TARGUM NEOFITI, EXODUS 16:15

GEOFFREY J. COWLING

Macquarie University

The new English version of Emil Schürer's *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*[1] remains cautious in its assessment of the value, for information about the cultural milieu of the New Testament, of those manuscripts known collectively as 'the Palestinian Targum'.[2] If we accept the 'rule of thumb' that 'unless there is specific proof to the contrary, the haggadah of the Palestinian Targums is likely to be Tannaitic and to antedate the outbreak of the Second Jewish Revolt in A.D. 132';[3] then these traditions are potentially more valuable than those in the Mishnah.

The language of the Targum (or targums) points to a date of composition after A.D. 132.[4] This has been disputed,[5] but I have argued that the attempt to demonstrate that the targum contains orthographical and morphological features that predate A.D. 132 has failed.[6] J. Bowker, accepting a probable date of compilation in the third century A.D., says: 'If this conclusion about the date is right, it means that the question of the relevance of Neofiti 1 to the New Testament is a difficult one.'[7]

The main argument for the Tannaitic—or even pre-Christian—origin of the traditions in the Palestinian Targum is expressed in terms of a comparison of those traditions (usually found in midrashic additions to the text) with early material. It is claimed that 'when comparative material is available, Targumic haggadah is usually paralleled, not only in the Talmud and Midrash, but also in the Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, Philo, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, etc.'.[8]

In this paper I wish to examine one claimed comparison with the New Testament, namely G. Vermes, 'HE IS THE BREAD: Targum Neofiti Exodus 16:15'.[9] I will show that the parallel does not exist. The claim will not stand textual criticism or linguistic analysis based on the precise dialect in which the Targum is written. I will demonstrate again the affinity of the Palestinian Targum dialect with the Galilaean dialect of the Palestinian Talmud, using a syntactical criterion which is much more effective in heavily revised texts than morphological or orthographical.[10] This same criterion can help to settle the relation of (Pseudo-) Jonathan to the Palestinian Targum: a question still left open in Schürer (p. 104).

In the article referred to, Vermes argues that the phrase *hw' lhm'* should be translated *'he* [i.e. Moses] is the bread'. The parallel to the sixth chapter of John in the New Testament is clear. 'Jesus said to them, "I am the bread of life." ' (John 6: 35 RSV.) But can the translation be justified? Vermes argues:

> 'In clear contrast to all these versions, Neofiti must have understood *hw'* in *mn hw'* as a pronoun referring, not to an object, but to a person. Otherwise the clause "for they did not know Moses" makes no sense. The Aramaic words *mn' hw'* are therefore to be translated "who is he" or more probably "what is he" ' (p. 258).

The text of the Hebrew and the versions of Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti 1 for Exodus 16:15 are:[11]

MT	wyr'w	bny yśr'l	wy'mrw	'yš	'l	'hyw
O	whzw	bny ysr'l	w'mrw	gbr	l'hwhy	
PJ	whmwn	bny ysr'l	whwwn	t'hwn		
			w'mrw	'ynš	lhbryh	
N	whmwn	bny ysr'l	w'mryn	gbr	l'hwy	

MT	mn	hw'	'ky	l' yd^{c}w	mh	hw'
O	mn'	hw'	'ry	l' yd^{c}yn	m'	hw'
PJ	m'n	hw'	'rwm	l' yd^{c}wn	m'	hw'
N	mn'	hw'	'rwm	l' yd^{c}yn	*mšh*	

MT	wy'mr	mšh	'lhm	hw' hlhm		'šr	ntn
O	w'mr	mšh	lhwn	hw' lhm'		d	yhb
PJ	w'mr	mšh	lhwn	hw' lhm'	**	wkdwn	yhbyh
N	w'mr	mšh	lhwn	hw' lhm'		dy	yhb
MT	YHWH	lkm	l'klh				
O	YWY	lkwn	lmykl				
PJ	YYY	lkwn	lmykyl				
N	YYY	lkwn	lmykl				

[** midrashic addition omitted here]

Sperber cites but two variants here: *yd^{c}w* and *yd^{c}wn* for *yd^{c}yn*. It is interesting to note that MS. Harley 5520 of the British Museum reads: whzw bny ysr/ [. . .] gbr *lhbryh m'n* [cf. PJ] hw' 'ry l' yd^{c}w m' hw' (omitted but supplied in the margin) lhm' [marked as an error] w'mr mšh lhwn hwh lhm' dyhb YY [. . .] lmykl. The two [. . .] represent scribal omissions from this manuscript. Despite the numerous errors this manuscript is important for the resemblance of its text to the Onkelos text of PJ. The two italic words indeed have a good claim to be original.

