The common background which some passages of the New Testament and of the Palestinian Targum betray, has already been several times asserted and I just want to give a few more paralleled instances.

Under the name Palestinian Targum, I list the fragmentary Targum 1), the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan ben ‘Uzziel 2), the fragments published by KAHLE 3) and DIEZ MACHO 4) and the Codex Neofiti 5).

This material is not perfectly homogeneous, yet its differences have not been sufficiently analysed to permit a worth-while statement on the chronological order of the various sources. Certain it is that the Targum contains ancient traditions, notwithstanding a number of geographical or historical names which point to more

---

1) The T. Jérushalmi was first printed for the rabbinical Bible in Venice, 1.517/1.518. MOSES GINSBURGER published: Das Fragmenten thargum (Targum Jérushalmi zum Pentateuch). Berlin, 1899. He took as the fundamental text of his edition Cod. Par. 110, and gave the varying readings of others mss, and, occasionally, of the printed text and other minor sources. I do not think that the various readings have been sufficiently collated.

2) First printed in Venice 1591, by ASHER FORINS who copied it out of a ms. belonging to the Foa Family. MOSES GINSBURGER edited: Pseudo Jonathan ben Uzziel (Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel zum Pentateuch). Nach der Londoner Handschrift (Brit. Mus. add. 27.031). Berlin 1903. But this edition remains far from being a critical one. Words are frequently incompletely rendered (yod and wau especially are missing) or they are changed into others. Marginal notes have not always been properly read; sometimes even a sentence is removed from the text and given among the footnotes or simply left out. On the contrary, additions from the medieval authors are inserted in the text. There are a few vocalized words in the ms., but we are not told of them.


4) Sefarad XV (1955) pp. 31-39. As the present study is confined to Genesis I shall not refer to other fragments of the palestinian Targum, belonging to other books.

5) A. DIEZ MACHO. The recently discovered Palestinian Targum: its antiquity and relationship to the other Targums in Congress Volume Oxford 1959 (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, VII 1960), pp. 222-245.
recent times but which really are nothing but late interpolations. The mixed character of the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan ben 'Uzziel—mainly its philological orientalisation—has been explained in terms of an accommodation of the Palestinian Targum to the Targum of Onkelos. This would imply the pre-existence of a T. Onkelos, already achieved. But one would rather imagine that the Palestinian Targum, i.e., the palestinian paraphrastic translations and comments of the Pentateuch, while being preached and, occasionally written down, gradually acquired these features which are now called orientalisms. They do not convey therefore an oriental—babylonian—editing but they are just the result of an accommodation of the palestinian paraphrasis to the biblical Aramaic which was held to be more or less the standard classic language 1). Writing and solemn preaching convey a certain amount of emphasis and of avoiding plain spoken forms. However, the choice of impressive and adequate expressions being difficult and to a certain extent allowing subjectivisms, one has to expect a lack of regularity in this kind of paraphrastic comment progressively elaborated 2). The T. Onkelos, if this assumption proves correct, ought to be considered as the last stage of the “litteralisation” of former traditions. It could not have reached its regularity, one must acknowledge, without the influence of learned people who were, on the other hand, aware of the babylonian literary activity. Minor retouches and improvements of T. Onkelos, under the hands of the babylonian doctors, are to be admitted as well.

So, we can understand better perhaps why the Aramaic of T. Onkelos, on one hand, keeps a Palestinian pattern in spite of its orientalisms and why the Palestinian Targum, on the other hand, preserves a number of orientalisms (‘lēhōm: for them”, for instance), which are not even to be found in the T. Onkelos.

Jn. iv 15 “... a well of water springing up into everlasting life”.

Palestinian Targum, Gn. xxviii 10 3): “Five signs were performed

1) We do not know which writings shared perhaps with the Bible the privilege of exhibiting classic standard Aramaic. It might be that words and expressions now held as being literally ones were instead real spoken Aramaic, or words considered as literary ones in certain places could be considered elsewhere, or in the same place at other times, colloquial.

2) Among the Palestiniam Targum sources the fragments published by KAHLE and DIEZ MACHO (Cf. above), seem to be the more homogeneous. And perhaps their most constant feature is the retention of the ending “ān ēnān” in the 1 pers. com. pl., either as an independent pronoun or as a suffix.

3) J. W. ETHERIDGE: The Targum of Onkelos ans Pseudo Jonathan ben