REMARKS
ON THE
ARAMAIC - ENGLISH PART

In the introduction to his Targum to Canticles According to Six Yemen MSS, Raphael Hai Melamed devotes forty pages to review textual variants and mistakes in these manuscripts. As I was working on the Aramaic text which I am proposing in this edition, I went over each one of his remarks; and considering possible alternatives, I made judgments based on all the data available to me. In time, I am sure that I will have to backtrack and maybe even reconsider what I have presently discarded!

As a major lingua franca in use for centuries over an immense geographical area, Aramaic displayed a rich variety of forms and syntactical assortments depending on regional factors. Similar to what holds true in Arabic today, there were distinct dialectical blocks which shaped the transmission of the consonantal text first, and later on of the superimposed vowels, whether sublinear or superlinear. In a basic study-edition like this one, the inclusion of both variety and uniformity, within the limits of the plausible, is certainly useful:

• variety, in preparation for the real texts where diversity reflects the ultimate reality; but also
• uniformity, to convey a sense of the underlying common structure which is also subject to change, albeit at a slower pace.

For example:

• vocabulary fluctuations such as זָרַע for זָרַע in 2:3; or simple vowel changes, such as יִשָּׁב in 8:6 versus יִשָּׁב in 3:8 belong to the first category;

while

• discrepancies in gender, such as יָשָׁב with m יָשָׁב instead of m יָשָׁב in 1:16; or in number such as זָרַע זָרַע the first songs instead of זָרַע זָרַע the first song may suggest structural shifts, faulty imitations or just plain mistakes!
THE FEMININE SINGULAR DETERMINED ENDING ננ

In Hebrew, the fs/fp opposition relies on a consonantal and a vocalic feature such as ש/ט שות. Yet, in Aramaic the corresponding קא, קא, קאא opposition is solely vocalic. It hinges on the shewatqames opposition to distinguish between the fs and the fp. It is quite tenuous, but viable. However, when even that disappears in a language which otherwise maintains a solid fs/fp opposition in areas such as the verb, then a clarification is necessary. Thus, when a text has קא, for the fs, the reckless substitution of קא for קא strikes me as a transfer of the Hebrew pretonic kames to Aramaic, in line with similar Hebrew reading habits quite frequently occurring in Aramaic. Therefore, in accordance with contextual requirements and the superlinear Babylonian vocalization, I have normalized all fp formations, changing them to standard fs forms.

THIRD WEAK mp PARTICIPLES

Deciding the vocalization of the Third Weak Masculine Plural Participles has been an annoyance. It is a fact that in Biblical Aramaic, these forms have a clear-cut י pattern which in Syriac is equally unambiguous with the י form. In Talmudic Aramaic, there are at least 7 phonetically related options for the mp Third Weak Participle, but in no case is the י of mp י ending vocalized with a kames, as if it were a feminine plural!

In this Targum, there are a few Third Weak mp Participles vocalized י י. However, in other obvious mp contexts, the vast majority of them is vocalized י י which is the mark of the fp! My hunch is that this does not reflect a change in grammatical gender, but that somehow the sight of an unvocalized י ending prompted readers to impose the -ן vocalization on it, so familiar to them from other Aramaic contexts. In other words, irrespective of gender considerations, it must have sounded "more Aramaic" to them! I have therefore vocalized as mp all Third Weak Participles which according to their contexts should be in the mp. Incidentally, mutatis mutandis, a similar situation but in reverse occurred in Asa's Ladino version, where it is possible to find las profetas side by side with los profetas!

TRANSCRIPTION

With so many languages at stake and so many people to please all over the world, transcription has not been a pleasant prospect for me. A simple, all-purpose system would be ideal; I have yet to come across one which fits that specification. Of course, aiming at consistency
was a paramount worry; but the diversity of readers and their interests is such that there will always be a substantial balance of problematic compromises liable to tip the scales towards dissatisfaction.