The margin of Neofiti reads: bmymr' dy lkwn lmzwn—replacing YY lkwn lmykl.

The crucial reading is clearly the *yd^cyn mšh* of Neofiti 1. The example quoted from Harley 5520 shows how easily a scribe may become misplaced. Thus it is not surprising that B. J. Malina treats the reading mšh in Neofiti 1 as a scribal error for *m' hw'*.[12] Díez Macho discusses Malina's and Vermes' views without making a firm decision.[13] He suggests the correction to *m' hw'* and the Spanish translation in the *editio princeps* reads 'porque no conocia a Moise's (o? que era aquéllo)?' The French and English translations ignore the original reading and accept the amendment. Can we determine the accuracy of the Neofiti reading? Pseudo-Jonathan is extant at this point and agrees with Harley 5520. No other manuscript of the Palestinian Targum is extant for this verse. We must therefore examine the intrinsic probability of the reading.

Vermes recognises that the syntax is unexpected. 'One would normally expect *yt* before an accusative, although its absence is by no means unique' (p. 256 n. 3). This needs to be more nuanced. *yt* is the equivalent of the Hebrew *'t*: it is invariable in the Cairo Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum. In these same fragments (which I have examined exhaustively as they represent the earliest form of the tradition) *yt* is not uncommon in the interpolated material, although here the normal Galilaean use of *l* before nouns (and frequently with pronominal suffixes) to indicate the direct object is the more common cf. Genesis 35:9 (MS. C) and Exodus 20:14 (F). Thus while *yt* is possible, *l* would be more likely when there was no *'t* in the Hebrew.

However, there is a far more serious objection. In the Cairo Geniza manuscripts and the text-groups represented by Vatican 440 and Paris 110 the Hebrew root /*yd^c*/ is translated by two Aramaic roots /yd^c/ and /ḥkm/. The one exception is Genesis 3:5 (Ms. B) where all versions use /gl'/. There is a clear complementary distribution: *ḥkm* is used with single word direct objects, including words prefixed by *yt* or *l*; *yd^c* when an object *phrase* is introduced by *d*, *'rwm* or *mh*.

There is one important exception: in Genesis 31:6 MS. E of the Geniza reads /ḥkm/ before *'rwm* (discussed later). Does this hold for Neofiti 1? If we examine the 147 uses of the root /yd^c/ in the Masoretic text of the Tora, we find that Neofiti 1 used /yd^c/ 96 times in translating these verbs, and /ḥkm/ 37 times. 14 times we have other roots, generally agreeing with Onkelos or PJ (e.g. Ex. 33:17—Ex. 33:13 neither).

The distribution generally follows the rule. The exceptions are:
Genesis 30:26, 39:6, 39:8 (N /yd^c/, MS. E /ḥkm/)

Genesis 44:15 (N /ydᶜ/ as expected, but margin /ḥkm/)
Exodus 16:15, 36:1 (N /ydᶜ/—no other reading)
Numbers 10:31 (both N and Margin /ydᶜ/)
Numbers 14:34 (N /ydᶜ/—no other reading)
        20:14 (N /ydᶜ/—margin /ḥkm/)
Deuteronomy 8:2 (N /ydᶜ/—no other reading)
           8:3 (N /ḥkm/, margin /ydᶜ/ against rule)
          18:21 (N and M /ydᶜ/ against rule)
          29:15 (N /ydᶜ/, margin /ḥkm/)

Thus the rule is kept in the majority of cases, and the deviations are readily explained as representing the influence of the Hebrew text. It is typical of the later manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum (and of Onkelos for that matter) that direct etymological equivalents of the Hebrew come to replace more idiomatic Aramaic words. The only times that /ḥkm/ occurs in Neofiti 1 when /ydᶜ/ would be expected are Genesis 31:6 (margin only, the same reading as manuscript E) and Genesis 44:15 (again margin—MS. D has expected reading. MS. E is not extant but almost certainly read as the margin of N).

