהָק יִשְׂרָא בְּחַלָּא דְגָרָר וְיִתִּיב ^{cc} תִּמְן
(18) יִתֵּב וְצִהָק דְּחִפְרָא יְהִי בְּרִי ^{dd} דְּמִיָּא דְּחִפְרָא ^{ee} בְּרִוְמִי
אֲבִרְהִם אֲבוּהִי ^{ff} יִשְׂמִילִין ^{gg} פִּלְשְׁתָּאֵי בְּחַר דְּמִיָּא אֲבִרְהִם וְקָרָא
לְהִין ^{hh} שְׂמִילִין זְשִׁמְהִין דְּהִיָּה ⁱⁱ קָרָא ^{kk} לְהִין ^{hh} אֲבוּהִי ^{ff}
- (19) דְּחִפְרָא ^{ll} עֲבָדִי וְצִהָק בְּחַלָּא יִאֲשַׁכְּחֻ ^{mm} תִּמְן בְּרִי ⁿⁿ
דְּמִין ^{oo} לְבִעִין ^{pp}

a Bom. דְּרַבִּינָא. *b* Bom. בְּנִבְרָא. *c Bom. יִבְאֲחֵיהּ.
d *C* יִהְקִטְלָא. *e Bom. הַד. *f Bom. בְּשִׁיחֵיהּ. *g* Bom. אֲזִיל.
h *B* has this word added on the margin. *B*. omits it.
i Bom. סְנִי. *k* Bom. דְּרַבִּינָא. *l* Bom. יִהְיֶה. *C* יִהְיֶה. *m* Bom.
גִּיְהִי. *n* Bom. יִגִּיְהִי. *o* Bom. יִשְׁפִּילְחָא. *A* has this word
erased in the text but added on the margin; whilst *B* has
it in the text and יִפְלַחָא on the margin. *p* *B* פִּלְשְׁתָּא.
q Bom. בְּרִי. *B* בְּרִיָּא. *r* Bom. דְּחִפְרָא. *s* Bom. אֲבִרְהִי.
t Bom. יִשְׂמִילִין and *Raši* quotes the word thus. *u* Bom. יִשְׂמִילִין.
x Bom. יִאֲמֹר. *y* Bom. אֲזִיל. *z* Bom. תְּקִיפֵת. *C* תְּקִיפֵת.
aa Bom. לְחַדָּא. *bb* Bom. בְּחֲמִין. *cc* Bom. וְיִתִּיב. *dd* Bom. בְּרִי.
ee Bom. דְּרַבִּינָא. *ff* Bom. אֲבִרְהִי. *gg* Bom. יִשְׂמִילִין.
The best reading would be יִשְׂמִילִין. *hh* Bom. לְהִין (*B*. לְהִין).
ii Bom. דְּרַבִּינָא. *kk* *C* has דְּקָרָא instead of קָרָא. *ll* Bom.
דְּחִפְרָא. *mm* *C* יִאֲשַׁכְּחֻ. *A* יִאֲשַׁכְּחֻ. *nn* Bom. בְּרִי. *oo* Bom.
דְּמִין. *pp* Bom. יִשְׂמִילִין.***

(20) וְנָצוּ רֵעוּתָא^a דְּגַרְר נִם רֵעוּתָא דִּיצְחָק לְמִימַר דִּילְלָא^b
מֵיָא וְקָרָא שְׁמָה^c דְּבִירָא עֵסֶק אֲרִי אֲתַעְסְקוּ^d עִמִּיהָ.

(21) וְהִפְרוּ בִיר^e אֲהֲרִי^f וְנָצוּ אֶף עֲלֵה וְקָרָא שְׁמָה שְׁטִינָה^{*}

(22) וְאֶסְתְּלַק מִתְמֵן וְהִפְר בִּיר^g אֲהֲרִי^h וְלֹא יָצוּ עֲלֵה וְקָרָא

שְׁמָה רַחֲוִיבֹתⁱ וְאָמַר^k אֲרִי כֵעֵן אֶפְתִּי הִי לֵילָא רִיפְשִׁינָא^l בְּאֲרֵעָא

(23) וְאֶסְתְּלַק^m מִתְמֵן לְבִאָר שְׁבַע

(24) וְאֶתְנַלִּיⁿ לִי הִי בְלִילִיָא הִהוּא וְאָמַר אֵילָא אֱלֹהִיָּה^o

דְּאֶבְרָהִם אֲבֹדָךְ^p לֹא תִדְהַל אֲרִי בְסַעְדָךְ^q מִימְרִי וְאֶבְרָנְדָךְ^r וְאֶסְנִי

רַח בְּנָךְ בְּדִיל אֶבְרָהִם עִבְדִּי

(25) וְבִנָא תְמֵן מְדַבְחָא^s וְעָלִי בְשִׁמָּא דְהִי וְפִרְסִיָּה תְמֵן

לְמִשְׁכְּנֵיהָ^t וְכִרוּ תְמֵן עִבְדִּי יִצְחָק בִּירָא

(26) וְאֶבְרָמֶלֶךְ אֲרָא^u לְוֹתִיהָ מְגַרְר וְסִיעֵת^x רַחֲמֵיהָ^y

וְפִיכּוּל רַב הִילִיָּה

(27) וְאָמַר^z לַהוּן יִצְחָק מִדִּין^{aa} אֲתִיתוּן^{bb} לְרִזִּי וְאֶתוּן

סִיחִתוּן יִתִּי וְשִׁלַּחְתוּנִי מְלוֹתְכוֹן^{cc}

(28) וְאָמַרוּ^{dd} מַחֲזָא^{ee} הַזֵּינָא אֲרִי הִוָּה^{ff} מִימְרָא דְהִי

בְּסַעְדָךְ^{gg} וְאָמַרְנָא תַתְקִיִּים^{hh} כֵּעֵן מוֹמְתָא דְהִוָּה בֵּין אֲבָהָתָאⁱⁱ

בִּינָא וְבִינָךְ רַגְזָר קָיִם עִמָךְ

a Bom. בְּעִזְוָה. *b* Bom. דְּרִילָא. *c* Bom. שְׁמָה. *d* Bom. אֲתַעְסְקוּ. *e* Bom. בִּירָא. *f* *A, B, C* אֲהֲרִי, Bom. אוֹתְרִי. The Šewa compositum given by *D* is irregular in the Spl. vocalization; אֲהֲרִי would be the best reading. *g* Bom. בִּירָא. *h* *A, B, C* אֲהֲרִי, Bom. אוֹתְרִי. *i* *C* רַחֲוִיבֹת. *k* Bom. נָאֵר. *l* *A, B* (more correctly) וְרִיפְשִׁי and וְרִיפְשִׁי. *m* Bom. וְסִלְיָק, *B, C* (more correctly) וְסִלְיָק. *n* *B* אֶתְנַלִּי. *o* Bom. אֱלֹהִיָּה. *p* Bom. אֲבִיד. *q* Bom. בְּסַעְדָךְ. *r* Bom. נֶאֱבְרָנְדָךְ. *s* Bom. וְסִיעֵת. *t* Bom. מִשְׁכְּנֵיהָ. *u* Bom. אֲרָא, *A* אֲרִי. *x* *A* רַחֲמֵיהָ. *y* Bom. בְּרַחֲמֵיהָ, *A, B* בְּרַחֲמֵיהָ, and the word is thus quoted in Gen. Rabb. c. 64 § 9 (in Wilna Edition). *z* Bom. נָאֵר. *aa* Bom. מִחִין. *bb* Bom. אֲתִיתוּן. *cc* Bom. מְלוֹתְכוֹן. *dd* Bom. נֶאֱמָרוּ. *ee* Bom. מַחֲזָא. *ff* Bom. הִוָּה. *gg* Bom. בְּסַעְדָךְ. *hh* Bom. אֲתַקִּיִּים. *ii* Bom. אֲבָהָתָא.

