THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE ESTHER TARGUM
IN THE ANTWERP POLYGLOT: EXIT TARGUM ESTHER III?

R. Le Déaut and B. Grossfeld

The manuscript tradition of Tg Esther knows of at least two types, one known as simply Targum to Esther—The Targum Rischon—and the Targum Shenii. These two types are represented by recensions more or less different, according to the quantity of paraphrase inserted into the text, particularly abundant in both Targums to Esther.

The special nature of Tg Esther in the Antwerp Polyglot [A] (Vol. III, 1571)\(^1\) has long been recognized and certain writers already suspected that this short Targum, practically without paraphrase, was a trimmed-down version of a Targum Rischon type.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Abbreviations

A = Tg Esther in the Antwerp Polyglot
B = Bodleian Library 1057
C = Add. 436 Cambridge University Library
M = MS Madrid 116 Z-40 (=Villa-Amil 5)
O = Laud. Or. 154 (Cat. Neubauer 129) Bodleian Library
RB = Second Rabbinic Bible (Venice 1527)
S = MS Salamanca 2

The problem has been taken up again in a volume of *Biblica* 56 (1975) where two diametrically opposed views are represented, those of M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and P. Grelot. The latter considered A as an ancient authentic text which had been inflated with Aggadic material so as to produce a Tg Esther I: "un texte secondaire, tardif, qui glose le livre d'Esther en y insérant des éléments midrashiques empruntés à la tradition rabbinique" (p. 68). Goshen-Gottstein had no difficulty in demonstrating through convincing examples that A is the result of a skillfully and systematically achieved surgery of 16th century editors, who worked on a manuscript prepared for the first Polyglot (Alcala/Complutum in Latin) of 1515-1517. Goshen-Gottstein based his arguments (as A. Merx had previously done) on the very explicit information contained in the Prefaces and other Latin documents of the Antwerp Polyglot, as well as an analysis of MS Madrid 116-Z40 (M), prepared by the converted Jew Alfonso de Zamora (1480-1545) for the Alcalá Polyglot. In this manuscript the Aggadic expansions are carefully indicated as such by the abbreviation *Add* in the margin of the Latin translation made by Zamora. The conclusion is: "The Antwerp recension can only be understood as a 'cut' recension—in this case cut by a Humanist editor (Arias Montano)—influenced in his decision and action by a Humanist scribe and critic (Alfonso)" (p. 321).

We have thought that this problem could be further investigated by pursuing the same method of Goshen-Gottstein, *viz.* a study of the external evidence furnished by contemporary documents, as well as a comparison between A and the manuscripts of Alfonso de Zamora. In fact, some additional important documents deserve to be added in this investigation. These documents raise certain problems which a patient historian might be able to solve by examining, in particular, the correspondence exchanged between the various protagonists of that famous undertaking.


4 An explanation already rejected by S. Posner (above, n. 2, 16), who suggests comparing Targum I and II for 1:1ff.

The Esther Targum in Antwerp Polyglot

I. Contemporary statements about the Polyglots, Alcala and Antwerp.  

The Alcala Polyglot printed only the Targum Onqelos. The Preface of the Regia (redacted by Arias Montano) informs us that this choice was intentional, because the other Targums were too paraphrastic and especially because they contained superfluous and apocryphal matter. On the pragmatic side, however, not all the Latin translations could be finished in time. After this notice, in particular reference to the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, Montano informs us that Cardinal Ximenes had these manuscripts, written on parchment (with their Latin version), deposited in the library of Alcala University. The latter, in turn, gave them to him for inclusion in the Regia ("Quae Academia...earum nobis copiam fecit, easque nos huic operi...adjecimus"). The same situation held true for the Targum of the Hagiographa attributed to R. Joseph ("Hujus paraphrasim in Latinum sermonem conversam ex eadem Complutensi Bibliotheca Bibliiis hisce regiiis addidimus").

These manuscripts had been carefully "expurgated," i.e., the additions to the Hebrew text were specifically noted. This is what Arias Montano tells us in the Preface to Vol. II ("Benedicti Ariae Montani Hispalensis in Chaldaicarum paraphraseon libros et interpretationes Praefatio") a propos the Targum of the Former Prophets, "which has additions that do not correspond to the usual style of the author nor to the letter of the Hebrew text,"  and which were clearly identified.


7"Ob eam potissimam causam quod quaedam in Chaldaico textu reperirentur, quae vel supervacanea aut etiam apocrypha viderentur." The unexpected death of Ximenes also explains why the manuscripts remained unused until the intervention of Philip II and A. Montano.

