THE PESHITTA TEXT OF SONG OF SONGS

Piet B. Dirksen

In my work on the text of Song of Songs for the Biblia Hebraica Editio Quinta Project part of the task was to check the text of the Peshitta on deviations from the Hebrew which might, but not necessarily do reflect a deviating Hebrew Vorlage. For the masoretic text use was made of BHS,¹ and for the Peshitta of the “Leiden Peshitta.”² To establish the best available text of the Peshitta an assessment had to be made of the relation between the readings listed in the critical apparatus and the corresponding ones in the text. The concrete question was: are any of the readings of the apparatus to be preferred to the corresponding readings adopted in the text?³ Since this question is relevant for anyone using the Peshitta of Song of Songs, the result follows below.

The manuscripts included in Edition, and to which accordingly the following article is restricted, are the following, two lectionaries being left out of account:

6h17: Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. sir. 106, fols. 74r-75v
7a1, the “Ambrosianus:” Milan, Ambrosian Library, B.21 Inf., fols. 144r-145v
8a1: Paris, National Library, Syr. 341, fols. 126r, v. In a number of places the text of this MS has been adapted to another type of text by a later hand; in these cases a distinction is made between 8a1* and 8a1c.
9c1: Paris, National Library, Syr. 372, fols. 140r-142r. Because of damage to the MS, a number of passages are illegible or missing.

¹Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968-1972); the editor of song of Songs was F. Horst.


³The text is basically that of the Ambrosianus (7a1). Though editorial rules allow for the emendation of 7a1 on the basis of manuscript support the editors have emended “only where an error seems likely” (p. iv).

9h1: London, British Library, Add. 14,624, fols. 52v-56v. A portion of fol. 52 is missing, as a result of which the text is only partly legible between 6:10 ( ''); and 7:3 ( ''); and between 8:9 ( '') and 8:14 ( '').

10c1: New Haven, Connecticut, Beinecke Rare Book Library, B 47b, fols. 230v-233v
10c4: Cambridge, Mass., Houghton Libr. 137, fols. 156v-158v. This ms became available only later on. Its readings were listed in the Symposium Volume of 1988.\footnote{Appendix, in P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder, ed., The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History (MPIL 4; papers read at the Peshitta Symposium, 1985; Leiden: Brill, 1988) 266-310.}


12a1: the "Buchanan Bible:" Cambridge, University Library, Oo 1.1, 2, fols. 132v-133r. Though the ms is illegible in some passages, all cases where the apparatus records a variant reading could be checked. Four times a later hand has changed a reading to make the text agree with the reading of 9c1 and its related mss, viz. in 1:7 (twice); 2:14; 4:8. These will be ignored in the following lists.

12k3: Baghdad, Chaldean Patriarchate. This fragment contains only 2:3-4:7.

In checking Edition against the mss in a number of places I noticed the following corrigenda et addenda, which have been taken into account in this article:

1:16, app.: the two occurrences of 9c1 have to be deleted, since for these two cases 9c1 is not extant.

5:1, text: seyame is to be added to אֵלָהּ.

5:4, app.: the reading אֶלָּה is shared also by 6h17.

5:5, app.: the variant "כָּרָאָם [ c. sey 8a1]" is to be deleted.

5:9, app.: the variant reading אֶל (without beth) is found also in 10c1.

6:1, app.: the preposition beth is omitted also in 11c1.

6:10, app.: the reading כָּרָאָם is found also in 9h1(vid); only rish and alaph are not clear.

6:11, app.: seyame is omitted also in 10c1.

7:3, app.: seyame is added also in 9c1(vid).

8:6, app.: prefixed וָּו is found also in 8a1c.

The following two readings should most probably be added: in 5:11 the two dots which in Edition have been taken as seyame above כָּרָאָם in 12a1 seem rather to have been written underneath כָּרָאָם in the previous line as vocalization dots, and in 6:8
9h1 seems to share the addition of אַלָף; there is space for the word and there seem to be traces of the letters, especially of the alaph. In the Introduction two errors are to be registered: for 9c1 אֶתְנָב בֶּן [אֶתְנָב בֶּן] in 4:8, and for 9h1 אֶתְנָב בֶּן אֶתְנָב in 5:10. On p. v, line 8, iii 16 has to be corrected to iii 6, and on p. vii, under 10c1, line 2, v 19 to v 9.

