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Among the many extant mss of Fragment-Targum to the Pentateuch, ms British Museum Or. 10794, folio 8, is unique, in that it is the sole representative of an otherwise unknown recension of this targum. The text was first published by M. Gaster in 1900, together with several other targumic and liturgical fragments from the Cairo Genizah.¹ Gaster wrote that his transcription was "ganz genau nach der Originalen abgedruckt."² As we shall see, however, aside from completely deleting more than eight lines from the text, Gaster's copy is, in fact, replete with errors.

Four years later, M. Ginsburger republished the text,³ reconstructing many of its lacunae. Unfortunately, Ginsburger

² Gedenkbuch ... Kaufmann, p. 223.
³ M. Ginsburger, "Neue Fragmente des Thargum jeruschalmi," ZDMG 58 (1904), 374-378.

[1]
did not have direct access to the ms, but rather relied upon Gaster's inaccurate transcription. As a result, whereas many of Ginsburger's reconstructions turn out to be quite correct, many others are totally mistaken.\footnote{E.g., Ginsburger was misled by Gaster's deletion of lines 13-20 of the verso, and by his misreading of the word בְּרֵךְ in line 21. Ginsburger, as a result, produces the reconstruction בְּרֵךְ מֵאָהוֹן, which he places in Deut. 4:26, instead of בְּרֵךְ מֵאָהוֹן מִאָהוֹן דְּמָהֲנָה, which belongs in Deut. 5:6.}

More recently, a portion of the ms has been republished in the sample fascicle of the Madrid Polyglot.\footnote{A. Díez Macho, \textit{Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia}, Series IV, Targum Palestinense in Pentateuchum, Book 5, Ch. 1, (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicos, 1965).} This edition, which is based upon a new transcription by P.J. Ramón Díaz, covers only 18 of the 50 lines of text, i.e., the targum of Deut. 1. Unfortunately, a number of Gaster's errors have been repeated, and a few others were newly introduced (see list that follows the text, below).

The text is written on both sides of a very poorly preserved, torn and worm-eaten sheet of paper, whose original size was estimated by Gaster as having been 17 x 12-13 cm. Each side contains 25 lines, in a hurried square script which probably dates to the 11th century CE.\footnote{The script of 10794 is similar to that of Cambridge University Library MS T-S 13 J 12, which was written in 1015 CE; see S.A. Birnbaum, \textit{The Hebrew Scripts}, (Leiden: Brill, 1971), Item no. 117. Gaster originally dated the ms to the 11-12th century; see \textit{Gedenkbuch ... Kaufmann}, p. 224.} It is sporadically vocalized in
the Tiberian system. The dages forte and lene are represented in three of the vocalized words: יָנִים (side a, line 18), יְנִים (b, 4), and יָנִים (b, 23). The tetragrammaton is symbolized in three different ways in this short text: יִים (a, 25; b, 20 bis), יְים (b, 14), and יִים (b, 25). The name "Israel" is abbreviated יִשָּׁר (b, 10, 20), and the name "Jephunneh" is written יֶפֶן (a, 18). Also, the final aleph and lamed are sometimes joined together as א (a, 3; b, 25).

The following signs are used in the transcription:  

\[\text{N} \] = doubtful reading  
\[?\] = very doubtful reading  
\[<N>\] = illegible, restoration probable  
\[///\] = illegible, restoration not evident  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
[ ]
\end{array}
\] = lacuna

---

7 The present transcription was made from Microfilm no. 8109, in the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem, and was subsequently collated against the original ms, in the Oriental Reading Room at the British Museum. I hereby express thanks to the Trustees of the British Museum and the staff of the Institute, for their kind assistance.
A Palestinian Fragment-Targum

British Museum MS Or. 10794, folio 8
(Gaster Collection) (Deut. 1:1 - 5:9)