- (29) אִם הִעֲבִיר^a עֲמֹא בִישָׁא כְּמֹא דִלָּא אֲנִיקְנֵךְ^b וְכִמֹּא
 הִעֲבִירָנָא^c עִמְךָ לְחֹדֶר טֹב וְשִׁלְתֵךְ בְּשִׁלְמֵ אֵת כֶּלֶן בְּרִיכָא דִּיהִי
- (30) וְעִבְד^d לַחֹן מִשְׁתִּיא^e וְאַלְלוּ^f וְשִׁתִּיא^g
- (31) וְאִקְוִימוּ בְּצַפְרָא וְקִימוּ דָּבָר לְאַחֵיהִי^h דְּשִׁלְחִינוּךְⁱ
 יִצְחָק וְאַלְלוּ^k מִלִּזְתִּיה בְּשִׁלְמֵ
- (32) וְהָיָה בְּיוֹמָא הַהוּא וְאַתּוּ^l עֲבָדֵי יִצְחָק וְהוּיֵאוּ לֵיהּ
 עַל עֵיסֶק^m בִּירָא דְהַפְרוּⁿ וְאַמְרוּ^o לֵיהּ אֲשַׁכְחֵנָא מֵיָא
- (33) וְקִרָא יְהִי שְׁבַע^p עַל כֶּן שְׁמָה^q דְּקָרְתָא בְּאֵר שְׁבַע
 עַד יוֹמָא הַדִּין
- (34) וְהָיָה עֵשׂו בֶר אַרְבַּעִין שָׁנִין וְנָסִיב אֶתְתָא יַת יְהוּדִית
 בַּת בְּאֵרֵי הַתְּאָה וְיָת בְּסַמָּת בַּת אֶלְוִן הַתְּאָה
- (35) וְהוּאָה מְסַרְבֵּן וְמַרְגָּן^r עַל מֵימַר יִצְחָק וְרַבְקָה^s

CHAPTER XXXI.

- (1) וְשָׁמַע יַת פְּחִלְמֵי כִנּוּ לִבֵּן דְּאַמְרוּן^t נָסִיב^u יִעֲקֹב יַת
 כָּל דְּלֵאבְרָנָא^x וְמִדְּלֵאבְרָנָא^y קָנָא יַת כָּל נַכְסֵיאָה הָאֲלוֹן
- (2) וְהוּאָ יִעֲקֹב יַת סָבֵר אֲפִי לִבֵּן וְהָא לִיתִינוּךְ^z עֲמִיהּ
 כְּמֵאֲתַמְלוּ^{aa} וְמִקְדָּמוֹהִי

a Bom. הִעֲבִיר. *b* Bom. אֲנִיקְנֵךְ. *c* Bom. דִּיקְנֵךְ, *B* הִעֲבִירָנָא.
d Bom. עִבְד. *e* Bom. מִשְׁתִּיא, *C* מִשְׁתִּיא. *f* Bom. אֲלָלוּ.
g *C* וְשִׁתִּיא. *h* *B* לֵיהּ instead of לְאַחֵיהִי. Bom. לְאַחֵיהִי.
i Bom. וְשִׁלְחִינוּךְ, *B* וְשִׁלְחִינוּךְ. *k* Bom. נִאֲלָלוּ. *l* Bom. קָרְא.
m Bom. עֵיסֶק. *n* Bom. דִּיקְפְרוּ. *o* Bom. נִאֲמְרוּ. *p* Bom. שְׁבַע
 (and not as *B*. שְׁבַע). This is likewise the Bib. Aram. form.
 Cf. Daniel 4, 13. *q* Bom. שְׁמָה. *r* Bom. מַרְגָּן. *s* Bom.
 וְרַבְקָה (and not as *B*. וְרַבְקָה). *t* *A* Bom. לְמֵימַר. So also *B*
 לְמֵימַר (which is better than *D*). *u* Bom. נָסִיב. *x* Bom.
 דִּיקְלֵאבְרָנָא. *y* Bom. וְדִיקְלֵאבְרָנָא. *z* Bom. לִיתִינוּךְ, *C* (text)
 לִיתִינוּךְ. On the margin לִיתִינוּךְ. *aa* Bom. מִקְדָּמוֹהִי, *C*
 מִקְדָּמוֹהִי (which is better than *D*).

- (3) וְאָמַר^a הִי לִיעֲקֹב תוֹב לְאָרְע^b אַבְהֵהֶדָּד^c וְלִזְלִירוֹתָד^d
וַיְהִי^e מִיַּמְרֵי בִסְעֵהָד
- (4) וְשִׁלַּח יַעֲקֹב וְקָרָא לְרַחֵל וְלִזְלֵאָה לַחֲקֵלָא^f לָרֹת עֲנִיָּה^g
- (5) וְאָמַר^a לַהֲוֹן^h הַזֵּיⁱ אֲנִי יֵת סֹבֵר אַפִּי אַבּוּכֹן^k אֲרִי^l
לִיחִינֹן^m עֲמִי כַמֵּאתִמְלִי לִמְקַדְמֵהִי וְאַלְהִיָּה דְאֲבָא דְהָא
בִּסְעָרִי
- (6) דְאֲתֹןⁿ יִדְעֵתִין^o אֲרִי בְכָל הַיְלִי פְלֵחִית^p יֵת אַבּוּכֹן^q
- (7) דְאַבּוּכֹן^r שְׁקָר^s בִּי דְאֲשִׁי^t יֵת אֲגִרִי עֵסֵר^u זִמְנִין דְלֵא
שְׁבָקִיה הִי לְאֲבֵאֲשָׁא עֲמִי
- (8) אִם כְּדִין הָוֵה אֲמַר^x נְמוּרִין הָוֵי אֲגֵרְךָ וַיְלִידֵךָ^y כֹּל
עֲנָא נְמוּרִין דְאִם כְּדִין הָוֵה אֲמַר רְגוּלִין הָוֵי אֲגֵרְךָ וַיְלִידֵךָ כֹּל
עֲנָא רְגוּלִין
- (9) דְאֲפִרִישׁ^z הִי מִן^{aa} בְּעִירָא דְאַבּוּכֹן^{bb} וַיִּחַב לִי
- (10) דְהָוֵה בְּעֵדִין דְאֵתְוֹחֵמָא^{cc} עֲנָא וְזִקְפִית עֲנִי וְחִזִּית^{dd}
בְּחֵלְמָא^{ee} דְהָא תִישְׂרָא^{ff} דְסֵלְקִין^{gg} עַל עֲנָא רְגוּלִין נְמוּרִין
וְשִׁזְחִין^{hh}
- (11) דְאֲמַרⁱⁱ לִי מִלְאֲבָא דְהִי בְּחֵלְמָא^{kk} יַעֲקֹב דְאֲמַר^{ll} הֵאֲבָא
- (12) דְאֲמַרⁱⁱ דְקוֹף כֵּן עֵינְךָ^{mm} דְחִזִּיⁿⁿ כֹּל תִישְׂרָא^{oo} דְסֵלְקִין

a Bom. וְאָמַר. *b* Bom. לְאָרְעָא. *c* Bom. אַבְהֵהֶדָּד. *d* Bom. וְלִזְלִירוֹתָד. *e* Bom. וַיְהִי. *f* Bom. חֲקֵלָא. *g* Bom. עֲנִיָּה. *h* Bom. לַהֲוֹן. *i* Bom. הַזֵּי. *k* Bom. אַבּוּכֹן. *l* Bom. אֲרִי. *m* Bom. לִיחִינֹן, which is the best reading. *n* Bom. דְאֲתֹן. *o* Bom. יִדְעֵתִין. *p* Bom. פְּלֵחִיתָא. *q* Bom. אַבּוּכֹן (B. אַבּוּכִין). *r* Bom. אַבּוּכֹן (B. אַבּוּכִין). *s* Bom. שְׁקָר. *t* Bom. וְאֲשִׁי. *u* Bom. עֵסֵר. *x* Bom. אֲמַר. *y* Bom. וַיְלִידֵךָ (the best reading would be וַיִּלְדֵךָ). *z* Bom. וְאֲפִרִישׁ. *aa* Instead of בְּעִירָא דְהִי, Bom. reads בְּעִירָא דְהִי. *bb* Bom. אַבּוּכֹן. *cc* Bom. בְּחֵלְמָא. *dd* Bom. וְחִזִּיתָא. *ee* Bom. בְּחֵלְמָא. *ff* Bom. תִישְׂרָא. *gg* Bom. דְסֵלְקִין, *B* דְסֵלְקִין. *hh* Bom. וְשִׁזְחִין. *ii* Bom. וְאֲמַר. *kk* Bom. בְּחֵלְמָא. *ll* Bom. הֵאֲבָא. *mm* Bom. אֲמַר and עֵינְךָ. *nn* Bom. וְחִזִּי. *oo* Bom. דְסֵלְקִין.

