



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

"SYRIACISMS IN THE TARGUM TO THE BOOK OF PROVERBS"

Pages 63-68 missing

Submitted to the faculty of the
Hebrew Union College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degrees of
Rabbi and Master of Hebrew Letters

Referee:

Dr. Henry Englander

Frank Minsker

April 15, 1940

Rec'd
5/79

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	i-iii
Introduction.....	I-XVIII
Key to discussion of Syriacisms.....	a-c
Syriacisms in Targum to Proverbs.....	1-115
(An error has been made in that Ch. XIX ends p.63, and ch. XX begins p.69)	
Chapter I.....	1-3
II.....	4-6
III.....	7-10
IV.....	11-13
V.....	14-16
VI.....	17-20
VII.....	21-23
VIII.....	24-26
IX.....	27-28
X.....	29-33
XI.....	34-37
XII.....	38-41
XIII.....	42-44
XIV.....	45-48
XV.....	49-51
XVI.....	52-55
XVII.....	56-57
XVIII.....	58-60
XIX.....	61-63
XX.....	69-72
XXI.....	73-76
XXII.....	77-80
XXIII.....	81-84
XXIV.....	85-88
XXV.....	89-92
XXVI.....	93-85
XXVII.....	86-98
XXVIII.....	99-102
XXIX.....	103-106
XXX.....	107-111
XXXI.....	112-115
Summation of results.....	116-123
Comparison of verses.....	116-119
Comparison of verb forms in verses.....	120-121
Table of Comparisons.....	122
Final results.....	123
Syriacisms in Targum to Proverbs which we failed to notice.....	124-132
Conclusion.....	133-141
Bibliography.....	142-143

Preface

A very interesting source of research for many scholars has been provided by the Aramaic and Syriac translations of the Old Testament. There are many points of similarity between these two works which are valuable for various scientific reasons.

But of all the Targumim to the Old Testament, those to Psalms, Job, and Proverbs show the closest similarity to the Peshitta. Here, we have few paraphrases, few homiletical variations from the original text, and more resemblance to the Syriac version in vocabulary and style than in all the other Aramaic translations of the Holy Scriptures.

Of these three, the Targumim to Job, Psalms, and Proverbs, the last mentioned is by far the most intriguing. Here is a work that has puzzled scholars for a long time. Diametrically opposed views have been stated by some of the most distinguished savants of the last two centuries, some stating that the Syriac was a copy of the Aramaic, and some saying that the Aramaic was a copy of the Syriac. One thing that they all did agree on, however, was that this Targum to Proverbs is quite a unique thing. Hundreds of verses are identically the same as in the Peshitta to Proverbs. The verb forms, nouns, style,----in short, everything about the Aramaic text, resemble the Syriac version too closely to allow a person to hold that the similarity between them (Targum and Peshitta to Proverbs) is incidental.

The first secondary sources which were consulted in our study were, naturally, the encyclopedias. So terse and interesting were the remarks in these works concerning the

Targum to Proverbs, that it might be of value to quote them verbatim. Says the Jewish Encyclopedia:¹ "This Targum (Proverbs) differs from all other Judeo-Aramaic translations of the Bible in that it shows Syriac characteristics, and also agrees in other respects with the Peshitta, to which, according to Geiger (Nachgelassene Schriften, iv 112) one half of it corresponds word for word. This Targum contains scarcely any haggadic paraphrases. It may be assumed either that its author uses, or, rather, revised the Peshitta, or with a greater degree of probability, that the Targum to Proverbs was derived from the same source as the Peshitta of that book, the Syriac version itself being based on a translation originally intended for Jews who spoke the Syriac dialect. This Targum also is quoted in the Aruk, and by Nachmanides as 'Targum Jerushalmi'."

The Catholic Encyclopedia states, very briefly:²

"The Targum to Proverbs is in language and contents very dependent on the text of the Syriac Peshitto (sic!) and is but little more than a Jewish recension of the same."

Realizing that much study would have to be devoted to the subject before we would be able to make any such categorical statements as are made in these encyclopedias, we carefully examined firstly, the Targum and the Peshitta themselves, and then,

-
1. The Jewish Encyclopedia, 1907, Funk and Wagnalls Company, N.Y. and London. Volume XII, page 62, bottom of first, and top of second columns.
 2. The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1907, Robert Appleton Co., N.Y. volume XIV, page 457, second column.

secondly, the most outstanding secondary sources. The results gained by an investigation of the original materials, will be found in the conclusion of the thesis proper, where also will be found many important facts and conclusions which we carefully selected from various secondary sources, especially from S. Maybaum.³

The following is the plan of the thesis: Firstly, there will be an introduction which will treat of the studies made by Dathe, Geiger, Baumgartner, Maybaum, and Noeldeke. Reference will be made to Kaminka's study of the relationship of the LXX to the Targum of Proverbs. Next will come our own comparison, with an introduction and a résumé. A section will follow which will treat of materials which we failed to notice in our comparisons, but which were found in the various secondary sources. Lastly, there will follow a conclusion, in which we will honestly endeavor to give a scientific view on the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac, and their relationship to one another. God grant that we be successful in our labors.

With these few prefatory remarks, we launch our work.
The pursuit for the truth is now on!

The Author

-
3. S. Maybaum, Ueber die Sprache des Targums zu den Spruechen
Archiv fuer Wissenschaftliche Erforschung des A. O.
Halle, 1871, Band II, Heft I

INTRODUCTION

Before we make our investigation of the Syriacisms in the Targum to the book of Proverbs, it would be best to discuss in a brief, yet comprehensive, manner, the work that has already been done on the question of relationship of the Targum to Proverbs to the Peshitta to Proverbs. This is the best way to become orientated in the work, and will enable us to have a better understanding of the Syriacisms. The work first to be examined is the treatise of Dathe.

a) J.A. Dathe

Dathe, the first of the important investigators of the Syriac influences in the Targum to Proverbs, delivered an opening lecture at the University of Leipzig in 1764, in which he asserted that the Syriac version preceeded the Aramaic one from the point of view of time. This lecture was later published in 1814 by Rosenmueller in Opuscula ad Crisin et Interpretationem V.T. Spectantia.

In his lecture, later titled De Ratione Consensus Vers. Syr. et Chal. Proverb., Dathe also showed definite instances of the very striking similarity that exists between the Targum and Syriac to Proverbs.¹

There is one instance in which Dath developed a very interesting theory. The Hebrew Text to Pr. 29.8 (~~not our ed.~~) reads **אֹנֶשׁ לִצְוֹן יִפְחוּ קִרְיָהּ וְחֲכָמִים יִשְׁבּוּ אֶתָּה** scoffers set a city aflame (or, in uproar), but wise men appease ~~all~~ wrath. The Targum to Proverbs in the regular edition has a variation here, which has little relationship to the Masoretic

1. Dathe, O. C., p. 120-124

text, which reads וּבְרָא מִמִּיקְנֵי מַמְלָלִין כִּדְבָא, whereas the Syriac, for the same verse, for the Hebrew קִרִּית, correctly uses כִּרְכָּא. Now Dathe is of the opinion that the Aramaic rendition which so often agrees with the Syriac, merely copied from the latter in this version as, indeed, he asserts, was done throughout the whole of the book of Proverbs, and erred in reading אֲדָרָא as אֲדָרָא, thus rendering כִּדְבָא as כִּרְכָּא. The verb form מַמְלָלִין was added later to make better sense. Consequently, he concludes that the Targum used the Peshitta, and not vice-versa.

However, Dathe erred here. This and many other such examples upon which he founded his thesis have since been disproved by a version of the Targum to Proverbs that was found in the Breslau Library, - which text definitely shows that many such verses in this Targum are corruptions. This correct Targum text, for example, for the same verse that Dathe quotes, reads וּבְרָא מִמִּיקְנֵי מַמְלָלִין כִּרְכָּא.²

Apparently, however, there was much to what Dathe held. For example, H. Finkuss and the great Th. Noeldeke support his contentions. Noeldeke holds, in no uncertain terms, that, in the main, Dathe was correct.³

Let it be admitted that we, unfortunately, have not been successful in locating Dathe's original thesis, which was written in Latin, though we went to great trouble to do so. However, as the essentials of the work can be constructed from the secondary material, as it is important to take cognizance of the

2. Vide S. Maybaum, Ueber die Sprache des Targums und dessen

Verhaeltnis zum Syrer, p. 68, Merx Archiv fuer die Wissenschaftliche Erforschungen des A. T., Band II, Heft I

3. Th. Noeldeke, Das Targum zu den Spruechen von der Peschitta abhaengig, p. 246, Merx Archiv etc., II, II

III

work of this great original scholar, and as his view was adopted by later scholars, with modifications and amplifications, of course, we thought it fit to include a brief survey of this, the first treatise that was done in the field.

b) S. Maybaum

By far the most thorough and comprehensive work on the Syriac influences in the Targum to the book of Proverbs was done by Siegmund Maybaum. No matter what one may think of his contentions, one must admire efficiency with which he handled the mass of material that he dealt with, and the marvelous manner in which he organized it.

Maybaum was the next great luminary after Dathe. He plumbed the depths of his subject, and was far more thorough than his predecessor. He was less given to flights of fancy; ^{he} substantiated his statements by sound facts.

In the introduction of his work, Ueber die Sprache des Targums zu den Spruechen und dessen Verhaeltnis zum Syrer, Maybaum states: "Es ist dies Targum ein Unicum in der ganzen Targumliteratur durch seine durchaus syrich gefaerbte Sprach; denn es finden sich hier in einem einzigen Capitel mehr Syriasmen vor, als in ganzen Buechern der andern Targumim. Ist schon dies eine merkwuerdige Erscheinung, so muss es anderseits nicht weniger auffallen, wenn wir in diesem Targum nicht blos einzelne Woerter und Wendungen, sondern ganze Saetze--und diese in grosser Anzahl--in vollstaendiger lexichische Uebereinstimmung finden mit dem Syrer."⁴ This is the key note of his treatise, the extraordinary number of Syriacisms

4. Merx, Archiv fuer Wissenschaftliche Erforschung des AT. II, I
p. 67.

which are found in the Targum to Proverbs. He then proceeds to solve the very difficult problems as to whether the Syriac preceeded the Targum to Proverbs, and as to which copied from the other, the Targum or the Peshitta. He next proceeds to show that Dathe, the only person to have made a penetrating study before him, had been wrong in many instances because this great scholar did not possess a correct copy of the Targum to Proverbs. (vide p.II of this section)

Thereupon, Maybaum gives an exposition of his studies in which he gives a very capable presentation of his work in the Aramaic text to Proverbs, in which he discusses pronouns, nouns, verbs with suffixes, particles, syntax, and the direct relationship to the Syriac. All of these sections will be found in the chapter at the end of our discussion of Proverbs, in which ^{chapter} we will treat of Syriacisms which we failed to notice.

Maybaum, on the bottom of page eighty and the top of page eighty-one of the Merx Archiv, states the following opinion: "Die Sprache des Targum zu den Spruechen ist eine Mischsprache, wie sie etwa um die Zeit des 5-6 Jahrhunderts in Palaestina gesprochen wurde, und von welcher wir ausser diesem Targum in den jerusalemischen Targum bereide Zeugen besitzen. Kurz, so viel steht uns fest, dass die Sprache des Targums zu den Spruechen eine syro-chaldaeische und die urspruengliche Sprache des Verfassers war."⁴

In these words, it is asserted that the language of the Aramaic text to Proverbs was that written in a dialect spoken by Jews in the fifth or sixth century of the Common Era, and, therefore, it would be possible that the Aramaic version could have been an original, and not a copy.

4. Merx Archiv, II,I, p.90

However, continues Maybaum (page 89), there need not have been any slavish copying. The editor who composed the latter version, whether it ~~may have been~~ the Targum or the Syriac, may have had the original before him, but yet not have been completely dependant upon it. For instance, there are some cases in which the Targum follows the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the Syriac differs. There are other instances, likewise, in which the Syriac follows the Masorah, and the Targum differs with the Hebrew tradition! The question which is still before us is, which came first, the Targum to Proverbs, or the Peshitta to Proverbs?

In order to refute the contention of Dathe that the Syriac came first, Maybaum proceeds to show that the four verses upon which his predecessor founded his theory were really corrupted texts. They are, in order, four in the Targum to Proverbs: ch. 5.19; ch. 29.19; and ch. 30.31. The other passage, 19.8 (really and error in number!), ^{19.8} has been discussed in the section of the introduction dealing with Dathe.

Next follows the section in which S. Maybaum tries to prove that the Targum to Proverbs came before the Peshitta. It must be admitted that some of his reasoning is rather weak. Firstly, he asserts that the Syriac version in all the books of the Old Testament made use of other versions, and that the Peshitta to Proverbs abounds with interpolations from the LXX. (Even the editor of the Merx Archiv could not make sense of this statement.) Hence, claims Maybaum, the Peshitta to Proverbs must be the later work. But this does not follow. First of all, how can we say categorically that the Targum did not make use of other sources than the Hebrew Bible? Furthermore, even Maybaum himself admits that the ^aTargum to Proverbs, as well as the Peshitta, contains some interpolations

from the LXX, or at least, reads the same as the Syriac when the latter follows the LXX, rather than ~~the~~ ^{the} Masorah.

Maybaum's second reason for the priority of the Targum is more convincing. He claims that we know from the Midrash Rabbah to Genesis where it is evident that texts from the hagiographa, and especially Proverbs, were used for preaching, that there must have been need for an Aramaic translation of Proverbs even before the time of the composition of the Midrash, let us say during the fifth or sixth century of the Common Era. This, of course is not necessarily so, but may be true. Since the preachers used texts from Proverbs, it may well be true that the Meturgemanim may have read texts from Proverbs aloud in the in the synagogue, or that such translations were made for use in the home or study. This hypothesis would be a thesis in itself.

Thirdly, Maybaum follows the fallacious methodology of Dathe, and mentions four passages (4.24; 7.14; 10.20; 29.9)⁵ in which the reading of the Syriac text, in order to make sense, must be emended on the basis of the corresponding verses in the Targum. This proof is not too convincing, as there may have been corruptions in the Syriac text, just as there were in the Targum text. Generally speaking, Maybaum is quite unconvincing. He is scarcely more logical than was Dathe, even though Maybaum has made a more thorough and systematic investigation than did his predecessor.

This much, however, remains; so far we have no substantial evidence that either the Targum or the Peshitta to Proverbs came first

5. Merx Archiv, II, I, pp. 91 bot., 92

C.- Abraham Geiger

Geiger has very little to say about the Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs, merely making a categorical statement about the similarities between the Targum and the Peshitta. So succinct is his statement, that it might be well to quote it verbatim:

"Wenn bei Megilloth die Fluth fruehzeitig anwuchs, so erhielt sich im Gegentheil das Thargum zu den Spruechen wohl am meisten in seiner alten Gestalt und zeigt einen von allen sonstigen thargumischen Arbeiten, die uns vorliegen, ganz abweichenden Character, der aber seiner Haelfte nach woertlich mit dem Syrer ueberstimmt, so dass sie zur gegenseitigen Berichtigungen dienen und zwar selbst da, wo vollstaendige Abweichungen von unserm Text stattfinden, und sie meist mit dem LXX uebereinstimmen."⁶ Here, Geiger tells us little that has not already been treated in great detail by Dathe and Maybaum. Geiger then proceeds to give us numerous verses, in which both the Targum and the Syriac have the same variation from the Masorah, and agree with the LXX.⁷ Some examples are: 1.22+23; 11.5; 12.21; 18.19; etc. It would be quite useless to quote all the verses as they are treated elsewhere in greater detail.

Hence, we see that A. Geiger was merely concerned with making a blanket statement that there are Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs, and with giving us an arithmetical account of the same.

6. A. Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften, vol. 4, Berlin, 1871, p.112

7. *ibid.* pp.112-116

He makes no stand as to whether the Peshitta to Proverbs preceded the Targum or not.

D. - Ant. J. Baumgartner, Etat du Texte du Livre des Proverbs

There are many things that are of great importance in Baumgartner's work on the Proverbs. We will treat of the following from his study of the Peshitta (p. 11-14), the Targum (p. 14-16), and the Aramean versions (266-269).

1) The Peshitta

According to Jacob of Edessa this translation goes back to the time of the apostle Addai, and King Abdar of Edessa. Be that as it may, the Syriac version was for a long time known already at the time of Ephrem the Syrian (398 C.E.). This Ephrem apparently did not know the meaning of many of the expressions in the Syriac, which would lead us to believe that this version was already quite old at that time. Melito of Sardis (around 170) appears to have cited from a Syriac version of Genesis.

Apparently, the Syriac conformed mostly with our present Hebrew Masoretic version of the Bible, with the exception of some borrowings from the Syriac, and some later additions. This Syriac version of the Bible must have gone through several revisions. Jacob of Edessa is said to have spent nine years correcting the text to the Peshitta.

The Peshitta, the first Christian version of the Old Testament, is of Judeo-Christian origin. There are ~~many~~ many examples of Midrashic interpretations and interpolations etc. in rabbinic style to be found here. Geiger, Preles, and Prager have contended that the Peshitta is of purely Jewish origin, whereas

Gesenius, Mirzel, Noeldeke, Haevermāch, de Witte, and others have held that it was of Judeo-Christian origin. Baumgartner holds that the Jewish elements in the Syriac version may have come from a converted Jew or Jews, who still thought in the traditional Jewish pattern.⁸

There are many differences between the styles of interpretation of the various books of the Bible into the Syriac. These differences, as well as many lexicographical differences, clearly indicate that the work was done by many translators.

The Peshitta is probably to be dated at the first part of the second century, or perhaps, even in an earlier date.

The book of Proverbs in the Syriac is of special note. Here we see a book that relies upon the LXX and yet tries to hold to the Hebrew Text. IT IS PROBABLE THAT THE CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS MADE ACCORDING TO THE LXX BELONG TO A MORE RECENT TIME, PERHAPS EVEN TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY OF THE COMMON ERA WHEN BISHOP PAUL OF TELLA MADE AN ABSOLUTELY LITERAL VERSION OF THE GREEK IN SYRIAC. HERCE, IT IS QUITE PROBABLE THAT OUR PRESENT PESHITTA TO PROVERBS CONSISTS OF AN ADAPTATION OF AN OLD VERSION ACCREDITED BY THE SYRIAC CHURCH AND OF NEWER SYRIAC VERSION THAN OF THE LXX.

2) The Targum

First, the Targum was developed by the various Meturgemanim during the readings in the synagogue. Later, these interpretations were put into writing. The same must have been the case with the Targum to Hagiographa. Consequently, it is possible that these Targumim to the Hagiographa, of which Proverbs is a part, date back

8. Etat du Texte du Livre des Proverbs, Ant, J. Baumgartner,

Leipzig, 1890, p.13

to rather ancient times. Mention is made of a Targum to Job, for example, cited at the beginning of the second century. There are evidences of an even more ancient edition, ^{of the Targ,} some passages of which still remain within the Targum Jerushalmi, as for example, the passage in Deut. XXXIII.11.

As for the Targum to Proverbs itself, it probably dates from the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century. THE TARGUM TO PROVERBS MUST HAVE BEEN PRECEDED BY THE SYRIAC VERSION WHICH MUST BE PLACED DURING THE COURSE OF THE SECOND CENTURY OF THE COMMON ERA.

3) The Aramaic versions (in the conclusion, pp265 ff.)

The Peshitta occupies an intermediary position between the LXX, the Targum, and the Hebrew, and is distinguished by the fact that it represents an effort to return to the original text. The author, who revised the work on the basis of the LXX (that is, took the old Syriac version accepted by the Church and tried to modernize it according to the LXX) still was quite dependent on the old text he had before him, which work was based on a version of Proverbs which was later revised by the Masorates. Some passages in which the Peshitta shows dependence upon the LXX are: 1.24; 6.6,10,22,25b,28; and 20.1a. There are many others, but it would be bootless to give all of these verses.

The Syriac version of Proverbs is indeed remarkable. It gives the sense of the original text, without being servile. It has a style all its own, which is fluid and expressive. We cannot know the special rules for translation and interpretation which the author of this version employed. However, as stated, this present Syriac text to Proverbs is not the original text, and hence has no claim to precedence. What is remarkable, is the

astonishing conformity it has has to the text of the Targum to Proverbs. Of the 915 verses in Proverbs, 300 are almost identical, except for secondary details, in both the Targum and the Peshitta. There are many verses which are identical, however, one need not necessarily have been COPIED from the other. What is most striking, are the verses in both versions which are identical, and have the same variation from the Hebrew text. Baumgartner gives some examples.⁹

One of them (Targum and Peshitta to Proverbs.) must have been the inspiration for the other. BOTH VERSIONS PROBABLY HAD THE HEBREW BIBLE IN FRONT OF THEM. As Dathe stated, it is probably that the Syriac version was the first. Baumgartner then proceeds to give many proofs for his contention, many of which were disproved by Maybaum.¹⁰ Some of them, however, are correct, and will be dealt with in our final supplementary section.

Thus ends the discussion of Baumgartner, who was not primarily concerned with Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs. He holds the opinion proposed by Dathe, that the Peshitta came first. Ant. J. Baumgartner also offered much valuable information about the Peshitta in general, and the Syriac to Proverbs in particular.

E- Th. Woelcke

Extracts from Des Targum zu den Spruechen von der Peschita Abhaengig. pp. 246-249 in Merx Archiv fuer die Wissenschaftliche Erforschungen Des A.T., Band II, Heft I

9. ibid., p.267-268

10. ibid. 268-269

It seems that Hoeldeke took it upon himself to refute the contention of S. Maybaum, which appeared earlier in the Merx Archiv, and of which we have already treated in this introduction.