Comparison of Targum and Talmud

The distribution of the words *ḥkm* and *ydᶜ* in the Targum corresponds most closely with the distribution in the Palestinian Talmud. *ḥkm* meaning 'know, recognise' and hence taking a direct object (including nouns preceded by *yt, l* and sometimes *b*) is most commonly found there, though examples may be found in *Wayyikra Rabbah* (S. 30) *Koheleth Rabbah* (XI.1). I have not thoroughly searched *Bereshith Rabbah* but I have as yet found no use of *ḥkm* with a direct object there, and none are quoted in Levy, Jastrow or Dalman.[14] I have found *ydᶜ* with a direct object there
e.g. 'n' ydᶜ lw š/ [or tlt m'h] mtlym (*Ber. R.* 88:7)
    (I know three hundred fables)

This seems quite rare in the Talmud, and may well be an error there, as it appears to be in the Targum.

In Sotah 1:4 (p. 16ᵈ) the clause
    kl 'ytt' dydᶜh mylḥwš lᶜyynh
    (every woman who knows how to heal his eye)
occurs. Later in the narrative the verb is different—
    'mr lh *ḥkmh* 't mylḥwš lᶜyynh
    (he said to her: 'Do you know how to heal my eye?')
If we compare the passage in *Berakhoth* 6:2 (10ᵇ)
    wl' 'nh ḥkym mbrk' ᶜlyh
    (I do not know how to say grace for it)

it would appear that the use of yd^c is incorrect. (See too *Mo^ed Katon* 3:5 (83b top). It is most unlikely that the use of the two different words was original, but it might be that the narrative was originally in a different dialect and only partially corrected to the general dialect of the Talmud.

The only other unexpected phrase I have so far found is in *Ta^canith* 4:56 (p. 68[d] top)

br nš l' yd^c bhwn

(no-one recognised them). Here yd^v takes a direct object (with *b*), though in *Berakhoth* 9:3 (p. 13^c)

ḥkym 'n' bšqqy šmy' kšqq' nhrd^c' qrty

(I know the streets of the sky like the streets of my own city, Nehardea). The verb is *ḥkym*.

Apart from these two examples the Talmudic usage appears identical with that of the Targum. In *Berakhoth* 2:3 (4[d]) and *^Abodah Zara* 3:1 (42^c) the Hebrew phrase

whmtym 'ynm ywd^cym m'wm' (Eccl. 9:5 'but the dead know nothing' RSV) is discussed, and the question is asked:

wḥkym 'ynwn klwm

(do they know anything?) The equivalent of the Hebrew yd^c is *ḥkm* in this context.

In the targum to Ecclesiastes, despite certain resemblances to the Palestinian targum (e.g. use of *'rwm* and *lyt*) we have lytyhwn yd^cyn md^cm.[15]

In a similar discussion in the Babylonian Talmud we have (*Berakhoth* 18[n])

'mr lyh wmy yd^cy kwl h'y

(do they—the dead—know all this?)

Further examples from the Palestinian Targum may be given.

Berakhoth 1:1 (2[d])

'yt bny 'ynšy (y)hbyn prytn *mḥkym* plṭyn

(people pay money to get to know a palace)

Kilaim 9:3 (32[b])

'mr lyh wḥkym 't lyh 'mr lyh

'yn 'n' ḥmy lyh 'n' ḥkym lyh

^cbr kl tlmydwy qwmwy wḥkm lrby ywsy

^cbr kl tlmydwy qwmwy wlkm lrby ywsy

(and he said to him: 'Do you know him?' He said to him, 'If I saw him I would recognise him.' All his students passed before him and he recognised rabbi Jose.)

Ma⁽ᶜ⁾aser sheni 5:2 (56ᵃ)
npq bᶜy myḥm' lwn wl' ḥkym
(he went out seeking to show [the way] to them but he didn't recognise [it].)

