



Aramaic Texts

Gavin Mcdowell

► To cite this version:

Gavin Mcdowell. Aramaic Texts. Armin Lange; Russell Fuller. Textual History of the Bible, 3A, Brill, pp.292-335, 2023, 978-90-04-42278-0. hal-03940910

HAL Id: hal-03940910

<https://hal.science/hal-03940910>

Submitted on 7 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1.3 Aramaic Texts (I.1.3.3)

Gavin McDowell

Although this entry covers “Aramaic Texts” (by Jews and for Jews, thus excluding Syriac and Christian Palestinian Aramaic), every one of the topics discussed in the following article is coterminous with the subject of “Targum” (@I.1.3.3), meaning “translation” and, in this context, specifically “translation into Aramaic.” In the first place, there are the texts officially designated “Targum” within rabbinic Judaism: the “canonical” texts of Targum Onqelos to the Torah (@I.2.4.3.3) and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (@I.3–5.1.3; @I.6–9.1.3). Most of the Writings – Psalms (@I.10.3.3), Job (@I.11.3.3), Proverbs (@I.12.3.3), the Five Megillot (@I.13–17.1.3), and Chronicles (@I.20.3.3) – have an accompanying Targum, sometimes (as in the case of Esther) more than one. The Torah too was subject to multiple translations. The Babylonian Targum Onqelos holds pride of place in rabbinic Judaism, but there were also many Palestinian Targumim to the Torah (@I.2.4.3.4). Two of these, the so-called Fragment Targum and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, were known from the early modern period and printed in Polyglot (@2.1.1.2) and Rabbinic Bibles (@2.1.2.7). A third, Targum Neofiti, was rediscovered only in the past century, while several manuscripts of Palestinian Targumim to the Torah turned up in the Cairo Genizah. The Samaritans, though not technically Jews, also produced an Aramaic Targum to the Pentateuch (@I.1.3.3.1.3; @I.2.4.4). Finally, modern Jews whose native tongue is Aramaic have now committed their translations of Scripture to writing.

Together, these diverse texts could constitute “The Bible in Aramaic,” although Targumim differ substantially from other versions of the Hebrew Bible in that they were not envisioned as a single corpus rendering all the Scriptures into a local vernacular. Rather, they were redacted over several centuries, in different dialects, and, if one includes the Samaritan Targum, for different religious communities. Onqelos and Jonathan took their current form over the course of late antiquity, while some of the Targumim to the Writings may not have been written before the later Middle Ages. Furthermore, unlike the Septuagint (@I.1.3.1.1), Vulgate (@I.1.3.5), or Peshitta (@I.1.3.4.) within Christianity, no Targum ever supplanted the Hebrew text (@I.1.2.2) as the primary version of Scripture. They instead had the secondary function of interpreting the Hebrew text within the synagogue service. This interpretative function opened the doors to “paraphrastic” translations that were not strictly literal and sometimes included lengthy additions with no parallel in the Hebrew text.

The practice of Targum is traditionally dated to the time of Ezra. The book of Nehemiah (8:1–8) narrates the return of the exiles from Babylon and Ezra’s reading of the Law of Moses (presumably the Pentateuch). Levites accompanying Ezra helped the crowd understand the text מְפָרֵשׁ “clearly” or perhaps “with interpretation.” In the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Meg.* 3a; *b. Ned.* 37a–b), this word is glossed as תרגום “translation.” It is doubtful that the practice of Targum – much less the production of texts that came to be called Targum – is as ancient as the fifth century B.C.E. It is incontestable, however, that Aramaic translations of the Scriptures began circulating well before the end of the Second Temple period. Two of the many revolutionary discoveries from Qumran were an Aramaic manuscript of a short section of Leviticus (4QtgLev [4Q156]; @I.2.4.3.1) and two manuscripts of an Aramaic book of Job (4QtgJob [4Q157]; 11QtgJob [11Q10]; @I.11.3.3.2). Scholars have reflexively labeled these texts “Targum” by

analogy with the existing Aramaic translations, although the appropriateness of this designation has been called into question. Nevertheless, they are Jewish Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Scriptures. Other Aramaic texts from Qumran, such as the *Genesis Apocryphon*, have also been compared to Targum, even though in this case it is an original text that has been written in Aramaic and not a translation. Their discovery has impacted targumic studies in other ways, namely with regard to the discussion of the dialects of targumic Aramaic.

The history of Targum studies ranges from the Second Temple period to the present day, but its historiography is frustratingly piecemeal. Martin McNamara (born 1930) has been a prolific chronicler of Targum studies, publishing several surveys over the course of his career.¹ Though he touches briefly on the medieval and early modern periods, the main focus of his essays is the three major discoveries of the twentieth century: the Cairo Genizah manuscripts (@I.2.4.3.4.4), the Qumran scrolls, and Targum Neofiti (@I.2.4.3.4.2), the last of which he translated into English for the *editio princeps* of Alejandro Díez Macho (1916–1984).² Roger Le Déaut (1923–2000), who translated Neofiti into French for Díez Macho, likewise published a pair of articles in 1974 evaluating the progress of Targum studies, one addressing the question generally, the other focusing specifically on Targum and New Testament.³ His articles cover some of the same terrain as McNamara's. Other scholars occasionally provided updates on the field in the intervening decades. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein (1925–1991) published two articles (essentially two versions of the same article) on the *status quaestionis* in 1985 and 1991.⁴ Unlike preceding efforts, they do not enumerate recent publications but are more theoretical in nature, dwelling on challenges facing the field (such as its innate interdisciplinarity). In 1994, Charles Thomas Robert Hayward (born 1948) published a more conventional conspectus of publications for the years 1983–1993.⁵ Simon Lasair (PhD 2008) documented scholarly progress until about 2010.⁶ In addition to these individual studies, monographs on the Targumim routinely include a history of research, sometimes broader than the subject of the monograph.⁷

The aforementioned studies focus almost exclusively on the past century, occasionally dipping into the nineteenth century. The early modern period (1500–1800) is starting to come into greater focus thanks to the project “A Jewish Targum in a Christian World,” which resulted in an edited collection of the same name.⁸ This collection contains several invaluable studies on Targum studies at the beginning of the age of print. One of the volume's editors, Eveline van Staaldune-Sulman (born 1964), has written an informative volume, *Justifying Christian Aramaism*, on the history of the Christian Polyglot Bibles produced during this period, filling in an important gap in

¹ McNamara, “Targumic Studies;” McNamara, “Half a Century of Targum Study;” McNamara, “Some Recent Writings (pre-1980) on Rabbinic Literature and the Targums;” McNamara, “Fifty-Five Years of Targum Study.” All of these essays are printed or reprinted in McNamara, *Targum and New Testament*.

² Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1*.

³ Le Déaut, “The Current State of Targumic Studies;” Le Déaut, “Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation.”

⁴ Goshen-Gottstein, “Aspects of Targum Studies;” Goshen-Gottstein, “Targum Studies—An Overview of Recent Developments.”

⁵ Hayward, “Major Aspects of Targumic Studies.”

⁶ Lasair, “Current Trends in Targum Research.”

⁷ E.g., McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum*, 5–66; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 1–112. For other examples, see the bibliography.

⁸ Houtman, van Staaldune-Sulman, and Kirn (eds.), *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World*.

the historiography of the discipline.⁹ There is no similar volume—or even a dedicated study—for the study of the Targum in the medieval period, although some useful references appear in Wilhelm Bacher’s (1850–1913) entry on “Targum” for the *Jewish Encyclopedia*.¹⁰ For antiquity and late antiquity, there is an abundance of secondary literature but little primary evidence for how the Targumim were used during these periods. David Shepherd (born 1972) and Willem Smelik (born 1961) have both written detailed monographs laying out the primary evidence for Targum study in (respectively) the Dead Sea Scrolls¹¹ and the Talmudic literature.¹²

The present survey aims to be as comprehensive as possible, uniting all the threads of Targum study into a continuous history from the earliest attested Aramaic translations to the most recent studies. Despite this, there are some conscious omissions (e.g., Josephus and the Targumim) for lack of space. It is divided into two roughly equal parts. The first half is the history proper, including the Second Temple, Mishnaic, and Talmudic periods where the data are open to interpretation and are, in fact, the locus of many academic debates about targumic literature, including the exact definition of “Targum,” when (and why) the practice of reciting Targum began, when the existing Targumim were first committed to writing, and whether the written Targumim belong primarily to the synagogue or to the academy. These are the debates that have animated Targum studies for the past century, and they will be duly discussed in the second part of this article.

1.3.1 A Historical Sketch

1.3.1.1 The Second Temple Period (515 B.C.E.–70 C.E.; @I.1.3.3.1.2)

The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Aramaic began in the Second Temple period. This is an indisputable fact. Whether any of the Aramaic texts from this period can be rightly called “Targum” in its specialized sense is, however, a matter of dispute. Certain Scriptures were not merely translated into Aramaic during this epoch. Some of them were directly written in Aramaic, including the Aramaic portions of the otherwise “Hebrew” Bible. As is well known, Ezra 4:8–6:18; 7:12–26 (@I.19.2.2) and Dan 2:4b–7:28 (@I.18.1) were originally written in Aramaic (and thus, these books do not have an accompanying Targum). Since the canon of authoritative sacred writings was not yet closed in the Second Temple period, it could have also admitted documents entirely composed in Aramaic, such as the different parts of *1 Enoch* or the aptly titled *Aramaic Levi Document*.

Despite the common assumption of the use of Targum already in the Second Temple period, there is shockingly little evidence of translation from Hebrew to Aramaic for this epoch. Prior to the discoveries at Qumran, scholars also suffered from a dearth of Aramaic texts. Qumran, however, yielded several Aramaic manuscripts, including at least two Aramaic translations of Scripture, the so-called Targum to Leviticus (4Q156; @I.2.4.3.1), covering only eight verses (Lev 16:12–15, 18–21), and two manuscripts of an Aramaic translation of Job (4Q157, 11Q10; @I.11.3.3).¹³ The first of these manuscripts consists of two small fragments, one of which is too

⁹ Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism*.

¹⁰ Bacher, “Targum.”

¹¹ Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*.

¹² Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*.

¹³ The official publications are J.T. Milik, “Targum du Lévitique,” **DJD VI*: 86–89 (4Q156) and J.T. Milik, “Targum de Job,” **DJD VI*: 90 (4Q157) as well as F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “11QtargumJob,” **DJD XXIII*: 79–180 (11Q10). The *editio princeps* of 11QtgJob was J.P.M. van der Ploeg and A.S.

small to be legible, while the other contains text corresponding to Job 3:4–5 and 4:16–5:4. The other manuscript, also known as 11QtgJob, translates approximately fifteen percent of the Hebrew text, ranging from Job 17 to the end of the book, with continuous text from Job 37:10–42:11. It constitutes the most substantial Aramaic translation of a biblical book from the Second Temple period.

The discovery of these texts was an unexpected boon to scholarship.¹⁴ Scarcely any Aramaic texts were known from Judea and the Levant in the Second Temple period. The three manuscripts preceded any other known Aramaic translation of Scripture by about five hundred years. The recovery of an ancient Aramaic version of Job was especially fortuitous, given that rabbinic literature refers to an Aramaic copy of Job from Second Temple times (*t. Šabb.* 13:2–3; *y. Šabb.* 16:1, 15b–c; *b. Šabb.* 115a; @I.1.2.2.4.2; @I.11.3.3.2.1). As rare witnesses to the Aramaic language during a key moment in the intertwined histories of Judaism and Christianity, they were also helpful for investigating the language of Jesus or the supposed Aramaic substratum of the New Testament.

Their discovery also immediately raised questions about their relationship to later targumic literature. None of the three manuscripts corresponds to any known Targum. Furthermore, their translation technique differs from that of later Targumim. They do not add to the Hebrew text, a characteristic feature of many Targumim (especially Palestinian Targumim), which has earned them the label “paraphrastic.” Somewhat paradoxically, they are not wedded to the grammar and syntax of the Masoretic Text, which is also a feature of later Targumim (@I.11.3.3.2.4). They avoid standard “Targumisms,” such as קדם “before” or מִמְרָא “word,” employed as circumlocutions when speaking of the divine.

Whether the manuscripts of Leviticus and Job constitute the earliest examples of “Targum” is therefore a matter of dispute. Although it has become conventional to refer to them as Targumim, even by those who are critical of the term, they are notably different from the Targumim transmitted in rabbinic circles. Targumim, despite their reputation as “paraphrastic” translations, are, for the most part, *literal* translations of the Masoretic Text that can incorporate additions into the text.¹⁵ The Job “Targum” from Qumran, however, treats the Hebrew text in a much looser manner. It willingly modifies the original for grammatical or stylistic reasons, much like the Syriac translation of Job (@I.11.3.4).

Another issue is whether the handful of verses from Leviticus constitute an Aramaic translation of the entire book, much less a translation of the entire Pentateuch (in which case, it would be the only pre-Christian Aramaic translation of the Torah). The eight verses are a frustratingly small piece of the text, and they all come from Leviticus 16 — the Yom Kippur ritual — a fundamental rite for the Qumran community and, of course, among Jews in general. The verses could very well be part of a larger text, whether a liturgical or ritual text or even a narrative that incorporates portions of Leviticus. Daniel A. Machiela (PhD 2007) makes the apt comparison to the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20), an original Aramaic text (not a translation) that retells the patriarchal history

van der Woude, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), which was swiftly followed by M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1974).

¹⁴ J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Le targum de Job de la grotte 11 de Qumran (11QtgJob): Première communication,” *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks* 25 (1962): 543–57 (555–56).

¹⁵ See the discussion in Flesher–Chilton, **The Targums*, 19–37.

in a manner similar to *Jubilees*. The end of the preserved text (1QapGen XXII:18–24) is practically an Aramaic translation of Gen 14:21–24. If only this section survived, one might even confuse it for a Targum of Genesis.¹⁶

Leviticus and Job are not the only biblical books with Aramaic evidence from Qumran. Klaus Beyer (1929–2014), who published a collection of all the Aramaic Qumran texts, also applied the label “Targum” to 4Q550^f (part of the *Tales of the Persian Court*) and the Aramaic Tobit manuscripts (4Q196–199).¹⁷ The fragment from 4Q550 consists of little more than an Aramaic adaptation of Isa 14:31b–32. Unlike the similarly scant evidence for Aramaic Leviticus, this fragment has not found widespread recognition as a “Targum.”¹⁸

The Tobit manuscripts from Qumran raise an interesting question, since a Hebrew copy of Tobit (4QTob^e [4Q200]; @II.14.2) was found along with the four Aramaic manuscripts (4QpapTob^a ar [4Q196], 4QTob^b ar [4Q197], 4QTob^c ar [4Q198], 4QTob^d ar [4Q199]; @II.1.2.3.1.2; @II.14.5). Was this deuterocanonical book first written in Hebrew and then translated into Aramaic, or vice versa?¹⁹ Since it is a deuterocanonical book, its Aramaic version is already distinct from the otherwise protocanonical Targumim (although there are also medieval Aramaic copies of Tobit).²⁰ One must also seriously entertain the possibility that Tobit was an Aramaic composition that was then translated into Hebrew, the exact reverse of the targumic process. Such an example could undermine the received idea that Targumim were necessary to bring the Scriptures to a broader public who understood Aramaic but not Hebrew.²¹

For more information about Aramaic texts of the deuterocanonical writings, including Enochic literature, see the pertinent articles in THB 2 and article @II.1.2.3 (@II.1.2.3.1.1 [Enochic literature]; @II.1.2.3.1.2 [Tobit]; @II.1.2.3.2.1 [Additions to Daniel]). The nature of this material and its usefulness for the textual history of these writings is summed up by Armin Lange (born 1961) as follows: “Given their fragmentary state of preservation, the Aramaic textual histories of Tobit and the various texts collected in *I Enoch*, is difficult to trace” (@II.1.2.3.3).

Not much is said here about the *study* of Aramaic translations in the Second Temple period because we only possess the texts – and not very many at that – without any further evidence as to how these texts were used. The only substantial Aramaic translation from this period is the manuscript of Job from Qumran Cave 11 (11Q10). That Job alone has survived is something of a conundrum. Does the translation of a comparatively minor biblical book signal the onetime existence of other translations of more important books (from the Pentateuch or Prophets) that have been lost? Or was Job translated for another reason, such as the difficulty of the Hebrew text? It is curious that the rabbinic references to a Second Temple Aramaic Job text (*t. Šabb.* 13:2–3; *y. Šabb.* 16:1, 15b–c; *b. Šabb.* 115a; @I.1.2.2.4.2; @I.11.3.3.2.1) are about removing the

¹⁶ Machiela, “Targum and Translation,” 233–37.

¹⁷ K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, Deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register*, Vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 169–86.

¹⁸ See M.G. Wechsler, “Two Para-Biblical Novellae from Qumran Cave 4: A Reevaluation of 4Q550,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 130–72 (131, note 9).

¹⁹ For a summary of the debate on the issue, see @II.14.5.3.

²⁰ See S. Weeks, S. Gathercole, and L. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions* (Fontes et Subsidia et Biblia pertinentes 3; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013).

²¹ Machiela, “Targum and Translation,” 237–43.

text from circulation. This story, coming as it does exclusively from rabbinic literature, is a stark reminder that there is no direct evidence for the ancient study of Targum in pre-rabbinic and extra-rabbinic sources.²² For the purpose and function of Targumim in antiquity, we are entirely dependent on rabbinic sources. It is to these sources that we now turn.

1.3.1.2 The Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods (70 C.E.–640 C.E.; @I.1.3.3.9)

In terms of evidence for the study of Targum, the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods are the reverse of the Second Temple period.²³ For the earlier period, we have texts but no context; for this period, we have only context, all deriving from the classical rabbinic literature of Midrash and Talmud. The earliest Targum manuscripts are those from the Cairo Genizah (c. 600–900 C.E.), which already postdate the Talmud. Before that, the only “manuscripts” are magic bowls (c. 300–600 C.E.) with adapted citations of biblical verses.²⁴ By contrast, there are well over a hundred references to Targum spread across the Mishnah, Tosefta, the two Talmudim, and the classical Midrashim.

The Sages were preoccupied with the recitation of Targum in the synagogue service rather than its status as a written text. Tractate *Megillah* of the Mishnah lays out the basic rules for the recitation of Targum in the synagogue service. The *meturgeman* or interpreter was to recite from memory the Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text verse-by-verse, alternating with the principal reader of the Torah scroll. In the case of readings from the Prophets, the interpreter translated after every three verses (*m. Meg.* 4:4). Certain passages of Scripture were to be read, but their translation was forbidden (*m. Meg.* 4:10).²⁵ Although it is not explicitly stated in the Mishnah, later sources make it clear that a written targumic text was not permitted at all in the synagogue – the Aramaic translation had to be recited from memory (*y. Meg.* 4:1, 74d).

Nevertheless, the Mishnah presumes the existence of written Targumim even in the Tannaitic period. At the same time, it reveals an ambivalent attitude about the status of Aramaic translations (or translation in general). For example, *m. Šabb.* 16:1 appears to equate the Scriptures written “in any language” (בכל לשון) with the Hebrew Scriptures that must be saved from fire and carefully stored away after they fall into disuse, while *m. Yad.* 4:5 seems to deny inspired status (“defiling the hands”) to Aramaic versions, barring the Aramaic sections of Ezra and Daniel. Finally, *m. Meg.* 1:8 states that the Scriptures may be written “in any language” (בכל לשון), but Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel (first century C.E.) opines that they may only be written in (i.e., translated into) Greek.

The Tannaitic Midrash *Sifre Deuteronomy* (§161) provides an early indication of the pedagogic (as opposed to liturgical) function of Targum. This passage lists Scripture, Targum, Mishnah, and Talmud as the basic steps of rabbinic education, with Targum occupying an intermediary place

²² Fraade, “Rabbinic Views,” 254.

²³ The somewhat musty term “Talmudic period” has been chosen because it conforms to the available evidence, since most Targum citations from late antiquity come from the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmudim as well as a few contemporary Midrashim.

²⁴ See S.A. Kaufman, “A Unique Magical Bowl from Nippur,” *JNES* 32 (1973): 170–74 (Jer 2:2 and Jer 2:1/Ezek 21:23) and C. Müller-Kessler, “The Earliest Evidence for Targum Onqelos from Babylonia and the Question of its Dialect and Origin,” *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001): 181–98 (two bowls with all or part of Exod 15:9–12).

²⁵ For this and parallel passages, see P.S. Alexander, “The Rabbinic Lists of Forbidden Targumim,” *JSJ* 27 (1976): 177–91; M.L. Klein, “Not to Be Translated in Public,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 80–91 (reprinted in *Michael Klein on the Targums*, 189–202); and Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 201–18.

between the Written (Scripture) and Oral Torahs (Mishnah, Talmud).²⁶ The classification of Targum as “Oral Torah” may have contributed to the rabbinic ambivalence about written Targumim. According to an oft-repeated adage, what is expressed orally must be transmitted orally. One citation of this adage is in conjunction with the prohibition of written Targumim in the synagogue (y. *Meg.* 4:1, 74d; cf. b. *Git.* 60b; b. *Tem.* 14b).