The assumption that the English alphabet reflects the Roman letters needs the constant reminder that the voice may be the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau! Unlike English, the vowels used in this transcription have only one value, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{as in father} \\
\text{e} & \quad \text{met} \\
\text{i} & \quad \text{in} \\
\text{o} & \quad \text{or} \\
\text{u} & \quad \text{rule}
\end{align*}
\]

Here are additional problems:

- Diacritical marks would force me to use the one font I have with that capability, a serious limitation in view of the other beautiful fonts available to me. Being of the Ataturk generation, I have used all my life \( h \) for \( h / h / h \) and I know that most lay people in our part of the world are as intimidated by the mysterious dots as I am by articles or books where Hebrew quotations are transliterated for economic reasons. We like \textit{haham}; we cannot stand \textit{hacham}, because those of us who know French would be tempted to read it \textit{hasham}, while those who do not know Hebrew may read it \textit{hatcham}, somewhat similar to \textit{Yitchak Rabin}!

Even for the \( ה \), the transliteration of \( n \) with \( h \) is not absolutely certain in every instance. We know that Proto-Semitic had two distinct phonemes \( h \) and \( h' \), and that based on the Arabic \( الح ) for \textit{brother}, the usual transliteration \( 'ah \) for \textit{hah} is in fact wrong! But more than that. Since in Arabic, \( \\text{ح} \) means \textit{cough}, whereas \( \\text{ح} \) means \textit{brother}, the Arabs must go through some \textit{coughing} and chuckling as we drown trying to make up our minds between Sephardic \( h \) and Ashkenazic \( h \) for our \( n \)! Uncompromising consistency in transcription often produces ridiculous results, as it can create more problems than it can solve!^1

---

^1 The Library of Congress, which sets standards way beyond the Beltway, catalogued its Ladino books according to Spanish standards, under the assumption that Ladino was the exclusive domain of Hispanic scholars. Then, for the sake of consistency, their cataloguer extended his peculiar transcription approach to Hebrew and Turkish words in Ladino. Thus, he wrote \textit{neymadim} (which at first, I took for \textit{Nemmedin}, a Turkish proper name) for the Hebrew word \textit{naima} or \textit{Joga} (which at first, I took for our good old \textit{Djoha}) turned out to be \textit{hodja}! And now, Harvard University is perpetuating this unpleasant situation in its latest catalogue of Ladino holdings under the pretext of consistency. We, the people who speak Ladino, didn't count! The problem could have been mitigated with cross-references. When a mistake has once been made, refusing to correct it, and even perpetuating it in the name of consistency, is outrageous.
• Same problem with $s$ for $z$ which limits me to one font! Thus, I have everywhere transcribed $z$ with $s$.

• In the transcription of $y$, too, I must avoid friction with the Arabs who distinguish between a dual construct in -ay and a plural construct in -y. That simple statement places me at odds with the entire Ashkenazi-influenced Hebrew-speaking world, conditioned by that $y$ sound in that particular slot! For an Arab, however, בֵּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל read as Benei/Beney Yisrael, means two Israelites, because both bney and bnei are duals in Arabic! So, too, אֵלֶּה pirkei/pirkey would mean two chapters-of-, etc. Therefore, to avoid this unnecessary friction in the plural construct, this $y$ must go! I prefer the transcription bené or pirké—which is what most Sepharadim use—over benei or pirkei which very easily deteriorates into beney or pirkey!

• Today the Jewish community in the United States is a leader in publishing Jewish materials for the entire world. Most people overseas are able to read English and can thus indirectly get in touch with their Jewish past through many English publications. Their general feeling is that anything coming from the USA must be right and correct; this places an awesome responsibility on our shoulders here.

Lately, I have been getting Jewish publications from Turkey translated from English books. These include proper nouns with their English spellings left intact. Obviously, the people there are unaware of the fact that in English some letters lack phonetic value and should be dropped in their own phonetic transcription system, not to mention those proper names with long-standing Ladino equivalents for which no English substitutions are needed. If they could only ask for some guidance!

For example, more and more I am coming across words like hallah, megillah, Torah and Elijah which in the Turkish system must be pronounced hallakh, megillakh, Torakh and Eleedjakh. Yet, in their local phonetic spelling, these should simply appear as halla, megilla and Torah. And as for Eleedjakh, why even bother with it, since the traditional Ladino form Eliyahu is the one they should be using anyway? O tempora, O mores! Apparently my own Jews have never heard of Eliyahu han-Navi! A mere generation ago, their parents would not be caught dead skipping that dageshed double $n$.

