

NOTES, MAINLY ORTHOGRAPHICAL, ON THE
GALILAEAN TARGUM AND IQ GENESIS
APOCRYPHON

DR. G. COWLING

(a) Codex Neofiti 1,

(b) Vatican ms. ebr. 440 ff. 198-227, Nürnberg Ms. Solger 2,2°, Ms. Sassoon 264, Leipzig 1, the printed edition of *Targum Yerushalmi* in *Biblia Hebraica* Venice 1515/17 and the fragment Ms. Or. 10, 794 fol. 8 of the British Museum (the 'Vatican 440 text group' in my terminology),

(c) Codex Paris 110, fragments Strasbourg Ms. n. 4017 and E. N. Adler 656 ('Paris 110 text group' in my terminology),

(d) the fragments of manuscripts labelled A-F by P. Kahle in *Masoretan des Westens II*, Stuttgart 1930, plus E. N. Adler 2107 fl, E. N. Adler 2755 fl and f2, E. N. Adler 2578 f20, 21,¹ are all witnesses to a single translation of the pentateuch into Aramaic. This translation is commonly known as 'the Palestinian Targum' (and earlier, Jerusalem targum), although Galilaean targum would be a much more precise term. For the language of the targum clearly belongs to the period when Palestinian rabbinic activity was centred in Galilee. The language is very similar to that of the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian (Jerusalem) Talmud and the Galilaean midrashim (especially *Bereshith Rabba*). This similarity extends to quite subtle features of syntax. All are written in the Galilaean dialect of Aramaic of which there is no trace before A.D. 135. Even the second century A.D. documents found, e.g. in Wadi Murabba'at, are in a very different, and earlier, dialect.

1. See M. Doubles, 'Towards the Publication of the Extant Palestinian Targum(s)', *Vetus Testamentum* 15, 1965, 16-26; A. Diez Macho, 'The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums', Congress Volume (1959), *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 7 Leiden 1960, 222-245, Macho, 'Nuevos fragmentos del Targum palestinense', *Sefarad* 15, 1955, 31-39; W. Baars, Review of *Polyglotta Matritensis* in *Vetus Testamentum* 17, 1967, 127-128, for information on most of these manuscripts. I am indebted to the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York for Xerox copies of the E. N. Adler manuscripts, the Vatican Library for microfilms of Codex Neofiti I and ebr 440 ff 198-227; Rabbi S. D. Sassoon and the Institute of Hebrew Manuscripts, Hebrew University, Jerusalem for microfilm of Ms. Sassoon 264, Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris for the microfilm Paris Hebrew 110, Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire Strasbourg for microfilm n. 4017.

The first hint of changing usage may be found in the contract published by J. T. Milik.² Here the use of šry 'au lieu de l'habituel yat^eba' (Milik p. 185) may point forward to the later Galilaeen use—though Milik sees a semantic differentiation instead. The dialect is in general 'l'araméen d'empire sous la forme qu'il revetue à l'époque greco-romaine' (Daniel, Qumran, Mur. 72).³ Milik⁴ and Kutscher⁵ believe that the targum could not have been composed as early as the second century A.D.

This conclusion does not accord with the views of those who consider that the targum is basically pre-Christian or at least pre-AD 135 in origin. There are certain features—mostly orthographical—of the better manuscripts of the Galilaeen targum which do not correspond with the usage in our editions of the Galilaeen Talmud and midrashim.

M. D. Doubles⁶ has suggested that 'the linguistic evidences for a late dating for the Fragment Targum may simply be the unconscious reflection of the time of Medieval copyists, while the actual date for the Targum must be determined by the survivals of ancient morphological and orthographical forms' (p. 89). The short answer to this, is that the linguistic evidences I rely on are not features which would be easily altered by copyists—and indeed textual analysis of the manuscripts shows alterations in a very different direction.⁷ I may cite the complementary distribution *hkm* and *yd^c*; *db^r* and *nsb* which are distinctly Galilaeen in the early manuscripts, the former also in Neofiti I, though there has been some blurring of the second distribution.

Many of the non-Galilaeen features in syntax and semantics are simply not Aramaic and arise from the extremely literal, word-for-word nature of the translation. The description of this targum as 'paraphrastic' must be dismissed as an aberration.⁸ As Kahle

-
2. 'Un contrat juif de l'an 134 après J-C.', *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, 182-190.
 3. J. T. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan II: Grottes de Murabba'at*, Oxford, 1961, 69.
 4. 'Saint-Thomas de Phordesan de Gen. 14:17', *Biblica* 42, 1961, 81 N. 2.
 5. 'The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon', *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 1958, 3.
 6. 'Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum', in *Memoriam Paul Kahle*, edited by M. Black and Georg Fohrer, Berlin, 1968, 79-89.
 7. Substantiation for this statement is to be found in my unpublished thesis, 'The Palestinian Targum: Textual and Linguistic Investigations in Codex Neofiti I and Allied Manuscripts', Aberdeen, 1968.
 8. Though accepted even by John Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge, 1969, 13: 'the Targums lie halfway between straightforward translation and free retelling of the Biblical text'. Targum (Pseudo-) Jonathan to the Tora seems to have confused people here.