Targumic citations in the Jerusalem Talmud and Midrashim are few and far between. When the Palestinian Sages do cite a Targum, it is often critical.²⁷ One famous example involves a translation of Lev 22:28, the prohibition against killing livestock and their young on the same day. R. Yose b. R. Bun, a fourth-century Rabbi, reprimanded those who would translate this verse with the explanatory proviso, “My people, children of Israel, just as I am merciful in heaven, so shall you be merciful on earth” (y. *Ber.* 5:3, 9c; y. *Meg.* 4:10, 75c). The passage attracted scholarly attention due to its similarity to two parallel Gospel logia (Luke 6:36; Matt 5:48), where Jesus calls on his disciples to be merciful just as his heavenly Father is merciful.²⁸ The passage is additionally noteworthy for its preservation in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, which, whatever its origins, is indebted to the Palestinian Targum tradition.²⁹ Only the invocation remains in Targum Neofiti, a possible sign that the offending portion was censored, as Neofiti does in other cases where “Forbidden Targum” is concerned.³⁰

The Babylonian Talmud reveals an entirely different attitude to the study of Targum, even when it attributes traditions to Palestinian Sages. The Palestinian Targumim are marked by diversity – there is not one single Palestinian Targum but several – but the Babylonian tradition is characterized by uniformity. According to b. *Meg.* 3a, there were two authorized Targumim: a translation of the Torah composed by one Onqelos the Proselyte under the authority of R. Eleazar b. Azariah and R. Joshua b. Hananiah (both first-century Tannaim), and a translation of the Prophets attributed to Jonathan b. Uzziel under the guidance of the biblical prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. This passage is the source of the titles of the two works known as Targum Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3) and Targum Jonathan (@I.3–5.1.3; @I.6–9.1.3), which, as stated above, have a semi-canonical status in rabbinic Judaism. The attributions, though traditional, are pseudepigraphic. A comparison of b. *Meg.* 3a with the parallel passage in the Jerusalem Talmud (y. *Meg.* 1:11, 71c) reveals that “Onqelos” is a deformation of “Aquila,” the well-known translator of a hyper-literal Greek version (@I.1.3.1.2) who is cited with approbation in Palestinian rabbinic literature.³¹ The origin of the attribution to Jonathan is less clear, but it might be a Hebraized form of Theodotion, another Greek Bible translator (@I.1.3.1.2).³² Neither Aquila nor Theodotion are known to have translated the Bible into Aramaic.

The same passage from b. *Meg.* 3a also refers to Jonathan b. Uzziel’s abortive attempt to translate the third section of Scripture, the Writings. He is stopped in his tracks by a “heavenly voice” (בַּת קוֹל), and, indeed, there are no “official” Targumim to the Writings as there are for the Torah and

²⁶ For this idea, see York, “Targum in the Synagogue and in the School,” 83–84.

²⁷ W.F. Smelik, “Language, Locus, and Translation between the Talmudim,” *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 3 (2001): 199–224. See also Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 414–27.

²⁸ McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum*, 133–38.

²⁹ See also m. *Meg.* 4:9, where a similar forbidden translation re-emerges in Pseudo-Jonathan to Lev 18:21

³⁰ M. McNamara, “Some Early Rabbinic Citations and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch,” *RSO* 41(1966): 1–15. Reprinted with postscript in McNamara, *Targum and New Testament*, 163–79.

³¹ Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 387–99 and 433–99.

³² Geiger, **Urschrift*, 164.

Prophets. However, since we currently possess Aramaic translations of nearly all the Writings, someone has evidently disregarded the prohibition. Even in the Talmud, one finds references to the translation of the Writings. As mentioned above (@I.3.1.1), the Rabbis were aware of a translation of Job from the Second Temple period (@I.1.2.2.4.2; @I.11.3.3.2.1), and *b. Meg.* 21b (cf. *b. Roš Haš.* 27a; @I.10.3.3.2) possibly refers to translated passages from the Psalms (the Hallel, Psalms 113–118) and the book of Esther (@I. 13–17.1.3.1.1).

The Babylonian Talmud cites the texts of Onqelos and Jonathan on numerous occasions, although, curiously, it never attributes the citations to the traditional authors. Instead, the text of Targum Onqelos is most often introduced with the words מתרגמין “as we translate.”³³ In one notable instance, the translation is simply designated תרגום דין “our Targum” (*b. Qidd.* 49a), the most direct reference to its authority among the Babylonian Sages. Citations corresponding to Targum Jonathan are most often placed in the mouth of the Amora R. Joseph b. Hiyya (fourth century C.E.). The attribution to R. Joseph is so consistent that he is sometimes suspected of being the redactor (or even the author) of the Targum.³⁴ This attribution is complicated by two factors. On at least three occasions (*b. Ber.* 28a; *b. Qidd.* 72b; *‘Abod. Zar.* 44a=*Roš Haš.* 22b), he cites a reading different from the received text of Targum Jonathan (Isa 41:16; Zeph 3:18; Zech 9:6).³⁵ Furthermore, twice (*b. Meg.* 3a=*b. Mo’ed Qaṭ.* 28b; *b. Sanh.* 94b) he claims that the Aramaic translation helped him to understand the Hebrew (Zech 12:11; Isa 8:6–7).³⁶ Beyond these two factors, he was reputed to be blind (*b. Qidd.* 31a; *b. Pesah.* 111b), making him eligible to recite Targum in the synagogue (*m. Meg.* 4:6) but unlikely to compose a written text. Two citations from the Writings (Psalms and Job) are also associated with R. Joseph (*b. Soṭah* 48b; *b. Naz.* 3a), but these are apocryphal: They are insertions into the text.³⁷ This did not prevent him from acquiring the reputation of having written Targumim to the Writings, especially the Targum to Chronicles (@I.20.3.3).

Perhaps the most famous passage about the study of Targum is *b. Ber.* 8a–b, where it is recommended to read the weekly Torah portion three times during private study, “[the Hebrew] Scripture twice and [the Aramaic] Targum once” (שניים מקרא ואחד תרגום). This prescription became a communal practice in the Middle Ages and, eventually, an obligation. Though preserved in the Babylonian Talmud, the dictum is attributed to two Palestinian Amoraim, R. Ammi of Tiberias and R. Joshua b. Levi (both third century C.E.). The Babylonian Talmud’s presumption of a written Targum is at variance with the prohibition of the same in the Jerusalem Talmud, at least in the synagogue service.

The two Talmudim demonstrate a stark divide between the two rabbinic cultures regarding the Targumim. The Palestinian literature focuses more on the recitation of Targum in the synagogue. The Jerusalem Talmud’s attitude to written Aramaic translations is ambivalent, prohibiting them in one place and preferring a Greek translation (Aquila’s) in another. By contrast, the Babylonian Talmud knows two fixed corpora (Targum Onqelos to the Torah; Targum Jonathan to the Prophets), both of which are given rabbinic pedigrees and are used to interpret Scripture or even to clarify earlier sayings of the Sages. According to Richard L. Kalmin (born 1953), the

³³ Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 364–87.

³⁴ Hai Gaon called it the “Targum of Rav Joseph.” See Geiger, **Urschrift*, 164.

³⁵ Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 334–51.

³⁶ Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 358–60.

³⁷ Smelik, *Rabbis, Language, and Translation*, 361–64.

Babylonian Talmud features no stories of Babylonian Sages translating Scripture in a synagogue setting (but cf. *b. Meg.* 25b, about a Palestinian Rabbi), nor are there many prescriptions dictating how to translate Scripture.³⁸ At the risk of overgeneralizing, the Jerusalem Talmud is concerned with the recitation of Targum (and how to control it), while the Babylonian Talmud is concerned with the exegetical value of the Targum's text.

On the Christian side, the only scholar of note is *Jerome* (347–420 C.E.), who never refers to any Targum by name in his voluminous writings. He is, however, keenly aware of Jewish traditions found within targumic literature, such as in his *Questions and Answers on Genesis*.³⁹ In his prologues to *Judith* (@II.9.5) and *Tobit* (@II.14.8), Jerome's comments on his efforts to translate these deuterocanonical books from the Aramaic (as he claims) suggest that the *vir trilinguis* may not have had a perfect mastery of Aramaic.⁴⁰ Similarly, many scholars have found Jewish traditions (but no direct Targum citations) in the writings of the Syriac Fathers.⁴¹

1.3.1.3 The Middle Ages (640 C.E.–1500)

The closing of the Talmudic corpus was soon followed by the Islamic conquests and the consequent introduction of a new vernacular, Arabic, into the rabbinic centers of Palestine and Babylon (now united under the aegis of a single government). Arabic did not drive out Aramaic immediately. Arabic did not become the dominant language of the Near East until the eighth century C.E., while Babylonian Rabbis continued writing in Aramaic until the end of the tenth century C.E.⁴² These same Rabbis extolled the value of studying the Targumim, especially Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3), which had acquired prestige due to its citation in Talmudic literature. The *responsa* of the Geonic period (589–1038 C.E.) reflect the tension between the advent of the new vernacular and the desire to maintain the study of a canonical text written in a language that would soon no longer be widely understood.

Sar Shalom ben Boaz (died 859 or 864 C.E.), gaon of the Talmudic academy of Sura in the first half of the ninth century C.E., lauded Onqelos to the exclusion of other Targumim to the Torah:

ותרגום זה שאמרו חכמים זה שיש בידנינו אבל שאר תרגומים אין בהם קדושה כתרגום זה ושמענו מפי חכמים
קדמונים שענין גדול עשה הקב"ה באקנקלוס הגר על שנעשה התרגום על ידו

The Targum of which the Sages spoke is the one that is in our possession, but other Targumim are not as holy as this Targum. We have heard from the mouth of earlier Sages that the Holy One, Blessed be He, did a great thing through Onqelos the proselyte when this Targum was made by his hand.⁴³

³⁸ Kalmin, "Targum in the Babylonian Talmud," 504.

³⁹ See the three essays in Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture*, 279–338 ("Part Three: Saint Jerome and Jewish Tradition").

⁴⁰ For the text of the prologues, see R. Weber, R. Gryson and l'Abbaye Saint-Jérôme (eds.), *Jérôme: Préfaces aux livres de la Bible* (trans. A. Canellis et al.; SC 592; Paris: Cerf, 2017), 368–75.

⁴¹ Among them: A. Levene, *The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis from a Syriac MS on the Pentateuch in the Mingana Collection* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951); T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Tradition* (ConBOT 11; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1978); S.P. Brock, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *JJS* 30 (1979), 212–32.

⁴² H. Gzella, *Aramaic: A History of the First World Language* (trans. B.D. Suchard; Eerdmans Language Resources; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021), 366–67.

⁴³ M.M. Meyuhas, *ספר שיערי תשובה* (ed. J. Fischl; Leipzig: Leopold Shnois, 1858), 29, no. 330.

Sar Shalom's successor, Natronai b. Hilai (died 858 C.E.), had a complementary reaction when he expressed alarm that Babylonian synagogues were ignoring the Aramaic Targum in favor of (apparently) Arabic translations:

ואמר רב נטרנאי גאון שאין מתרגמין ואומרים אין אנו צריכין לתרגם תרגום אלא בלשון שלנו בלשון שהצבור מבינים אין יוצאין ידי חובתן מ"ט דהדין תרגום דרבנן על קראי היא ואסמכוהו רבנן

Rav Natronai Gaon said: "Those who do not translate and say, 'We do not need to translate Targum except in our language, in the language that the public understands,' they have not fulfilled their obligation. What is the reason for this? Because it is the Targum of our Rabbis on the Scriptures, and our Rabbis supported it."⁴⁴

He goes on to cite *b. Ned.* 37b and its reference to the foundational myth of the Targum's origins, *Neh* 8:8. Finally, Judah ibn Quraysh (ninth century C.E.), a native of Algeria, sent a letter (*risāla*) to Fez expressing alarm that the Jewish community there had abandoned the study of Targum.⁴⁵

Hai Gaon (939–1038 C.E.) was president of the Pumbedita academy and the last major figure of the Geonic period (his death signifies the epoch's *terminus*). He provides several insightful references to the status of Targum in the Middle Ages. First, he, like some of his contemporaries (notably Samuel ha-Nagid [993–1055 C.E.]), lamented the neglect of the Targum in Spain. Hai objected on the grounds that targumic study was commanded in the Talmud and even already in the Mishnah.⁴⁶ At the same time, he was aware of a Palestinian Targum to the Torah (@I.2.4.3.4) without having seen it. In a *responsum* about the meaning of *b. Qidd.* 49a and its reference to "our Targum," he acknowledges that a Palestinian Targum, though its author is unknown, could be included under this heading if it can be proved to be as ancient as Targum Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3).⁴⁷ He was more skeptical about Targumim to the Writings. In a *responsum* found in the Cairo Genizah, he denies that such Targumim were written by Jonathan b. Uzziel and upholds the allegedly divine prohibition of composing any Targum to these books because they refer to the end times.⁴⁸ He mentions specifically the case of Esther (@I.13–17.1.3.2.5): Even though Hai's interlocutor knows an inoffensive Targum to this book, Hai is aware of many different versions that are replete with haggadic additions. His remarks are generally taken to be an early reference to Targum Sheni to Esther.

The pessimistic portrait of the Geonic *responsa* does not reflect the whole reality of Targum study in the Middle Ages. A twelfth-century business letter from the Cairo Genizah mentions in passing: "Your boy Faraj now reads the Targum accompanying the lections – as I guaranteed you he would."⁴⁹ Two thirteenth-century sources, one from Spain and the other from Provence, include Targum within a curriculum of study but for an entirely different purpose – not in order to prepare them to serve as *meturgeman* in the synagogue but to acquaint them with the Aramaic

⁴⁴ J. ben Barzillai, *ספר העתים* (ed. Y. Schor; Berlin: M'kize Nirdamim, 1903), 266.

⁴⁵ The most recent edition is D. Becker (ed.), *The Risāla of Judah ben Quraysh: A Critical Edition* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 7; Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University Press, 1984).

⁴⁶ Ben Barzillai, *ספר העתים*, 268.

⁴⁷ Cited in M. Ginsburger, "La traduction de la Bible d'après Haï Gaon," *REJ* 42 (1901): 232–36.

⁴⁸ Summarized and cited in J. Mann, "Addenda to 'The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim as a Source of Jewish History' (*JQR.*, N.S., Vols. VII–X)," *JQR* 11 (1921): 433–71 (465–71).

⁴⁹ S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Vol. 2: *The Community* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 175.

language as a stepping stone to the Talmud. The Spanish writer Judah ibn Abbas (thirteenth century), in his moral treatise *Ya'ir Nativ* (chapter 15), outlines the ideal sequence of pedagogical instruction, including Targum and vernacular translation, for the explicit purpose of Aramaic instruction.⁵⁰ In the Provence, the short anonymous treatise *Sefer Hupkei ha-Torah* refers to Targum study in statutes seven and eight.⁵¹ As with Ibn Abbas' outline, Targum study is done in tandem with study of the vernacular translation of Scripture (in this case, the translation of both the Hebrew and Aramaic texts). Both statutes clarify that Targum study is a prelude to Talmud study. The liturgical recitation of Targum is alluded to as something that was done in the past for the benefit of women and the unlearned, a possible sign that Targum no longer had a prominent place in the synagogue service. Some targumic passages lingered in the liturgy, especially for the feasts of Passover and Shavuot.⁵²

Whatever their status among the general populace, the Targumim were scarcely forgotten by the great luminaries of the Middle Ages. In addition to Hai Gaon, who cites Onqelos and Jonathan fifty times in his commentary on the Mishnah, targumic literature is abundantly cited in the works of Saadia Gaon (892–942 C.E.), R. Solomon b. Isaac (Rashi, 1040–1105), R. Solomon b. Meir (Rashbam, 1085–1158), Abraham ibn Ezra (1092–1167), Moses Maimonides (Rambam, 1138–1204), David Kimhi (Radak, 1160–1235), and Moses Nachmanides (Ramban, 1194–1270), to name only the most famous.⁵³ Most of these figures used the Targum in their biblical commentaries (and Onqelos would eventually receive its own commentary in the form of the anonymous thirteenth-century *Patshegen*). Saadia Gaon, however, was (among many other things) a biblical translator who looked to Targum Onqelos as a guide for his own translation into Arabic, particularly the way the Aramaic text handled divine anthropomorphism (*Book of Beliefs and Opinions* II.9; @I.1.3.6.1.8.1).⁵⁴ Maimonides, best known as a philosopher, was apt to cite the Targumim under the names of their alleged authors, Onqelos and Jonathan, reflecting their complete induction into the ranks of the Sages. As with Saadia before him, Maimonides found the Targumim congenial to his arguments against anthropomorphic depictions of God: “I do not consider those men as infidels who are unable to prove the incorporeality, but I hold those to be so who do not believe it, especially when they see that Onkelos and Jonathan avoid [in reference to God] expressions implying corporeality as much as possible” (*Guide for the Perplexed* I.36).⁵⁵

The Targum was equally important to medieval Jewish philologists, grammarians, and lexicographers. The *Risāla* of Judah ibn Quraysh (ninth century C.E.), mentioned above, is in the main a treatise dedicated to comparative Semitic philology (Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic). Other pioneers of Hebrew lexicography and grammar naturally turned to Targum (usually Onqelos or Jonathan) to see how a biblical word was translated into Aramaic. Among them are Menahem ibn Saruq (920–970 C.E.), the compiler of the first Hebrew dictionary, and his rival, Dunash ben

⁵⁰ Cited in A. Houtman, “The Role of the Targum in Jewish Education in Medieval Europe,” in *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (eds. A. Houtman, E. van Staaldouine-Sulman, and H.-M. Kirn; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 27; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 81–98 (92–93).

⁵¹ Cited in Houtman, “The Role of the Targum in Jewish Education,” 87.

⁵² I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. R.P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: JPS, 1993), 154: “In Germany and France, the Targum was used only for the two most solemn readings: the splitting of the Red Sea on the seventh day of Passover (Exod 13:17–26), and the revelation on Mt. Sinai (Exod 19:20) on Pentecost.”

⁵³ Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, 2.175–84.

⁵⁴ For a translation, see Saadia Gaon, *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions* (trans. S. Rosenblatt; Yale Judaica Series 1; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 116.

⁵⁵ Moses Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed* (trans. M. Friedländer; 2nd ed.; London: Routledge, 1910), 52.

Labrat (920–990 C.E.). Jonah ibn Janah (990–1055 C.E.), author of *Kitab al-Anqih*, a combined Hebrew dictionary and grammar (the first of its kind), cites Targum more than 150 times. In fact, consulting an Aramaic translation was a near universal practice among Jewish philologists.⁵⁶

The above-cited authors favored (sometimes exclusively) the “official” Targumim of Onqelos and Jonathan, but the Palestinian Targumim were not forgotten. In the tenth and eleventh centuries C.E., the Babylonian Hai Gaon knew of the existence of a Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch but was not personally acquainted with it. In the twelfth century, the Spaniard Judah ben Barzillai (eleventh–twelfth centuries) alluded to the reading of Palestinian Targumim (with their lengthy additions) in the synagogue as a form of commentary, although it is not clear if this practice was current:

ותרגום של ארץ ישראל שיש בו תוספת הגדות זה הוסיפו חזנן שלהן מחמתן ואמרו שמותר לאומרו בבית הכנסת מפני שפירוש הוא

And the Targum of the Land of Israel, which has in it haggadic additions, this the cantors themselves added for their own purpose, and they said that it was permissible to recite it in the synagogue because it is interpretation.⁵⁷

In the liturgical and legal miscellany *Kol Bo* (§37), a passage attributed to Meir of Rothenburg (1215–1293) approves of the Palestinian Targum due to its fuller explanations, even though local communities did not possess it:

ועוד כתב ה"ר מאיר שאינו מועיל כך כשאדם חוזר ג' פעמים מקרא כמו שיחזור ב' פעמים מקרא ואחד תרגום כי מן הדין היה לנו לחזור תרגום ירושלמי לפי שבטוב יותר מפרש העברי יותר מן התרגום שלנו אך שאינו מצוי בינינו ואף כי אנו נמשכין אחר מנהג בבליים

The Rabbi Meir also wrote that it is not useful when one reviews Scripture three times as one would review Scripture twice and Targum once, for from the statute we were to review the Jerusalem Targum, which explains the Hebrew better, even more so than our Targum, but it is not found among us, and so it is that we take after the custom of the Babylonians.⁵⁸

These statements would lead one to believe that while the nature of Palestinian Targumim was known, they were no longer in widespread use.

Nevertheless, the Italian lexicographer Nathan b. Yehiel (died 1106) cites (in addition to Onqelos) Palestinian Targumim to the Torah numerous times in the *Arukh*, his dictionary of rabbinic literature – and the readings often correspond to the text of Targum Neofiti.⁵⁹ He does not, however, cite any readings unique to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. Likewise, Samuel b. Nissim Masnut (thirteenth century) attests readings from the Palestinian Targumim in his midrashic work

⁵⁶ A. Maman, *Comparative Semitic Philology in the Middle Ages: From Sa'adiah Gaon to Ibn Barūn (10th-12th C.)* (trans. D. Lyons; Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 40; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11.

⁵⁷ Ben Barzillai, *ספר העתים*, 258.

⁵⁸ כל בו (Venice: Marco Antonio Giustiniani, 1547), 39b.

⁵⁹ R. Speier, “The Relationship between the *Arukh* and the Palestinian Targum, Neofiti 1,” *Leš* 31 (1966–1967): 23–32, 189–98; (1969–1970): 172–79 [Hebr.].

Bereshit Zuta (@I.2.4.3.4.5).⁶⁰ The first medieval author to cite unique readings from Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is Menahem b. Solomon (died after 1143), the author of *Sekhel Tob*, a midrashic compilation on the Torah, and the grammatical work *Even Bohan*.⁶¹ The first author to cite Pseudo-Jonathan by name (that is, as a Torah Targum attributed to Jonathan b. Uzziel) is Menahem Recanati (died 1310), who made abundant use of it in his kabbalistic commentary to the Torah.⁶² He cites this text as both “Targum Yerushalmi” and as “Targum Jonathan.” The mistaken attribution is commonly believed to be a misreading of the abbreviation for “Targum Yerushalmi” (י"ת) as “Targum Jonathan” (@I.2.4.3.4.1). An example of such a misreading occurs in the Tosafot to *b. Hag. 27a*, where “Targum Jonathan” to Lev 11:29 is cited from the *Arukh* (סלמנדרא “salamander”), which has “Targum Yerushalmi.”⁶³

Citations of the Targumim to the Writings – practically unknown in the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods – began appearing in the medieval period. Tractate *Soferim* (eighth century C.E.), one of the “extracanonical” tractates of the Babylonian Talmud, cites Targum Sheni to Esther 3:1 (*Soferim* 13:6, 13:3 in the edition of Michael Higger [1898–1952]; @I.13–17.1.3.2.5) and refers to the reading of a Targum to Lamentations (@I.13–17.1.3.2.3) on the Ninth of Av for the sake of women and children (18:4; 18:6 in Higger). The originality of both passages, however, is questionable.⁶⁴ Hai Gaon, cited above, acknowledged the existence of Targumim to the Writings and warned about one specifically, a second Targum to Esther. Rashi cites Targum Sheni to Esther in his comments on Deut 3:4, although it is unclear whether he knew any other Targum to the Writings. His grandson Rashbam certainly did. He cites Targum Job 4:15 in his commentary on Exod 15:2 and Targum Proverbs 14:34 in his commentary on Lev 20:17. In both cases, he attributes the translation to R. Joseph b. Hiyya, the blind Amora who, in the Talmud, most frequently quotes Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (@I.3.1.2). Most Targumim to the Writings are cited for the very first time in the *Arukh*. Early references to the Aramaic renditions of Psalms (@I.10.3.3), Proverbs (@I.12.3.3), and Job (@I.11.3.3) are found there along with citations of the Five Megillot (@I.13–17.1.3).⁶⁵

Of all medieval Jewish writers who made use of Targum, Rashi deserves special attention both for his breadth of knowledge and for the degree of influence he exerted over later generations. In his commentary on the Torah, he cites Targum Onkelos for nearly every chapter of the biblical text.⁶⁶ He occasionally cites a “Targum Yerushalmi” as well and makes extensive use of Targum

⁶⁰ For examples, see A. Díez Macho, “Las Citas del Targum Palestinense en el Midras Bereshit Zuta,” in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (eds. A. Caquot et al.; AOAT 215; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985.)