עַל עֲנֵא רַעְלִין נְמוּרִין וְפַעְיָהִין^a אֲרִי גֵּוִי קַדְמֵי יָת כָּל רַעְלִין^b
עֲבִיד לָךְ

(13) אֵינֵא אֱלֹהֵא^c דֵּאֲהַלְלִינִי^d עַלְךְ בְּבֵית^e אֵל דְּמִשְׁחַתָּא^f
הֲמִן^g קָמֵא דְקִיּוּמָתָא^h קַדְמֵי הֲמִן קָיִים כְּטִן קוּם פּוּקⁱ מִן אַרְעֵא
הֵדְא^k הַרְיֵב לֵאדֵע לְדִדְוּתְךָ^l

(14) וְאֲהֵיבִית^m רְהֵל דֵּעֵלָה וְאֲמַרָאⁿ לִיה הַעִיד^o כְּטִן לֵא
הוּלֵק דֵּאֲהַסְטֵא^p בְּבֵית אַבְרָמָא^q

(15) הֵלֵא נֹכְרֵאִין^r אֶת־הַשְּׁבוּאָא^s לִיה אֲרִי זְבֻנָא וְאֵגֵל^t אִפ
מִיכַל יָת כְּסִפָא

(16) אֲרִי כָּל עֲתִדָא^u דֵּאֲפִרִישׁ^x הִי מִן אַבְרָמָא^y דִּילְנָא^z
הוּא הֲרַב־נָא^{aa} וְכִטִּין כָּל דֵּאֲמַר^{bb} הִי לָךְ עֲבִיד

(17) דְקָם יַעֲקֹב וְנִטְל יָת בְּנוֹהֵי יָת נְשׂוּהֵי עַל נְמֵלָא

(18) וְדַבֵּר יָת כָּל גִּיתְוָהִי^{cc} יָת כָּל קַנְיֵיה דקנא גִּיתְוָהִי
דקננייה דקנא בְּפִדִין אֲרִים^{dd} לְמִיתֵי לֹאת יַצְחַק אַבְרָהִי לֵאֲרַעֵא
לְכַנְטִין

(19) רַעְלִין אֵזֵל לְמַגֵּז^{ee} יָת עֵנִיה^{ff} וְנִסְיַבֵּת^{gg} רְהֵל יָת
בְּלִמְנָא דְלֵאֲבַרָא^{hh}

(20) רַפְסֵיⁱⁱ יַעֲקֹב מִן לְבָן אֲרַמְאָה עַל דֵּלֵא הוּי^{kk} לִיה אֲרִי
אֵזֵל הוּא

a Bom. ופפפפפפ. b Bom. דֵּי לָבָן. c Bom. אֲלֵהָא. d Bom. קַדְמֵי.
e C בֵּיה. f Bom. דֵּי פִפְפִתָּהָא. g B inserts קָמֵא before.
h Bom. דֵּי קַיּוּמָתָא. i Bom. פּוּק. k C reads אֲרֵעֵא instead of הֵדְא.
l Bom. נְדִדְוּתְךָ. m Bom. נְאֲהֵיבִיה. The correct form is וְאֲהֵיבִיה.
n Bom. נְאֲמַרָא. o Bom. הַעִיד. p Bom. נְאֲחַסְטָא. q Bom. אַבְרָמָא.
r Bom. נֹכְרֵאִין, B נֹכְרֵאִין. s Bom. אֶת־הַשְּׁבוּאָא. t Bom. וְאֵגֵל.
u Bom. עֲתִדָא. x B דֵּשׁוּבִי which is preferable.
y B בְּאֲבַרָא. z Bom. אֶת־הַשְּׁבוּאָא. aa Bom. וְכִטִּין. bb Bom. דֵּי־לָבָן.
cc Bom. גִּיתְוָהִי. dd Bom. אֲרִים. ee Bom. לְמַגֵּז. ff Bom. עֵנִיה. gg Bom. וְנִסְיַבֵּת. hh Bom. דֵּי נְאֲבַרָא. ii Bom. רַפְסֵי. kk Bom. הוּי.

(21) וְאֵזֶל^a הוּא וְכָל דְיָעִיה^b רָקַם וְעִבְרָ^c ית פֶּרֶת^d וְשׂוּי
יֵת אֶפְוֵהִי לְטוֹרָא^e דְגַלְעָד

(22) וְאַתְחִתְהָה^f לְלִבְךָ בְיוֹמָא תְלִיתָאָה אַרְוִי אֵזֶל וְעִקְבִּי

(23) וְדַבְרָ יֵת אַחֲוֵהִי עִמִּיה וְרִדְף בְּתַרְוֵהִי מְהֵלָךְ שְׂבַע^g
יּוֹמִין וְאֲדַבְּיִק^h יֵהִיה בְּטוֹרָא דְגַלְעָד

(24) וְאַתָּא מִימְרֵ מִן קֶ(דָם) יְהִי לִוְת לִבְךָ אַרְמָאָה בְּחַלְמָאⁱ
דְלִילֵוִיָא וְאַמְרָ לֵוִיה אִסְתְּמֵר^k לָךְ דְלִמָּא תְמַלִּיל עִבְ וְעִקְבִּי מִטְב
עָד בִּישׁ

(25) וְאֲדַבְּיִק^l לִבְךָ יֵת וְעִקְבִּי וְיֵעִקְבִּי פֶרְסֵ יֵת מִשְׁכַּנֵּיה
בְּטוֹרָא וְלִבְךָ אֶשְׁוִי^m יֵת אַחֲוֵהִי בְּטוֹרָא דְגַלְעָד

(26) וְאַמְרָⁿ לִבְךָ לֵיִעִקְבִּי מָא^o עֵבְדְהָא^p וְכִסְיָהָא^q מִזִּי
דְדַבְּרַת^r יֵת בְּנִתֵי^s כְּשַׁבְיַת^t הָרַב^u

(27) לִמָּא טְמַרְתָּא^x לְמִיזֵל וְכִסְיָתָא^y מִזִּי דְלֵא הָוִית^z לִי
וְשַׁלְחַתְךָ^{aa} פּוֹן^{bb} בְּהַדְרָא^{cc} וְבַתְשַׁבְּהֵן^{dd} בְּתוֹפְזִין וְבַנְזִרִין^{ee}

(28) וְלֵא שְׂבַקְתְּוִי^{ff} לְנִשְׁקָא לְבַוִּי וְלְבַנְתֵּי כֶעָן אִסְכִּילְתָּא^{gg}
לְמַעַבְדִּי^{hh}

(29) אִוִּיה הִילָא בְרִדְוִי לְמַעַבְדִּיⁱⁱ עִמְכוֹן בִּישָׁא^{kk} וְאַלְהָא^{ll}

a Bom. וְאֵזֶל. *b* Bom. דְיֵה יֵה. *c* Bom. וְעִבְרָ. *d* *B* וְפֶרֶת which is better. *e* Bom. בְּטוֹרָא, *C* בְּטוֹרָא. *f* אֶתְחִתְהָה would be a better reading. *g* *B*. שְׂבַע. *h* Bom. וְאֲדַבְּיִק. *i* Bom. אֶתְחִתְהָה. *k* The correct text should be אִסְתְּמֵר. *l* Bom. אֶתְחִתְהָה. *m* Bom. אַחֲוֵהִי. *n* Bom. וְאַמְרָ. *o Bom. יֵה. *p* Bom. אֶתְחִתְהָה. *q* Bom. וְכִסְיָהָה. *r* Bom. יֵתְחִתְהָה, *A* יֵתְחִתְהָה, *B* יֵתְחִתְהָה. *s* Bom. בְּנִתֵי (B. בְּנִתֵי), *B* בְּנִתֵי. *t* Bom. בְּשַׁבְיַת, *A* בְּשַׁבְיַת. The best reading would be בְּשַׁבְיַת. *u* Bom. חָרַב. *x* Bom. אֶתְחִתְהָה, *A* אֶתְחִתְהָה. *y* Bom. וְכִסְיָתָה. *z* *A*, *B* הָוִית. The best reading would perhaps be הָוִית. *aa* Bom. וְשַׁלְחַתְךָ, *A*, *B* וְשַׁלְחַתְךָ. *bb* Bom. adds פּוֹן before בְּהַדְרָא. *C* has the same word here whilst *B* and *D* insert it on the margin. Vide Barth in ZDMG. XXX, p. 190. *cc* Bom. בְּהַדְרָא. *dd* Bom. וְבַתְשַׁבְּהֵן. *ee* Bom. וְבַתְשַׁבְּהֵן, *A* וְבַתְשַׁבְּהֵן. *ff* Bom. שְׂבַקְתְּוִי. *gg* Bom. אִסְכִּילְתָּא. *hh* Bom. לְמַעַבְדִּי. *ii* Bom. לְמַעַבְדִּי. *kk* Bom. בִּישָׁא. *ll* Bom. וְאַלְהָא (B. וְאַלְהָא), *A*, *B*, *C* וְאַלְהָא.*

וְאֵבְרִיךְ בְּרִמְשָׁא אֲמַר לִי^a לְמִימַר אִסְחָר לְךָ מִלְמַלְאָה^b עַם
יְעַקֵּב מֵעַב עַד נוֹשׁ

(30) וְכָעַן מִיּוֹל אֲזַלְתָּה^c אֲרִי הַמְדָּא הַמִּידְחָא^d לְבֵית אַבְרָךְ
לְמָא נְעִיבְתָהּ יְת דְחֵלְתִי^e

