REFLECTIONS ON THE PREPARATION OF A CRITICAL EDITION
OF THE TARGUM OF KOHELETH

Ernest G. Clarke

Targumists, including our colleague Professor le Déaut, have often argued the
need for critical editions of the targums as a primary desideratum for serious re-
search in targumim. It is a fortunate "fate" when one has only one manuscript as
is the case with Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. The opposite, however, is true for most
of the biblical books: there are too many manuscripts. The Targum of Koheleth
falls into the second category. Because of this situation the studies to date on the
Targum of Koheleth have been incomplete and inconsistent in the utilization of
manuscripts available.

The first publication of the Targum of Koheleth to be made readily available
to scholars was produced by P. de Lagarde in 1873.\(^1\) De Lagarde simply repro-
duced the consonantal text of the First Rabbinic Bible with some corrections based
on the Second Rabbinic Bible. De Lagarde recognized the inconsistencies in the
vocalization as found in the Rabbinic Bibles and, since he was not interested in
that problem, he reproduced only the consonantal text. On the basis of de
Lagarde's edition C. D. Ginsburg produced an English translation of the Targum
for his Commentary, \textit{Qoheleth}.\(^2\)

The first serious critical study of the Targum was undertaken by Alfred Levy in
his 1905 Breslau Dissertation.\(^3\) Levy made use of five manuscripts, plus the \textit{editio princeps} of the First Rabbinic Bible by Bomberg, 1517, and the Antwerp Polyglot
of 1569-72. Of the five manuscripts, only four are actually Yemenite, despite the

\(^1\) P. de Lagarde, \textit{Hagiographa Chaldaica} (Leipzig 1873).
\(^3\) A. Levy, \textit{Das Targum zu Koheleth nach Südarabischen Handschriften} (Breslau 1905).
title of his thesis. The Breslau 1106 from the thirteenth century is a manuscript with sublinear vocalization and definitely belongs in the Western camp. The two printed editions which Levy employed also have sublinear vocalization and belong to the Western group. The basis for Levy's base text, against which he placed variants, was a conflation of two British Museum manuscripts which are Yemenite (Or 2375 and Or 1302). If these two had contained the same text one could do what Levy did. The fact is, however, that British Museum Or 2375 (15th century) has many phrases omitted, many of these possibly because of homoiooteleuton. This is apparently the reason Levy conflated Or 2375 and Or 1302 (14th century) and regarded them as witnesses to the same text.

The second attempt at providing a text of the Targum of Koheleth in readily available form was by A. Sperber in 1968. Sperber reproduced the Yemenite manuscript British Museum Or 2375, which we have noted to be inferior to Or 1302. Sperber recognized the inferiority but rather than follow Levy's conflationary approach, he supplemented the text by filling the lacunae with readings from the Targum of the Jacob ben Hayyim Bible, which he left unvocalized so the reader could see what was from the manuscript and what had been added.

In 1976 P. S. Knobel produced a Ph.D. thesis for Yale University under the supervision of F. Rosenthal, entitled Targum Qoheleth: A Linguistic and Exegetical Inquiry. Knobel utilized eleven manuscripts (six Yemenite and five Western) plus the Rabbinic Bible. I will return shortly to a fuller evaluation of Knobel's work since, on the surface, one could assume that Knobel had produced a satisfactory critical edition.

In 1978 Etan Levine produced a "conceptual analysis" of Koheleth. After an introduction Levine provides a translation in English based on the Vatican Library manuscript Ebr. Urbinas 1. The critical notes appended to the translation give variants without specific manuscript identification. To this translation and notes an extensive collection of midrashic parallels is added. He also provided pho-

6 ibid. VII.
tographs of the manuscript, but these are so greatly reduced that it is impossible to read them.