8"Nonnullis adjectionibus plerisque in locis auctum, quae neque cum reliquo auctoris stylo...neque etiam cum simplici Hebraicae veritatis sententia omниno conveniunt." This text refers to the famous manuscript of Masius, to which we will return below.
These manuscripts, prepared for the Bible of Ximenes were used as the basic text for the Regia. This was, in effect, considered the continuation of the Alcalá Polyglot. Already in February 1565, long before the arrival of Arias Montano in Antwerp (May 15, 1568), Christopher Plantin intended to print "Biblia Complutensia et d’y ajouter le Targum," which represented the great novelty of the enterprise, as pointed out by many documents of the time. As the official responsible for this work by order of King Philip II, Arias Montano would obviously write to Spain to request a copy of the Targum of Proverbs, because he wanted the text of this Bible to conform to the manuscripts of Spain. The censors of the University of Louvain, in a letter to the Pope, carefully point out that "what was missing from the Chaldaic paraphrase in the Alcalá edition had to be supplied from the Venice Bibles, after having first collated ("collatis tamen prius...") the manuscripts that Cardinal Ximenes, before he died, had had carefully corrected in Alcalá by learned men ("per viros doctos fideliter corrigi jussit").

9 A. Merx was correct when he wrote (above, n. 2, 153): "Jonathan-und Hagiographen-Targum in der Antwerpener Polyglotte in Wahrheit (ist) Complutensischen Ursprungs," and: "Die Antwerpener Drucke...einer vorher gemachten handschriftlich aufbewahrten Bearbeitung entnommen ist" (p. 157).

J. Llamas affirms that, according to contemporary documents about the Regia, it was considered as "a corrected and augmented edition of the preceding" ("Un manuscrito desconocido, ejemplar directo del texto hebreo Complutense," Religion y Cultura, Escorial [1933] 6 and 9).

10 The letter of Plantin to Masius (26 February 1565), cf. M. Rooses, Correspondance de Christophe Plantin III (Antwerpen 1911) 1. See also II, pp. 11-12 where A. Hunnaeus speaks of Plantin, to whom the king "a confié l’impression des Bibles de Complute" (i.e. Alcalá); II, p. 276; III, p. 42.

11 Such as the Preface of Fr. Raphaelengius to his Variae Lectiones in the last volume of the Regia.

12 "Porque toda la lección ordinaria desta Biblia vaya conforme a los ejemplares de España," cited by J. Llamas (above, n 9, 11) From a letter of Montano to the private counsel of the king (4 January 1572) we learn that "il avait été envoyé...avec charge et commission expresse de faire...imprimer les S. Bibles...avec l’entièrre paraphrase Chaldaïque ancienne, selon la copie des Bibles jadis imprimées à Complute en Espagne," Correspondance de Plantin II, 276.

13 This is true only for Proverbs, Canticles, and Lamentations, because they were not found in time among the manuscripts that came from Spain, cf. A. Merx (above, n. 2), 156ff., who cites the whole text.
know what this meant and, consequently, in the second Preface of Vol. I A. Montano is anxious to emphasize the care with which the text of the Targum was prepared for publication, after having been expurgated and translated into Latin ("expurgati et Latini facti").

Therefore, it was according to the indications of the Spanish "correctors" that the Antwerp scholars edited their texts. A. Díez Macho concludes that "there existed around Arias Montano an atmosphere of corrections which explains his zeal to correct the Targum of Job and other Targums of the Antwerp Bible." These corrections were motivated by an obsession to return to the veritas hebraica in a climate of tension perceivable in the contemporary controversy about the Vulgate (considered since the Council of Trent in 1546 as an "authentique" text), and in the violent reactions which followed immediately upon the publication of the Regia, and even before it was finished.

As far as the Alcala Polyglot is concerned, the motivation was apologetical in nature, namely the preoccupation with eliminating traditional Jewish interpretation of Scripture. The humanist editors of the Regia were free of such prejudiced intentions and the Alcala Polyglot was published with the goal of providing a text that was as accurate as possible. This led to the inclusion of Targums in the volume, which were included in the Polyglot in an attempt to reconcile Jewish and Christian readings of the Bible.

---

14 "Le Targum de Job dans la tradition Sefardie" in De La Torah au Messie (Mélanges Henri Cazelles; Paris 1981) 554.

15 B. Rekers recreates very well the climate of the time (above, n. 5, 45-69: Chap. III, "The Polyglot Bible"). We read in a letter from Estrada to Montano (ibid., 145, Letter #54; cf. also Letter #56): "Cierta persona ha querido persuadir...que los originales hebraicos y caldaicos de la divina Scriptura estan corrompidos por los judios...." The censor of the Regia appointed by the Spanish Inquisition, the Jesuit Juan de Mariana, "criticized Masius' Chaldaic paraphrase, which relied entirely on rabbinical authorities" (B. Rekers, above, n. 5, 63) Cf. also F. Asensio, "Juan de Mariana y la Poliglota de Amberes," Gregorianum 36 (1955) 50-80. Even Mariana denuded the absurd hatred of Jewish sources prevalent in Spain" (B. Rekers, above, n. 5, 63), where the scholars who made use of Jewish sources were termed "Judaizantes."