Hoeldeke starts out by stating that though Dathe may have erred in many insignificant details, he was still correct in his contention that the Syriac to Proverbs preceded the Aramaic. Thereupon, he asserts that the language utilized in the text of the Targum to Proverbs could never have been a spoken language. Hoeldeke further substantiates his assertion by showing that, since the language of the Targum to Proverbs is essentially Syriac in character, it must have originally come from a pure Syriac text. He then proceeds to show that, furthermore, were this book of the Targum the original, rather than the Syriac, and were an almost pure Syriac spoken by the Jews of Palestine in the fifth or sixth centuries, the Christian Syrians would still have had to take this dialect in Proverbs and "ruin" it by making it pure Syriac. This is improbable. It is more likely that the opposite was true, that the Jews converted the Syriac into Aramaic, still retaining many Syriacisms. Although there is something to such reasoning, it is not entirely convincing.

Hoeldeke further expatiates upon the composite linguistic character of the Targum to Proverbs. First, he states, the text of the Syriac was utilized. Later, a copyist who was familiar with the dialect of the Targums to Job and Psalms, recopied the original, which therefore, by this process, became slightly more Aramaized. Later copyists or translators may have added more Aramaic influences. Hence, a language arose in the text of the Targum to Proverbs which could have been neither a spoken tongue

nor a language in which scholars wrote. As proof for this contention, he cites a work by Landsberg, Tabellen des Sophos, in which it is fairly clearly known that the book was originally in Syriac, and that it was copied by a Jewish writer, and that Aramaic influences thus gradually crept into the book. This argument is fairly logical, but somehow, not completely convincing.

Furthermore, states Koelcke, the very fact that both the Targum and Peshitta to Proverbs utilize the LXX where they vary with the Masorah shows that the Targum relied upon the Syriac. It was the Syriac that originally followed the LXX. Not only that, but how could a Targumist have utilized the prohibited LXX? In this same line of reasoning: Even if the author of the Peshitta to Proverbs did use as original Aramaic text, which could have had little reference to the LXX, such an author must still of necessity have relied more upon the LXX than the Targum. Koelcke is very clever here, but is still very unconvincing.

Koelcke concludes in words to the following effect: A Jew took the Syriac translation as the basis for his Targum. He also relied upon the Masoretic text in the Hebrew, which, in his translation, he improved and corrected in many places. This Jew relied more upon the Syriac than upon the Jewish exegetical tradition.

Apparently, states Koelcke, the Targum to Proverbs, as well as that to the other books of the Hagiographa, are private works, which had little to do with the methodology of the Jewish schools. The dependence of the Peshitta to the Pentateuch upon the Jewish Targumic tradition does not apply at all in the case of the book of Proverbs.

We must confess that Koelcke seems no more logical to us

than did Maybaum. Nevertheless, the arguments from "purity of language," "dialect resulting from copying," and from the "variations due to the LXX, and the fact that it was forbidden to Jews to use the LXX" are merely clever rationalizations.

Maybaum's contention that an almost pure Syriac was spoken in ^a Palestine in the fifth and sixth centuries, as proven by the similarity of expressions in the Targum to Proverbs to expressions in the Targum Yerushalmi would refute Hoelcke's first two claims. The last two claims, based upon the use of the LXX, are also fallacious. Supposing that it were forbidden for Jews to use the LXX. Why, then, should an indirect copy of parts of this LXX be made via the Syriac? Wouldn't the presence of such elements in the Targum to Proverbs make the Jews forbid the printing of such a translation to Proverbs side by side with the Hebrew even if it were not used in the Synagogue? Secondly, supposing that the translation of the book of Proverbs were the work of an individual, and did not follow the tradition of the various Jewish schools of interpretation, why, then, was this translation printed in texts as the standard Jewish translation, and accepted by the Jews? Of course, Hoelcke is very clever and very analytical. But somehow, he fails to be completely convincing.

F- A. Kaminka

From: Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia, HUC Annual, vol. 8-9, Phil., 1932, pp. 169-191

THE TARGUM TO PROVERBS A PROBLEM BY ITSELF (pp. 171-174)

Kaminka starts by telling us what we have already learned, namely, that the Targum to Proverbs, unlike the other Targumim to the Hagiographa, has few Aggadic interpretations, few paraphrases

and the like, even though it gives a free translation at times, in the manner of the LXX. Further, he states the well known fact that there are many Syriac words and Syriac forms in this Targum. What Kaminka is especially concerned about, however, is THAT THIS BOOK MORE THAN ANY OTHER IN THE WHOLE BIBLE DIFFERS WITH THE MASORAH TEXT IN A VERY GREAT NUMBER OF PLACES, IN WHICH PLACES IT AGREES WITH THE LXX. A. Kaminka then gives a statement about the work that has been done about the dependency of the Targum upon the Syriac, or vice-versa, by Dathe, Eichhorn, Hitzig, Moeldeke, Maybaum, and Pinkuss. He discusses Pinkuss's theory in a brief manner, namely, whereas the Targum was not translated from the Greek, it has nevertheless either not translated out of the Hebrew original, or at least that the Hebrew original was not taken into consideration. He disagrees with Pinkuss.

KAMINKA THEN PROCEEDS TO MAKE A VERY INTERESTING CLAIM. THE TARGUM TO THE BOOK OF PROVERBS MUST BE VERY OLD, MUST BELONG TO A VERY EARLY, PRE-TANINATIC PERIOD. PERHAPS IT EVEN BELONGS TO THE THIRD CENTURY B.C.E. THE INFLUENCES FROM THE LXX TO BE FOUND IN THE TARGUM TO PROVERBS ARE NOT TO BE EXPLAINED AS COMING DIRECTLY FROM THE LXX, OR AS COMING FROM A USE OF THE SYRIAC TRANSLATION, BUT AS COMING FROM A TEXT WRITTEN BEFORE THE FIXING OF THE CANON, IN WHICH PERIOD THE HAGGADIC METHODS OF INTERPRETATIONS HAD NOT YET BEEN ADOPTED. FURTHERMORE, IT IS PROBABLE THAT THE TRANSLATORS OF THE LXX, OF THE TARGUM, AND OF THE SYRIAC ALL USED THE SAME ORIGINAL HEBREW VERSION AND WERE ALL WRITTEN IN THE SECOND OR THIRD CENTURIES BEFORE THE COMMON ERA. Later, when revisions were made in the Hebrew text, the Jewish scholars did not bother about changing the no longer acceptable readings in the Targum to Proverbs which were retained in the LXX. FURTHERMORE, KAMINKA

ASSERTS THAT THE TARGUM TO PROVERBS IS OLDER THAN THE LXX AND INFLUENCED THIS GREEK VERSION. Such verses as 3.12; 8.23; 8.30; 10.12; 14.30; 15.6; 19.7; 23.4; and 26.8 may prove this contention."

Thereupon, A. Kaminka cites many passages (parts of passages) in the LXX to Proverbs, in which the Greek reading shows a misinterpretation due to the wrong reading of the Hebrew consonants, dalet and resh.

Next, Kaminka gives a list of verses in which the LXX AGREES WITH THE TARGUM. (pp. 178-191). It might be well to make a list of verse^s in which such agreements occur:

I- 19,21,27
II-11,17
III-12,37
IV-14,26a
V-17
VI-7,27,30
VII-22
VIII-13,23,30
X-2,4,7,23,
XI-15,26
XII-16,19,21,25,28
XIII-11,15,19,22
XIV-4,12,28,30
XV-4,6,18,20,28
XVI-11,23
XVII-12
XVIII-5,6
XIX-6,7,14,19,26
XX-4,24,25,30
XXI-4,13
XXII-1,11,16
XXIII-1,4,35
XXIV-5,12,23
XXV-1,19,20,26
XXVI-3,5,10,26,28
XXVII-16,19,21,22,24
XXVIII-3,4
XXIX-4,21
XXX-31
XXXI-6,8

11. Septuaginta und ~~xxxviii~~ Targum zu Proverbia, RUC An.

vol. 8-9, Phil. 1932, pp. 173-174 ^{overlaid with} vol. 14, 1942,

pp. 85-141

G- H. Pinkuss

Der Syrische Uebersetzung der Proverbien ZA:W, vol. 14, 1894,
pp. 65-141

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TARGUM (TO PROVERBS) TO THE SYRIAC (TO
PROVERBS) pp. 113-120

In this section, Pinkuss discusses briefly the work of the various who have gone before him. Later, he takes his stand with those who state that the Syriac was the first from the point of view of time, and that the Targum copied from the Syriac. He bases his claim upon the fact that he feels that the Targum has made a false translation on the basis of the ^Syriac in a number of verses, some of which are: 1.9; 5.20; 6.26; and 25.20. It would be purposeless to copy all of his proofs, as they are not convincing, at least not convincing enough to base a thesis upon.

In the second subdivision of this section, Pinkuss shows that the Syriac OFTEN USED THE HEBREW TEXT AS THE BASIS OF ITS TRANSLATION. Verses such as 16.28; 18.1; 22.21; 29.4 and 11, which can only be accounted for as direct adaptations of the Hebrew text, prove ~~xxxx~~ this fact. The Hebrew text, which S. had before it differed but little with our Masoretic text.

Pinkuss then goes through a discussion as to the origin of the Peshitta as to whether it be of Jewish or Christian origin. He has little to offer that is new, claiming, with many before him, that it is of Christian origin. He then states, even as many did before him, that the Peshitta to Proverbs came first. The only new thought he has to offer in this line is that it is highly improbable that the Syriac Christian Church Fathers would accept a Jewish translation of the book of Proverbs. But isn't the book of Proverbs itself of Jewish origin?

Pinkuss then devotes a whole section to the relationship of the Syriac to the Masoretic Hebrew text (pp. 120-121), which it would be purposeless to mention here, Suffice it to say that there appear to be many verses which show that S. and M. are closely related. However, the question raised by A. Kaminka's article which we have discussed earlier in the introduction, as to which Hebrew text, the present Masoretic text or a previous one, the Syriac used, does not seem to be taken into account by Pinkuss.

Conclusion of introductory section

It goes without saying that there are many more savants who have dealt with some phase of the work we are about to examine than we have mentioned in this introduction. It would be purposeless to deal with all of their articles, as it would take far too much time, and there would be a great deal of repetition, as many have more or less the same thesis. Maybaum, Dathe, Noeldeke, Kaminka, etc. have dealt with the most important phases of the Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs, and have done a very thorough job at that.

Our investigation into the text of the Targum to Proverbs will now follow, now that the preliminary discussion is completed.

KEY TO DISCUSSION OF SYRIACISMS IN

PROVERBS

In order to come to definite conclusions in any piece of scholarly work, it is necessary to investigate the original sources. Hence, the following section will be devoted to an examination of the texts of the Aramaic versions^{and} of the Peshitta of Proverbs. The purpose of this section will be to show the actual Syriac forms in the Text of the Targum of Proverbs, and also to show, whenever possible, what words are used in Proverbs alone in the same sense as in the Syriac. Wherever whole sentences in the Targum and Syriac are either identical or almost identical, mention will be made of such fact. Whenever possible to determine with any degree of accuracy, it will be shown that both the Syriac and the Targum have had the same interpretation of a difficult verse. Indication will be made of any instances in which the Targum and the Syriac have the same variation from the present Hebrew text, whether the present Hebrew text be simple or difficult. Similarities in literary style between the Peshitta and the Targum will be stressed throughout this study.

Furthermore, so that the investigation may be more accurate, verses will be divided into two parts, a and b, whenever possible, and will be discussed in this manner.

There are certain terms which must be made clear. Firstly when it is stated that two verses, or parts of verses, are identical except for minor differences arising from the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages, by that is meant that, for all practical purpose, the verses are identical, but that there are ^{distinct} grammatical differences of the two languages, or to the fact that

the same word is spelled differently in Syriac than it is in Aramaic. For instance, ܡܢ ܕܢܝܚܐ in the Aramaic is spelled ܡܢ ܕܢܝܚܐ in Syriac. Whenever it is stated that the Targum is "similar" to the Syriac, by that is meant that the two differ only in one word, or in one point of grammar or of style. Occasionally, it may mean that the two differ in both one point in grammar and in one word in vocabulary, or in two points of grammar, or in two words in vocabulary. By the phrase "slightly similar" is meant that the Syriac and the Targum are somewhat alike in spirit, even though there are variations. By the phrase, "very similar", or "extremely similar", is meant that the Syriac and the Targum have but minor, or negligible, variations. By the phrase, "differing in style", is meant that the Syriac and Aramaic differ in one grammatical form, or in one point of interpretation. Occasionally, it may refer to two differences in grammar or in interpretation. By the phrase, "differing in vocabulary", is meant that different words are used in Syriac and Aramaic to translate the same word in Hebrew in one instance. Occasionally, it may refer to the use of different words in two instances. The phrase, "is a Syriacism," or "is a definite Syriacism", merely means that there is some Syriac influence, apparent in the verb, or noun, as the case may be.

The final point that must be made clear is the use of abbreviations. "T." has reference to the Targum text, Warsaw edition (1874), really a part of ספרות הגלגל. Occasionally this text will be corrected according to the text of de Lagarde, from his book on the Hagiographa (Leipzig, 1873). There will be no abbreviation used for "de Lagarde", - the full

spelling will be used throughout. "S." will have reference to the text in the Peshitta to Proverbs, being an abbreviation for "Syriac." "H", being an abbreviation for "Hebrew" will represent the present Hebrew Massoretic text to Proverbs.

Slight attention will be paid to variant readings from the LXX in this following section, as they would render the study less unified. Whenever such readings are important, they will have been discussed either in the introduction, or in the résumé or conclusion.

Now we will begin our verse by verse comparison.

Chapter I

- 1: Both T. and S. are almost identical.
- 2: H. **כדוּתא** translated as **כדוּתא** in both T. and S.
- 4: H. **כדוּתא** translated as **כדוּתא** in T. and S.
- 5: H. **כדוּתא** translated as **כדוּתא** in T. and as **כדוּתא** in S.
 H. **כדוּתא** translated as **כדוּתא** in both T. and S. This word **כדוּתא** occurs only in passages in T. to Proverbs according to J. Levy, Chaldaeisches Woerterbuch II, p. 9.
- 6: H. **כדוּתא** is translated as **כדוּתא** in both T. and S. **כדוּתא** only mentioned as occurring in T. to Proverbs 1.6^{alone} by J. Levy, Chaldaeisches Woerterbuch, II p. 256.
- 8: Both T. and S. are almost identical.
- 9: H. **כדוּתא** is translated as **כדוּתא** in T. and as **כדוּתא** in S.
- 10: Both T. and S. almost the same. **כדוּתא** in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is almost the same as the corresponding form in the S., which, however, unlike the T. form, takes a pronominal suffix. The Aramaic form takes an object (**כדוּתא**). **כדוּתא** from **כדוּתא** is used in both the regular text of T. and S. In view of the fact that it (**כדוּתא**) makes good sense and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., it is, perhaps, to be preferred to de Lagarde's reading, **כדוּתא**.
- 11: H. **כדוּתא** translated as **כדוּתא** in T. and as **כדוּתא** in S. **כדוּתא** in T. is almost the same as S. For H. **כדוּתא** T. has **כדוּתא** "for nothing." S. has **כדוּתא** "in deceit."

- 12: T. and S. almost the same, with ^{the} exception of minor differences due to nature of Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 13: T. and S. show slight differences in style, but ^{are} almost ~~the~~ same in other respects. S. has "his wealth" instead of just "wealth" as in T.
- 14: T. and S. are practically the same. De Lagarde emends T. to read פִּסְרָא for כִּסְרָא. This corresponds to S. פִּסְתָּא.
- 15: T. and S. ^{are} the same except for one word, T. having מִנְּךָ and the S. having כְּלִי רִגְלָךְ.
- 16: T. and S. ^{are} almost the same. T. uses the word, לְמִשְׁכָּךְ The Syriac, in better style, uses לְמִשְׁכָּךְ -- better for "to spill." The S. makes an addition, reading מִכָּאן וְעַד מִכָּאן.
- 17: T. and S. differ greatly in style in this verse. S. is shorter; more to point. Both T. and S. have the same word for bird, T. reading מִכְּרִיתָא, and S. reading מִכְּרִיתָא.
- 18: De Lagarde's corrected text for T. and the Syriac are practically identical. However, the uncorrected T. text is closer to the Hebrew and yields better sense.
- 19: ^{is} ^{are} The same, except for minor differences due to the nature of Syriac and Aramaic. De Lagarde reads מִכְּרִיתָא instead of מִכְּרִיתָא making the word the same as the corresponding Syriac word. This is the only way that it makes sense.
- 20: Verses ^{are} similar with minor differences.
- 21: T. and S. are almost identical. As a translation of the Hebrew הוֹמִיּוֹת, "noisy streets," T. should perhaps read בְּרִיתָא "streets" instead of בְּרִיתָא "palaces." Jastrow makes this suggestion: This emendation בְּרִיתָא is a definite Syriacism or at least under some Syriac influence.

- 22: T. and S.^{are} somewhat similar, except for the beginning.
 שְׁבוּתָא in T. as a translation of the Hebrew שְׁבוּתָא occurs only
 in Proverbs according to J. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch and is
 the same as the Syriac שְׁבוּתָא. For Hebrew שְׁבוּתָא, T.
 gives מְסִיחָא and the S. rendering מְסִיחָא.
- 23: T. and S. differ considerably here. The style, however,
 is the same--only the vocabulary varying.
- 24: T. and S.^{are} similar. ^{There are} No definite Syriacisms. ^{The} Differences ^{are}
 purely in use of words; ^{the} style ^{is} almost identical.
- 25: T. and S. have same style and word order, but use
 different vocabulary.
- 26: T. and S.^{are} similar in style.
- 27: T. and S. differ considerably in words and style. T.
 better than S. stylistically and also more accurate.
- 28: The text of De Lagarde ^{is} more accurate than the usual
 editions of T. ^(2nd) indicates the possibility of many Syriacisms.
 T. and S.^{are} very similar here. Syriacisms: 1) נְקִרְוָנִי
 2) נִשְׁכָּחֵנִי . Both of which begin with nun instead of
 yodh.
- 29: T. and S.^{are} almost identical, ^{there} being slight
 differences in word usage.
- 30: T. and S.^{are} almost alike in style and language.
- 31: T. and S.^{are} almost alike in style and language.
- 32: T. and S.^{are} almost identical word for word.
- 33: T. and S.^{are} similar in style, but the words differ somewhat.
 There are definite Syriacisms here: In T. נִשְׁרָא, beginning with nun
 instead of yodh is a Syriacism, and so is נִשְׁרָא as well.

Chapter II

- 1: T. and S.^{drē} almost the same, except at the very end, where T. has גלבר' and S. גלבר.
- 2: T. and S.^{drē} Almost the same, except at the very end. T. has לביונה and S. לסוכלא.
- 3: The a part of verse is differently interpreted, T. translating-- and you will call understanding "mother," whereas S. renders simply,-- "you will call for understanding." Otherwise, the words are the same, and the b part is rendered similarly in both T. and S.. S. follows a text which would read in Hebrew כִּי אֵם, "but" or "unless" instead of כִּי אֵם, as T. interprets. S. follows the present Hebrew text, T. a different one.
- 4: T. and S. are the same except for one word.
- 5: T. and S.^{drē} mostly similar in style, but vary slightly in one place. T. reads וידעתא מן קדם אלהא תשכח, "And you will find wisdom from before God;" the S. reads simply ותשכח ידעתא דאלהא, "you will find the knowledge of God."
- 6: T. and S.^{drē} almost same. S. has מריא and סוכלא, T. has מריא and מריא.
- 7: T. and S. differ in style in a part, S. being simpler and better than T. T. and S.^{drē} almost identical in b part.
- 8: T. and S.^{drē} very similar, there being a slight variation in the T., a part, וננ at end of b part of verse is same as the S. וננ, and is a definite Syriacism since it begins with nun instead of yodh.
- 9: T. and S.^{drē} similar in style, differing greatly, however, in vocabulary.

10. T. and S.^{are} almost the same. However, at beginning, T. has ^{ארי}, "behold" and S. has ^{כך}, "when."
11. T. and S. differ greatly. T. translates better and more succinctly.
12. Following de Lagarde rather than the usual editions of T., and reading ^{אחרי} as a translation of Hebrew ^{תהפכות} (which, indeed, is better), T. and S. thus amended are the same except that S. uses the plural rather than the singular in the b part.
13. T. and S.^{are} similar in style. S. uses singular rather than plural as in T. Different words are used.
14. T. and S.^{are} almost the same, -minor differences.
15. T. and S. are absolutely the same.
16. T. and S. differ in style. S.^s simpler and shorter, but not so accurately translated as is T., if we follow present Hebrew Text.
17. T. and S. are almost identical. De Lagarde text, better here, reads ^{אחרי} with the Syriac, instead of ^{אחרי} as in the regular T. text.
18. T. and S. vary greatly, Due, perhaps, to fact that each translated from a different text.
19. T. and S.^{are} similar in style but vary greatly in words.
20. T. and S. vary greatly here. May be due to different texts, or may be just different interpretations of same text.
21. T. and S.^{are} similar in style, but use different words. ^{אחרי} instead of ^{אחרי}, as de Lagarde suggests, is the same as the Syriac ^{אחרי} and is a definite Syriacism, the word ^{אחרי} "to dwell" being used much more in Syriac than Aramaic.
22. T. and S. vary considerably. However, the forms ^{אחרי}

and נתעקרן, beginning as they do with nun instead of yodh,
are under Syriac influence.

Chapter III

- 1: ^{There are} Considerable differences in T. and S.
- 2: The two reditions, T. and S., are almost the same, except for one word, the T. reading ^{יוסף}, and the S. reading ^{נתחוספון}. The nun instead of yodh at the beginning of ^{יוסף}, marks it as a Syriacism. De Lagarde's reading of ^{יוסף} instead of ^{יוסף} as in the ordinary text of T. is identical with the Syriac ^{יוסף}. Both are a translation of the Hebrew ^{אור}, "length."
- 3: There are some differences in the a part of the T. and S. The b parts of the verse, however, are very similar. The word ^{יוסף} in the a part of the T., using a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism. It is identical with the corresponding Syriac form.
- 4: ^{is} T. a bit longer than the S. There are some differences in vocabulary. However, the b parts of T. and S. are just about identical.
- 5: ^{is} Style: the same in T. and S., however, the choice of words shows considerable difference.
- 6: ^{There are} / Some stylistic differences in T. and S., but the choice of words is just about the same.
- 7: Both T. and S. use almost the same words. However, there are stylistic differences. S. is clearer, and longer.
- 8: ^{are} T. and S. / similar, except for one word. In translating the Hebrew ^{לשרך}, "thy navel," the T. renders it as ^{לכונשרך}, "thy navel," whereas S. renders it as ^{לבשרך}, "to thy flesh."
- 9: The a parts of T. and S. differ in vocabulary. The b parts are almost the same.