As an aside, one can note that in addition to the translation into English by C. D. Ginsburg (1861) and E. Levine (1878), P. S. Knobel also provided an English translation of his reconstructed Aramaic text. A. D. Corre as well, in his 1953 Master's thesis for Manchester University entitled "Sources of the Targum of Koheleth," provided an English translation based on the British Museum manuscript Or 1302.9

In many ways one would think that Knobel's study should suffice for Koheleth and there would be no further need for "another" critical edition. Although Knobel used eleven manuscripts—six Yemenite with superlinear vocalization and five Western with sublinear pointing—he produced from these an eclectic text of maximum length, including the targumim aherim as an extension of specific verses. As he claims: "this method provides for the largest number of phenomena to be studied"10 for, as his title suggests, his interest is in a "linguistic and exegetical enquiry"—not in producing a critical text which could elucidate the textual history of the Targum of Koheleth.

Furthermore, although Knobel used manuscripts with Tiberian pointing, he opts for the Yemenite vocalization tradition on the assumption that the sublinear vocalizations are "unreliable."11 Even when he included a western reading in his reconstructed text, he gave those readings Yemenite vocalization despite the fact that they have Tiberian pointing in the manuscript(s) on which he based his reading.

Knobel presented a grammatical sketch of the language of the targum based on the eclectic text which he had produced. For all intents and purposes the production of such an eclectic text is a questionable procedure both textually and grammatically. In the grammatical sketch the points being illustrated as Yemenite are often not identified by manuscript. It is impossible to write a grammar of the Yemenite Aramaic of the Targum of Koheleth based on mixed Yemenite and

9I am most grateful to Professor Corre for placing a copy of his thesis at my disposal.
10Knobel (above, n. 7) 4.
11Ibid., 3.
Western manuscripts. Moreover, Knobel provided a list of so-called Palestinian characteristics found in the targum without always identifying the manuscript sources, and adding to the problem, these Palestinian characteristics are given Yemenite vocalization.

For the eclectic text which he produced Knobel has provided justification in the form of variants based on the several manuscripts. But because the text is a conflation, the notes do not clearly indicate the unique characteristics of any specific manuscript or group of manuscripts.

Consequently, there is room for another attempt at producing a critical edition of the Targum of Koheleth, but along different lines. There are two preconditions which must be addressed before such an edition can be considered.

In the first instance there is the question of the relationship between the Western and the Yemenite/Babylonian traditions. For most of the biblical books, and certainly for the Ketubim there are two major textual traditions. Those traditions are (1) Palestinian as expressed in Western manuscripts with Tiberian pointing—often called the "textus receptus"; and (2) Babylonian, with superlinear vocalization, transmitted through manuscripts found in Yemen or reconstructed from Western manuscripts which have Babylonian pointing, as studied by Kahle and others. For the Hagiographa, since it was not part of the Babylonian liturgical tradition according to van der Heide and Díez Merino, the manuscript witnesses are Yemenite in origin. Several scholars, beginning with Kahle in 1913, have pointed out the need to edit both traditions separately, and this is certainly a way of controlling the volume of manuscript witnesses. But it also allows one to set apart the differences which are said to exist between the two traditions. P. S. Alexander, in an unpublished paper read to the winter meeting of the British Society of Old Testament Studies in 1984 on "The Textual Tradition of Targum Lamentations," points out that there are two

14 van der Heide (above, n. 12) 2.
16 Kahle (above, n. 13) 216.
forms of the text, as already noted by van der Heide in his study of the Yemenite manuscripts of the Targum of Lamentations. Alexander's conclusion was that there never existed an Urtext for the Targum of Lamentations, but rather a fluid tradition that crystallized into two different, though related, forms. In order to respect the integrity of the two text-forms he advocated printing them in their entirety, side by side—not artificially conflating them. Recently, Díez Merino argued in a similar fashion for the publication of a critical edition consisting of the two text-forms.17

No one has actually undertaken such a dual study. There have been studies of the Yemenite tradition by van der Heide for Lamentations, Melamed for Canticles,18 and Levy for Koheleth, but no one has examined the Western and Oriental traditions separately. There are only generalized impressions. Levy did make reference to the Western tradition by using one manuscript and two printed editions, but these were mixed together in his notes. Knobel consulted five Western manuscripts, but focused his whole study on the Yemenite tradition. Therefore, for Koheleth, one must decide whether to produce the textual traditions side by side or not.