16 Richard Simon (Histoire critique du Vieux Testament [Paris 1680] 338-9) recalls the discussions a propos the inclusion or not of Targums in the Alcala Bible, and then in the Regia. Some people, he writes, did not see the usefulness of the paraphrases "écrites d'un style barbare et remplies d'une infinité de fables ridicules et superstitionnées...C'est pourquoi le Cal Ximenes se contenta de mettre dans la Bible d'Alcala la seule paraphrase d'Onkelos qu'il corrigea en quelques endroits et ordonna en même temps qu'on conserverait le reste des Paraphrases Chaldaïques dans la Bibliothèque publique de l'Université de Complute, après qu'il les eût fait réformer et qu'on en eût ôté toutes les gloses inutiles et superstitionnées. Arias Montanus a aussi fait imprimer dans la Bible d'Anvers les Para-
dices but they had, nevertheless, to take into account the position of the authorities, hoping to have one day an official approval of their work. On the other hand, the correcting of the Targums, intended to bring the text back to the sources and to the letter of the original Hebrew text, was in harmony with the spirit of the Renaissance. We have an explicit confession of their activity as "abbreviators" in a list (of only three pages) of "Loca ex Chaldaica Paraphrasi rejecta, quae supervacanea videbantur," in Vol. VIII. This list is probably that of Fr. Raphaelengius. It is very incomplete; for instance, there is nothing from Esther. But Joshua, Ruth, and Qoheleth are absent as well, and from the Prophets, only Isaiah is represented. Therefore, the only thing the abbreviators did in this list was to retrieve the paraphrases which might have had some interest for the Christian reader for whom the Polyglot was intended.

Among all the Targums published in the Regia, the Targum of Esther has its own story, connected to that of the manuscript of the Former Prophets already mentioned. The edition had already begun, when A. Montano realized that "among the Chaldaic books (=Targums) which the cardinal had prepared to be printed" there was missing at Alcala one volume, namely, that of the Former Prophets which are Joshua, Judges, and the books of Samuel and Kings, which remained in the possession of Zamora when the cardinal died. This book has disappeared from Spain, and while I was here, I learned that it had arrived in Rome and that there, Andreas Masius,\(^{17}\) secretary of the Duke of Bavaria...had bought it...As he was passing through here this summer, I spoke to him and asked him to lend it to me in order to add it to the other (manuscripts of Alcala) in this Bible...But when he brought it to me, I found that it did not have a Latin translation (except for twenty verses of the first chapter in Joshua)...so I was forced to translate it myself in order that all the entire Chaldaic (text) had its own translation.\(^{18}\)

phrases Chaldaïques avec une partie de ces corrections." But the work of Montano was attacked because "favorisant les superstitions des Juifs qui paraissaient avoir été approuvées par les Docteurs de Louvain" (French spelling modernized).

\(^{17}\)Orientalist and exegete (1514-1573). He had an important role (especially at the beginning) in the production of the Antwerp Bible, though it is difficult to determine precisely what his role was.

\(^{18}\)Letter of 9 November 1568, written from Antwerp by Montano to Zayas, secretary of Philip II, cited by J. Llamas (above, n. 9) 11. Cf. L. Díez Merino, "La Biblia aramea de
Arias Montano gives more details in his Preface to Vol. II of the Regia already cited. He informs us there that he instantly recognized that this manuscript ("exemplar correctum atque expurgatum") belonged to the very same hand that had written "the other manuscripts of Alcala, Aramaic text and Latin version," evidently that of A. de Zamora. Because of its extreme usefulness ("propter insignum utilitatem"), Montano incorporates it into his edition. He then specifies that

in this (manuscript) the additions which are found in the other known manuscripts were indicated in certain chapters. Although most of them contain nothing that might offend the reader; nevertheless, because of the apocryphal content and a certain style which does not fit in with the rest (of the text), these are duly indicated, and they appear separated from the context of the manuscript. It is this expurgated manuscript that we have received from Masius...and which we have mainly utilized in this Bible.20

This is a case, then, of an unfinished manuscript,21 containing only the Aramaic text (without the Latin version), and, it seems, with the paraphrastic passages noted and isolated in the text—perhaps written in smaller letters or preceded by the term Tosephta, as in Chapter 1 of the Tg Esther of the Ms Salamanca 2 (also written by A. de Zamora). The most interesting thing we learn from other documents is that this manuscript of Masius contained other books besides the Former Prophets: all the lists are not complete, but several mention Esther explicitly.

So Fr. Raphelengius gives us a list of "correctissima exemplaria" which had been chosen for editing the Targums of the Regia: "Namely, for the Pentateuch the edition of Alcala; for the Former Prophets, ESTHER, Job, Psalms, and Qo-

Alfonso de Zamora," p. 72. In the Correspondance de Plantin, one finds allusions to this manuscript of Masius: III, 1, 52, 73, 78, 87.

19 One can find this important text in A. Merx (above, n. 2) 154-5.

20 "In eo additiones illae, quae in caeteris vulgatis exemplaribus habentur, certis capitibus notatae erant: quorum magna pars, licet nihil habeat, quod lectorem possit offendere; quia tamen apocryphum argumentum et certum quoddam orationis genus continet, quod cum reliquo non satis cohaeret, merito adnotatione, atque ab ipsius exemplaris contextu separatae conspiciuntur. Hoc itaque repurgato exemplari a Masio accepto, atque a nobis qua potiusus fide et diligentia latinitate donato in hisce Bibliis praecipue usi sumus."