⁶¹ For examples, see L. Gottlieb, “Towards a More Precise Understanding of Pseudo-Jonathan’s Origins,” *Aramaic Studies* 19 (2021): 104–20 (109–15) and G. McDowell, “The Date and Provenance of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: The Evidence of Pirke deRabbi Eliezer and the Chronicles of Moses,” *Aramaic Studies* 19 (2021): 121–54 (127–29).

⁶² For examples, see McDowell, “The Date and Provenance of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan,” 126 note 19.

⁶³ A. Kohut (ed.), *Arukh Completum sive Lexicon vocabula et res, quae in libris Targumicis, Talmudicis et Midraschicis continentur, explicans auctore Nathane filio Jechielis* (8 vols.; Vienna: Georg Brög, 1878–1892), 6.60.

⁶⁴ M. Higger, *מסכת סופרים* (New York: Devei Rabbanan, 1937), 240 [Hebr.], puts the Esther citation in a footnote due to its inconsistent presence in the manuscripts. He includes the Targum Lamentations passage (317) but indicates his doubts about its originality in the introduction (29).

⁶⁵ See the index to Kohut, *Arukh Completum*.

⁶⁶ P. Toledano, “Rashi’s Commentary to the Pentateuch and Its Relation to the Targumim with Special Reference to Targum Onkelos,” (PhD diss., 2 vols.; University College London, 1980), 1.283–98.

Jonathan for his commentary on the Prophets.⁶⁷ Rashi also referred to the targumic literature in his Talmud commentary. It is here (in his comments to *b. Qidd. 49a*) where he makes his claim that the Targum was given at Sinai and later reconstituted by Onqelos with divine aid. This claim sits uneasily with passages from his biblical commentary where he seems to reject the interpretation given by Onqelos because it does not accord with the “plain” (*peshat*) sense of Scripture. According to Eran Viesel (born 1972), these positions can indeed be harmonized: Rashi treats the Targum as a midrashic source that does not need to conform to the literal sense of scripture.⁶⁸

Following a tradition that goes back to the dawn of printing, every *Chumash* is accompanied by Rashi’s commentary on the Torah and Targum Onqelos. Before they were neighbors, they were rivals. Moses b. Jacob de Coucy (1200–1274), author of the highly influential *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, an enumeration of the 613 commandments, first proposed that Rashi’s commentary on the weekly *parashah* was a fitting substitute for reading the Targum and fulfilled the instruction in *b. Ber. 8a–b* to read the Hebrew twice and the Targum once.⁶⁹ This idea became deeply enracinated in Jewish law, eventually finding a place in the authoritative *Shulhan Arukh*, although its author, Joseph Karo (1488–1575), advocated that a pious man ought to study both.⁷⁰ Anticipating this advice, most manuscripts of Rashi’s biblical commentary also feature the Targum.⁷¹

Rashi was the means by which Christian Hebraists of the Middle Ages became acquainted with targumic literature. Hugh (1096–1141) and Andrew (1110–1175) of St. Victor, both renowned exegetes of the Christian Old Testament, knew the Targum either through the mediation of Rashi or a Jewish informant who had read him.⁷² At about the same time, Herbert of Bosham (died 1189) referred to Onqelos and Jonathan in his *Psalterium cum commento*, again leaning heavily on Rashi.⁷³ Judith Olszowy-Schlanger (born 1967) has drawn attention to a thirteenth-century English school of Christian Hebraists connected to Ramsey Abbey in East Anglia, whose knowledge extended to the Targum, reflected in a trilingual (Hebrew, Latin, French) dictionary.⁷⁴ They too possessed copies of Rashi’s biblical commentaries.

The most prominent Christian Hebraists of this period, Raymond Martini (Ramon Martí, 1220–1285) and Nicholas of Lyra (1270–1349), also happened to be polemicists (@1.13.1.4). They both used Targum in keeping with the medieval Christian program of quoting Jewish texts against the Jews (not only the Bible, but the Talmud and, eventually, the Zohar). According to Philippe Bobichon (1954–2020), Martini quotes a Targum no fewer than 225 times over the course of his dense polemical work *Pugio Fidei*.⁷⁵ In addition to the expected references to Onqelos and Jonathan, he includes passages from the Targumim to the Writings (Psalms, Song of

⁶⁷ P. Toledano, “Rashi’s Commentary to the Pentateuch,” 2.544–59.

⁶⁸ E. Viesel, “Targum Onkelos in Rashi’s Exegetical Consciousness,” *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 15 (2012): 1–19.

⁶⁹ Moses de Coucy, *ספר מצות גדול* (Jerusalem: A.P. Farber, 1990), 28 (עשה 19, end).

⁷⁰ J. Karo, *שלחן ערוך: מטור אורח חיים הנקרא בית יוסף* (4 vols.; Venice: G. di Cavalli, 1567), folio 1.56b (הלכות שבת 285b).

⁷¹ E. Lawee, *Rashi’s Commentary on the Torah: Canonization and Resistance in the Reception of a Jewish Classic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 36–38.

⁷² Burnett, “The Targum in Christian Scholarship to 1800,” 251.

⁷³ E. De Visscher, *Reading the Rabbis: Christian Hebraism in the Works of Herbert of Bosham* (Commentaria 5; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 120–25.

⁷⁴ Olszowy-Schlanger, “The Study of the Aramaic Targum by Christians in Medieval France and England.”

⁷⁵ Bobichon, “Ramon Martí’s *Pugio fidei*.”

Songs, Lamentations). Some of his quotations, drawn from a “Targum Hierosolymitanum,” have yet to be identified. While Martini was skilled enough to consult Targumim independently, he was also a reader of Rashi, whom he cites 237 times in his work. Nicholas of Lyra likewise made use of the Targum – probably mediated through Rashi – to demonstrate that Jews interpret Genesis 49, Jeremiah 23, and other texts messianically, as do Christians.⁷⁶ His independent use of a Targum is debatable. In *Probatio diuinitatis et humanitatis Christi*, he accurately describes one known layout for a Targum manuscript, but he mistakenly believes there is only one Targum, and it was composed by Jonathan b. Uzziel:

The writing of Jonathan son of Uzziel ... is authentic for the Jews, and so far no one has dared to contradict it. In the more noteworthy books of the Jews, the pure Hebrew text is given in one column, and the Chaldaic text of this Jonathan in the other, written in Hebrew letters. And the Jews use this Chaldaic translation as an explication, because some things that are very obscure in the pure Hebrew text, are much clearer in this Chaldaic translation, and because they are, as it were, set out.⁷⁷

Christian knowledge of targumic literature would increase dramatically in the age of print.

1.3.1.4 The Early Modern Period (1500–1800)

The invention of the printing press (@1.1.3.1.2; @II.1.1.1) was salutary for the dissemination of Targum. Christians, who had heretofore shown an extremely limited interest in targumic literature, began printing these texts – in key cases, with the aid of Jewish converts. The two most important monuments of this epoch are, on the one hand, the first and second Rabbinic Bibles (1517; *RB1, *RB2; @2.1.2.2) and their many successors and, on the other, the *Complutensian Polyglot (1514–1517; @2.1.1.2) and its successors and imitators. In addition to these enormous, multivolume texts, individual annotated editions of shorter books were printed as textbooks for learning Aramaic. Additional aids for Aramaic pedagogy were produced during this period, so that by its end there were not only several editions of every major Targum (@2.6.1.1) but also several dictionaries, grammars, and manuals for students.

Many Targumim had already received an *editio princeps* before the consequential year of 1517. Targum Onqelos was among the first “Hebrew” (that is, Hebrew script) books to be printed, as part of the first edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch (Bologna, 1482; @2.1.2.1.2.2).⁷⁸ Onqelos was joined by his friend and rival, Rashi, in the margins, surrounding the Hebrew text. Targum Jonathan was first printed in 1494, more than a decade later, and then only incompletely. It appeared in an edition of the Former Prophets (@I.3–5.1.3) printed in the Portuguese city of Leiria (@2.1.2.1.3.7)⁷⁹ alongside the biblical commentaries of Levi b. Gershon (1288–1344) and David Kimhi (1160–1235). The first Polyglot Bible was not the famous Complutensian Polyglot but the more modest (though costly) *Octapulus Psalterii* (Genoa, 1516) of Agostino Giustiniani (1470–1536; @2.1.1.2), which contained the Psalter in five languages (Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, Arabic, and Latin) plus excerpts from *Midrash Tehillim* and other Jewish commentaries. The Targum was accompanied by a Latin translation.

⁷⁶ Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers*, 52–56, 97–102.

⁷⁷ F. van Lier, “The Literal Sense of the Books of Samuel and Kings: From Andrew of St. Victor to Nicolas of Lyra,” in *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture* (eds. P.D.W. Krey and L. Smith; Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 90; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 59–81 (78).

⁷⁸ A. ben Hayyim (ed.), *חמשה חומשי תורה* (Bologna: Joseph b. Abraham Caravita, 1482).

⁷⁹ *נביאים ראשונים עם פירוש דוד קמחי ובהוספת תרגום ופירוש הרל"ג* (7 vols.; Leiria: Samuel d’Ortas and Sons, 1494).

Most of the rest of the Targumim were printed for the first time in the first Rabbinic Bible of 1517 (*RB1; @2.1.2.2). The Rabbinic Bible was the brainchild of Daniel Bomberg (1483–1549), a Christian merchant living in Venice who wanted to produce a Hebrew Bible with Targum and commentary that would appeal to both Jewish and Christian interests.⁸⁰ He was aided in these endeavors by Felix Pratensis (died 1539), an Augustinian monk who was born a Jew (he was the Hebrew teacher of Aegidius of Viterbo [1472–1532], for whom Targum Neofiti was initially copied). While the second Rabbinic Bible (Venice, 1525; *RB2; @2.1.2.2) is more famous for the history of the Hebrew text (it was the *textus receptus* until the twentieth century), the first is more consequential for the study of the Targum. Targum Onqelos was included, as was the so-called “Fragment Targum” (a collection of 850 targumic translations of verses from the Pentateuch; @I.2.4.3.4.3), the entirety of Targum Jonathan, and the Targumim to the Writings. The second Targum to Esther (@I.13–17.1.3.2.5) was placed in an appendix. Missing from the first Rabbinic Bible was Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (@I.2.4.3.4.1), which was only first published at the end of the century (Venice, 1590),⁸¹ and Targum Chronicles (@I.20.3.3.2), which was first printed by Mathias Friedrich Beck (1649–1701).⁸² They were incorporated into later editions of the Rabbinic Bible.

In comparison with the Rabbinic Bible, the *Complutensian Polyglot (@2.1.1.2) only contained Targum Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3), which had been prepared (and translated into Latin) by Alphonso de Zamora (1474–1544) with the assistance of Pablo Núñez Coronel (1480–1534). Both were Jewish converts to Christianity. They also edited and translated other Targumim, but these were not printed in the Polyglot. Instead, the manuscripts were held at the Complutensian University for private consultation. Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros (1436–1517), the archbishop of Toledo and prime mover behind the Complutensian Polyglot, simultaneously justified the inclusion of Onqelos and the exclusion of the other Targumim in his introduction to the reader:

For the Aramaic in the books other than the Pentateuch is corrupted in several places and littered with tales and trifles from the Talmudists and therefore unworthy to be inserted into the sacred text. However, because [the Aramaic version] miraculously favours the Christian religion in some places, where the text is pure and not corrupted, we had the remaining books of the entire Old Testament translated from Aramaic to Latin and we had them accurately copied with their Latin translation and placed in the public library of our Complutensian University.⁸³

Later Polyglot Bibles would, however, print Zamora’s texts and translations, beginning with the Antwerp Polyglot (1569–1572).⁸⁴ This Polyglot, in addition to reproducing Onqelos, included Targum Jonathan and the Targumim to the Writings (along with their translations), which were found at the Complutensian University or, in the case of the Former Prophets, at a book market in Rome. This copy of the Former Prophets had been commissioned for the Complutensian Polyglot, but the Latin translator had barely begun his work. The editor, Benito Arias Montano

⁸⁰ Stern, “The Rabbinic Bible in Its Sixteenth-Century Context.”

⁸¹ Asher Forins (ed.), *חמשה חומשי תורה* (3 vols.; Venice: Bragadin, 1590).

⁸² M.F. Beck, *Paraphrasis Chaldaica I Libri Chronicorum* (Augsburg: Theoph. Goebelum Impressa, 1680); M.F. Beck, *Paraphrasis Chaldaica II Libri Chronicorum* (Augsburg, Theoph. Goebelum Impressa, 1683).

⁸³ Quoted according to van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism*, 19.

⁸⁴ *Biblia Sacra hebraice, chaldaice, graece, et latine : Philippi II. Reg. Cathol. Pietate, et studio ad sacrosanctae Ecclesiae usum* (8 vols.; Antverpiae: Plantinus, 1568–1572).

(1527–1598), supplied a new translation but expurgated certain targumic additions. This Bible, nevertheless, came under fire for its inclusion of Targumim and its overall benevolent attitude towards Jewish literature.⁸⁵ The Paris Polyglot (1628–1645)⁸⁶ adopted both the Aramaic and Latin texts from the Antwerp Polyglot. The London Polyglot (1654–1657),⁸⁷ however, maintained Zamora's Latin translations while relying on the Rabbinic Bibles for the Aramaic text. The Fragment Targum and Pseudo-Jonathan were first translated into Latin for this Polyglot.

In addition to the various Polyglots and Rabbinic Bibles, a remarkable number of minor editions consisting mainly of smaller books (from the Twelve Prophets [I.6–9.1.3] or the Five Megillot [I.13–17.1.3]) were printed over the course of the sixteenth century (2.6.1.1), usually adapting the Aramaic text from the Rabbinic Bible and adding a Latin translation.⁸⁸ The printers were Christians looking for short texts of Christological import that could serve as primers in the Aramaic language. To this end, the Latin translations were often literal. In the seventeenth century, it became more common to find targumic texts published solely in Latin translation, sometimes as part of a larger commentary on a particular biblical book.

The sudden influx of printed Targumim required tools necessary to read and interpret them.⁸⁹ Zamora included a Hebrew-Aramaic dictionary in volume six of the Complutensian Polyglot. The sixth volume of the Antwerp Polyglot likewise features an Aramaic dictionary, an expanded version of the *Enchiridion expositionis vocabulorum* (1523) of Santes Pagnino (1470–1541),⁹⁰ which was based on an abridgment of the *Arukh*. Sebastian Münster (1488–1552) published a *Dictionarium Chaldaicum* (Basel, 1527)⁹¹ based off the same abridgment, although he is better known for his Aramaic grammar, *Grammatica Chaldaica* (Basel, 1527),⁹² the first of its kind. In 1541, Elias Levita (1469–1549) published the first true targumic dictionary, *Meturgeman*.⁹³ Though Jewish, Levita composed this work for Christian readers at the behest of his patron, Aegidius of Viterbo. The work was printed in Isny by Paul Fagius (1504–1549), who made his own contribution to targumic studies when he published an independent translation of Targum

⁸⁵ Van Staaldvine-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism*, 122–26.

⁸⁶ Le Jay, **Biblia*.

⁸⁷ Walton, **Polyglotta*.

⁸⁸ Van Staaldvine-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism*, 74–109.

⁸⁹ The source of information for this and the following paragraphs is Burnett, "The Targum in Christian Scholarship to 1800."

⁹⁰ S. Pagnino, *Enchiridion expositionis vocabulorum: Haruch, Thargum, Midraseim, Bereseith, Scemoth, Vaicra, Midbar Rabba, Et Multorum aliorum Librorum* (Rome: Thomas Strozi, 1523).

⁹¹ S. Münster, *ערוך Dictionarium Chaldaicum, non ta[m] ad Chaldaicos interpretes q[uam] Rabbinoru[m] intelligenda co[m]mentaria necessarium* (Basel: Johannes Froben, 1527).

⁹² S. Münster, *Chaldaica Grammatica, Antehac À Nemine Attentata, sed iam primu[m] per Sebastianum Munsterum co[n]scripta & ædita, no[n] tam ad Chaldaicos interpretes quàm Hebræoru[m] com[m]entarios intelligendos, Hebraicæ linguæ studiosis utilissima. Item in פירושים hoc est, commentaria Hebræorum, Regulæ aliquot generales: Modi loquendi Hebraici plurimi: Abbreviaturæ Hebraicæ generales, nec non plurimæ speciales, & latine & Hebraice explicatæ* (Basel: Johannes Froben, 1527)

⁹³ E. Bahur, *ספר מתורגמן Meturgeman: Lexicon Chaldaicum avthore Eliia Levita, qvo nullum hactenus à quoquam absolutius æditum est, omnibus Hebrææ linguæ studiosis, inprimis [et] utile [et] necessarium* (Isny: Paulus Fagius, 1541).

Onqelos (1546)⁹⁴ intended to serve as a text for students. David de Pomis (1525–1594), following the example of Levita, was a Jew who composed a Hebrew/Aramaic dictionary for Christians. His *Zemach David* (once again, based on the *Arukh*) appeared in Venice in 1587.⁹⁵

In the seventeenth century, Johannes Buxtorf, the Elder (1564–1629) and son (1599–1664) established the standard reference works for early modern Targum study. The elder Buxtorf printed the sixth edition of the Rabbinic Bible (Basel, 1618–1619),⁹⁶ the one that would go on to supply the Aramaic text of the London Polyglot.⁹⁷ His *Grammaticae Chaldaicae et Syriacae* (1615)⁹⁸ – an ambitious work that covered Aramaic as well as Syriac – replaced Münster’s grammar from nearly a century earlier. Father and son both contributed to the encyclopedia *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum* (Basel, 1639),⁹⁹ a dictionary that sometimes functioned as a virtual concordance (it cites, for instance, every occurrence of the word “Messiah” in the Targumim).¹⁰⁰ Both Buxtorfs also worked on a textual commentary to the Targumim called *Babylonia*, which was intended to be printed in the London Polyglot but was never published. It reflects the elder Buxtorf’s attempts to standardize the text (including the vocalization) of the Targumim.

Heading into the eighteenth century, the most significant contribution to Targum studies was the cataloguing of Hebrew manuscripts undertaken by Giulio Bartolucci (1613–1687) and Giuseppe Carlo Imbonati (died 1697) for the *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica* (1675–1694)¹⁰¹ and Johann Christoph Wolf (1683–1739) for *Bibliotheca Hebraeae* (1715–1733).¹⁰² These were soon followed by Benjamin Kennicott’s (1718–1783) *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum* (1776–1780)¹⁰³ and Giovanni Bernardo de Rossi’s (1742–1831) *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (1784–1788).¹⁰⁴ Though focusing on Hebrew manuscripts, such catalogues could not help including information about the Targumim, which often accompanied the Hebrew text.

The major developments of this period were by or oriented towards Christians, but Jews did not neglect the Targumim. The sixteenth century witnessed the emergence of the seemingly counter-intuitive practice of translating the Targum. While Christians occupied themselves rendering the Aramaic text into Latin, a scholastic language, Jews translated the Targumim into the local

⁹⁴ P. Fagius (ed.), *Thargum, hoc est, paraphrasis Onkeli chaldaica in sacra Biblia ex Chaldaeo in Latinum fidelissime versa: Additis in singula fere capita succinctis annotationibus: Pentateuchus, sive quinque libri Moysi* (Strasbourg: Messerschmidt, 1546).

⁹⁵ D. de Pomis, *צמח דוד Dittionario Novo Hebraico, molto copioso, Dechiarato in tre lingue; con bellissime annotationi, e con l’indice latino, e volgare, de tutti li suoi significati* (Venice: Ioannes de Gara, 1587). Not to be confused with the similarly titled chronicle of David Gans, first published in Prague in 1592.

⁹⁶ J. Buxtorf the Elder (ed.), *Biblia sacra Hebraica & Chaldaica Cum Masora* (Basel: König, 1620).

⁹⁷ Walton, **Polyglotta*.

⁹⁸ J. Buxtorf, the Elder, *Lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldaicum* (Basel: König, 1615).

⁹⁹ J. Buxtorf, the Elder, *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum* (ed. J. Buxtorf the Younger; Basel: Ludwig König, 1639).

¹⁰⁰ G.F. Moore, “Christian Writers on Judaism,” *HTR* 14 (1921): 197–254 (217).

¹⁰¹ G. Bartolucci and G.C. Imbonati, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica: De Scriptoribus, & scriptis Hebraicis, ordine Alphabetico Hebraicè, & Latine digestis*, Vol. 1: *Tres primas Alphabeti literas complectens א ב ג* (Rome: Typographia Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1675).

¹⁰² J.C. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea: Sive notitia tvm avctorum hebr. civivscvnque ætatis, tvm scriptorum, qvæ vel hebraice primvm exarata vel ab aliis conversa svnt, ad nostram ætatem dedvcta* (Reinbek: Liebrecht, 1715).

¹⁰³ Kennicott, *1776–1780.

¹⁰⁴ De Rossi, *1784–1788.

vernacular. The Song of Songs, for example, was translated into Judeo-Arabic, Ladino (Judeo-Spanish), Yiddish, Italian, Turkish, Judeo-Persian, Neo-Aramaic, and even back into Hebrew.¹⁰⁵ Song of Songs was not the only Targum to receive this treatment. Other books, especially the Megillot (@I.13–17.1.3), benefited from such translation, because they were far removed from their Hebrew models; translation was not necessary in the case of Targumim that follow the Hebrew text closely. These translations show that reading the Targum, whether for private or public devotion, was still a living tradition. It would soon also become an object of academic study within Judaism.