---

2 I once attended a Karaitic service. In their minhag, the $x$ is pronounced $ch$ as in chalk. What an ordeal it was to hear מִשְׁרָאֵל pronounced Tchiyon, Mitchrayim! In my Sephardic tradition, we still eat masa on Passover and give sedaka to the poor, just as the Turks, too, give sadness to the poor! I know that in this delicate inter-cultural equation the wave of the future cannot be stopped and that the Ashkenazi $ts$ pronunciation of modern Hebrew is here to stay. But in works where I am quoting Sephardic authorities of the past, I cannot "force" them to utter words which would sound to them like Tchiyon and Mitchrayim in that Karaitic service! Asia would laugh at either Tsadikim or Zadikim: my skin has grown a little thicker, but in my dreams, $x$ is still $s$ or $g$. Because of Turkish, I am immune to the loss of that emphatic dot under the $s$, but I do get cold shivers at the sight of a $ts$ or a $z$, just as you would, if suddenly you were compelled to tsing / tzing a tsong / zong in Tsintsinnati / Zinzinnati!
I also know that there is some friction on the Arab side which does not relish Meccah and Medinah instead of Mecca and Medina. That is why I have taken the risk of transcribing all words ending in ḫ with a final -a and dropping the h, the way the Jerusalem Post does it with Tora, Sara, etc.\(^3\) I am keeping the h for ḫ Nogah!

**ARAMAIC TEXT**

**LAYOUT**

The layout of the Aramaic text was dictated by the layout of the printed Ladino Paraphrasis, with 2 pages of the Paraphrasis corresponding to 1 page of the Aramaic text and a star of David ★ to mark the beginning of the second page in the Paraphrasis.

Within the constraints of typography, I have tried to arrange the layout of the Aramaic text to reflect the Targum's understanding of the underlying Biblical verse. That is why some sentences which could be longer, have been shortened. In 5:3, for example, the layout clearly reflects the Targum's view of how the verse should be interpreted.

Ideally, each Biblical verse should have been printed before its targumic exposition for easier comparison. As a matter of fact, I have done just that in the special edition I use in class. At this time, however, it has not been possible to have the same arrangement for this edition, but we hope to improve next time. The fonts used are Superhebrew and Hebraica in a comfortable 24 point size. They are available from Linguist's Software in Edmonds, WA.

When we study a foreign language in the classroom, and later when we visit the country where that language is spoken, we always feel that the natives are speaking too fast. What is their hurry, we say, can't they speak a little slower? In reality, they are not speaking fast, we are listening too slowly!

What is true for the ear is also true for the eye! Beginners always complain that the print in their texts is too small and that they cannot clearly see all those dots, whether in Hebrew or in Arabic. In reality, the dots are just about what they should be; it is they who are looking at them too slowly!

If for the spoken language, the solution to this problem is to insist on speaking slower, the solution to the small print/dots problem is to have larger print with larger dots! Hebrewists

---

\(^3\) Our HUC Ulpan teachers in Israel are doing nothing to discourage the firmly established belief that in the so-called Lamed ה or Third Weak verb ה, the final ה is a radical! In spite of forms such as רָכַב with a visible yod and רָכַב with an audible yod, for them the underlying root is still רָכַב! And from this piece of wisdom, students naturally conclude that the h in the English word Torah, too, represents the final ה of the Hebrew word רָכַב!
and Arabists, who in their classes are careful to speak slowly, enunciating every word with clarity, have yet to discover that a similar visual solution is required in the preparation of their reading materials for nurturing speed during the initial stages. For the average small size book, a 20% or 35% enlargement makes quite a difference, with no additional paper requirement, but only one more button to push on the copier!

**PUNCTUATION:**

Traditional texts lacked not only vowels, but punctuation as well. By today's standards, reading them is like driving on a wide highway with no markings for the lanes, nor signs for expected exits. When we study these texts, we are seldom told that something else made up for the lack of navigational piloting: that was the chanting which was part of their normal reading. Differently said, these texts were not read silently the way we moderns read our books "to ourselves". Instead, youngsters learned at an early age how to chant their texts by grouping together chunks of subclauses which formed small, semantically balanced packages.

Since we do not chant our texts, I left in this edition more than the usual blank spacing after commas or periods as an advance visual indication of the semantic subgroups and as a hint where to expect the end of a given clause or subclause. In the past, nothing was more frustrating to me than to call upon a student to read a text and then watch that student continue reading long past the expected exit for his particular semantic unit!