(31) וְאֲתִיב יְעַקֵּב וְאֲמַר^f לְלִבְנֵי אֲרִי דְחֵלְתִי^h אֲרִי אֲמַרְתִּיⁱ
דְלִמָּא תִינֹס^k יְת בְּיַד מִי^l

(32) אֲתֵר דְאֲשַׁבְחִי^l יְת דְחֵלְתִי^m לֹא וְתִקְרִיםⁿ קְדָם אֲהֵלָא
אֲשַׁתְּמַדְעֵךְ לְךָ מָא^o דְעִמְוִי וְעַב לְךָ וְלֹא רָע^p יְעַקֵּב אֲרִי רַחֵל
נְעִיבְתִינוּן^q

(33) וְעַל לִבְנֵי בְּמִשְׁנָא דְיְעַקֵּב וּבְמִשְׁנָא דְלֵאָה וּבְמִשְׁנָא
דְהֶרְתִּין לְחֵינְתָהּ וְלֹא אֲשַׁבְחֵהּ וְנִפְק מִמִּשְׁנָא דְלֵאָה וְעַל בְּמִשְׁנָא
דְרַחֵל

(34) וְרַחֵל נְעִיבְתִי^r יְת עֲלִמְלִיָּא וְשׂוֹיֵאֲתִינוּן^s בְּעִבְרִיָּא דְנִמְלָא
וְיִתִּיבְתִי עֲלֵיהֶון וְמִשִּׁישׁ^u לִבְנֵי יְת כֹּל מִשְׁנָא וְלֹא אֲשַׁבְחֵהּ

(35) וְאֲמַרְתִּי^x לְאַבְרָהָא^y לֹא וְתִקְרֵי^z בְּעִינֵי רַבּוּנֵי אֲרִי לֹא
אִיכּוּל^{aa} לְמִקְדָּם^{bb} מִן קְדָמְךָ אֲרִי אֲוִרָה נְשִׁין לִי וְבִלְשׁ וְלֹא
אֲשַׁבְחֵהּ יְת עֲלִמְלִיָּא

(36) וְתִקְרֵי^{cc} לְיְעַקֵּב וְנִמָּא בְּלִבְנֵי דְאֲתִיב^{dd} יְעַקֵּב וְאֲמַר^{ee}
לְלִבְנֵי מָא^{ff} הִזְבִּי מָא סְרַחְתִּי^{gg} אֲרִי רַדְשָׁתָא בְתֵרִי^{hh}

a *B* has בְּרִמְשָׁא לִי אֲמַר in the text, but margin as above.
b *C* Text דְלִמָּא הַלְלִיל. Margin as above. *c* Bom. אֲזַלְתָּה.
d Bom. תְּסַדְחָהּ. *e* Bom. תְּחֵלְתִי. *f* Bom. נְאָדָם. *g* Bom. נְאָדָם.
h Bom. תְּחֵלְתִי. *i* Bom. אֲמַרְתִּי. *k* Bom. תִּנֹּס. *l* Bom. דִּי
תִּנֹּס. *m* Bom. תְּחֵלְתִי. *n* Bom. תְּחֵלְתִי. *o* Bom. יְת.
p Bom. וְרַע (B. רַע). *q* Bom. נְעִיבְתִינוּן. *r* Bom. נְעִיבְתִי.
s Bom. נְשׂוֹיֵאֲתִינוּן, *B* נְשׂוֹיֵאֲתִינוּן. *t* Bom. נְיִתִּיבְתִי. *u* *B* מִשִּׁישׁ.
x Bom. נְאָדָרְתִּי. *y* Bom. נְאָדָרְתָּהּ. *z* Bom. תְּחֵלְתִי. *aa* Bom.
אִיכּוּל, *B* אִיכּוּל. *bb* Bom. לְמִקְדָּם. *cc* Bom. אַתְּ אַתְּ אַתְּ
וְתִקְרֵי. *dd* Bom. נְאָדָם. *ee* Bom. נְאָדָרְתִּי. *ff* Bom. יְת.
gg Bom. סְרַחְתִּי (B. סְרַחְתִּי). *hh* *C* בְּתֵרִי.

- (37) אָרִי מְשִׁישָׁא^a יֵת כְּלָב^b מֵיָמָּא^c אֲשַׁכְּחֵתָא מִלְּלָ מֵיָ
 בֵּיתָךְ שׁוּר^d הַכֹּא^e קַ (דָּם) אֵהִי וְאֵהָךְ^f יוּזְכֵּהוּן בֵּין הָרֹאֲאִ
 (38) הֵן עֶסְרִין שִׁין אֵאָא עֵמֶךְ רְחֵלְךְ^g וְעוֹךְ לֹא אֲתַנְלִי^l
 וְדַכְרִי עֵךְ לֹא אֲכַלִּית^h
 (39) רַחֲבִירָאⁱ לֹא אִיתִיחִי^k לְךְ דְּהֵרַת שְׁנֵיא^l מִמִּנְיָא^m מֵיָ
 אִתְּ בְּעֵי לֵה נְטוּרִיתⁿ בּוּמָמָא וְנְטוּרִית בְּלִילִיא
 (40) הֵיחִתִּי בּוּמָמָא אֲכַלְוִי^o שְׂרָבָא^p וְגַלְדָּא נְחִית^q עֵלִי^r
 בְּלִילִיא רְנִדְתִּי^s שְׁתִּיתִי^t מֵעֵינִי
 (41) הֵן לִי עֶסְרִין^u שִׁין בְּבֵיתָךְ פְּלַתְהָךְ^x אַרְבַּע עֶסְרִי
 שִׁין בְּתַרְתֵּין בְּתָךְ רֵשִׁית^y שִׁין בְּעֵךְ רֵאשִׁיתָא^z יֵת אֲנִי
 עֶסֶר זְמִין
 (42) אִילּוּכָא פּוֹן^{aa} אֲלֵהִיה^{bb} דְּאָבָא אֲלֵהִיה דְּאָבִיחָה
 וְדִדְחִיל^{cc} לִיה יִצְחָק הֵרַה בְּסַעְדֵי^{dd} אֵרִי כְעֵן רִיקָם^{ee} שְׁלַתְתִּי^{ff}
 יֵת עֲמַלִי יֵת לִיאוֹת^{gg} דֵּרִי גֵלִי קַ (דָּם) הִי אֲזוּכָה בְרֵמְשָׁא
 (43) וְאֵתִיב^{hh} לְבֵן רְאֲמִרⁱⁱ לִרְעֻבָב בְּתָא בְּתִי^{kk} וּבִיאָ בֵּי^{ll}

a Bom. מְשִׁישָׁא. *b* Bom. קָל (B. כל). *c* Bom. יָמָּא. *d* Bom. שׁוּר which is preferable here. *e* B. כֹּא. *f* Bom. וְאֵהָךְ. *g* Bom. רְחֵלְךְ. *h* Bom. אֲכַלִּית. *i* Bom. רַחֲבִירָא, B. רַחֲבִיר. *k* Bom. אִיתִיחִי. The best punctuation would be אִיתִיחִי. *l* The correct punctuation is שְׁנֵיא. *m* Bom. מִמִּנְיָא (B. מֵן מִנְיָא), A. מִן מִנְיָא, B. מִן מִנְיָא. *n* Bom. נְטוּרִית. *o Bom. אֲכַלְוִי. *p* Bom. שְׂרָבָא (but שְׂרָבָא better). *q Bom. נְחִית (B. נְחִית). A, B, C. נְחִית. *r Bom. עֵלִי. *s Bom. וְנְטוּרִית. *t Bom. שְׁתִּיתִי. *u* Bom. עֶסְרִין (B. עֶסְרִין). *x* Bom. פְּלַתְהָךְ. *y Bom. רֵשִׁית. *z* Bom. רֵאשִׁיתָא. *aa* Bom. אִילּוּכָא. *bb* Bom. אֲלֵהִיה. *cc* Bom. וְדִדְחִיל. *dd Bom. בְּסַעְדֵי. *ee A. רִיקָם, C. רִיקָם. *ff* Bom. שְׁלַתְתִּי, C. שְׁלַתְתִּי which is better. *gg* Bom. לִיאוֹת (B. לִיאוֹת). *hh* Bom. וְאֵתִיב but וְאֵתִיב would be a better punctuation than that given by the Mss. *ii* Bom. רְאֲמִר. *kk* Bom. בְּתִי (B. בְּתִי). *ll* Bom. וּבִיאָ.********