says: 'the Palestinian targum contains besides the *exact translation* of the Hebrew text of the Bible, a very full exposition from the Midrash.'⁹ It is only necessary to write out the Hebrew text, and write the targum (esp. Cairo Geniza manuscripts) below to see the exact word-for-word order forcing the Aramaic to conform to Hebrew syntax (e.g. in the use of infinitive absolute).

It might be emphasised also here that the amount of 'exposition from the Midrash' decreases sharply with increasing age of the manuscript. It is quite distinct from the text—it may be added between two clauses of the text (e.g. Ms. B Genesis 4:8) but usually comes before the entire verse (Genesis 3:22 B) or after it (Genesis 37-33 D).

This paper will be devoted to an examination of the orthography of the Palestinian targum manuscripts, starting from M. C. Doubles' discussion. Doubles' aim appears to be to demonstrate that Vatican 440 preserves orthographical features characteristic of the period before AD 500 and not after. He also suggests that these forms belong to the 'same period of transition' (p 88) as Qumran Aramaic—presumably implying a pre-Christian date of original composition. What is not clear is what his reaction would be to a suggestion that the works were composed between AD 200 and 500—when these same features may still have been in use. The phrase 'early date' (p. 89) is too general. I would suggest that the important question is whether there is any indication that the origin of the targum falls in the Middle Aramaic—pre AD 200 period—though the question whether it pre-dates the Galilaean Talmud and Midrashim is also of importance if it is in fact post AD 200.

I prefer J. Fitzmyer's classification of Middle Aramaic, *viz.*

Old Aramaic	c.925 - 700 BC
Official Aramaic	c.700 - 300 BC
Middle Aramaic	c.300 BC - AD 200
Late Aramaic	c.AD 200 - 700 ¹⁰

rather than E. Y. Kutscher's (after AD 500).

M. Doubles has not made clear what manuscripts or editions he is using as his standard of 'middle Aramaic' nor taken into account the corruptions introduced into them by copying.¹¹

I. FINAL HE AND FINAL ALEPH (M. Doubles, p. 82)

When M. Doubles says (P. 80) that 'In this situation, Kutscher states that although it is true that Targums are of very

9. *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford, 1959, 197. *Italics mine.*

10. Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, Rome, 1966, 19-20.

11. See E. Y. Kutscher, *Investigations in Galilaean Aramaic* (offprint), Jerusalem, 1955.

early origin, it has not been possible so far to fix their date or to state how much earlier they are than the Talmudic period (200-500 C.E.)' he is not making it clear that Kutscher is speaking exclusively of Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan to the prophets. ('We are by no means able so far to fix the date of our T.O. as known to us and to state how much earlier it is than the Talmudic period' . . . 'The Palestinian Targum [Pseudo-Jonathan and Yerushalmi] are late. It should be noted that the texts with the exception of those edited by Kahle are corrupt, and have to be used very cautiously. N10. The fragments edited by Kahle are dated by him to 700-900 C.E. . . . They certainly reflect the language spoken a few hundred years earlier. But the exact date cannot be established.')12

M. Doubles examines the use of *he* as a final *mater lectionis* and identifies the use in Vatican 440 with that in IQ *Genesis Apocryphon*, and raises the question 'whether both the Fragment Targum and the *Genesis Apocryphon* do not reflect western Aramaic under the influence of eastern Aramaic already moving toward the regular use of *aleph* at the end of a word' (p 83).

'It is a matter of doubt whether one can distinguish between Western and Eastern Aramaic before' AD 200.¹³ We must also realise that we are comparing a thirteenth century manuscript with a manuscript written between 100 BC and 70 AD and that the thirteenth century manuscript has undergone a much longer history of copying than the other. We must allow for about a millenium when corruptions could be introduced by scribes more familiar with the conventions of eastern Aramaic than western. We must use text-critical methods, including a knowledge of the type of errors actually introduced by copying, to determine what readings of Vatican 440 are original and which are not, *before* the comparison with a pre-Christian document will be profitable.

An investigation of the history of the transmission of the Galilaean targum shows clearly that the *he* is the original ending for final *ā* and that *aleph* is a later alteration. This is in agreement with Kutscher's findings.¹⁴ In my investigation¹⁵ I drew up *he/aleph* ratios for different manuscripts using the following methodological rules:

1. Proper names were excluded.
2. The article on proper names was included.

12. 'The Language . . .', pp. 2, 3.

13. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon* . . .

