

Introduction to *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*

by

A. Houtman
J.C. de Moor

Protestant Theological University, Kampen
2005 – 2010

First published in
A. Houtman, J.C. de Moor, *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*,
Vol. 21: Introduction, Additions and Corrections, Indices, Leiden 2005, 1-15.

see further: <http://www.brill.nl/default.aspx?partid=210&pid=7151>

1. A Short History of *BCTP*

A concordance is one of the most useful tools for textual research. Nevertheless it has taken a long time before a start was made with the production of a concordance to the Targum of the Prophets. Already at the beginning of the last century, Emil Brederek intended to compile such a concordance, but unfortunately he never carried out his plan.¹ Brederek noted the necessity of a bilingual presentation for concordances of the ancient Bible translations. In his own words (p. vii):

Es ist ja eigentlich zu verwundern, daß die Septuaginta bisher die einzige Überetzung des A.T. ist, über die wir Konkordanzen besitzen. Denn die verschiedene Vulgatakonkordanzen kann man hier nicht mitzählen, da ihnen allen m.W. das Wichtigste fehlt, die hebräischen Äquivalente.

In the sixties of the previous century, one of us (De Moor) started to implement the idea of a bilingual concordance to the Targum of the Prophets in the form of a key-word-in-context concordance which he prepared together with J.D. de Haan and F. Sepmeijer.² However, since at that time they were still working by hand with a card index, this early project proved too time-consuming. However, with the arrival of affordable personal computers able to process Hebrew characters new opportunities arose. Consequently, in 1987 a fresh start was made with the computer-aided production of a bilingual concordance to the Targum of the Prophets at the Theological University of Kampen.³ In 1995 the first volume of *BCTP* was published by Brill (Leiden) and now, eighteen years later, the series is complete.

It must be acknowledged that not all goals that were stated at the start of the project have been achieved. In the Preface to the first volume two goals were formulated:⁴

1. A computer concordance of the Targum to the Prophets which will enable users to search under Aramaic, Hebrew or English keywords. This concordance will also contain comments and bibliographical references to individual verses of the Targum.
2. Printed concordances per book of the Prophets, listing Aramaic and corresponding Hebrew lemmas. These printed concordances are not merely intended for scholars who do not use computers, but will primarily serve as a convenient basis for comparison of the translation techniques of the individual books.

The second aim has been fully achieved. The first one, however, remains unfulfilled because it proved to be too ambitious for the period and manpower devoted to the task. The Hebrew-Aramaic indices in the volumes dealing with the individual books and the cumulative English-Aramaic and

¹ Cf. E. Brederek, *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos* (BZAW, 9), Gießen 1906, vi.

² The lack of context was a big disadvantage of J.B. van Zijl, *A Concordance to the Targum of Isaiah* (SBL Aramaic Studies, 3), Missoula 1979.

³ For more background on the early phase of the project, see J.C. de Moor, 'A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets', in: I.E. Zwiép & A. Kuyt, *Dutch Studies in the Targum: Papers read at a workshop held at the Juda Palache Institute, University of Amsterdam* (18 March 1991), Amsterdam 1993, 104-117.

⁴ *BCTP* I, vi. See also J.C. de Moor & A.J.P.W van der Wal, 'Report on a Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets', in: *Bible et informatique: "matériel et matière": Actes du Quatrième Colloque International, Amsterdam 15-18 Août 1994*, Paris 1995, 373-78 (374).

Aramaic-Hebrew indices in this volume essentially fulfil the goal we envisaged. Moreover, the cumulative Aramaic-Hebrew index enables the user to see at a glance in which books a certain Aramaic lemma occurs.⁵

During the past eighteen years a large number of people participated for a longer or shorter period in the project. First of all there were the editors, J.C. de Moor, W.F. Smelik, E. van Staaldune-Sulman, B. Grossfeld, F. Sepmeijer, T.J. Finley and A. Houtman. Important roles were played by M. Smelik-Oldenhof as assistant editor and A.J.P. van der Wal as programmer. Jerome A. Lund who worked on the Targum of the Prophets for Stephen Kaufman's *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*⁶ kindly provided us with lists of errors he had spotted in Sperber's edition.⁷ The following persons rendered valuable assistance during one or more stages of the editing process: J. Biewer, R. Blanco, F. de Boer-Knegt, R. de Hoop, J. Kader, G. Klompmaker, A. Knop, C. Kors, D.J.D. Kroeze, G.W. Lorein, J. Mosbarger, G.H. Offringa, J.C. Overeem, J. Renkema, L. Roersma, S.E. Scheepstra, D. Shepherd, J.M. Tanja, A. Tol, J. Vonk, D. Wiggers.

