dealings with men; (2) the insertion of the preposition “before” (oτp) when God is the object of any action ; (3) the use of the passive for the active voice, *e.g. crφ* ,⅛ for jπ, or '«i; \*p t'~≈, for jw; ,⅛nn for "ay, as·, -n,, m3; τ□τ for Ί31; (4) the use of periphrasis for the more pronounced anthropomorphisms, such as “ to smell,” “ to taste," or when the use of the *status constructus* might seem to bring God into too close connexion with men or things; (5) the use of different expressions, or the insertion of a preposition before the divine name, when God is compared to man, or the same action is predicated of God and man; (6) the use of ” for m.τ and tJ'∏⅛H, and the rendering κ⅛>rrι or xij’o when c'∏Sκ denotes heathen gods. Instances of this endeavour to maintain, as it were, a respectful distance in speaking of God occur on every page of the Targums, but cases also occur, by no means infrequently, where human actions and passions are ascribed to God. The explana­tion of this phenomenon is to be found in the fact that anthropo­morphisms, as such, were not necessarily avoided, but only in those cases where they might be misunderstood by the people.

(2) In addition to the Targutn of Onkelos two other Targums to the Pentateuch are cited by Jewish authorities, under the titles of the *Targum Jerushalmi* and the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel. Of these the former contains only portions of the Pentateuch,@@1 and is therefore usually designated the Fragmentary (Jerusalem) Targum. In a large number of cases this Targum gives merely a variant rendering of single words: where longer passages are given it presents a very paraphrastic translation, and bears all the marks of a late Haggadic composition. Its fragmentary character arises from the fact that it is simply a collection of *variæ lectiones* and additions to the version of Onkelos, intended possibly for use at public services.@@2 That this Targum was really intended to supple­ment that of Onkelos is shown by comparing the two texts. For the former is frequently unintelligible without the latter, since it offers no translation of those words, or clauses, for which it gave the same rendering as Onkelos. On the other hand, the version of Onkelos affords just the supplementary material that is required to restore sense to the shorter text. Moreover, in not a few eases the Fragmentary Targum itself attaches to its variant rendering the succeeding word from Onkelos, thus indicating that from this point onwards the latter version is to be followed. More con­clusive still is the fact that in a number of old *Mahzor* MSS. we find Targums to the Song of Moses and to the Decalogue, in which this process has been fully carried out, the text of Onkelos being given as well as the variants of the Fragmentary Targum.

The second Jerusalem Targum, or the so-called pseudo-Jonathan, admittedly owes its ascription to Jonathan ben Uzziel to the incorrect solution of the abbreviated form by which it was fre­quently cited, viz. '\*n, or *Targum Jerushalmi'* (,b⅛bti' cun). This Targum represents a later and more successful attempt to correct and supplement the Targum of Onkelos by the aid of variants derived from another source. It is not, however, a revision of the Fragmentary Targum—for it is clearly independent of that version—but is rather a parallel, if somewhat later, pro­duction, in which the text of Onkelos is already combined with a number of variants and additions. It is noticeable that this Tar­gum has been considerably influenced by the Targum of Onkelos, and in this respect, as in others, is far less trustworthy than the Fragmentary Targum, as a witness to the linguistic and other peculiarities of the source from which they were both derived. It exhibits, to a marked degree, that tendency to expand the text by additions of every kind, which has been already noted as char­acteristic of the later stages of Targumic composition. Homilies, legends, traditional sayings and explanations, in fact every form of Haggadic expansion are utilized by the Targumist, so that at times his works convey the impression more of a late *Midrash* than of a translation. This impression is fully confirmed by (a) a comparison of the Talmud and later Midrashic works with which it has obvious points of contact, and (*b*) the historical allusions, such as the mention of Constantinople (Num. xxiv. 19), of a wife and daughter of Mahomet (Gen. xxi. 21), and the references to Esau and Ishmael as representative world-powers (Gen. xlix. 26; Deut. xxxiii. 2; ef. Fragm. Tg. to Gen. xlix. 2; Deut. xxxiii. 2).@@3 In its translation of the Hebrew pseudo-Jonathan is careful to avoid anthropomorphisms and to give the sense of all but the most simple metaphors, though his method is not so thorough as that of Onkelos. Every endeavour is made to gloss over, or modify, expressions which seemed derogatory to the ancestors of

Israel, and to amplify everything which redounded to their credit. On the other hand, pseudo-Jonathan shows a tendency to condense those additions which it has in common with the Fragmentary Targum: in particular he omits all quotations from Scripture.

