
This text was most recently edited by Drijvers.1 His edition was included in the database of the on-line Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon,2 and it has recently been reissued by the publishers of Lund's concordance.3 The text is attested in only one manuscript,4 and such renewed interest is to be welcomed. While there have been several other editions and translations, this is the first attempt to make a systematic concordance of this important representative of early Syriac literature.

Lund has chosen to adopt a key-word-in-context (KWIC) approach, in which every form in the corpus is listed together with six or seven others that precede and follow it. This approach has the advantage of making it easier to find a word, but it has the disadvantage of not making the grammatical clause the context of the citation. The user will find it difficult to observe the syntactic behaviour of a word, since the clause is the minimum unit required for that task. To keep the context of every form on one line, the concordance pages are laid out as landscape, so that the reader must rotate the book 90 degrees to read it.

The first part of the book (pp. 1–232) comprises a concordance of words. It includes separate entries for \( \& \), \( \& \), \( \Delta \), which helps considerably in formalising the usage of these proclitics. The second part (pp. 233–234) is a concordance of personal names, such as \( \alpha \), \( \alpha \); the names of planets, constellations, deities etc. were treated in the first part. The third and final part (pp. 235–236), a concordance of geographic names, excludes adjectives derived from geographic names, which were also treated in the first part.

2) http://cali.cn.huc.edu/.  
5) \( \alpha \) has been split into two entries: one for the prepositional use (pp. 52–58) and one for the conjunctional use (pp. 58–73).
Every entry in the concordance consists of two sections: the heading (or 'lemma line') and the list of occurrences. The heading is divided into three columns, giving the lemma, the part of speech (abbreviated) and an English gloss; occasionally additional linguistic information, such as cross references, antonyms, etc., is provided. Every occurrence is listed according to a numerical sequence which is supplemented with other units of relevant information: grammatical information, number and state for nouns and adjectives, and stem formation for verbs; the form in which the occurrence is attested; the page and line number in Drijvers where it occurs; and finally the key word in its context. This layout could hardly be more user-friendly.

One of the decisions lying behind the organisation of entries makes it easy to use the concordance. Verbs are presented according to root rather than the 3rd. masc. sg. pe'al perfect, so it is easier to discern different types of verbs, such as hollow and geminate (these are presented with a doubled second radical, e.g. אָלָפָה, גָּלֶפָה, יָם). Similarly, III-yodh verbs can be distinguished from those with a consonantal alaph as final radical; had they been listed as perfects both would have ended in alaph.

A number of entries have been misplaced in the alphabetical sequence:

- p. 15 אָלָפָה before אָלָפֹת; should appear before אָלָפֹת (p. 18);
- p. 22/3 אָלָפֹת before אָלָפָה; order should be reversed;
- p. 26 אָלָפֹת before אָלָפָה; order should be reversed;
- p. 38/9 אָלָפֹת before אָלָפֹת; order should be reversed;
- p. 43 אָלָפָה before אָלָפֹת (adjective); should appear before אָלָפָה (p. 46);
- p. 113 אָלָפֹת before אָלָפָה; order should be reversed;

6) p. xii.
7) These decisions are explained briefly on pp. xii–xiii.
p. 122: māchām before māchām; should appear before māchām (p. 123);
p. 174: māchām before māchām; order should be reversed;
p. 176: māchām before māchām; should appear before māchām (p. 177);
p. 195: māchām before māchām; should appear after māchām;
p. 196: māchām before māchām; order should be reversed;
p. 215: māchām before māchām; order should be reversed;
p. 218: māchām before māchām; should appear before māchām (p. 219).

Some of these can be explained as a tendency to group together entries that are etymologically related, i.e. words that are derived from the same root; e.g. māchām after māchām, both from root *mābh-; māchām after māchām, both from root *mābh-; māchām after māchām; māchām after māchām (verb); and māchām after māchām.

But the entries māchām, māchām, māchām and māchām are respectively in an alphabetically incorrect sequence with māchām, māchām, māchām (adjective) and māchām, which are derived from the same roots, so cognate etymology does not always explain the sequence of entries. As for the other cases listed, there is no clear relationship to the entries that surround them, and the reasons for the sequence here remain unclear.10

The list of abbreviations (p. ix) includes only the abbreviations for parts of speech, as used in the second column of the headings section of the entries.11 The abbreviations for grammatical functions, as used in the second column of the occurrences section of the entries, are not explained. While most of those will be easily understandable, a few deserve to be explained. Because there is a certain amount of inconsistency, for occasionally several abbreviations refer to the same function, it would have been helpful to include some or all of the following items: ‘ab’ / ‘abs’ for ‘absolute state’; ‘cn’ / ‘const’ / ‘cs’ for ‘construct state’; ‘em’ for ‘emphatic state’; ‘p’ for plural; ‘quad’ / ‘quadr’ for ‘quadriliteral root’; ‘s’ for ‘singular’; ‘sf’ for ‘(pronominal) suffix’; ‘t’ for ‘reflexive stem’.