- 10: All but the last two words of T. and S. ^{are} almost the same. The reading of de Lagarde of שבע for שבעות makes it identical with the S. שבע. The T. נשפט beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is definitely a Syriacism, in spite of the fact that the corresponding word in the S. is נבע.
- 11: The a parts of both T. and S. are very similar. There are great discrepancies in the vocabularies of the b parts.
- 12: The T. and S. are almost identical.
- 13: The a parts of both T. and S. are identical. However, there is considerable difference in the interpretation, words, and style in the b part. The S. shows finer style. Both T. and S. seem to have had a different text than the one we have at present, in the b part.
- 14: T. and S. ^{are} almost identical. S. adds, in b part, the word עללתה before מיתר. This is not found in T., and it is the only difference between T. and S.
- 15: T. and S. ^{are} almost identical, except that S. inserts גיר between ה' א and בין.
- 16: Accepting the de Lagarde reading of נוגדא for נוגדא the T. and S. are identical word for word.
- 17: Words are identical in T. and S., but there is a slight variation in style.
- 18: ^{is} Style in T. and S. similar, but different words are used in the two for the same idea.
- 19: There are a few differences in T. and S. in style and words.
- 20: The a part of both T. and S. are identical, except for word order. There is a great difference in the b part.

- 20: (con't) The T. reads, in its b part . ושלם עמי בטל
 The S. reads, in its b part . ופני רמי טל. Jastrow, in
 his Dictionary of the Talmud, suggests, on the bottom of page 1484
 and top page 1485 that the whole b part of the T. be changed to
. ופני רמי טל. This makes better sense than the regular T.
 or than the deLagarde reading. If Jastrow's reading be accepted,
 then both T. and S. are almost alike throughout the verse. Even
 if Jastrow's emendation is not accepted, it must be admitted that
 the regular T. is difficult, and some light may be shed upon the
 original reading of T. by the text of S.
- 21: The vocabulary of T. and S. varies a bit here. The
 style varies a little, likewise, the T. using the imperative . ופני
 and the S. the infinitive Peal . ללכ. The form in T. . נל,
 beginning with a nun, instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism.
 The corresponding form in the S. . נל, is identically the same.
- 23: The vocabulary of T. and S. the same. There are some
 differences in style.
- 24: The vocabulary in T. and S. is the same. The word order
 is different. The S. follows the word order of the Hebrew text,
 and the T. changes it. The S. is clearer than T. and more
 accurate.
- 25: Both T. and S. are similar in style. S. interprets
 the Hebrew text a bit more freely. The de Lagarde reading of . ופני
 for . ופני in the regular T. must be maintained, because it alone
 makes sense. It is also similar to the corresponding S. reading
. ופני, and has a similar meaning.
- 27: T. and S. ^{are} somewhat similar in vocabulary, but there are
 differences in style.

28: There is some similarity in language and style between T. and S. in first part. However, there are discrepancies in the b part.

29: ^{There is} / Some similarity between T. and S. in vocabulary. However, the style differs greatly.

31: The b parts of T. and S. are somewhat the same, the a parts differ considerably.

34: Both T. and S. are very similar in the a part. The verb נסחוף, in the T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical in consonants with the S. form נסחוף.

35: T. and S. are similar in style but differ in vocabulary. נחסכן in the T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh is a definite Syriacism, even if the corresponding S. form is נחרתן. נקבלן in the T with a nun at the beginning instead of a yodh is a definite Syriacism, and is similar to the corresponding Syriac form נקבלן.

Chapter IV

- 1: The a parts of both T. and S. are similar, but there are great differences in vocabulary in the b part.
- 2: The T. and S. are identical here.
- 3: ^חVocabulary ^יidentical in T. and S. There are some differences in style, however.
- 4: The first and last parts of T. and S. are similar in style and vocabulary (parts a and c). The middle parts (b parts) of T. and S. differ in style and vocabulary.
- 5: The T. and S. are almost identical in style and vocabulary the only major difference~~x~~ being that the T. uses **בִּינָא** for the Hebrew **בִּינָה**, whereas the S uses **סוכלא**.
- 6: The T. and S. are very similar in style and vocabulary. However, at the very end, the T. uses **לתשגבין** as a translation of **ותצר**, whereas the S. uses **דתשוזבך**.
- 7: Both T. and S. almost identical, except for the very last words. Hebrew **בִּינָה**, the last word, is rendered as **בִּינָא** in T. and as **סוכלא** in S.
- 8: Both T. and S. almost the same in style and vocabulary. There is one difference, however. For Hebrew **תחבִּקְנָה**, T. has **ותפקיה**, and S has **וחבִּקְיָה**.
- 10: Both T. and S. almost identical. Hebrew **אמר** is rendered as **חני** in T. and as **מלי** in S. Inasmuch as the T. translation of **אמר** doesn't make much sense, it were perhaps best to emend it to read as the rendition ³"מלי." Were this done, the verse in both T. and S. would be identical. **נסגין** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in S. **נסגין**.

- 11: T. and S. are almost identical.
- 14: T. and S. show considerable similarity in style and vocabulary. The difficult form סות as a translation of the Hebrew סוּחַ occurs both in T. and S.
- 15: The last part of verse 15 seems to be tacked onto the beginning of verse 16 in the S. The style of the last part of T. 15, and this added first part of S verse 16 are very similar in style and vocabulary. As for the rest of verse 16, there are many similarities in style and vocabulary between T. and S.
- 17: There is great similarity in style between T. and S., but the vocabulary throughout varies greatly.
- 18: The style in T. and S. is identical, but the vocabulary varies somewhat. Some of the words, especially the verbs, are the same in T. and S., however.
- 19: The style of T. and S. similar in a part of verse, but the vocabulary varies somewhat. The vocabulary of S. is simpler. In the b part of the verses, both T. and S. are almost identical both in style and in vocabulary.
- 21: Exc opt for differences in the nature of the languages, the T. and S. are just about the same here. נעל in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding Syriac form, which is נעל .
- 22: In the a part of the verse, the T. and S. are just about identical in style and vocabulary, except that the S. takes an indirect object (stylistic for a direct object) after נשפח , whereas the T. takes a direct object. The b part of T. and S. are alike in vocabulary, but the T. apparently follows the present Hebrew text, whereas the S. follows a text which would read in

Hebrew גל בשרו מרפא .

- 23: The a parts of T. and S. are similar, except that the T. apparently uses the present Hebrew text, and the S. uses a text which would read in Hebrew ככל כשומר נטור לבך . The b parts of T. and S. are absolutely identical.
- 24: The a parts of T. and S. are the same in vocabulary and somewhat alike in style. The b parts of T. and S., though stating the same thing, differ both in vocabulary and style.
- 25: The T. and S. are somewhat similar in vocabulary and style. נאמן in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding word in the S., נחורן . נתרצון in the T. beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and, indeed, is consonantly the same as the corresponding Syriac form נתרצון .
- 26: The T. and S. are identical in the a part, both in style and in the use of vocabulary. Both seem to translate from a text which would read in Hebrew העבר רגלך מן ארחות רעות , instead of from the Hebrew text which we have, which reads פלס מעגל רגלך . The b parts of T. and S. are almost identical in style and in use of vocabulary. The S, however, adds the word אל at the beginning of the b part of the verse.

Chapter V

- 2: Except for minor differences, which result from the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages, T. and S. are identical here.
 נוסר in the T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is identical with the corresponding form in the S., נוסר.
- 4: The vocabulary used in both T. and S. is almost identical word for word,---that is, taking into account the differences between Aramaic and Syriac. However, there are some minor differences in style in T. and S.
- 5: The vocabulary used in T. and S. is almost identical, again taking into account the differences between Aramaic and Syriac. However, there are some slight differences in style.
- 6: There is some similarity in style between T. and S. However, they differ widely in use of vocabulary.
- 7: Except that the T. uses ושתא for the Hebrew ושתה, and the S. uses שתה, the T. and S. are identical. Of course, this takes into account the differences resulting from the nature of Syriac and Aramaic.
- 8: The T. and S. are almost identical. The only difference is that one form in the T. is תקר, in the Taaal, and the corresponding form in the S. is תתקריב, in the Ethpaal.
- 10: T. and S. are almost identical, again taking into account the differences in the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
 נשבט in the T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is, practically speaking, almost the same as the corresponding Syriac form, נשבט.

- 12: T. and S. are identical, except that, in rendering the Hebrew ^אאִי, the T. reads הִכְנָה, whereas the S. reads לִמְנָה גִּיר. The reading of de Lagarde, of אִסְלִי for אִשְׁלִי is preferable, because it makes better sense and is the same as the corresponding Syriac form.
- 13: T. and S. almost identical in style, with minor differences in choice of words. For Hebrew מוֹרִי T. has מוֹרִית and S. has מוֹלֶנִי. For Hebrew מוֹלֶמֶד T. has מוֹלֶפֶנִי, and S. has מוֹשֶׁעֶנִי.
- 14: T. and S. read same word for word, except that S. adds הוֹא for style between קָלִיל and קוֹיִת.
- 15: T. and S. almost the same in style, except that for Hebrew בּוֹר T. uses בּוֹר and S. uses בּוֹר, and that for Hebrew בּוֹר T. uses בּוֹר and S. uses מוֹרִין.
- 16: T. and S. differ considerably here in style and language. However נִשְׁפָּע in T, beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is in the Peal, and not in the Ethpeal as the corresponding S. form נִשְׁתַּפֵּעוֹן.
- 17: T. and S. ^{are} identical in word order, style, and vocabulary. There are minor ^{variations} ~~variations~~ due to differences arising from the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages. נִשְׁתַּפֵּעוֹן in T, beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is somewhat similar to the corresponding form in the S, נִשְׁתַּפֵּעוֹן.
- 18: T. and S. ^{are} identical throughout in style and vocabulary. However there is a slight difference between T. and S. in word order in the a part.
- 19: T. and S. differ considerably here in ~~language~~ style and vocabulary.
- 20: T. and S. are very similar in style, but differ in choice

of vocabulary.

- 21: T. and S. are identical in style and choice of vocabulary, there being slight variations due to the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. However, there is a different word order in the a parts.
- 22: The a parts of T. and S. are similar in style, but not in choice of language. However, the b parts of T. and S. are identical. De Lagarde's emendation of נתפכך in the regular text of T. read נתפכך is in accord with the Syriac reading, and is a more accurate translation of the Hebrew יתכר. This form נתפכך, beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and, of course, is identical with the corresponding form in S, נתפכך.
- 23: There is some similarity between T. and S. in style and language, but it is not at all striking. However, the form 'עס in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is in the Peal instead of the Ethpeal, as is the corresponding form in the S., נתעס.

Chapter VI

- 1: T. and S. are the same except for minor differences resulting from the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 2: T. and S. show similarity in style and language, especially in the a part. The b part of T. and S. varies little.
- 3: T. and S. show some similarity in the a part, though S. makes an addition not found in current Hebrew text. In the b parts, T. and S. differ considerably.
- 4: T. and S. show some similarity in style and language. There are some differences, however. For example, for the Hebrew
מן, T. has מן, and S. has מן.
- 5: T. and S. are absolutely the same.
- 6: T. and S. are the same in the first three words of the a part. However, T. and S. differ somewhat afterwards. It seems that S. includes in this verse part of what is, in the present Hebrew text, verse 7.
- 7: T. and S. differ considerably here.
- 8: T. and S. similar in style, but differ somewhat in vocabulary.
- 9: T. and S. show some similarity in style and language, though it is not striking.
- 10: T. and S. show some slight similarity. However, in the b part, S. does not seem to be a literal translation of the present Hebrew Text.
- 11: T. and S. show some similarity, especially in vocabulary. However, the word order and style differ somewhat in T. and S.
- 13: T. and S. are identical except for minor differences due to nature of Syriac and Aramaic languages.

- 14: T. and S. almost identical in a parts, but in b part S. differs considerably from T. It is possible that this difference is due to the fact that S makes a slight addition.
- 15: T. and S. ^{ave} identical except ~~that~~ at the very beginning, where, for Hebrew לכן, T. has לטול היכנא, and S. has דטול הנא. נית in T. beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is almost identically the same as the corresponding form in the S. מתנר. נית in T., likewise, beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is but slightly different than the corresponding form in the S., מתנר.
- 16: T. and S. are absolutely identical in vocabulary, but there are some slight~~ly~~ variations in style.
- 17: T. and S. have the same style and word order, but there are some variations in vocabulary. For instance, for Hebrew לשון שקר, T. has לישנא דשקרא, whereas S. has לשנא דגלא.
- 18: T. and S. have the same style in a part, but differ~~ences~~ in vocabulary. In b part, T. and S. are identical.
- 19: T. and S. have ~~some~~ differences in vocabulary and style, which, however, are by no means striking.
- 20: Adopting the more sensible reading of de Lagarde of נילוס for ננידוס in T, T. and S. are absolutely identical except for differences which arise from the very nature of Aramaic and Syriac.
- 21: T. and S. vary considerably in style and vocabulary in a part, though obviously following same original text. In b part, however, T. and S. are absolutely identical.

- 22: It is striking to note here that T. and S. vary tremendously in style and vocabulary, though apparently they are both translated from the a text like the present Hebrew text.
- 23: T. and S. are almost alike. However, there are some minor variations in style. For example, S. adds the particle וְ.
- 24: T. and S. are similar in the a part, but there are great differences in style and language in the b part. It seems possible that T. and S. were translated from texts with different readings in the b part.
- 26: The a part of T. and S. are similar in vocabulary, but vary a little in style. The b parts of T. and S. are identical.
- 27: The a part of T. and S. is just about identical. The b part of T. and S. varies little.
- 28: T. and S. are similar, though not strikingly so, due to variations in vocabulary, and some slight variations in style.
- 29: T. and S. are very similar both in vocabulary and style. There are, however, some slight variations in the latter. נִכְ in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נִכְ.
- 30: T. and S. vary greatly. The vocabulary in T. and S., however, bear certain striking resemblances. For example, both T. and S. begin with לֹא לִמְתַּדְמִרוּ, "let them (people) not be astonished." It is interesting to note that both T. and S. do not actually translate the present text of the Hebrew, but merely circumvent it. It is, of course, quite possible that both T. and S. translated from a different text in the Hebrew (or Septua.) as

the case may be) than the present one.

32: The a parts of T. and S. are very similar in style and vocabulary. However, the S. is shorter in the b part, and seems to have added the end of what is now verse 32 in the Hebrew onto the first part of verse 33.

34: T. and S. vary a little in style in the a part; both are identical in the b part.

35: T. and S. vary a little in style in the a part, T. reading כל ד'יב ל'ה מוחב for the Hebrew כל כפר; the S. reading simply דקורבנא. In the b part both T. and S. are almost identical.

Chapter VII

- 2: T. and S. are identical, except for minor variations due to the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 3: T. and S. are somewhat similar. However, in the a part, S. reads "bind them upon thy neck" (כרר), whereas T. reads "bind them upon thy fingers" (על מצבטתך) with the present Hebrew reading.
- 4: There are some similarities between T. and S., especially in the a part. However, they are not striking, in view of the fact that there are variants in the b part of T. and S.
- 5: The form ך ננסר in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with the corresponding form in the S, ך ננסר. However, the rest of the verse in T. and S. bear no striking resemblances.
- 9: T. and S. show slight similarities in style. However, there are some differences in language. For example, for Hebrew אפלה, T. uses חבירא (according to the corrected text by de Lagarde) and S. uses עסטינא.
- 10: T. and S. show some similarity in the a part, however with some variation in style and vocabulary. However, in the b part it seems as though a different text than the present Hebrew was the basis for translation.
- 12: It is interesting to note that the T. and S. vary considerably here.
- 13: Except for the very first word in the verse, T. and S. are just about identical. For Hebrew והחזיקה, T. has ואתק'פא, and S. has ואחד תה.
- 16: T., emended to read as de Lagarde reads it, and, as, indeed,

it must be read to make sense, is identical with the S.

- 17: T. and S. are just about identical, except for the difference in the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages, and for the fact that the S. adds a "vav" at the beginning of the verse.
- 18: T. and S. very similar in the a part. In the b part, T. and S. differ a little in vocabulary. In this b part, it may be possible that, as a translation of the Hebrew נתעלסה, T. which reads נעפק should be emended to read the same as the S. נעפק "let us embrace." This involves only the changing of one letter, and makes much better sense. Should this emendation be made, T. and S. would be practically the same in the b part.
- 19: T. and S. are identical in language, and somewhat similar in style. The word order varies, however, and the S. adds particles such as ג'ר. The S. is a clearer rendition here.
- 20: The T. and S. in the a part^{are} similar, except that for Hebrew לקח, T. reads נסב, and S. שקל. The b parts in T. and S. vary somewhat. For Hebrew ויום הכסא, T. reads וליומא דעמא, whereas S. reads וליומא הן סגומא, "after many days."
- 21: T. and S. are very similar in the a part, especially when T. is corrected according to de Lagarde's reading. However, they differ somewhat in the b part.
- 22: T. and S. are almost identical in the b part. In the a part of T. and S., there are some variations. For example, for Hebrew פתאם, T. reads שלימית "unawares" and S. reads איך שברא, "like a fool."
- 23: T. and S. identical in a part. Both vary a bit from T., and add מילא (מ'ל) "like a hart." Both read in the a part instead of like Hebrew, "like a hart whose liver an arrow hath

split."

- 25: T. and S. similar in the b parts. There are some differences between T. and S. in the a part.
- 26: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the a part. In the b part, T. and S. are identical.
- 27: There is some similarity between T. and S. in the A part, but Sig fuller, and reads as though translating from a text, the Hebrew wording of which would be דרכי שאול דרכי ב'תה , The b parts show very slight resemblances.

Chapter VIII

- 2: T. and S. show some similarity in vocabulary, but differ somewhat in style.
- 3: T. and S. are almost alike. The only important difference is that T. adds **דכרכא** "of the city" in the b part, between **תניע** and **משתבחא**. It is interesting to note that both T. and S. render the difficult Hebrew **תיונה** as **משתבחא ומלרא**.
- 4: T. and S. are similar in style and vocabulary, but not strikingly so.
- 5: T. and S. differ considerably, and may have been translated from manuscripts which read differently. However, **נסתכלון** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with what must be the corresponding form in the S, **נסתכלון**.
- 6: T. and S. identical in vocabulary, and extremely similar in style. This difference in style is due to the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 7: T. and S. show some similarity in the a part. In the b parts, T. and S. differ considerably, but probably translated from the same, or very similar texts.
- 8: T. and S. are almost alike, the differences arising mostly because of the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 9: T. and S. show some slight similarities in vocabulary, but differ somewhat in literary style.
- 10: T. and S. are almost identical, except that S. adds one word in the b part, **טב**, between **דעתא** and **סן**. There are also other minor differences which result from the very nature of Syriac and Aramaic.
- 11: T. and S. show considerable similarity. However, in

the a part, T. seems to have an addition, perhaps to have translated from a different wording than S., a wording that would read in Hebrew כִּי טוֹב חֲכָמָה מִמְּחֹךְ וּבִמְנָח וּמִפְּנִינִים.

The vocabulary in T. and S. are just about identical throughout.

- 12: Reading with de Lagarde, T. and S. are identical in the a part. However, the regular T. in the a part is a better translation of the present Hebrew text, for Hebrew שְׂכִנְתִּי is the same as T. דְּרִית. The b parts of T. and S. are not alike.

- 13: T. and S. identically the same except that for Hebrew יְהוָה, T. reads אלהם and S. reads דְּרִית. Of course, there are other minor differences due to the nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.

- 14: T. and S. show some slight similarities, though by no means striking. T. in its a part is almost the same as the corresponding a part of S. The T. c part is identical with the b part of S, when T. is properly corrected, as in the de Lagarde text, which reads סִימָה instead of סִימָה (which makes no sense). However, T. has a b part not found in S., וּסְן דְּחֵבָה אוּבִירִינִין, which seems to be a translation of the present Hebrew וּמִפְּנִי.

- 20: T. and S. are identical taking into account the fact that the Hebrew צִדְקָה in T. is צִדְקָה and in S. is צִדְקוֹתָא.

- 21: T. and S. show similarities. However, for Hebrew יֵשׁ, "substance," T. has שְׁנֵי סְגִימָתָא "many years," and S. has סְבֵרָא "hope." Otherwise, T. and S. read the same word for word.

- 22: T. and S. show almost identical except for the very last word. For Hebrew וְיָדָה, T. reads דְּרִישׁ, and S. reads כְּלָהוֹן.

- 23: T. and S. show some similarity, both in vocabulary and style.

- 24: T. and S. are identical in a part. S. is much simpler in b part, and may be translated from a different original text than T. ܢܗܢ in the a and b parts of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, are definite Syriacisms, and are identically the same as the corresponding forms in the S, which are also ܢܗܢ.
- 25: T. and S. differ considerably, but apparently had the same or similar texts, to translate from. However ܢܗܢ in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, although it differs from the corresponding form in the S.
- 26: T. and S. almost identical, differing only in slight details.
- 27: T. and S. show some similarities, though not striking ones.
- 28: T. and S. show some similarities, though by no means striking ones.
- 29: T. and S. show some very slight similarities.
- 31: T. and S. identical in a part. There are minor differences in the b part.
- 32: T. and S. are somewhat different in a part, though both say the same thing. T. and S. are identical in the b part.
- 33: T. and S. are identical in the a part. T. and S. differ in vocabulary in the b part.
- 34: T. and S. differ somewhat, but say just about the same thing. However, ܢܗܢ, beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S.
- 35: T. and S. differ somewhat in the a part, but they are very similar in the b part.