The second precondition which must be answered concerns the manuscripts and their relationship to each other. Here, at the first stage and without prejudice, one can separate the manuscripts into Western and Yemenite. All the previous studies have used only a selection of all the extant manuscripts. Firstly, one should examine all the manuscripts available before making any decision as to how many and which ones to include, and how to arrange them in the edition. This is particularly true for the Yemenite manuscripts where, for Koheleth, some one hundred exist, although most of them are nineteenth-century texts of the Targum with an Arabic translation and commentary.

So first, the Western manuscript witnesses: there are thirteen ranging from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries. In addition there are the printed editions, all

17Díez Merino (above, n. 15).

18R. H. Melamed, "The Targum of Canticles according to Six Yemenite MSS, Compared with the 'textus receptus' as contained in de Lagarde's 'Hagiographa Chaldaica'," JQR 10 (1919-20) 377-410; 11 (1920-32) 1-20; 12 (1921-22) 57-117. The Dropsie College dissertation (1915) was separately published under the same title, Philadelphia, 1921.
of which, more or less, stem from one text witness. The manuscripts can be described as follows:

(1) Sassoon 282,19 completed in 1189 CE, is written in a German hand. It is written in three columns with 30 lines to the column, with clear Tiberian pointing. The full Hebrew verse is followed by the Targum.

(2) Breslau 1106,20 dated by Díez Merino21 to 1238 CE, is written in a German hand with Tiberian pointing. It is written in three columns with 35 lines to a column. A full verse of Hebrew is followed by the Targum.

(3) Copenhagen 11,22 completed in 1290 CE, is also written in a German hand, consisting of three columns with 35 lines to the column. Only the first word of the Hebrew text is written, followed by the Targum.

(4) Nurnberg, Solger 2, 2, completed in 1290 CE, also is written in a German hand, consisting of three columns and 35 lines to the column.

(5) Vatican, Ebr. Urbinas 1,23 completed in 1294 CE by Yišaḥaq ben Simeon Halevi, is written in a German hand, consisting of three columns of 35 lines to a column. A verse of the Hebrew is followed by the Targum.

(6) Parma 31,24 completed by Natan the scribe in the fourteenth century.

20 Breslau 1106.  
21 L. Díez Merino, Targum de Proverbias (Madrid 1984) 141.  
22 J. Loewinger, Catalogue of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, 2, no. 5499.  
(7) Parma 32,25 also a fourteenth century manuscript according to the paleography. But as with (6) there is no colophon.

(8) Angelica 72,26 completed in 1413, consisting of one column of 28 lines.

(9) Paris 110,27 completed in 1455 CE by Nathan ibn Saadyah ha-Kohen Shalal in Algiers, was described by Knobel as "Yemenite cursive." Correctly speaking it is North African/Spanish as far as the hand is concerned. It also reflects the Western rather than the Yemenite manuscript tradition. The first word of the Hebrew verse is followed by the Targum. It is unvocalized.

(10) Paris 17,28 completed in Mantua in 1512 CE, is written in a German hand with clear Tiberian pointing. There are three columns consisting of 41 lines to a column. A Hebrew verse is followed by the Targum. This is an inaccurately copied manuscript because many phrases, omitted through homoioteleuton, are added in the margin in (an)other hand(s).

(11) Villa Amil 5 (116 Z 40),29 completed in 1517 CE, is written in a Spanish hand in two columns with Hebrew and Targum in one and a Latin translation in the other. This manuscript along with the following were prepared by Alfonso de Zamora.

(12) Salamanca 2,30 the youngest of the Western manuscripts, written in a Spanish hand, was also prepared by Alphonso de Zamora in 1532 CE. It contains the text of the Targum without any Hebrew lemma.