In regard to the source of the two Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch, we must accept the conclusion of Bassfreund@@4 that they both derived their variants from a complete *Targum Jeru­shalmi.* This conclusion is based on the following grounds: (1) Various Jewish works dating from the 11th to the 14th century contain a large number of quotations under the heading '\*n, *i.e. Targum Jerushalmi.* Of these rather less than a quarter are found in the Fragmentary Targum, the remainder being mostly taken from passages for which no translation of that Targum exists. This completer work, however, cannot be identified with the pseudo-Jonathan, for more than half of these quotations are missing from the latter; and further, in passages for which we possess both the Targums, the text of the Fragmentary Targum agrees much more closely with the quotations: the linguistic evi­dence also shows that the Fragmentary Targum is a more faithful representative of the original source; (2) the pseudo-Jonathan displays a curious inconsistency in its rendering of particular words and phrases, at one time following Onkelos, at another a different source. That this latter source is the *Targum Jerushalmi* is proved, in the majority of cases, by a comparison with the Fragmentary Targum; (3) quotations from Scripture preserved in the Frag­mentary Targum point to a completer version than our present Fragmentary Targum. But though the existence of an older *Targum Jerushalmi* cannot be denied, it is clear that the form in which it was utilized by the two Palestinian Targums cannot be of an early date, for many of the latest elements in the Fragmentary and pseudo-Jonathan Targums were undoubtedly derived from their common source. Moreover, the existence of a written Pales­tinian Targum at an early date is expressly excluded by the evidence at our disposal. In the middle of the 2nd century a.d. R. Simon ben Gamaliel forbade the translation of the Pentateuch in any language but Greek;@@5 and this command was upheld by R. Johanan in the 3rd century. Even in the time of the later Amoraim there is no mention of a written Palestinian Targum, though the official Babylonian Targum is repeatedly referred to in the Babylonian Talmud, in the Midrashim, and at times also by Palestinian Amoraim. These considerations are sufficient to dis­prove the theory of Geiger,@@6 which has for so long been accepted in one form or another, that the Targum of Onkelos was merely a reproduction of the old *Targum Jerushalmi* revised in accordance with the “new Halakha” introduced by R. Aqiba. Yet it is impossible to hold that the Targum of Onkelos was the only repre­sentative of Targum tradition that existed among the Jews down to the 7th century a.d., the period to which the internal evidence compels us to assign the *Targum Jerushalmi* as used by the Frag­mentary Targum and the pseudo-Jonathan. We must rather assume that a tolerably fixed Targum tradition existed in Palestine from quite early times. The language employed in the Targum of Onkelos is, admittedly, Palestinian or Judaean, and since language and thought are ever closely allied, we may conjecture that the current Judaean exegesis, which, in part at least, must go back to the 2nd century A.D., was not without its influence on the Babylonian translation. This old Targum tradition, however, never received official recognition in Palestine, and was unable, therefore, to hold its own when the new Babylonian version was introduced. We may infer that, as time went on, a reaction in favour of the older renderings made itself felt, with the result that these were collected in the form of variants and appended to Onkelos. But the authority enjoyed by the latter rendered it secure against any encroachments; hence any later expansions, especially those of a popular Haggadic character, naturally found their way into the less stereotyped *Targum Jerushalmi.* Unfortunately, we possess but little material for controlling the texts either of the Frag­mentary Targum or of the pseudo-Jonathan. Of the latter only one manuscript (Brit. Museum Add. 27031) is known to exist, and this has been utilized by Ginsburger in his *Pseudo-Jonathan.* (Berlin, 1903). The same scholar has also edited the Paris manuscript (110) of the Fragmentary Targum *(Das Fragmententhargum,* Berlin, 1899), to which he has added the variants from Cod. Vat. 440 and the manuscripts at Nuremberg and Leipzig. In the same edition are collected the various fragments of the *Targum Jerushalmi,* which are to be found in the early editions of the Pentateuch and in part also in various manuscripts.

II. TaRGUMS **ON THE PROPHETS**

The" official Targum on the Prophets is stated by the Babylonian Talmud@@7 to have been “said” by Jonathan ben Uzziel,the disciple of Hillel, and is usually known, therefore, as the *Targum Jonathan.* Elsewhere in the Talmud, however, the quotations from this Targum are given under the name of Joseph bar Chijah, head of

@@@1 According to Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge,* 2nd ed., p. 80, its contents bear the following proportions:—⅓ to Genesis, 3/20 to Exodus, about 1/14 to Leviticus, ⅕ to Numbers, and ¼ to Deuteronomy.

@@@2 Seligsohn, *De duabus Hier. Pent. paraphrasibus* (1858): for a fuller discussion see Bassfreund, “ Das Fragmenten Targum ” in *M.G.W.J*.xl.

@@@3 The view that Deut. xxxiii. 11 could only have been written by a contemporary of John Hyrcanus cannot be maintained; cf. Dalman, *Gramm.* p. 30 f., and, more fully, Bassfreund, *M.G.W.J.* xliv. (1900), pp. 481 f.

@@@4 *M.G.W.J.* xl.

@@@*5 Meg.* i. 11.

*@@@6 Urschrift* (1857), pp. 162 ff., 451 ff.; *Nachgelassene Schriften,* iv. p. 98 L; *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (1871), ix. p. 85 f.

*@@@7 Meg.* 3*a*.