The concordance tends to follow a semantic or translational approach, for the overall organisation of the entries is permeated not only by their linguistic

10) māchām and māchām would have been in the correct sequence if they had been cited in the absolute state, but not with the emphatic ending.
11) The abbreviation ‘d’ for ‘divine name’ (as on p. 14 māchām and p. 231 māchām) is not given, presumably because it is not a ‘part of speech’ in the grammatical sense; but it does occur and it should have been included.
12) The abbreviation ‘const’ occurs only once and is used incorrectly, for it is applied to a form in the emphatic state (p. 120 māchām under māchām).
features but also by their meanings or translations. This tendency results in a 'split' entry for a word with divergent meanings; e.g. there are separate entries for the noun <i>כְּלַעַשׁ</i> (pp. 119–120), one for the translation 'life, mode of being', and one for the translation 'animal'. This also happens where different stem formations of a verb diverge in meaning; e.g. <i>מָשַל</i> (p. 187) one entry for the <i>af</i> ‘to sin, to be wrong’, and another for the <i>etpe’al</i> ‘to understand’; similarly <i>טַמִּשׁ</i> (p. 198) has one for the <i>etpe’el</i> ‘to mix’ and another for the <i>pe’al</i> ‘to set’.\(^\text{13}\)

An 'adjectival' passive participle, but not a 'verbal' one, is given its own entry, separated from the verb from which it derives.\(^\text{14}\) This distinction is also based on semantics rather than morphology, for both have the same form. A positive aspect of listing a passive participle separately from its verb is that one does not have to know the root from which it is derived to find it, for it can be found under its first letter. This is a clear advantage for someone with limited linguistic knowledge. But 'split' entries imply that the forms are derived from two different lexemes. In many cases this is true, and in those cases Lund's treatment\(^\text{15}\) is linguistically appropriate, but it is not true for the examples given above. Words like these may have several diverging translations but their morphological and syntactical behaviour indicate that they are the same lexeme. The same goes for the passive participles given a separate entry; they are certainly not separate lexemes but dependent on a verbal root.\(^\text{16}\)

A way in which the concordance could have clarified its linguistic analysis would have been to provide cross references to the root or lexeme from which a

---

\(^{13}\) Why the <i>etpe’el</i> should precede the <i>pe’al</i> is not clear. It can hardly be influenced by the order of the form within the text, since the <i>pe’al</i> (<i>כְּלַעַשׁ</i>) occurs before the <i>etpe’el</i> (<i>כְּלַעַשׁ</i>).\(^\text{14}\) Passive participles that apparently are deemed to have an 'adjectival' nature (defined as 'adjective' as the part of speech in the concordance) are given their own entry; e.g. p. 26 <i>דַלְיָל</i>, p. 41 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 50 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 127 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 140 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 203 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 208 <i>כַּל</i>, and many more. Passive participles that are considered to be of a more 'verbal' nature are treated under the entries of the verbs to which they belong; e.g. p. 4 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 126 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 168 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 179 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 185 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 190 <i>כַּל</i>, p. 202 <i>כַּל</i>, etc.\(^\text{15}\) Including (near) homographs such as pp. 78–79 <i>dallîl</i> 'few' and <i>dallîl</i> 'easy', pp. 191–192 <i>תַּבָּדַל</i> 'servant' and <i>תַּבָּדַל</i> 'labor, work, operation, activity, thing', etc.\(^\text{16}\) Moreover, Lund does not seem to be entirely consistent in his practice of splitting entries when translations differ; e.g. the entry for <i>יָס</i> (p. 227) is not split, even though the translations for the <i>pe’al</i> (to rest (ות על) upon'), <i>pa’el</i> (to begin') and <i>etpe’el</i> ('to be dissolved') diverge greatly. Similarly, the <i>pe’al</i>, <i>etpe’el</i> and <i>etpa’al</i> of <i>דָל</i> are treated under the same entry, despite a considerable difference in meaning (pe’al ‘to ask’, etpe’el / etpa’al + ל to abstain from').
given form derives;\textsuperscript{17} additional grammatical information would be of further help. Unfortunately, this concordance does not give cross-references to roots or lexemes, and the linguistic information it provides is rather scanty. The second column of the occurrences section provides information only for nouns, adjectives, and verbs. For nouns and adjectives, only the number and state are given,\textsuperscript{18} not gender; for verbs, only the stem formation is given, not tense, person, gender or number. Of course, a concordance will not be expected to give a full grammatical analysis of each form, but a little more support, especially in the parsing of forms considered difficult, would have been helpful. Providing cross-references and more grammatical information would have posed no threat to the structure and organisation of the entries.