21 We know about several other unfinished manuscripts of A. de Zamora, cf. L. Díez Merino, "La Biblia aramea..." (above, n. 6) 73.
heleth, a manuscript copy of Andreas Masius; and for the Latter Prophets, (a manuscript copy) of Arias Montano.\textsuperscript{22} Still more clearly, in his list of variants to the texts of the Targum published in the Regia, he mentions as deriving "Ex Masiano exemplari" the following books: Judges, Ruth, I/II Samuel, I/II Kings, ESTHER, Job, Psalms, and Qoheleth. For the Latter Prophets and the Minor Prophets, we read: "Ex B. Ar. Montani sive Hispalensi exemplari" (the Spanish manuscript of Montano). This statement agrees with the other statement supplied by the same text. When Raphelengius mentions the authorities upon which he relied in correcting the vocalization of the texts "by analogy with that of Daniel and Ezra," he quotes, besides Elias Levita,

the authority of two outstanding manuscripts (duorum praestantissimorum...exemplarium), one of which was brought from Spain through Arias Montano. The other one we owe to Andreas Masius, who bought it while he was in Rome and placed it at our disposal" (nobis copiam fecit).\textsuperscript{23}

The books of the "Masius MS" are precisely those for which Arias Montano had to provide a Latin translation ("A. Montano interprete"), while, for the other books he only "corrected" the Latin translation of A. de Zamora, which came from the Alcalá library.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22}In his "Variae Lectiones et Annotatiunculae quibus Thargum, id est, Chaldaica Paraphrasis infinitis in locis illustratur et emendatur," in Vol. VIII. Latin text in A. Merx (above, n. 2) 157.

\textsuperscript{23}We prefer this translation according to the meaning of this expression in Classical Latin, rather than "to make a copy" (like Díez Macho, "Le Targum de Job..." [above, n.14] 554 and L. Díez Merino, Targum de Salmos [Madrid 1982] 26). This meaning is possible in Medieval Latin and the Chancellary language, cf. D. Du Cange, Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis, Vol. III (Paris 1678) 553-4. Referring to this same manuscript, A. Montano used the expression "nobiscum...communicavit" (a few lines before the text quoted in n. 20), cf. A. Merx (above, n. 2) 155. Nevertheless, we will speak later on of "copies" by Masius, when again referring to this famous manuscript, in n. 28, below. It is worthy of noting that among the Targumic sources of the Regia, two texts prepared by A. de Zamora had a prominent place.

\textsuperscript{24}We owe to Montano the Latin versions of the following books: Former Prophets (including Ruth), ESTHER, Psalms, and Qoheleth, signed by a formula like "B. Aria Montano interprete." For all the other books (the Latter Prophets, the Minor Prophets, Proverbs, Canticles, and Lamentations), he simply corrected Zamora's translation. Thus, for Canticles we read: "Chaldaicae Paraphrasis Translatio in Cantica Cantorum ex Bibliotheca Complutensi ad Hebraicam veritatem ex Chaldaeis exemplaribus correcta,
Therefore, it appears that the Targum of Esther of the Regia derives from the Masius MS, of which we have lost track—it is not known even if it still exists. The editors considered this manuscript an excellent one and used it as much as they could. It appears that it was copied in such a way that it was practically ready for printing. Nevertheless, it was incomplete: not only was the Latin translation missing, but also the Targums of Proverbs, Canticles, and Lamentations had not yet been copied. In this case recourse was had to the Bomberg editions of Venice, comparing them with the manuscript of the Alcala.

Here we have a problem: If Arias Montano brought with him all the manuscripts formerly prepared by A. de Zamora for the Bible of Ximenes, he would have had at his disposal the manuscript Madrid 116 Z-40 (No. 5 in the catalogue of Villa-Amil de Castro, of the University library). This, in fact, is the last part of a Bible (Hagiographa) of which he himself says (Preface of Vol. I) he possessed the Latter Prophets (MS 116 Z-39; Villa Amil 4). Why did Montano not make use of this manuscript for the missing Targums (Proverbs and opera B. Ariae Montani." Therefore he has consulted for Canticles (and Job, Proverbs) the MS Madrid 116 Z-40.

25 L. Díez Merino, "La Biblia aramea..." (above, n. 6) 73. This manuscript is mentioned several times in the correspondence between Plantin and Masius. Thus we read in a letter from 26 December 1569: "Quant au livre que de votre grâce particulière m’avez prêté et confié contenant l’autre partie de la paraphrase chaldàique des Bibles de Complute, lequel nous avons suivi en notre impression..." (in italics in the text) (Correspondance de Plantin, III, p. 52); 31 January 1571: Plantin asks of Masius to be able yet to keep his "Chaldaic book, of which we made very much use in the printing..." to allow his son-in-law (Raphelengius) to notate "all the variant readings" (III, p. 74); 29 October 1571: "Je vous renvoie votre Targum..." (III, p. 87). Masius died on 7 April 1573. It would be interesting to know the fate of his rich library. We were not able to consult Max Lossen, Briefe von Andreas Masius und seinen Freunden, 1538-1573 (Leipzig 1886).