Ketubboth 5:6 (30ᵃ)
r/ šmw'l 'mr ḥkym 'n' lḥyyt' dyldyn ly
r/ yhwsᶜ bn lwy 'mr ḥkm 'n' lgzyrh dgzryn ly
rby ywḥnn 'mr ḥkym 'n' lnšyy' dṣbtyn ᶜm 'ym'
(Rabbi Samuel said: 'I knew [recognised? or remember?] the midwife who assisted at my birth' [reading *dmldyn*]. Rabbi Joshua ben Levi said: 'I knew the one who circumcised me[?].' Rabbi Yohanan said: 'I remember the women who kept my mother company.' [Cf. Jastrow p. 1260.])

Terumoth 11:7 (48ᵇ)
'//r nys' 'n' l' 'n' ḥkym l'b'
(Rabbi Nisa said: 'I never knew my father.')

Rosh ha-shanah 2:1 (47ᵈ bottom) and *Yoma* 3 (40ᵇ)
ḥkym' hy' mylt'
(she knew a word)

Shekalim 7:3 (50ᶜ)
w'mr yḥkmwn špyy' qytryhwn . . . 'mr yḥkmwn syqyyry' ᶜbdnhwn
(and said: 'Let the wine dealers recognise their knots . . .' and said: 'Let the sausage makers recognise their products')

Hagigah 2:2 (78ᵃ)
'mr mylp wmylph kl mty yᶜbwd mh dhw' *ḥkm* [myᶜbd]
(he said: 'To learn and teach. Let everyone coming do what he knows how to do.')

ibid.
'mr kl dmty yḥkwm zwg'
(he said: 'Let everyone who comes take a partner.')

Ma⁽ᶜ⁾aser Sheni 4:6 (55ᵇ bottom)
hhw' gbr' l'ymy' hw' ḥkym
(You have 'known'—sexually—your mother)
hhw' gbr' l'ḥt' hw' ḥkym . . .
(You have 'known'—sexually—your sister)

These last two examples are noteworthy because they represent a loan translation of the Hebrew *ydᶜ* (as the English 'carnal knowledge' also does).

ydᶜ used with *mh* and *d*.

Berakhoth 2:1 (4ᵇ)
'//l kl ᶜlm' ydᶜyn dr' 'lᶜzr
tlmydyh dr ywḥnn
(he said to him: 'The whole world knows *that* Rabbi Eleazar
is Rabbi Johanan's student')
and kl ᶜlm' ydᶜ yn dr//m tlmydw dr' ᶜqyb'
(everyone knows *that* Rabbi Meir is Aqiba's student)

Berakhoth 1:5/8 (p. 3ᶜ top)
'y yhbt ly lbk wᶜynyk 'n' ydᶜ d't ly
(if you give your heart and eyes to me, I know *that* you are
mine)

Kilaim 9:3 (32ᵇ)
wydᶜ *d* hw' kᶜys ᶜlwy
(and he knew that he was angry with him)

Hagigah 2:2 (77ᵈ)
ydᶜ 'n' d't gbr ḥsyd
(I know that you are a worthy man)

Taᶜanith 4:5/6 (68ᵈ)
ydᶜyn hwytwn *mh d*hwyn' ᶜbd lkwn b' pyhwn
(you know *what* I did for you before your eyes)

Shabbath 6:2 (8ᶜ)
ᶜd dnydᶜ mh hwy bswpyh
(until I know what is his fate)
—compare Genesis 42:36 in the Palestinian Targum
lyt 'n' ydᶜ mh hwwh bswph
(I don't know what is his fate)

ibid. l' 'n' ydᶜ mh smᶜt
wl' ydᶜyn mh 'mr d' wmh 'mr d'
(I do not know what you heard and they do not know what
—man—said this and what man that)

Berakhoth 6:1 (10ᵇ)
lyt 'n' ydᶜ *mh* 'mrwn ly
(I do not know what they said to me)

The Targums to the Writings[16]

Wherever these Targums directly represent the Hebrew text
ḥkm is not used to translate Hebrew *ydᶜ*: verbs based on the root
/ydᶜ/ or /gly/ are normally used. When there is a doublet or
explanation of the text then *ḥkm* is used for knowing plus direct
object.