Chapter IX

- 1: T. and S. show some similarity in style, but differ in vocabulary a little.
- 2: T. and S. the same, except that for Hebrew ערכה, T. reads סדרה, and S. reads טיבת. There are other minor differences, due to the differences in the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 3: T. and S. only slightly similar. However, the form נקרין (an emendation by de Lagarde, ---the regular T. reads תוקרין) beginning with a nun instead of a yodh is a definite Syriacism, and is similar to the corresponding form in the S., נקרין.
- 4: T. and S. are almost identical, word for word. נמחא in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נמחא.
- 5: T. and S. extremely similar. There are minor differences, due to the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. However, T. reads חסרת, and S. reads סתן חסרי.
- 6: T. and S. somewhat the same in the a part, but vary somewhat in the b part.
- 8: T. and S. almost the same. נרחמך and נסניך in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, are definitely Syriacisms, are identically the same as the corresponding forms in the S., נרחמך and נסניך.
- 11: T. and S. the same in the a part, and somewhat similar in the b part. נסגמון in T. (as emended by de Lagarde), beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is almost the same as the corresponding form in the S., נסגון.
- 12: T. and S. vary greatly. S. seems to give a full dissertation here, of fully eight lines.

- 13-14: T. and S. differ considerably. S. runs 13 and 14 together.
- 15: T. and S. almost the same.
- 16: T. and S. very similar. **NON** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S. **NON**.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a part, and are similar in the b part, differing here in vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. somewhat similar. The Syriac, however, makes addition of five lines that is not found in T., perhaps in the nature of sermonizing.

Chapter X

- 1: T. and S. show some slight similarity in style and vocabulary in the a part. However, though there is some similarity in style in the b parts of T. and S., the vocabulary varies somewhat. 'נחד' in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is not the same as the corresponding form in the S., 'סחל'. It is interesting to note that the S. leaves out the superscription, כשלוי דשלומו.
- 2: T. and S. differ somewhat in style in the a part, but the b parts are rather similar.
- 3: T. and S. very similar in style and vocabulary in the a parts, the differences being of only minor import. In the b parts, they (T. and S.) are similar in vocabulary, but vary a little in style. The form נסחף in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is not the same as the corresponding form in the S., סחף.
- 4: If S. were to add the word מ'רס at the end of its a part, T. and S. would be identical in this part. In the b part, the vocabulary of T. and S. is the same, but there is a very minor variation in style.
- 5: It might be said by some that T. and S. are absolutely identical in this verse. However, upon close observation, it will be noted that there is a very slight difference in word order.
- 6: T. and S. are the same in a part, except that T. uses the plural throughout, and S. uses the singular. In the b parts, there is some slight difference in vocabulary and style. However, the form 'סס in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is the same as the corresponding

form in the S. נכס.

- 7: T. and S. differ a little in vocabulary, but the meaning is the same. However, the form נדער in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh is a definite Syriacism, and is identically the same as the corresponding form in the S., נדער.
- 8: T. and S. are identically the same in the a parts. They are also very similar in the b parts, but for the Hebrew מיל שפתיך T. has סכלא בשפותיה, and S. has דששן שפותיה.
- 9: T. and S. alike in the a part, except that for the Hebrew חט, T. uses חטא, whereas S. uses חטא. T. and S. are identical in the b part. The form ניל, in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is not the same as the corresponding form in the S., אל. The form, נתידע, beginning also with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נתידע.
- 10: T. and S. are almost alike in the a parts, except that S. adds one word for style. However, T. and S. vary considerably in the b parts.
- 11: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ a little in the b parts. However, נכס in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identically the same as the corresponding form in the S., נכס.
- 12: T. and S. show some similarity in the a part, except that for Hebrew קדנך, T. reads תגיר, and S. reads ג'ד. T. and S. differ considerably, T. reading with the present Hebrew "but love covereth all transgressions," whereas S. reads "but shame (בהתא) covereth all transgressions,"

- 13: T. and S. vary considerably,---must have translated from originals that varied greatly, or else interpreted the same verse much differently.
- 14: T. and S. absolutely identical in a parts,---however, there is some difference in language and style in the b parts. ܡܫܢ in the a part of the T. beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identically the same as the corresponding form in the S.,--- ܡܫܢ.
- 15: T. and S. are almost the same in the a part. They differ slightly in vocabulary in the b part.
- 16: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts. In the b parts, they are also similar, but for the Hebrew שׁוּן, T. reads שׁוּן and S. reads שׁוּן.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a part, but seem to translate a little differently in the b part.
- 18: T. and S. are identical in the a part, except that for Hebrew קָשׁ, T. has קָשׁ and S. has קָשׁ. In the b part, both T. and S. say the same thing, but differ quite a bit in style and vocabulary.
- 19: T. and S. differ somewhat in the a part. However, in the b part, they are the same,--- that is, taking into account the differences between the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 20: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a part,--- in the b part, however, there are differences. For the Hebrew שׁוּן T. has שׁוּן "deficiency", and S reads שׁוּן "bitterness".
- 21: T. and S. differ in the a part, in fact, give different renditions. However, they are almost alike in the b part.. The form שׁוּן in the b part of the de Lagarde reading (regular

reading is (**נְסוּת**) in beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is identically the same with the corresponding form in the S., **נְסוּת**.

22: T. and S. are slightly similar, though not strikingly so. The form **נְסוּת** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in S. is **נְסוּת** is by no means the same.

23: T. and S. are but slightly similar. In the b part, S. is translated from a text which would read in Hebrew **לְאִישׁ חֲבוּתוֹ** whereas T. reads like the present Hebrew.

24: T. and S. vary greatly here.

25: T. and S. vary considerably here. However, the form **נְסוּת** (or **נְסוּת** according to de Lagarde) beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is not the same as the corresponding form in the S.

27: T. and S. are similar in the a parts. The b parts differ. The form **נְסוּת** in the b part, however, beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is by no means the same as the corresponding form in the S., **נְסוּת**.

28: T. and S. are almost identical, except that for Hebrew **נְסוּת**, T. has **נְסוּת** whereas S. has **נְסוּת**. The form **נְסוּת** in the T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S. **נְסוּת**.

29: T. and S. are almost identical in the a part,-- but differ in the b part, though they say the same thing here. The form **נְסוּת** in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.

- 30: T. and S. ~~are~~ almost identical in the a parts but differ in the b parts, though they say the same thing there. The form ܘܕܪܝܢ in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܘܕܪܝܢ.
- 31: T. and S. vary a little in vocabulary in the a parts, but are almost identical in the b parts. The form ܘܕܪܝܢ in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S. ܘܕܪܝܢ.
- 32: T. and S. show some slight similarities, though they differ in style and vocabulary.

Chapter XI

- 1: T. and S. show some slight similarities, especially in vocabulary.
- 3: Though T. and S. are by no means similar, the forms נ and נ in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, as they do, are definite Syriacisms.
- 4: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, though for Hebrew T. has ה and S has ה. T. and S. have less striking similarities in their b parts.
- 5: Let it be understood before any comment is made that in the T., verses 5 and 6 are to be reversed (this reversal of the verses is substantiated by the Syriac). Hence my comment here shall be on what is numbered verse 6 in T.
T. and S. are identical in their a parts, and differ only in vocabulary in the b part.
- 6: In consequence of what I have stated in verse 5, I am now quoting on what is numbered verse 5 in T.
T. and S. are almost alike in the a part, differing just in one word. In the b parts, they show some less striking similarities.
- 7: T. and S. show some similarities, which are by no means striking.
- 9: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts--almost identical except for one word. They are also somewhat similar in their b parts.
- 10: T. and S. show quite a few similarities here.
- 11: T. and S. show some similarities here,---though they are not outstanding.

- 12: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ considerably in style in the b parts.
- 13: T. and S. show similarities in the a parts, and are almost identical in the b parts.
- 14: T. and S. differ quite a bit in interpretation, but are somewhat similar in vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. vary considerably in style and interpretation here. However, there is some similarity in vocabulary.
- 16: T. and S. vary tremendously here. S. almost sermonizes.
- 17: T. and S. vary tremendously here, though they apparently say the same thing.
- 18: T. and S. are identical in the a part, except for one word. For the Hebrew קרי, T. has קריש, whereas S. has מחש "of deceit." Adopting the corrected reading of de Lagard e rather than the regular reading (which is indeed a wise course), both T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 19: T. and S. vary much here, S. having a much simpler reading.
- 20: T. and S. vary a little here, T. reading from an original text which doesn't have the present Hebrew קרי (T. reading just "upright", instead of "upright in their way") S., however seems to follow the present Hebrew very closely. There are also some differences in vocabulary.
- 21: Both T. and S. seem to read from a different text than the present Hebrew in the a part. T. and S. are almost identical in this a part. In the b parts, T. and S. are almost the same, too, but differ slightly in vocabulary.

T. and S. are identical throughout,---the only differences resulting from the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.

23: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. In the b parts, T. and S. differ only in that for Hebrew רשעים T., uses 'ר'ש' whereas S. uses מ'ש'ל, and in that there are minor differences resulting from the Aramaic and Syriac languages.

24: T. and S. vary considerably,---it may be possible that S. translated from a text worded much differently than the present Hebrew.

25: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but very dissimilar in the b parts.

26: T. and S. are almost identical in the a part. Both T. and S. here give a translation that is different than the present Hebrew,---or, at least, is a circumvention or explanation of the present Hebrew. The form נשבק'יה in this a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., נשבק'יה. In the b parts, T. and S. are very similar, except that S. is fuller, reading "and a blessing shall be upon the head of the one who sells grain."

27: T. and S. show some similarities, which, however, are by no means striking.

28: T. and S. are somewhat similar, differing a little in vocabulary.

29: T. and S. are ^{dis}/similar in the a parts, S. either translating from another text than the present Hebrew, or

sermonizing and circumventing. S. is much fuller.

In the b parts, T. and S. are almost identical.

30: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, except for minor differences due to the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. However, in the b parts, they differ considerably, even interpret differently.

31: T. and S. differ somewhat, though, in the a parts, there is a slight similarity in vocabulary.



Chapter XIII

- 1: T. and S. are similar in their a parts, the major differences being that T. uses ת for "whose", whereas S. uses merely ך. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are similar in the a part, differing but slightly in vocabulary. נתן in T. (an Ethpeal form) beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נתן. T. and S. are almost the same in the b parts, the only difference being that T. reads טקרתין דעדי'ן, whereas S. reads simply טקרא דעדי'ן. The form ננוץ in T.b, beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננוץ.
- 4: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, but differ considerably in the b parts.
- 5: T. and S. are very similar in their a parts, but differ considerably in their b parts.
- 6: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary, and are absolutely identical in their b parts.
- 7: T. and S. are very similar in the a part, differing but slightly in vocabulary (עולא for רשיע). The forms נשתנחין and נתהפכין in the a part of T., beginning as they do with a nun instead of a yodh, are definite Syriacisms, and are the same as the corresponding forms in the S., (נשתנחין and נתהפכין).

- 8: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are similar in vocabulary, but vary somewhat in style.
- 9: T. and S. vary tremendously in style and vocabulary, though they say the same thing.
- 10: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, except that S. adds מין between וד' and נפשא. However, T. and S. vary considerably in the b parts.
- 11: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts,--the only major difference being that T. has יסב and S. has נסב. In the b parts, likewise, T. and S. are very similar, the only difference being that for Hebrew וסרף, T. has ודרף, whereas S. has ודרף (in the a part, the reading of de Lagarde, rather than the regular T., should be maintained).
- 12: T. and S. differ considerably. However, the form נתק' in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, although it is by no means the same as the corresponding form in the S., נשח.
- 13: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts. In the b parts, T. and S. are identical except for very minor differences which arise from the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 14: T. and S. show some slight, though by no means striking, similarities.
- 15: Adopting the more sensible reading of de Lagarde (וסר' instead of וסר'), T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing^{only} in that for Hebrew נח, T. has נח and S. has נח. In the b parts, T. and S. differ only in that they use different words for "to hide".

- 17: T. and S. vary considerably, though they both say the same thing. However, the form נִתְּנִי in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is מַלְלִי.
- 18: T. and S. are absolutely the same, except for the addition of the word נִתְּנִי in the b part of S. (This is, of course, adopting the reading of de Lagarde in the a part, reading מִן מַלְלִי דְּמַלְלִי rather than מִן מַלְלִי).
- 19: T. and S. show some slight, though by no means striking similarities. Both, at least in the b part, vary with the present Hebrew.
- 20: T. and S. vary considerably in the a parts. However, in the b parts, T. and S. are almost identical, varying but slightly in vocabulary.
- 21: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts,-- both having the same false translation of the present Hebrew, or a different translation based on a different text than the present Hebrew. In the b parts, T. and S. are likewise similar, differing but slightly in vocabulary.
- 22: T. and S. show some slight similarities. There are some differences in vocabulary, however.
- 23: T. and S. differ considerably, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~
In the a part, S. translates as though the Hebrew text were אָדָם עָרַם כְּנֶסֶף (נֶסֶף) דַּעַת rather than אָדָם עָרַם כְּנֶסֶף דַּעַת.
Throughout this verse, T. makes better sense than S.
- 25: T. and S. show some similarities, especially in vocabulary.

26: T. and S. differ, T. reading in the a part like the present Hebrew, and S. yielding the same as the J.P.S. translation. In the b parts of T. and S., there are some slight similarities.

27: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts. There are differences in the b parts, however. The form  in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with the corresponding form in the S., .

28: T. and S. are absolutely identical (adopting the more sensible reading of de Lagarde for T.).

Chapter XIII

- 2: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, but differ considerably in the b parts. The form נבוכד in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נבוכ.
- 3: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, but differ considerably in style and language in the b parts.
- 4: T. and S. vary considerably in the a parts, but are quite similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary.
- 5: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, except that they differ in word order. In the b parts, T. and S. are likewise very similar, differing but slightly in vocabulary. The forms נבוח and נחפר, in the b part of T., beginning as they do with a nun instead of a yodh, are definite Syriacisms, and are the same as the corresponding forms in the S., נבוח and נחפר.
- 6: T. and S. are very similar, almost identical in the a parts, but differ somewhat in the b parts.
- 7: T. and S. are about identical in the a parts, but they vary somewhat in the b parts.
- 8: T. and S. are similar in vocabulary, but not in thought, in the a parts, S., following the present Hebrew, makes better sense. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts.
- 9: T. and S. are identical throughout, except that in the b parts, for the Hebrew דרש'ע, T. reads רש'ע, whereas S. reads ד'עולא. נרז and נדעך in T., beginning

as they do with a nun instead of a yodh, are definite Syriacisms, and are the same as the corresponding forms in the S., נִרְוֶן and נִדְעָן.

- 10: T. and S. vary greatly in the a parts, T. slavishly translating from the present Hebrew, and S. circumventing and explaining. T. and S. are identical in the b parts, however.
- 12: T. and S. show considerable similarity in the a part. S. makes better sense than T., reading "One who begins to help himself is better than (וְ) one who depends on hope." T. reads וְ in this place, which word does not make sense. T. and S. are identical in the b parts, except for a slight variation in the word order.
- 13: T. and S. are almost identical in their a parts, but differ in interpretation in the b parts. נִתְחַבֵּל in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the corresponding form in the S., נִתְחַבֵּל. Incidentally, S. does a great deal of commenting and sermonizing in the b part of נִתְחַבֵּל similar in the a parts.
- 14: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, S., however, translating from a text that had תּוֹרַת הַכֹּהֵן rather than the present Hebrew תּוֹרַת הַכֹּהֵן. T. and S. differ somewhat in the b parts, although using the same vocabulary. S. apparently tries to interpret the Hebrew text into clearer language.
- 15: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. use different styles, though both say essentially the same thing.
- 17: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts, both using the

word **ܡܠܝܬܐ** for "messenger".

- 19: T. and S. show some essential similarities in language and style, which, however, are not striking.
- 20: T. and S. are rather similar in the a parts. **ܡܠܝܬܐ** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding thought in the S. is expressed as **ܡܠܝܬܐ**. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. **ܡܠܝܬܐ** in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., **ܡܠܝܬܐ**.
- 21: T. and what is the c part of 20 in S. are almost identical.
- 22: T. and what is 21 in S. are just about identical.
- 25: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary.

Chapter XIV

- 2: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing a little, however, in style and language. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 3: T. and S. are very similar in the a part, differing but slightly in style and language. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts. ננט in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננט.
- 4: T. and S. are absolutely identical.
- 5: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. T. and S. are extremely similar, almost identical, in the b parts. (All of this is, of course, following the corrected reading of de Lagarde for T.)
- 6: T. and S. differ considerably in style and language, though they both say the same thing essentially.
- 7: T. and S. are quite different, even in interpretation.
- 9: What is verse 9 in T. and what is verse 10 in S., show some slight, though by no means striking, similarities.
- 12: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and differ considerably, even in interpretation, in the b parts.
- 13: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts. ננט in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננט. T. and S. differ considerably in the b parts, however, even in interpretation.
- 14: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts, T. having just מן דחלתיה S. having מן דחלתא דנשפיה. ננט in the a and b parts

of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yod h, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the a and b parts of S., ܡܠܝܬܐ.

- 15: T. and S. are rather similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. However, there is quite a bit of difference in style between T. and S. in the b parts, though they both say essentially the same thing.
- 16: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. T. and S. differ somewhat in interpretation in the b parts, although the first two words are strangely identical.
- 18: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. T. and S. differ, however, in the interpretation ^{of} the b part.
- 19: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary (following the de Lagarde reading of T., which reading is more sensible.) ܡܠܝܬܐ in the b part of T. (de Lagarde reading for ܡܠܝܬܐ) beginning with a nun instead of a yodh is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., ܡܠܝܬܐ.
- 20: T. and S. are identical throughout, taking into consideration, however, the differences due to the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 21: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing only in word order. In the b parts, T. and S. are very similar, differing only slightly in vocabulary.
- 22: Reading ܡܠܝܬܐ for ܡܠܝܬܐ with de Lagarde, T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in

- vocabulary. T. and S. differ greatly in the b parts, S. sermonizing and making a long addition.
- 23: T. and S. differ considerably, in the a part, S. having a much fuller a part. T. and S. show some very slight similarities in the b part.
- 24: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ considerably in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 25: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, but differ in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 26: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a part, differing slightly in style. T. and S. are also somewhat similar in the b parts, differing, this time in vocabulary. 'ינן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, as it does, is a definite Syriacism, and is similar to the corresponding form in the S., מנן.
- 27: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, they are similar in ~~xxxxxxx~~ vocabulary, but differ slightly in style.
- 28: T. and S. are similar in vocabulary in the a parts, but differ greatly in style in the b parts.
- 29: T. and S. are but slightly similar, in vocabulary.
- 30: T. and S. show some similarity in the a parts, but differ in the b parts.
- 31: T. and S. differ considerably.
- 32: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. However, in the b parts, they differ, even in interpretation.
- 33: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differ-

ing slightly in style. In the b parts, they are slightly similar, but both differ from the present Hebrew which text makes no sense.

Here T. reads, "And folly shall make itself known in the inward part of fools," whereas S. reads, "But in the inward part of fools it (wisdom) does not make itself known.

34: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. T. and S. differ in the b parts, however.

35: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the a parts. However, the b parts differ somewhat. Not only that, S. has a long addition in this verse, which is the end of the chapter,*which ending is not found in T. . .

Chapter XV

- 1: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a parts, but differ both in style and vocabulary in the b parts.
- 2: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a parts, but differ both in style and vocabulary in the b parts. However, ܡܝܪܝܢ in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it has no corresponding form in S.
- 3: T. and S. show ~~some~~ slight, ~~although by no means~~ striking, similarities.
- 4: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing only in the word order in one place. T. and S. are extremely similar in the b parts, both giving the same interpretation, but apparently not following the present Hebrew.
- 6: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and rather similar in the b parts.
- 7: T. and S. show ~~some~~ similarities throughout, though differing slightly in vocabulary and style.
- 9: T. and S. show some faint similarities. ܡܝܪܝܢ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.
- 11: T. and S. show some similarities throughout, which, however, are not striking ones.
- 13: T. and S. show some slight similarity in the a parts, except for the last word. However, in the b parts, they differ somewhat.
- 14: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. However, in the b parts, they give

entirely different interpretations.

- 15: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. However, in the b parts, they differ somewhat, although they both say essentially the same thing.
- 16: T. and S. differ in interpretation, although there are some similarities in language.
- 17: T. and S. are similar throughout, though there are some differences in style.
- 18: T. and S. are quite dissimilar, but, strangely, often use the same words in the same way. For example, both T. and S. use for Hebrew מִן הַמַּדְבָּר, the phrase גִּבּוֹר מִדְּבָר.
- 19: T. and S. are somewhat different in the a part, but are similar in the b part, only differing in that T. uses the singular throughout, whereas S. uses the plural.
- 20: T. and S. show some similarities in the a parts, but differ somewhat in the b parts.
- 21: T. and S. show few similarities in the a parts, but are quite similar in their b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary.
- 2 3: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, differing slightly only in style. In the b parts, T. and S. are quite different, though they say essentially the same thing.
- 24: T. and S. show some similarities in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. In the b parts, however, T. and S. are identical. מִן הַמַּדְּבָּר in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism,

and is the same as the corresponding form in the
S., 𐤍𐤒𐤕𐤕.