fol. 8a

א.PathVariable [1:1] 1
עב כְּלָי ישראל לאוּקְכָה לֵיהוֹ [4]
כָּל חַכָּי הַקָּדָשׁ לֹא הָיְתָה [5]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [6]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [7]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [8]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [9]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [10]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [11]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [12]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [13]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [14]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [15]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [16]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [17]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא Дֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [18]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְهوּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [19]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [20]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [21]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [22]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [23]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [24]
כָּל הַדּוֹרֵךְ הוּא לֹא דֶרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֹשׁ [25]
ועל חותם קורין榕אמקרת[5] הנשורי ו
כמל: 16  
ועשו תهجות בחלק[7]המח circumcision נמות: 17  
השגרה על תחתית ומחותרי על טוב כל: 9 
נשב בבאixo усл全て פזור: 29  
ברח"ל[8]  
ברוח התחבור הם נבילים ותחייתם טבע: 12  
ומבחה[20] על קו. יכרך ניסים והבר הבר: 14  
כ inauguration מתורג השכרת: 30  
כصحة של ויעקבלבר[16] לבר: 16  
והיכן גאופור[38]නגרו[17]  
ולכבוד שמה: כץכרם ממילא[42]  
fork רכז[43] מתורג[48] מצלחתנרה  
יכהריך פניקס ז名牌 את[21]  
וכל יד🥑 שית נח[8] מצלחתנרה[23]  
כupportInitializeみたいי ולא낼ות[1]  
כארו אויבах אוול אהלותオン[25]
The present transcription differs from its predecessors in the following readings:
a,1-2. Both G(aster) and D(íaz) omit these two lines. However, since the Madrid Polyglot does not reproduce any Hebrew lemmata, the omission may reflect a conscious editorial policy.
a,4. עבּ[ל]וֹנָה (G); The ms clearly reads עבּ[ל]וֹנָה (D). The ms clearly reads עבּ[ל]וֹנָה (D).
a,5. יִהְיֶהֽוּ [בָּמָד] missing in G and D.
a,6. דִּמְגָּא [דִּמְגָּא] (G,D); The ms clearly reads דִּמְגָּא (G,D).
a,7. יִסְמָא (G,D).
a,8. אַסְרְאֵל (G).
a,11. פְּסָלֵת [פְּסָלֵת] (G,D); The ms clearly reads פְּסָלֵת (G,D); both earlier editions have a mistaken line divider.
a,12. [תָּדָּּבָר יִנְיָא (וֹלָלִין)] missing in G and D
a, 14. [רֵי יִלֶּוּת (וֹלָלִין)] missing in G and D; there is space in the ms for the preformative aleph of the ‘aph’el.
a,15. נָגַה (G), נָגַה (D)
a,16. כְּפּרִים (כְּפּרִים) (G)
a,18. אֲלָחוֹת (G); בֵּית גֵב (יִנְבָּה) (G); אֲלָחוֹת (G); אֲלָחוֹת (G); [אֲלָחוֹת] missing in G and D.
a,21. הַרְבּוֹגָלָה (G).
a,25. חֲשֵׁר (א) [הֲשֵׁר] (G).
b,4. שְׁחוֹר (G).
b,5. This entire line, except the last word, is omitted in G. The word נוֹדֵשׁ apparently belongs to the midrashic expansion to Deut. 3:2, that appears in the other mss of Fragment-Targum (except ms Paris Hebri. 110):
... It is of no small signifi-
...
also misplaced in ms Nürnberg 1 where it follows v.11. Likewise, the deletion of v.9 in ms Vatican Ebr. 440 and in ms Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek B.H. fol. 1, is probably related to this same confusion. Line b,5 of the present MS is, therefore, an important link between 10794 and another recension of Fragment-Targum.

The importance of ms Br. Mus. 10794 lies in the fact that it does not belong to any of the other presently known recensional families of Fragment-Targum. As recognized by Gaster, our text belongs to a fragmentary recension, i.e., an intentional selection of targum to certain verses and parts of verses. Gaster had at his disposal M. Ginsburger's Das Fragmententargum, published just one year earlier (Berlin, 1899), and he correctly concluded that our text differs from

---

Ginsburger's main text (Paris 110) as well as from the variants
cited in that work (Vatican 440 and Leipzig 1). Today, with
much more targumic source material at hand, the situation
warrants restatement and elaboration.

Our text represents a third recension different from those
of a) ms Paris 110 (P), and b) mss Vatican 440, Nürnberg 1 and
Leipzig 1 (VNL).\(^9\) Whereas our ms, in its torn condition,
preserves parts of at least 42 verses of Deut. 1:1 - 5:9, P
preserves parts of only four verses,\(^10\) and VNL preserves parts
of 24 verses.\(^11\) Of these, only 13 are verses preserved in our
ms, while the remaining 11 are missing entirely from 10974.
Moreover, of the 13 verses that are common to our text and VNL,
four are a targum to exclusively different parts of the verses
(Deut. 3:11,17; 4:20,42). Finally, even in the passages of
common targum, the present text preserves additional phrases,
not contained in P or V,\(^12\) and vice versa. Thus, הָֽפַּלְפָּל
(a,5) and לָכַמְחַלְחֲלָל (a,15) are missing in P,V; and

\(^9\) Earlier descriptions of this group speak of VBNL, which
includes the first Biblia Rabbirica (Venice: Bomberg, 1517-18).
More recently, mss Moscow-Glinzburg 3 (M) and Sassoon 264 (S)
were recognized as belonging to this recensional family. However,
as I have shown in a detailed study (HUCA 46, see previous note),
only V, N and L are primary sources. B and M are direct copies
of N; and S is but a copy of a later edition of B.