I Chronicles 12:32 (33)
wmbny ysskr *yd^cy* swkltny l^cdny
    [[ḥkymyn lmqb^c ryšy šnym. . . .]]
(and of the children of Issachar that were acquainted with reasoning on times // knew how to determine beginnings of years. . . .)
and Esther 2:18, the addition
lyt 'n' yd^c' wl' ḥkm' yt ^cmy . . .
(I don't know and I don't know my people . . .)

In the latter example, either we have a doublet, or the difference in the verb is due to the direct object after the second verb. We may note too the use of *yt* not corresponding to a Hebrew *'t*.

Clearly the same idiom occurs in the Palestinian Talmud as in the Palestinian Targum. With personal objects only *ḥkm* may be used. In some of the examples the root /ḥkm/ does not correspond in meaning with the Hebrew /yd^c/. This is particularly so when the meaning is 'recognise'. However, these examples have been included because they illustrate the syntactical use of /ḥkm/ in the dialect of the Talmud. Sufficient examples of the use of /ḥkm/ have been given which correspond to the Hebrew /yd^c/—including the sexual connotation—to indicate the semantic correspondence with the Targumic use.

We can say confidently that if *yd^cyn mšh* is not a scribal lapse, then *yd^cyn* has resulted from the alteration of an original *ḥkmyn* to agree (etymologically) with the Hebrew. The likelihood that this verb should be so changed and yet the novel interpretation be left unaltered is remote. The presence of the verb *yd^cyn* makes it almost certain that the word *m'* and not *mšh* followed the verb.

Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan

In the 147 occurrences of the root /yd^c/ in the Torah, by the rule of the direct object we would expect /ḥkm/ some 48 times. Neofiti 1 has 37 occurrences of this verb; the margin corrects the use twice. In Targum Onkelos for these passages, /yd^c/ occurs some 128 times and /ḥkm/ once. The exact number depends on the manuscript followed. The single use of /ḥkm/ probably represents the meaning 'be wise': it does not accord with the Talmudic or Targumic use—and is hence not found either in Neofiti 1 or Ms. B of the Geniza. Pseudo-Jonathan follows Onkelos here.

Pseudo-Jonathan uses /yd^c/ 110 times (out of 147), and /ḥkm/ 19 times. These nineteen do not all correspond either with the Palestinian Targum or the Talmudic use. Only 11 (out of 48) follow the rule we have elucidated. These 11 agreements with the Palestinian Targum are not evenly or randomly distributed through Pseudo-Jonathan.

In Genesis Pseudo-Jonathan *never* uses /ḥkm/ as a translation of the Hebrew /yd^c/ when the Palestinian Targum does so. In Genesis 3:5 PJ agrees with Onkelos; in Genesis 47:6 it is alone in the reading—and no direct object follows the verb.

In Exodus Pseudo-Jonathan agrees with the Palestinian Targum at 1:8—but in 9:30, 10:7, 18:11, 34:29, Pseudo-Jonathan uses /ḥkm/ with 'rwm (in 9:30 MS. D of the Cairo Geniza uses /yd^c/). In Exodus 23:9 Pseudo-Jonathan agrees with the margin of Neofiti 1 in using /ḥkm/ with yt. In Exodus 2:4 Pseudo-Jonathan uses Ithpael of /ḥkm/ before m'!

In Numbers Pseudo-Jonathan does not use /ḥkm/ at all, though there are seven places which require it. Neofiti uses /ḥkm/ four times, once the margin corrects the reading (20:14), but in Numbers 10:31, 14:31 the margin confirms the unexpected /yd^c/. Unfortunately no earlier manuscripts are available for these two passages.

This accounts for two of the nine agreements with the Palestinian Targum.

In Deuteronomy up to chapter nine there is no use of /ḥkm/ (though it is consistently found where expected in the Palestinian Targum).