I. Readings Unique to One MS

The majority of variant readings listed in the apparatus are readings unique to one MS. There is an a priori probability that unique readings are overruled by majority readings, but this is not necessarily so. There exist a few MSS, though not containing Song of Songs, with a number of unique readings which appear to represent a text form older than that of the main stream. The two major examples are 5b1 and 9a1, which show substantial and sustained agreements in their unique readings with MT (besides a good number of unique readings inferior to the majority reading). The question has been debated whether the agreements with MT go back to the translator himself or are the result of a later adaption to MT. The matter now seems settled in favor of the first possibility.

The unique readings in Song of Songs concern minor matters and often are intrinsically inferior to the majority reading, if not an obvious error. Neither by inherent quality nor by a pattern of agreement with MT do they challenge the majority readings and it would be an exercise in futility to deal with all the cases individually. Therefore they will only be rubricized, with an indication of the point of difference. Readings registered only in the Introduction of Edition and not in the first or second apparatus (unique readings which are obvious errors, orthographic variants, corrections by first hand), have been ignored.

6h17, total 37°

sey, with MT: 2:2; 3:6; 4:6 (2x); 7:1; against MT: 1:6; 4:8; 5:1, 11, 12; 6:2; 7:2, 5; 8:1 (2x); in variant: 6:5; 8:1; pref &, against MT: 5:9; pref w, with MT: 3:2; 6:4; 7:9; against MT: 2:12;


6For an explanation of abbreviations see at the end of this paper.
5:16; 7:12; om, with MT: 5:16; against MT: 4:8; 5:9; inner-Syr: 4:10; 5:13; 7:6 (see below); 8:1, 6; var, against MT: 5:5; in variant: 7:1; err: 7:1 (2x), 6

In 7:6 6h17 has ֶבֶשַׁבַּת instead of emphatic state + dâ. In the apparatus the elements have been divided over two variants.

7a1, total 8, all against MT
sey: 6:5; 7:2; pref w: 1:16; om: 2:13; 8:6; var: 4:4; err 2:7; 5:9

7a1’s readings in 2:7 and 5:9 are obvious errors, but also its other unique readings are easily explained as clerical mistakes. In Edition all unique readings have been relegated to the 1st app., with the alternative readings adopted in the text.

8a1: sey, against MT: 4:1; 7:2; pref w, with MT: 7:13

8a1c: transp: 5:5

9c1, sey, against MT: 8:5

9h1, total 11
sey, with MT: 5:5, 7; against MT: 1:12 (prob err; in Edition registered as an orth difference); 5:16; 7:5, 9; pref w, with MT: 2:13; (prob) err: 1:11; 2:16; 3:4; 7:2

10c1: sey, against MT: 2:13; add, with MT: 8:6

11c1: total 6, all against MT
sey: 1:5; pref d: 2:10; pref w: 5:16; var: 7:9; (prob) err: 4:1, 8

12a1, total 29
sey, with MT: 2:13; 7:2; against MT: 2:8, 9; 7:2; 8:5; pref d, with MT: 3:10; pref w, against MT: 4:3; 6:9 (2x); 7:7; add, against MT: 2:7; 7:7; om, against MT: 1:16; 7:6; in variant: 7:1; inner-Syr: 4:4, 13, 14 (2x); 6:2; var, with MT: 3:9; against MT: 2:14; 5:15; 8:6 (2x); (prob) err: 3:10; 5:1 (2x)

12k3 (as far as it goes, see above): total 12, all, except 3:9 and 4:6, against MT pref d: 4:1; pref w: 3:2; add: 2:9, 10; 3:1, 2; om: 2:15; var: 2:10; 3:5, 9; 4:1, 6

II. Shared Variant Readings

A. 9c1 and related mss

Besides the unique readings there are a number of variant readings shared by two or more mss. The first question to be asked is whether each of the witnesses is an inde-
ependent witness or whether any number among them belong together as related MSS, and actually together form one witness.