\(^10\) Deut. 1:1,2; 3:1,29.

\(^11\) Deut. 1:1,2,3,24,44; 2:8; 3:1(V), 2,5,9(N),11,14,17,23,24,
29; 4:7,18,20,24,33,34,42,44,48. Ginsburger had already noted
the quantitative and qualitative discrepancy between 10794 and
the other two recensions; cf. ZDMG 58 (1904), 377.

\(^12\) In the following examples, "V" represents the entire VNL

group.
conversely, אשר והיא (P), as opposed to (V), מובאת דיאה (a,8); versus ביכרין (P,V), מיקולאת הלא רוחך (a,10); and and דיא סיב פא (`מעוני) (P,V), versus מיקולאת הלא (a,11). There are also translational differences: יורעיהו (a,10,11): רוב ביכרין (P,V); and further variances in the use of the active and passive verb: אפרשים (a,6): העד פא (P,V); and further variances in the use of the active and passive verb: אפרשים (a,6): העד לכול (P,V).

The implications of these details are clear enough. The various Fragment-Targums represent distinct recensions or selections of a basic Palestinian targumic tradition. The fullness of these selections varies, P being the sparsest, and the present text being the fullest.

Although not directly related to the Palestinian Targum according to ms Neofiti 1, our text seems to be recensionally closer to it than to the Fragment-Targums just mentioned. Neofiti is in agreement with 10794 in all of the latter's differences with P and VNL. Neofiti contains (a,5) and הכפר על חוכמך (a,8). Likewise, it does not have either גזר עליכך על תכלת (a,10), or (a,11). Also, Neofiti employs the translations (a,10,11), and the translations (a,20) in addition to:

There are, nevertheless, a number of significant differences between Neofiti and the present text, which preclude any direct

13 Neofiti contains an additional phrase,_whether it is a noun or verb, found neither in the present text, nor in P and VNL.
lineage between the two texts: לְכִלּוּ בְנוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof); וְעַלֹּלַ עֵמֶק מְנַהֵל רְיֻ (Neof); מַעֲרָת בֵּית מֶרֶם (a,11): בַּשָּׂרָה דְּרֵי חֶתְרָה (Neof); רְכִפָּר (a,15): בְּכִפֶּר (Neof); עַלֹּלַ נְתָנֹלָה (a,18): לְכִלּוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof); בּוֹצָר (b,4): לְכִלּוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof); הַיָּרְדֵּנֶה (b,6): נְתָנֹלָה דְּרֵי (Neof); גֶּשֶׁר: (b,13): שְׁעַרְתָּוָה וְדְמֵרָה (Neof); יַסְרֵי וְטָרְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof); מַעֲרָת בֵּית מֶרֶם (b,12): לְכִלּוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof); כִּלּוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (b,15): לְכִלּוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Neof).

Thus, although very closely related to Neofiti 1, 10794 does not derive from a direct ancestor of it.

Since none of the other known Genizah fragments of Palestinian Targum contains targum to Deut 1-5, it is impossible to undertake any detailed comparison. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to certain general observations. Our text differs from the other Genizah fragments, in that it is part of a fragmentary or selective recension, whereas all of the others are fragments of what appear to have once been complete


15 Strangely enough, in these last two geographical identifications, 10794 is in agreement with Pseudo-Jonathan, except for the verb סָלִיק/פָּסַר (b,4).

Palestinian Targumim. Even the collections of festival readings, such as Oxford Bodleian MS Heb e43, folios 57-65 (Kahle's ms F), are composed of entire chapters of targum. The only possible exception is Jewish Theological Seminary ms 605 (ENA 2587), folios 6-7, which contains series of non-consecutive verses from within the festival readings.

Inasmuch as the various Genizah fragments represent many different recensions of the Palestinian Targum, we need not expect 10794 to be in total agreement with any of them.

Finally, the fact that an early ms of Fragment-Targum in an eastern script was found in the Cairo Genizah, enhances the possibility of this type of recensional activity having taken place in the area of Palestine.

POSTSCRIPT: Some years after this article was written, a new manuscript of Fragment-Targum to Deut 23-33, was discovered by Dr. Julia A. Foster in the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Collection at Cambridge University Library. Dr. Foster is presently preparing the fragment for publication. Although it is clear that the British Museum and Cambridge fragments do not derive from the same original manuscript, it will be important to compare the two texts. Also this new discovery bolsters my concluding statement regarding the provenance of this recensional activity.

17 Masoreten des Westens II, pp. 49-62. See also, Maḥzor Vitry (Machsor Vitry), ed. S. Hurwitz, (Münnerberg: Bulka, 1923), pp. 305-309, 335-344, for similar festival collections.