14. 'Investigations in Galilaean Aramaic', p. 12 and §1.3.

15. Undertaken at the University of Aberdeen, 1966-68. Fuller details are to be found in my thesis.

3. The words *l'*, *'yl'*, *h'*, which are always spelt with *aleph*, were excluded.
4. The Hebrew text was taken as discriminator when it was difficult to distinguish between the pronominal suffix (consonantal *he*) and the *he* of the article (*he* as vowel letter).

The average ratios were:

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>He/aleph ratio</i>	<i>Date of the Ms.</i>
Ms. A of the Geniza	4:1	AD 700 (Kahle)
E	24:1	AD 750-800 (Kahle)
B	1.5:1	} AD 850-900 (Kahle)
C	1:10	
D (Genesis, Exodus)	1:3.5	
Deuteronomy)	31:1	
F	2:1	Tenth or Eleventh Centuries (Kahle)

Samples of Neofiti 1 were taken using random sampling numbers as numbers of the folio;¹⁶ viz. 030, 364, 133, 391, 013, 212. The results showed great inconsistency—

033 (Genesis)	13:19, approx.	1:1.5
364 (Deut.)	25:9	„ 2.5:1
133 (Exodus)	14:33	„ 1:2.3
391 (Deut.)	10:10	„ 1:1
013 (Genesis)	27:53	„ 1:2
212 (Lev.)	59:9	„ 6.5:1

Mss. B, F and D showed a great degree of inconsistency between the separate occurrences of a word and within a single verse. In these manuscripts the frequency of occurrence of *aleph* tends to be greatest in the common words:

- e.g. 'r' (B *he* 0:9 *aleph*; D *he* 0:32 *aleph*; F *he* 6:6 *aleph*)
 'm' (D *he* 4:2 *aleph*; F *he* 6:14 *aleph*)
 'my' (D *he* 0:11 *aleph*) (3 in Deut.)
 'šmy' (B *he* 0:2 *aleph*; D *he* 0:7 *aleph*; F *he* 5:0 *aleph*)

These ratios are generally lower than the average. This would appear to indicate that the words familiar to the scribe were written with *aleph*, i.e. that the scribe was familiar with the Onkelos convention. It is possible that the Hebrew exerted a contrary influence (especially where the Hebrew and Aramaic were interlinear) with feminine nouns, e.g. *hybwth* is always so spelt—Ms. D. Genesis 7:17—8:6, six occurrences.

I have no explanation for the sudden change in the D manuscript in Deuteronomy. It appears to correspond to no other altera-

16. M. G. Kendall and B. Babington Smith, *Tables of Sampling Numbers: Tracts for Computers* xxiv, cf. Y. Uday Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary*, Cambridge, 1944, 35-6.

tion in the text: I have not seen photographs of the original. Neofiti also has the lowest ratio in Genesis and Exodus, the proportion of *he* increasing in later books. Genesis 1-3 has the lowest ratio of all (1:38). This ratio improves after chapter 4.

I haven't investigated Vatican 440 fully, but one example (*not* sample) was the two pages Numbers 21:15-23-22. The ratio was 6:93. This does not give me great confidence in Vatican 440 as a repository of ancient orthographic forms.

The evidence seems to indicate that the earlier manuscripts tend to the normal Galilaeian convention of *he* representing final \bar{a} .¹⁷ It can only be the use of inferior witnesses to the Galilaeian material that led M. Doubles to say 'this use of *he* is generally associated with texts written at a date centuries earlier than that often assigned to the Palestinian Targum(s)' (p. 82). The situation before AD 200 is quite different. In old Aramaic and Official Aramaic *aleph* was the rule for the emphatic state, *he* for the feminine absolute.¹⁸ There seems to be little consistency in the infinitives. In grammatical forms *he* is the rule (exceptions: *h'*, *d'*, and *l'*).

IQ *Genesis Apocryphon*¹⁹ retains the *he* for pronouns but uses *aleph* almost exclusively for final \bar{a} elsewhere. *He* at the end of words other than pronouns in general represents final \bar{e} : though there are several inconsistencies. The other Qumran material uses *aleph* is a feature of (the later) eastern Aramaic. It is so used in *aleph* frequently for all grammatical forms though 3Q15 retains *he* in many instances of the feminine.²⁰ The consistent use of Palmyrene and later dialects. By contrast the inscriptions in Jerusalem and the other parts of Palestine show an increasing use of *he*,²¹ although Milik notes some occurrences of *aleph* for the feminine absolute. This use of *he* seems best explained as the influence of Hebrew orthography on the writing of Aramaic.