1.3.1.5 The Wissenschaft des Judentums Movement (1800–1930)

In the early modern period, Targumim were typically printed as part of a larger enterprise, as an accompaniment to the Hebrew text in a Rabbinic or Polyglot Bible. They were never the main center of interest. In the nineteenth century, the Targumim were published in individual editions, often from new manuscript sources, as the primary object of study. In 1884, Abraham Berliner (1833–1915) published Targum Onqelos according to the Sabbioneta edition of 1557, accompanied by a major study of the history of the Targum.¹⁰⁶ He had previously edited the Masorah of the Targum (1877),¹⁰⁷ which Samuel Landauer (1846–1937) subsequently reedited in alphabetical (rather than biblical) order.¹⁰⁸ In 1899, Moses Ginsburger (1865–1949) published the Paris manuscript (Cod. Par. 110) of the Fragment Targum. He included targumic *toseftot* (additions) to Onqelos and quotations of “Lost Targumim” from the *Arukh*, *Meturgeman*, and other sources.¹⁰⁹ A few years later (1903), he printed Targum Pseudo-Jonathan from its sole manuscript, British Library add. 27031, though this edition was notorious for its many errors.¹¹⁰ In 1872, Paul Anton de Lagarde (1827–1891; @1.1.13.1.5.2; @1.1.3.3.4.2) printed Targum Jonathan to the Prophets from its most ancient manuscript, Codex Reuchlinianus No. 3 (1105 C.E.), including its many *toseftot*.¹¹¹ A year later, he produced an edition of the Targumim to the Writings, including Chronicles, from diverse sources.¹¹²

This flurry of activity was contemporaneous with the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement, and most of the preceding figures were participants in it (Lagarde, a notorious anti-Semite, was not). This movement, focusing on the critical investigation of rabbinic literature and Jewish origins, marks the birth of Jewish studies as an academic discipline. Its major figures – including Leopold Zunz (1794–1886), Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), Zacharias Frankel (1801–1875), and Wilhelm Bacher (1850–1913) – had at least something to say about the Targumim in their writings. Zunz, the pioneer of the movement, dedicated a chapter of his classic work *Die gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden* (1832; 2nd ed. 1892) to Targum.¹¹³ This chapter reads much like a contemporary introduction to targumic literature, describing each of the known Targumim and elaborating their relationship to each other. The most enduring aspect of his study might be

¹⁰⁵ Alexander, “Notes on Some Targums of the Targum of the Song of Songs.”

¹⁰⁶ Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*.

¹⁰⁷ A. Berliner, *Die Massorah zum Targum Onkelos* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1877).

¹⁰⁸ S. Landauer, *Die Mâsôrâh zum Onkelos auf Grund neuer Quellen lexikalisch geordnet und kritisch beleuchtet* (Amsterdam: Levisson, 1896).

¹⁰⁹ M. Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum (Thargum jeruschalmi zum Penteuch)* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1899).

¹¹⁰ M. Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch) nach der Londoner Handschrift (Brit. Mus. add. 27031)* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1903).

¹¹¹ P. de Lagarde, *Prophetæ chaldaice e fide codicis reuchliniani* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1872).

¹¹² P. de Lagarde, *Hagiographa chaldaice* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1873).

¹¹³ Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 65–86.

his hypothesis, based on targumic *toseftot* (such as those in Codex Reuchlianus), that an entire Palestinian Targum to the Prophets once existed as a counterpart to Targum Jonathan, much as there are both Palestinian and Babylonian Targumim to the Pentateuch.

Geiger's *magnum opus*, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857; @1.1.3.3.4.1), has little to say about the Targum, despite its title.¹¹⁴ In his lifetime, he composed a brief article on the origin of Onqelos¹¹⁵ and left an introduction to all the Targumim in his posthumous papers.¹¹⁶ His position was that Onqelos was a fourth-century C.E. Babylonian abridgment of a fuller Palestinian Targum from the Second Temple period. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan was a later attempt to restore the original form of the Palestinian Targum. Geiger left to posterity two received ideas about targumic literature. First, he claimed that Jonathan b. Uzziel was a calque on the Jewish Greek Bible translator Theodotion, just as Onqelos was a calque on Aquila (@1.1.3.1.2).¹¹⁷ He credited this idea to Samuel David Luzzato (1800–1865), whose *אוקב גר* or *Philoxenus* (Vienna, 1830), written in Hebrew, was the nineteenth century's most celebrated "traditional" commentary on Onqelos.¹¹⁸ Second, Geiger established the questionable rule that whatever contradicts the Mishnah must be prior to it.¹¹⁹ Thus, the Palestinian Targumim, which sometimes oppose rabbinic positions, must be more ancient than rabbinic literature.

Frankel was most famous for claiming that the Septuagint was influenced by the Targumim. He makes this argument in such works as *Historisch-Kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta nebst Beiträgen zu den Targumim*¹²⁰ and *Über den Einfluss der Palästinensischen Exegese auf die Alexandrinische Hermeneutik*,¹²¹ but his focus is the Greek text rather than the Aramaic. He did write a lengthy study of Targum Jonathan,¹²² where he argues that Rav Joseph, rather than Jonathan, was the author on account of the Targum's Babylonian-inflected language. Nevertheless, the text was not left untouched by later alterations. In a shorter article, he outlines the relationship between the Fragment Targum and Pseudo-Jonathan: The Fragment Targum was an older version of the Palestinian Targum that was eventually replaced by Pseudo-Jonathan.¹²³ He believed Onqelos was the product of Babylonian Jewry just as Pseudo-Jonathan was a product of Palestine.

Bacher's major targumic study, "Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum," was a systematic study of the *toseftot* in Codex Reuchlianus, which had recently been published by Lagarde.¹²⁴ The *toseftot* are indicated by a bewildering array of roughly synonymous terms: חרגום "Palestinian Targum," ספרי אחר "another book," לישנא אחרנא "another version," ואית "there are some who translate," דמתרגמי "disagreement." Bacher attempted to uncover the

¹¹⁴ Geiger, **Urschrift*, 162–67 and 451–80.

¹¹⁵ A. Geiger, "Das nach Onkelos benannte Thargum zum Pentateuch," *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 9 (1871): 85–104.

¹¹⁶ A. Geiger, "Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften," in *Abraham Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften*, Vol. 4 (ed. L. Geiger; Berlin: Louis Gerschel, 1876), 98–116.

¹¹⁷ Geiger, **Urschrift*, 164.

¹¹⁸ S.D. Luzzato, *Philoxenus sive de Onkelosi, Chaldaica Pentateuchi versione, dissertatio hermeneutico-critica* (Vienna: Schmid, 1830).

¹¹⁹ Geiger, **Urschrift*, 456–79.

¹²⁰ Frankel, **Vorstudien*.

¹²¹ Frankel, **Einfluss*.

¹²² Z. Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten* (Breslau: F.W. Junfer, 1872).

¹²³ Z. Frankel, "Einiges zu den Targumim," *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums* 3 (1846): 110–20.

¹²⁴ W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum," *ZDMG* 28 (1874): 1–71.

logic behind these different labels. In the second half of this long study, he turned his attention to the checkered textual history of Targum Jonathan. A sort of appendix (“Das gegenseitige Verhältniss der pentateuchischen Targumim,” that is, “The Reciprocal Relationship of the Pentateuchal Targumim”) was yet another attempt to articulate the relationship between Onqelos and the Palestinian Targumim.¹²⁵ His position was that the Fragment Targum was the remnants of an older Palestinian Targum that served as additions to Onqelos. Pseudo-Jonathan was dependent on both the old Palestinian Targum and Onqelos. Finally, Bacher wrote the entry “Targum” for the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1901–1906). It is distinguished from other dictionary and encyclopedia articles by its orientation towards the history of research.¹²⁶

Many research tools from this period are still in use today due to their widespread availability in the public domain. Among them are John Wesley Etheridge’s (1804–1866) English translations of Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan (1862–1865),¹²⁷ Jacob Levy’s (1819–1892) *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums* (1867–1868),¹²⁸ Marcus Jastrow’s (1829–1903) *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1903),¹²⁹ and Gustaf Dalman’s (1855–1941) *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, which first appeared in 1901.¹³⁰

Two research tools are historically important beyond their utility for Targum study. The first is the *Chrestomathia Targumica* of Adalbertus Merx (1838–1909), where he put forth the view that one could improve the Targum text by reconstituting the Babylonian (rather than Tiberian) vocalization.¹³¹ This led to the publication of several Targum editions based on Yemenite manuscripts, which use supralinear vowels like in the Babylonian system, including complete or partial editions of Joshua,¹³² Judges,¹³³ Jeremiah,¹³⁴ Ezekiel,¹³⁵ Ruth,¹³⁶ Qohelet,¹³⁷ Song of

¹²⁵ W. Bacher “Kritische-Untersuchungen,” 59–71.

¹²⁶ Bacher, “Targum.”

¹²⁷ J.W. Etheridge, *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: From the Chaldee* (2 vols.; London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862–1865).

¹²⁸ J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums*, (2 vols.; Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1867–1868).

¹²⁹ Jastrow, **Dictionary*.

¹³⁰ G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1901). Subsequent editions appeared in 1922 and 1938.

¹³¹ A. Merx, *Chrestomathia Targumica quam collatis libris manu scriptis antiquissimis Tiberiensibus editionibusque impressis celeberrimis ad codices vocalibus Babylonicis instructos* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium 8; Berlin: H. Reuther, 1888).

¹³² F. Praetorius, *Das Targum zu Josua in jemenischer Überlieferung* (Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1899).

¹³³ F. Praetorius, *Das Targum zum Buch der Richter in jemenischer Überlieferung* (Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1900).

¹³⁴ L. Wolfsohn, *Das Targum zum Propheten Jeremias in jemenischer Überlieferung* (Halle: W. Drugulin, 1902).

¹³⁵ S. Silberman, *Das Targum zu Ezechiel nach einer südarabischen Handschrift* (Strassburg: W. Drugulin, 1902).

¹³⁶ S. Wessel, *Das Targum zum Buche Ruth* (Berlin: H. Itzkovski, 1898).

¹³⁷ A. Levy, *Das Targum zu Qohelet nach südarabischen Handschriften herausgegeben* (Breslau: H. Fleischmann, 1905).

Songs,¹³⁸ and Isaiah.¹³⁹ This trend culminated in Alexander Sperber's (1897–1970) important yet infamous *The Bible in Aramaic*, which will be discussed in the next section (@1.3.1.6).

The second research tool which achieved historical significance beyond its immediate existential purpose was the second edition of Dalman's *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (1905).¹⁴⁰ In this edition, he reversed course from the first where he depended on Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum to construct a grammar of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. In the second, he instead used Targum Onqelos (edited in Babylon, but putatively of Palestinian origin) to reconstruct the language of first-century C.E. Palestine. The discoveries of the twentieth century – which included both Palestinian Targumim and Aramaic texts from first century C.E. Palestine – would ensure that the debate over the dialects of the Pentateuchal Targumim and their relation to one another would remain lively for years to come.

After this burst of activity, the first quarter of the twentieth century was a comparatively quiet one for Targum studies. The most consequential figure of this period was probably Pinkhos Churgin (1894–1957), who became better known to Targum specialists due to the 1983 reprint of his *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, originally published in 1927.¹⁴¹ Churgin's view that Targum Jonathan was continuously edited down to the Islamic period fits well with the earlier studies of Frankel and Bacher. This was not his only work on Targum. He also penned studies on the Targum and the Septuagint,¹⁴² the Targum and Halakha,¹⁴³ and the Targumim to the Writings.¹⁴⁴ Other writers of the early twentieth century were dwarfed by the momentous changes to the field occasioned by a succession of fortuitous discoveries, beginning in 1930.

1.3.1.6 The Twentieth Century and Beyond (1930–2020)

The past century of Targum scholarship was marked by three successive Copernican revolutions. The discovery of the Cairo Genizah in 1896 (@1.1.3.3) unearthed a vast treasury of manuscripts shedding light on Mediterranean Jewish life, including multiple Targum manuscripts. In 1930, Paul Ernst Kahle (1875–1964; @1.1.3.3.4.3) published seven of these manuscripts as part of his multivolume study of the biblical Masorah.¹⁴⁵ Shortly thereafter, in 1947, the first scrolls were discovered at Khirbet Qumran in the Dead Sea region (@1.1.3.4). A mere two years later, in 1949, Alejandro Díez Macho (1916–1984) noticed that a Vatican manuscript labeled “Targum Onqelos” was nothing of the kind. He eventually realized that the manuscript, Neofiti 1, was a full Palestinian Targum to the Torah (@2.4.3.4.2), independent of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (@2.4.2.4.1), which, though written in the sixteenth century, possibly reflected the state of the Palestinian Targum as it existed in late antiquity or even earlier. He announced his discovery in

¹³⁸ R.H. Melamed, “The Targum to Canticles according to Six Yemenite MSS.: Compared with the ‘Textus Receptus’ as Contained in De Lagarde’s ‘Hagiographa Chaldaica’” (PhD diss., Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1921).

¹³⁹ J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949).

¹⁴⁰ G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des palästinischen Talmud, des Onkelostargum und Prophetentargum und der jerusalemischen Targume* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905).

¹⁴¹ P. Churgin *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (Yale Oriental Series 14; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927).

¹⁴² P. Churgin, “The Targum and the Septuagint,” *AJS* 50 (1933): 41–65.

¹⁴³ P. Churgin, “The Halakha in Targum Onqelos,” *Horeb* 9 (1946): 79–93 [Hebr.].

¹⁴⁴ P. Churgin, *The Targum to the Hagiographa* (New York: Horeb, 1945) [Hebr.].

¹⁴⁵ P.E. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Vol. 2: *Das palästinische Pentateuchtargum, die palästinische Punktation, der Bibeltext des Ben Naftali* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammtik des Hebräischen 4; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 1–65.

1956¹⁴⁶ and published it in six large volumes (for each book of the Pentateuch plus appendices) from 1966 to 1979.¹⁴⁷ Most of the developments in Targum studies since then have been reactions to one of these three events.

Kahle's publication of the Genizah Targumim brought to light the earliest manuscripts of any Targum text. Most of them belonged to the Palestinian Targum tradition and were as early as the seventh century C.E. To Kahle, this showed that Targum Onqelos (@2.4.3.3) had not yet overtaken the Palestinian versions as the "official" Targum. From this and other considerations (such as deviations from rabbinic Halakha), he drew the conclusion that the Palestinian Targumim (@2.4.3.4) represent the oldest stratum of targumic literature and go back to the pre-Christian period, reversing the position held by Dalman:

In the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch we have in the main material coming from pre-Christian times which must be studied by everyone who wishes to understand the state of Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity. And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it is very similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians. It is material the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated.¹⁴⁸

The presuppositions of this paragraph became the founding principle of the so-called "Kahle School," whose representatives included New Testament scholar Matthew Black (1908–1991) as well as several prominent names in modern Targum studies: Díez Macho, Roger Le Déaut (1923–2000), and Martin McNamara (born 1930).

The Aramaic texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls immediately called this conclusion into question. Strange to say, the debate did not revolve around one of the "Targumim" from Qumran but the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Since it was unquestionably an Aramaic work from the Second Temple period, its language could serve as a litmus test for Kahle's thesis. Edward Yechezkel Kutscher (1909–1971; @1.1.3.4.2.1.2), in a classic essay, concluded that the linguistic features of the *Genesis Apocryphon* were in fact closer to Targum Onqelos than to any of the extant Palestinian Targumim (which reflect the dialect of a later period).¹⁴⁹ This has not deterred researchers from calling on the *Genesis Apocryphon* as a witness to early targumic traditions or even calling the *Genesis Apocryphon* a Targum itself.¹⁵⁰ Another Qumran text that has impacted Targum studies – in this case, a text that is not even written in Aramaic—is the *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab; @I.21.2.1). The Peshar allegedly drew upon Targum Jonathan (especially for its interpretation of Hab 1:15–16), indicating the Targum's antiquity, although most scholars remain skeptical.¹⁵¹ Of course, Qumran yielded Aramaic translations of biblical books, but these have already been discussed above (@1.3.1.1).

¹⁴⁶ A. Díez-Macho, "Una copia de todo el Targum jerosolimitano en la Vaticana," *Estudios Bíblicos* 15 (1956): 446–47.

¹⁴⁷ A. Díez-Macho, *Neophyti 1*.

¹⁴⁸ Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 208.

¹⁴⁹ E.Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHie 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965), 1–35.

¹⁵⁰ M.J. Bernstein, "The Genesis Apocryphon and the Aramaic Targumim Revisited: A View from Both Perspectives," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (2 vols.; eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, and M. Weigold; VTSup 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2.651–71. Reprinted in M.J. Bernstein, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran* (2 vols.; STDJ 107; Leiden: Brill), 1.266–85.

¹⁵¹ For the most recent view, and a review of earlier scholarship, see P.B. Hartog, "The Qumran Pesharim and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets: Rethinking their Relationship," *Aramaic Studies* 19 (2021): 25–40.

One of the most important publications of the past century has little to do with these discoveries, and its author was actively hostile to them. Sperber's *The Bible in Aramaic* (1959–1973) marks the first attempt at a critical edition of Targum Onqelos and Targum Jonathan.¹⁵² While using a Yemenite manuscript (with supralinear pointing) as his base text, Sperber constructed a critical apparatus using a small number of manuscripts that nevertheless reflected all known text types. He also published individual manuscripts of the Megillot (@I.13–17.1.3) and Targum Chronicles (@I.20.3.3.2) but did not even attempt a critical apparatus because he deemed the Writings to be closer to Midrash than Targum (he did not even print the Targumim to Psalms, Proverbs, and Job). His edition remains the *textus receptus* of Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3.4) and Jonathan (@I.3–5.1.3; @I.6–9.1.3.2), yet it has also been subjected to harsh criticisms.¹⁵³ Namely, the Yemenite vocalization tradition is not identical to the Babylonian. It represents a distinct textual tradition that was prone to mixture with Tiberian vocalization. Such was the case with the manuscripts Sperber chose. The problem was compounded by the late date and small number of manuscripts that he used.¹⁵⁴ Díez Macho, in a critical review of Sperber's final, introductory volume, was justifiably annoyed at Sperber's total neglect of Targum Neofiti or any other Palestinian Targum.¹⁵⁵

The Barcelona School, consisting of Díez Macho and his students, endeavored to publish editions of the Targumim that accurately reflected the Babylonian tradition. In 1974, Díez Macho published a facsimile of an important manuscript of the Former Prophets with Babylonian vocalization (@I.3–5.1.3.7).¹⁵⁶ The next year, Luis Díez Merino (born 1939) published a catalogue of all known manuscripts (Bible, Targum, Masorah) in the Babylonian tradition, *La Biblia babilónica*.¹⁵⁷ Emiliano Martínez Borobio (PhD 1975) edited the Former Prophets in three volumes (@I.3–5.1.3.7).¹⁵⁸ In an initial publication, based on his dissertation, Josep Ribera Florit (1935–2007) edited all of the Babylonian fragments of the Latter Prophets (@I.13–17.1.3).¹⁵⁹ He later produced individual volumes on Isaiah,¹⁶⁰ Jeremiah,¹⁶¹ and Ezekiel.¹⁶² The Barcelona School has many other Targum editions to its credit (the Minor Prophets, the Writings), not all of

¹⁵² Sperber, **Bible in Aramaic*.

¹⁵³ See Gordon, "Alexander Sperber."

¹⁵⁴ M. Martin, "The Babylonian Tradition and Targum," in *Le Psautier: Ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son influence* (ed. R. De Langhe; Leuven: Institut Orientaliste, 1962), 425–51.

¹⁵⁵ A. Díez Macho, "The Bible in Aramaic, IV B: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible by Alexander Sperber," *JSJ* 6 (1975), 217–36.

¹⁵⁶ A. Díez Macho, *Targum to the Former Prophets: Codex New York 229: From the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1974).

¹⁵⁷ L. Díez Merino, *La Biblia babilónica* (Madrid: Sección Targúmica, 1975).

¹⁵⁸ E. Martínez Borobio, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica* (3 vols.; Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 38, 46, 63; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1987–1998).

¹⁵⁹ J. Ribera Florit, *Biblia babilónica: Profetas Posteriores (Targum)* (Barcelona: Varona, 1977).

¹⁶⁰ J. Ribera Florit, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Posteriores en tradición babilónica: Isaías* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 43; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988).

¹⁶¹ J. Ribera Florit, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Posteriores en tradición babilónica: Jeremías* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 52; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1992).

¹⁶² J. Ribera Florit, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Posteriores en tradición babilónica: Ezequiel* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 62; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1997).

which are in the Babylonian tradition, but there is not enough space to discuss them here.¹⁶³ Díez Macho had intended to publish a proper Babylonian edition of Targum Onqelos based on a Vatican manuscript (Ebr. 448), but he did not realize this project before his death in 1984. A facsimile of the manuscript was, however, published in 1977.¹⁶⁴

The other Targumim to the Pentateuch benefited from new editions. No fewer than three new editions of Pseudo-Jonathan appeared to replace the error-ridden publication of Ginsburger. The first of these was David Rieder's (1898–1978) edition with a Hebrew translation and notes,¹⁶⁵ but it was soon superseded by the text and concordance of Ernest G. Clarke (1927–1997).¹⁶⁶ This has become the standard edition of the Targum and provides the text used in electronic and online resources. The third edition of Pseudo-Jonathan was included as part of the multi-volume Madrid Polyglot, where it appears synoptically with Targum Neofiti and the Fragment Targum. A Spanish translation accompanies the text.¹⁶⁷ All three use the London manuscript as the base text, although the Madrid Polyglot includes variants from the *editio princeps*. Michael L. Klein (1940–2000) published new editions of the Fragment Targum (including both Paris 110 and Vatican 440)¹⁶⁸ and a fuller edition of the Genizah Targumim.¹⁶⁹ These have now become the standard reference works, eclipsing the previous editions of Ginsburger and Kahle.