27H. Zotenberg, Catalogues des Manuscrits Hébreux et Samaritains de la Bibliothèque Imperiale (Paris 1866) 11-12.
28Ibid., 2-3.
(13) Budapest Kaufman 13.\(^{31}\)

For the Yemenite or superlinear tradition there is a multiplicity of witnesses. I have counted 105 manuscripts containing the Targum of Koheleth in the catalogue of the National and University Library's Institute of Manuscripts on Microfilm at the Hebrew University. Levy had used four for the Yemenite tradition and Knobel used six of these manuscripts in his edition. Many of the 105 manuscripts belong to a Shelosh Megillot scroll, i.e., a manuscript containing Song of Songs, Ruth, and Koheleth because these three books continue to be read on the occasion of three Jewish festivals: Canticles on Pesah, Ruth on Shavuot, and Koheleth on Succot. These Shelosh Megillot consist of the Hebrew text, the Targum with superlinear pointing and the Rashi commentary. These manuscripts are almost exclusively nineteenth century. There are eight older manuscripts with superlinear vocalization which must be examined in detail.

(1) British Museum Or 2375,\(^{32}\) completed in the fifteenth century by Benyahu the scribe, is in a Yemenite hand. Most of the manuscript is only the Hebrew text but for the five Megillot, the Targum is added. Sperber published this manuscript with additions from the ben-Ḥayyim Bible. It was also used by A. Levy and P. S. Knobel. There are many gaps in the text due to homoioteleuton.

(2) British Museum Or 1302,\(^{33}\) dated to the fourteenth or fifteenth century, is written in a Yemenite hand. As with the previous manuscript only Ruth, Song of Songs, and Koheleth are accompanied by the Targum. This manuscript is more complete than Or 2375 except for the last four verses of chapter 12. Or 1302 was used by A. Levy and P. S. Knobel.

\(^{31}\)M. Weisz, Katalog der hebräischen Handschriften und Bücher des Professors Dr. David Kaufman (Frankfurt a.M. 1906).


\(^{33}\)Ibid., vol. I 123-125.
(3) Bodleian Opp Add 4 139,\textsuperscript{34} is undated. It is written in a Yemenite hand. This manuscript contains only Song of Songs, Koheleth, and Lamentations with Targum.

(4) British Museum Or 2377,\textsuperscript{35} completed in the fourteenth century, is written in a Yemenite hand. Only Lamentations, Koheleth, and Esther have the Targum. For Koheleth, 1.1-2.5; 2.11-11.10 and 12.6-14 are missing.

(5) Lutzki 427b,\textsuperscript{36} completed in the fifteenth century, is written in a Yemenite hand. The manuscript consists of Koheleth, Lamentations, and Song of Songs with the Targum. For Koheleth, 1.1-14; 5.9-19; 7.1-7, 26; 8.1-4, 7-8; 9.4, 9 and 11.9 to the end are missing.

(6) Lutzki 473,\textsuperscript{37} completed about 1500 CE, is written in a Yemenite hand. The manuscript contains only Koheleth and Song of Songs to 6.8. For Koheleth, 1.1-16; 2.5-10, 17-24 and 11.10-12.11 are missing.

(7) Lutzki 431,\textsuperscript{38} completed in 1621 CE, is written in a Yemenite hand. The five Megillot have the Targum as well as an Arabic translation.

(8) Jerusalem National and University Library Heb 4 1143, 3.\textsuperscript{39}

Having examined all the above listed manuscripts in detail two facts appear obvious: (1) The consonantal text of all the manuscripts, both Western and Yemenite, is very close; (2) While the vocalization in the Western manuscripts presents a very confused situation, for the Yemenite manuscripts the situation is much more homogeneous. Thus van der Heide could write that the Yemenite

\textsuperscript{34}A. D. Neubauer, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford (Oxford 1886) 812.

\textsuperscript{35}Margoliouth (above, n. 32), vol. I, 109-110.

\textsuperscript{36}This manuscript and the following two are from the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and are described in a handwritten list prepared by Professor Alexander Marx.