The documents from Wadi Murabba'at show little consistency, but the later documents show a definite tendency to use *he*,

17. Kutscher, *Investigations*, p. 12. H. Odeberg, *Short Grammar of Galilaeian Aramaic II*, Lund, 1939, 152 is quite incorrect in saying that *aleph* 'is regularly used' for final \bar{a} : in *Galilaeian Aramaic*. The texts he was using were late and inferior to Ms. Vatican ebr. 30 which Kutscher used. See too 'Jewish Inscriptions from Dabbura, Golan' (in Hebrew), D. Urman *Qadmoniot IV*, 1971, 131-133.

18. W. Baumgartner 'Das Aramaische im Buche Daniel', *ZAW NF* 4, 1927, 81-140.

19. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, Jerusalem, 1956, also Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon . . .* My investigation of the grammar of this scroll was done independently.

20. J. T. Milik's index in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan III: Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran*, Oxford, 1962.

21. E. Y. Kutscher, 'The Language . . .', p. 28, N. 38.

as does also the contract of AD 134.²² The inconsistencies seem to be due rather to the interaction of an Eastern (conservative) *aleph* current and a Western *he* current than of the rather complex 'learned' and 'popular' currents postulated by Milik.²³

It is clear that there is no real comparison between use in IQ *Genesis Apocryphon* and in Vatican 440. Vatican 440 shows sporadic examples of the original western use, almost completely eradicated by copying. Both are indeed 'moving towards the regular use of [*aleph*] at the end of a word' (M. Doubles, p. 83), but IQ *Genesis Apocryphon* represents a stage in the language, Vatican 440 the results of a millenium of copying.

II. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *DY* (p. 83)

Before we can discuss the significance of the orthography of this particle we must examine its use in the early manuscripts of the Galilaean Targum. Here we find that *d* and *dy* occur in a complementary distribution. The matter additional to the translation uses *d* almost exclusively—although *dy* does occur, apparently arbitrarily.

- (1) *dy* is found in the translation when
 - (a) 'šr occurs in the Hebrew text but not followed by a preposition.
 - (b) When an infinitive in the Hebrew is translated by a relative clause in the Aramaic, e.g. *k' š r* is translated by *kywnn dy* (temporal) and *hyk mh dy* (comparative): Exodus 7:13,22.
- (2) When the Hebrew 'šr is followed by a preposition then the Aramaic has *d'yt* and *dhwh* (or *dhwnn*). Neofiti 1 has revised most of these out of the text (not found in Hebrew or Onkelos), but the usage is clear in earlier manuscripts (including Vatican 440). Neofiti generally retains the distinction between *dy* and *d* (better than Ms. F).
- (3) *d-* is used
 - (a) for the Hebrew article before a participle;
 - (b) when an understood relative pronoun is expressed in full (e.g. instead of an article, *drms* for *hrms*);
 - (c) genitival use.

We clearly have a translation phenomenon here—as the general distinction of usage between translation and added matter

22. J. T. Milik, 'Un Contrat juif de l'an 134 après J-C.', *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, 182-90.

23. 'Le Rouleau de cuivre provenant de la Grotto 30 (eQ15)', *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan III: Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran*, Oxford, 1962, 224 and P. B. Bagatti and J. T. Milik, *Gli Scavi de 'Dominus Flevit'*, Jerusalem, 1958, 106.

emphasises. There are too many instances of *dy* in the non-translation material (seven examples of *dy*) for one to say that *d* was the normal usage at the time of writing of those portions, but it is very probable. The artificial translation usage is not very informative. The Qumran use of *dy* is also found in *Megillath Ta'anith*, the Letters of Gamaliel and the Divorce Document.²⁴ (Hebrew *pn* (lest) is translated by *dl'*; 'šr l' is of course translated by *dy l'*.)

The common Galilaean use of *dhw'*, *dhy'* (Dalman *Grammatik* . . . p. 116) is found only in the interpolated material, e.g. Gen. 37:33 (D). The abbreviation of this form (*dy* or *dw*) is not found.

There may thus be a slight indication that the targum preceded the Talmud and *Midrashim* in time, but we need to know rather more about the use of *dy* and *d* in early manuscripts of the other Galilaean literature before we can be sure. The evidence from manuscripts of Targum Onkelos quoted by Doubles from Sperber (which is very general) merely seems to show that medieval scribes considered the forms interchangeable. We do not know when the use of a separate *dy* ceased in the West.

III. THE WESTERN CHARACTER OF CERTAIN VERBAL FORMS (p.84)

In this section M. Doubles argues, it seems, that certain examples of *waw* in verb forms are linguistic survivals and may date from pre-Christian times. He argues from the mere similarity to forms in 1Q *G.A.* that they are not errors in the later witnesses to the Galilaean targum—and ignores the overwhelming textual evidence against them. He instances the form *yqw s w n* in Numbers 11:26 (pointed *ykosun*).