From this chapter to the end nine of the eleven agreements occur. This might suggest that a thorough revision of a Palestinian targum had lapsed in Deuteronomy. While this cannot be ruled out completely on this evidence alone, the *distribution* of these agreements suggests a different explanation. The agreements are 'bunched', and five examples of /yd^c/ against the idiom and witness of the Palestinian Targum occur between the 'bunches'.

with PT Deut. 9:24;
      13:3, 7, 14; 22:2; 28:33, 36;   34:6, 10
against Deut. 11:28;
            28:64; 29:25; 31:13; 32:17

There is also one use of /ḥkm/—Deut. 31:29—against the witness of the Palestinian Targum, and without a direct object.

It is quite clear that, despite sporadic agreement with the Palestinian Targum, Pseudo-Jonathan has a very different distribution of the translation equivalents of the Hebrew /ydᶜ/ than the Palestinian Targum. The way in which the agreements occur suggest rather a combination of sources than a revision. This is also suggested by the fact that the more *obvious* features tend to be Galilaean (though only the use of *ḥm'* and *'rwm* agrees with the Palestinian Targum in syntactic and semantic distribution); while the subtler features of distributions and frequencies approach more closely to Onkelos.

This suggests a superficial 'Palestinization' of an Onkelos base; plus a very eclectic borrowing of material from a wide range of sources.

/hkm/ with 'rwm

'rwm is a translation idiom—it does not occur in non-Targumic literature (see pp. 48-49 of my article). The idiom of *'ḥkm'* followed by *'rwm* is found in one manuscript of the Cairo Geniza, namely manuscript E. In the portion which has survived there is one example (Genesis 31:6), while in four other places the expected /ydᶜ/ occurs before the *'rwm*. As I hope to show elsewhere the Neofiti marginal source which S. Lund[17] compares to Vatican 440 in Deuteronomy is in Genesis even more closely allied to MS. E. Hence it is not surprising that at Genesis 31:6 the margin of Neofiti also reads /hkm/ before *'rwm*. But this is found only one other time in the margin, namely Genesis 44:15, *against* the witness of MS. D. Pseudo-Jonathan however, has the idiom five times—out of the nineteen occurrences of /hkm/ as a translation of /ydᶜ/.

Conclusions

1. The reading *ydᶜyn mšh* in MS. Neofiti 1 Exodus 16:15 is almost certainly a scribal error. There is no parallel to the New Testament here.

2. All manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum reflect the syntactical use of /hkm/ with direct objects (especially persons), /ydᶜ/ with object clauses introduced by *'rwm, d,* or *mh.* The manuscript E of the Geniza = margin of Neofiti 1 sporadically has /hkm/ with *'rwm*: it is not possible to say on the evidence here whether this is an original reading or a correction. The same use is common in Pseudo-Jonathan. The use of /ydᶜ/ with direct objects in the manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum is due to revision of the text—probably unconscious—to bring it in line with the Massoretic text.

3. The closest analogue to the Targumic use is in the Palestinian Talmud. It does not seem that there is an earlier use. This indicates that in the absence of other evidence we may assume that not only Neofiti text, but all the Palestinian Targum manuscripts have acquired their linguistic form (either by composition or revision) later than the third—fourth century I have suggested previously. I can agree with Okamoto that 'a strong redactionary tendency evident in N cannot have emerged much earlier than 426 A.D. (d. of Rav. Ashi), postulating that there had existed the basic Targum'.[18] But the evidence for a Targum before that time becomes slimmer—and much of the revision of Neofiti 1 must have taken place well after that time. The witness of the Geniza manuscripts suggests that.

4. Pseudo-Jonathan is so far from following Galilaean usage (as exampled in the Talmud) that it ought not to be spoken of as a Palestinian Targum. Whether it is a heavily revised Palestinian Targum or Onkelos spiced with Palestinian Targum elements is almost irrelevant here. If it is revised, it is so revised as to leave little genuine Galilaean idiom. Even when the language is superficially like that of the Palestinian Targum closer analysis shows divergences. The explanation of eclectic borrowing and clumsy imitation of Galilaean words seems the most plausible hypothesis at the moment.