\textsuperscript{37}See note 36.

\textsuperscript{38}See note 36.

\textsuperscript{39}Loewinger (above, n. 22).
manuscripts "are vocalized according to a systematic and consistent tradition of
the grammar of Aramaic that is absent from the Western text."\textsuperscript{40}

On the other hand, in those manuscripts with sublinear vocalization there is
what can be called a confused state of vocalization.\textsuperscript{41} Knobel called the
vocalization of the Western tradition "unreliable" and so concentrated on the
Yemenite vocalization. Already in the sixteenth century Elias Levita had
despaired of writing a grammar of Aramaic based on extant manuscripts because
there was no coherence in the vocalization manifested in the Western
manuscripts. Levita suggested vocalizing on the basis of Biblical Aramaic, a
suggestion which T. Buxtorf adopted in his seventeenth-century Basel Rabbinic
Bible (1618-1619) and which Walton subsequently adopted for the Targum in the
London Polyglot (1653-57).

In a number of these manuscripts several stages of vocalization can be discerned:
First of all, there was clearly a stage of the consonantal text before any vocaliza-
tion was added. Examples exist where a gibrus or a qames haufj is written with
an internal waw, and there are even a few examples of a double vocalization.
Secondly, there are examples of corrected vocalization. Thirdly, there are incons-
stencies in spelling the same word within and among these manuscripts which,
in general, concern the character of the waw. There are also inconsistencies among
the manuscripts, and even within the same manuscript, as to how to spell the
simple participle and the simple infinitive. In addition to these occurrences,
which represent only a few of the more common cases, there is inconsistent use of
the dagesh in connection with and without raphe. Also, the practice of adding
shewa to a final heh and 'ayin is common in Paris 17. One other feature common
in all these manuscripts is the position of the mappiq in the 3ms suffix. Rather
than it being written in the bosom of the heh, it is placed underneath.

The net result of this evidence is that when these manuscripts are examined in
detail, there is no consistency in the vocalization within each one, let alone
across all of them.

The situation for manuscripts Villa Amil 5 and Salamanca 2 is somewhat dif-
ferent. The vocalization in these two manuscripts conform, to a very large degree,

\textsuperscript{40} van der Heide (above, n. 12) 1.

\textsuperscript{41} Sperber (above, n. 5) 34, writes "The vowel signs are applied there (in Tiberian point-
ing) haphazardly, and no valid laws could be discovered governing their application."
with that known from Biblical Aramaic. They also do not reflect any earlier stage of use of matres lectionis. Hence "wisdom" is always spelled with a waw. There is a large degree of consistency in spelling the same word in the same way throughout the manuscripts. These manuscripts also show greater affinity to the Rabbinic Bibles and Paris 110 where these two texts agree against the other manuscripts. Hence these two manuscripts represent the end of a long process in which most of the spelling inconsistencies noted in the earlier manuscripts have disappeared.

With regard to the consonantal text a detailed analysis of chapters 1-3 and 10-12 was undertaken with the use of the computer to establish how close the relationship was between the Western and the Yemenite texts. Using a program developed by Professor S. A. Kaufman while he was at the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, I examined the relationships of the various manuscripts by lining up the text of each manuscript on successive lines. Kaufman’s programme allows one to see immediately the inter-relationships between several manuscripts. The initial decision was taken to align the manuscripts in reference to Paris 110. The basic reasons for using Paris 110 as the base text will be discussed below. The startling result is the extensive similarity between Paris 110 and all the other manuscripts, Western and Yemenite, for those chapters analyzed in regard to the consonantal text.

On further detailed analysis of Paris 110 I have noted two basic features which support its being preferred as the base text. First, there is a large degree of consistency in the manuscript in the spelling of specific words such as שִׁמְשָׁה, הֹכַּמְתָּה, הָלִיבָּה etc. Another aspect of this consistency is that the consonantal text of Paris 110 appears to be the same as that of the greater part of all the other manuscripts, both Western and Yemenite. Thus, even though it is a younger manuscript, the integrity of its consonantal text is confirmed. In fact, one might argue that because there is such a large degree of agreement of Paris 110 with the consonantal text of the other manuscripts, one could choose the oldest—Sassoon—and reproduce it without vowels as the base text. It is at this point that one must consider the second reason why Paris 110 is preferred over the others.