This is found only in the printed edition of 1515/17, and in none of the closely related manuscripts. At least, it is not found in Vatican 440, nor in Ms. Sassoon 264 (a seventeenth century Yememite text very similar even in format to the printed edition). I have not consulted Nürnberg I but I presume that if it had the reading, Doubles would have cited it. The phenomenon does not occur anywhere in the Geniza fragments—though of course we have *ymwtwn*, *ydwnwn* and *yqmwn* from *ayin-šureq* verbs.

Even if this should prove to be the correct reading, it does not compare with the *ykwlnw* of 1Q *G.A.* This is from a *pe yodh* verb—but it is not plausible to derive *yqwswn* from such a root. The reading is a sheer error.

24. G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 1905, rp. Darmstadt, 1960, 116 and *Aramäische Dialektproben*, 1927, rp. Darmstadt, 1960, 1-5.

The reading *twqsw* in 1Q *G.A.* (19.16) is not a 'Pe'al imperative masculine plural' (p. 84)—not in a negative command! It is a 2 mpl jussive form. It is probably from a root *qws*.

The forms of imperative cited by Doubles seem perfectly normal for Onkelos manuscripts. Dalman did not consider it to be a Galilaean use, but the form *is* found in the Geniza manuscripts: *zbwnw*, *twrw* (from *ntr*), *°bwrw*, *°qwpw* and *°qrybw* (error in ms. or transcription). There does not seem to be any convincing evidence to show why we should consider it either western or early.

Doubles also finds a 'western use of *waw*' in past participle forms. In Gen. 35:9 Vatican 440 had *mbwrk* instead of *mbrk*, and in Ex. 12:42 *mzwmm* instead of *mzmm*. The textual evidence this time is against the originality of the reading. The form never appears in the Geniza fragments. The first example would seem to betray Hebrew influence (Pual), though the second is not so explicable. It is not uncommon even in the Geniza fragments to find Hebrew words written instead of the Aramaic—viz. *myym* (water), *'t*, *°zym*, *zh* and *°sdyqym*. Ms. F has once *°bdwn*—the two dots show that the *s* is to be eliminated—the scribe started to write the Hebrew verb *°sh* instead of the Aramaic *°bd*.

As for the use of *waw* in Aph'el preformatives, we may dismiss Gen. 12:3 as an aberration—there are no Aphels of *brk*: this is a first person Pael imperfect. The use of a *waw* for a *shewa* is interesting and will be discussed later. The correctness of the reading in Gen. 44:18 is very doubtful. It is spelt *'qmyt* or (*'qmt*) in the printed edition and in Neofiti 1. It is also so spelt in Ms. E. (E. N. Adler 2518 f.21) at Gen. 43:9 (from which verse this word is quoted at 44:18). There is unfortunately a *lucuna* in Gen. 44:18 in Ms. D (the only Geniza fragment extant at this point). There does not appear to be any reason *not* to take it as an error.

The use of *waw* in prepositions, where a *shewa* might be expected, does form a point of comparison with 1Q *G.A.* *qwdm* seems to be the rule in 1Q *G.A.* (cf. 21.3; 22.9,10; 20.32; 19.25).

In the Geniza manuscripts we have—

	A	B	C	D	E	F
<i>qdm</i> (all suffixes)	3	7	10	15	6	4
<i>qwdm</i> "	—	—	—	3	—	5
(k) <i>lqbl</i>	—	—	—	—	28	35
(k) <i>lqwbl</i>	—	—	—	3	—	5
<i>hlp</i>	—	—	—	—	3	—
	—	1	—	—	1	—
<i>hwlp</i>	4	—	—	—	3	—

and in nouns,

	A	B	C	D	E	F
šb ^c h (ti)	—	1	—	—	16	—
swb ^c h (ti)	—	—	—	—	2	15
gbr (all forms of sfs)	8	3	6	10	20	1
gwbr	1	—	1	6	8	—

The u: sound before a labial is not particularly distinctive of the earlier manuscripts—it is more common in the later (i.e. D 6:10 compared to E 8:20 for *gwbr/gbr*). The u: is found in *gbr* commonly in manuscripts of Onkelos, and the change a to u is found in Mandaean. *qwdm*, on the other hand, is characteristic of E and the later F—and hence also the related manuscripts including Vatican 440 and Neofiti 1 margin.²⁵

The Galilaean targum also resembles 1Q G.A. in the third person plural perfect. For both works, only verbs finally weak have a final nun. There is only one exception in all Geniza fragments, out of a total of 70 forms, namely *'tgrwn* (D, G 7:24—in D, G 7:18, 19, 20 it is correct). I depend on the accuracy of Kahle's printed text. It will be necessary to take notice of this in all further investigations of Galilaean Aramaic—but probably only indicates that in the west the differentiation continued into the period of late Aramaic, not that the Galilaean targum predates AD 200.