The latter is clearly the case with respect to 9c1, 9h1, 10c1, 10c4 (see remark on the first page of this article), 11c1 with or without 8a1c. In this respect the situation in Song of Songs is a confirmation of what has previously been established for other books, viz. that the early Nestorian MSS and 8a1c are closely related. M. D. Koster proved this with respect to the MSS 9b1, 10b1, 10j1 and 8a1c for Exodus. In an article of 1985 I argued with respect to Judges that 9c1, 10c1, 10c4 had most probably been copied from the same MS, to which also 8a1c was closely related. In the Appendix of the Symposium Volume (above, n. 4) I argued the same for the books of Samuel. In this Appendix K. D. Jenner contributes the collation of 10c4 against 7a1 with respect to Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs. He found that with respect to 1 Kings 9c1, 10c1, 10c2, 10c4, 11c1 usually agree, often supported by 8a1c (p. 281). This holds true also for Proverbs (p. 285), Ecclesiastes (p. 287), and Song of Songs (p. 289); in the latter book 9h1 joins the group. Jenner is not sure about the exact relations of the MSS between themselves (p. 289). In my view a common parent MS would be a likely answer to this question, but this is of secondary importance. The facts clearly point to a very close relationship between these MSS.

With respect to Song of Songs these facts are the following:

1. 9c1, 9h1, 10c1, 10c4, 11c1, with or without 8a1c, have basically the same text. They stand apart from the other MSS in a number of readings unique to themselves. Among these there are at least three errors, some readings which are to be considered distinctive, and some which by themselves are not special but which together offer corroborative evidence.

2. There are some differences between these MSS. These concern either readings unique to one of them, or readings shared by one or more other MSS. The first may point to the fact that the MS involved is not the source of any of the other MSS of the group. The readings shared by one or more other MSS concern only minor matters over which MSS very often differ from each other. The supporting MSS do not show a pattern which might suggest a stemmatic relationship.

The evidence is the following:

7M. D. Koster, *The Peshitta of Exodus*; see note 5.

Readings Unique to this Group of MSS:

pref w, against MT: 2:11; 5:1 (2x); 6:4; 7:13; 8:6; add, against MT: 1:16 (9c1 not extant); 4:6; 8; 5:13; 6:8; om, against MT: 4:13; in variant, 8:14 (see below); transp, against MT: 3:10 (err); 5:7; inner-Syr: 1:8, 16 (אֲבִי is prob err; in 3:10 the MSS have אֵלֶי – 9c1 not preserved); 2:15; 5:4 (err; see below); 6:1, 2; 8:12; var: 1:7 (err; see below); 8:14 (see below). Moreover they stand apart without 9h1 in 1:17 (sey; 9c1 not extant); 4:8 and 5:11 (both pref w), without 10c1 in 1:16 (err; 9c1 not extant), and without 11c1 in 5:11 (sey) and 7:3 (sey; 10c4 n.l.).

In 1:7 these MSS (+12a1c) share the reading אָכַלך, ‘how.’ This would normally be a correct translation of Hebrew אָכַל‎, which usually means ‘how’ but here must mean ‘where,’ as in Aramaic: “tell me... where you graze (your flock), and where you rest (them).” cf. v7fht in 2 Kgs 6:13. Since ‘how’ hardly makes sense here, אָכַלך must be a clerical error; see for the second occurrence below under the heading “7a1 + 9c1.”

A notable case is 5:4 where 6h17, 7a1, 8a1, 12a1 have צְרֵף whereas these manuscripts have צְרִיף. There can be no doubt that one of the two readings is an inner-Syrac corruption of the other. The editors have opted for צְרֵף as the older form, and considered the other reading as an error, or at least a possible error (p. IV). However, although צְרִיף, “were moved,” is usually construed with צָרָה, “to have compassion on,” it is a perfectly adequate rendering of the Hebrew צָרָה and certainly better than the alternative “called out.” One wonders whether the choice in Edition is perhaps due to confusion of צְרֵף with the homograph גָּשׁו. In view of both its inherent quality and its much stronger support 7a1’s reading is certainly preferable to the reading now adopted in the text.