42I am most grateful to Professor Kaufman for his advice and for allowing me to use his program.
The second reason why Paris 110 appears to be the best candidate for a base text is the clearly Palestinian lexical and morphological features when compared with the other manuscripts called Western. We shall now discuss some of the salient lexical and morphological features of this manuscript:

(1) The particle "also" spelled נָא is common in Paris 110, although there are a few instances of נא. That there is a relationship between Paris 110 and the other Western manuscripts is demonstrated by the fact that usually, in the places where Paris 110 has נא (1.11; 6.3; 9.6), some of the other manuscripts write נא. But where Paris 110 normally has נא, the other manuscripts, as well as the Yemenite ones, most often write נא. Since Fitzmyer only records נא, as does Targum Onkelos and Syriac, while, for instance, a text from Khirbet Mird has נא, the shift to נא should be considered to have taken place after 200 CE. In Neofiti the spelling is normally נא.

(2) The spelling of the word "mouth" according to Kutscher, is a clear indication of origin. This is a very important word to be used in a study of Paris 110 because it is spelled without a waw in every instance except one (10.12). Fitzmyer as well as Díez Macho argue for the spelling נ as being Palestinian.

(3) The choice of usage for the verb "to see" is not as clearly distinguished as in the evidence of the previous examples. Díez Macho says that נ is Palestinian. It is also the word used in a Khirbet

---


47Fitzmyer (above, n. 43) 334.

48A. Díez Macho (above, n. 45) 242, no. 18.

Mird\textsuperscript{50} texts and in the Samaritan Targum, but Fitzmyer\textsuperscript{51} lists only יִזּוֹ. This may be similar to number (1) above and indicate a pre/post 200 CE distribution. As far as Paris 110 is concerned, in the first part of chapter 1 the verb used is יִזּוֹ, but at 1.14 יַרְכָּב is written and appears almost exclusively from there to the end of chapter 12. However, in the few instances where Paris 110 has יִזּוֹ, the other manuscripts invariably have יַרְכָּב (5.17; 8.9, 14; 11.8) instead of the usual יִזּוֹ. As in number (1) above, this oscillation underlines the relationship between Paris 110 and the other manuscripts at a very basic level. In the Yemenite manuscripts we find יִזּוֹ exclusively.

(4) The numeral "two" with suffix is spelled יַרְכוֹת whereas in the other manuscripts it is יַרְכָּו. Kutscher\textsuperscript{52} writes: "it seems clear that (tryhwn) existed in Western Aramaic...." Díez Macho concurs.\textsuperscript{53} The form in the Yemenite manuscripts is truyhwn.

(5) The particle "before," בְּדֶלֶת, although usually spelled in Paris 110 with daleth has some instances of the Palestinian form where daleth is assimilated (2.24; 4.16; 5.8). The form in the other Western manuscripts as well as the Yemenite ones is בָּדֶלֶת. There are examples in the Cairo Geniza Aramaic material of בָּדֶלֶת with the daleth assimilated.\textsuperscript{54}

As far as morphology is concerned, there are some features to be noted with regard to Paris 110 which underline, in addition to the above, its Palestinian character.

\textsuperscript{50}C. Perrot (above, n. 44).
\textsuperscript{51}Fitzmyer (above, n. 43) 319a.
\textsuperscript{52}Kutscher (above, n. 46) 26-28.
\textsuperscript{53}Díez Macho (above, n. 45) 242, no. 19.
\textsuperscript{54}See examples in M. L. Klein, The Geniza Manuscripts of the Palestine Targum to the Pentateuch (Cincinnati 1986).
(6) The 3mp perfect of the verb ending in nun is a Palestinian form as noted by Díez Macho and Sokoloff. So יָנֶה is written in 4.2 compared to יָנֶה in the other manuscripts and the Yemenite manuscripts.