- 25: T. and S. are entirely different. However, '𐤍𐤕𐤕
in T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is
a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding
form in the S.
- 26: T. and S. are quite different in the a parts, though
they say the same thing essentially. In the b parts, T. and
S. are identical.
- 28: T. and S. are identical in the a parts (reading T.
according to the corrected version of de Lagarde '𐤍𐤕𐤕 for
𐤍𐤕𐤕). However, they differ somewhat in the b parts, though
they say the same thing essentially.
- 29: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts,
and quite similar in the b parts, differing a little in style.
- 30: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, but differ
in vocabulary.
- 31: T. and S. are absolutely identical.
- 32: T. and S. differ in vocabulary in the a parts, but
are somewhat similar in the b parts, the T. being a little
longer.

Chapter XVI

- 1: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts. In the b parts, they are also extremely similar, T. using for the Hebrew יהוה, אלהה, and S. using סריא.
- 2: T. and S. are extremely similar throughout, differing only in vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are somewhat similar throughout, differing a little in style and vocabulary.
- 4: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, but differ a little in the b parts, where, however, they say essentially the same thing.
- 5: T. and S. are somewhat dissimilar, especially in the b parts, where S. makes a considerably large addition. ידד in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it is nothing like the corresponding form in the S.
- 6: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary.
- 7: T. and S. say about the same thing, but differ considerably. However, ושל, in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.
- 8: T. and S. are identical, that is, taking into account the differences between the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 9: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, and almost identical in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary.

- 10: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, but differ in the b parts in vocabulary. לִגְדֹל (or לִגְדֹל) in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, as it does, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. מִגְדֹל differs from it.
- 11: T. and S. differ somewhat in the a parts, but are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 12: T. and S. are quite different in the a parts, but show some similarities in the b parts.
- 13: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 14: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing only in order of one word. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts. מִגְדֹל in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., מִגְדֹל.
- 15: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and are extremely similar in the b parts, differing only slightly.
- 16: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, T. having מִגְדֹל whereas S. merely has מִגְדֹל. There are also some similarities in the b parts, though T. and S. vary in style here.
- 17: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, that is, taking into account the nature of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. T. and S. are also quite similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in style.

- 18: T. and S. show some very slight similarities (that is, following the reading of T. as corrected by de Lagarde.)
- 20: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. In the b parts, T. and S. are also slightly similar, but differ somewhat in style and vocabulary.
- 21: T. and S. differ somewhat in the a parts, but are absolutely identical in the b parts, that is, taking into account the differences arising from the natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 22: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the a parts, which, however, are by no means striking ones, seeing that there are so many differences. However, in the b parts, T. and S. are almost identical, S. having a slight stylistic addition.
- 23: T. and S. show some similarities, especially in the b parts. However, there are also differences in style and language.
- 24: T. and S., though not identical, are extremely similar throughout. The major difference is in the a part, where, for Hebrew אמל, T. has אמול, whereas S. has אמ'ול.
- 25: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and somewhat similar in the b parts, differing from one another in style and vocabulary.
- 26: T. and S. differ considerably.
- 29: T. and S. differ in the a parts, but are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 30: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing

slightly in style. T. and S. are also somewhat similar in the b parts, differing this time in vocabulary.

31: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.

32: T. and S. are almost the same in the a parts, S. leaving out the 'BX'. In the b parts, T. and S. are absolutely identical.

33: T. and S. are extremely similar throughout, differing ever so slightly in style and vocabulary.

Chapter XVII

- 1: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in style.
- 2: T. and S. are identical throughout, that is, taking into account the differences between the Syriac and Aramaic languages. For instance, in the a parts, for the Hebrew קטשכיל, T. has סוכלתנא, whereas S. has סכולתנא. נפלג or נפלג in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נפלג.
- 3: T. and S. are somewhat similar, but differ somewhat in language and style.
- 4: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a part, taking into account the differences between the Aramaic and Syriac, but the b parts differ somewhat, although they say essentially the same thing.
- 5: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary, but they differ in style and vocabulary in the b parts.
- 6: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style, and are similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 7: T. and S. differ even in interpretation.
- 8: T. and S. differ somewhat.
- 9: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary, but differ somewhat in the b parts.
- 11: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, but differ in interpretation in the b parts.

- 13: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, but differ slightly in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 16: T. and S. show some slight similarities, which, however, are by no means striking ones.
- 17: T. and S. show some slight similarities, differing somewhat in vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. show some similarity throughout, there being slight differences in style and vocabulary.
- 19: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the b parts.
- 20: T. and S. show some similarities throughout, differing in style and vocabulary, however.
- 22: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts (that is, adopting the more sensible reading of de Lagarde).
- 24: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, and ever so slightly differ in vocabulary and style in the b parts.
- 26: T. and S. are identical throughout, that is taking into account the differences in the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 27: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ considerably in the b parts.
- 28: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in style.

Chapter XVIII

- 2: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, but differ considerably in the b parts.
- 3: T. and S. differ somewhat. S. seems to have an addition in the b part.
- 4: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary, and are absolutely the same in the b parts.
- 5: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are almost identical, differing slightly in style.
- 8: T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts.
- 9: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, and are very similar in the b part, differing slightly in the vocabulary and style.
- 10: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style. They are somewhat similar in the b parts, but S. interprets differently than T. טרה in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., טרה.
ט'רה in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, although there is no corresponding form in the S. with which to compare it.
- 12: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style. T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. טע'נה in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a

definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., נס'בר'ה.

- 15: T. and S. differ somewhat in style and vocabulary. However, the נקנא in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is קנא.
- 16: T. and S. are almost identical, the only differences being that T. has the singular throughout, whereas S. has the plural.
- 17: T. and S. show some slight similarities, differing both in style and language. However, נצ' in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is בך.
- 19: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing a little, however, in interpretation and vocabulary (that is, reading T. as de Lagarde does). T. and S. are extremely similar in the b parts, especially in vocabulary (also reading according to de Lagarde)
- 20: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts. T. and S. differ in the b parts only in that T. adds | at the very beginning. ו'ל' in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ו'ל'.
- 21: T. and S. differ in the a parts, only in that S. adds | at the end. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts. ו'כ' in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is

very similar to the corresponding form in the S.,

לכח.

22: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, T. adding an extra word. There are some slight similarities in the b parts.

23: T. and S. show some similarities throughout, even though there are differences in style and vocabulary. ללח
, in the a and b parts of T., beginning as it goes, with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though they differ with the corresponding form in the S., ללח.

24: T. and S. differ somewhat.

Chapter XIX

- 1: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, except that S. adds 177. T. and S. differ considerably in the b parts.
- 2: T. and S. are almost identical, that is, taking into account the differences due to the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 3: T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing somewhat, however, in style and vocabulary.
- 5: T. and S. differ considerably, though they both say essentially the same thing. 'כדן in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., נדנן. נדנן in the b part of T., beginning also with a nun instead of a yodh, is also a definite Syriacism, though it too differs from the corresponding form in the S., נדנן.
- 6: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a parts, and differ in the b parts in one very inconsequential respect (T. has |'ש' לד 7' whereas S. has |'ש' לד 7'. Strange as it is that both T. and S. differ considerably with the present Hebrew, and give the same reading.).
- 7: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a and b parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. The S. does not have the c part found in the present Hebrew Text and T., but includes it as the first part of verse eight. Stangely, this first part of eight in S. is almost identical with the c part of T., as corrected by de Lagarde.
- 8: T. and S. show some slight similarities, but differ in many important respects in style and vocabulary.

- 9: T. and S. show some slight similarities. However, **ܬܢܢ** in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., **ܬܢܢ**.
- 10: T. and S. are absolutely identical, that is, taking into account the differences arising from the natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages. **ܬܢܢ** in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., **ܬܢܢ**.
- 11: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, though they differ slightly in style and vocabulary. T. and S. vary somewhat in the b parts, though they both say the same thing essentially. **ܬܢܢ** or **ܬܢܢ**, in the b part of T., however, since it begins with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.
- 12: T. and S. show some slight similarities, though they differ somewhat in style and vocabulary. The a parts are especially similar.
- 13: T. and S. show considerable similarity in the b parts.
- 14: T. and S. show some very slight similarities.
- 15: T. and S. show but slight similarity. However, **ܬܢܢ** in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is **ܬܢܢ**.
- 16: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, but differ somewhat in the b parts.

- 19: Reading the corrected text of de Lagarde, T. and S. are absolutely identical.
- 20: T. and S. are slightly similar.
- 21: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, but differ somewhat in the b parts, although they both say essentially the same thing.
- 22: T. and S. differ somewhat, even in interpretation.
- 23: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are extremely similar in the b and c parts, differing slightly in style. נבית and נפקוד in the b part and c prt of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, are definite Syriacisms, and are identical with the corresponding forms in the S., נבית and נפקוד.
- 24: T. and S. differ, even in interpretation.
- 25: T. and S. differ considerably. However, נבית in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is נבית.
- 26: T. and S. are absolutely identical, except for one word in the a part. For the Hebrew מברח, T. has מעריק and S. has מעקף. It is understood, of course, that the parts are identical.
- 27: T. and S. are slightly similar, but show considerable differences.

Chapter XX

- 1: T. and S. are quite different, though they both say essentially the same thing. However, ננחנח in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.
- 2: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary; they are absolutely identical in the b parts, taking into account, of course, the differences between the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 4: This is a very interesting verse. T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, the only difference being that for the Hebrew עזע, T. has עטע, whereas S. has חוננח. Both have, apparently, the identical mistranslation of the present Hebrew text's בחורף עזע לע' חרוש. Our translation says, and ~~more~~ correctly, "The sluggard will not plow, when winter setteth in," T. and S. say "The sluggard who is put to shame (נחנח) does not keep silent (שתרק)." T. and S. are absolutely the same in the b parts, when S. is corrected. The word נ' at the end of the b part of S. really belongs in the a part of the following verse.
- 5: T. and S. differ in the a parts, T. reading, "Counsel (נענח) in the heart of man is like deep water," whereas S. reads "Counsel (נלח) in the heart of the king (נלח) is like deep water (reading נ' from the last part of verse 4)." T. and S., however, are very similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in style. נדל' in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is ^{similar to} ~~the same as~~ the corresponding form in the S., נדל'.

- 6: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a parts, and differ ever so slightly in the b part, S. adding /'7.
- 7: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing somewhat, however, in style.
- 8: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts they differ somewhat, both in style and vocabulary.
- 9: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, but differ somewhat in style. T. and S. show more similarities in the b parts, but differ a little in vocabulary.
- 10: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in style. T. and S. are somewhat similar in the b parts, but differ in vocabulary and style.
- 11: T. and S. are absolutely identical throughout, that is, taking into account the differences due to the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 12: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ somewhat in the b parts.
- 13: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts. However, for the Hebrew ²ד, T. has נד²77, whereas S. has נ²77. T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts as well. However, S. adds stylistically, נ²77 at the very beginning.
- 14: T. and S. differ somewhat in style and vocabulary, though they both say the same thing essentially. It is interesting to note that both T. and S. have the same mistranslation of the present Hebrew. They both probably resolved נ²77 in the a part of Hebrew as נ²77(ל)77, or had the text before them that justified their translation. The forms, נ²77, נ²77, and נ²77 in T. beginning with a nun instead of a

yodh, are all definite Syriacisms.

- 15: It is interesting to note that both T. and S. make this verse a continuation of the previous one. In the T., this is indicated by a "7" placed before the verse proper, in the S. this is indicated by having the last word of the preceeding verse here, reading " 7 ܐܢܝܢ ". T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, this previous variation being the major difference. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts, differing a little in style.
- 16: T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in style and vocabulary. ܐܢܝܢ in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܐܢܝܢ.
- 18: T. and S. show some similarities, though very negligible, especially in style. ~~xxx~~ The vocabulary differs.
- 19: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary.
- 20: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and are quite similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. For the Hebrew ܐܢܝܢ, T. has ܐܢܝܢ, whereas S. has ܐܢܝܢ. ܐܢܝܢ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with the corresponding form in the S., ܐܢܝܢ.
- 21: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary and style. The S. seems to be a more polished

translation here (b part).

- 22: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, though there are many differences.
- 24: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in that S. has an additional word, and thus varies in style.
- 25: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. They differ somewhat in the b parts, though they both say essentially the same thing.
- 26: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts, that is, taking into consideration the differences due to the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages,
- 27: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style and vocabulary. There are some slight similarities in the b parts.
- 28: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout.
- 30: There are few similarities. The b parts of T. and S. are slightly similar.

Chapter XXI

- 1: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are extremely similar in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in style. נִכְּחַ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., מִכְּחַ.
- 2: T. and S. are rather similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are somewhat similar, varying slightly in style and vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 4: T. and S. show but slight similarities. However, it is interesting to note that they both resolved נִנְּחַ in the b part of the Hebrew as נִנְּחַ (נִנְּחַ) rather than נִנְּחַ (tillage).
- 5: T. and S. differ considerably.
- 6: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. The vocabulary of T. and S. varies somewhat in the b parts.
- 7: S. is much simpler than T.
- 8: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing only in that S. adds מִנְּחַ at the very beginning.
- 9: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. The a parts are somewhat unlike, S. even neglecting to translate the Hebrew מִנְּחַ.
- 10: T. and S. differ considerably, even in interpretation.

- 11: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the a parts; differ in the b parts. However, נחכס in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even if the corresponding form in the S. is מתחכס.
- 13: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, the only difference being that S. doesn't translate the Hebrew מרעץ דל at all. In the b parts, T. and S. are similar, differing somewhat in style. נשמע in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with the corresponding form in the S., נשמע. The same is true of נקרא in the b part of T., the corresponding form in the S. also being נקרא. If נתעני in the b part of T. is read according to the de Lagarde correction, נעני then it is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., נעני. In any event, it is a definite Syriacism, since it begins with a nun instead of a yodh.
- 14: T. and S. show some slight similarities in the a parts, though differing both in style and vocabulary. T. and S., however, differ somewhat in the a parts, even in interpretation.
- 15: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing somewhat in style. The b parts are quite different.
- 16: T. and S. are absolutely identical here, except for minor differences which result from the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. This is especially striking as this verse has some forms and some vocabulary that are somewhat out of the ordinary, for example, both T. and S. have for the Hebrew רפא, בני ארעא. נתתני which occurs both in T. and S., is also a bit out of the ordinary. This נתתני which occurs in the b part of T., since it begins with a nun

is a definite Syriacism, and as just stated, is the same as the corresponding form in the S.

- 17: T. and S. are just about identical, the only difference being that T. repeats the word **ר'ח'ם**, whereas S. does not.

ר'ח'ם in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., **ר'ח'ם**.

- 18: T. and S. show some slight similarities in style.

- 19: T. and S. have some similarities in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S., in the b part, are almost identical, there being an almost negligible variation in style. **נב לטון** in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is similar to the corresponding form in the S., **נב לטון**.

- 21: T. and S. are only vaguely similar, and in style alone.

- 22: T. and S. are almost identical in the a part, differing only in the spelling of one word. T. and S. are absolutely unlike in vocabulary in the b parts, but they say the same thing.

- 23: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, and differ a little in vocabulary and word order in the b parts.

- 25: T. and S. show some very slight similarities. T. is a little more ornate and complicated.

- 26: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, and differ only a little in vocabulary in the b parts.

- 27: T. and S. are but slightly alike in the a parts. However, the b parts are just about identical, differing ever so slightly in style. It is interesting to note that they both

have the same mistranslation of the Hebrew מִן in their b parts.

28: T. and S. show faint resemblances in the a parts.

However, T. and S. are rather similar in the b parts, differing slightly in ~~style~~ vocabulary.

29: T. and S. show some slight similarities, but differ quite a bit in style.

30: T. and S. are but slightly similar, differing both in vocabulary and style. However, the Hebrew לִנְגֹּף is rendered as לִנְגֹּף (לִנְגֹּף) in both T. and S.

31: T. and S. show some similarities, which, however, are not striking ones,

Chapter XXII

- 2: T. and S. are absolutely identical in the a parts, but differ a little in style and vocabulary in the b parts.
- 4: T. and S. have some similarities.
- 5: T. and S. differ a little in the a parts, but are almost identical in the b parts.
- 6: T. and S. differ somewhat. However, נִסְיָן or נִסְיָן (de Lagarde) in T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, though there is no corresponding form in the S. 'טוֹן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., 'טוֹן.
- 7: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing somewhat in style. However, נִשְׁתַּלֵּט in the a parts of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נִשְׁתַּלֵּט.
- 8: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, taking into account the differences caused by the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary. נִחְזָק in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., נִחְזָק. נִגְמָר in the b part of T., likewise, is a Syriacism, and is also very similar to the form in the S. that corresponds to it, namely נִגְמָר.
- 9: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, the only difference being that T. has two occurrences of the word instead of one, as in the case of S. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts. נִתְבַּר in the a part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a

a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., **נְתִיבָר**.

- 10: T. and S. are quite unlike, S. even adding an addition found neither in H. nor T.
- 12: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing but slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. differ considerably in the b parts.
- 14: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ a little in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 15: T. and S. are somewhat similar, though T. and S. give slightly different interpretations in the a parts. However, **נְתִיבָר** in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is **נְתִיבָר**, which is somewhat different.
- 16: T. and S. show some slight similarities throughout, though differing in style and vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, except for such differences as arise from the very natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages. T. and S. are likewise identical in the b parts, though the differences between the Aramaic and Syriac languages are somewhat noticeable here. **נְתִיבָר** in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., **נְתִיבָר**.
- 19: T. and S. are similar in style in the a parts, though different in vocabulary. In the b part, S. translating the Hebrew **אֶתְּ אֶתְּ**, whereas H. does translate it as **אֶתְּ אֶתְּ**. **נְתִיבָר** in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, ~~instead~~

is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., 'nn̄ .

- 20: T. and S. are just about the same in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. seems to translate from a ^{slightly} different text than the present H.
- 21: T. and S. differ somewhat in the a parts (possibly what is the last part of this verse was read with the last part of the last verse in S.). However, T. and S. are very similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary and style.
- 22: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, and show some similarities in the b parts.
- 23: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, and differ slightly in the b parts in language.
- 24: T. and S. are somewhat similar throughout, though not markedly so.
- 25: T. and S. are similar in style throughout, though they differ in vocabulary.
- 27: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the b parts, that is, taking into account, of course, the differences which arise from the natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. 'l̄nn̄ in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a nun instead of a yod h, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., 'l̄nn̄ .
- 28: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and differ only in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 29: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT THE S. IS APPARENTLY AT A LOSS TO TRANSLATE THE H. 'nn̄ , AND HENCE

MENTELY TAKES IT OVER INTO THE S. TEXT.

T. and S. are absolutely the same in the b parts.

𐤀𐤍𐤊, occuring twice in the b part of T., is a definite Syriacism, and is identical with the corresponding forms in the S., which are also 𐤀𐤍𐤊.

Chapter XXIII

- 4: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, but differ in style. T. and S. differ in vocabulary and style in the b parts, but show some similarity. It is interesting to note that both T. and S. read differently than the present Hebrew, both T. and S. rendered into into English, would read "Do not come near the rich man, but, in your wisdom, keep away from him."
- 5: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. vary somewhat in vocabulary and style in the b parts, but still show some similarity.
- 7: T. and S. are quite different.
- 8: T. and S. are quite similar throughout, differing in style.
- 9: T. and S. show some very slight, almost negligible, similarities.
- 10: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, having a very minor difference in style. T. and S. are identical in the b-parts, taking into account, of course, the differences between the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 11: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary, T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing in style. /173 in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., /173.
- 12: T. and S. are identical, taking into account, of course, the differences due to the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 13: T. and S. show some slight similarities throughout.

- 14: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing this time in vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. are almost alike in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. show some slight similarities in the b parts, but differ considerably in style.
- 16: T. and S. are very similar throughout, differing slightly in style. /ןןן in the first part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a Syriacism, even though it is not similar to the corresponding form in the S., ףןן.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and differ only slightly in vocabulary in the b parts. ןןן in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ןןן.
- 18: T. and S. show some minor similarities. However, ןןן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism and is identically the same as the corresponding form in the S., ןןן.
- 20: T. and S. are similar in vocabulary, but differ in word order.
- 21: T. and S. are ^{slightly} similar in the a parts, differing mostly in that S. adds words to make the statement clearer, and that there is a slight difference in vocabulary. T. and S. are different to some degree in the b parts, even when the more sensible reading of de Lagarde is adopted. However, ןןן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ןןן.
- 22: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing slightly

in style and vocabulary.

- 23: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and differ but slightly in vocabulary in the b parts.
- 24: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, but differ considerably in style in the b parts. However, $\gamma\tau\tau$ in the a part of T., and $\gamma\tau\tau$ in the b part of T., both beginning with a nun, are Syriacisms. The first is the same as the corresponding form in the S., $\gamma\tau\tau$. The second is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., $\gamma\tau\tau$.
- 25: T. and S. are slightly similar in both parts.
- 26: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and differ a ~~little~~ little in style in the b parts.
- 27: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing a little in style and vocabulary. T. and S. are similar in the b parts as well, differing in vocabulary.
- 28: T. and S. differ considerably here, even in interpretation.
- 29: T. and S. show some slight similarities throughout, but differ in vocabulary and style.
- 30: T. and S. show only negligible similarities, differing as they do in style and vocabulary. However, it is interesting to note that S. has an addition of a sermonic nature.
- 32: T. and S. are quite dissimilar in the a parts, S. apparently circumventing the text in the Hebrew, or having a differing text than the present Hebrew, but are very similar in the b parts, where they vary slightly in style.
- 33: T. and S. are slightly similar in vocabulary, though there are differences. However, S. tries to reinterpret the verse to make more sense, almost sermonizes, and misses the

connection of this verse to the two previous ones.

34: T. and S. are similar in the a ^yparts, differing somewhat in style. S. apparently had a text which varied from the present Hebrew as the basis of its translation in the b part.

35: T. and S. are unlike in the a parts, but show slight similarities in the b parts. However, it is interesting to note that both T. and S. have וְנִי at the beginning of their a parts, and that there is no corresponding form in the present Hebrew text.