**STRESSED SYLLABLE**

In the traditional Sephardic pronunciation, the majority of Hebrew and Aramaic words is stressed פָּרָא (para abasho) on the last or ultima syllable. Those words which are stressed on the second to last or penultima syllable are called פָּרָא (para arriva) and belong to well-defined categories such as duals, segolates. Perfect cs. 2 ms and cp forms, etc. In this Targum, every word has been marked with the sign ` on the first consonant of its stressed syllable.

**MAKKEF**

To emphasize the important notion of package, so basic to Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic syntax, I have used the connecting dash called makkef whenever there was a place for it, as in:

| פָּרָא | קָרָא | 27 |
| פָּרָא | מֵעָתָה | 28 |
| פָּרָא | בָּשָׂר | 214 |
| פָּרָא | מֵאָרָא | 215 |
which are *constructs in cascade*. Arabic does not use any *makkef* signs *per se*, but their *wasla* is a potential *makkef* incorporated within a given word, as illustrated by the one-word looking amalgamation of *bismillahirrahmanirrahimi* according to the traditional Muslim pronunciation.

**KAMES GADOL/KATAN**

Every *kames gadol* which is followed by a vocal *sheva* has been provided with a *metheg* for proper identification. Our Sephardic tradition is so intolerant on the matter of the *kames gadol*/*kames katan* that any weakness in that department is seen as a total disaster for one's Hebrew profile! The folkloric basis for this attitude probably rests with elementary education in years past, when everyone of us—at least once—must have gone through the misfortune of missing on the *kames katan*, specifically in the word יָנוֹשׁ *ozné*, by reading it *azné*! The teacher would immediately chide the student with the words: *azno sos tu* רמא הנוא ואתך you are the ass (in Ladino *azno* means *ass*). After that, we all learned to spot *kames katans*, or else!

However, the case of יָנָשׁ is delicate because two traditions seem to converge on this particle:

- On the one hand, the Tiberian tradition has יָנוֹשׁ with a *makkef* in the Aramaic sections of Daniel, indicating a *kames katan* pronunciation *kol*.

- On the other hand, the Babylonian *superlinear* vocalization in the Targum has a *kames gadol* everywhere, which anyway was more of an *o* than an *a*! Thus, the insistence of the Sephardim that key liturgical Aramaic words such as יָנוֹשׁ kal *nigré* and יָנוֹשׁ kal *hamira* have a *kames gadol* may go back all the way to a Babylonian tradition which indeed had a *kames gadol*, which we then retroactively pronounced as a long *a* since in our tradition a *kames gadol* is pronounced as a long *a*! It is clear that in the absence of such a solid tradition, no amount of scholarly lobbying would have done the trick of conservation so efficiently!

**KAL NIDRÉ**

I confess complete ignorance of what goes on in Ashkenazic synagogues on Yom Kippur Eve. But in a Sephardic synagogue, as the scrolls of the Law are auctioned off on that night, everybody—men, women and children—knows that the *sefer* before the first *sefer* is indeed the big item of the evening, the one and only annual יָנוֹשׁ שָאוֹר יָנוֹשׁ *Sefer Kal Nidré* (with a soft *d*) and that it will be outbid to the highest possible price. And on their way home that night, members of different congregations see each other on the street, and the big "news" of the evening is always, *kuanto se vendyo el Sefer Kal Nidré*, for how much was the *Kal Nidré* *Sefer* auctioned off?

---

Therefore, if you ever come across a Sephardic congregational bulletin in this country with the words *Kol Nidrei* clearly visible, you can be sure that a change of direction has taken place.

**Kal Hamira**

The day before Passover, known also as Passover Eve, marks the end of a major cleanup period lasting a few days. It is concluded with the search for וּמָן, and the recitation of an Aramaic passage starting with the words כל şeyים או שום בירושא which I may have in my possession, etc. In years past, when there were no electric gadgets around, this cleaning process over a number of days was extremely taxing on women, especially the elderly. They often got pneumonia from being exposed to drafts while scrubbing unheated basements and attics; many of them fell from ladders trying to clean high windows. Hence the expression *komo dia de kal hamira, like the day of kal hamira*, commonly used by Ladino-speaking women, to describe any day of the year spent doing heavy work. Phrases such as, *oy estuvo dia de kal hamira / oy tuvimos dia de kal hamira, today was just like another Kal Hamira day*, meant: "we are dead tired, we just can’t take it anymore"! And it is hard to assume that there could be a male conspiracy regulating the pronunciation of the word בַּק in key liturgical Ladino words all the way to the clichés used by women, unless there was a basis and a long-standing tradition for such a pronunciation.