(7) A significant and consistent Palestinian morphological construction in Paris 110 concerns the 3ms suffix on plural nouns. Without exception Paris 110 has יָנֶה whereas all the other manuscripts, including the Yemenite ones, have יָנֶה, although sometimes the other manuscripts will have יָנֶה which again underlines the basic relationships. Dalman noted this as a Palestinian spelling.

(8) The simple infinitive can be mqtl or mqtwl. In Paris 110 the Palestinian mqtwl is found a number of times (3.5; 9.11; 10.9; 11.8). In each instance the other manuscripts have mqtl, as do the Yemenite ones. This Palestinian characteristic has been noted by a number of scholars, including Svedlund, Kutscher, Dalman and Díez Macho.

It can be concluded, therefore, from the discussion that Paris 110 is the ideal candidate for the base text for a new critical edition of the Targum of Koheleth. When Paris 110 is considered in relation to all the other manuscripts both Western and Yemenite, it has the most Palestinian characteristics. Given the influence of Biblical Aramaic and the Babylonian Talmud on European mediaeval scribes, I am inclined to argue that the other Western manuscripts were "Babylonianized," but not completely, as evidenced by the remaining occurrences of Palestinian forms in the Western manuscripts, rather than that Paris 110 has been "Palestinianized." Those places in Paris 110 where, for instance, יָנֶה rather

55Díez Macho (above, n. 45) 243, no. 27.
56M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI (Ramat Gan 1974) 180.
57G. Dalman, Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch (Darmstadt 1960) 98, 204-5.
58G. Svedlund, The Aramaic Portions of the Pesiqta de Rab Kahana (Uppsala 1974) 41.
60Dalman (above, n. 57) 279.
61Díez Macho (above, n. 45) 244, no. 34.
than יִסְמָכ appears, show the incompleteness of the "Babylonianization" in Paris 110.

In the second place, the marked similarity between the consonantal text of Paris 110 and that of the Yemenite manuscripts (different in only four verses) suggests that the Yemenite tradition and the Western tradition have a common origin. This could explain the existence of such a great number of cases of homoiooteletun in the Yemenite manuscripts compared to the Western ones.

In the third place, although it has been argued that one should prepare a new edition of the targum presenting the Western and Yemenite traditions in tandem, it does not appear necessary to do so for Koheleth, even though the case has been made to do so for other targums of the Megillot. In fact, it would appear that each one of the books of the Megillot has a text history distinct from that of the others. For instance, in a detailed study of the targumim acherim in Koheleth one finds, strictly speaking only three targumim acherim (5.8; 7.7, 19). All the manuscripts—both Western and Yemenite—present targumim acherim for 5.8 and 7.19. Only Paris 110 presents a targum aher in 7.7. By contrast, in Job, in a group of manuscripts ranging form the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, the number of targumim acherim ranges from a low of 36 in Parma 31, to a high of 146 in Paris 110.\(^{62}\) In Proverbs there are no targumim acherim.\(^ {63}\) In Psalms the range is from 2 to 18.\(^ {64}\)

In addition to these targumim acherim in Koheleth there are four additional verses (2.4, 20; 7.15; 11.10) where the text of some manuscripts differ. The variant verse in 2.4 appears only in the Western manuscripts—Paris 110 and Salamanca/Madrid—and in no others. The variant verse in 2.20, 7.15 and 11.10 appear exclusively in the Yemenite manuscripts. Therefore, these verses can be presented without presenting all the texts of Koheleth in tandem.


\(^{63}\) L. Díez Merino, Targum de Proverbios (Madrid 1984) 133-35.

\(^{64}\) L. Díez Merino, Targum de Salmos (Madrid 1982).
NOTE

After completing this manuscript, L. Díez Merino published *Targum de Qohelet, Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil no 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Madrid 1987). He has included much valuable comparative manuscript evidence.