In 8:14 MT has “flee (hasten?), my beloved, and be like....” The verb כָּרָה is strange here. The majority reading of the Peshitta renders: כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה, “and when came my beloved, and be like,” which makes no sense. 9c1 etc. have מָצָא מָצָא מָצָא מָצָא (in the apparatus of Edition divided over three variants), “my beloved turned around / turn around my beloved, (and) be like....” The first word can be vocalized as a perfect etpe’el (10c1, 10c4), as a perfect etpa’al (Urmia edition) or as an imperative (Lee’s edition; etpe’el). The latter would at least produce a syntactically correct sentence and reflect MT’s vocalization as an imperative. It is tempting to assume that in this case 9c1 etc., with the verb read as an imperative, present the original translation, but in view of both the ambiguity of the form and the support of all other witnesses for the alternative reading the case must remain undecided.

In no case, except for 8:14, do these MSS in their shared reading challenge the majority reading; in all cases there is a movement away from MT.
Differences between the mss of this Group:

(a) Readings unique to any of these mss; these have been listed above.

(b) Readings shared by one or more other mss: 1:5, 6, 7, 16, 17; 2:3; 4:3, 8; 5:11 (2x); 6:7, 10; 7:3 (2x) [10c4 n.l.].

(c) Readings in which two of these mss stand over against the other members of this group: 1:17 (9h11, 11c1; 9c1 not extant); 2:14 (9h1, 11c1); 4:3 (9h1, 11c1); 5:9 (9c1, 9h1); 5:15 (9c1, 11c1) 6:11 (9c1, 10c1). In these few cases one may wonder whether this agreement reflects an authentic textual tradition or is purely accidental. 8a1c has one unique reading in 5:5 for which there is no apparent source.

The evidence clearly points to a close relationship between these mss, which means that together they are to be treated as a single textual witness. In the following their shared reading will be referred to by 9c1 (italics). It is to be noted that when these five mss (or six with 8a1c) are taken together as one witness, the real strength of manuscript support for a variant reading is different from that suggested by the number of manuscripts listed in the apparatus.

B. Combinations of Two mss

What is true of the unique readings also holds good for the readings shared by any two of the mss involved: they concern matters over which mss easily and often disagree, without any pattern of (dis)agreement with MT.

6h17

+7a1 4:2 (sey); 6:6 (sey); 8:14 (sey); +8a1 7:6 (sey); +9c1 4:3 (sey); 7:3 (add); +9c1 1:8=5:9 (see below); 5:12 (see below); +9h1 1:5 (orth or err); 2:3 (sey); +10c1 1:6 (inner-Syr); +12k3 2:7 (om); 3:6 (pref d), 11 (var)

1:8 and 5:9 concern the same difference: 7a1, 8a1, 12a1 have רְקַיִם ṭוֹרָשָׁה, “the beautiful one among the women,” in agreement with MT, whereas 6h17 and 9c1 have דְּרוֹשָׁה, “the beautiful one of the women.” Absolute certainty is not possible, but a likely guess is that the form with the beth reflects the Hebrew. A construct state form of an adjective before a preposition is good Syriac, but in the present case the connection between the adjective and the following word with preposition is less direct than the examples listed in Nöeldeke’s grammar, § 206 (e.g. כיָּהָּוָּמָּו דְּרוֹשָׁה, “beautiful in appearance”).9 The omission of beth, then, was probably a smoothing

out of the Syriac, since we now have a perfect construct state construction. That we have here a conscious choice and not a clerical oversight is suggested by the fact that the same difference appears also in 6:1, where 9c1 again has the form without beth, whereas here 6h17 retains it.

In 5:12 6h17 and 9c1 read כְּבָדֵי, "(those of) a dove," whereas 7a1, 8a1, 12a1 agree with MT in the plural form. On the basis of manuscript support it is difficult to choose. Yet, the singular may be explained as an adaptation to 1:15 and 4:1, where all mss have "dove" in the singular (against the Hebrew, which has a plural). There is nothing intrinsically against the plural, it agrees with the Hebrew, and the plural form therefore seems to be preferable contrary to Edition; in any case there is no reason to relegate 7a1’s reading to the apparatus.

7a1
+6h17 see above; +8a1 1:17 (err); 6:7 (sey); +9c1 1:7 (see below); +12a1 8:5 (see below), 7 (inner-Syr)

In 1:7 7a1 shares with 9c1 (minus 9h1) the reading כְּבָדֵי against כְּבָדֵי of 6h17, 8a1*, 9h1, 12a1*. Edition has maintained 7a1’s reading in the text, but it would seem much more likely that the same Hebrew word (כְּבָדֵי) has been translated the same way in both occurrences. In the second occurrence ‘how’ instead of ‘where’ is just as meaningless as in the first; cf. for the first occurrence above, under 9c1 unique readings. In this case, then, the reading of 7a1 and its following would better have been relegated to the first (and second) apparatus, with its alternative in the text.