Despite *kal nidré / kal hamira* and despite my bias for the Babylonian superlinear system, I have decided in the case of בַּק in favor of the *makkef* of the Tiberian Masoretes which is also part of the tradition we follow in Hebrew today.

**Methodology for Studying the Targum**

**Identifications** (Diagramming)

Go over your verse looking for unusual verb or noun formations, *hapax legomena*, repeated sounds, potentially redundant items, ethical datives, conjunctive *waw* liable to become adversative *waw*, etc. Look at the structure of the verse for synthetic or antithetic parallelisms, be prepared to subdivide the verse into a number of subunits—not necessarily full subclauses—as the Targum will exhaust every avenue, including *gematria*,\(^5\) to bend the text in the direction of its preconceived overall themes. Here are a few illustrations of how the Targum handles the text:

---

\(^5\) *Gematria* consists in assigning each letter of the Hebrew alphabet a numerical value based on *one, two* and *three*, parallel to Γ = 3 γάμμα τρία (*gematria*) in the Greek alphabet. Thus י”ו is 70 for the seventy nations; י’ל is 22, for the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, etc.
numerical value 70, for the seventy nations

read as your signs and translated this world and the world to come

circular pendants, read as plural of the words of the Torah

read My will (also in 6:4)

ethical dative taken as the Imperative of Come on, get out!

another ethical dative split from its main verb and then read as if it were no, subsequently expanded to Never ever again will you see them in the future!

The Targum then interprets with this severed ס, as follows:

blossoms, read as a combination of miracle and the agent ending. miracle-workers, and interpreted as referring to Moses and Aaron

split into and spice of the generation and interpreted as the Sages (also in 7:13)

translated as like the night, but also suggestive of crown

Moriyya is for Abraham; is for Isaac; is for Jacob who fought with the Angel

for the 60 letters of the Priestly Blessing and by extension the Priestly Blessing itself

read as His people

wedding suggests dedication

split into rendered who is your teacher

split into rendered depending on what he said, by the directive of his mouth

read as milk

(hapax) with full authority......to acquit or to condemn

read tablets

towers, read raising and translated raising, generating

read who learn and translated who are occupied (studying)

read = 12 and rendered

with the taken as nota accusativa, the Targum has
I serve the Master of the world

The phrase גֵּרָה לְדוּרִי I belong to my beloved is ideal for advocates of unio mystica in matters divine; or infatuation in earthly relationships.

The Targum, however, demonstrates its dislike of that concept by inserting the verb אַלָּא I serve before לְדוּרִי and making this love relationship conditional on service, and therefore on commitment! What a beautiful wedding sermon this phrase would be for those who have chosen to engrave גֵּרָה לְדוּרִי on their wedding rings!

6:4 בֵּין בָּנָיו Tirsa read between and translated when your desire is...
6:5 שְׁעַרְבָּךְ your hair read כְּעֵבֶר the rest [of your students]
6:12 אֵל split from דְּשַׁבָּה, and translated no more!

translated positively as כְּפַלָּקִים I promise myself

7:5 מַעֲשֵׂה read as מַעֲשִׂים computations of...
7:6 אִיזֶר identified as Abraham, because of he declared the sovereignty of God
identified as Isaac, because of his having been bound
7:7 יַבְשִׂים identified as Jacob, because of the watering-troughs

7:8 רָאִיתָ read פַּלַּקְתָּ interpreted פַּלָּקְתָּ (the rest of) your congregation
7:9 רָאִיתָ read פַּלַּקְתָּ interpreted (the rest of you) = the people of the House of Israel
7:12 רָאִיתָ let us lie down, interpreted as רָאִיתָ praying
8:9 תֹּאֵל door read הָעָלֶה poor, devoid of

probably read יָינָא (נ > ל) we shall pray on her behalf

Since the Targum usually expounds one verse at a time, it is best to proceed initially on a verse by verse basis. Later on, it will become apparent to you that there are clusters of verses which can be grouped and expounded together as part of a larger unit. Setting the closest possible one-to-one relationship between every word in the Biblical text and its counterpart in the Targum is also the best way to probe the expository methodology of the Targum.