2. The Layout of *BCTP*

Although the use of a concordance is largely self-evident, a few remarks concerning the editorial principles we adopted of the concordance are in place.⁸ First of all it must be made clear what may be expected from the concordance. What does it include? How is the material organised? And how is it presented?

2.1 Contents

The concordance includes all content words, with the exception of personal names and toponyms. Names tend to remain unaltered in a translation and are therefore generally not included in the concordance. An exception has been made for cases where the Aramaic rendering differs considerably from the Hebrew source text.⁹ These cases are marked by an asterisk to remind the reader that not all occurrences of the name in the Targum have been included. If one wishes to do research into a name, one should therefore use a Hebrew concordance and add the occurrences found there to the occurrences in the bilingual concordance.

Some frequent particles were omitted from the concordance, since their inclusion did not seem to be useful. This applies to the following cases:¹⁰ ב, ד, ה introducing a question, ו, כ, ל, לא, מן 'from', ע, ע' to', על, עמ, unless they are part of fixed compounds like להל, כד etc.

2.1.1 Base Texts

The Hebrew text of the concordance is the text of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. We used the

⁵ This desideratum has rightfully been mentioned by J. Ribera-Florit in his review in *JSJ* 32 (2001), 352-54 (353).

⁶ See <http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/info.html>.

⁷ A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, vols 2 & 3, Leiden 1959-1962.

⁸ See also W.F. Smelik, 'Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan', *JJS* 49/2 (1998), 286-305; Idem, 'Translation and Commentary in One: The Interplay of Pluses and Substitutions in the Targum of the Prophets', *JSJ* 29/3 (1998), 245-60.

⁹ See *BCTP* I, ix, rule 16.

¹⁰ See *BCTP* I, ix, rule 21.

text of the Center for Computer Analysis of Texts of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia as base text with a few minor corrections from the Online Bible BHS text. For the Targum we decided to use the text of Targum Jonathan as found in Alexander Sperber's edition,¹¹ which in turn was based on the manuscripts MS 2210 for the Former Prophets and MS 2211 for the Latter Prophets, both in the British Library. This choice was motivated by practical considerations. Although the edition of Sperber has been justly criticised,¹² it still is the best we have at the moment, and moreover it is widely available. As a matter of course obvious errors in the text have been corrected.¹³ The corrections were carried out without explicit note.¹⁴ Instead we announced that we would provide a complete list of all the emendations in the index volume.¹⁵ It concerns the following cases:

- Samuel

I 8,9	דימליך → דימלוך
I 9,13	למיכל → למיכל
I 18,10	ביומא → ביומה
II 11,19	כשיצויתך → כשיצויתך
II 14,7	למקטל → למקטל
II 22,3	לארמא → לארמא
II 22,25	כברירורתי → כברירורתי

- Kings

I 13,31	יתיב → יתיה
I 20,30	תון → תין
II 3,8	דאדום → דאדום
II 18,19	רמזנא → רמזנא
II 20,11	יד → ית
II 22,11	תועיבתא → תועיבתא

- Isaiah

1,17	זכו → זכו
5,25	רוגזיה → רוגזיה
10,33	רבון → רבון

¹¹ A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, 5 Vols, Leiden 1959-73. Paperback reprint Leiden 1992.

¹² For a summary of the critique, see e.g. A. Houtman, 'Planning a New Targum Edition: Look Before You Leap', *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2/2 (2000), 213-231 (217).

¹³ In this respect we like to note again the invaluable help of Jerome A. Lund who generously placed the list of errors he detected during his work for the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon at our disposal. Unfortunately his corrections to Joshua and Judges arrived too late to be incorporated in the concordance. These and other cases will be mentioned in Chapter 2. For Isaiah we could also draw upon the lists of errors produced by J.B. van Zijl, 'Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah', *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4 (1965), 189-91; Idem, 'A Second List of Errors in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah', *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 7 (1968-69), 132-34.