The same pattern emerges, leading to the same conclusion, if the translation variants of the Hebrew words lqh and lhm are examined. In the former, the Palestinian Targum tends to avoid the Onkelos use of dbr for people: in general agreement with the Talmud (except for actual leading by the hand). In the latter $mzwn$ and lhm occur in a complementary distribution. Neofiti is revised, the margin in particular supplying the $mzwn$. Pseudo-Jonathan is sporadic in agreement.

———————

1. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar, Volume I (Edinburgh, 1973).

2. For a list of these manuscripts see my article 'Notes, mainly orthographical, on the Galilaean Targum and *1Q Genesis Apocryphon*', *AJBA*, II (1972), p. 35. There are several printer's errors in this article, of which the most serious are to be found on line 24 of page 40 (this line, the first one beginning '*aleph* . . .' should come after the line beginning '*he* . . .'), line 19 of page 43 (for t\`ebdwn read t\`esbdwn) and the table on page 43 (omit line 2 from the table). A good introduction to the targums is J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, 1969). See too Roger le Déaut, 'The Current State of Targumic Studies', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, IV (1974), pp. 3-32.

3. Schürer, p. 105.

4. Cf. J. T. Milik, 'Saint-Thomas de Phordesan de Gen. 14:17', *Biblica*, 42 (1961), p. 81 N 2; Y. Kutscher, 'The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon', *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958), p. 3; and J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (second edition, Rome, 1971), pp. 19-29.

5. For a summary of the arguments see le Déaut *op. cit.*, pp. 24-26. He does not mention M. C. Doubles, 'Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum', *In Memoriam Paul Kahle*, edited M. Black and Georg Fohrer (Berlin, 1968), pp. 79-89, though this is the source of some of his arguments, including the weird argument from the antiquity of the non-word $b^c\check{s}$.

6. In the article mentioned in note 2.

7. Bowker, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

8. Schürer, p. 104.

9. *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (Edinburgh, 1969); listed in bibliography of Schürer, p. 112.

10. As the frequency distribution of words is less obvious to a scribe than orthography and morphology this is less likely to be altered. As long as the word is familiar to the scribe, it is not likely to be altered even if its context is a little odd. This does not apply to obviously dialectical words. It is a weakness of the words chosen here—perforce, as they are relevant to Exodus 16:15—that one (*ḥkm*) is specifically Galilaean in the meaning 'know'. Nevertheless, by placing emphasis on the syntax the method is quite sufficient for the purpose of this article. It certainly meets le Déaut's criterion of neutrality (*op. cit.*, p. 31).

11. Onkelos (symbol O) from Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Volume 1 (Leiden, 1959); Pseudo-Jonathan (PJ) from MS. add. 27031 of the British Museum and Neofiti 1 (N) from *Neophyti*, Volume II, edited by A. Díez Macho (Madrid-Barcelona, 1970).

12. *The Palestinian Manna Tradition* (Leiden, 1968).

13. *Neophyti*, Volume II, p. 59*-60*
    '? Hay que corregir el texto? Este es el problema.'

14. Jacob Levy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Worterbuch* (Leipzig, 1876-84); Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York, 1950); Gustav Dalman, 'Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (Leipzig, 1905, r.p. Darmstadt 1960).
    Quotations from the Palestinian Talmud come from the *Talmud Yerushalmi* (Zhitomir, 1860-67) and (Krotoschin, 1866). I cite by pereq and halakhah number as well as the page and column reference of the *editio princeps*. The latter is taken from the Krotoschin edition. The halakhah number appears to differ between the editions on occasion. When I have noted this I have put both numbers, but there may be some inconsistencies remaining.
    Bereshith Rabbah is quoted from the Theodor and Albeck edition, English translation from the Soncino *Midrash Rabbah*; translated into English with notes, glossary and indices, H. Freedman and M. Simon (London, 1939).

15. A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Volume IVa (Leiden, 1968).

16. *Ibid.*

17. 'The Sources of the Variant Readings to Deuteronomy 1:1-29:17 of Codex Neofiti 1', *In Memoriam Paul Kahle, BZAW*, 103 (1968), pp. 163-8.

18. Quoted by Díez Macho, *Neophyti*, II. p. 76*. When le Déaut cites me as affirming a fourth century date of composition: that was for the original Palestinian Targum. I have always seen Neofiti as a later recension: revised and added to.