IV. NOUNS PARALLEL IN THE FRAGMENT TARGUM AND QUMRAN

M. C. Doubles points out that the Galilaean targum has *drmsq* instead of *dmsq* of the Masoretic text. He is correct in pointing out that this is also to be found in Qumran manuscripts ('both the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Isaiah scroll*') but he is not correct in implying that this phenomenon is confined to the Qumran material and (hence) that they are 'apparently archaic forms' (p. 85). The Qumran spelling is to be found in the Masoretic text of Chronicles (1 Chronicles 18:5, 6; 2 Chronicles 24:23; 28:5, 6, 23), but the intrusive *r* is also to be found in Mishnaic literature, and Jastrow (*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*, New York, 1950) gives *drmsqws* as the reading in *Genesis Rabba* s. 44. The targum spelling is also found in Syriac (cf. Payne Smith, *Syriac Lexicon*) but not apparently in Christian Palestinian Aramaic (Schulthess' *Lexicon*). The Syriac form definitely proves

25. See S. Lund, 'The Source of the Variant Reading to Deuteronomy 1, 1-29, 7 of Codex Neofiti I', *In Memoriam Paul Kahle*, Berlin, 1968, 163-8.

that the form survived to the period of middle Aramaic and it may well be Galilaean, though the evidence is not definite at this point. The form may have been found in the Hebrew text ultimately lying behind the targum (see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Hebrew) with English summary, Jerusalem 1959, 5, 6, 77, IX).

Doubles cites the spelling *r'sh* (head) as an archaic form. The Geniza fragments have *r'sh* exclusively (13 examples from Mss. C, D, E and F). Further investigation is necessary, but the use of *aleph* would seem to be western (under the influence of Hebrew) and *yod* probably eastern (cf. Syriac) introduced into later manuscripts by the usual process. 1Q G.A. has both *r'sy* (x 2) and *r'ysh* (x 3).

This question is part of the wider question of interchange of symbols in the manuscripts.²⁶ An *aleph* is sometimes written orthographically for *yod* in verbs initial *aleph*, e.g. *lm'kwl* (Ms. E, one example), *lm'kl* (B,1) instead of *lmykl* (E,2 and *lmykwl* (E,1). The *yod* may in fact be the earlier form (only A and E use it, if we except the *aphel* form *'yykl* in F):

y'klwn (D,1), *tykwl* (A,1), *t'klwn* (B,D,F), *n'kl* (B,1), *t'kl* (B). However, for *'mr* we have *t'mr* (C,E) and *tymr* (D,F), *lm'mr* (A,C) but *lmymr* (C,D,E,F) etc.²⁷

We also have *m'mryh d'dny* (B, 'word' of the Lord) and *mymrh dy* (D,E,F).

We must see in this a conflict between phonetic spelling and etymological, the latter reinforced by the Hebrew text (influenced too by Biblical Aramaic?). It is possible that *yod* was the original Galilaean use, but we need to investigate other literature where a direct influence from the Biblical usage is not so likely. But we cannot label any one form as 'archaic'.

V. 'AN ARCHAIC VERBAL SPELLING' (p. 86)

It seems to be a blunder on M. C. Doubles' part that he should think that the *ʿayin* in *b'sh* represents an archaic spelling. The Old Aramaic for mis *b'sh* without exception. 1Q G.A. has—correctly—an *aleph* (21,7). The noun occurs at 20, 17, 28, 29, naturally with an *aleph* although late Aramaic has *by'sh*. In the Cairo Geniza Mss. we have the verb /*b'sh*/ seven times (B, C, D, E), always with *aleph*. The noun form has the *yod*-adjective *by'sh* (eighteen times) and substantive *b'y'sy*' (the sick) Gen. 35:9 (C).

26. I discuss it in §4.i Orthography of chapter 4. Grammar of the Palestinian Targum, in my previously mentioned thesis.

27. Details in my complete concordance to the Geniza fragments submitted with my thesis to Aberdeen University, 1968.

In Genesis 4:5 Neofiti 1 text has *bš* = Ms. B but the margin has an *ayin*. In Genesis 4:6 the text and margin are reversed.

The substitution of *ayin* for *aleph* (or *yod*) is not uncommon in late manuscripts, and is part of the general phenomenon of interchange of consonants. The general opinion that Galilaean speakers confused the gutturals may not be true—it seems rather a feature of later scribes.

Even in Ms. E we have *'r^cm* from */rwm/* (!) — Gen. 29:1 cf. *yrym* in Gen. 41:44. The margin of Neofiti 1 (source =^t E) has *'r^cm* at Genesis 29:11 and 39:15, etc. The form is also found in Pseudo-Jonathan. *sgy^cyn* (many) is used by Paris 110 at Exodus 19:21 (Geniza fragment *sgyn*—as also usually Neofiti 1, though *sgy'yn* is found as the marginal reading at Numbers 24:24, (so also Pseudo-Jonathan and Paris 110 ad loc). Sepher-he-Aruk²⁸ in the three examples there cited spells the word *sgy'yn* (Genesis 3:29, Ex. 19:21; Nu. 24:24). Neofiti also has the spelling *srq^cyn* (Saracen-Aruk always uses *aleph*).