Incidentally, in Correspondance de Plantin (II, p. 20, 31), we find two of his letters (10/31 Dec. 1568) to the Cardinal of Granvelle (Rome) mentioning "Targum de Jonathan sur le Pentateuque." Granvelle was sending him another letter about this Targum. A. Montano, "very happy," was anxious to buy it or at least to borrow it in order to print it in the Regia. It would be interesting to see what might have happened to the Pseudo-Jonathan after undergoing the rolling-mill of our Antwerp editors. At about the same time, Azaria de Rossi (Me'or 'Enaim [Vilna 1863] 127) mentions two copies of Ps. Jonathan which were then found in Italy (cf. R. Le Déaut, Targum de Pentateuque, I [Paris 1978] 29-31).

26 Cf. A. Merx (above, n. 2) 157 and the letter of Montano to Zayas a propos Proverbs (n. 12).
Canticles), since we know that he consulted their Latin translations to correct them.27

We might also ask who, in fact, prepared the Aramaic text of Esther for the edition? The last one responsible for "the arrangement and correction of the text" (according to an oft-repeated formula) was Arias Montano. However, he occupied himself mainly with the Latin versions, for which he had help from others. In the second Preface of Vol. I, he attributes to A. Masius the Targum of the Former Prophets, Psalms, Qoheleth, and Ruth.28 It is, therefore, possible that Montano himself had extracted the text of the Tg Esther from the Masius MS. However, it is very difficult to pinpoint precisely the part played by each of his immediate collaborators like Fr. Raphaelengius29 and Guy Lefèvre de la Boderie (Fabritius Boderianus). The latter was to write later an epigram against the apparent pretensions of Montano to attribute to himself all the merit of the Regia.30 A letter

27 Proverbs and Canticles were to be found in the MS Madrid 116 Z-40, and Lamentations in the MS 116 Z-39, after Jeremiah, fol. 148a-157a (cf. L. Díez Merino, "La Biblia aramea..." [above, n. 6] 75). There existed also in Spain a Ms of the Former Prophets (now Bibl. Nac. M5 7542), copied by A. de Zamora in 1533 for Don Antonio Ramirez de Haro. This manuscript was probably not as available as those prepared for the Polyglot and deposited in Alcala University. Cf. J. M. Millas Vallcrosa, "Manuscritos hebraicos de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid," Sefarad 8 (1943) 292-294. There was no reason for this manuscript to be at the University Library as stated by Fr. Delitzsch, Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte (Leipzig, 1871) 28, n. 2.

28 This is how we should interpret the following text (with A. Merx [above, n. 2] 155):

"Ab Andrea Masio...plerisque valde doctis annotationibus et Chaldæica Paraphrasi in priores Prophetas, Psalmos, Ecclesiasten et Ruth, ope Hispani exemplaris a se Romae invenit...aucti sumus."

It may also be a question of Targumic texts prepared by A. Masius for the edition in a letter sent to him by Plantin on 18 March 1571 (Correspondance de Plantin III, p. 78). After having said that he would send him back his books (Targum and Arabic dictionary) as soon as possible, Plantin adds: "Mais quant est de renvoyer vos copies il ne me serait aucunement permis, d’autant que par l’ordonnance du Roy les visitateurs [=les censeurs? ⏤ R.D/B.G.] les doivent garder," until the entire edition is finished.

29 In his Preface to the New Testament (Vol. V), Guy Lefèvre de la Boderie thanks Raphaelengius for producing a complete Chaldaic paraphrase, much more correct ("longe emendatiorem") than heretofore, with a vocalization restored according to the analogy of the books of Daniel and Ezra. He also praises his work as a "Corrector," before A. Montano went through the whole thing in order to examine it prior to giving his approval.

30 Thus we read, among other things:
of his mentor, Guillaume Postel, to Theodore Zwinger (19.9.1572) explicitly attributes to him the credit for "the entire Targum as well as the Syriac N.T.".\textsuperscript{31}

It is worth noting that in his edition of Tg Esther with its Latin version (Vol. III), Arias Montano merely reproduced the short Prologue of Jerome (18 lines) which attacks the Greek additions to the book, in order to defend his own literal Latin translation of the Hebrew. In the Vulgate, these additions are duly indicated by an obelus, introduced by a note of Jerome,\textsuperscript{32} who finally regrouped them all at the end of the book. He was already doing to Esther, at the same time, the work of A. de Zamora and that of the editors of the Regia!

II. The Antwerp text: A short recension of Tg Esther à la Bodl. 1057 (B)?

P. Grelo\textsuperscript{33}, in response to Goshen-Gottstein's article, put forward the following hypothesis: A. de Zamora had in front of him a short text of Tg Esther which he had been collating with his Addis in order to produce something like a "critical" text. In his search for this "lost manuscript," Grelot refers to an additional footnote of A. Brüll (in his re-edition of L. Zunz's \textit{Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden}, Frankfurt am Main 1892): "A shorter Targum without digressions is contained in the Antwerp Polyglot, probably corresponding to Rome 1424." This note

\begin{quote}
Donc qu'Arias l'Espaignol ne s'enxyvre
Tout seul de l'honneur de ce livre.
\end{quote}

(Text in B. Rekers [above, n. 5] 54.) On the other hand, in a letter to the Pope in 1571 when he was sent to Rome to present the \textit{Regia} to Gregory XIII in the name of the king of Spain, Montano writes: "Tertium Tomum totum fere ipse conscripsi" ("The third volume I wrote almost entirely myself"). This is a rather general statement, but it is, in fact, the volume which contains the book of Esther.