¹⁴ Apparently some users missed this. See e.g. the review of M. Maher, *JSOT* 89 (2000), 60.

¹⁵ See *BCTP* VI, vi, rule 9.

11,4	בהימנותא → בהימניתא
16,3	תקר בין → תקרבין
25,10	גברותא דיוי → גבורתאדיוי
38,8	טול → טוב ¹⁶

- Jeremiah

2,8	ונביי שקרא → ונביישק רא
3,11	זכיא → זכיא
3,13	אלהיך → אלהיך
25,14	רברבין → רברבין
27,4	תימרין → תימרין
30,9	דויד → דויד
39,10	ומנינון → ומנינוי
49,7	לאדום → לאדום
50,31	רגזי → רגזי
51,25	יקידא → יקירא

- Ezekiel

4,8	לסטרך → למטרך
7,24	רבית → רבות
11,7	קטיליכין → קטיליכין
11,12	ודיני → ודיני
13,9	לצדיקי → לצדיקי
20,13	במדברא → במדברא
20,21	נטרו → נטרי
20,42	דישראל → דישראל
36,25	אדכי → אדכ
40,16	ולאליהון → ולאליהין
40,36	וכוין → וכין

- The Twelve

Zp 2,5	דיתבין → דיתבון
Ze 14,15	דיהי → דיה

At the outset of the project it was decided out of practical considerations to present only the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible and of Targum Jonathan. Some scholars considered this a disadvantage because the vowels may change the morphological or semantic structure, which determines the meaning of the word.¹⁷ Of course the editors were well aware of this fact and therefore the vowels were certainly taken into account in establishing the lemmas.¹⁸

¹⁶ Although the reading טוב is in accordance with MS 2211, which is the base text of Sperber's edition, it still must be considered an error.

¹⁷ E.g. J. Ribera-Florit in his review of *BCTP* XII-XVII, *JSJ* 32/3 (2001), 352-54 (354).

¹⁸ See *BCTP* I, vii.

2.1.2 Variant Readings

All major variants listed by Sperber are included in the concordance. Variant readings that did not lead to a different lemma were ignored. Also variant readings that were obvious writing errors were generally ignored. The variants from Sperber are indiscriminately marked by the addition of a superscript ^v to the designation of the verse, e.g. 24,15^v.¹⁹ The reader is referred to the apparatus of Sperber for identification of the source(s) of the variant. In the first volumes of *BCTP*, especially Joshua and Judges, variants from sources other than Sperber were also included. These are indicated by a superscript ^t. Those in Joshua were derived mainly from the Tosefta Targum in MS T.S. B 13,12.²⁰ Especially the volume of Smelik on Judges is enriched with variants from different sources that were not collated by Sperber. One has to consult his book on Judges to find out the source of the variants.²¹ From *BCTP* III onwards the variants are restricted to the ones collated by Sperber.²²

2.2 Organisation of the Material

First of all the Aramaic text was analysed grammatically and studied in connection with the Hebrew source text. Apart from the exceptions mentioned above, each Aramaic word was lemmatised and provided with an elementary English translation. For the lemmas the following forms were chosen.²³

- Verbs are cited according to their root. Different stems are treated as separate lemmas.
- Nouns are cited in the determined state.
- Adjectives are cited in the masculine absolute state.
- Numerals are taken in the masculine absolute state.

Generally the spelling of Aramaic lemmas relies on Gustav Dalman's dictionary.²⁴ The few cases where we deviated from his decisions are listed in *BCTP* I, viii. The spelling of the Hebrew lemmas

¹⁹ Ribera-Florit remarked in his review (see note 17) that it would have been advantageous if a distinction had been made between the Eastern and Western recensions.

²⁰ H. Fahr & U. Gleßmer, *Jordandurchzug und Beschneidung als Zurechtweisung in einem Targum zu Josua 5* (Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 3), Glückstadt 1991.

²¹ W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden 1995.

