the school at Pumbadita in the 4th century a.d. Both in language —though naturally there is some variation of vocabulary—and style it closely resembles the Targum of Onkelos, and appears to have been modelled on that translation: in certain passages, indeed, it appears to have made use of it.@@1 Probably, like Onkelos, it did not assume its final form in Babylon before the 5th century a.d. It naturally follows from the character of the original that the rendering of this Targum is less literal than that of Onkelos, espe­cially in the prophetic books, but, when due allowance is made for the difficulty of the Hebrew, it may be described on the whole as a faithful reproduction of the original text. Its peculiarities of rendering are due to the same principles which were noted as underlying the translation of the Pentateuch. Anthropomorphisms, as a rule, are avoided by means of the same expedients as those employed by Onkelos, expressions derogatory to the dignity of God, or of the heroes of the nation, are softened down, while figurative language is either boldly transposed, or its character clearly shown by the introduction of the particle “ as ” or “ like." There is, further, a tendency to narrow down the scope of the prophetic utterances, and to limit their application to Israel and its immediate enemies. Lastly, in the obscurer passages the Haggadic method of interpretation is employed to its fullest extent, while the translation throughout shows a marked tendency to explanatory additions.

Of a *Targum Jerushalmi* to the Prophets but little is known, though it is hardly doubtful that such a Targum existed, if only in oral form. Traces of this version have been discovered by Bacher@@2 in the variants attached to the margin of the *Codex Reuchlinianus,* and printed by Lagarde in his edition of *Prophetae Chatdaice* (1872). These fragments, which have been preserved under the headings ≡rπ, , 'n’, 'τ 'ιτπ, exhibit certain features in common with the Jerusalem Targums to the Pentateuch, and are demonstrably of post-Talmudic date. According to Kohut’s list of Targum quotations in *'Arük,* a Jerusalem Targum existed also for the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther, but this list is scarcely reliable, and, as Dalman has pointed out,@@3 the quotations in *'Arūk* to Kings, Ezekiel, Proverbs and Lamentations are the only ones that point with certainty to the existence of a *Targum Jerushalmi.*

III. Targums to the Hagiographa

These Targums possess but little interest for the student of Jewish literature as they are almost entirely the work of indi­viduals, made in imitation of the older Targums. Despite the reference to a Targum of Job in the 1st century (see above), all the extant Targums to the Hagiographa are later in date than the Targums to the Law and the Prophets.

(1) *Targums to the Psalms and Job.*—These Targums present certain features in common and may therefore be treated under the same heading. Like all the later Targums they exhibit a large amount of explanatory addition, chiefly Haggadic in character. At the same time the translation of the original is not neglected ; and, when separated from the later accretions, this is found to follow the Hebrew tolerably closely. Peculiar to these Targums are the double translations, which they give to many verses, one of which is usually Haggadic in character, while the other is more literal. Bacher@@4 would assign these Targums to the 4th or 5th century, but, as Dalman has pointed out,@@5 they exhibit linguistic features in common with the Jerusalem Targums to the Pentateuch. They cannot be earlier than the 7th century a.d., and possibly are of a considerably later date.

(2) *The Targum to the Proverbs* stands apart owing to the peculiarity of the language in which it is written. The influence of the Peshitta version is so clearly marked,@@6 that Dalman (*l.c.*) de­scribes it as a Jewish revision of that version. But setting aside the Syriasms due to the use of the Peshitta, the Targum shows affinity to the Targums to the Psalms and Job. The translation is literal and almost entirely free from Haggadic additions.@@7