\textsuperscript{31}"Unus ex meis praefuit editioni tam \textit{Thargumi totius} quam Syriaci Novi Testamenti." Cf. F. Secret, "Documents pour servir à l'histoire de la publication de la Bible d'Anvers," \textit{Sefarad} 18 (1958) 124. Postel did not approve of the fact that they did not again make use of the Targum in the Bomberg edition, but "used another edition so far never seen by Christians" (\textit{ibid.}, 123). He was well aware of the innovative and artificial character of the text of certain Targums.

\textsuperscript{32}So, for instance, in the beginning of chap. 15 (LXX): "Haec quoque \textit{addita} repperi in editione vulgata" (=LXX). In the beginning of the book of Job, Montano inserts two of his own Prologues to justify his editions of the Greek and that of the Hebrew. Normally, he simply reproduces those of Jerome. In any case, he could not overlook the one to Esther, which expressed so well his own views.

\textsuperscript{33}Above, n. 3, 69, 72.
is reproduced in the revised edition in Hebrew by Ch. Albeck (Jerusalem, 1950) without any further details about the manuscript, and P. Grelot was not able to identify it. In any case, Brüll was wrong, as we shall see.

Goshen-Gottstein\textsuperscript{34} did not deny the possible existence of short recensions of Tg Esther and gave as an example the Rome Maḥzor, Cat. Bodl. 1057/1058[B]. This is a Maḥzor according to the Roman Minḥag (and definitively not a manuscript from a library in Rome, as we have ascertained years ago). The first part, containing Esther, was written in San Severino Marche (province of Macerata, Italy) in 1424.\textsuperscript{35} This is precisely the manuscript Grelot was looking for.

Goshen-Gottstein rightly pointed out "the cuts in this Targum Esther tradition."\textsuperscript{36} It is definitely a shorter Tg Esther, as one can see from numerous verses where there the additions contained in the traditional recensions are missing. The following examples emerged from a comparative study of B with a traditional recension, such as the Targum I of the RB.

I. In comparison to Tg I as contained in the RB, it lacks the large Aggadic paraphrases of the latter in the following passages: 1:1, 3(2); 3:8; 5:1; 8:15; 10:3.

II. In other instances it contains Aggadic material of its own often considerably shorter in form, 5:14; 6:1.

III. But by and large, the brevity involves a word or two, or even an entire sentence; cf. 1:2, 4, 10, 14, 22(2); 2:3, 7, 8, 9, 13, 23; 3:4, 7, 8, 9, 12; 4:8, 10, 12(2); 5:1, 2, 3(3), 5(2); 6:10(2), 13; 7:2(2), 6(2), 13(2); 7:2(2), 6(2); 8:2, 11; 9:1, 5, 6, 23(2), 27, 29(2), 31(2).

\textbf{Examples}

I. Lacking large Aggadic paraphrases:

1) 1:1: יְדִיב בִּימֵי אָמָרָהוּ Here, in the RB Targum, a Tosefta appears within a larger Aggadic discussion of the phrase, which is lacking in B (and in P and M).

\textsuperscript{34} Above, n. 3, 315, n. 3.


\textsuperscript{36} ibid.
2) 5:1: Within the context of an Aggadic paraphrase, the Tg I in the RB, upon referring to Haman's part in Vashti's death, mentions his ulterior motive—Haman's secret wish to have the king select his own daughter in marriage, a scheme that was foiled by "Heaven." This section is not found in B, though it does exist in P and M. This is noteworthy, since B is usually more similar to P and M than to RB.

3) 10:3: Here B has virtually a literal translation of the Hebrew (only ויהיה ויהיה has been added at the appropriate place), whereas RB contains an expansion of the Hebrew מושב ות joseph which it renders פרושר (RB has the literal הרויה here). RB adds that Mordekhai was also the treasurer and chief elder statesman of the Jews, whose fame had spread far and wide, from one end of the world to the other (cf. Esth. 9:4), with all monarchs being in fear of him, and that Mordekhai was likened to Venus and the Morning Star (the first simile occurs for Esther in 2:7 of M).

II. Containing Aggadic material of its own:

1) 5:14: For this verse, the Tg I of the RB contains an extremely elaborate, Aggadic supplement, dealing with Zeresh's and Haman's friends' advice to Haman as to the invincibility of the Jewish people, enumerating how earlier historical personalities of Israel escaped death by a variety of attempted executions directed against them. This eventually leads to their counselling Haman to try the so-far untested method of the gallows against Mordekhai. In B (as well as in M and P) this Aggada occurs in considerably reduced form, involving only the three Patriarchs, Moses and the Israelites, and Daniel.