One new development is that the Targumim of the Writings finally started receiving critical editions. Some noteworthy examples are Le Déaut's edition of Targum Chronicles,¹⁷⁰ Bernard Grossfeld's (1933–2013) editions of the First¹⁷¹ and Second¹⁷² Targum to Esther, David M. Stec's (born 1951) edition of the Targum to Job,¹⁷³ and Derek R. G. Beattie's (1946–2019) edition of the Targum to Ruth.¹⁷⁴ Albert van der Heide (born 1942) has edited a version of Targum Lamentations in the Yemenite tradition, but it does not reflect the whole textual tradition

¹⁶³ Díez Merino, "Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions." See also Ribera Florit, "Las investigaciones targúmicas en España."

¹⁶⁴ A. Díez Macho, *The Pentateuch: With the Masorah Parva and the Masorah Magna and with Targum Onkelos, Ms. Vat. Heb. 448* (5 vols.; Makor: Jerusalem, 1978).

¹⁶⁵ D. Rieder, *Pseudo-Jonathan: Thargum Jonathan ben Uziel on the Pentateuch Copied from the London MS* (Jerusalem: Salomon's Press, 1974).

¹⁶⁶ E.G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (with collaboration by W.E. Aufrecht, J.C. Hurd, and F. Spitzer; Hoboken: Ktav, 1984).

¹⁶⁷ A. Díez Macho et al. (eds.), *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia*, Series 4: *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio* (5 vols.; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977–1988).

¹⁶⁸ M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AnBib 76; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1980).

¹⁶⁹ M.L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (2 vols.; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1986).

¹⁷⁰ R. Le Déaut, *Targum des Chroniques (Cod. Vat. Urb. Ebr. 1)* (2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971).

¹⁷¹ B. Grossfeld, *The First Targum to Esther according to the MS Paris Hebrew 110 of the Bibliotheque Nationale* (New York: Hermon, 1983).

¹⁷² B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Sheni to the Book of Esther: A Critical Edition Based on MS. Sassoon 282 with Critical Apparatus* (New York: Hermon, 1994).

¹⁷³ D.M. Stec, *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition* (AGJU 20; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

¹⁷⁴ D.R.G. Beattie, "The Targum of Ruth: A Preliminary Edition," in *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretations in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (ed. P.V.M. Flesher; Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 231–90.

of this Targum.¹⁷⁵ Finally – although it is also not a critical edition – Díez Merino has published a well-received study and text of the Targum to Proverbs.¹⁷⁶ These are the editions that now serve as the base texts for the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (<http://cal.huc.edu/>; @4.2.2.1.3) maintained by Stephen A. Kaufman (born 1945), itself an invaluable resource for Targum study. The Targumim of Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Lamentations, and Qohelet still await complete critical editions.

A work that is not exactly an edition yet remains invaluable is Moshe Goshen-Gottstein's (1925–1991; @1.1.3.4.2.1.2) *Fragments of Lost Targumim*, which he compiled with the help of his student Rimon Kasher (born 1945).¹⁷⁷ These slim volumes contain “unsourced” citations of Targumim from medieval authors and manuscripts (@1.2.4.3.4.5). Kasher himself published 150 *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets* from more than a hundred first editions and manuscripts, more than half of which came from Codex Reuchlinianus.¹⁷⁸ Another work that has some bearing on Targum studies is Michael Sokoloff's (PhD 1971) and Joseph Yahalom's (born 1941) *Jewish Palestinian Aramaic Poetry from Late Antiquity*.¹⁷⁹ The Aramaic poems have recently been translated by Laura S. Lieber (born 1972).¹⁸⁰ These poems not only share a liturgical setting with the Targumim, but some of them are also embedded in targumic texts.

Only in the modern period has the entire targumic corpus been translated into a living language. The *editio princeps* of Targum Neofiti was published with three translations – not only in Spanish (by Díez Macho) but also in French (by Le Déaut) and English (by McNamara). Le Déaut and McNamara would go on to spearhead other translation projects. Le Déaut translated both Neofiti and Targum-Jonathan and printed them on facing pages.¹⁸¹ McNamara oversaw the publication of the *Aramaic Bible* series (1987–2008), where all the complete Targumim were rendered into English in twenty-two volumes, eleven dedicated to the various Targumim to the Pentateuch and eleven dedicated to the Prophets and Writings.¹⁸² Klein's editions of the Fragment Targum and Genizah manuscripts were also accompanied by an English translation.

The number of reference works for studying the Targumim has not always kept pace with new discoveries. The publication of new Targumim spurred the creation of new grammars: David M. Golomb (born 1945) published a grammar of Targum Neofiti in 1985,¹⁸³ and Steven E. Fassberg (born 1956) produced one for the Genizah Targum texts in 1990.¹⁸⁴ These works partially replace

¹⁷⁵ A. van der Heide, *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations: Critical Text and Analysis of the Variant Readings* (StPB 32; Leiden: Brill, 1981).

¹⁷⁶ L. Díez Merino, *Targum de Proverbios: Edición Principe del Ms. Villa-Amil no. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Bibliotheca Hispana biblica 11; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1984).

¹⁷⁷ M. Goshen-Gottstein, *Fragments of Lost Targumim* (2 vols.; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1983–1989) [Hebr.].

¹⁷⁸ R. Kasher, *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1996) [Hebr.].

¹⁷⁹ J. Yahalom and M. Sokoloff, *Jewish Palestinian Aramaic Poetry from Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1999) [Hebr.].

¹⁸⁰ L.S. Lieber, *Jewish Aramaic Poetry from Late Antiquity: Translations and Commentaries* (Études sur le Judaïsme Médiéval 75; Leiden: Brill, 2018).

¹⁸¹ R. Le Déaut, *Targum du Pentateuque: Traduction des deux recensions palestiniennes complètes avec introduction, parallèles, notes et index* (5 vols.; SC 245, 256, 261, 271, 282; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978–1981).

¹⁸² M. McNamara (ed.), *The Aramaic Bible* (22 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987–2008).

¹⁸³ D.M. Golomb, *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti* (HSM 34; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).

¹⁸⁴ S.E. Fassberg, *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah* (HSS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

Dalman's grammar, which has long since gone out of date. There is no descriptive grammar for the idiosyncratic language of Onqelos and Jonathan, which achieved their final form in Babylon but are not written in the same dialect as the Babylonian Talmud. Another gap is a grammar for Late Jewish Literary Aramaic, the putative dialect of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targumim to the Writings. For the Aramaic Qumran texts, one has the recent grammar of Takamitsu Muraoka (born 1938) at their disposal.¹⁸⁵

Scholars are better served by dictionaries and concordances. Sokoloff has now produced two large dictionaries for each of the main Jewish Aramaic dialects: Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (now in its third edition)¹⁸⁶ and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.¹⁸⁷ His dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic is limited to the Byzantine period: It includes Neofiti, the Fragment Targum, and the Genizah manuscripts as sources but excludes Onqelos, Jonathan, and Pseudo-Jonathan. Onqelos and Jonathan were judged to have Palestinian roots – but before the Byzantine period. Pseudo-Jonathan is deemed to cause more confusion than clarity, owing to its later date and mixed dialect. Consequently, these Targumim are not used for his dictionary of Babylonian Aramaic either. Edward M. Cook (born 1952), however, has filled part of this gap with his *Glossary of Targum Onkelos*.¹⁸⁸ There is as yet no dictionary for Targum Jonathan, but Cook's dictionary can be used in the interim, since the two Targumim are written in the same dialect and share common vocabulary. The same author has also written a *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*.¹⁸⁹

The most recent concordance for Targum Onkelos is from 1940.¹⁹⁰ The Targum Institute of the Protestant Theological University in Kampen, the Netherlands – the “Kampen School” – has assembled a concordance of Targum Jonathan in twenty-one volumes (one for each book according to the Christian enumeration).¹⁹¹ Kaufman and Sokoloff generated (via computer) *A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti*.¹⁹² Clarke's edition of Pseudo-Jonathan¹⁹³ includes a concordance, as does Grossfeld's edition of Targum Sheni to Esther.¹⁹⁴ Finally, the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (@4.2.2.1.3) can be used to create a concordance for any Targum. It is also, true to its name, a lexicon that draws on Sokoloff's dictionaries as well as works in the public domain and, hence, includes entries for all the Targumim.

Since the discovery of Neofiti there have been several book-length introductions to targumic literature, but most are now of antiquarian interest only. In 1966, before even the publication of

¹⁸⁵ T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 38; Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

¹⁸⁶ M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (3rd ed.; Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash, and Targum 2; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2017).

¹⁸⁷ M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash, and Targum 3; Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002).

¹⁸⁸ E.M. Cook, *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos according to Alexander Sperber's Edition* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 6; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

¹⁸⁹ E.M. Cook, *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015).

¹⁹⁰ H.J. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Aquilae Versionis* (Jerusalem: Harav Kook, 1940; revised ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986) [Hebr.].

¹⁹¹ J.C. de Moor (ed.), *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets* (21 vols.; Leiden: Brill 1995–2005).

¹⁹² S.A. Kaufman and M. Sokoloff, *A Key-in-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti: A Guide to the Complete Palestinian Aramaic Text of the Torah* (Publications of The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

¹⁹³ E.G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch*.

¹⁹⁴ B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Sheni to the Book of Esther*.

Neofiti, Le Déaut wrote a well-regarded primer on the Targumim for students.¹⁹⁵ More recently, he penned a volume of the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* dedicated exclusively to the subject of “Targum.”¹⁹⁶ It was published posthumously, but it is already twenty years old and no longer represents the most current scholarship. Other members of the Kahle School have written introductory volumes to Targum: Díez Macho’s *El Targum* (1972) condenses the contents of his lengthy introductions to the *editio princeps* of Neofiti,¹⁹⁷ while McNamara’s *Targum and Testament*, though focusing on themes pertaining to the New Testament, is also a general introduction to Targum and features a description of the extant Targumim.¹⁹⁸

John Bowker’s (born 1935) *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* attempted to fill a gap in Hermann L. Strack’s (1848–1922) *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, which excluded the Targumim.¹⁹⁹ Bowker’s own book does not much resemble that classic work. He spends as much space discussing rabbinic literature as the Targumim and dedicates the main body of the text to a translation and commentary of Pseudo-Jonathan’s rendition of Genesis. This was welcome in an era when the only English translation was Etheridge, but it is no longer necessary. About half of Madeleine Taradach’s (born 1929) confusingly titled *Le Midrash* is an introduction to Targum.²⁰⁰ In terms of format it more closely resembles Strack. However, it is riddled with errors.²⁰¹ Etan Levine’s (1934–2021) *The Aramaic Version of the Bible* (1988), focusing on theological aspects of the Targumim,²⁰² also received critical reviews.²⁰³ Yehuda Komlosh (1913–1988), an Israeli scholar who began studying Targum before the major discoveries of the twentieth century, collected his work in *The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations* (1973).²⁰⁴ It is ample, but its main subjects are Onqelos and Jonathan with little to say about the Palestinian Targumim. Also, it is quite old. In 1995, Uwe Glessmer (born 1951) published an introduction to targumic literature in German, but it only covers the Targumim to the Pentateuch (@I.1.3.3.11; @I.2.4.3.2).²⁰⁵

The most recent, most complete, and (so far) best book-length introduction to the Targumim is Bruce D. Chilton’s (born 1949) and Paul V. M. Flesher’s (born 1957) *The Targums: A Critical*

¹⁹⁵ R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).

¹⁹⁶ R. Le Déaut, “Targum,” *DBSup* 13:1*-344*.

¹⁹⁷ A. Díez Macho, *El Targum: Introducción a las traducciones aramaicas de la Biblia* (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1972).

¹⁹⁸ M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972; 2nd ed. published under the title *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010]).

¹⁹⁹ J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

²⁰⁰ M. Taradach, *Le Midrash: Introduction à la littérature midrashique (Drš dans la Bible, les Targumim, les Midrashim)* (Le Monde de la Bible 22; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991).

²⁰¹ R. Le Déaut, review of M. Taradach, *Le Midrash (Drš dans la Bible les Targumim les Midrashim)*, *JSJ* 22 (1991): 286–92.

²⁰² E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW 174; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988).

²⁰³ M.J. Bernstein, review of E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* by Etan Levine, *JAOS* 112 (1992): 324–25. The opening line of Bernstein’s review states, “The title of this book promises far more than it delivers.”

²⁰⁴ Y. Komlosh, *The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations* (Bar Ilan University Research Monographs 12; Tel Aviv: Dvir Publishing House, 1973) [Hebr.].

²⁰⁵ U. Glessmer, *Einleitung in die Targume zum Pentateuch* (TSAJ 48; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

Introduction (2011).²⁰⁶ The introduction includes a measured consideration of the definition of “Targum” (rejecting, in particular, the frequent characterization of its translation technique as “paraphrase”). Its first half describes the contents of the Targumim to the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Writings, while the second half deals with the “world” of the Targum (Aramaic in Judaism, other ancient translations, Targum and New Testament). While not above criticism (for example, regarding its dating of Pseudo-Jonathan), there is no serious alternative.

Of recent longer articles that can serve as introductions to Targum studies, one might mention those of Cook,²⁰⁷ Moshe J. Bernstein (born 1946),²⁰⁸ and Charles Thomas Robert Hayward (born 1948),²⁰⁹ all of whom have made significant contributions to Targum studies. Philip S. Alexander's (born 1947) frequently cited pair of articles on Targum in *Mikra*²¹⁰ and the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*²¹¹ might be the most influential short introductions to the subject.

For more specific studies, one can consult bibliographical resources, but this is one area where Targum scholarship needs an update. Grossfeld compiled *A Bibliography of Targum Literature* in three volumes, but the last one was published in 1990.²¹² Each volume includes a section on Targum and New Testament, but there are also two separate publications treating this topic exclusively: the first was Peter Nickels' (1934–2012) *Targum and New Testament* (1967),²¹³ which was superseded by James Terence Forestell's (1925–2000) *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament* (1979).²¹⁴

Much has happened since 1990, however, including the founding of societies (the International Organization of Targum Studies) and journals (*Aramaic Studies*) devoted to Targum study. Some bibliographical references have appeared online. The Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies (<http://targum.info/>) has a bibliographical section that has not been updated since 2004. The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (@4.2.2.1.3) also has bibliographical archives, and it has been updated more recently (2019). It is not, however, a completely adequate replacement for a printed volume or even an electronic bibliography dedicated solely to Targum studies (CAL includes material pertaining to the study of all Aramaic texts, not just Targum). The Kampen School is responsible for some invaluable electronic resources, notably the *Targum Manuscripts Database* (<http://www.targum.nl/MSDB/searchMS.aspx>).

²⁰⁶ Flesher-Chilton, **The Targums*.

²⁰⁷ E.M. Cook, “The Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in the Targums,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 92–117.

²⁰⁸ M.J. Bernstein, “The Aramaic Targumim: The Many Faces of the Jewish Biblical Experience,” in *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible* (ed. G.J. Brooke; JSS Supplement 11; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 133–65.

²⁰⁹ C.T.R. Hayward, “The Aramaic Targums,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1: *The Bible from the Beginnings to 600* (eds. J.C. Paget and J. Schaper; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013): 218–41.

²¹⁰ P.S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures,” in Mulder, **Mikra*, 217–54.

²¹¹ P.S. Alexander, “Targum, Targumim,” *ABD* 6:320–31.

²¹² B.A. Grossfeld, *A Bibliography of Targum Literature*, Vols. 1 and 2 (Bibliographica Judaica 3 and 8; New York: Ktav, 1972–1977); Vol. 3 (New York: Hermon, 1990).

²¹³ P. Nickels, *Targum and New Testament: A Bibliography together with a New Testament Index* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967).

²¹⁴ J.T. Forestell, *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament: An Annotated Bibliography with a New Testament Index* (SBL Aramaic Studies 4; Chico: Scholars Press, 1979).

1.3.2 Topics within Targum Studies

In a trenchant presentation delivered at the Society of Biblical Literature in 1978 but only published in 1985, Kaufman illustrated the state of modern Targum studies in the form of multiple-choice questions.²¹⁵ Among them:

- I. The Palestinian Targum is:
 - A. Pre-Christian
 - B. Tannaitic
 - C. Amoraic
 - D. Gaonic
 - E. Late medieval
 - F. A translation from the Greek
 - G. All of the above
- II. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is:
 - A. *The* Palestinian Targum
 - B. A Palestinian Targum
 - C. *Basically* a Palestinian Targum
 - D. Dependent on Onkelos
 - E. A late composition
 - F. An early composition
 - G. None of the above
- III. Targum Onkelos is:
 - A. Dependent on Pseudo-Jonathan
 - B. The origin of Pseudo-Jonathan
 - C. A late Babylonian composition
 - D. An early Palestinian composition
 - E. A late Palestinian composition
 - F. Properly read only from manuscripts with supralinear vocalization
 - G. Totally irrelevant

While the field has undergone many developments since 1985, it is hard to categorically state that the situation has materially changed. A great deal is still unknown about the Targumim, and there is still a lack of consensus regarding, for example, the dialect of Onkelos or the date of Pseudo-Jonathan. There are also ebbs and flows in trends. For example, the relationship of the Targumim to Christianity (both the New Testament and the Peshitta) was once a very popular topic. It is currently in abeyance, although it is unlikely to stay that way. The following section is intended to highlight the major points of contention within contemporary trends.

1.3.2.1 The Setting and Origin of the Targumim

One recurring question in the study of Targum is the most basic of all: Where do the Targumim come from? And why, one might add, were they written in the first place? The longstanding presupposition is that the Targum was intended to bring Scripture to the unlearned masses who no longer understood the Hebrew original. This is a medieval opinion, mentioned already in Tractate *Soferim* (18:4 [Higger 18:6]) and in Rashi's Talmud commentary (*b. Meg.* 21b). However, it is an assumption and not a fact. There may have been more academic reasons for producing an Aramaic translation (and Hebrew may have had greater longevity than previously

²¹⁵ Kaufman, "On Methodology," 119.

thought).²¹⁶ Furthermore, rabbinic literature speaks of Targum as a liturgical practice, but there is a gulf between the practice of Targum in the synagogue and the written texts that have come down to us. For one, according to the Rabbis, the written Targum was not permitted to be read in the synagogue. There are also written Targumim for books that were never read as part of the liturgy (such as Job).

This problem has been succinctly summarized by Lester L. Grabbe (born 1945):

It seems to be a common assumption that the targums known to us today had their origin in the synagogue liturgy. That is, of course, one possibility but hardly the only one. It has yet to be demonstrated that the written rabbinic targums are oral in origin or that the targumic method as such first derived from the synagogue liturgy. The earliest targums known to us from Qumran caves 4 and 11 are fairly literal renderings of the Hebrew text and seem to be literary in origin. The actual synagogue liturgy of the first century is not known; there is no evidence so far that the readings of the Law and Prophets were accompanied by translations into Aramaic at this time.²¹⁷

Even if the Qumran texts are separated from the Targumim, the point is the same. Aramaic translations of Scripture seemed to serve a purpose beyond “sheet music” for the meturgeman.

Anthony D. York (died 2018), in “The Targum in the Synagogue and the School,” draws attention to references suggesting Targum was part of an educational curriculum (*y. Meg.* 4:1, 74d; *Sifre Deut.* 161; *’Abot de-R. Nathan B* 12; *b. Qidd.* 49a; and even Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* XI.5.3) and concludes that the school was just as important as the synagogue for the Targum’s dissemination.²¹⁸ Alexander, in “The Targumim and Rabbinic Rules for Delivering the Targum,” identifies three settings for the Targum – not only the school and the synagogue but also private devotion.²¹⁹ In a later study, he put forth the provocative thesis that the Targum was one means by which the Rabbis themselves could learn Hebrew.²²⁰ Steven D. Fraade (born 1949), who deplores the modern scholarly separation of the synagogue from the school, more forcefully rejects the idea that Targum was ever intended to replace the Hebrew text and emphasizes that the Aramaic translation was never separated from its Hebrew source. It instead functioned as a form of exegetical literature comparable to Midrash.²²¹ According to Abraham Tal (born 1931) the Targum was initially a means of teasing out the meaning of Scripture without altering the Hebrew text.²²² Alexander Samely (PhD 1989), who denies that Targum is translation,²²³ argues that the exegetical features of Targum are more important than the Aramaic language.²²⁴

²¹⁶ See, for example, G. Baltes, “The Origins of the ‘Exclusive Aramaic Model’ in the Nineteenth Century: Methodological Fallacies and Subtle Motives,” in *The Language Environment of First Century Judaea* (eds. R. Buth and R.S. Notley; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 26; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 7–34, and the other essays in this volume.

²¹⁷ L. Grabbe, “The Jannes/Jambres Tradition in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Its Date,” *JBL* 98 (1979): 393–401 (394 note 6).

²¹⁸ York, “The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School.”

²¹⁹ P.S. Alexander, “The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum,” in *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (ed. J. Emerton, VTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 14–28.

²²⁰ P.S. Alexander, “How Did the Rabbis Learn Hebrew?” in *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (ed. W. Horbury; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 71–89.

²²¹ S. Fraade, “Locating Targum in the Textual Polysystem of Rabbinic Pedagogy,” *BIOSCC* 39 (2006): 69–91.

²²² A. Tal, “Is There a *raison d’être* for an Aramaic Targum in a Hebrew-speaking Society?” *REJ* 160 (2001): 357–78.