To do that:

1. Read and thoroughly master the meaning of a given verse.

2. Read and translate the text of the Targum using the translation provided. Look up unfamiliar forms in the Aramaic-English glossary to check their parsing. This two-pronged strategy builds momentum and is initially very beneficial, until such time—at about midpoint, around chapter 4 or 5—when you are quite familiar with the vocabulary and the thinking of the Targum and will gradually wean yourself from the pony.

3. Pit the targumic text against the Biblical verse, back and forth, until you begin to see possible similarities and dependencies. Since what the Targum is doing often involves a real tour
De force, expect at times an introductory statement of one or more lines telling you, the reader, the Sitz im Leben, the particular historical circumstance where the verse is going to be fitted. At this point, you are ready for some "algebra type" accounting and simplification, and the best place to start is not necessarily the beginning or the end, but wherever you feel more confident. Hop around, pick your identifications in the order of certainty and narrow it down to the last word. Except for an insignificant number of cases:

- the order of your identifications in the Targum corresponds to the word order in the Biblical verse, and

- in a given translation, the expository material may precede or follow the particular Aramaic word it is translating from the Biblical Hebrew original. Here is an example with the Biblical and Targumic texts blended into one sequence:

    שנים תוחבי לעת קיימים דירשהלא שימי התחפה תלב
    לירוהלא שימי תוחבי לעת קיימים דירשהלא שימי תלב
    לבקלא נבוחה הניחו מלכיים למתבנה עב בשמואלעני דוד מהתה יكه שיבך ובכאריה שקר עב
    כMahon שלמלים פמא למשה ית עמה דירוהלא
    לבנהאילה, משחלמה על מומרא דוד, מתחלה הלאחלה
    המחמה: משדחלמה דירשהלא ידויה.

Commentary
1. The first vier calls for a return to the Almighty
2. The second vier is for a return to Jerusalem [based on Shulamit]
3. The third vier is for a return to the house of the study of the Tora
4. The fourth vier is for a return of prophecy [based on רומ which overlaps with the next part]

וַיִּלְךָ הָגֶפֶן evokes יַהֲנַר vision, prophecy, hence the prophets who prophesy
יבַּיאָה דְרַמְּתַכּוּנָי the same ב in מבש, the Name being the memra of God
בּוֹכָה same ב in the Targum asking a question
והָלִוה the question reverses the nature of prophecy which now applies to the false prophets
The same text could be diagrammed vertically, as follows:

Another example of the *Biblical* and *Targumic* texts blended into one sequence:

糟伟 7:1

שאני קולו בנות אבריהם דישראלי

שהי השכלתיה קולו לירנה

שהי קולו ליברה אבריהם

שלמי קולו לברא אבריהם

מלכי קולו לברא אבריהם

טאת קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולو לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולו לברא אברים

זאד קולو ل
Daniel said, situates this verse in Daniel's period
was read and translated as the decree [of the Lord's memra]
translated as just as
interpreted as old wine
translated as just
interpreted as before Him
interpreted as Elija and Elisha
interpreted as [thanks to whose] spoken prophecy
translated as the sleeping

The same text could be diagrammed vertically, as follows:
In my preface, I mentioned the need to be creative when translating Hebrew/Aramaic texts of a limited vocabulary into modern languages. And I gave רָחֲנָא, comely as an example. Here are additional illustrations showing the possibilities inherent in this process.

Let us start with עִדָּה and עֶסֶק. The easy way out is to say that the first looks like a carbon copy of the Hebrew עידות future and that the second is equally similar to the Hebrew עֶסֶק busy, and there is nothing else to add.

 UserId: After some research in the lexica, the following picture emerges: עידות does not primarily mean future but prepare/ready, and obviously prepare/ready lead to future/destined to, etc. Thus depending on context, prepare/ready can mean prone to, earmarked for and even anticipate. In my glossary, I have placed these connotations in quotation marks because they are my own subjective extensions based on the primary prepare/ready meaning.

UserService: The word עֶסֶק does not even occur in the Bible! Pursuing the matter in Aramaic and other cognate dictionaries, we realize that it has the meaning of being heavy/burdened and therefore engaged in, involved which puts some "spirit" into busy.