Because a concordance is such an important tool for analysing a text, it is expected that it will reflect the original text as accurately as possible. This text is attested only in the London manuscript B.L. Add. 14658, written in the sixth or seventh century,\textsuperscript{19} but instead of basing his concordance directly on the text of the manuscript, Lund has chosen to follow the edition of Drijvers’s.\textsuperscript{20} But it is not entirely clear whether Drijvers actually consulted the manuscript for his edition; at least he never explicitly states that he consulted it. What he does say is that ‘the present edition keeps to the text of the manuscript as closely as possible’,\textsuperscript{21} and he informs us that he used as his textual basis the edition of Nau, \textit{Livre des lois, texte syriaque}; after checking Nau’s edition of \textit{Patrologia} he had corrected some ‘obvious errors’ and added a number of proposals for emendation.\textsuperscript{22} Some of the comments of Drijvers on those proposals\textsuperscript{23} suggest that he had consulted the manuscript, but others give the impression that he had not. In fact, the layout of the Syriac text in Drijvers is exactly the same as in Nau, \textit{Livre des lois, texte syriaque} (except for a number of letters that are erased or added in Drijvers’s edition), even to the extent of including some accidental spots that could have been mistaken for diacritical dots (See notes 27 and 29 below).

\textsuperscript{17} Kiraz, \textit{A Computer-Generated Concordance to the Syriac New Testament} (Leiden: Brill, 1993) does as a rule give the root in his entries.

\textsuperscript{18} Nor is the information on state entirely satisfactory: absolutes and constructs are both listed under the same label ‘ab/cn’, leaving the decision to the user as to which is which. The same goes for emphatics and constructs + pronominal suffix, both listed under the label ‘em/sf’.

\textsuperscript{19} See note 4 above.

\textsuperscript{20} p. xi.

\textsuperscript{21} op. cit., p. 65.

\textsuperscript{22} ibid., p. 3.

\textsuperscript{23} ibid., pp. 66–67.
If Drijvers relied mainly on Nau, his edition is in fact an indirect one. All kinds of errors may have occurred from the manuscript to Nau, and then from Nau to Drijvers. If Nau happened to copy a detail inaccurately, Drijvers may have preserved the inaccuracy, and he may even, as a result of his corrections, have created new inaccuracies himself. It is certainly worthwhile to compare Drijvers’s edition with the manuscript text and to note the variants. Some simply amount to an addition or omission of punctuation; but others show that the consonantal text has not been accurately reproduced. A superficial comparison between the two witnesses undertaken by the reviewer shows a number of such variants, which are tabulated below. It is likely that a thorough study would yield further examples. A number of these instances were noted by Drijvers (e.g. and positioned higher above the text. See also note 29 below).

### Table: Variant Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page / Line</th>
<th>In Drijvers</th>
<th>In Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 8, l. 16</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 10, l. 1</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 14, l. 19</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 16, l. 5</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 16, l. 17</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 20, l. 1</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
<td>نلا نلا نلا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24) Drijvers (ibid., p. 67, N.B. 2) states that he has disregarded the absence of *seyame* in cases where it is immediately clear that we have to do with a plural; therefore, cases where the manuscript and Drijvers disagree on this point have been ignored here.

25) An argument supporting the notion that Drijvers neglected to consult the manuscript might be that the corrections he proposes for and are superfluous: these errors are only present in Nau, *Livre des lois, texte syriaque*, not in the manuscript.


27) The upper diacritical dot above the * is most likely an accidental spot of printer’s ink, that is already present in Nau and has also entered in Drijvers: firstly, we see that it is not placed exactly above the *; but between the * and the * a position that seems difficult to achieve in printed Syriac. Secondly, if we compare the dot with other upper dots, e.g. those above and in line 4 of the same page, we see that it is thinner, more oval-shaped and positioned higher above the text. See also note 29 below.

28) The manuscript does have a dot below the word, but it clearly does not belong to , but to the of * in the line below it.
More and more elaborate electronic tools for textual and linguistic analysis are now being developed, and they offer a whole range of possibilities to perform detailed searches about complex word patterns. But even if doubts are raised about using a traditional concordance like this, it must be remembered that a book has the advantage of immediate accessibility over its electronic equivalent. So often a computer program requires much learning experience before it does what one wants it to do, while the required information can be extracted from a book much more easily. Although there appear to be some limitations regarding reliability and accessibility when using Lund’s concordance, clearly he has succeeded in providing us with a valuable contribution to the study of the Book of the Laws of the Countries, and this achievement will be welcomed.

Dirk Bakker
Leiden University

---

29) Here, too (see note 27 above), the upper diacritical dot is likely to be a spot of ink in Nau, and subsequently in Drijvers: it is thinner than other upper dots, and it is placed farther to the right and lower above the text (compare e.g. the upper dots in line 15, line 19, etc.).

30) Such as Bible Works (http://www.bibleworks.com), Accordance (http://www.accordancebible.com) and similar software packages.