²² See *BCTP* III, v. Hitherto the plan announced there to publish variant readings in a separate series has not been carried out. Kasher's rich collection of targumic Tosafot partly serves the goal, cf. R. Kasher, תוספות חרומים לנביאים, Jerusalem 1996. In 2001 it was decided that what was really needed was a new critical edition of the Targumim, cf. A. Houtman, 'Planning a New Targum Edition: Look Before You Leap', *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2/2 (2000), 213-231. For more information on the present state of that project, <http://targum.org/>.

²³ See *BCTP* I, viii, rules 12-15.

²⁴ G.H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, Göttingen 1938.

is based on the dictionary of William Holladay.²⁵ If Dalman gives both the *plene* and the defective spelling under the same lemma, the defective spelling is chosen. In cases where this might lead to confusion, the *plene* spelling is added in brackets, e.g. ‘man’ (גברא (גוברא)). In the case of orthographic variation, like סמלא/סמאלא/שמאלא, Dalman's preferred spelling is followed. The tags that were applied to the words indicate whether a word is a verb or not, and if it is a verb, to which stem it belongs.

2.2.1 Target Text Orientation

In the case of a bilingual concordance, in which both the source text and the target text are represented, only one of the texts can serve as a point of departure. As the name already indicates, for *BCTP* the target text, i.e. Targum Jonathan, was chosen as a base.²⁶ The advantage of this approach is that it allows easy access to Aramaic pluses and exegetical expansions. Moreover, because of the sanctity of the Hebrew Bible, the meturgemans seldom skipped a word in their translation, so that with a target text oriented approach well nigh both texts are covered. However, exceptions to this rule exist. With the chosen approach these exceptions cannot be indicated otherwise than by the insertions of lacuna-marks in the Aramaic verse quotation.²⁷ So, unfortunately, *BCTP* does not allow a systematic investigation of the limited number of Hebrew words that were skipped in the Aramaic translation.

2.2.2 Equation

An important step in the production of the concordance was the assessment of the relation between the source text and the target text. In other words, it was necessary to determine to which Hebrew word in the source text the relevant Aramaic word referred.²⁸ This proved sometimes to be rather complicated, especially in the Latter Prophets who are more poetic than the Former Prophets. The following cases can be problematic: *Ketib Qere*, double-duty verbs, similes, and multiple translations.

- *Ketib Qere*. Usually the Targum agrees with the *Qere* and therefore the *Qere* is accepted as the Hebrew equivalent. But since we do not know whether the Targum preceded or followed the Masoretic reading tradition, the *Ketib* also is generally incorporated as an equivalent. This practice inevitably distorts the statistics.
- *Double-duty verbs*. This term refers to verses using a certain verb once, but assuming it twice, quite a regular phenomenon in classical Hebrew.²⁹ These verbs often receive a second translation in the Targum. Whether the repetition is a linguistic necessity in Aramaic remains open to conjecture. Stylistic preferences, or the tendency to avoid

²⁵ W.L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Based upon the Lexical Work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner*, Grand Rapids 1988 (corrected reprint of first edition, Leiden 1971).

²⁶ For the terminology, see J. Toury, ‘Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance — Toward a TT-Oriented Approach to Literary Translation’, in: Idem, *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv 1980, 35-50.

²⁷ See e.g. the case of Kgs II 14,26 in *BCTP* VII, 45.

²⁸ For a detailed treatment of this issue, see W.F. Smelik, ‘Translation and Commentary in One: The Interplay of Pluses and Substitutions in the Targum of the Prophets’, *JSJ* 29/3 (1998), 245-60; Idem, ‘Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan’, *JJS* 49/2 (1998), 286-305.

²⁹ See e.g. M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, Winona Lake 1980, 122-29.

ambiguity wherever possible, may also have played a role. On whatever premise, the second translation is a synonym for the source text, representing the Hebrew verb as well as the first translation. Therefore as a rule both translations are included as separate equivalents to the Hebrew verb in question.