UserService: Similarly with עֶסֶק which means strong. Depending on context, I have translated

4:4 רָחֲנָא עַל בָּכָר בַּכֹּל עַה נְבֵי חוֹדֵיתָהָ

the Head of the Academy is enhanced by merit

(Without some basic sense, he would not be Head of the Academy!
What he always needs is additional sense to enhance his position)

4:8 עֵקֵטֶר יָמִין בַּכֹּל עַה

stronger than leopards

5:15 עֶסֶק בָּכָר יָמִין

like a young warrior who is mighty

7:5 עֶסֶק בָּכָר יָמִין

the President of the Court is empowered over the people

8:6 עֶסֶק בָּכָר יָמִין

the jealousy they harbor is "unyielding" as Gehinnam
my children are sturdy like a tower,
and in Modern Hebrew means inoculation, as it makes one strong/resistant to a given virus!

PUNCTUATION

The Chicago Manual of Style belongs to the typewriter era. It needs a thorough revision to reflect the myriad of options which desktop publishing has brought to us. In the meantime, many hardened positions have developed which only common sense will eventually overturn.

One of those is the habit of underlining book titles! You can get killed for not abiding by the "rules" of the Chicago Manual which says that book titles must be underlined.

First of all, there is nothing sacrosanct about underlining, since the entire purpose is to bring out titles in a bibliographical listing for easier use. Therefore, if a bibliography is very short, or if all the titles are separately indented so that they do stand out clearly, individuals should have the flexibility of doing as they please.

Second, underlining was a way of telling the printer to use italics for a particular word or sentence. Apparently people have not noticed that bibliographies in printed books have no underlined titles because these are italicized and that is sufficient! Yet, I sense that there is "bibliographophobia" everywhere. Nowadays, when practically every student has a word processor with numberless functions, including italics, some still underline titles, or better, both italicize and underline them just to be on the safe side with their boss.

In the area of parentheses/quotation marks and commas/periods, I find the European system much more satisfactory, as most cases of .) or ." boil down to .). or .". I have avoided the combination ," by using italics as much as possible6. Obviously, there will be some right on either side and in time, some middle ground will be found.

METHODOLOGY FOR STUDYING THE TARGUM IN ENGLISH

With the proper guidance under the direction of someone who can handle the original sources, it is even possible to blend the English translation of the Song of Songs with its Targum. Here is a typical example:

6 If after typing in black a paragraph with a sequence of words in quotation marks, separated by commas, we decided for emphasis to print just those words in red ink while also getting rid of the quotation marks, would the remaining commas still separating those words be red or black? With the commas before the end quote, they should be red; with the commas after the end quote, they should be black, as is the rest of the punctuation in the sentence. Chicago seems to be saying that they should be red; I am saying they should be black!
**Song of Songs:** You have captured my heart, my sister, my bride; You have captured my heart with one look of your eyes, with one bead of your necklace.

**Targum:** Pinned upon the wall of My heart is your love, My sister, the Community of Israel, who is comparable to a bride who is bashful. Pinned upon the wall of My heart is My affection for the least one of your members who is righteous as one of the scholars of the Sanhedrin, or as one of the kings of the House of Juda upon whose neck a crown of royalty has been placed.

**Blended Text:** You have captured my heart, pinned upon the wall of My heart is your love, my sister, My sister, the Community of Israel, my bride, who is comparable to a bride who is bashful. You have captured my heart, pinned upon the wall of my heart is My affection for the least one of your members who is righteous, with one look of your eyes as one of the scholars of the Sanhedrin, with one bead or as one of the kings of the House of Juda of your necklace upon whose neck a crown of royalty has been placed.

Of course, one can even diagram this blended English text, with the corresponding items in bold face! Figuring out that capture corresponds to **pinned** is equally easy or difficult in English as is figuring out that רכbaugh corresponds to שיבח in the Hebrew/Aramaic originals. Here is an example of diagramming based exclusively on the English translations:

You have captured: **pinned** upon

my heart: the wall of My heart is your love,

my sister: My sister, the Community of Israel.

my bride: who is comparable to a **bride** who is bashful.

You have captured: **pinned** upon

my heart: the wall of My heart is My affection for the least one of your members who is righteous,

with one glance: as **one**

of your eyes: of the scholars of the Sanhedrin,

with one head: or as **one** of the kings of the House of Juda

of your necklace: upon whose neck a crown of royalty has been placed.