Chapter XXIV

- 1: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing in style.
- 2: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, there being one major difference in vocabulary. They are extremely similar in the b part, differing only in word order.
- 3: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but are quite ~~un~~alike in the b parts.
- 4: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, there being a slight difference in vocabulary. In the b parts, there are also some similarities, though there are differences both in style and vocabulary.
- 5: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style. T. and S. are likewise similar in the b parts, even though there are some striking differences both in style and vocabulary. It is interesting to note that both T. and S. have the same misinterpretation of the present Hebrew. It is, of course, possible that both T. and S. were interpreted from texts that were quite different from the present Hebrew.
- 6: T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts.
- 7: T. and S. are considerably different in the a parts, S. apparently following the present reading of the Hebrew very closely. The b parts, however, are identical.
- 8: T. and S. are but slightly similar, S. giving a much simpler rendition than T. However, נקרן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, even if it does differ with the corresponding form in the S., נתקרא.
- 10: T. and S. differ here, even in interpretation and

meaning.

- 11: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 12: This is a very long verse. T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. T. and S. are identical in vocabulary in the b parts, but differ in style (That is, following the regular reading of S., rather than that of de Lagarde).
- 13: T. and S. are very similar throughout, but vary in style throughout.
- 14: T. and S. differ somewhat. ܡܢܢ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it is different than the corresponding form in the S., ܡܢܢ .
- 15: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, they are also similar, but differ in vocabulary.
- 16: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, where even such minor differences in vocabulary as do occur might be attributed to the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 17: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing style. T. and S. are also slightly similar in the b parts, differing, this time, both in style and vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts, differing ever so slightly.
- 19: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing, this time, in vocabulary.

- 20: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in style. They are similar in the b parts, also, differing, this time, in vocabulary. ܐܘܬܐ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܐܘܬܐ.
- 21: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in style and vocabulary. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 22: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in style. T. and S. are identical in the b parts.
- 23: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in style. It is interesting to note that T. and S. have an addition here not found in the Hebrew (ܐܘܬܐ and ܐܘܬܐ). T. and S. are just about identical in the b parts, differing ever so slightly.
- 24: Following the corrected reading of de Lagarde, T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are also slightly similar in the b parts, differing somewhat in style and vocabulary.
- 25: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in style. In the b parts, they are identical, except for a very minor difference or two arising from the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages,
- 26: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, but differ in the b parts. ܐܘܬܐ in the a parts of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܐܘܬܐ.
- 27: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing, however, both in style and vocabulary. In the b

parts, they are very similar, differing slightly in style.

- 28: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. In the b parts, they are also ~~slightly~~ similar, but differ, however, in vocabulary.
- 29: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. In the b parts, they are also slightly similar, but differ in vocabulary.
- 30: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing slightly in vocabulary.
- 31: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. They are also similar in the b parts, where, again, they differ in vocabulary.
- 32: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts, there are some similarities, but S. has a slight omission.
- 33: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing in style.
- 34: T. and S. show slight similarities in the a parts, though differing somewhat in style. In the b parts, they are almost identical, differing ever so slightly in style.

Chapter XXV

- 1: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, such differences as there are arising from the very natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages. It is strange that both T. and S. have the same mistranslation of M. here. T. and S. are identical in the b parts.
- 2: T. and S. are similar throughout, differing in vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are identical throughout.
- 4: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. In the b parts, S. is rather similar, but reads, at the very end, as though it translated from a different text than the present H.
[15] In the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., [15].
- 5: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing both in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, they are very similar, but differ in word order.
- 6: T. and S. are absolutely identical throughout.
- 7: T. and S. are quite dissimilar throughout, differing both in style and language. However, [15] in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., [15].
- 8: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style. They are also slightly similar in the b parts, but differ considerably in style and even interpretation.
- 9: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. T. and S. are very similar in the b parts also, differing ever so slightly in style.

- 10: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing only in word order. In the b parts, however, they are extremely different, even in interpretation. ךָּטוֹן in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ךָּטוֹן .
- 11: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing only in that where T. uses the singular, S. uses the plural. In the b parts, S. omits quite a bit, merely saying $\text{דַּמְמַלל בִּילְתָּ}$, T. adds סִפְּא'י .
- 12: T. and S. are faintly similar in the a parts, where they differ both in style and vocabulary. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, where they differ mainly in that S. has נִכְנַח at the beginning.
- 13: T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing only in minor details.
- 14: T. and S. are very similar in the b parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. show some slight, though by no means striking similarities.
- 16: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the b parts, reading T. according to de Lagarde. ךָּטוֹן and ךָּטוֹן , in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, are Syriacisms, and are the same as the corresponding forms in the S., ךָּטוֹן and ךָּטוֹן .
- 18: Reading T. according to the corrected version of de Lagarde, as indeed must be done here, T. and S. are identical in the a parts. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing in style and vocabulary.
- 19: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differ-

ing slightly in style. T. and S. have almost entirely different vocabularies in the b part.

20: Following the reading of de Lagarde, T. and S. are extremely similar throughout, there being minor differences in style. THIS IS VERY INTERESTING TO NOTE, SINCE BOTH T. AND S, ARE QUITE DIFFERENT THAN THE PRESENT HEBREW, AND SINCE THE VOCABULARY, WHICH IS THE SAME THROUGHOUT, IS A BIT OUT OF THE ORDINARY. There must be some close relationship between T. and S. here, which was due to direct copying, consultation, or some such reason.

21: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in style and vocabulary. Following the reading of de Lagarde in the b part, T. and S. are similar, differing a little in style.

22: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, there being slight differences, however, both in style and vocabulary. The b parts are quite unlike. However, נשאלם or נשאל in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., נשאל.

23: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, there being some very inconsequential variations. The b parts, however, though somewhat similar, vary in style and vocabulary.

24: When T. is read according to the corrected version of de Lagarde, as, indeed, it must be read, T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. The b parts, however, vary somewhat, even in interpretation.

26: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in that

S. is clearer and longer. There are also differences in vocabulary.

27: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. They differ in vocabulary in the b parts, but still show similarities.

28: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style. Following the corrected text of de Lagarde, T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in style.

Chapter XXVI

- 1: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and ^{are} just about identical in the b parts as well, where they differ only in word order.
- 3: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 4: T. and S., when de Lagarde readings are used, are identical in the a parts. IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT T. HERE USES THE SYRIAC נתן FOR "TO GIVE", (נתן) WHICH USAGE IS A RATHER RARE OCCURANCE, T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing in style and word order.
- 5: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT BOTH T. AND S. USE THE RATHER STRANGE FORM חכיסותא HERE. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts. ננס in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננס.
- 7: T. and S. are identical throughout. T., in the a part, again uses the Syriac נתן for "to give". BOTH T. AND S. HAVE THE SAME MISINTERPRETATION OF THE PRESENT HEBREW,
- 8: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary, however, T. and S. differ in interpretation in the b parts.
- 9: T. and S. are ^{somewhat} similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts.
- 10: Reading T. according to de Lagarde's corrected text, as, indeed must be done, T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, and are identical in the b parts. In the a parts, they

differ in vocabulary.

- 11: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but vary in interpretation in the b parts.
- 12: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are similar in the b parts where there is a slight addition in S.
- 14: T. and S. are ~~are somewhat similar, differing in style.~~
~~The b parts are slightly~~ similar, differing in that S. has an addition, and also, in vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. are unlike. However, 'ܢܢܢ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S. is ܢܢܢ.
- 16: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing both in vocabulary and style. T. and S. are identical in the b-parts, however, except for a slight difference caused by the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 17: T. and S. show some slight though not striking, similarities throughout,~~x~~
- 19: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing, however, both in style and vocabulary. In the b part, S. ^{very} makes a long addition, even sermonizes. At the/end of the b parts, T. and S. are alike.
- 20: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. In the b parts, there is a great difference in vocabulary, but a similarity in style.
- 21: T. and S. are identical in the a parts.
- 23: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts. differing only in vocabulary.

- 24: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, having the same misinterpretation of the present Hebrew.
- 25: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary.
- 26: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, there being one major difference in vocabulary, however. T. and S. are identical in the b parts, discounting the differences arising from the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages.
- 27: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, but differ in word order and style. $\zeta 137$ in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., $\zeta 57$. T. and S. are likewise similar in the b parts, differing in style.
- 28: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, having the same misinterpretation of the present Hebrew. T. and S. differ in the b parts, T. being much more complicated than S., though similar in meaning.

Chapter XXVII

- 1: T. and S. are almost alike in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. They are also/somewhat similar in the b parts, differing both in style and vocabulary.
- 2: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. נשלוך or נשלוך in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., נשלוך. T. and S. are somewhat similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, there being some slight differences because of the very natures of the Syriac and Aramaic languages. They are also very similar in their b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 4: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, though not markedly so.
- 5: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style, and are identical in the b parts.
- 7: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are similar in the b parts, where they differ somewhat in style.
- 8: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 9: T. and S. are quite similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. They are also similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 10: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. They are very similar in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the c parts, T. and S. are also similar, but differ in vocabulary.

- 11: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. The b parts are quite dissimilar, though they both say essentially the same thing.
- 12: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts they are also similar, although there are differences both in style and vocabulary.
- 13: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, there being a very minor difference. T. and S. are absolutely identical in the b parts (both parts must be read according to the corrected version of de Lagarde.).
- 14: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. However, in the b parts, T. and S. differ even in interpretation.
- 15: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts, they are slightly similar, but considerably in style, S. being shorter.
- 16: T. and S. are identical. THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE THEY BOTH HAVE THE SAME VARIATION FROM THE PRESENT HEBREW.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing, however, in vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in style. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. However, נח"ך in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it is different from the corresponding form in the S.,
נח"ך.
- 19: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, though not strikingly so, IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT BOTH

HAVE THE SAME VARIATION FROM THE PRESENT HEBREW.

- 20: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. are somewhat similar in the b parts, there being a more pronounced difference in style here.
- 21: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. T. and S. are identical in the b parts.
- 23: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. They are also similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 25: Following the corrected reading of de Lagarde, T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. In the b parts, they are absolutely identical.
- 26: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 27: T. and S. show similarities in the a parts, are even identical. In the b part, however, S. neglects to give any translation of the Hebrew וְחַיִּים לְנִשְׁרוּתֵיךְ .

Chapter XXVIII

- 1: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. In the b parts, T. and S. differ even in interpretation. S. apparently omits quite a bit.
- 2: T. and S. show but slight similarities, they might best be called unlike. However, ננר in the b part of T. (reading thus according to the corrected version of de Lagarde), beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננר.
- 3: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. They are identical in the b parts.
- 4: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary. However, T. and S. are very different in the b parts, differing even in interpretation.
- 5: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. They are also slightly similar in the b part, differing in vocabulary and style.
- 6: T. and S. show some similarities, but S. apparently leaves out the comparison (ננר).
- 8: T. and S. show some very slight similarities throughout, which similarities, however, are not striking ones.
- 9: T. and S. are similar in both the a and b parts, in both of which they vary in vocabulary. ננר in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננר.
- 10: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, where they differ in vocabulary. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, where they differ, however, both in vocabulary and style. ננר in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism,

and is the same as the corresponding form in the S.,

|| נון.

- 11: T. and S. are similar in the a part, differing in style. They are also similar in the b parts, differing in that S. has a stylistic addition (one word) not found in S.
- 13: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing in both vocabulary and style. T. and S. also show some very slight similarities in the b parts, where there are considerable differences both in style and language, however, נצלח in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נצלח . נוחק in the b parts of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs somewhat with the corresponding form in the S., || מתרחן.
- 14: T. and S. are but remotely similar in the a parts, where they differ somewhat in both style and vocabulary. However, in the b parts, they are quite alike, differing slightly in style.
- 15: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing considerably in vocabulary. In the b parts, they are very similar, but, nevertheless, differ in both vocabulary and style, as well as sense.
- 16: T. and S. are similar in both the a and b parts, in both of which, however, they differ in vocabulary. || נגרון in the b part of T., (read according to de Lagarde) beginning as it does with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., || נגרון.
- 17: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are slightly similar in the b parts, where, however, they differ

both in style and vocabulary, and even in meaning. However, נטרוק in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נטרק.

18: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, where they differ, however, in vocabulary. נתפרק in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., נתפרק. T. and S. are similar in the b parts as well, but, whereas T. reads נכדח (after present Hebrew גאח), S. reads גומחא (which would come from a Hebrew reading גאח). נפל in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is almost the same as the corresponding form in S., נפל.

19: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, where they differ slightly in vocabulary. ונל which occurs in both the a and b parts of T., beginning as it does with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding forms in the S., both of which are also ונל.

20: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but differ, even in interpretation, in the b parts. However, נטר in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.

21: T. and S. are quite different, though giving approximately the same sense. However, נחל in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though the corresponding form in the S., נחל is quite different.

22: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing slightly in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are identical.

- 23: T. and S. are but remotely similar in the a parts, differing as they do both in style and vocabulary. However, ܢܨܬ in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S., ܢܨܬܢ. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in a minor point of style.
- 24: T. and S. are but remotely similar, as there are considerable differences in vocabulary.
- 25: T. and S. are but remotely similar, inasmuch as there are considerable differences in vocabulary and style, though both yield essentially the same sense. However, ܢܨܬ in the b-part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܢܨܬܢ.
- 26: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. In the b parts, T. and S. show some similarities, but vary in interpretations at the very end. ܢܨܬ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the ~~S.~~ S., ܢܨܬܢ.
- 27: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are somewhat similar in the b parts, where they differ, however, both in style and vocabulary. ܢܨܬ in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is identically the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܢܨܬܢ.
- 28: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts, as well, T. and S. are also very similar, but differ in style. ܢܨܬ in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ܢܨܬܢ.

Chapter XXIX

- 1: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. In the b parts as well, T. and S. are very similar, and, again, there are differences in style. ננתר in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., ננתר.
- 2: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are almost identical, differing slightly in style. ננתר in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs from the corresponding form in the S., ננתר.
- 3: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. are but slightly similar in the b parts, differing considerably in vocabulary. 'נדנ in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is just about identical with the corresponding form in the S., 'נדנ.
- 4: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. נ'ק'ס in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S., ס'ק'ס.
- 5: T. and S. are identical throughout, when the corrected text of de Lagarde is used for T.
- 6: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. T. and S. are also slightly similar in the b parts, where, again, they differ in vocabulary.
- 7: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in style.

- 8: T. and S. differ in interpretation in the a parts, T. varying with the present Hebrew and with S. However, T. and S. are identical in the b parts.
- 9: T. and S. are similar in both parts, but differ, however, in vocabulary in both parts.
- 10: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. In the b parts, however, T. and S. differ, even in interpretation.
- 11: T. and S. are extremely similar in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style, and in word order. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, too, when the more sensible reading of de Lagarde is followed. S. makes better sense than T. does in the b part.
- 13: T. and S. are similar in both a and b parts, where they differ, however, in vocabulary.
- 14: T. and S. are vaguely similar, there being an omission in S., and variations in vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are similar in the b parts, where they differ, however, both in style and vocabulary.
- 16: T. and S. are slightly similar, though differing in vocabulary, and, in the b part, even in meaning. However
'לֹ in the a part of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S., 'לֹ.
- 18: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary.
- 19: T. and S. are identical throughout, when the more sensible reading of de Lagarde is adopted. IT IS INTERESTING

TO NOTE THAT BOTH T. AND S. HAVE THE SAME READING FOR THE B PART, WHICH READING DIFFERS FROM THAT OF THE PRESENT HEBREW. נ'ל in the b part of T. is really a Syriacism, and is rare in Aramaic.

20: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in the a parts. In the b parts, there is considerable difference, even in interpretation, S. giving the more sensible as well as simpler reading.

21: T. and S. are just about identical in the a parts, differing in the most negligible detail in style. The b parts are also similar, but differ in style, S. giving the more sensible reading and the clearer version. ללל in the a part of T., beginning with a nun is a definite Syriacism, and is almost the same as the corresponding form in the S., ללל.

22: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, but differ in vocabulary in both parts.

23: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. The b parts vary tremendously both in vocabulary and style, though they both say essentially the same thing. However, לפל or לפל in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though there is no corresponding form in the S.

24: T. and S. are identical in the a parts. In the b parts they are very similar, but differ in style. It is very interesting to note that both T. and S. have the same interpretation of the difficult b part of this verse. לפל or לפל (according to de Lagarde) beginning with a nun, is a definite Syriacism, even though it differs somewhat from the correspond-

ing form in S., 𐤏'𐤃𐤁.

- 25: T. and S. are similar in the ay parts, differing slightly, however, both in vocabulary and style. T. and S. are but slightly similar in the b parts, where there are variations both in vocabulary and style. However, 𐤁𐤅𐤁 in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in the S., 𐤁𐤅𐤁.
- 26: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are slightly similar in the b parts, where, however, they differ both in style and vocabulary.
- 27: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, but vary considerably both in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, there is even a minor difference in interpretation.

Chapter XXX

- 1: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, but vary considerably in the b parts, even in interpretation.
- 2: T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing, however, both in style and vocabulary.
- 3: T. and S. are similar throughout, but differ in vocabulary in both parts.
- 4: Other than that S. has an addition, ܝܢܪܝܬ at the very beginning not found in either T. or H., the a parts of T. and S. are quite similar. T. and S. are vaguely similar in the b parts, but differ both in vocabulary and style, S. giving a simpler reading.
- 5: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, but differ, however, in vocabulary in both parts.
- 6: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and, were it not for a minor difference caused by the very natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages, would be identical in the b parts as well.
- 7: T. and S. are identical throughout.
- 8: T. and S. are slightly similar in the a parts, differing, however, both in vocabulary and word order. T. and S. show more similarities in the b parts, where, however, they differ in vocabulary.
- 9: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, where they differ, however, in vocabulary.
- 10: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, differing in vocabulary in the b parts, however, ܝܢܪܝܬ or ܝܢܪܝܬ, in the b part of T., beginning as it does with a

nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs from the the corresponding form in the S., נלול.

- 11: Following de Lagarde's reading of T., T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary.

נלול or נ'לול in the a part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S., נלול. T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing slightly in style. מלול in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S.,

- 12: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, but differ here, too, in vocabulary.

- 13: T. and S. are similar, in the a parts, differing, however, both in style and language.

- 14: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, both in style and language. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, where they again differ in vocabulary.

- 15: T. and S. are slightly similar in the b parts, where they differ, however, both in style and vocabulary.

- 16: T. and S. are almost the same in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. are also very similar in the b parts, differing, this time, in vocabulary.

- 17: T. and S. are similar in the b parts, differing ever so slightly when the reading of de Lagarde is adopted, as, indeed, must be done, if sense is to be made of the b part of T. מלול in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is almost the same as the corresponding form in the S., מלול.

- 18: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are almost identical in the b parts, differing in an almost negligible point of style.
- 19: T. and S. are absolutely identical, that is, taking into account a slight difference resulting from the very nature of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 20: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, differing ever so slightly in style. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing slightly in vocabulary and style, there being a slight omission in T., which makes for a simpler style.
- 22: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, except for a minor difference arising from the very natures of ^{the} Aramaic and Syriac languages. נמל in the a partx of T., beginning with a nun instead of a yodh, is a Syriacism, and is almost the same as the corresponding form in S., נמל. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, differing in vocabulary.
- 23: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are slightly similar in the b parts, differing somewhat in vocabulary.
- 24: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and show some slight similarities in the b parts, even though there is a slight difference in interpretation.
- 26: T. and S. are slightly similar throughout, but differ somewhat in vocabulary, in both parts.
- 27: T. and S. are absolutely the same, except for minor differences caused by the very natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages.
- 28: T. and S. are identical throughout, except for

minor differences caused by the very natures of the Aramaic and Syriac languages. THE WORD **ܢܕܘ** IN BOTH THE REGULAR EDITIONS OF T. AND IN THE DE LAGARDE EDITION, MUST BE EMENDED TO **ܢܕܘ** SO THAT THE VERSE MAKES SENSE. THIS IS VERY SIGNIFICANT. THE FACT THAT THE TWO VERSES ARE IDENTICAL WHEN THE VOCABULARY IS SO MUCH OUT OF THE ORDINARY, AND THE SYRIAC WORD **ܕܘ** MEANING "TO DWELL" IS USED IN T., SHOWS THAT THAT THERE MUST HAVE BEEN SOME DIRECT COPYING, OR SOME CONNECTION OF SUCH KIND IN THIS VERSE, BETWEEN THE EDITORS OF THE S. AND THE JEWS.

- 29: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are just about identical, differing ever so slightly in a minor point of style.
- 30: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing somewhat, however, in style and vocabulary. In the b parts, T. and S. are but slightly similar, S. having an addition not found in T.
- 31: Following the more sensible reading of de Lagarde, T. and S. are identical in the a parts. THIS IS SIGNIFICANT AS THE VOCABULARY AND STYLE ARE OUT OF THE ORDINARY AND BOTH T. AND S. HAVE THE SAME VARIATION FROM THE HEBREW. In the intermediate section, T. and S. differ somewhat even in interpretation. T. and S. are somewhat similar in the last sections, T. being a little fuller in vocabulary.
- 33: T. and S. are quite unlike in the a and b parts. In the c parts, T. and S. are similar, differing slightly in vocabulary and style. **ܢܕܘ** in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, and is the same as the correspond-

ing form in S., קִיב . קִיב in the c part of
T., beginning with a nun, is also a Syriacism, even though
it differs with the corresponding form in the S., קִיב

Chapter XXXI

- 1: T. and S. show some slightly similarities, although S. differs in vocabulary and style, and has some omissions. However, it is interesting to note that S. reads ס'דא rather than סדא.
- 2: T. and S. are identical when the corrected reading of de Lagarde is adopted.
- 3: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. 'דן in the a part of T., a feminine plural absolute ending in a yodh, is a Syriacism, and is very similar to the corresponding form in the S., דנא.
- 4: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in the word order and in the fact, mentioned above, that, whereas the T. uses למאן, S. reads מאן. In the b parts, they are absolutely identical. THIS VERSE IS IMPORTANT FOR BOTH T. AND S. GIVE THE SAME RENDITION OF THE DIFFICULT H., WHICH RENDITION VARIES WITH THE PRESENT H. IN MEANING.
- 5: T. and S. show some slight similarities throughout, differing slightly in style and vocabulary in both parts.
- 6: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing, however, in style. T. and S. are identical in the b parts.
- 7: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing in vocabulary. נאן and נאן in the a part of T., both beginning with a nun, are Syriacisms, and are the same as the corresponding forms in the S., נאן and נאן.
- 8: The b parts are slightly similar, differing in both vocabulary and style. However, נאן in the b part of T., beginning with a nun, is a Syriacism, even though it differs with the corresponding form in the S., נאן.