- *Similes*. The Targums show the tendency to substitute realistic meanings for (presumed) metaphors in the Hebrew text. Often the literal translation is maintained, but preceded by the realistic meaning in combination with the preposition כּ.³⁰ Realistic substitutions for metaphors are taken as valid equivalents. Extended similes where both the tenor and the vehicle are retained are likewise considered as valid equivalents.
- *Multiple translations*. Sometimes a word or expression in the MT is translated two, or even more, times.³¹ This may be for different reasons. In some cases, a verb is taken as a double-duty verb that serves different parts of the verse, as we have seen above. At other times, the meturgeman apparently wanted to preserve two different readings of the source text, e.g. Isa 19,18 ההרס and ההרס. In still other cases, the goal of the double translation was probably to maximise the sense of Scripture.³² For example, in Isa 27,1 the MT התנין is interpreted twice, first as a wordplay, and then literally as ‘dragon’. Whatever the reason may have been, all translations are considered valid equivalents of the Hebrew source text.

In many cases the relationship between target text and base text can be explained in various ways. For this reason the individual editors were granted much freedom in establishing correspondencies and choosing translations from the possibilities the dictionaries of Dalman and Holladay offered (see further 1.3 below). Only in the indices published in this volume we felt obliged to standardise renderings where this seemed expedient.

After the editor responsible determined the relation between the target text and the source text, the Aramaic lemma was linked to the Hebrew lemma in a self-learning database program.³³

From this database a rough concordance was produced automatically. In this preliminary version of the concordance the Aramaic and the Hebrew keywords were counted and outlined correctly, but the context still needed editing. In the design of the concordance it was decided to delimit the context to sensible units that illustrate the meaning of the lemmas as clearly as possible. This part of the job had necessarily to be done manually. At this stage lacuna marks also were inserted for parts of a sentence that had no equivalent in the parallel text. These marks serve to clarify the connection between the Hebrew and the Aramaic. The human factor in this procedure accounts for some of the inconsistencies mentioned below. When this tedious job was finished, the files were converted into LATEX files, the typesetting system that has been used for the printed

³⁰ See e.g. F. Böhl, ‘Der erweiterte Vergleich in Targum’, *FJB* 18 (1990), 23-44.

³¹ Z. Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten*, Breslau 1872, 39-40; P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New Haven 1907 [=1927], 139-41; E.Z. Melammed, *המקרא מפרשי*, 2 vols, Jerusalem ²1978, I.331-32; L. Díez Merino, ‘Procedimientos targúmicos’, in: V. Collado-Bertomeu & V. Vilar-Hueso (Eds), *II. Simposio Bíblico Español (Córdoba 1985)*, Valencia 1987, 461-86 (482-83); J.C. de Moor, ‘Multiple Renderings in the Targum of Isaiah’, *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001), 161-80.

³² P.S. Alexander, ‘Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture’, in: J.M. Mulder & H. Sysling (eds) *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen 1988, 217-53 (227).

³³ This computer program was written by Peterjan van der Wal.

edition. After the last necessary stage of thorough proofreading and correction, the final version was produced.

2.3 Presentation of the Material

Now that the contents and the organisation of the material have been explained, here is some comment on the presentation of the material.

- *Order of quotations.* Under the lemmas the quotations are first ordered according to the alphabetical order of the context forms. Within this order they are sorted according to their occurrence within the biblical books.
- *Round brackets.* Round brackets in the Targum text enclose text that the editor restored to render a variant reading understandable. In the Hebrew text round brackets indicate a Ketib Qere in the simplest possible notation.³⁴
- *Lacuna marks.* When the target text has a plus vis-à-vis the source text this is indicated by means of a lacuna mark consisting of four hyphens.³⁵ Only one lacuna mark is inserted in the text, regardless of the number of extra words in the target text.
- *Word order.* Generally the meturgemans kept strictly to the word order of the Hebrew source text. In the few cases where they did not, there was no univocal way to indicate the transposition.³⁶ Therefore, if the user encounters a case where it seems that lacuna marks are missing for certain words, the possibility of a transposition should be considered. An example of this is II Kgs 12,5 *BCTP* VII, 166) where the Hebrew expression לבִּיאִישׁ is translated by גבר בלביה. There can be no doubt here about the semantic parities לבא || לב and איש || גברא. Therefore the Aramaic גבר occurs in the first half of the citation without a parallel lacuna mark, whereas its Hebrew equivalent איש can be found in the second half of the citation.
- *Statistics.* Between the Aramaic lemma and its Hebrew equivalent, two numbers are given. The number between square brackets indicates the total number of times the Aramaic lemma occurs within the given book. The other number indicates in how many of these cases it is the translation of the given Hebrew equivalent. It must be noted that the statistics are not fully reliable. The numbers should be interpreted more as an indication than as absolute values. Two factors are responsible for the confusion. Firstly, in the earlier volumes of *BCTP* the complete variant readings were analysed and included, even if part of the text did not lead to new lemmas. This could mean that the same text was included two, or sometimes even more times. Since the statistics simply count all the occurrences listed, and not only the occurrences in the base text, the statistics are biased. Secondly, the inclusion of compound words as well as their constituent parts has inevitably corrupted the statistics.