דַּעֲמָא^a עֵינֵי^b רַבֵּל דַּאֲת הַזֵּי^c דִּינֵי^d הוּא וְלִבְנֵיהִי^e מֵא^f אַעֲבִיד
לְאַלְתֵּיךָ יוֹמָא דִּין אִךְ לִבְנֵיהוֹן^g דִּינִירָא

(44) וּבִנְךָ אִירָא^h נִגְדָר קָרִיםⁱ אִנָּא דַּאֲת וְיִהִי^k לְסִהִיד
בִּינָא וְבִינְךָ

(45) וְנִסִּיב^l יַעֲקֹב אֲבִינָא דְרִקְסָה^m קָמָא

(46) דְאֵמֵרⁿ יַעֲקֹב לְאַחֵיהִי לְקוּטוּ אֲבוּנִי^o וְנִסִּיבוּ אֲבוּנִי

דְעִבְדוּ^p דְגוּרָא^q וְאַלְלוּ^r תָּמָן עַל דְגוּרָא^s
(47) וְקָרָא לֵיהּ לִבְנֵי הַזֵּי שְׁהִדוּתָא דְיַעֲקֹב קָרָא לֵיהּ
נִגְדָר

(48) דְאֵמֵר^t לִבְנֵי דְגוּרָא הַדִּין סִהִיד בִּינָא^u וְבִינְךָ יוֹמָא

דִּין עַל כֵּין קָרָא שְׁמִינָה גִלְגָּד^x

(49) רִסְבוּתָא^y דְאֵמֵר^z יוֹסֵךְ^{aa} מִימְרָא דְהִי בִינָא וְבִינְךָ אֲרִי

נִסְכְּוִי^{bb} עֵבֶר מִהֶבְרִינָה

(50) אִם הַעֲלִי^{cc} ית בְּנֵיהִי^{dd} רָאם תִּסֵּב תִּשְׁקִי עַל בְּנֵיהִי

כִּיִּת אֲנִישׁ^{ee} עֲמִינָא הַזֵּי מִימְרָא דְהִי סִהִיד בִּינָא וְבִינְךָ

(51) דְאֵמֵר^{ff} לִבְנֵי יַעֲקֹב הָא דְגוּרָא הַדִּין דְהָא קָמָתָא^{gg}

דְאֵקִימִית^{gg} בִּינָא וְבִינְךָ

(52) סִהִיד דְגוּרָא הַדִּין רִסְבוּתָא קָמָתָא^{hh} אִם אִנָּא לֹא אַעֲבִיר^{hh}

a Bom. נַעֲמָא. *b* Bom. עֵינֵי, *A* עֵינֵי, *C* עֵינֵי. *c* Bom. הַזֵּי, *A* הַזֵּי, *B* הַזֵּי. *d* Bom. דִּינֵי, *B* לֵי. *e* Bom. וְלִבְנֵיהִי. *f* Bom. מֵא. *g* Bom. לְבְנֵיהוֹן (B. לְבְנֵיהוֹן). *h* Bom. אִירָא is a better vocalization. *i* Bom. קָרִים. *k* Bom. וְיִהִי. *l* Bom. וְנִסִּיב. *m* Bom. וְרִקְסָה. *n* Bom. דְאֵמֵר. *o* Bom. אֲבוּנִי. *p* Bom. דְעִבְדוּ. *q* Bom. דְגוּרָא. *r* Bom. וְאַלְלוּ. *s* Bom. מִימְרָא, *B* has לֵיהּ before בִּינְךָ. *t* Bom. דְאֵמֵר. *u* Bom. בִּינָא. *x* Bom. גִּלְגָּד, *A* גִּלְגָּד. *y* Bom. רִסְבוּתָא. *z* Bom. דְאֵמֵר. *aa* Bom. רִסְבָּה (B. רִסְבָּה which is perhaps the best vocalization), *C* רִסְבָּה, *B* רִסְבָּה. *bb* Bom. מִהֶבְרִינָה. The best punctuation is בִּינָא וְבִינְךָ. *cc* Bom. אִם. *dd* Bom. בְּנֵיהִי (B. בְּנֵיהִי). *ee* Bom. אֲנִישׁ. *ff* Bom. קָמָתָא. *gg* Bom. דְאֵקִימִית. The vocalization should be דְאֵקִימִית. *hh* Bom. אַעֲבִיר, *C* אַעֲבִיר.

- לֹא־הָיָה יָתֵד דְּגִוְרָא^a הָדִין יָאֵם אֵת לֹא תַעֲבֵר^b לֹא־הָיָה יָתֵד דְּגִוְרָא^a
הָדִין יָיִת קָמְתָא^c הָדָא לְבִישׁוּ
(53) אֵלֶיהָ^d דְּאֲבֵרָהִם וְאֵלֶיהָ^e דְּנִחֹר^f דְּדִי־וֹן^g בְּיָנָא^h
אֵלֶהָⁱ דְּאֲבוּהֹן^k וְקָיִים יַעֲקֹב בְּדִדְהִיל^l לִיָּה אֲבוּהִי^m וְצִהָק
(54) וְנָכְסⁿ יַעֲקֹב נִכְסֵהָ בְּטוּרָא וְקָרָא לְאֲחוּהִי^o לְמִיכַל
לְחֵמָא וְאֲכָלוּ^p לְחֵמָא וְבָתוּ בְּטוּרָא
(55) דְּאֶקְדִּים לְבִן בְּצַפְרָא דְנִשְׁיָק^q לְבִנּוּהִי וְלִבְנֵיהָ וְבִרְדִּי^r
דְּהֵהוּן^s וְאֲזַל^t דְּתַב^u לְבִן לְאֲתֵרִיה

CHAPTER XLI.

- (1) וְהָיָה מִסּוּף תְּרֵתִין שְׁנִין וְפָרְעָה הִלָּם^x וְהָא קָאִים^y
עַל נְהָרָא
(2) וְהָא מִן נְהָרָא סִלְקִין^z שְׁבַע^{aa} תּוֹרִין^{bb} שְׁפִירִין לְמַחְזִי^{cc}
וְפִטְיָמִן בְּסַר דְרַעֲיָן בְּאֵהוּא^{dd}
(3) וְהָא שְׁבַע תּוֹרִין אֵהֲרִנִין סְלִיקָא^{ff} בְּתֵירוּהֹן^{gg} מִן נְהָרָא
בִישָׁן לְמַחְזִי וְהִסִּירִין^{hh} בְּסַר וְקָמָאⁱⁱ לְקַבְלֵהוּן דְּתוּרְתָא עַל
פְּיָה נְהָרָא

a Bom. דְּגִוְרָא. *b* *C* תַעֲבֵר. *c* Bom. קָמְתָא. *d* Bom. אֵלֶיהָ.
e Bom. וְאֵלֶיהָ, *C* וְאֵלֶיהָ. *f* Bom. דְּנִחֹר (B. נִחֹר), *A* דְּנִצְחָק.
g Bom. דְּדִי־וֹן. *h* *A* בְּיָנָא. *i* Bom. אֵלֶיהָ. *k* Bom. דְּאֲבוּהֹן.
l Bom. בְּדִדְהִיל. *m* Bom. אֲבוּהִי. *n* Bom. וְנָכְסִים, *B* וְנָכְסִים.
o Bom. לְאֲחוּהִי. *p* Bom. וְאֲכָלוּ. *q* Bom. וְנִשְׁיָק. *r* Bom. וְבִרְדִּי.
s Bom. דְּהֵהוּן. *t* Bom. וְאֲזַל. *u* Bom. דְּתַב. *x* Bom. הִלָּם,
B, *C* הִלָּם. *y* Bom. קָאִים. *z* Bom. סִלְקִין. *aa* Bom. שְׁבַע.
bb Bom. תּוֹרִין. *cc* Bom. לְמַחְזִי. *dd* Bom. בְּאֵהוּא. *ee* Bom.
אֵלֶיהָ, *C* אֵלֶיהָ, *B* אֵלֶיהָ, *A* אֵלֶיהָ. The punctuation should
be אֵלֶיהָ. *ff* Bom. סִלְקִין which is correct. *gg* Bom. בְּתֵירוּהֹן
(B. בְּתֵירוּהֹן). *hh* Bom. וְהִסִּירִין (B. וְהִסִּירִין). *ii* It should
be וְקָמָא.