- 8: T. and S. vary considerably in the a parts, even in interpretation. However, in the b parts, they are absolutely identical.
- 9: T. and S. are somewhat similar in the a parts, differing in style. In the b parts, they are only slightly similar, differing both in style and vocabulary.
- 10: T. and S. are almost identical throughout, differing slightly, however, in style in both parts. (this applies, in the b part, when using the corrected reading of de Lagarde) HOWEVER, S. HAS AN ADDITION AT THE VERY END WHICH IS FOUND NEITHER IN T. NOR H., THIS WOULD MEAN THAT THE b PARTS ARE UNALIKE.
- 11: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, but differ both in vocabulary and style in the b parts.
- 12: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, where, they differ, however, in vocabulary. T. and S. are also similar in the b parts, where they differ in style.
- 13: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, even though there is a major difference in style here.
- 14: T. and S. are almost identical in the a parts, there being a very minor difference in style. There are some similarities in the b parts, even though T. and S. differ in style and ~~interpretation~~ vocabulary.
- 15: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, even though there are differences both in style and vocabulary. They are also similar in the b parts, where there is somewhat of a difference in vocabulary.
- 16: T. and S. vary considerably in the a parts, but are

absolutely identical in the b parts.

- 17: T. and S. are similar in the a parts, differing slightly in vocabulary (however, it is possible that either T. or ^S should be emended, so that both T. and S. would be alike here.). There is some similarity in the b parts, though they differ here in vocabulary.
- 18: T. and S. are quite similar throughout, though there are differences in style in both parts, especially in the second parts.
- 19: Though T. and S. are quite unlike throughout, there is a striking similarity in the fact that they are somewhat similar in vocabulary, in vocabulary that is out of the ordinary run of vocabulary.
- 20: T. and S. are somewhat similar throughout, though they differ both in vocabulary and style in both parts.
- 21: T. and S. are very similar in the a parts, differing in style. They are also very alike in the b parts, where, however, there are differences both in style and vocabulary, and where S. is shorter, since it omits.
- 22: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, where, however, they differ in word order and vocabulary.
- 23: T. and S. are absolutely the same in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, where they differ slightly in vocabulary.
- 24: T. and S. are similar throughout, but they differ in vocabulary in both the a and b parts.
- 25: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, though differing considerably in style

and vocabulary.

26: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, where, however, they differ in vocabulary.

27: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, which fact is interesting, inasmuch as both have the same variation from the present H. The b parts are also similar, there being some differences in style.

28: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and are very similar in the b parts, differing very slightly in style.

29: T. and S. are very similar throughout, but differ in style throughout.

30: In the first part of the a parts, T. and S. vary greatly in vocabulary. In the second part of the a part, T. and S. are identical. In the b parts, T. and S. are similar differing both in style and vocabulary.

31: T. and S. are identical in the a parts, and almost identical in the b parts, differing ever so slightly in style.

נשכח in the b part of T., beginning with a mun, is a definite Syriacism, and is the same as the corresponding form in S., נשכח.

It is interesting to note that the Syriac has a little appendix here, stating that the book of Proverbs has ended, and giving the number of words in the Syriac Proverbs.

Summations of results

Comparison of Verses

Chapter I

<u>Verses identical</u>	<u>Almost identical</u>	<u>Similar</u>	<u>Slightly Similar</u>
	1, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32	13, 17, 20, 24, 25	22, 26, 27

Chapter II

<u>Verses identical</u>	<u>Al. Id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slightly sim.</u>
15	7b, 12, 14, 17	1, 2, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13	7a, 9, 19, 21

Chapter III

<u>Identical</u>	<u>Al. Id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slight. sim.</u>
13a, 16	2, 3b, 4b, 9b 11a, 12, 20a & poss. 20b, 34a	8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 24, 31a 35	5, 7, 18, 25, 27, 28a

Chapter IV

<u>Id.</u>	<u>Al. Id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slight. sim.</u>
2, 23b, 26a	10, 11, 19b 21, 22a	1a, 3, 4a, 4c, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 24 a, 26b	18, 19a

Chapter V

<u>Id.</u>	<u>Al. Id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slight. sim.</u>
2, 18b, 22b	4, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18a, 21	5, 7, 12, 15	6, 13, 22, 23

Chapter VI

<u>Id.</u>	<u>Al. Id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slight. Sim.</u>
5, 18b, 21b 26b, 34b	1, 13, 14a, 20, 23, 27a, 35b	2a, 4, 15, 16, 18a, 24a, 26a, 27b, 29, 32a, 34a	3a, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 28

Chapter VII

<u>Id.</u>	<u>Al. id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>Slight. sim.</u>
16, 23a	1, 17, 18, 22b	13, 19, 20a, 21a, 25b	2, 1a, 9, 10a, 27

Chapter VIII

<u>Id.</u>	<u>sl. id.</u>	<u>sim.</u>	<u>slight. sim.</u>
12a, 24a, 31a, 32b, 33a	6, 8, 14a, 20, 26, 31b, 35b	3, 7a, 10, 13, 21, 22	2, 4, 11, 23, 27, 28, 29, 33b
IX			
11a, 17a	4, 5, 9, 15	1, 2, 6a, 11b, 16, 17b	3
X			
8a, 9b, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a	5, 10a, 15a, 19b, 21b, 28, 29a, 30a 31b	2b, 3, 4, 6, 8b, 9a, 11b, 15b, 16, 27a	1, 7, 12a, 14b, 18, 20b, 22, 23 31a, 32
XI			
5a, 12a, 18b, 21a, 22, 23a, 25a, 30a	4a, 9a, 13b, 26a 29b	5b, 6a, 9b, 10, 13a, 18a, 21b, 23b, 26b, 28	1, 4b, 6b, 7, 11, 27
XII			
6b, 27a, 28	7a, 14b, 18, 21a	1, 3, 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 11, 16, 20b, 21b	14a, 15, 19, 22 25, 26a
XIII			
3a, 9a, 10b 17b, 25a	6a, 7a, 8b, 12, 13a, 22?	2a, 4b, 5, 9b, 12a, 14a, 15a, 20, 25b	17a, 19
XIV			
2b, 3b, 4, 12a, 13a, 19a, 20, 24a	5, 18a, 21, 25a, 33a	2a, 3a, 14, 15a, 16a, 19b, 21b, 22a, 26, 27, 28a 32, 34a	23b, 29, 30a, 33a, 35a
XV			
1a, 2a, 6a, 24b, 26b, 28a, 31	4a, 14a, 15a	4b, 6b, 7, 19b, 20a, 21b, 23a, 24a	3, 9, 11, 13a, 17, 30, 32?
XVI			
8, 11a, 13b, 15a, 17a, 21b, 29b, 31b, 32b	1, 21a, 10a, 15b, 17b, 20a, 22b, 32a, 33	6b, 14, 16, 24, 30, 31a	3, 6a, 12b, 13a, 16, 20b, 22a, 23b

<u>idem.</u>	<u>Al. id.</u>	<u>Sim.</u>	<u>slight. sim.</u>
XVII			
2, 4a, 13a, 26, 27a	1b, 6a, 22b, 24	6b, 9a, 13b, 18, 22a	1a, 3, 5a, 11a, 16, 17, 19b, 20, 28a
XVIII			
4b, 20a, 21b	5b, 16, 19b, 22a	4a, 5a, 9b, 10, 12a, 14b, 19a, 20b, 21a	2a, 8b, 9a, 12b, 17, 22b, 23
XIX			
6a, 10, 19, 21a, 26b	1a, 2, 6b, 23b, 23c, 26a	7a, 11a, 15b	3a, 9, 12a, 16, 17, 18a, 20, 23, 27
XX			
2b, 6a, 11, 12a, 17a, 19a, 20a, 21a, 26b	2a, 6b, 8a, 9a, 17b, 19b, 20b, 21b, 25a, 26a	4, 5b, 13, 15, 27a	7, 8b, 16b, 18, 22, 24a, 27b, 28, 30b
XXI			
3a, 16, 23a	1b, 8, 9a, 19b, 22a, 23b, 26, 27b	1a, 2, 3b, 6a, 13, 17, 26b	4, 11a, 14a, 15a, 18, 19a, 25, 27a, 28a, 29, 30
XXII			
2a, 8a, 9b, 14a, 18a, 27b, 28a, 29b	5b, 9a, 12a, 18b, 20a, 23a, 29a	2b, 8b, 14b, 21b, 23b, 28b	4, 5a, 7, 15, 16, 19a, 22, 24, 25
XXIII			
10b, 12, 17a, 23a, 26a	5a, 10a, 15a, 16, 17b, 23b, 32b	4a, 8, 11, 14, 22, 26b, 27	4b, 5b, 13, 15b, 18, 20, 21a, 24a, 25, 29, 34a, 35b
XXIV			
3a, 7b, 21b, 22b	2b, 16a, 22a, 23 24a, 25b, 28a, 34b	1, 5a, 11a, 12, 15, 19, 20b, 25a, 26a, 27b, 28b, 30, 31, 33	2a, 4, 5b, 6b, 8, 13, 16b, 17, 18, 20a, 21a, 24b, 27a, 29, 32b, 34a
XXV			
1b, 3, 4a, 6, 9a, 17b, 18a, 27a	1a, 9b, 10a, 11a, 13b, 20, 23a, 28	2, 5b, 6a, 12b, 14b, 18b, 22a, 24a	4b, 5a, 8b, 12a, 15 16, 19, 21, 23b, 26a 27b

XXVI

XXVII

iden.	al. id.	sim.	slight. sim.
XXVI			
1a, 4a, 5b, 7, 9b, 10b, 11a, 12e, 20a, 21a, 24a	1b, 5a, 10a, 16b, 23a, 26b	4b, 8a, 12b, 23b, 27b, 28a	3a, 9a, 14, 16a, 17, 19a, 20b, 25b, 26a, 27a
XXVII			
5b, 7a, 11a, 13b, 16, 17a, 21b, 25b, 26a, 27a	1a, 3a, 5a, 12a, 13a, 15a, 20a	2b, 3b, 7b, 8, 9, 10, 12b, 14a, 17b, 18, 21a, 25a, 26b	1b, 2a, 4, 15b, 18, 20b
XXVIII			
3b, 17a, 19a, 20a, 22b, 26a, 27a	4a, 14b, 19b, 23b, 28a	3a, 5a, 9, 10a, 11a, 16, 18a, 22a, 26b	1a, 6, 8, 10b, 11b, 13, 15, 17b, 18b, 23a, 26b, 27b
XXIX			
5, 8a, 15a, 19, 24a, 26a	1, 2b, 3a, 11a, 15b, 21a	2a, 4a, 7a, 9, 10a, 11b, 13, 20, 21b, 23a, 24b, 25a	3b, 14, 16a, 22, 25b, 26b, 27a
XXX			
1a, 6a, 7, 19, 22a, 23a, 24a, 27, 28, 31a,	6b, 16a, 18b, 20a, 29b	2a, 3, 4a, 8b, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13a, 14, 16b, 17b, 18a, 20b, 22b, 29a, 30a, 33c	4b, 5, 8a, 15b, 23b, 24b, 30b
XXXI			
2, 4b, 6b, 8b, 13a, 16b, 22a, 25a, 26a, 27a, 28a, 31a	10a, 11a, 14a, 21a, 26b, 31b	3a, 4a, 6a, 7a, 9a, 12, 15a, 17a, 18, 20, 22b, 24, 25b, 26b, 27b, 29, 30a	1, 5, 8b, 9b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 17b, 21b

Comparison of verb forms in verses

Verbs with nun, same as S.
or almost the same.

Verbs with nun, not same as
S., or with no corres. S.

I.

one in 10, 2 in 11, 1 in 33

2 in 28

II.

1 in 8

2 in 22

III.

1,3,21,34,35

1 in 10, 1 in 35

IV.

1 in 10, 1 in 21,
1 in 25

1 in 25

V.

2,10,17,22

16,20,23

VI.

2 in 15, 29

VII.

5

VIII

5, 2 in 24

25,34

IX.

3,4, 2 in 8,11,16

X.

6,7,9,11,14,21,28,30,31

1,3,9,22,25,27,29

XI.

26

3

XII

2 in 3, 2 in 7,27

12,17

XIII

2, 2 in 5, 2 in 9,13,20

20

XIV.

3,13, 2 in 14,19,26

XV

24

2,9,25

XVI

14

5,7,10

XVII

2

Verbs with nun, same as S.
or almost the same

Verbs with nun, not same
as S., or with no cor. S.

XVIII

10,20,21

10,14,15,17, 2 in 23

XIX

9,10, 2 in 23

2 in 5, 11,17,25

XX

5

1, 3 in 14

XXI

3 in 13,16,17,19

1,11

XXII

6,7, 2 in 8,9,16,19,27,29

6,15

XXIII

11,17,18,21, 2 in 24

16

XXIV

20,26

8,14

XXV

4,7,10, 2 in 17

22

XXVI

5,27

15

XXVII

2

18

XXVIII

2,9,10,13,16,17, 2 in 18,19,25,
27,28

13,20,23,26

XXIX

2,5,21,25

4,16,23,24

XXX

22,33

10, 2 in 11, 17,33

XXXI

2 in 7,31

8

-122-
Table of Comparisons

ch.	verses same whole	$\frac{1}{2}$ v.	almost same lv.	$\frac{1}{2}$ v.	similar lv.	$\frac{1}{2}$ v.	Slighty sim. lv.	$\frac{1}{2}$ v.	mun imp. in thrd. cor. in S.	per. no cor. in S
1.			16		5		3		4	2
2.	1		3	1	8	1	3	1	1	2
3.	1	1	2	7	9	1	5	1	5	2
4.	1	2	3	2	6	5	1	1	3	1
5.	1	2	6	1	4		3	1	4	3
6.	1	4	4	3	4	7	5	2	3	
7.	1	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	5	
8.		5	4	3	5	1	7	1	3	2
9.		2	4		3	3	1		6	
10.		6	2	7	4	6	6	4	9	7
11.	1	7	5	1	9		4	2	1	1
12.	1	2	4	4	7		4	2	5	2
13.		5	2?	5	2	9	1	1	7	1
14.	2	6	2	3	3	9	1	4	6	1
15.	1	6		3	1	7	6	1	1	3
16.	1	8	4	6	4	2	2	6	1	3
17.	2	3	1	3	1	4	4	5	2	
18.		3	1	3	1	8	2	5	3	6
19.	2	3	1	5		3	6	3	4	5
20.	1	8		10	3	2	4	5	1	4
21.	1	2	2	6	3	4	5	6	6	2
22.		8		7		6	17	2	9	2
23.	1	4	1	6	5	2	5	7	6	1
24.		4	1	8	7	7	6	10	2	2
25.	2	6	2	6	1	7	4	7	5	1
26.	1	10		6		6	2	8	2	1
27.	1	9		7	4	9	2	4	1	1
28.		7		5	2	7	4	8	12	4
29.	2	4	1	5	3	9	2	5	4	4
30.	4	6		5	6	12	1	6	2	5
31.	1	11		6	5	12	2	7	3	1
TOT	30	145	65	139	106	168	121	117	126	68

The final results of our investigation, in which it was our purpose to examine the verses in the Aramaic version of Proverbs which were like the Peshitta to Proverbs in a more thorough manner than has been done previously, has been the following:

Number of verses in which T. and S. are absolutely identical=30

Number of half-verses in which T. and S. are identical=145

Number of verses in which T. and S. are almost identical=65

Number of half-verses in which T. and S. are almost identical=139

Number of verses in which T. and S. are similar=106

Number of half-verses in which T. and S. are similar=168

Number of verses in which T. and S. are slightly similar=121

Number of half-verses in which T. and S. are slightly similar=117

Number of times that T. has a third person imperfect with a nun when there is a corresponding form in the S. that is the same or similar=126

Number of times when T. has the third person imperfect with a nun when the corresponding form in the S. is not similar, or when there is no corresponding form=68

Therefore, we see that there are Syriac influences in 656½ verses out of a total of 915 verses in the Targum to Proverbs. There are also 194 ^{instances} ~~verses~~ in which there are verb forms beginning with a nun. These are the main things with which we are concerned. A section will now follow which will include Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs which ~~forms~~ we failed to notice, and were listed by Maybaum.

Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs which We Failed to Notice

After we made our study of the Targum to Proverbs, it became apparent to us that we had missed many Syriacisms, because we concentrated chiefly upon similarities in style with the Peshitta, and upon verb forms in the third person imperfect which began with a nun. After reading Maybaum's article, Ueber die Sprache des Targums zu den Spruechen, mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, we decided to supplement our own treatment of the Syriacisms.

We will follow Maybaum's systematic arrangement of the Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs. First, we will treat of the pronouns, the nouns, the verbs, the verbs with suffixes, and the particles. Then will follow a section on syntax which will be subdivided into discussions of pronouns, nouns, and verbs.

I. Discussion of forms

A. Pronouns

1) The third person masculine singular pronoun in the Targum to Proverbs is not אִן , but הוּ , which may have been pronounced "hau," like a diphthong. Consequently, this form is very similar to the corresponding Syriac form. This spelling of the third person masculine singular occurs in Tar. Pr. 16.19, 32; 19.1; 24.5; 25.20; 26.18; and 28.6. (This is, of course, the case in a corrected text of this Targum.)

The second person feminine singular, pronoun אִתְּךָ in 7.4 is also a Syriacism. In the other Targumim it is אִתְּךָ .

2) The demonstrative pronouns in this Targum also show Syriac influence. The plural demonstrative הֵם "these," is written here as הֵם , which was probably originally pronounced as הֵם , but in the course of time, was wrongly vocalized. Such a spelling of

This word as this is not Aramaic, and is a Syriacism. One becomes convinced that this form is a definite Syriacism from the fact that this Targum also uses another pronoun with the same meaning as the previously mentioned one, and that this pronoun is a peculiarity of the Syriac language. This pronoun ܕܝܢܐ , "these," occurs in the following passages of T., 23.30; 24.23; and 31.8. The Syriac ܕܝܢܐ , "this," is used in Targ. Fr. in 22.19.

3) Although, for the interrogative pronoun, "who," this Targum uses the non-Syriac form ܕܝܢܐ , there are some similar forms which are definitely Syriac. For instance, the Syriac ܕܝܢܐ (ܕܝܢܐ) for "who", is used in 20.6; 27.4; 30.9. Also used for the pronoun "who" is the Syriac form ܕܝܢܐ which occurs, for example, in Targ. Fr. 11.26; and 27.16. This form is not used in other Targumim. The Syriac particle ܕܝܢܐ occurs in one passage in the best codex to Targ. Fr.

4) The Syriac ܕܝܢܐ and ܕܝܢܐ (mentioned in 2) are also used with "ܕ" (" ܕܝܢܐ " " ܕܝܢܐ ") as relative pronouns in the following passages: 23.30; 28.4; 30.5; 31.8.

There are 500 instances in this Targum where, in 294 passages, the Syriac emphatic state in the masculine plural noun is used, rather than the Aramaic emphatic. True, the ending is sometimes ܕܝܢܐ rather than ܕܝܢܐ , but that is merely due to mistakes in spelling made by later copyists, or by an attempt to utilize the spelling of the Hebrew script. There are such Syriac forms ending in ܕܝܢܐ in the following passages:

I- 4,6,7,10,12,20-23

II- 7,9,19-22

III- 2,15,18,20,25,33-35

IV- 11,14,17,19,22,23,26

- V- 6,9,10,16,17,22,23
VI- 14,17,-19,23,28,33
VII- 7,10,12,14,24,28
VIII- 2-5,11,15,16,20,25,34-36
IX-10,11,18
X- 2,3,6,7,11-17,19,20,26-32
XI- 3,5,6,9,10,11,16,19,21,23,28,30,31
XII- 3,5-7,9,10,12,18,21,23,24,26,28
XIII-2,4,9,10,12,14,15,19-21,25
XIV-3,8,9,11,15,18-20,22,24,27,30,33,34
XV-2-4,6-8,12-15,17,19,21,24,26,28-31
XVI-7,11,13-15,17,19,22,24,27,28
XVII-1,216,14
XVIII-4,5,15,16,18,21,23,24
XIX-4-6,13,23,27,29
XX-15,26,29,30
XXI-1,4,7,8,13,21,22,27
XXII-3,4,7,12,13,17
XXIII-1,10,12,17,28
XXIV-1,4,7,8,16,19-21,23-26,30,31
XXV-1-6,11,12,14,19,22,23,25,27
XXVI-3,6,13,16,18,20,21
XXVII-2,12,19,22,25-27
XXVIII-1,3,5,6,8,10,12,21,28
XXIX-2,7,8,10,12,14,16,19,26,27
XXX-3,14,25,28,31,33
XXXI-6,8-10,16,20,31

There are some other peculiarities about the nouns used in the Targum to Proverbs that show definite Syriac influence. For instance, דְּלוּחִיכּוֹן in 1.27, is definitely the Syriac construct דְּלוּחִי plus the suffix. מַלְכוּ and חַשְׁלִי, which both occur many times, are also under Syriac influence, even though they drop the ה (חַשְׁלִי for חַשְׁלוֹהִי)

c) The Verb

For one thing, the Targum to Proverbs follows the Syriac language in that it has infinitives in conjugations other than the Peal in which there is a mem preformative. Examples of this phenomenon are to be found in 1.2, לְעִיתִּבְרָחָא, and ethpeel infinitive, and in 6.30, לְמַתְדַּמְרוּ.