³⁴ In the volumes on Isaiah round brackets are occasionally used to indicate a reverse word order.

³⁵ Because of the holiness of the Hebrew text the opposite occurs only rarely.

³⁶ See note 34.

- *Guiding references.* A long arrow after an entry serves as a guiding reference. It refers the spelling under which a certain word is listed.
- *Cross-references.* The words ‘See also’ under a lemma refer to related lemmas.

3. Unity and Variety

Now that *BCTP* has been completed, some mention must be made about the issue of unity and variety in the work as a whole. Although all volumes appeared under the umbrella of *BCTP* and were subjected to the guidelines we described earlier, in a sense they remain independent scholarly works. *BCTP* must be seen as a series, rather than as a compound, rigorously unified work. Guidelines are not the same as strict orders. Experience teaches that scholars do not like to be ordered around. They are trained to take notice of the work and ideas of others, but in the end they make their own decisions. This is good, but it complicates the production of a compound work. Therefore the decision was made to allow the editors a certain amount of freedom. The structure and layout of the work had to be uniform, as well as the orthography and, as far as possible, the English translation of the lemmas, but the decision to solve difficult or ambiguous cases was left to the individual editors. In the case of a Targum, no other policy is defensible. In many cases several different solutions are possible to explain the relationship between base text and target text, so any editor should be allowed to make her or his choice.

Moreover, over the years insights have changed. By using the earlier volumes in practice, the disadvantages of some of the decisions taken at the outset became clear. In this respect we would like to thank the users who have taken the trouble to share their experience with us. Due to these experiences, some of the editorial principles of the first volumes have been adapted to new insights in the book of Kings, and some others have been added.³⁷ Still later, some of these principles were again adapted slightly, although we tried as best as we could to maintain continuity wherever possible. In some cases the English translation of lemmas had to be changed for practical reasons. Sometimes the translation chosen earlier did not meet the needs of the editors of later books, while in other cases a rendering was simply too long to fit into the given space.

In order to enable the users to employ the series of concordances to the separate prophetic books as a compound concordance to the Targum of the Prophets, an attempt will be made here to give an overview of the differences of which one should be aware.

3.1 Analysis

Since there is still no comprehensive description of the grammar of the language of Targum Jonathan, opinions may differ as to the classification of certain words. This explains some differences in the analysis of identical word forms. This concerns chiefly participles that occur both as nouns and as verbs. Mostly we followed Dalman in this respect too, but unfortunately he frequently left open both possibilities. The user is therefore advised to check both lemmas.

Another source of differences of opinion is the analysis of words like בלבב as *Quadrilittera* (*BCTP* IX, XVIII) or as *Palpel* (*BCTP* III) verbal forms.

³⁷ For the first set of editorial principles, see *BCTP* I, vii-ix. For the second set, see *BCTP* VI, vi.

3.2 References

BCTP applies a double system of references. A large arrow after an entry serves as a guiding reference. It refers to another entry without giving any occurrences, e.g.:



This is the case when a reader might look for a word according to a certain common orthography, while we decided to use the orthographic representation chosen by Dalman. The different editors do not provide such references in an equally consistent way.