(4) וְאֵלֶּנָּא^a תּוֹרְתָא דְבוּשָׁן^b לְמַחְזִי וְהַסִּירָן בְּסַר יָת שְׂבַע

תּוֹרְתָא דְשִׁפְרִין לְמַחְזִי וְפְטוּמְתָא^c רְאֵתֵר^d פְּרַעָה

(5) וְדַמּוּד וְחַלְסִים^e תְּנוּנוֹת וְהָא שְׂבַע שְׂבִלִין^f סְלֶקָן^g בְּקִנְיָא^h

חַדⁱ פְּטוּמָן^k וְטַבָּן

(6) וְהָא שְׂבַע שְׂבִלִין לֶקֶן וְשִׁקְפָן^l קְדוּם צְמָחָן^m

בְּהַרְיָחָןⁿ

(7) וְכַלְנֵא שְׂבִלְיָא לְקִיחָא יָת שְׂבַע שְׂבִלְיָא פְטוּמְתָא

וְמַלְלָהָא רְאֵתֵר^o פְּרַעָה וְהָא הִלְמָא^p

(8) וְהָיָה בְּצַפְרָא וְמִטְרָפָא^q רִוְחִיהָ וְשִׁלְחָ וְקָרָא יָת כָּל

הַרְשִׁי^r מִצְרִים וְיָת כָּל הַסִּימָהָא^s רְאֵתֵנִי פְּרַעָה לַהּוֹן יָת

הִלְמִיָּה^u וְלִיִּת דְפִשְׁרָא^x יַתְהוֹן לְפְרַעָה

(9) וְמַלְלִיל^y רַב שִׁקִּי עִם פְּרַעָה לְמִימְרָא יָת סְרַחְנִי^z אֵינָא

מִדְכָר יוּמָא דִּין

(10) פְּרַעָה רְגִזָּא^{aa} עַל עֵבְדֵיהּ וְיִהֵב וְיָתוּ בְּמִסְרַת^{bb} בְּרַת

רַב קְטוּלְיָא יָתוּ רַב נַחְתוּמִי^{cc}

(11) וְהִלְמָנָא^{dd} הִלְמָא^p בְּלִילְיָא הַד אֵינָא וְהוּא גַבְרָא כַּלְשָׁרָן

הִלְמִיָּה^p הִלְמָנָא

(12) וְהִתְמָן^{ee} עִמְנָא עוּלִים עֵבְדִי^{ff} עֵבְדָא לְרַב קְטוּלְיָא

וְאֵשְׁהֵינָא^{gg} לִיָּה וְפִשְׁרָא לָנָא יָת הִלְמָנָא^{hh} גַבְרָא כַּלְמִיָּה^p פִּשְׁרָא

a Bom. וְאַקְלָא. *b* Bom. דְּבוּשָׁן (B. דְּבוּשָׁן). *c* Bom. וְשִׁקְפָא. *d* A וְאֵתֵר. *e* Bom. וְחַלְסִים. *f* Bom. שְׂבִלְיָא. *g* Bom. סְלֶקָן. *h* Bom. בְּקִנְיָא. *i* Bom. חַד. *k* A בְּלֶקֶן. *l* Bom. בְּהַרְיָחָן (B. וְשִׁקְפָן). *m* Bom. צְמָחָן (B. וְשִׁקְפָן). *n* B. בְּהַרְיָחָן. *o* C רְאֵתֵר. *p* Bom. הִלְמָא and usually S. C אֵינָא and always H. *q* הִלְמָנָא would be a better vocalization. *r* Bom. הַרְשִׁי. *s* הִלְמָנָא is the correct punctuation. *t* Bom וְאֵשְׁהֵינָא. *u* C הִלְמִיָּה. *x* Bom. דְּפִשְׁרָא, A דְּפִשְׁרָא. *y* Bom. וְמַלְלִיל. *z* Bom. סִרְחָנִי (B. סִרְחָנִי). *aa* Bom. רְגִזָּא. *bb* Bom. בְּמִסְרַת. *cc* Bom. נַחְתוּמִי (B. נַחְתוּמִי). *dd* Bom. וְהִלְמָנָא. *ee* Bom. וְהִתְמָן (B. וְהִתְמָן). *ff* Bom. עֵבְדִי, A עֵבְדָא. *gg* Bom. וְאֵשְׁהֵינָא. *hh* Bom. וְהִלְמָנָא but is very inconsistent; thus in verse 11 and in verse 12 and in verse 12.

- (13) וְהָיָה כִּמְאֵ דַפְשָׁר^a לֵאמֹר כִּינֹן הָיָה יְהִי אֲהִיב^b עַל שְׁמוֹשֵׁי יְרֵתֶיהָ צֶלֶב
- (14) וּשְׁלַח פְּרֻעָה וְקִרְא יְת יוֹסֵף דְּאַרְהֵתוּהוּ^c מִן בַּיִת אֲסוּרֵי רֹסֵר דְּשֵׁנִי כְּסוּתֵיהָ רַעַל לֹאֵת פְּרֻעָה
- (15) וְאִמֵּר פְּרֻעָה לִיוֹסֵף הִלְמָא הִלְמִית^d וְפִשָׁר^e לִית לִיה וְאֵלֵא שְׁמַעִית עַלְךְ לְמִימֵר דְּאֵת שְׁמַע הִלְמָא וּמְפִשָׁר^f לִיה^g
- (16) וְאֲהִיב^h יוֹסֵף יְת פְּרֻעָה לְמִימֵרⁱ לֵאמֹר מִן הַכְּמִתִּי אֲלֵהִינָן^k מִן קַ(ד)ם) וְהִי יְהִיב^l שְׁלֵמָא^m דְּפְרֻעָה
- (17) וְמַלִּילⁿ פְּרֻעָה עִם יוֹסֵף בְּחִלְמֵי הָאֵלֵא קְאִים עַל כִּיף^o נְהָרָא
- (18) וְהָא מִן נְהָרָא סְלִקָן שְׁבַע תוֹרָן פְּטִימָן בְּסַר דְּשְׁפִירָן לְמַחְזֵי דְרַעֲקָן בְּאֵהוּרָא
- (19) וְהָא שְׁבַע תוֹרָן אֲהֵרְנִין^q סְלוּקָא^r בְּתַרְיֵהוּן הִסִּיכָן וְבִישָׁן לְמַחְזֵי לְחָדָא וְהִסִּיכָן בְּסַר לֵאמֹר הִזִּיתִי דְכּוֹתֵהוּן בְּכָל אַרְעָא דְמַצְרַיִם לְבִישׁוּ
- (20) וְאֵלֵא תוֹרָתָא הִסִּיכְתָּא וְבִישְׁתָּא יְת שְׁבַע תוֹרָתָא קְדַמֵּיתָא^s פְּטִימָתָא^t
- (21) דְּעֵלֵא^u לְמַעֲהוּן^v וְלֵא אַתִּידַע אֲדִי עֵלֵא לְמַעֲהוּן^w וְמַחְזֵיהוּן^x בִּיש כּדבְּקְדַמֵּיתָא^y וְאַתְעֲרוּת

a Bom. דַּפְשָׁר. *b* Bom. אֲהִיב. The best vocalization would be אֲהִיב. *c* Bom. וְאַרְהֵתוּהוּ. *d* Bom. הִלְמִית. *e* Bom. וּפִשָׁר (B. וּפִשָׁר). *f* Bom. וּמְפִשָׁר, *B* וּמְפִשָׁר. *g* B. קְהִי. *h* Bom. וְאֲהִיב. We should expect וְאֲהִיב. *i* Bom. לְמִימֵר. *k* Bom. אֲלֵהִינָן. The best vocalization would be אֲלֵהִינָן. *l* Bom. וְהִיב. *m* Bom. שְׁלֵמָא. *n* Bom. וְמַלִּיל. *o* For an explanation of this word cf. "Aruḥ. of Natan b. Jehiel". s. v. כִּיף. *q* For the correct vocalization of these two words v. verse 3. *A* אֲהֵרְנִין, *B* אֲהֵרְנִין, *C* אֲהֵרְנִין. *r* Bom. קְדַמֵּיתָא. *s* Bom. פְּטִימָתָא. *t* Bom. וְקְדַמֵּיתָא. *u* Bom. לְמַעֲהוּן (B. לְמַעֲהוּן). *x* Bom. וְמַחְזֵיהוּן (B. וְמַחְזֵיהוּן). *y* Bom. כּדבְּקְדַמֵּיתָא.