2) 6:1: Here B (as well as P and M) contains an Aggadic passage which, in its concise manner, describes how God responded to the cry of Israel which ascended to heaven, sounding like the cry of kid goats. The attribute of mercy thereupon reverses Haman's decree against Israel, initiating the process by disturbing Xerxes' sleep. For this passage Tg I of the RB has, instead, an extremely elaborate paraphrase revolving around the opening words of this chapter "During that night," describing in turn the restless nights experienced by the "king," God, Mordekhai, Haman, Esther, and King Xerxes.
III. Brevity involving a word or two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Word</th>
<th>(RB)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>הנפ יי רשי עָּבַדְתָּךְ</td>
<td>(RB)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>עָּבַדְתָּךְ עָמֹדָה</td>
<td>(RB)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>מְשַׁרְכֵּךְ יִוְדָאָה</td>
<td>(RB)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>יִוְדָאָה רֹבְכִּךָ</td>
<td>(RB)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, what about the position of B in relationship to the other extant texts of Tg I? It is much more similar to P and M than to RB. However, it contains peculiar additions of its own, not found in the above traditional recensions, but rather in manuscripts such as C and O (9:25, 28), and even at times in Sassoon 282 of Targum Sheni (9:14, 28).

In any case, this particular recension of Tg Esther is totally different in nature from the Antwerp text, which remains a unique recension.\(^{37}\)

III. Detailed Comparison of A and M.

Basing himself on M. Goshen-Gottstein was able to show the dependence of A in relation to the texts prepared for the Alcala Polyglot. He pointed out clear and convincing examples, particularly the same errors or omissions and clumsy cuts (so 1:1, 2:21; 3:12, 15; 4:3, 5, 17; 6:1; 9:31). This dependence, however, remains indirect, since we no longer have the basic manuscript from Zamora's hand with which the editors worked. It is, nevertheless, legitimate to pursue the work of Goshen-Gottstein using an indirect testimony, which allows us to realize what actually took place.\(^{38}\)

\(^{37}\) In regard to the relationship between A and the text published in the Paris Polyglot (1629-1645, vol. VIII), we read in the Dictionnaire de la Bible, V (Paris 1908) 521: "For the Targums, the Antwerp text is mixed with the text of the Bomberg Bible" (in the Paris Polyglot). This is not correct as far as Tg Esther is concerned. The Paris text is the exact reproduction of A, except for six misprints (1:17; 2:1; 4:2, 17; 8:9; 9:18) of its own. Cf. the same conclusion of Posner (above, n. 2) 12.

\(^{38}\) We are indebted to Professor S. A. Kaufman who prepared for us a computerized alignment of the Esther Tg. texts of M and A.
We know from the colophon that M was prepared for Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros for his Polyglot. It is carefully copied and is presented in the same format as Onkelos in Vol. I: words are not cut at the end of the line, yodhs are used to fill out the lines, and there are indications in the margin of verbal roots. A detailed and complete comparison between this manuscript and that of Salamanca (Hagiographa, copied in 1532) demonstrates how accurate A. de Zamora was in recopying his texts— he at times even reproduces the same errors! The "Masius MS" (reflected in A) might have been, therefore, very much a twin of M. Moreover, the affinities of A and M are irrefutable. We have verified that all the additions indicated by Add in S (53 examples) are to be found in M, and that all of them exactly correspond to cuts actually reflected in A. On the other hand, when an Aggadic addition remains in A, there is no indication of Add in M or S, which supposes that they were, following the indications of one manuscript, annotated and "expurgated."

The affinity between A and M can be seen also from 10:3, where A = M against all the other recensions of the Tg Esther I.

A further argument may be drawn from the Variae Lectiones pointed out by Raphelengius (Vol. III). For Esther he has some thirty critical remarks on the Tg Esther of A ("Ex Masiano exemplari"), some of which concern errors or omissions which are to be found in M or S as well: 3:12, 13; 4:11; 10:3 (for other examples see below Examples under IA and IB).

On the other hand, the editors of the Regia had in their hands the text of M. We have seen that in comparing the Masius MS with "caetera Complutensia exemplaria Chaldaise et Latine exarata" they recognized the hand of A. de Zamora. An examination of A will presently show that they in fact consulted several manuscripts and editions.

Since, however, we are no longer able to refer to the main manuscript, certain examples remain problematic. The following are examples showing the depen-


40 Cf. Grelot (above, n. 3) 60. It is noteworthy that in 10:3, A and M are in agreement in omitting the suffix of the MT (וּלְךָ) in rendering וּלָךְ, the simple emphatic state. Moreover, one notices that practically the entire text of A is to be found in M, and that the text of M, cut according to the indications in the margins, gives us exactly A.

41 Thus Goshen-Gottstein was right in stating: "The indications are clear that the Antwerp recension was guided by Alfonso’s Mss" (above, n. 3) 321; and: "The dependence of Antwerp on that Ms (=M) seems beyond doubt" (ibid., 322).
dance of A on M and give an idea of the nature of the manuscript actually used by the editors of A.