On a different note, Kasher emphasizes the liturgical function of the Targum based on internal evidence in the Targum manuscripts themselves, such as expansions at the beginning or end of liturgical divisions (*sedarim*) and direct addresses to the congregation.²²⁵ However, he believes that *verbatim* translation (from Hebrew to Aramaic) was indeed part of elementary education, while the long expansions might be traditions that originated in a more advanced educational setting such as the house of study (*bet ha-midrash*). Therefore, a manuscript like Neofiti 1 is a “mixed text” where a variety of approaches to biblical study converge – but in a synagogue setting. Chilton and Flesher have a much stronger dissenting opinion: “The role of Targums and other translations in teaching and private study is poorly evidenced in rabbinic literature.”²²⁶ Indeed, there are only a handful of references to targumic study in rabbinic literature, but the Targumim themselves, where references to the *bet ha-midrash* dwarf references to the synagogue, are also a source of evidence for their use as scholastic texts.²²⁷

Another trend is to view the Targumim as non-rabbinic. Even though rabbinic Jews are responsible for the transmission of the extant Targumim, these texts did not necessarily originate within rabbinic communities. This perspective goes hand-in-hand with the belief that Targumim existed already in the Second Temple period and were hence pre-rabbinic. This view, however, is not contingent on the antiquity of the Targumim. The rabbinic rules concerning the recitation of Targum have been viewed as an attempt to impose order on something that was ultimately beyond the Rabbis’ control. Or, as Avigdor Shinan (born 1946) put it: “The sources, in fact, tell us much more about what the *meturgeman* was forbidden to do than what he actually did.”²²⁸ The so-called “anti-Mishnaic” rulings found in some Targumim, though often marshaled as evidence in favor of an early date for this literature (see below, @1.3.2.3), can also be interpreted as evidence for their non-rabbinic origin. In this view, the synagogue is the matrix for the development of the Targum, and the type of Judaism that produced it is variously characterized as “popular,” “liturgical,” or, more recently, “synagogal.”²²⁹

The two major trends – the Targum as an object of study and the Targum as a product of the liturgy – are not mutually exclusive. The targumic literature clearly found a place in both the house of study and the synagogue, both in late antiquity and in the Middle Ages. It is a false dichotomy to completely oppose the two, or, to use the words of Fraade: “The alternatives should

²²³ A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ 27; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 158–59.

²²⁴ A. Samely, “Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew? A Reflection on Midrashic and Targumic Rewording of Scripture,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 92–100.

²²⁵ R. Kasher, “The Aramaic Targumim and their *Sitz im Leben*,” in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 4–12, 1985: Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* (ed. M. Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988), 75–85.

²²⁶ Flesher-Chilton, **The Targums*, 319.

²²⁷ S. Fine, “‘Their Faces Shine with the Brightness of the Firmament’: Study Houses and Synagogues in the Targumim to the Pentateuch,” in *Biblical Translation in Context* (ed. F.W. Knobloch; Studies and Texts in Jewish History and Culture 10; Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 2002), 63–92. See also: R. Hayward, “The Aramaic Targum and Its Ancient Jewish Scholarly Environment,” in *Jewish Education from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of Philip S. Alexander* (eds. G.J. Brooke and R. Smithuis; Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 100; Leiden: Brill, 2017), 128–46.

²²⁸ A. Shinan, “Live Translation: On the Nature of the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch,” *Prooftexts* (1983): 41–49 (42).

²²⁹ J. Costa, “Que'est-ce que le ‘judaïsme synagogal’?” *Judaïsme Ancien – Ancient Judaism* 3 (2015): 63–218.

not be reduced to complete rabbinic control or no rabbinic influence at all.”²³⁰ Nevertheless, the Targumim, though incorporated into the rabbinic canon, remain one source (along with *piyyut* — liturgical poetry — another “synagogal” genre) for the examination of Judaism beyond the rabbinic academies.

1.3.2.2 The Dialects of the Targumim

Developing a footnote in his commentary on the *Genesis Apocryphon*,²³¹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer (1920–2016) proposed a five-phase history of the Aramaic language that has since become standard: 1) Old Aramaic (925–700 B.C.E.); 2) Official Aramaic (700–200 B.C.E.); 3) Middle Aramaic (200 B.C.E.–200 C.E.); 4) Late Aramaic (200–700 C.E.); and 5) Modern Aramaic.²³² The current scholarly consensus would place the language of Targum Onqelos and Targum Jonathan within Middle Aramaic (or what Jonas C. Greenfield [1926–1995], in an equally influential article, called “Standard Literary Aramaic”),²³³ while the others would belong to Late Aramaic. This periodization raises some problems when they are applied to the Targumim, since there is a clear difference between the language of Targum Neofiti on the one hand and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Writings Targumim on the other. The study of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Writings Targumim led Kaufman to propose a new dialect, Late Jewish Literary Aramaic.²³⁴ The dialects of the Targumim are therefore quite diverse. For example, each of the three complete Pentateuchal Targumim (Onqelos, Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan) represents a different dialect as well as a different historical phase of Aramaic.

The current consensus was the process of a long development. Goshen-Gottstein, writing in 1978, already outlined three developments in the debate over Onqelos in “The Language of Targum Onqelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic.”²³⁵ In the earliest period, which he deemed the “Geiger–Nöldeke” period, Geiger’s belief that Onqelos was a Babylonian composition was pitted against the view of the prominent Semiticist Theodor Nöldeke (1836–1930) that Onqelos was a Palestinian Targum with Babylonian coloring. The second phase stretched from Dalman to the 1950s. Dalman followed Nöldeke and used Targum Onqelos as the basis for his grammar of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, but he believed that Onqelos reflected an artificial, literary form rather than the vulgar spoken tongue – the “diglossia” of the article title. Kahle, meanwhile, supported Geiger’s position without using Geiger’s arguments: He believed that Onqelos (and Jonathan) were unknown in Palestine until the end of the first millennium C.E. Goshen-Gottstein’s third period follows the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which caused scholars to embrace (again) a Palestinian origin for the Targumim.

²³⁰ Fraade, “Locating Targum,” 78.

²³¹ J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 19–20 note 60.

²³² J.A. Fitzmyer, “The Phases of the Aramaic Language,” in J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 57–84.

²³³ J.C. Greenfield, “Standard Literary Aramaic,” in *Actes du premier Congrès internationale de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris 16–19 juillet 1969* (eds. A. Caquot and D. Cohen; Janua Linguarum Series Practica 159; The Hague: Mouton 1974), 280–89.

²³⁴ S.A. Kaufman, “Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic,” *Aramaic Studies* 11 (2013): 1–26. Originally published in M. Bar-Asher et al. (eds.), *Moshe Goshen-Gottstein – In Memoriam* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1993), 363–82 [Hebr.].

²³⁵ M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Language of Targum Onqelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic,” *JNES* 37 (1978): 169–79.

This final shift owes much to Kutscher's above-mentioned (@1.3.1.6) study of the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, where he compared it to the language of Targum Onqelos. According to him, both works were written in a literary dialect that died out in the West (but not the East) following the Jewish revolts.²³⁶ Tal, Kutscher's student, reached a similar conclusion in his now classic study of the language of Targum Jonathan, dating it (and, by extension, Onqelos) to before the Bar Kochba revolt of 135 C.E.²³⁷ These conclusions have proved durable. Most scholars today posit that a proto-Onqelos (and Jonathan) was composed in Palestine but received its final redaction in Babylon around the fourth century C.E.²³⁸

Cook offered a different solution.²³⁹ Noting the slender evidence Kutscher provided to tie Onqelos exclusively to Western Aramaic, he advocated a "dialect continuum" between Eastern and Western Aramaic and placed Onqelos in a new category he christened "Central Aramaic." He imagined the geographic provenance of Central Aramaic as a triangle with Damascus, Edessa, and Assur as the points. Syriac, which is classed as "Eastern Aramaic" yet remains distinct from the language of the Babylonian Talmud, would also fall into this category. Christa Müller-Kessler (born 1957) also departed from the *status quo* when she suggested that Babylonian magic bowls reflect the dialect of Onqelos, and so a Babylonian provenance for the Targum was not out of the question.²⁴⁰ Alexander, in a recent publication, criticized both positions. While he found Cook's proposition attractive, it was lacking on historical grounds: What Jewish group existed in Upper Mesopotamia with the scholarship and resources to produce a work like Onqelos (or, *mutatis mutandis*, Jonathan)?²⁴¹ Against Müller-Kessler's conclusion that Onqelos' dialect was transferred from Palestine to Babylon after the destruction of the Second Temple, Alexander suggested that the reason for the spread of such a dialect was the popularity of Onqelos and Jonathan, which remain Palestinian in their exegetical substance.²⁴²

The dialect of Onqelos frankly remains an open question. The incontrovertible data is puzzling: It was edited in Babylonia, and yet its language is distinct from that of the Babylonian Talmud. If it was a product of Babylonian Jews, why is it written in a different dialect than the Talmud? If it was a product of Palestine, why are references so scarce (or even non-existent) in later Palestinian Jewish literature? It should also be noted that the dialects of the Qumran "Targumim," which are used as the basis for evaluating the date and provenance of Onqelos and Jonathan, are by no means settled. Muraoka, for example, has advocated the Eastern origin of 11QtgJob (11Q10; @I.11.3.3.2),²⁴³ leading David Shepherd (born 1972) to warn that a text's provenance is not always a good indicator of its dialect.²⁴⁴

The dialect of Targum Neofiti raises a different set of issues. In this case, there is no serious dispute about the Targum's language, since there is universal agreement that it is written in

²³⁶ Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," 10 note 44.

²³⁷ A. Tal, *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and Its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 1; Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University Press, 1975) [Hebr.].

²³⁸ Flesher-Chilton, **The Targums*, 84.

²³⁹ E.M. Cook, "A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (eds. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Pres, 1994), 142–56.

²⁴⁰ Müller-Kessler, "The Earliest Evidence for Targum Onqelos."

²⁴¹ P.S. Alexander, "The Aramaic Bible in the East," *Aramaic Studies* 17 (2019): 39–66 (42–43)

²⁴² Alexander, "The Aramaic Bible," 52.

²⁴³ T. Muraoka, "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," *JJS* 25 (1974): 425–43.

²⁴⁴ Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*, 29.

Palestinian Aramaic. The controversy over Neofiti concerns rather the date of its dialect. Díez Macho insisted that the Targum reflected the spoken Aramaic of the first century C.E. and so was distinct from the Palestinian Aramaic of the Jerusalem Talmud and the Midrashim.²⁴⁵ Kaufman agreed with him to the extent that the literary language of one period reflects the spoken language of an earlier period, meaning that Neofiti might well approximate the spoken Aramaic of first-century C.E. Palestine, but the written Aramaic of that period would be closer to Onqelos and Jonathan.²⁴⁶ Tal partially supported Díez Macho's contention on one point, that Neofiti's dialect was earlier than that of the Jerusalem Talmud and Midrashim (but later than the first century C.E.).²⁴⁷

The dialect of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Writings Targumim represents yet a third debate within Targum studies. Even before its publication, Pseudo-Jonathan received the designation "Targum Yerushalmi," which, given the reputation of the Palestinian Targum in the Middle Ages, may have had more to do with its expanded text than its language. Scholars since at least the nineteenth century noticed that Pseudo-Jonathan shares readings not only with the Fragment Targum ("Targum Yerushalmi II") but with Targum Onqelos.²⁴⁸ How, then, does one account for this "Babylonian" substratum? Some, such as Gerard J. Kuiper (1933–2014), claimed that Onqelos was derived from Pseudo-Jonathan.²⁴⁹ However, it is apparent that Onqelos was one of the *sources* of Pseudo-Jonathan. Cook, in his dissertation, called Pseudo-Jonathan the "Conflate Targum," combining Onqelos with a genuine Palestinian Targum.²⁵⁰ Kaufman reached a similar conclusion but extended it to the Writings Targumim – they were written in a dialect he deemed Late Jewish Literary Aramaic.²⁵¹ He has since used the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (@4.2.2.1.3) to pinpoint the core representatives of this dialect: Pseudo-Jonathan, Psalms, Job, and Targum Sheni to Esther.²⁵²

1.3.2.3 The Dating of the Targumim

The dating of each Targum is closely linked to its dialect. In the case of Onqelos and Jonathan, there is little to add to the previous discussion. The external evidence for both (citations in the Babylonian Talmud and the Babylonian magic bowls) places their *terminus ante quem* firmly in the fourth to sixth centuries C.E., while the *terminus post quem*, owing to their unusual dialect, would be shortly after the Second Temple period. The idiosyncratic opinions of a few researchers, such as Israel Drazin (born 1935) (fourth century C.E. for Onqelos, after the

²⁴⁵ Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 31–73.

²⁴⁶ Kaufman, "Methodology," 122–23.

²⁴⁷ A. Tal, "The Dialects of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch," *Sefarad* 46 (1986): 441–48.

²⁴⁸ J. Bassfreund, "Das Fragmenten-Targum zum Pentateuch: Sein Ursprung und Charakter und sein Verhältniss zu den anderen pentateuchischen Targumim," *MGWJ* 40 (1896): 1–14, 49–67, 97–109, 145–163, 241–252, 352–365, 396–405 (56).

²⁴⁹ G.J. Kuiper, *The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Its Relationship to Targum Onkelos* (Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum 9; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1972).

²⁵⁰ E.M. Cook, "Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum" (PhD diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1986), 48.

²⁵¹ Kaufman, "Late Jewish Literary Aramaic."

²⁵² S.A. Kaufman "The Dialectology of Late Jewish Literary Aramaic," *Aramaic Studies* 11 (2013): 145–48.

Tannaitic Midrashim)²⁵³ or Samson H. Levey (1913–1998) (ninth or tenth century C.E. for Jonathan, contemporaneous with Saadia Gaon)²⁵⁴ are outliers.

By contrast, the dating of Neofiti has been the source of controversy. In conformity with his views on Neofiti's language, Díez Macho believed that the substance of Neofiti was pre-Christian and offered several arguments for his position.²⁵⁵ Le Déaut later condensed these into seven major points:²⁵⁶

- 1) The presence of numerous passages contrary to the Halakha of the Mishnah
- 2) Messianic interpretations (which Rabbis would have suppressed in the face of Christianity)
- 3) Historical and geographic references from before the second century C.E.
- 4) The absence of manifestly "late additions" as in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
- 5) The presence of Greek and Latin words from the Hellenistic period
- 6) Parallel expressions and ideas in the New Testament
- 7) A Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic Text

These arguments became something like a creedal statement for the Kahle School. McNamara, when discussing the date of the "Palestinian Targum" in *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, simply refers to what Le Déaut had written on the subject.²⁵⁷

York dismantled each of these arguments in his article "The Dating of Targumic Literature."²⁵⁸ Many of them are simply irrelevant. Anti-Mishnaic does not mean pre-Mishnaic, since rabbinic literature includes many contrary opinions (there is also the issue, mentioned above [1.3.2.1], whether targumic literature is rabbinic). Messianic traditions are found in all the Targumim, not just the Palestinian ones (and so the Palestinian Targumim cannot be said to be earlier on this basis). Old geographical names, New Testament parallels, and Greek and Latin words – although consistent with a Second Temple date – are not proof of a Targum's antiquity. The absence of late material and a non-Masoretic *Vorlage* are similarly inconclusive. York's article was determinative in reversing the trend of assigning Neofiti an early date; today it is more commonly dated to the fourth or fifth century C.E. (1.2.4.3.4.2).

Pseudo-Jonathan has undergone a trajectory similar to Neofiti (1.2.4.3.4.1). In this case, Pseudo-Jonathan has undeniably "late" features, such as references to the six orders of the Mishnah (Exod 26:9; 36:16), the city of Constantinople (Num 24:19, 24), and, most famously, the names Aisha and Fatima, the wife and daughter of Muhammad (Gen 21:21). The last feature, in particular, means that the Targum cannot be earlier than the early Islamic period. Thus Shinan, a specialist of this Targum, assigned it to the seventh or eighth century C.E.²⁵⁹ The "late features" are occasionally dismissed as glosses so that the Targum can be dated to an earlier period.

²⁵³ I. Drazin, "Dating Targum Onkelos by Means of the Tannaitic Midrashim," *JJS* 50 (1999): 246–58.

²⁵⁴ S.H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets," *VT* 21 (1971): 186–96.

²⁵⁵ A. Díez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the Other Targums," in *Congress Volume Oxford 1959* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 225–36.

²⁵⁶ Le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale*, 41–46.

²⁵⁷ McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum*, 64–66.

²⁵⁸ York, "The Dating of Targumic Literature."

²⁵⁹ For example, A. Shinan, *The Embroidered Targum: The Aggadah in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992), 198 [Hebr.].

Hayward, for example, has consistently defended a pre-Islamic date for the Targum.²⁶⁰ One issue where he came to blows with Shinan revolves around the Targum's relationship to the late midrashic work *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer* (eighth century C.E.), which shares many unique traditions with Pseudo-Jonathan. According to Hayward, the two works could have separately derived their traditions from other late antique sources.²⁶¹ Shinan, however, has indicated that the Targum presumes traditions that are only reported in full in *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer*.²⁶² On a different note, Beverly P. Mortensen (born 1939), a student of Flesher, dismissed the Islamic references in favor of a priestly milieu for the Targum,²⁶³ a position that Flesher himself has supported.²⁶⁴ According to her, the Targum could have only been written during the brief rule of Julian, the last pagan emperor of Rome (r. 361–363 C.E.), who threatened to rebuild the Temple as an affront to Christianity.

Recently, Leeor Gottlieb (born 1972)²⁶⁵ and Gavin McDowell (born 1985)²⁶⁶ have independently, and using different sets of data, reached the conclusion that Pseudo-Jonathan could not have been composed prior to the twelfth century. Gottlieb indicated that Pseudo-Jonathan seems unfamiliar with biblical geography despite being a “Palestinian” Targum. More significantly, the work of Menahem b. Solomon (died after 1143) has important parallels to Pseudo-Jonathan – yet Menahem never cites the Targum by name or even draws upon Targumic material for some of these parallels. The implication is that Pseudo-Jonathan uses Menahem's work. McDowell, for his part, returned to the issue of Pseudo-Jonathan and *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer*. He argued that while the two works share much in common, *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer* is not cognizant of the Palestinian Targum tradition (what Flesher would call the “proto-PT” source), which is fundamental to Pseudo-Jonathan. Furthermore, *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer* is not even the latest potential source of Pseudo-Jonathan; the Targum is also closely connected to the *Chronicles of Moses*, first cited in the *Arukh* at the beginning of the twelfth century.

In contrast to Pseudo-Jonathan, the Targumim to the Writings have always been considered late. They are generally recognized as later than the Babylonian Talmud, but scholars have hesitated to date them much later than the early Islamic period based on the assumption that Aramaic had ceased to be a living language (and, hence, the Targumim could no longer serve their liturgical purpose). Gottlieb has called this assumption into question, arguing that not all Targumim served a liturgical function and that both Aramaic compositions and the study of the Aramaic language continued into the Middle Ages.²⁶⁷ Rashi, for example, presumes that his readers know and

²⁶⁰ See, for example, the essays collected in Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture*, 107–278 (“Part Two: Dating Targum Pseudo-Jonathan”).

²⁶¹ R. Hayward, “Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 215–46.

²⁶² Shinan, *The Embroidered Targum*, 176–85; A. Shinan, “The Relationship between Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Midrash Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer,” *Teudah* 11 (1996): 231–43 [Hebr.].

²⁶³ B.P. Mortensen, *The Priesthood in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Renewing the Profession* (2 vols.; Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 4; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1.12.

²⁶⁴ P.V.M. Flesher, “The Literary Legacy of the Priests? The Pentateuchal Targums of Israel in their Social and Linguistic Context,” in *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins until 200 CE: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001* (eds. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; Coniectanea biblica 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 467–508.

²⁶⁵ Gottlieb, “Pseudo-Jonathan's Origins.”

²⁶⁶ McDowell, “The Date and Provenance of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.”

²⁶⁷ L. Gottlieb, “Composition of Targums after the Decline of Aramaic as a Spoken Language,” *Aramaic Studies* 12 (2014): 1–8.

understand Targum. It should come as little surprise that a work like Targum Chronicles could have been written after the demise of Aramaic as a vernacular.

1.3.2.4 The Targumim and the New Testament

Although there is a four-hundred-year history of the Christian study of Targum prior to the twentieth century, the discovery of new Targum manuscripts and the claims of the Kahle School reinvigorated the use of targumic literature in New Testament studies. A key work is McNamara's *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (1966; 2nd ed. 1978).²⁶⁸ He documents some of the most common parallels between the two corpora, such as the alleged citation of Targum Ps 68:19 in Eph 4:8, the reference to Jannes and Jambres in 2 Tim 3:8 (cf. Pseudo-Jonathan to Exod 1:5; Exod 7:11; and Num 22:22), and shared expressions such as "Second Death," "Our Father in Heaven," and the ever-present "Word (*Memra*) of the Lord" (surprisingly, there is no discussion of Jesus' cry of dereliction in Matt 27:46 – *Eli, eli, lama sabachthani* "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" – and Targum Ps 22:2). McNamara's monograph was preceded by Le Déaut's *La Nuit Pascale* (1963), which takes a slightly different approach.²⁶⁹ He isolates one targumic tradition – the "Poem of the Four Nights" in Exod 12:42 – and analyzes it in relation to early Jewish tradition (with clear implications for New Testament study). These two books were the first monographs on Targum following the major discoveries of the twentieth century.

Both authors addressed the subject in subsequent works destined for general audiences: Le Déaut's *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament* (1965), which was later translated as *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (1982),²⁷⁰ and McNamara's *Targum and Testament* (1972), which he recently updated as *Targum and Testament Revisited* (2010).²⁷¹ At about the same time, McNamara published a collection of his targumic studies, *Targum and New Testament* (2011). It is notable for having a large section dedicated to the history of research.²⁷²

Despite the criticisms of the Kahle School in the 1970s, study of the Targum and the New Testament has continued. Most research lying at the intersection of the two fields, as attested in Forestell's bibliography, is New Testament scholarship that uses targumic literature as one of several background sources rather than works focused specifically on the Targum. For example, Black, a prominent member of the Kahle School, incorporated the evidence of Qumran and Neofiti into the third edition of his *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (1967).²⁷³ Of particular note is Chilton, who has written books on both Targum and New Testament: He studied the Isaiah Targum as part of the fabric of Second Temple Jewish literature and then examined the same Targum as background to the preaching of Jesus.²⁷⁴ In the *Critical Introduction* he co-authored with Flesher, he accepted the criticisms of the Kahle School while simultaneously lamenting the view that, because the extant Targumim postdate the New

²⁶⁸ McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum*.

²⁶⁹ Le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale*.

²⁷⁰ R. Le Déaut, *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament: Le témoignage des versions araméennes* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965); R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (trans. S.F. Miletic; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1982).

²⁷¹ McNamara, *Targum and Testament*.

²⁷² McNamara, *Targum and New Testament*.

²⁷³ M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 35–49.

²⁷⁴ B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSup 23; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982); B.D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah* (London: SPCK, 1984).