(22) הַיּוֹם^a בְּהַלְמֵי וְהָא שֶׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי^b שְׁלֹשָׁן^c בְּקִיָּא^d הָרִי^e
בְּלִיָּן^f רִבְבֵי^g

(23) וְהָא שֶׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי זֵינָן^h לְקִיָּאⁱ שְׁקִיָּן^j קְדוּם זְמַן^k
בְּתִיבְהוֹן^l

(24) וּבְלֵאָה שְׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי לְקִיָּא יָת שֶׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי זְמַן^m
לְאֲמֵרִיתⁿ לְהַשְׁמָא^o וְלִית זְמַן לִי

(25) וְאֲמַר^p וְזִסְף לְפָרְעָה הַלְמָא דְפָרְעָה הָרִי הוּא יָת דְּלִי
עֵרִיד^q לְמַעְבַּד^r הָרִי לְפָרְעָה

(26) שֶׁבַע הוֹרְהָא טְבִיחָא שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי אֲזִין^s וְשֶׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי
טְבִיחָא שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי אֲזִין^t הַלְמָא הָרִי הוּא

(27) וְשֶׁבַע תּוֹרְהָא הַסִּיחָא וּבִישְׁתָּא וְסִלְקָא^u בְּתִיבְהוֹן
שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי אֲזִין וְשֶׁבַע שְׁבֻעֵי לְקִיָּא דְשְׁקִיָּן קְדוּם וְהָרִין^v
שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי טְבִיחָא

(28) הוּא פְתַנְמָא דְמַנְיֹתָ^w עַם פָּרְעָה^x דְּלִי עֵרִיד^y לְמַעְבַּד^z
אֲהוּ^{aa} יָת פָּרְעָה^{bb}

(29) הָא שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי אֲזִין טְבִיחָא רְבָא בְּנַל אֲרַעָא
דְּמַעְרִים

(30) וּקְוֹמִין^{cc} שֶׁבַע שְׁלֵי טְבִיחָא בְּתִיבְהוֹן יוֹתְנָשִׁי כָּל
טְבִיחָא^{dd} בְּאֲרַעָא דְמַעְרִים וְיִשְׁתַּיְי טְבִיחָא יָת זְמַן דְאֲרַעָא^{ee}

(31) וְלֵא וְהוֹדַע טְבִיחָא^{ff} בְּאֲרַעָא מִן קְדוּם טְבִיחָא הַהוּא
דְּיָהוּ בְּתַר כֵּן אֲרִי הַקִּיָּא^{gg} הוּא לְהוֹרָא

a Bom. .תְּהוּמָה. b Bom. .שְׁבֻעֵי. c Bom. .שְׁלֹשָׁן. d Bom. .בְּקִיָּא. e Bom. .הָרִי. f Bom. .בְּלִיָּן. g Bom. .רִבְבֵי. h Bom. .זֵינָן. i Bom. .לְקִיָּא. j Bom. .שְׁקִיָּן. k Bom. .קְדוּם. l Bom. .בְּתִיבְהוֹן. m Bom. .זְמַן. n Bom. .לְאֲמֵרִית. o Bom. .לְהַשְׁמָא. p Bom. .וְאֲמַר. q Bom. .עֵרִיד. r Bom. .לְמַעְבַּד. s Bom. .אֲזִין. t Bom. .אֲזִין. u Bom. .וְסִלְקָא. v Bom. .וְהָרִין. w Bom. .פְתַנְמָא. x Bom. .עַם. y Bom. .דְּלִי. z Bom. .עֵרִיד. aa Bom. .אֲהוּ. bb Bom. .יָת. cc Bom. .וּקְוֹמִין. dd Bom. .טְבִיחָא. ee Bom. .בְּאֲרַעָא. ff Bom. .וְהוֹדַע. gg Bom. .הַקִּיָּא.

- (32) וְעַל דֵּאֲתוּרָא^a הִלְמָא לְפָרְעָה תִּרְתִּין זְמַן אֲרִי תִקְוִן^b
 פִּתְגָמָא מִן קַ(דָם) לִי וּמוֹתִי^c לִי לְמַעַבְדִּיהָ^d
- (33) וְכַעַן יַחֲזִי^e פְּרַעְהָ גְבַר סְבַלְתֵּן^f וְחַנּוּם וּמִינִינִיהָ^g עַל
 אֲרַעָא דְמַצְרַיִם
- (34) יַעֲבִיד^h פְּרַעְהָ וּמִינִי מִהוּמַן עַל אֲרַעָא וּיִזְרֹזֵן יֵת
 אֲרַעָא דְמַצְרַיִם נְשַׁע שִׁי סְבַלְתָּⁱ
- (35) רִיכְנִשׁוּן^k יֵת כֵּל עֲבוּרָא שְׁנָא טְבַתָּא דֵאֲתִין אֲלִין^m
 רִינִינִיןⁿ עֲבוּרָא תַחֲתֵי רֵד^o מִהוּמַי פְּרַעְהָ^p עֲבוּרָא בְקַרְוִיא
 רִינִינִין
- (36) וְהִי^q עֲבוּרָא גִנּוּז^r לְעָמָא דֵאֲרַעָא לְשַׁע שִׁי טְבַתָּא
 דִּיהִרְתֵּן^s בְּאֲרַעָא דְמַצְרַיִם וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּיְעוּ^t עָמָא דֵאֲרַעָא בְּנַפְתָּא
 וְשַׁפֵּר פִּתְגָמָא בְּעֵינֵי פְּרַעְהָ וּבְעֵינֵי כֵל עֲבַדְוֵהוּ
- (37) וְשַׁפֵּר פִּתְגָמָא בְּעֵינֵי פְּרַעְהָ וּבְעֵינֵי כֵל עֲבַדְוֵהוּ
- (38) וְאֲמַר פְּרַעְהָ לְעַבְדֵּיהּ הַשְּׁשֶׁה^u בְּדִין גְבַר דִּירוּהָ^x
 בְּוֹאָה מִן קַ(דָם) לִי בֵיה
- (39) וְאֲמַר פְּרַעְהָ לִיּוֹסֶס בְּתַר דֵּהוּדַע לִי יֵתָךְ יֵת כֵּל דֵּא^y
 לִיֵת סְבַלְתֵּן^z וְהַכִּים כֹּרְתֵךְ
- (40) אֵת תֵּהוּ מַמְלָא^{aa} עַל בֵּיתֵי וְעַל מִירְמֵךְ יֵתָךְ כֵּל
 עֵמִי לַחֹד כְּרַעֵי מְלַכְוֹתָא הַדִּין אֵיהוּ^{bb} יְקוּר מַנְךְ
- (41) וְאֲמַר פְּרַעְהָ לִיּוֹסֶס תִּזוּ^{cc} דְמִנִּיתֵי יֵתָךְ עַל כֵּל
 אֲרַעָא דְמַצְרַיִם
- (42) רֵאֲעוּ^{dd} פְּרַעְהָ יֵת עֲזַקְתִּיהָ^{ee} מֵעַל רֵדִיהָ וּוְהַב יֵתָה^{ff}

a Bom. דֵּאֲתוּרָא, *B* דֵּאֲתוּרָא. It should be דֵּאֲתוּרָא. *b* Bom. לְקַמְעַבְדִּיהָ. *c* Bom. לִי וּמוֹתִי is the correct punctuation. *d* Bom. לְמַעַבְדִּיהָ. *e* Bom. יַחֲזִי. *f* Bom. סְבַלְתֵּן. *g* Bom. וּמִינִינִיהָ. *h* Bom. יַעֲבִיד. *i* Bom. טְבַתָּא. *k* Bom. רִיכְנִשׁוּן. *l* *C* עֲבוּרָא. *m* Bom. אֲלִין. *n* Bom. רִינִינִין. *o* Bom. יֵד. *p* Bom. פְּרַעְהָ. *q* Bom. וְהִי. *r* *A* גִּנּוּז. *s* Bom. דִּירוּהָ, *C* יֵתָךְ. *t* *B* יֵתָךְ. *u* Bom. הַשְּׁשֶׁה, *A* הַשְּׁשֶׁה. *x* Bom. דִּירוּהָ. *y* Bom. דֵּא. *z* Bom. סְבַלְתֵּן (B. רִיכְנִשׁוּן) *B*, *C* סְבַלְתֵּן. *aa* *A* מַמְלָא. *bb* Bom. אֵיהוּ. *cc* Bom. תִּזוּ. *dd* *A* רֵאֲעוּ. *ee* Bom. עֲזַקְתִּיהָ. *A* עֲזַקְתִּיהָ, *B* עֲזַקְתִּיהָ (?). *ff* Bom. יֵתָה.