In 8:5 6h17, 8a1, 9c1 have המְלֵא, against 7a1 and 12a1, which have המְלֵא. The first reading, adopted in the text of Edition, agrees with the Hebrew; the variant reading can easily be explained as a smoothing out of the text and/or as an adaptation to the same form earlier in the verse.

8a1
+6h17/7a1 see above; +9c1 6:5 (see below); 8:2 (see below); +12a1 1:12 (err); +12k3 3:6 (see below);

In 3:6 the difference is over beth in כְָלַם. 8a1 and 12k3 omit the preposition beth. This is also the case in 9c1, but to judge from the microfilm, the beth has been added by the first hand. The difference is inner-Syriac. Formally, the form without beth agrees with the Hebrew. It is difficult to say which of the two readings is the older one.

In 6:5 כְָלַם, which renders רָצוֹנַי, is omitted by 6h17, 7a1, 12a1. There is no obvious cause for this omission; yet there can be little doubt that the error lies in the
omission, not in a later addition of /modal/. Syntactically, the word can hardly be missed, and it is found in all MSS in the parallel in 4:1.

In 8:2 6h17, 7a1, 12a1 have the emphatic state /modal /modal , whereas 8a1 and 9c1 have the noun with a proleptic suffix. The difference is inner-Syriac. The first reading has a somewhat greater probability of being the older reading since the other one can be explained as an adaptation to a smoother form of Syriac. In any case there seems to be no reason to relegate that reading to the apparatus as is the case in Edition. Compare for the same difference, but with differing support, 3:4, below, under “C. Remaining Combinations.”

9c1
+6h17 see above; +10c1 8:11 (sey)

9c1
+6h17/7a1/8a1 see above; +12a1 1:6, 8 (sey); 3:5 (see below); 4:16 (pref w); 5:13 (inner-Syr); 6:12 (var); 7:1 and 8:14 (pref u); +12k3 2:10 (transp), 12 (var), 14 (see below).

In 2:14 9c1 and 12k3 (+ 12a1c) have /modal  (12k3 without sey), “in the clefts,” against /modal in 6h17, 7a1, 8a1, 12a1*. /modal means ‘thistle, goad;’ Payne Smith also gives ‘fissura,’ but without references, and for this place also mentions the alternative reading. /modal has as its normal meaning ‘cleft.’ Either the majority of MSS share a clerical error and the correct reading is preserved in 9c1 and 12k3, or the majority reading has been replaced in the latter two MSS by a word carrying the unambiguous meaning of ‘cleft.’

In 3:5 6h17, 7a1, 8a1*, 12k3 have /modal , “by the stags,” whereas 9c1, 12a1 have /modal , “by the young roes,” which is a bit closer to the Hebrew. The latter translation is also found in all MSS in the parallel in 2:7. It is difficult to explain why 9c1’s reading, if it were the older one, was changed into the other one, but one might assume that if the majority reading is the older one, the variant reading was an adaptation to the parallel in 2:7.

9h1
+6h17 see above; +11c1 5:15 (sey); +12a1 6:10 ([10c1]; prob err).

10c1 see under 6h17, 9c1.

11c1 see under 9c1, 9h1.

12a1 see under 7a1, 8a1, 9c1, 9h1
12k3 see under 6h17, 8a1, 9c1.

C. Remaining Combinations

After the exclusion of readings unique to one MSS and readings occurring in two MSS there remain a few cases where two competing readings are each supported by varying combinations of MSS. These will be discussed below.

1:17: *Seyame* in הָעָרֶם, “beams,” is omitted by 8a1*, 9h1, 11c1, over against 6h17, 7a1, 8a1c, 10c1, 10c4. 9c1 is not extant for this case. The 9c1-MSS are divided. The form with *seyame* has a somewhat stronger support, is in agreement with MT and, what is the most important, is the most likely form: “the beams (not ‘the beam’) of our house are cedars.”