Testament writings, they have nothing to say about the Second Temple period. He outlines four kinds of comparisons (shared wording, exegesis, concepts, and themes) that can be fruitful for using Targum to illuminate the world of the New Testament.²⁷⁵

One persistent subject of interest is the study of the circumlocutions for the Divine – *Memra* “word,” *Shekinah* “divine presence,” or Glory – that are taken to be intermediaries or divine hypostases after the manner of the *Logos* in the prologue to John’s Gospel (1:1–18). This subject has fascinated Christians since the days of the Polyglot Bibles, and it was already a robust topic of debate in the early twentieth century.²⁷⁶ The studies since 1950 (with the additional data provided by Neofiti) are legion. A few notable examples are Domingo Muñoz-León’s (1931–2021) two hefty tomes on the *Memra* and the *Shekinah* in the Targumim;²⁷⁷ Hayward’s *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra*;²⁷⁸ Andrew Chester’s (born 1948) *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim*;²⁷⁹ and, most recently, John Ronning’s *The Jewish Targums and John’s Logos Theology*.²⁸⁰ The *Memra* is also central to Daniel Boyarin’s (born 1946) *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*.²⁸¹ Their conclusions are not uniform. Muñoz-León and Hayward disagree on the exact nature of the *Memra*. Chester is entirely skeptical that the term was used in any consistent manner in the Targumim. Ronning, on the other hand, enthusiastically upholds the targumic *Memra* as the forerunner to John’s *Logos*, and Boyarin rhetorically asks, “If the *Memra* is just a name that allows one to avoid asserting that God himself has created, appeared, supported, and saved, and thus preserves his absolute transcendence, then who, after all, did the actual creating, appearing, supporting, saving?”²⁸²

The modern era of Targum studies has also produced several volumes on topics of interest to New Testament specialists that are squarely focused on targumic themes rather than early Christianity. Among them are Levey’s *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation* (1974),²⁸³ Klein’s *Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim of the Pentateuch* (1982),²⁸⁴ and Harry Sysling’s (born 1947) *Tehiyyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the*

²⁷⁵ Flesher-Chilton, **The Targums*, 385–408.

²⁷⁶ See, for example, the opposing conclusions of G.F. Moore, “Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: *Memra*, *Shekinah*, *Metatron*,” *HTR* 15 (1922): 41–85, and G.H. Box, “The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on *Memra* and *Shekinah*,” *JQR* 23 (1932): 103–19.

²⁷⁷ D. Muñoz-León, *Dios -Palabra: Memrá en los Targumín del Pentateuco* (Granada: Institución San Jerónimo, 1974); D. Muñoz-León, *Gloria de la Shekiná en los Targumín del Pentateuco* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977).

²⁷⁸ R. Hayward, *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra* (Totowa: Allanheld, Osmun & Co., 1981).

²⁷⁹ A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ 14; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).

²⁸⁰ J. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John’s Logos Theology* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010).

²⁸¹ D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004).

²⁸² Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 117.

²⁸³ S.H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation: The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (New York: Ktav, 1974).

²⁸⁴ M.L. Klein, *Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1982) [Hebr.].

Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature (1996).²⁸⁵

McNamara, reviewing his career, noted a recent decline in the number of studies dedicated to New Testament and Targum.²⁸⁶ While this is true, a new avenue is opening where the Targumim are studied in tandem with Second Temple literature, a category that includes, but is not limited to, the New Testament. Jan Joosten (born 1959) recently wrote a programmatic article outlining ways the Targum and Second Temple literature could be mutually illuminating without resorting to simple “parallelomania” (e.g., “targumisms” in the Septuagint).²⁸⁷ He has also co-edited two collections dedicated to Targum and Second Temple Judaism, one on *The Targums in the Light of the Second Temple Period*²⁸⁸ and a second on the more specific subject of *Septuagint, Targum and Beyond*.²⁸⁹

1.3.2.5 The Targumim and the Peshitta

The Peshitta (@I.1.3.4) is the most significant Syriac version of the Christian Bible, including the Hebrew Bible. Since Syriac is a dialect of Aramaic, the Peshitta invites comparison to the Jewish Aramaic versions of the Bible. The mysterious origin of the Peshitta has also led to the speculation that, like the Targumim, it was translated by Jews (or even Jewish Christians). This debate has not been resolved. A separate issue is the specific relationship of Targum Proverbs (@I.12.3.3) to the Peshitta translation of the same book (@I.12.3.4). The two works manifest close similarities that have raised questions of dependence. In this particular case, the majority of scholars favor Jewish dependence on the Peshitta rather than the reverse (@I.12.3.3.5.2; see also the discussion below).

Peter (Piet) Dirksen (born 1928), in his history of the comparative study of Peshitta and Targum,²⁹⁰ traces the origin of the modern debate to the 1859 dissertation of Josef Perles (1835–1894), who advocated a Jewish origin for the Peshitta based on the presence of Jewish exegetical traditions (without, however, claiming that the Peshitta depends on a Targum).²⁹¹ From this fount, Dirksen delineated three trends in the research of the relationship between the Peshitta (especially the Pentateuch) and the Targumim:²⁹²

1. The Peshitta Pentateuch depends on a Targum (usually Palestinian).
2. The Peshitta Pentateuch is an independent translation of the Hebrew, but the translator also consulted Targum Onqelos.
3. The translator was influenced by Jewish exegetical traditions without recourse to a Targum.

²⁸⁵ H. Sysling, *Tehiyyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (TSAJ 57; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

²⁸⁶ M. McNamara, “Fifty-Five Years of Targum Study,” 24.

²⁸⁷ J. Joosten, “How Old is the Targumic Tradition? Traces of the Jewish Targum in the Second Temple Period, and Vice Versa,” in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions*. (eds. A. Piquer Otero and P. Torijano Morales; Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1; Leiden: Brill, 2017), 143–59.

²⁸⁸ T. Legrand and J. Joosten (eds.), *The Targums in the Light of Traditions of the Second Temple Period* (JSJSup 167; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

²⁸⁹ D. Shepherd, J. Joosten, and M. van der Meer (eds.), *Septuagint, Targum and Beyond: Comparing Aramaic and Greek Versions from Jewish Antiquity* (JSJSup 193; Leiden: Brill, 2019).

²⁹⁰ Dirksen, “The Old Testament Peshitta.”

²⁹¹ J. Perles, *Meletemata Peschitthoniana: Dissertatio inauguralis* (Breslau: Grassius, 1859).

²⁹² Dirksen, “The Old Testament Peshitta,” 265.

The most significant development after Perles' study was the formulation of what became known as the Kahle-Baumstark hypothesis, named after Kahle and Carl Anton Baumstark (1872–1948), who both advocated a West Aramaic (i.e., Palestinian) origin for the Peshitta. The inciting incident for this hypothesis was the discovery of the Palestinian Targumim in the Cairo Genizah. Baumstark, in his *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (1922), had initially advocated Onqelos' influence on the Peshitta,²⁹³ but he changed his mind after examining the Genizah manuscripts. The fullest presentation of his opinion is his 1931 article "Peshitta und palästinensisches Targum," where he claims that some Peshitta readings can only be explained via influence from Palestinian Aramaic.²⁹⁴ He posits that both the Peshitta and Onqelos are revisions of an initially Palestinian *Urtext* whose paraphrastic nature was suppressed. Kahle put forth a similar hypothesis in his introduction to the second volume of *Masoreten des Westens*²⁹⁵ and again in *The Cairo Geniza*.²⁹⁶ According to him, the Peshitta is a rewriting of a Palestinian Targum following the conversion of the royal family of Adiabene to Judaism in the first century C.E. The targumic *Vorlage* would have been even more ancient than the exemplars found in the Genizah, which have haggadic additions.

Kahle's and Baumstark's students, Curt Peters (1905–1943)²⁹⁷ and Schaje Wohl (born 1897, date of death unknown),²⁹⁸ both wrote dissertations intended to substantiate their teachers' claims with hard data. Unfortunately, in attempting to isolate unique readings of the Targumim and Peshitta against the Masoretic Text, both overlooked other versions such as the Septuagint. Arthur Vööbus (1909–1988) also supported Baumstark's position in a monograph, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs* (1958), where he sought to unearth an older Syriac text behind the Peshitta (via biblical citations that deviate from the *textus receptus*) reflecting a more paraphrastic version akin to the Palestinian Targumim.²⁹⁹ According to him, the Peshitta was shorn of its targumic "pigment" over the course of several centuries.

The Kahle-Baumstark hypothesis was criticized by Preben Wernberg-Møller (1923–2016) in a pair of articles that called into question the lack of firm textual evidence.³⁰⁰ He emphasized the need for "phraseological similarity" in order to demonstrate literary dependence, whereas defenders of the hypothesis often offered only individual words as evidence. He believed that the Peshitta was translated from Hebrew, not adapted from a Targum, although he was amenable to the possibility that the Syriac translator consulted Targum Onqelos. This is, however, an unfalsifiable hypothesis. Sperber criticized the Kahle-Baumstark hypothesis from a different

²⁹³ A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1922), 18.

²⁹⁴ A. Baumstark, "Peshitta und palästinensisches Targum," *BZ* 19 (1931): 257–70.

²⁹⁵ Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Vol. 2, 3*–4*.

²⁹⁶ Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 272–73.

²⁹⁷ C. Peters, "Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs: Ihre Beziehungen untersucht in Rahmen ihrer Abweichungen vom masoretischen Text," *Mus* 48 (1935): 1–54.

²⁹⁸ S. Wohl, "Das palästinische Pentateuch-Targum: Untersuchungen zu den Geniza-Fragmenten und ihrem Verhältnis zu den übrigen Targumen und der Peschitta" (PhD diss., Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 1935).

²⁹⁹ A. Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs: Neues Licht zur Frage der Herkunft der Peschitta aus dem altpalästinischen Targum* (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 9; Stockholm: Etse, 1958).

³⁰⁰ P. Wernberg-Møller, "Some Observations on the Relationship of the Peshitta Version of the Book of Genesis to the Palestinian Targum Fragments Published by Professor Kahle, and to Targum Onkelos," *ST* 15 (1961): 128–80; P. Wernberg-Møller, "Prolegomena to a Re-examination of the Palestinian Targum Fragments of the Book of Genesis Published by P. Kahle, and their Relationship to the Peshitta," *JSS* 7 (1962): 253–66.

angle.³⁰¹ He questioned the implausibility of Baumstark's theory: Why should a translator edit and adapt a Palestinian Targum to Eastern Aramaic when it would have been more economical to simply translate anew from Hebrew? Sperber believed that Onkelos and the Peshitta belonged to the same family of translations (that is, they have a common ancestor), but he draws no further conclusions.

The research begun by Perles came full circle with the monograph of Yeshayahu Maori (1937–2021), *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (1995).³⁰² Maori's position is identical to Perles'. The Peshitta was translated from Hebrew and not from another Aramaic dialect, but it was translated in a Jewish environment, reflected by the numerous concurrences between the Syriac text and Jewish exegetical tradition. He does not posit direct dependence on any Targum. In fact, he excluded the Targumim from the main body of the work (chapters 6–8) as one of his (rabbinic) Jewish exegetical sources, although the eleventh chapter addresses the issue of targumic parallels.³⁰³

The last major publication on this issue was a collection edited by Flesher under the simple title *Targum and Peshitta* (1998), containing nine studies, generally skeptical in tone. Two are of special interest. The first is Marinus D. Koster's (born 1933) "The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta," where he takes aim at the arguments of Vööbus in particular.³⁰⁴ Vööbus claimed that the Old Syriac was a "wild" text – like the greatly expanded Palestinian Targumim – which had diminished with time to become the literal translation found in the Peshitta. Koster argues that the reverse has occurred: The oldest Syriac manuscripts reflect the Masoretic Text; later manuscripts deviate from the Hebrew model. The differences reflect the final, not the initial, form of the Syriac text, and consequently there is no targumic stratum, no "Old Syriac" behind the Peshitta, and no revision of this Old Syriac to create the Peshitta.

The other article of interest is Robert J. Owens' (1921–2014) "The Relationship Between the Targum and Peshitta Texts of the Book of Proverbs: *status quaestionis*," where he gives the history of the other side of Targum/Peshitta studies, one where there has never been a serious doubt of dependence.³⁰⁵ The first full study was Johann August Dathe's (1731–1791) *De ratione consensus versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum Salomonis* (1764), published a full century before Perles' study.³⁰⁶ Whereas Perles argued for Jewish influence on the Peshitta Pentateuch, Dathe found the reverse relationship in the case of Proverbs (@I.12.3.3; @I.12.3.4): The Targum depends on the Syriac! This thesis, with its provocative conclusion that Jews would depend on a Christian translation, was challenged by Siegmund Maybaum (1844–1919) in

³⁰¹ A. Sperber, "Peshitta und Onkelos," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut* (eds. S.W. Baron and A. Marx; New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1935), 554–64. An English version of this study appears in Sperber, **Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4B.409–17.

³⁰² Y. Maori, *The Peshitta Versions of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (Publications of the Perry Foundation; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995) [Hebr.].

³⁰³ See Maori, "The Peshitta Pentateuch and the Pentateuchal Targums," for an adapted English version of this chapter.

³⁰⁴ Koster, "The Origins of the Peshitta."

³⁰⁵ Owens, "The Targum and Peshitta Texts of the Book of Proverbs."

³⁰⁶ J.A. Dathe, *De ratione consensus versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum Salomonis* (Leipzig: Officina Langenhemia, 1764).

1871.³⁰⁷ He outlined the essential characteristics of the Targum: its non-haggadic character (compared to the other Targumim to the Writings), the strong Syriac character of its language, and its *verbatim* agreement with at least 300 of the book's approximately 900 verses. Nevertheless, he believed that the Peshitta depended on the Targum. His conclusion was refuted in the very same publication by no less an authority than Nöldeke, who doubted the mixture of Jewish Aramaic and Syriac could constitute a living language.³⁰⁸ He believed that the Targum was a Syriac text that had been "Aramaized" by a Jewish scribe (one thinks of Kaufman's Late Jewish Literary Aramaic and its Syriac substratum).

Nöldeke had also noticed that both Targum and Peshitta frequently agree with the Septuagint (@I.12.3.1) against the Masoretic Text (@I.12.2.2), something he believed was inherent to the Syriac. Other scholars have observed the same phenomenon but came to different conclusions. Armand Kaminka (1866–1950) took the Targum's agreements with the Septuagint as a sign of its great antiquity, assigning it to the second or third century B.C.E.³⁰⁹ Joosten, however, found that Syriac Proverbs is partially translated from the Septuagint, reflected in double translations of the Hebrew and Greek.³¹⁰ Extrapolating from Joosten's study, one must conclude that the Targum carries over the doublets from the Syriac text.

Other major studies – notably those of Hermann Pinkuss (1867–1936),³¹¹ Ezra Z. Melamed (1903–1994),³¹² and Díez Merino³¹³ – elaborate on the conclusions first proposed by Dathe, but John F. Healey (born 1948), who translated Proverbs for McNamara's *Aramaic Bible* series, has a dissenting view. In his most recent publication on the issue, he sowed doubt over the common opinion that the Targum depends on the Syriac text, citing our lack of knowledge about the time of the Targum's redaction.³¹⁴ He also questioned the assumption that the language was an artificial dialect. He points to a variety of Aramaic dialects in late antique Northern Mesopotamia and argues that the language of Targum Proverbs is consistent with an earlier date. At the same time, he admits that this hypothesis is highly speculative, lacking in evidence, and formulated to avoid an undesirable conclusion (a Jewish translator relying on a Christian text). As Healey himself points out, Michael P. Weitzman (1946–1999) – whose posthumous *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament* dedicates the better part of a chapter to Targum – provides a few historical circumstances where Jews did consult Christian and specifically Syriac texts: Hai Gaon once dispatched a messenger to the Catholicos of Baghdad about a difficult Psalm verse (Ps 141:5b);

³⁰⁷ S. Maybaum, "Über die Sprache des Targum zu den Sprüchen und dessen Verhältniss zum Syrer," *Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* 2.1 (1871): 66–93.

³⁰⁸ T. Nöldeke, "Das Targum zu den Sprüchen von der Peschita abhängig," *Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* 2.2 (1871): 246–50.

³⁰⁹ A. Kaminka, "Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia," *HUCA* 8–9 (1931–1932): 169–91.

³¹⁰ J. Joosten, "Doublet Translations in Peshitta Proverbs," in *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden, 19–21 August 1993* (eds. P.B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij; Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 8; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 71–83.

³¹¹ H. Pinkuss, "Die syrische Übersetzung der Proverbien textkritisch und in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem masoretischen Text, den LXX und dem Targum untersucht," *ZAW* 14 (1894): 65–141, 161–222.

³¹² E. Z. Melamed, "The Targum on Proverbs," in *Memorial to H.M. Shapiro, 1902–1970* (ed. H.Z. Hirschberg; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1972), 18–91 [Hebr.].

³¹³ Díez Merino, *Targum de Proverbios*.

³¹⁴ J.F. Healey, "Targum Proverbs and the Peshitta: Reflections on the Linguistic Environment," in *Studies on the Text and Versions of the Hebrew Bible in Honour of Robert Gordon* (eds. G. Khan and D. Lipton; VTSup 149; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 325–35.

in response, the Catholicos cited the Syriac version.³¹⁵ Weitzman also draws attention to Peshitta quotations in the work of Samuel b. Nissim Masnut and Nachmanides.³¹⁶ The Targumist's use of the Peshitta is not *prima facie* impossible.

Since the dawn of the third millennium, the study of the Peshitta and the Targum has lain fallow. One measure of this disinterest is the recent collection *Jews and Syriac Christianity* (2020), which has no studies on the Peshitta and Targum.³¹⁷ The same collection demonstrates a lively interest in the intersection between the two religious communities, showing that there is potential for a renaissance of Peshitta/Targum studies, though probably drawn along different lines than simple questions of dependence.

1.3.2.6 Targum Jonathan and the Tosefta Targumim

The Pentateuchal Targumim dominate the field of Targum studies, but Targum Jonathan to the Prophets has benefited from a recent explosion in interest, much of it inspired by the Kampen School and their study of the textual history of Targum Jonathan, especially the Book of Samuel. The one general book on the whole Targum is Leivy Smolar's (1937–2007) and Moses Aberbach's (1924–2007) reprint of Churgin's short study *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, to which they appended a book-length preface of their own, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (1983).³¹⁸ Robert P. Gordon (born 1945) also published a series of short *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets from Nahum to Malachi* (1994), based on his dissertation from two decades earlier.³¹⁹

Otherwise, the trend has been to publish lengthy commentaries on the Aramaic version of a single biblical book. Individual monographs, many quite substantial (500 pages or more), have been written on the Targum to Judges,³²⁰ Samuel,³²¹ Kings,³²² and Zephaniah.³²³ These volumes are not of equal value. Carol Dray's (1943–2007) monograph on *Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings* focuses on translation issues and does not discuss the date, manuscripts, or text of the Targum (she relies on Sperber's edition). Ahuvah Ho's (born 1943) lengthy commentary on *The Targum of Zephaniah* was severely criticized by Hector M. Patmore (born 1981), who drew attention to her confusion between a textual tradition and a manuscript's *mise-en-page*, leading to an arbitrary grouping of manuscripts and an unsatisfactory stemma.³²⁴

³¹⁵ Weitzman, **Syriac Version*, 110.

³¹⁶ Weitzman, **Syriac Version*, 121–22, 160–62.

³¹⁷ A. M. Butts and S. Gross (eds.), *Jews and Syriac Christians: Intersections across the First Millennium* (TSAJ 180; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020).

³¹⁸ L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav, 1983).

³¹⁹ Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets*.

³²⁰ Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*.

³²¹ Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *The Targum of Samuel*. See also R.J. Kutty, *Studies in the Syntax of Targum Jonathan to Samuel* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 30; Leuven: Peeters, 2010); Patmore, *The Transmission of Targum Jonathan*; V. Condrea, *Syntactic Studies in Targum Aramaic: A Text-Linguistic Reading of 1 Samuel* (Gorgias Biblical Studies 71; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2020).

³²² C.A. Dray, *Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 5; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

³²³ A. Ho, *The Targum of Zephaniah: Manuscripts and Commentary* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 7; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

³²⁴ Patmore, *The Transmission of Targum Jonathan*, 49–52.

Another trend has been the study of the Tosefta Targumim, marginal additions to Targum Jonathan often written in Palestinian Aramaic. Kasher published the relevant material in his *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets* (cited above, @1.3.1.6). Alberdina Houtman (born 1956) and Sysling – both alumni of the Kampen School – wrote a volume on these *Alternative Targum Traditions* as part of the school’s work on illuminating the textual history of Targum Jonathan.³²⁵ The book is also intended as a means of broadening the work of Kasher and his mentor Goshen-Gottstein (including their *Fragments of Lost Targumim*) to a public that does not have access to their Hebrew-language studies. Its primary focus is Targum Jonathan to Samuel. Alinda Damsma (PhD 2008) has performed a similar feat for the Toseftot in Targum Ezekiel.³²⁶ The origin and purpose of these Toseftot is still a mystery (Did they, as Zunz supposed, once constitute a complete Palestinian Targum to the Prophets?), so the increased interest in them is most welcome.

1.3.2.7 The Targumim to the Writings

The publication of several new editions of the Writings Targumim has stimulated more scholarship on these generally neglected works. Targum Proverbs (@I.12.3.3.) was discussed above under “The Targumim and the Peshitta” (@1.3.2.5) but Job (@I.11.3.3),³²⁷ Psalms (@I.10.3.3),³²⁸ Esther,³²⁹ Qohelet,³³⁰ Lamentations,³³¹ Ruth,³³² Song of Songs (@I.13–17.1.3),³³³ and Chronicles (@I.20.3.3)³³⁴ have now received at least one monograph, to say nothing of journal articles, the editions and commentaries of the Barcelona School, and the introductions to the translations in the *Aramaic Bible* series.

1.3.2.8 The Samaritan Targum (@2.6.2; @I.1.3.3.1.3; @I.2.4.4)

The Samaritan Targum stands apart from the others.³³⁵ While the Hebrew version of the Samaritan Pentateuch is well-known, its Aramaic translation is comparatively obscure and sometimes passes unmentioned even in major works of Samaritan scholarship. Like other aspects of Samaritan studies, our knowledge of the Targum is hindered by *lacunae* in our knowledge of

³²⁵ Houtman and Sysling, *Alternative Targum Traditions*.