Apart from these guiding references, there is also a system of cross-references. These are marked by the words ‘See also’ under the lemma. Whereas one editor uses such references sparingly, another prefers a liberal use to avoid misunderstanding. Generally speaking the following rules applied:

- Cross-references are chiefly used in cases where semantically related, but not identical, lemmas occur in different spellings, as for example בצרתא, בצורתא, and בצירתא. In cases like these, one could argue about whether or not they are merely orthographic variants, but since it needs specialised study to decide such examples – and then opinions will still differ –, we decided not to burn our fingers on these issues, but to simply follow Dalman. Wherever he decided to include a related form as a separate lemma, we followed his decision. However, cross-references were inserted to the related lemmas as assistance for the user.
- Another possible use is when a noun is clearly derived from a verb, such as for instance פִּרְיָקָא ‘redeemer’ from *Peal* פִּרְקַא to untie, redeem’. Here a cross-reference may be inserted to point out the relation, because originally a *plene* written participle might have been involved.
- In the case of compound words, some editors inserted cross-references to the central word and to related compounds, such as for instance the case of דִּין ‘this’, to כְּדִין הַדִּין and מְדִין.³⁸
- Fixed word combinations like בעיל דבבא or בית מקדשא are treated as lemmas in their own right. Yet all individual components are also registered under their respective lemmas. Some editors chose to give under the individual word a cross-reference to the combination.³⁹

3.3 Lacuna Marks

Lacuna marks are inserted for parts of a sentence that have no equivalent in the parallel text. These marks serve to clarify the connection between the Hebrew and the Aramaic. The application of

³⁸ See e.g. *BCTP* I, 99.

³⁹ See *BCTP* VI, vi, rule 7. It must be noted that this rule was applied rather inconsistently.

these lacuna marks differs from book to book, according to the insights of the respective editors. Some editors included for instance a lacuna mark for בעלא when it appeared under the lemma דבבא as part of the word combination בעיל דבבא,⁴⁰ while others argued that this would incorrectly give the impression of an addition in the Aramaic text where this obviously is not the case.⁴¹ A similar variation can be noted in the treatment of double translations. The editorial remarks in the first volume of Kings state that if a lemma is rendered twice or even thrice in TJon, all equivalences are registered under their respective lemmas, but with the positions of the lacuna marker changing to indicate the pseudo-pluses.⁴² Some editors preferred not to insert a lacuna mark in these cases, especially to avoid the impression that the alternative renderings must be considered an addition.⁴³

In the second set of editorial rules in the first volume of Kings, it is suggested that to point out the position of a plus graphically, pre- and suffixes may occasionally be separated by a lacuna marker from the word to which they belong.⁴⁴ Some editors had objections to this rule and therefore left the affixes in place in all cases.⁴⁵

3.4 Content

The concordance includes all content words, with the exception of personal names and toponyms. As remarked above, names are generally not included in the concordance. An exception is made for cases where the Aramaic translation differs considerably from the Hebrew source text.⁴⁶ The criteria for what was considered a major difference varied between the different editors. For example, the representation of מיכיהו in 1 Kgs 22,28 by מיכה in TJon was passed over in silence by Grossfeld as orthographic variance. But De Moor in his volumes on Isaiah included the representation of יהזקיהו in Isa 1,1 by יהזקיה, considering it a significant deviation because it is in line with a scribal tradition that deemed it improper to shorten the divine name.

As mentioned above, some frequent particles are omitted from the concordance because inclusion did not seem to be useful. In the editorial rules given at the outset of the project, it was suggested that it could sometimes be worthwhile to deviate from this rule. For example in the case where the Targum deviates from its custom of rendering Hebrew אַת by יַת and uses על instead. Not all editors included cases like these.⁴⁷

3.5 Variant Readings

As indicated above (2.1.2) selected variant readings from Sperber's edition and some other sources were included. Even though rules were applied to determine selection, some arbitrariness could not be avoided because editors sometimes weighed variants differently.

Moreover, the inclusion of the variants may have corrupted the statistics occasionally, especially in the earlier volumes where the complete variant readings were analysed and included,

⁴⁰ See e.g. *BCTP* IX, 250.

⁴¹ See e.g. *BCTP* VI, 255-56.

⁴² *BCTP* VI, rule 6.

⁴³ See e.g. the editorial remark in *BCTP* XVIII, vi.

⁴⁴ *BCTP* VI, vi, rule 5.

⁴⁵ Since the lacuna marks are inserted manually, one may incidentally even detect the hands of various assistant editors within one biblical book.

⁴⁶ See *BCTP* I, ix, rule 16.