This appears to be an over-correction phenomenon (perhaps dictation?). Double's argument, of course, completely falls to the ground.

VI. INTERCHANGES OF *YODH*, *HE* AND *ALEPH* TO REPRESENT THE SOUND (e:) AT THE END OF A WORD

1Q G.A., I claim, *regularly* uses *he* at the end of a word (unless a grammatical form, especially pronominal) to represent e:—but does the Galilaean targum? It is never used for e: in the Geniza manuscripts.

The use of *qšh* for *qšy* in Gen. 44:18 (additional matter) is easily explained as the mistaken writing of the Hebrew form—something we have seen to be common enough even in the Geniza manuscripts. Interestingly, this reading is found in Sassoon 264, pointed as a Hebrew word (*qāšā*), but *qšy* in Neofiti, the printed edition (but pointed *qāse*) and Paris 110. (cod Ox2305 has *tqyn*—Ginsburger *Das Fragmenten Thargum* Berlin 1903, 73).

Similarly in the Ithpael forms we have Hebrew orthography instead of Aramaic. These are such normal scribal slips that alternative explanations are just unnecessary.

28. Cf. R. Nathan b. Jehiel edited H. Sperl, Lemberg, 1857. Shlomo Speier *Hyhsym sbyn h'rwk ltrgwm yrwslmy, nywpyty l Leshonenu* 31, 1966/7, 23-32, 189-198; 3- 1970, may be consulted with profit as he has used good manuscripts of *Aruk*, but in his articles so far he has only treated a small selection of the total number of quotations found in *Aruk* citations I mention in my thesis was compiled but was not in fact submitted to the University.

The other examples cited by Doubles are simply examples of the mutation of *aleph* and *yod* which we have seen earlier (§IV) as an etymological use.

In the Geniza fragments 3 ms Peal of verbs finally weak always end in orthographic *he* or *aleph*: *qārā* always takes an *aleph*. The use of final *yod* in later manuscripts seems to be a confusion of transitive and intransitive forms (*ā* and *ī*).²⁹ The form *yh'* for *yhy* does not occur in the Geniza fragments, although there is one example of *yyt'* for *yyty* (Ms.A). The form *yh'* seems to be a late phenomenon.

The *aleph* in the Peal infinitives are probably etymological. There is nothing in these minor scribal differences between manuscripts belonging to the same textual tradition to suggest any antiquity for the variations. The answer to Doubles' question: ' . . . does this have any bearing on the origin of the language of the Fragment Targum?' (p. 87) is no.

VII. 'PLENE SPELLING' (p. 87)

Manuscripts A and E tend to avoid the use of *yod* in the final syllable of a word. Hence *brh* can mean: *the son, his son or her son* (Onkelos and later manuscripts *br'*, *bryh* and *brh*). The *yod* is even omitted on occasions in the first person singular perfect of the verb (/t for /yt). This omission is rare in the other manuscripts. The addition of *yod* in Ms. E seems to be secondary—it occasionally occurs in the wrong place, e.g. *gnbyt* for *gnbt* (2 singular, Genesis 31:27).

In contrast, Ms. E frequently uses a *yod* for a short initial vowel. This is not a feature of other manuscripts, e.g. *byr* (son), *byturyyh*, *bysrh*, *kypnh*, *myrh*. The *yod* is occasionally used for short *i* (or *e*), e.g. *myn* (D.2); *myny* (B.2; D.1), *mynk* (B. C. D. E), to distinguish *mn* 'from' and *mn* 'who'. The alteration of *a* to *i* (or *e*) in closed syllables³⁰ does occur, e.g. *'yba* (father D,3) and *'b'* (D x3), *byr* (E.12). This latter is occasionally found in Pseudo-Jonathan.

It is not surprising in view of the preceding that Ms. E more commonly writes consonantal *yod* and *waw* as double letters.

wwld (A, E)—wld (D)

hwwh (B, D x 3, E, F)—hwh (B,D)—hww' (C, D x 1).

byyt/ (A, C, E x 17)

byt/ (A, C, D, E x 5, F) etc.

One odd reading is *twwry'* (mountain). This consonanted *waw* for the usual vowel is regularly found in Pseudo-Jonathan. Macho³¹

29. See G. Dalman, *Grammatik* . . . p. 338.

30. G. Dalman, *Grammatik* . . . p. 88.

31. A. Diez Macho, *The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum* . . . p. 241.

compares Samaritan Aramaic *tbr'* (the mutation *waw* — *pe* — *beth* is common in the Geniza fragments, e.g. *hbw* for *hww*, *šwyn* for *špyyn*).