³²⁶ A. Damsma, *The Targumic Toseftot to Ezekiel* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 13; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

³²⁷ R. Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of the Book of Job* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1979) [Hebr.].

³²⁸ T. Edwards, *Exegesis in the Targum of The Psalms: The Old, the New, and the Rewritten* (Gorgias Dissertations 28; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007).

³²⁹ B. Ego, *Targum Scheni zu Ester: Übersetzung, Kommentar und theologische Deutung* (TSAJ 54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

³³⁰ E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of Qohelet* (New York: Hermon, 1978). Levine has also published studies of Ruth (*The Aramaic Version of Ruth* [AnBib 58; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973]), Lamentations (*The Aramaic Version of Lamentations* [New York: Hermon, 1976]), and (from the Prophets) Jonah (*The Aramaic Version of Jonah* [New York: Hermon, 1975]).

³³¹ C.M.M. Brady, *The Rabbinic Targum of Lamentations: Vindicating God* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 3; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

³³² C.M.M. Brady, *The Proselyte and the Prophet: Character Development in Targum Ruth* (Supplement to Aramaic Studies 14; Leiden: Brill, 2017).

³³³ A.W. Litke, *Targum Song of Songs and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic: Language, Lexicon, Text, and Translation* (Supplements to Aramaic Studies 15; Leiden: Brill, 2019).

³³⁴ L. Gottlieb, *Targum Chronicles and Its Place Among the Late Targums* (Supplements to Aramaic Studies 16; Leiden: Brill, 2020).

³³⁵ For further information, see Tal, “The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: Its Distinctive Characteristics,” and Tal, “The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch.”

Samaritan history. Only eight manuscripts of the Targum have survived—and only one of them in a complete form—the oldest of which dates from the twelfth century, after Arabic had replaced Aramaic as the vernacular. The Targum was still copied by scribes, since it was often transmitted with the Hebrew and Arabic versions of the Samaritan Pentateuch, but by the fourteenth century the Targum was removed from the liturgy. Samaritans continued to copy targumic manuscripts until at least the nineteenth century, sometimes at the behest of European scholars.

European knowledge of the Samaritan Targum begins in 1616 when Pietro della Valle (1586–1652) brought a copy from Damascus to Rome. This manuscript, a triglot with the Samaritan Pentateuch in its Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic versions, was no more ancient than 1514. It was first published by Jean Morin (1591–1659) in the sixth volume of the Paris Polyglot (1645),³³⁶ and then it was reprinted, with needless emendations by Edmund Castell (1606–1686), in the London Polyglot (1657).³³⁷ These early editions used the paleo-Hebrew Samaritan alphabet. Adolf Brüll (1846–1908) published the same text in the square Hebrew script in 1875.³³⁸ It served as the “vulgate” text for European scholars for centuries even though it was not a good text of the Targum. Its language reflected the intrusive influence of Hebrew (the liturgical language) and Arabic (the vernacular), and it abounded in strange words. Julius Heinrich Petermann (1801–1876) made the first attempt at a complete critical edition, using four manuscripts he obtained in Nablus and collating them with the printed text already known to European scholars.³³⁹ The manuscripts he used, however, were not ancient but were produced by the local Samaritans at his request. This edition was roundly criticized. Tal’s critical edition (1981–1983) is now the definitive text and will remain so for the foreseeable future.³⁴⁰

1.3.2.9 Neo-Aramaic Targumim

The most recent body of literature—and perhaps the most obscure—is the Neo-Aramaic Targumim of the Jews of Kurdistan. The Neo-Aramaic translations, which were initially transmitted orally, found their way into writing at the behest of Israeli scholars who requested that their religious leaders (*hakhamim*) record them in their local dialects.³⁴¹ Consequently, we now have large portions of the Hebrew Bible in the Neo-Aramaic dialects of (at least) Zakho, Amidya, Dihok, Nerwa, Urmia, and Arbel/Rewanduz.

It is unclear whether these texts should be classed as Targumim in the stricter sense or whether they are more like biblical translations into any other Jewish vernacular. The Neo-Aramaic translations are not used in the liturgy but in the school as a means of learning Hebrew. To this end, they follow Hebrew instead of Neo-Aramaic syntax. They are therefore written in an

³³⁶ Le Jay, **Biblia*.

³³⁷ Walton, **Polyglotta*.

³³⁸ A. Brüll, *Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch: Zum ersten Male in hebraeischer Quadratschrift: Nebst einem Anhang textkritischen Inhalts* (Frankfurt a.M.: W. Erras, 1873–1876).

³³⁹ J.H. Petermann and K. Vollers, *Pentateuchus Samaritanus ad fidem librorum manuscriptorum Nablusianus repertorum: ed. et varias lectiones adscripsit* (5 vols.; Berlin: Moeser, 1872–1891).

³⁴⁰ A. Tal, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition* (3 vols.; Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 4–6; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1980–1983) [Hebr.]. Tal has also written *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* (2 vols.; HO 1.50; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

³⁴¹ M. Rees, *Lishan Didan, Targum Didan: Translation Language in a Neo-Aramaic Targum Tradition* (Neo-Aramaic Studies 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008), 1–18. See also J.E. Burns, “A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Translation of Genesis Recorded in Mosul, Iraq, ca. 1841 (Ms. Syr. 7, Houghton Library, Harvard University),” *Aramaic Studies* 5 (2007): 47–74.

artificial, “literary” language, somewhat like the “Jewish Literary Aramaic” posited for Onqelos and Jonathan. At the same time, they show unmistakable local influence. Consonant with their educational aim, Neo-Aramaic renditions tend to be hyper-literal, but they are not completely immune to exegetical or haggadic additions, sometimes on the basis of classical commentaries (Rashi) and the printed Targumim (Onqelos, Pseudo-Jonathan),³⁴² sometimes in the form of actualization (references to terrorists and the modern state of Israel).³⁴³

Yona Sabar (born 1938) has been the most industrious scholar of Neo-Aramaic Targumim. He has published the entire Pentateuch in the dialect of Zakho³⁴⁴ – his native tongue – as well as an edition of the Five Megillot in various dialects.³⁴⁵ Among his other publications are an edition of the Neo-Aramaic version of the Targum to Song of Songs³⁴⁶ and – *mirabile dictum* – a Neo-Aramaic version of Daniel!³⁴⁷ He has also published a dictionary of the Northwestern Neo-Aramaic dialects.³⁴⁸ Thus the process of translating the Bible into Aramaic continues even into the twenty-first century.

1.3.2.10 The Targumim and Textual Criticism

The last topic is the one that most directly addresses the interests of this reference work. The Targumim have only a marginal utility for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. There are many reasons for this. The very nature of the targumic texts—which modify the Hebrew text for purely theological reasons—inhibits their ability to be used for textual criticism. When the Hebrew text behind the Aramaic can be discerned—a task that is easier than it sounds, since the Targumim, though often adding to the Hebrew text, retain its structure and syntax as much as possible—it is always the Masoretic Text (except, of course, the Samaritan Targum). This is certainly the case for Targum Onqelos (@I.2.4.3.3.3) and Jonathan (@I.3–5.1.3.5; @I.6–9.1.3.5), but it is also true of the so-called “Palestinian Targumim” (@I.2.4.3.4). For these reasons, scant attention has been paid to the Targumim as a witness to the Hebrew textual tradition.

There are exceptions. Sperber was a notable advocate for the value of Targum Onqelos and Jonathan for the textual criticism of the Masoretic Text. He believed he had found an important variant in the Aramaic text of Jer 11:14 that was closer to the original Hebrew than the Masoretic Text (namely, God refuses to hear the prayers of Jeremiah rather than sinful Israel; cf. Jer 7:16). In the same article where he tells this anecdote, Sperber lists 650 variant readings (drawn, however, from different manuscripts of Onqelos).³⁴⁹ This list builds on work that he had already

³⁴² Y. Sabar, “Targumic Influence on Jewish Bible Translations in Neo-Aramaic,” *Aramaic Studies* 1 (2003): 55–65.

³⁴³ Y. Sabar, “The Five Scrolls in Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialects,” in *Neo-Aramaic Dialect Studies: Proceedings of a Workshop on Neo-Aramaic Held in Cambridge 2005* (ed. G. Khan; Neo-Aramaic Studies 1; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2008), 177–95.

³⁴⁴ Y. Sabar, *The Book of Genesis in Neo-Aramaic in the Dialect of the Jewish Community of Zakho: Including Selected Texts in Other Neo-Aramaic Dialects and a Glossary* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Language Traditions Project, 1983) [Hebr.]. The subsequent books of the Pentateuch appeared in 1988, 1990, 1993; and 1994.

³⁴⁵ Y. Sabar, *The Five Scrolls in Jewish Neo-Aramaic Translations: Dialects of ‘Amidya, Dihok, and Urmiya* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2006) [Hebr.].

³⁴⁶ Y. Sabar, *Targum de-Targum: An Old Neo-Aramaic Version of the Targum on Song of Songs* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991).

³⁴⁷ Y. Sabar, *The Book of Daniel in a Neo-Aramaic Translation* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2014) [Hebr.].

³⁴⁸ Y. Sabar, *A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary: Dialects of Amidya, Dihok, Nerwa and Zakho, Northwestern Iraq* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2002).

³⁴⁹ A. Sperber, “The Targum Onkelos in Its Relation to the Masoretic Hebrew Text,” *PAAJR* 6 (1935): 309–51.

done for the third edition of Rudolf Kittel's (1853–1929) *Biblia Hebraica* (1929–1937),³⁵⁰ and it anticipates the complete list he incorporated into his *Bible in Aramaic*.³⁵¹ He found many of the variants supported by non-Masoretic versions and believed that unsupported variants were equally significant, since non-Masoretic versions were occasionally corrected to conform to the Masoretic Text.

Critics of Sperber were unimpressed by his variants. Dominique Barthélemy (1921–2002), who bemoaned the lack of a critical edition of the Targumim and thought Sperber's edition of Onqelos and Jonathan "scarcely merits that title," succinctly judged: "Indeed, in most cases, [the Targum] testifies to an early Jewish exegesis rather than to an independent Hebrew *Vorlage*."³⁵² Emanuel Tov (born 1941) was similarly skeptical of the large number of variants, pointing out that they are culled from a variety of manuscripts and reflect contextual harmonization and similar changes. Even should all of these variants indeed represent the Hebrew *Vorlage*, they constitute only a fraction of the text—less than .05 percent in Tov's estimation. Sperber's list of variants for Targum Jonathan is even shorter. His conclusion is that the Targum differs from medieval manuscripts of the Masoretic Text as much as these differ among each other.³⁵³

The use of the Palestinian Targumim for textual criticism follows a different trajectory but ends at the same conclusion. Following a theory proposed by Geiger in his *Urschrift*,³⁵⁴ Díez Macho argued that Targum Neofiti depends on a Hebrew version different from the Masoretic Text, which would establish a date older than the second century C.E., when the Masoretic Text became uniform. He gave several pages of examples as part of his much broader argument in favor of a pre-Christian date for the Targum.³⁵⁵ His examples were refuted, point-by-point, by Wernberg-Møller, who was careful to claim that he was only dismissing these specific examples and not Díez Macho's general conclusion, which might still be borne out by the textual evidence.³⁵⁶ Klein further refined Wernberg-Møller's criticism and suggested that the differences between Neofiti and the Masoretic Text were the result of paraphrastic or orthographic peculiarities. His conclusion: There are no *Vorlage* variants in Targum Neofiti.³⁵⁷

The Qumran Aramaic texts stand outside the mainstream Targum tradition and so represent a different set of problems, since, as Second Temple texts, they emanate from a time when there was still a multiplicity of Hebrew versions of the Scriptures. The sole Pentateuchal manuscript, 4QtgLev, is too fragmentary to provide any useful information about its *Vorlage* (@I.2.4.3.1), but there has been more debate over the Aramaic manuscripts of Job (@I.11.3.3.2). The preliminary report of Johannes van der Ploeg (1909–2004) already noted that there were deviations between the underlying Hebrew and the Masoretic Text, while acknowledging that by and large it follows

³⁵⁰ Kittel, *BH³

³⁵¹ Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic, Vol. 4B.265–375.

³⁵² Barthélemy, *Studies, 540–41. Translated from Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle 1992, ccix

³⁵³ E. Tov, "The Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin Translations of Hebrew Scripture vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text," in *Εὐκαρπία: Études sur la Bible et ses exégètes, réunies par Mireille Loubet et Didier Pralon en hommage à Gilles Dorival* (eds. M. Loubet and D. Pralon; Paris: Cerf, 2011), 173–85 (reprinted in Tov, *Collected Writings 3, 82–94).

³⁵⁴ Geiger, *Urschrift, 451–80.

³⁵⁵ Díez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," 233–36.

³⁵⁶ P. Wernberg-Møller, "An Inquiry into the Validity of the Text-Critical Argument for an Early Dating of the Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," VT 12(1962): 312–30.

³⁵⁷ M.L. Klein, "Text and *Vorlage* in Neofiti 1," VT 22 (1972): 490–91. Reprinted in Michael Klein on the Targums, 203–05.

what would become the traditional consonantal text.³⁵⁸ A few others have documented places where 11QtgJob departs from the Masoretic Text.³⁵⁹ In general, however, the Qumran “Targum” is viewed as close to the Masoretic Text with only a few major differences, notably a truncated ending after Job 42:11 that could have been purposely omitted, missing in the *Vorlage*, or damaged in the manuscript (@I.11.3.3.2.5). Agreements between 11QtgJob and Syriac Job (@I.11.3.4) against the Masoretic Text could be the result of similar translation techniques resulting from linguistic constraints.³⁶⁰

For the sake of completion, a brief word about the remaining Aramaic texts is in order. For most of its printed history, the text of the Samaritan Targum has been in a deplorable state (@2.6.2). The surviving manuscripts do follow the Hebrew word-for-word (@I.2.4.4.4), making the recovery of the *Vorlage* an easy task. That *Vorlage*, unsurprisingly, is the Samaritan Pentateuch (@I.1.2.3), although there are also many deviant readings, some of them even agreeing with the Masoretic Text (@I.2.4.4.6). As for the Neo-Aramaic Targumim, they were only written recently, and they are of no use for textual criticism.

Today, the standard reference work, Tov’s *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, currently in its third edition, allots fewer than four full pages to all the Targumim.³⁶¹ This represents a serious change from the early days of critical inquiry into the text of the Hebrew Bible, when a manual like Johann Gottfried Eichhorn’s (1752–1827) *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* could devote 123 pages to the Targumim.³⁶² The quantity of material available for study has increased, but its value relative to the critical study of the Hebrew text has greatly diminished.

Bibliography

P.S. Alexander, “Notes on Some Targums of the Targum of the Song of Songs,” *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (ed. P.V.M. Flesher; Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 159–74.

W. Bacher, “Targum,” *JE* 12:57–63 (1906).

A. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos: Herausgegeben und erläutert* (2 vols.; Berlin: Gorzelanczyk, 1884), 2.167–200.

M.J. Bernstein and A. Koller, “The Aramaic Texts and the Hebrew and Aramaic Languages at Qumran: The North American Contribution,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden: Brill, 2012): 155–95.

P. Bobichon, “Quotations, Translations, and Uses of Jewish Texts in Ramon Martí’s *Pugio fidei*,” in *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean: Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context* (Études sur le judaïsme médiéval 65; ed. J. del Barco; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 266–93.

³⁵⁸ J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Le targum de Job de la grotte 11 de Qumran,” 553–55.

³⁵⁹ F. Morrow, “11Q Targum Job and the Massoretic Text,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 253–56; R. Weiss, “Recensional Variations between the Aramaic Translation to Job from Qumran Cave 11 and the Massoretic Text,” *Shnaton* 1 (1975): 123–27 [Hebr.]

³⁶⁰ Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*, 259–86.

³⁶¹ Tov, *TCHB³, 147–50.

³⁶² Eichhorn, *Einleitung, 2.1–123.

S.G. Burnett, "The Targum in Christian Scholarship to 1800," in *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (eds. A. Houtman, E. van Staaldune-Sulman, and H.-M. Kirn; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 27; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 250–65.

A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense Ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (6 vols.; Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 7–11, 20; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968–1979).

L. Díez Merino, "Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (eds. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Pres, 1994), 51–91.

P.B. Dirksen, "The Old Testament Peshitta," in Mulder, **Mikra*, 255–97.

Flesher–Chilton, **The Targums*.

S.D. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third–Sixth Centuries," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. L.I. Levine; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 253–86.

Geiger, **Urschrift*.

R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VTSup 51; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 5–39.

R. Gordon, "Alexander Sperber and the Study of the Targums," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (eds. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Pres, 1994), 92–102.

M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Introduction: Targum-Studies – An Overview of Recent Developments," *Textus* 16 (1991): 2–11.

M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Aspects of Targum Studies," *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 4–12, 1985; Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* (eds. M. Goshen-Gottstein and D. Assaf; World Union of Jewish Studies; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 35–44.

C.T.R. Hayward, *Targums and the Transmission of Scripture into Judaism and Christianity* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 10; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

C.T.R. Hayward, "Major Aspects of Targumic Studies 1983–1993: A Survey," *CurBS* 2 (1994): 107–22.

A. Houtman, E. van Staaldune-Sulman, and H.-M. Kirn (eds.), *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives 27; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

A. Houtman and H. Sysling, *Alternative Targum Traditions: The Use of Variant Readings for the Study in Origin and History of Targum Jonathan* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 9; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Kahle, **Cairo Geniza*, 191–208.

R. Kalmin, "Targum in the Babylonian Talmud," in *Envisioning Judaism: Studies in Honor of Peter Schäfer on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (eds. R.S. Boustani et al.; 2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 1:501–25.

R. Kasher, "The Aramaic Translations of the Bible," *Pe'amim* 83 (2000): 70–107 [Hebr.].

S.A. Kaufman, "On Methodology in the Study of the Targums and their Chronology," *JSNT* 7 (1985): 117–24.

M.L. Klein, *Michael Klein on the Targums: Collected Essays 1972–2002* (eds. A. Shinar et al.; Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 10; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

D.C. Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Reading of Jewish Text in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

M.D. Koster, "The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta," in *Targum and Peshitta* (ed. P.V.M. Fleisher; Targum Studies 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 15–54.

S. Lasair, "Current Trends in Targum Research," *CurBR* 10 (2012): 442–53.

R. Le Déaut, "The Current State of Targumic Studies," *BTB* 4 (1974): 3–32.

R. Le Déaut, "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation," *BTB* 4 (1974): 243–89.

R. Le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42* (AnBib 22; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), 19–71.

D.A. Machiela, "Hebrew, Aramaic, and the Differing Phenomena of Targum and Translation in the Second Temple Period and Post-Second Temple Period," in *The Language Environment of First Century Judaea* (eds. R. Buth and R.S. Notley; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 26; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 207–46.

Y. Maori, "The Relationship Between the Peshitta Pentateuch and the Pentateuchal Targums," in *Targum and Peshitta* (ed. P.V.M. Fleisher; Targum Studies 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 57–73.

M. McNamara, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (WUNT 279; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

M. McNamara, "Fifty-Five Years of Targum Study," in *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (WUNT 279; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 1–24.

M. McNamara, "Some Recent Writings (pre-1980) on Rabbinic Literature and the Targums" *Milltown Studies* 9 (1982), 59–101. Reprinted in M. McNamara, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (WUNT 279; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 68–105.

M. McNamara, "Half a Century of Targum Study," *Irish Bible Studies* 1 (1979), 57–68. Reprinted in M. McNamara, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (WUNT 279; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 48–58.

M. McNamara, "Targumic Studies," *CBQ* 28 (1966): 1–19. Reprinted in M. McNamara, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (WUNT 279; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 27–47.

M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AnBib 27a; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 5–66.

M.P. Miller, “Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29–82.

J. Olszowy-Schlanger, “The Study of the Aramaic Targum by Christians in Medieval France and England,” in *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (eds. A. Houtman, E. van Staaldouine-Sulman, and H.-M. Kirn; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 27; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 233–49.

R.J. Owens, “The Relationship Between the Targum and Peshitta Texts of the Book of Proverbs: *status quaestionis*,” in *Targum and Peshitta* (ed. P.V.M. Flesher; Targum Studies 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 195–207.

H.M. Patmore, *The Transmission of Targum Jonathan in the West: A Study of Italian and Ashkenazi Manuscripts of the Targum to Samuel* (JSS Supplement 35; Oxford: OUP, 2015), 1–52.

J. Ribera Florit, “Las investigaciones targúmicas en España a partir de la obra de A. Díez Macho (1984-2001),” *Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos: Sección de hebreo* 50 (2001): 49–58.

Y. Sabar, “The Neo-Aramaic Pentateuch: A Summary of Findings,” *Pe‘amim* 83 (2000): 108–17 [Hebr.].

Z. Safrai, “The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature,” in *The Literature of the Sages, Part 2: Midrash and Targum, Liturgy, Poetry, Mysticism, Contracts, Inscriptions, Ancient Science, and the Languages of Rabbinic Literature* (eds. S. Safrai et al.; CRINT 2.3b; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006), 243–78.

D. Shepherd, *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job* (SSN 45; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004).

W.F. Smelik, *Rabbis, Language and Translation in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OtSt 36; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1–112.

E. van Staaldouine-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism: Editions and Latin Translations of the Targums from the Complutensian to the London Polyglot Bible (1517-1657)* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives 33; Leiden: Brill, 2017).

E. van Staaldouine-Sulman, *The Targum of Samuel* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 1; Brill: Leiden 2002), 1–48.

D. Stern, “The Rabbinic Bible in Its Sixteenth-Century Context,” *The Hebrew Book in Early Modern Italy* (eds. J.R. Hacker and A. Shear; Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2011), 76–108.

L.T. Stuckenbruck, “An Approach to the New Testament through Aramaic Sources: The Recent Methodological Debate,” *JSP* 4 (1991): 3–29.

A. Tal, “The Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch: Its Distinctive Characteristics and Its Metamorphosis,” *JSS* 21 (1976): 26–38.

A.D. York, "The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School," *JSJ* 10 (1979): 74–86.

A.D. York, "The Dating of Targumic Literature," *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49–62.

L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt: Ein Beitrag zur Alterthumskunde und biblischen Kritik, zur Literatur- und Religionsgeschichte* (ed. N. Brüll; 2nd ed.; Frankfurt a.M.: Kauffmann, 1892), 65–86.