
The vocabulary of Targum Onkelos has been included in European language dictionaries of rabbinic literature since J. Buxtorf’s *Lexicon chaldaicum, talmodicum et rabbinicum* (Basel, 1639–1640) and, as in Buxtorf’s dictionary, it has always been presented together with the vocabulary of many other Aramaic and Hebrew rabbinic corpora. Even today, the two most widely-used dictionaries in the study of Targum Onkelos, those of Marcus Jastrow (*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* [New York: Putnam’s Sons, 1903]) and Gustaf Herman Dalman (*Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* [Göttingen: Eduard Pfeiffer, 2nd edn, 1938]) also include other rabbinic sources, and this mixture of languages and dialects has confused many a student and scholar. Edward Cook, who is well known for his contributions to Biblical, Qumran, and Targumic Aramaic, has now for the first time presented those working in the field with a scientific glossary that is devoted solely to Targum Onkelos. We are all in his debt.

Cook opens the volume with a succinct summary of the history of lexicography pertaining to Targum Onkelos. This is followed by an excellent description of the state of research concerning the dialectal status of the Targum. Though Cook does not subscribe to the majority view, as evidenced in articles that he has published in the past, he presents, nonetheless, a well-written, fair, balanced, and informative picture of current thinking on the subject.

Cook has chosen to base the glossary on the text of Targum Onkelos that serves as the basis for almost all investigations into the Targum: MS Or. 2363 from the British Museum, a Yemenite manuscript with Babylonian vocalization, which is the basic text in Vol. 1 of Alexander Sperber’s series, *The Bible in Aramaic* (Leiden: Brill, 1959–1973). The glossary itself is laid out in a pleasing and easy to use manner. Each entry is composed of a lemma, which is pointed according to the supralinear vocalization found in Sperber’s edition, the part of speech, the gloss, and references to the main modern scientific Aramaic dictionaries. Cook lists the lexemes according to alphabetical order and not root, and in this follows most modern dictionaries of Hebrew and Aramaic. When there are fewer than ten occurrences of the lexeme, he lists them all. Occasionally he adds a note or an additional bibliographical reference.
A few desultory remarks: readers might be interested to know that E.Z. Melamed published an Aramaic-(modern) Hebrew glossary to Targum Onqelos (תָּרְגּוֹמָה אֲוֹנְקֶלוֹס), where each form is listed alphabetically (e.g., יָיסְפָּח is listed under yodh).

Even though almost four decades have passed since M.Z. Kaddari wrote his masterful survey of Targum Onqelos (‘Research on Onqelos Today’, pp. 340–374, in B. Uffenheimer (ed.), Bible and Jewish History: Studies in Bible and Jewish History Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver [Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1971]), his description of the history of research up until 1971 is comprehensive and many of the desiderata he pointed out then are still desiderata today.

Cook acknowledges that Sperber’s volume is not a ‘true critical edition’ and that a complete scientific lexicon can only be undertaken after the completion of a new critical edition, which should be based, among other things, on Babylonian manuscripts, as opposed to later Yemenite manuscripts. Perhaps it should have been noted that Sperber’s edition has been severely criticized for inaccuracy in the transcription of the main text and the recording of variants. See e.g., R.P. Gordon in his foreword to the reprinted paperback edition of Sperber’s The Bible in Aramaic (Leiden: Brill, 1992) or L. Diez Merino in ‘Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions’, in D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara (eds.), The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context (JSOT, 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), pp. 68–75.

On occasion Cook cites variant readings of manuscripts that appear in the two apparatuses in Sperber’s edition. Not all variants, however, are of equal value. For example, Cooks lists אֶלּ הַבָּד as a variant to בַּדָּל ‘inactivity’; this variant is attested, however, only in the first Rabbinic Bible and in the second hand of MS Solger №2 (a manuscript with Tiberian pointing), and as such is of little importance. On the other hand, in the case of יִנְע ‘rest, ease’ and the cited variant יִנְע, the difference in pointing reflects an important diagnostic that distinguishes between the Babylonian realization of shewa mobile before a yodh (nîyâh) as opposed to the Tiberian realization, in which a shewa mobile preceding a yodh is realized as a short hiriq (nîyâh) See Israel Yeivin, The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985), p. 280.

Two pointed texts that have played an important role in earlier Onqelos scholarship might have been mentioned. The first is the 1557 Editio Sabbioneta (certain aspects of the Tiberian pointing in the edition reveal that it was transcribed from a Babylonian pointed manuscript), which was the basis of investigations by A. Berliner and the concordance of C.J. Kasovsky (cited in p. xvi, n. 33 by Cook) and was also cited at times in Gustaf Herman Dalman’s