2:5: 6h17, 9c1, 12k3 have אֲמִכָּה, against אִמְכָּה of 7a1, 8a1*, 12a1. The Hebrew מִכָּה is translated in a number of cases by Syriac מִכָּה when it refers to the laying of hands on a person or a sacrificial animal, e.g. Num 8:10, Lev 8:14, though for the same Hebrew expression also מִכָּה is used, e.g. in Lev 1:4. In other cases, where the Hebrew means ‘to support,’ the appropriate translation מִכָּה is used. In this place מִכָּה makes no sense. Meaning, not manuscript support, makes it likely that אֲמִכָּה is the older reading and that אִמְכָּה is a later clerical error. In this case then 7a1’s reading might better have been preserved in the text with the rival reading being relegated to the apparatus.

2:8: 7a1, 8a1*, 12k3 (app) differ from 6h17, 9c1, 12a1 (text) in the form כָּה כָּה without prefixed *dalath*, in agreement with the Hebrew. The Hebrew כ функциons here as an adverb of place: “there he comes.” The Peshitta has missed this meaning and translated כָּה כָּה, “look, he has come” (the edition of Lee and the Urmia edition have a participle: “who is coming”). This mistranslation has probably attracted following כ to smooth out the text. It is not clear why the editors have emended 7a1. If the above is correct then 7a1’s reading is the older one, and would deserve to be in the text, the form with *dalath* being relegated to the apparatus.

2:14 and 4:3: The case is orthographic: 9b1, 11c1, 12a1 have כָּה כָּה whereas 6h17, 7a1, 8a1, 9c1, 10c1, 10c4, 12k3 have כָּה. In view of its stronger support, the latter reading is probably the older one.

10The nomen rectum כָּה is plural under the influence of the plural of the nomen regens; see W. Gesenius-E. Kautzsch, Hebräische Grammatik (Leipzig: Verlag von F. C. W. Vogel, 1896) §124q; C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956) §72a.
2:15: The reading _clause, “catch,” of 7a1, 9c1 (minus 9c1) and 12k3 has been adopted in the text, whereas the plural form of 6h17, 8a1, 9c1, 12a1, which agrees with MT, has been relegated to the apparatus. Apart from the stronger support for the plural imperative, this latter form seems more appropriate here, so that the reading of the apparatus is preferable to that of the text.

3:4: The difference is inner-Syriac, between an emphatic form (6h17, 8a1*, 12a1) and the form with proleptic suffix (7a1, 9c1, 12k3). On the basis of manuscript support it is not possible to decide which is the older form. One might suspect that the emphatic form has been changed into the somewhat smoother form with proleptic suffix, but it is not possible to be positive about it.

3:10: 9c1, 12a1, 12k3 differ from 6h17, 7a1, 8a1 over prefixed waw. The reading of the latter three ms (with pref. waw), adopted in the text of Edition, agrees formally with MT and has a somewhat stronger support, but since the difference may be inner-Syriac there can be no certainty.

5:9: The reading of 6h17, 8a1, 10c1, 10c4, 11c1, 12a1, adopted in the text of Edition, is _clause, “you adjure us,” in agreement with the Hebrew, whereas 7a1, 9c1, 9h1 have the suffix of the first person, “you adjure me.” On the basis of manuscript support and especially of meaning the majority reading is to be preferred.

6:7: seyame is added to _clause, “of a pomegranate” by 6h17, 9c1, 12a1. The singular form, which is in agreement with the Hebrew, seems the most natural: “as a piece of a pomegranate.”

Conclusion

By far most of the variant readings recorded in the apparatus of the Leiden Peshitta are no challenge to the corresponding reading adopted in the text. There are a few cases where the reading of the apparatus deserves attention, but still must give way to the reading of the text. In the following cases the reading registered in the apparatus seems to be preferable to that adopted in the text: 1:7 (_clause); 2:5 (Clause); 2:8 (Clause); 2:15 (Clause); 5:4 (Clause); 12 (Clause); 8:2 (Clause).

Abbreviations (in lists):

add(ition); app(arus); err(or); om(ission); orth(ographic); pref(ixed) w(aw)/d(alath); prob(ably); sey(ame); Syr(iac); transp(osition); var(ious)

n.l.: non liquet