על ידא דינרסא דאנטיס דתיה דבויק דשוי מניבא^a
דדחמא על גוריה

(43) דארטיב^b דתיה דרתיבא דנתיבא^c דינתיב^d דאנתיב^e

קדמודי דין אבא למלכא ומני^f דתיה על כל ארעא דמצרים
(44) דאמר פרעה ליוסף אבא פרעה דבר^g מממירך לא

ירום^h דבר ית דתיה למיחד דיןⁱ דתה דגליה למרוב על סיסיא^j
בכל ארעא דמצרים

(45) דקרא פרעה שום^k יוסף גברא דמטמך^l גלן^m ליהⁿ
דיהב ליה ית אסנת בת פוטי פרע רבא דאין דאהו^o דנשק יוסף

שלים על^p ארעא דמצרים

(46) דיוסף בר הלחין שנין בר קם ק(רם) פרעה מלכא
דמצרים דנשק יוסף מן ק(רם) פרעה דעבר בכל ארעא דמצרים

(47) דכשלו דיירי^q ארעא בשבע שני סבעא^r עבדא
לאוצרון^s

(48) דכש' ית כל עבדו שבע שניא דהואה בארעא דמצרים
דיהב עבדא בקרוא עבדו דקל קרא^t דבסחרהא^u דהב בננה

(49) דכש' יוסף עבדא דהלא דרמא סני לחדא עד דפסק^v
מלממני^w ארו לית מנין

(50) דליוסף אתדלדו^{aa} דדין בון עד לא עלת^{bb} שהא
דכפנא דינתיב^{cc} ליה אסנת בת פוטי פרע רבא דאין

a Bom. דניבא. b Bom. דארטיב. c Bom. דתניבא. d Bom. דינתיב. e Bom. דינתיב. f Bom. דנתיב. g Bom. דבר. h Bom. דירום. i Bom. דין. j Bom. דסיסיא. k Bom. דשום. l Bom. דמטמך. m Bom. דגלן. n Bom. דליה. o Bom. דאהו. p Bom. דעל. q Bom. דיירי. r Bom. דסבעא. s Bom. דלאוצרון. t Bom. דקרא. u Bom. דבסחרהא. v Bom. דפסק. w Bom. דמלממני. aa Bom. דאתדלדו. bb Bom. דעלת. cc Bom. דלינתיב.

(51) וְקָרָא יוֹסֵף ית שׁוֹם נְכָרָא מִנְשֵׁה אֲרִי אֲנִשְׁיָנִי^a הִי
ית כָּל עַמְלֵי^b וְית כָּל בֵּית אֲלֵכָא

(52) וְית שׁוֹם תַּנְיָנָא^c קָרָא אֲפֵרִים^d אֲרִי אֲפֵשְׁנִי הִי בְּאַרְעֵ^e
שׁעבֹדֵי

(53) וְשִׁלְיָמָא שְׁבַע שָׁנֵי סִבְעָא דְהֵוָה בְּאַרְעָא דְמִצְרַיִם

(54) וְשׁוּרְיָא^f שְׁבַע שָׁנֵי כְּפָנָא לְמִיתֵי כִמָּא דְאִמְרֵ^g יוֹסֵף

דְהֵוָה כְּפָנָא בְּכָל אַרְעָתָא וּבְכָל אַרְעָא דְמִצְרַיִם הֵוָה לְתַמָּא

(55) וְכִפְיָת^h כָּל אַרְעָא דְמִצְרַיִם וְצֹחַⁱ עֵמָא^j קָ(דָם) פְּרַעָה

לְכַחֲמָא^k וְאִמְרֵ פְּרַעָה לְכָל מִצְרָאֵי^l אִזְוִלוּ לֹת יוֹסֵף דִּיִּימֵר^m
לְכוּן תְּעַבְדוּןⁿ

(56) וְכִפְיָא הֵוָה עַל כָּל אֲפֵי אַרְעָא וּפְתַח יוֹסֵף ית כָּל

אוּצְרֵיָא^o דְּבַהוּן^p עִבּוּרָא דְזַבִּין^q לְמִצְרַיִם^r וְתַקִּיף כְּפָנָא בְּאַרְעָא
דְּמִצְרַיִם

(57) וְכָל דִּיִּירֵי^s אַרְעָא אֲתוּ לְמִצְרַיִם לְמִזְבֵּן עִבּוּרָא מִן

יוֹסֵף אֲרִי תַקִּיף^t כְּפָנָא בְּכָל אַרְעָא

a Bom. אֲנִשְׁיָנִי, *B* אֲנִשְׁיָנִי. *b* Bom. עַמְלֵי, *B* עַמְלֵי. *c* *A* הַנְיָנָא.

d *A* אֲפֵרִים. *e* Bom. בְּאַרְעָא. *f* Bom. וְשׁוּרְיָא. *g* Bom. דִּי אִמְרֵ.

h Bom. וְכִפְיָת. *i* Bom. וְצֹחַ. *k* *B*, *C* לְכַחֲמָא. *l* *A* מִצְרַיִם.

m Bom. דִּיִּימֵר. *n* Bom. תְּעַבְדוּן (*B* תַּעֲבְדוּן). *o* Bom. אוּצְרֵיָא.

p Bom. דִּי בַהוּן. *q* Bom. וְזַבִּין. *r* Bom. לְמִצְרַיִם (*B* לְמִצְרָאֵי).

s Bom. דִּיִּירֵי. *t* Bom. תַּקִּיף. *u* Bom. תַּקִּיף.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

An italic number signifies that the line is counted from the bottom of the page upwards.

- Page 3, line 5. Cf. Zunz, l. c. p. 132.
- „ 6, „ ult. Pro he lege the.
- „ 8, „ 7. Cf. Seligsohn. l. c. p. 20.
- „ 13, „ 17. Pro devise lege device.
- „ 13, „ 2. Pro S. lege Š.
- „ 15, „ 3. Cf. Diwan of Jehudah Halleivi; No. 65 in Luzzatto's Edition where יאָפּר (it should be יאָפּר) is rimed with וָפּר.
- „ 15, „ 6. Pro קָרְבֵּי lege קָרְבֵּי.
- „ 16, „ 4. Cf. Friedländer. "A third system of symbols for the Hebrew vowels and accents". (Jewish Quarterly Review VII, 27. p. 567).
- „ 16, „ 2. Pro exemples lege examples.
- „ 19, „ 2. Pro דְּשֵׁלֶטֶן lege דְּשֵׁלֶטֶן.
- „ 21, „ 6. Cf. אָלוּל וְתַרְחֻמָּה (Jeremiah 14, 14) and שְׁרוּתֵיהֶן (Jeremiah 15, 11).
- „ 26, „ 2. Pro בְּסִינְדָא lege בְּסִינְדָא.
- „ 32, „ 7. Cf. Aboth de R. Nathan. Ch. 34.
- „ 37, „ 12. Cf. Raši a. l.
- „ 46, „ 9. מְקַיֵּם lege מְקַיֵּם.
- „ 47, „ 15. אֲשֵׁרִי lege אֲשֵׁרִי.
- „ 47, „ 2. Cf. Barth in ZDMG. XXX, p. 193.
- „ 48, „ 2. Pro מְגַלֵּב lege מְגַלֵּב.
- „ 50, „ 4. Cf. Midraš Genesis Rabba ch. 42. § 7 in Wilna Edition.

- Page 50, line 12. Pro חֲשַׁבְתָּן lege חֲשַׁבְתָּן.
- „ 51, „ 8. Pro מִשְׁחֵיֶיךָ lege מִשְׁחֵיֶיךָ.
- „ 52, „ 1. Pro לִסְחָרִי lege לִסְחָרִי.
- „ 56, „ 11. Pro שְׂרִיבֵינִי lege שְׂרִיבֵינִי.
- „ 56, „ 5. Pro אֶהְיֶה lege אֶהְיֶה.
- „ 58, „ 6. Pro וְאֶשְׁרֵי lege וְאֶשְׁרֵי.
- „ 59, „ 6. Pro רִדְעָא lege רִדְעָא.
- „ 59, „ 13. Pro חֲדָדְיִיחֵן lege חֲדָדְיִיחֵן.
- „ 60, „ 5. v. Ibn Ezra, to this verse, who explains the Jewish Interpretation from צָפַן = to hide and פָּתַח = to open.
- „ 61, „ 10. Pro דִּשְׁרָה lege דִּשְׁרָה.
- „ 62, „ 2. Pro לִשְׂרָה et שְׂרָה lege לִשְׂרָה et שְׂרָה.
- „ 63, „ ult. v. Barth in ZDMG. XXX. p. 192.
- „ 64, „ 7. „ „ „ „ „ p. 190.
- „ 67, „ 3. v. Seligsohn. l. c. p. 26.
- „ 71, „ 11. Pro וְנִצְחָק lege וְנִצְחָק.
- „ 73, „ 1. Pro אֶלֶף lege אֶלֶף.
- „ 78, „ 9. Vide Friedländer. l. c. p. 568.

A few Hireqs which sprung off during printing are not specified as they are easily recognisable.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URE

APR 24 1968

JRL-LD

REC'D LD-URE

OCT 03 1968

OCT 30 1968

Form L9-75m-7,'61 (C1437s4) 444

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
LOS ANGELES

Printed by W. Drugulin, Leipzig (Germany).

University of California Los Angeles



L 006 377 372 5

PS
709.l4
B26t

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 621 573 5

Unive
Sou
Li