This variation is a feature of the scribe and whether or not the manuscript (*not* the targum) was written with pointing in mind. There does not seem to be any feature of the targum manuscripts here that differentiate them from any other late Aramaic (post 200 A.D.) texts. After all, texts have been written unvocalised right through the mediaeval period and are so written today. We can only expect early vocalisation for Biblican texts and targumim.

It seems probable that M. Doubles, like myself, has used in the main printed editions of the Midrashim. Obviously such cannot be used for detailed comparison with the targum *manuscripts*. Vatican 440 should be compared with e.g. British Museum Addit. 27169 (13th century).

VIII. A FURTHER POINT OF CONTACT BETWEEN THE GALILAEAN TARGUM AND IQ G.A. (NOT IN DOUBLES)

In the Aramaic text *'rwm* stands as the equivalent of the Hebrew /*ky*/ (*kī*) in the whole range of meaning. The only exception in the Geniza fragments is Genesis 43-25 in manuscript D, where the normal Galilaeen *d* of content has replaced the *'rwm* (*sm⁶w dtmn*). This is clearly an error, as all other manuscripts extant for this passage have *'rwm*. Genesis 30:13 (ms. E) may be a further exception, but the translation is here paraphrastic (an unusual occurrence).

The 'that' of content (of thought or speech) is always *d* in the interpolated passages. *'tbsr dmytt* (C. Genesis 35:9); *rḥys . . . dhwh* (D Genesis 38:25); *m skyyn . . . d hyh* (E Genesis 31:2). *'rwm* is used in the interpolated passages only with the meaning 'for, because, since'.

(D) Genesis 44:18 'for (*arum*), as Pharaoh your lord is mighty . . .

(C) Genesis 32:27 'let me go . . . *for* the time has come. . . '

(F) Exodus 20:13a, 13b, 13c, 14 'do not kill . . . *for* by the sin of murder death comes upon the world.

When we turn to the earlier IQ *G.A.* we find a similar syntactical use. *'ry* occurs five times (3:3; 19:10; 20:20; 20:22; 21:14).

19:10 'Do not cut down the cedar, *for* . . . '

20:20 'not one healer or magician or sage could stay to cure him, *for* the spirit scourged them all . . . '

20:22 '*for* the king had a dream'

21:14 'see the length and breadth of the land, *for* it is yours.'

'ry gives the reason for a previous statement or action, as does 'rwm in the interpolated passages of the Galilean targum. An alternative seems to be *bdy*—1Q *G.A.* 2:20 'for he was beloved' i.e. 'in that'.

There are some examples of *dy* in 1Q *G.A.* which may be translated 'because' but not 'for'. e.g. 2:25 'And I say to you (least) you be angry with me because (*dy*) I come here.' For I came here' is impossible in English, and 'ry in Aramaic would give not the cause of anger but the reason why one should *not* be angry, i.e. the phrase would have to be recast in the shape 'Do not be angry *for* I have come here.' The phrase as it is in 1Q *G.A.* could be translated 'lest you be angry with me *who* has come here. . . .' In 20:13 'Blessed art thou, O Most High God, my Lord, for all ages, Thou *who* art Lord' is the probable translation.

Targum Onkelos also uses 'ry but as an equivalent of Hebrew *ky*, and hence does not throw any light on Aramaic syntactical use. But Onkelos and 1Q *G.A.* seem to be the only works that use 'ry (*Dalman*, pp. 7f, does cite 71 examples of 'ry in the *Aramaic Book of the Hasmonaeans*, but this may be in imitation of targumic use), and the equivalent 'rwm in non-Biblical parts of Galilean targum shows the closest resemblance to 1Q *G.A.* syntactical use. I am not prepared to interpret this in chronological terms at this stage (though the orthographical difference 'ry/'rwm must be given its full weight), but one must raise the question how this affects arguments on the semitic background of the gospels, e.g. in Matthew 13:16 ('because you see' is suggested to be a translation of Aramaic *d* (Luke 10:23—*which* see). But in 1Q *G.A.* this would be 'ry and in Galilean targum (non-Biblical passage) 'rwm. This is not the place to discuss this further.

The Geniza fragments represent relatively early witnesses to Galilean Aramaic and must be used in any investigations into that dialect. although it is clear that corruption and error had already affected them. Vatican 440 (together with the margin of Neofiti) often preserves these early forms more accurately than other manuscripts of comparable date. The comparison of the Galilean targum with other western Aramaic (=Galilean) texts is hampered by the fact that our comparative material itself is not readily available in a sufficiently pure form. Hence it is possible to over-emphasise and misunderstand the difference between early manuscripts of the Galilean targum from late manuscripts (and printed edition) of other Galilean writings. There can, however, be no doubt that the Galilean targum belongs to this class of literature.