⁴⁷ E.g. Houtman in her volumes to the XII did not include these exceptions.

even if part of the text did not lead to new lemmas. In this way it could occur that the same text was included two, or sometimes even more times. For instance, in *BCTP* II, 226-227 we find 4 almost identical references to Jud 5,4 אוריתך דיהבת להון לישראל, once as the base text, once as a variant of Sperber, and two variants that were collated by Smelik himself. Since the statistics simply count all the occurrences listed, and not only the occurrences in the base text, the statistics are distorted. Yet one should not jump to the conclusion that this implies duplication, because it is possible that the same phrase occurs twice within a variant, as is the case for instance in Judges 5,5^v.⁴⁸

3.6 Equation

Generally auxiliary verbs are not considered a plus, even if they represent a Hebrew word together with the noun they qualify. In those cases they are a syntactic rather than a semantic component of the correspondence between source and target text. This rule was, however, not applied consistently. For example, in II Kgs 19,16 the Hebrew verb *Qal* שמע is translated as עביד פורענו. Both Aramaic words are considered equivalent to Hebrew *Qal* שמע. When we look at the concordance, we see that in the case of the equivalence שמע || פרענותא || lacuna marks are inserted below ועביד, as if it should be considered a plus. But if we look on the other hand under the lemma עבד || *Peal* שמע no lacuna marks are inserted below פרענו. In a comparable case in II Kgs 19,4, where יעביד פורענותא is the Aramaic translation of Hebrew *Hiphil* יכה, *Peal* עבד is considered a plus and is included therefore under the lemma עבד || *Peal* פרענותא. עבד פרענותא is equated with Hebrew *Hiphil* יכה. If these kinds of inconsistency can occur within the work of one editor, *qal wahomer* in the work of several editors...

3.7 Word Combinations

It is impossible to develop strict criteria regarding which word combinations should be considered a regular translation of a single Hebrew word, and which combinations should be regarded as a translation plus an explanatory addition. For example, the Hebrew word בית is, when used in the meaning of Temple of God, translated consistently as בית מקדשא. One could argue that בית מקדשא is the regular expression to denote the Temple. In that case בית מקדשא should not be considered an addition. On the other hand, knowing the preference of the meturgemans to differentiate sharply between holy and profane, one could consider the word מקדשא an explanatory addition. Some editors preferred to regard בית מקדשא as the regular expression for בית in the meaning of Temple (Van Staalduine-Sulman, Houtman, De Moor in Isaiah), while others regarded מקדשא as an addition (De Moor in Joshua, Smelik, Grossfeld, Sepmeijer, Finley).

Another kind of word combination is the usage of translating the Hebrew סביב as the Aramaic סחור סחור.⁴⁹ However, since Hebrew knows the single as well as the repeated use of סביב,⁵⁰ most editors considered the second occurrence an addition if the double סחור was used to render a single סביב.⁵¹

⁴⁸ *BCTP* II, 175.

⁴⁹ See J. Ribera, 'La expression adverbial *shwr shwr* y su campo semántico', *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987) 147-49.

⁵⁰ See e.g. *BCTP* XVI, 310-13.

⁵¹ De Moor in his volume on Joshua and Houtman in *The Twelve* considered both occurrences equivalent to סביב.

Some editors were more inclined to consider certain compound expressions that describe a single word than others. For instance, Finley included the expression **טִינָא פִּטִירָא דְלֵא תְבִנָּה** as the translation of Hebrew **תבל**.

Finally we have to note that not only did the treatment of Aramaic word combinations lead to some inconsistencies, but also the treatment of Hebrew word combinations. The general rule issued to the editors was to lemmatise the Hebrew word according to the dictionary of Holladay. According to this rule, a compound word like **לבד לבד** should be lemmatized as **בד**. Yet some editors preferred to distinguish between the use of **בד** and **לבד**. The chief editors decided to allow them this freedom. Confusing cases, however, where in one book the same word is lemmatized once as **בד** and another time as **לבד**, are included in Chapter 2 (Additions and Corrections) in this volume.

3.8 Transpositions

As described above, transpositions are normally not indicated. An exception to this rule can be found in the volumes on Isaiah, where occasionally the equivalent Hebrew text is inserted in brackets to clarify the relationship between source text and target text.