Very often, in this, the Targum to Proverbs, the imperfect is replaced by a particle followed by אִי, which later form is thereupon inflected as in the Syriac. For example, ^{the}verse 31.21, reads מַטּוֹל דְּכּוֹלְהוֹן בְּנֵי בֵיתָה לְבִישִׁין חוּן.

MOST IMPORTANT, THIS TARGUM HAS 149 verses in which a third person imperfect begins with a nun. The following are the passages which have such forms:

I-10,28,33

II-8,32

III-2,3,10,34,35

IV-10,21,25

V-2,10,16,17,23

VI-15,29

VII-5

VIII-5,20,25,34

IX-8,11,16

X-1,3,6,7,9,11,14,21,22,25,27,30,31

XI-3,26
 XII-3,7,17
 XIII-2,5,9,13,20
 XIV-3,13,14,19,26
 XV-4,9,24,25
 XVI-5,7,10,14
 XVII-2
 XVIII-4,10,12,14,15,20,21,23
 XIX-5,9,10,11,17,23,25
 XX-1,3,17,20
 XXI-1,11,13,16,17,20
 XXII-6,9,15,18, ~~21,22,23~~ 19,29
 XXIII-11,17,18,21,24,25
 XXIV-8,14,20,26
 XXV-4,5,7,10,17
 XXVI-5,15,27
 XXVII-2,18
 XXVIII-2,9,10,13,16-21,23,25-28
 XXIX-1-4,16,21,23-25
 XXX-10,11,17,22,23
 XXXI-7,31

Another peculiarity of the Targum to Proverbs is a plural imperative ending in י. Passages in which this occurs are 5.7; 7.25; 8.32; 30.8; 31.6.

A quite ^{un}common form of the verb in the Aramaic of the Targumim is this particular conjugation, which, however, is frequently used in Syriac. This conjugation is used quite a few times in this Targum to Proverbs. One instance is in 8.4

קרינא , "I call to you, O ye men." Other examples are:

C. Discussion of Syntax

1) nouns

Such phrases as עֲנִידָא לְהָא, מוֹסְרִיָּה דְפִנְיָא
דְּחִלְתִּי דְּאִלְהָא, נִשְׁלִי דְּשִׁלְוָא, are seldom used in other Targumim. This construct state with an anticipatory inflexion^{ct} and a dalet before the object (i.e., his proverbs of Solomon.), is used both in the Syriac and the Targum~~im~~ to Proverbs.

2) Verbs

The Targum to Proverbs shows definite Syriacisms in that the transitive verbs generally take a direct object beginning with a lamed, instead of the usual direct objects preceeded by א'. That means, in other words, that the transitive verbs in the Targum to Proverbs are connected to the following object not by the ~~particle~~ ~~in~~ particle א', but, ~~like~~ as in the Syriac, through a lamed, which really designates the dative case.

Examples of this phenomenom are to be found in Tar. Pr. 1.12; 3.12; etc. ONLY IN THREE PLACES DO WE NOTICE THE ARAMAIC PARTICLE ל', IN 3.6; 23.11; 2nd 25.8.

There are two further types of Syriacisms which Maybaum mentions. First, there are verses which are identically alike in both the Targum and the Peshitta to Proverbs. Secondly, there are verses in which both the Syriac and the Aramaic have the same ~~xx~~ variation from the Hebrew Masoretic text.

There are, according to Maybaum, 304 verses which are alike in both the Syriac and the Aramaic text to Proverbs.

They are the following:

I-1,6,8,10,13,15,18,21-23,25,30,33

II-1,4,10,14,17,21

III-2,4,6-6,15,19,21,25,29

- IV-2,3,10,14,18,21-23,25-27
V-2,4,5,7,8,10,13,16,21,23
VI-1,2,4,6,13,15,16,17,19,26,28,34
VII-2,4,10,16-18,23-25
VIII-4,8,10,12,13,20,23,26,32
IX-4,5,11,14,
X-3,5,7,9,16,22,30,31
XI-7,13,14,18,21,22,26,27
XII-3,6,7,11,16,18,21,25-28
XIII-5,6,8,15,17,19,20-22
XIV-2,5,9,10,12,14,16,19,20,27-29
XV-3,4,7,11,12,20,26,28,29,31
XVI-1-4,6,8,9,13-17,20,21,24,25,29,31
XVII-2,6,13,18,20,22,24,26
XVIII-4,5,6,20,21
XIX-6,8,10,14,19,26
XX-2,4,6,10,11,13-15,17,22,25-27
XXI-1,3,4,8,13,16,17,20,28-30
XXII-4,5,9,14,16,18,23,28,29
XXIII-4,5,8,10,11,12,16,17,23,26
XXIV-1,2,6,12,13,22,23
XXV-1,3,6,18,20,27
XXVI-1,4,5,7,9,10,16,23,27
XXVII-3,5,7,8,10,12,13,15,16,21
XXVIII-11,19,22,28
XXIX-1,3,5,13,18,19,21,24,26
XXX- 3,6,7,16,19,20,22,27-29
XXXI-2,4,6,13,21,23,27,29,31

(In the conclusion we will endeavor to show from our own findings, that, ~~due~~ to the fact that the verses were not taken by distiches, there were many inexactitudes in this count of 304 verses.) However, to be scientific and fair, we quote Maybaum's division of the verses which are similar in both the Syriac and the Aramaic.)

The following are some of these passages in which both T. and S. have the same variations from the Masoretic text:
1.7; 4.26; 16.4; 16.25; 27.19; 18.5.

Other passages in which both T. and S. give a different reading than M., and agree with each other are: 1.24; 5.9; 7.22x and 23; 9.11; 11.26; 12.19; 12.21; 14.14; 15.4; 20.4x and 14; 21.4x; 22.16; 24.5,22; 25.20,27; 26.5,7,10; 28.5,11; 29.18,21; 30.31; 31.6.

This finishes the lists of Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs which are mentioned in Maybaum's article. They are fairly exhaustive. We shall disagree with some of his computations in our final count.

Conclusion

Now that we have examined many of the secondary sources and have made our own investigation, we may attempt to come to some conclusion as regards the true relationship of the Targum of Proverbs to the Peshitta of that same book. Let it be understood that we have already accomplished our main task, namely, to point out, in as accurate a manner as possible, all of the Syriacisms that occur in the Aramaic text of Proverbs.

It is our belief that most previous investigators did not observe the stylistic relationships of the Syriac and Targum carefully enough. They tried to compare whole verses, rather than half-verses. Even a perfunctory glance at the texts will convince a reader that even in the same verse, the first parts in both T. and S. are identical, while the second parts vary greatly.

Maybaum has stated that of the 915 verses in the Targum, some 304 are "identical" with the Syriac. This assertion, while of value, is not quite accurate, unless by "identical" ~~with the~~ he meant very similar as well as absolutely alike. In our belief, it would be far more scientific to claim that 656¹/₂ verses of this Targum are more or less like the corresponding verses in the Peshitta. We only found 30 verses which are absolutely the same as the corresponding verses in the Peshitta. ¹⁴ No True, we find 145 half verses which were also identical. True we did find 65 verses which were almost identical. True we did find 139 half verses which were almost identical. Yet, it is ERRONEOUS to say that 304 verses in the T. and S. are identical. It is likewise an inexactitude to make the general statement that 304 verses of T. are similar to the corresponding verses in S.

Maybaum further stated that there were 149 verses in which a third person imperfect beginning with a nun is to be found in the T. to Proverbs. This is, of course, absolutely correct. However it is of utmost importance to COUNT THE EXACT NUMBER OF TIMES THAT SUCH A PHENOMENON APPEARS. We did, and found it to be 194 times. Not only that, we felt it to be of great importance to differentiate between the number of times ^{in which, which} such a phenomenon did appear, there was a corresponding form in the Syriac identically the same as or very similar to, the form in T., and the times in which ^{when} such a phenomenon did appear, the form in S. either differed with the form in T., or there was no corresponding form in the S. We believe that we have made such a distinction. There are 126 cases of the former (when there was a ^{similar} corresponding form in the T.) and 68 of the latter.

The next step will be to analyze the work of each authority we have discussed in the introduction, in order to see just what there is in his conjectures or conclusions.

First, there is Døthe. There is no doubt that his ^{an} contentions were, in the main, based on/incorrect text of the Targum to Proverbs, as Maybaum has conclusively proved. Nevertheless, it is still possible that there was something to his theory that the Syriac came first.

Then, there is Maybaum. No one ^{appears} to have made quite so careful a study of the Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs as did he. Yet, he is somewhat illogical in his conclusions. One thing that he did state that may be of value, THAT THE LANGUAGE IN THE TARGUM TO PROVERBS WAS SPOKEN IN PALESTINE IN THE FIFTH OR SIXTH CENTURY C.E. ^{Tal.} He backs up this contention by stating ^{that there are phrases in} the Targum to Proverbs. ^{similar to lang. in Talmud Yerushalmi.} His argument on the basis of the Genesis Rabbah, namely, that since ~~it~~ is apparent that texts from Proverbs

were used for preaching, ergo, there must have been a need for an early Aramaic translation, is not so convincing. YET IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THERE MAY HAVE BEEN AN EARLY ORAL TRANSLATION ~~BY~~ WHICH WAS LATER COMMITTED TO WRITING.

Baumgartner merely repeats the usual theories about the composition of the Peshitta, which same theories may be found in the Jewish Encyclopedia under the Article Peshitta. If it could be definitely shown that the Peshitta is of Jewish origin, and was read in the synagogues before the Aramaic translation arose, then our problem of tracing the relationship of the T. to Pr. and S. to Pr. would be much simpler. However, no definite information, that is beyond refutation, about such a use of the Peshitta has come to us yet.

BAUMGARTNER'S ASSERTION THAT THERE MAY HAVE BEEN A LATE REVISION OF THE SYRIAC VERSION OF PROVERBS ON THE BASIS OF THE LXX WOULD BE OF GREAT VALUE IF IT WERE TRUE. However, it seems to be merely a hypothesis.

Although there is no conclusive evidence that is beyond refutation, there is some sense to Baumgartner's claim that the Targum to Proverbs was composed at the end of the second century of the common era or at the beginning of the second century. However there is definitely no basis upon which he might make the further assertion that the Peshitta to Proverbs, made during the second century C.E., preceded the Aramaic version.

We now go to Hoelcke. He, too, seems to have little to say about the connection between T. and S. to Proverbs. His assertion that the T. came later, and was based upon the S., is largely a matter of feeling. All his arguments may be easily refuted. It is, of course, remotely possible that he may be

correct when the he says that the language of the Targum to Proverbs is more or less of a mixture, and could never have been either a spoken tongue, or a scholarly medium of expression. BUT HE FAILED TO NOTE THAT THROUGH THIS MIXTURE WE CAN SEE CERTAIN PREDOMINANT ELEMENTS WHICH MAY EASILY POINT TO AN ORIGINAL TIME OF COMPOSITION. The original text may have received many dialectical accretions as time went on. However, it is very obvious that there is ONE BASIC DIALECT OF ARAMAIC in which the text was written. It may have been written, as Maybaum states, in the fifth or sixth centuries C.E. in Palestine. Noéldeke's citation of Tabellen des Sophos, in which copying was done from the Syriac into the Aramaic is by no means conclusive. After all, this was a non-canonical book. No doubt, more care would have been exercised in case of a translation to Proverbs---no Syriac book would have been directly copied.

Next, we come to Kaminka. His contention that ^The Targum to Proverbs dates to a Pre-Tannaitic period, is very radical, of course. His contention that the Targum to Proverbs was composed before the time of the LXX is also quite incredible. HOWEVER, HIS THEORIES DO EXPLAIN SOME DIFFICULTIES. Firstly, if the present Aramaic text to Proverbs were based on a Hebrew text that preceded the Masorah, upon the basis of which the LXX was translated as he states, then it can be understood why a book containing so many readings that tally with the forbidden LXX was still retained in the Hebrew Mikraot Gedolot for many centuries.

Now we are in a position to develop some original hypothesis: Let it be understood at the very outset, that the relationship of the T, and S. to Proverbs is, and always will be, more or less of a mystery, unless several other problems are cleared up. First,

the relationship of the Targum in general to the Peshitta as a whole must be established definitely. Secondly, the dates of composition of these works must be ascertained. Thirdly, it would have^{to} been proved that the dialect spoken by the Palestinian Jews of the fifth or sixth centuries was an almost pure Syriac.

We return now, to a contention by Hoelcke that the dialect in the T. to Proverbs could never have been spoken, could never have even been a scholarly tongue. But what are the real facts? Of the various third person imperfect beginning with a nun, 126 have similar or identical verb forms in the Syriac, and 68 other have either no corresponding form in the Syriac, or have a corresponding form which is quite unlike them. Maybaum on page 75 of his work, enumerates in 79 verses/which 3rd person imperfects occur with a yodh. Third person imperfects with a nun, which do not correspond to the Syriac forms, which begin with a yodh are therefore, both very common in this book of the Targum. This definitely indicates a composite language, which is very close to the Syriac, and refutes the contention that the book is a conglomeration IN TOTO. No doubt, many 3rd person imperfect forms with a yodh were due to miscopying by later editors. No doubt, since the book was copied and recopied time and time again, the language in the Targum to Proverbs is more or less nondescript. YET, FROM THE VERY PRESENCE OF NUN FORMS IN THE THIRD PERSON IMPERFECT WHERE THERE IS CONSIDERABLE VARIATION FROM THE CORRESPONDING SYRIAC TEXT IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THERE MAY HAVE BEEN A SPOKEN LANGUAGE QUITE SIMILAR TO THE SYRIAC.

So much for this. Now we return to another problem. Was there any literary copying from T. to S., or from S. to T. Supposing such a contention is the fact that 656½ verses in both show some

similarity to each other. Furthermore, the vocabulary used in both T. and S. is very similar. Opposing such a view is the fact that within one verse, the a parts of T. and S. may be identical, while the b parts vary greatly.

Now, having all this in mind, we may come to some hypothesis, which, of course, cannot be definitely proved.

The most likely hypothesis is the following: There was once an original translation of the book of Proverbs, in an oral form, which was used by both the Jews and the Syriac peoples in and around Palestine. (It is fairly certain that even our present day Targum to Proverbs is a Palestinian work.) It may have been committed to writing sometime before the composition of the Midrash Rabbah to Genesis. Such a translation must have been made upon the basis of a pre-Masoretic reading of the Hebrew. Hence, many readings which are found in the LXX were found even in this original Targum to Proverbs. It may have been made either in Hebrew or Syriac script, or both. This original text was kept by the Jews for centuries. It was undoubtedly rendered into Syriac script by converted Jews, or by others, and incorporated ~~fixally~~ into the original Peshitta.

Finally, a redaction of the Peshitta ^{to Proverbs} may have been made on the basis of the LXX. This must have happened fairly late. The editors of (or perhaps editor of) this new edition of the Syriac Proverbs, however, were somewhat conservative, and stuck to either the pre-Masoretic or Masoretic text just as much as they did to the LXX. They must have had the Hebrew before them, ~~also~~, hence, even the newer version must have been very similar to the old one.

Palestinian Jewry must then have learned that a new translation of the Peshitta ^{as Pr.} had been made, and that their text to

Proverbs, which was as yet but semi-authoritative, was somewhat like the Syriac. This irked the Jews, not so much because the S. was similar to the T., since that had always been the case anyhow, but rather because the Syriac peoples thought of making a new translation before they did. Hence, a new redaction was made in Palestine too, in which attempts were made to "better" the Syriac. Some parts of ~~the~~ verses were purposely changed, even though the other part ~~was~~ allowed to correspond with the Syriac word for word. However, a very strange phenomenon occurred. Instead of adapting the newer methods of translation, as used in most other Midrashim (Haggada and Rabbinical Hermeneutics of various kinds; paraphrases, etc.), an attempt was made to make a fine literary translation, so as to do better than the editors of the Peshitta did. Not only that, the new translators loathed to depart from the old traditional Targum, even though it was but semi-official. An additional strange thing occurred. The language spoken in Palestine at that time was very similar to Syriac. Thus, the new version of the Peshitta to Proverbs, and the new version of the Targum to the same book were still very similar.

Frankly, this theory is very far-fetched. It cannot be substantiated. In each step, there may be many errors. Yet, we do not hesitate to posit this hypothesis, since it accounts for many things that otherwise remain a mystery.

Essentially speaking, then, it would be true that the original versions of T. and S. to Proverbs, very similar to the present texts, were both committed to writing in about the second or third century. And these original versions, according to our hypothesis, need not have been "copied" from each other. Even in

the final redactions, only an element of copying is involved, not actual literary theft. Therefore, we do not have a definite answer as to whether T. or S. came first, and which copied from the other. We would rather explain the Syriacisms in this T. to Proverbs on the basis of a chain of historical accidents.

Furthermore, this is the only way in which we can explain the readings which correspond to the LXX rather than to the Masorah which occur on both T. and S. Why should such readings be found in the Targum?

Of course, there are any number of other possible explanations. There may have been a revision of the Targum in which the meaning of many verses was unclear, and definite copying from the Syriac may have occurred in these doubtful places. The same may have been the case with the Peshitta, the editors of this Peshitta may have been obliged to copy ~~to copy~~ from the Targum in doubtful passages, when a revision was being made. But why, then, should there have been so many doubtful passages? There may have been a collaboration between the Syrian Church Fathers and the Rabbis for purposes of making a new translation. However, this is somewhat unlikely.

Somehow, the whole thesis of saying that either the Targum or the Peshitta to Proverbs came first does not appeal to us. We prefer to think that the whole phenomenon is a much more complex one. Somehow, too, we feel that the Jews would have been loathe to copy directly from the Syriac, and that the Syriac peoples, on the other hand, would not have copied directly from the Targum. However, we do feel that there must have been any number of indirect influences.

1) Let us review briefly what we do know for certain. 1) There are even more Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs than was previously acknowledged. 2) It is fairly certain that the Targum to Proverbs may have been composed in its final form in Palestine, even as late as the fifth or sixth century, even though there must have been a very similar edition three centuries before that time. 3) That the Targum to Proverbs is based on either a spoken or written dialect, though there are later accretions in the text.

Of course, even these facts are open to doubt. There are too many problems which are very important for our work which ~~we~~ have not as yet been definitely solved.

Perhaps, it would be best to state, simply, that there are an unusual number of Syriacisms in the Targum to Proverbs, and that we really cannot explain why this is so. However, we have felt it best to posit some hypothesis, however fallacious, that would explain some of the mysteries that surround both the Targum and the Syriac versions of Proverbs.

Perhaps, some day, more will come to light about this problem. Perhaps, the truth will be even stranger than the hypotheses that have been thus far posited.

So much remains. Dathe, Maybaum, Koeldeke, Baumgartner, and Kaminka have not really found the truth. They failed to see many of the complications involved in this work, and made theories that are ill-founded.

Not wishing to claim that we have found the truth, we admit that our hypothesis is, perhaps, somewhat fanciful. Yet with it one finds the answers to many problems. Knowing that the search for the truth will continue, we pray that someday the true relationship of the Peshitta and the Targum to Proverbs may be

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Original Sources

- A. Mikraot Gedolot to Proverbs, ed. Julius Sittenfeldt,
third part: Hagiographa, containing Proverbs, (Aramaic Text)
Berlin, 1866, pp. 112-154
- B. Mikraot Gedolot, Section: Hagiographa (Aramaic text), Proverbs,
Suessmann and Abraham Jabetz, Warsaw (1874), pp. 182-269
- C. Syriac to Proverbs in Vetus Testamentum Syriace (Peshitta to
A.T.), ed. S. Lee, A.M., London (1823), pp. 451-570

II. Dictionaries

- A. Dictionary of the Talmud, M. Jastrow
- B. Syriac-English Dictionary, J. Payne Smith, Oxford press (1903)
- C. Chaldaeisches Woerterbuch, J. Levy, *Leipzig, 1867.*

III. Secondary Materials

A. Encyclopedias

1. Jewish Encyclopedia, Funk and Wagnalls Co. (1907), *2 vols.*
a. Article on Targum, vol. 12, p. 62
b. Article on Peshitta, vol. 9, pp. 653-655
2. Catholic Encyclopedia, *1st. edition 1907, N.Y.*
Article on Targum, vol. 14, p. 457

B. Corrected text of Targum

(Liber) Proverbiorum
De Lagarde, Hagiographa Chaldaice, pp. 118-145, Leipzig (1873)

C. Previous Works on the subject

1. Baumgartner, Ant. J., Etude Critique sur L'Etat du Texte
du Livre des Proverbs, Leipzig, 1890, pp. 1-5, 11-17,
246-271
2. (Dathe, J. A., De Ratione Consensus Vers. Syr. et Chal.
Proverbe, in Opuscula ad Crisin et Interpretationem
V.T. Spectantia by S. Rosenmueller, 1814, Leipzig, p. 106ff.)

3. Geiger, A., Nachgelassene Schriften, vol. IV, pp. 112-116,
ed. Ludwig Geiger, Berlin (1876)
4. Kaminka, A., Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia, HUC Annual,
vol. 8-9, Philadelphia (1932), pp. 169-191
5. Maybaum, S., Ueber die Sprache des Targum zu den Spruechen, in
Archiv fuer Wissenschaftliche Erforschung des A.T., Merx,
Halle, 1871, II, I, pp. 66-93.
6. Hoeldeke, Th., Das Targum zu den Spruechen von der Peshitta
abhaengig, pp. 246-249, Archiv fuer Wissenschaftliche
Erforschung des A.T., II, II, Halle, 1871, pp. 246-249.
7. Pinkuss, H., Der Syrische Uebersetzung der Proverbien, ZATW,
vol. 14, 1894, pp. 165-141