(3) *The Targums to the Megilloth.—*The chief characteristic of these Targums is their exaggerated use of paraphrase. They mark the final stage in the development of Haggadic interpretation, in which the translation of the text has practically disappeared in a mass of fantastic and irrelevant matter. The Targum of Esther is known to us in three recensions (1) that of the Antwerp Polyglot, almost a literal translation; (2) that of the London Polyglot, which gives practically the same text with many additions of a Haggadic char­acter; (3) the so-called second *(sheni)* Targum, a much larger work, containing a collection of later *Midrashim* to this book. According

to Zunz@@8 this “ second ” Targum is quoted by Rashi (to Deut. iii. 4) as a Jerusalem Targum, and also (1 Kings x. 19) as the “ Haggada ” of the Megilloth Esther. The Targιιm to Canticles is of a similar character to that of the “ second ’’ Esther. Dalman assigns these Targums to a date half-way between the Babylonian Targums (Onkelos and that to the Prophets) and the Jerusalem Targums to the Pentateuch and those to the greater Hagiographa. The British Museum possesses three important Yemen manuscripts for the five Megilloth and the “ second ” Esther Targum in MSS. Or. 1302, 1476, and 2375.

(4) *The Targum to the Chronicles* was first edited from an Erfurt manuscript by Μ. F. Beck, 1680-1683. A more complete and accurate edition from a Cambridge manuscript was edited by I). Wilkins in 1715. In the translation, which at times is fairly literal, use appears to have been made of the Jerusalem .Targums to the Pentateuch, and of the Targums to the books of Samuel and Kings. The text represented by the Erfurt manuscript is assigned to the 8th, that of the Cambridge manuscript to the 9th century a.d.@@9

No Targums have so far been discovered to Daniel and Ezra and Nehemiah. (J. F. St.)

**TARIFA,** a seaport of Spain, in the province of Cadiz, at the extreme south point of the Peninsula, 21 m. by rail W.S.W. of Gibraltar. Pop. (1900) 11,723. The town is nearly quad­rangular, with narrow, crooked streets, and is still surrounded by its old Moorish walls. On its east side, just within these, stands the citadel. The rocky island in front of the town, connected with the mainland by a causeway, is strongly fortified; on the south side there is a modern lighthouse. Anchovy and tunny fishing is carried on, and there is some coasting trade, chiefly in live stock, salt fish and fruit. The manufactures (leather and earthenware) are unimportant. The oranges of Tarifa are famed for their sweetness.

Tarifa is the *Julia Joza* of Strabo, between Cades and Belon. According to that writer, it was colonized by Romans and the removed inhabitants of Zelis in Mauretania Tingitana. The *Julia Transducta* or *Traducta* of coins and of Ptolemy appears to be the same place. Its present name, dating from early in the 8th century, is derived from Tarif, whom Ṭāriq sent to Spain in command of the advance-guard of the Moorish invaders (see Caliphate and Spain: *History).* In 1292 Tarifa was taken by Sancho IV. of Castile from the Moors, who made several subsequent attempts to recapture it. In the defence of Tarifa Alphonso XI. gained the battle of Salado, a short distance to the westward, in 1340. In 1812 a French force of 10,000 men under Generals Victor and Laval vainly endeavoured to capture Tarifa, which was garrisoned by 2500 troops (mostly British) under General Gough.

**TARIFF** (adapted in English from the French; the word comes through the Spanish *tarifa,* a list or schedule of prices, from the Arabic, *ta'rifa,* information, an inventory, *'arf,* know­ledge), a table or list of articles on which import or export duties are levied, with the amount of the duty specified, hence often used as a collective term for the duties imposed, or for the law or code of regulations imposing such duties or varying the scale of charges. The word is also used quite widely of any schedule of prices or charges, and, particularly in America, of the freight or other charges of a railway or steamship line.

Resort is made to tariffs, or duties on imports, partly to secure revenue, partly to affect the course of industry within a country. Strictly speaking, these two objects are inconsistent with each other; since a customs duty, in so far as it causes a domestic in­dustry rather than a foreign to supply the market, ceases to be a source of revenue. But in a great number of cases the imposi­tion of a duty causes only a partial displacement of the foreign supply, and hence brings some revenue from that which remains. This circumstance strengthens the hold of the protective system, especially in countries where customs duties are an important source of revenue, the combination of fiscal convenience and of protection to home industry being a highly attractive one. Where tariff duties are imposed solely for revenue, an equivalent excise tax is imposed within the country, so as to put the domestic producer precisely on the footing of his foreign
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