I. A used a MS similar to M as the basis for the Esther Targum:

A. Same Errors

1) 4:11; 5:2(2)  
   MT שֵׁרַבֶּשׁ
   M נָקֵבָא
   A אַנְנֶא

2) Nebiim  
   MT נֶבֶּיִים
   M, A עַבְרֵיַהּ בֹּדֶר בְּנְדֵל

b) The error involves a res/daleth confusion here as well. Most Tg I witnesses have some form of עִבְרָא—“intercalation” which makes excellent sense here; so P and RB, for instance. In S, Zamora continues his error, though he renders in tempore celebrationis eorum in his Latin translation in M.

6:1  
   MT נְדוּדָה שִׁנָּה דָּמֶלָה
   M נְדוּדָה שִׁנָּה דָּמֶלָה
   A נְדוּדָה שִׁנָּה דָּמֶלָה
c) The correct form should be the feminine נְדוּדָה, referring to the feminine subject שִׁנָּה. The other witness—P, RB, B, as well as S—have the correct form.

B. Same Omissions:

3:13  
   MT לָשׁוֹתֵא לְלָבָרִי
   M, A לָשׁוֹתֵא לָלָבָרִי
d) The Aramaic equivalent לֵכַשָּׁל, missing here, is present in the two other passages (7:4; 8:11), where this expression occurs. P, RB, and B have the expected לֵכַשָּׁל here too. This is one of the examples listed by Posner,\(^2\) as an omission he attributes to the printer, the others being: 1:16, 17; 2:16; 3:6, 7; 4:2. Cf. further 2:16 (אַחַשְׁרוֹרִ֨שׁ the missing word), 5:2 (בּוֹעֵנִ֔י is left untranslated), and 5:12

\(^2\)Posner (above, n. 2) 12.
(where עָמַד המֶלֶךְ is not translated). Except for 5:2, S still contains the same omissions.

C. Same Additions

3:13

basheshu teyshar lothshu sinu teyshar

MT

basheshu teyshar lothshu sinu teyshar

M, A

bimalek hathiloth umalek lehem theshir

e) Here A follows M precisely in adding יָמָה after and after the ordinal number שַׁלְשֵׁה, and although other witnesses of Tg I also add this noun, the wording is different: E and P have וּפְנֵה יָמָה וּפְנֵה יָמָה, respectively, while the latter adds after the ordinal number and E adds nothing. Thus A having the exact version of M here, certainly must have made use of it, or Masius’ now lost manuscript must have had an identical reading.

D. Wrong Cuts

Professor Goshen-Gottstein has already cited some convincing examples.43 The following ones only serve as additional examples to augment the position.

1) 4:4, 5

| MT | בֹּנֶה | נְלָבֹשׁ מֵלֹכְתָּא |
| M  | לָבֹשׁ מֵלֹכְתָּא |
| A  | לָבֹשׁ |

f) The cutting of מֵלֹכְתָּא leaves the construct לָבֹשׁ suspended. Tg I witnesses RB, B, P, and S all, without exception, have the genitive מֵלֹכְתָּא.

2) 9:5

| MT | מַכֶּה חֶרֶב יָדֹר וּמַבֶּדֶן |
| M  | מַכֶּה שַׁפָּלוּת סְיפָא בֶּסָּלוּת וּלֶפֶת |
| A  | מַכֶּה שַׁפָּלוּת סְיפָא בֶּסָּלוּת וּלֶפֶת |

g) A suspended construct as a result of cutting the genitive מַלְפֶּט (present in RB, P, and S). B is extremely literal here.

43 Above, n. 3, 319-320.
II. Characteristics of A's Editorial Policy

A. Adjustment to Conform to the Hebrew Text:

1) 3:4

| MT       | יָשָׂם דִּיָּמְעָה | יָשָׂם דִיָּמְעָה
| M        | כָּלָּמָה | כָּלָּמָה
| A        | רָמָּה | רָמָּה |

h) A literal rendering of the Hebrew not reflected in any of the other witnesses. RB has שָׂם דִּיָּמְעָה; B and O: שָׂם דִּיָּמְעָה; S: שָׂם דִּיָּמְעָה, וְיִנְנוֹר חֲדָדוֹד. Another example is 6:13: שָׂם מְוֹרָעַד, which M, RB, B, P, O, and S all render מְאֹרָעַד, while A translates literally מְאֹרָעַד-צְרָיִי-יִדְרוֹזַי. All render מְאֹרָעַד מֵרַעַד, going back to the Hebraica Veritas.

2) 4:1

| MT       | יָצָא בֵּיתָךְ הָעָרָה | יָצָא בֵּיתָךְ הָעָרָה
| M        | שָׁמָּן בֵּן בֵּיתָתָה | שָׁמָּן בֵּן בֵּיתָתָה
| A        | וּבֵן בֵּיתָתָה | וּבֵן בֵּיתָתָה |

i) RB, P, B, and S also lack a translation here. Cf. also 9:27 in the case of בּוּלָּה שָׁמָּן רַשָּׁה.

B. Utilization of other MSS:

1) 4:17

| MT       | רַעְבָּר | רַעְבָּר
| M        | נָסֵת | נָסֵת
| A        | נָסֵת | נָסֵת |

j) The root כָּסָּא is also used in P (כָּסָּא) and in RB (כָּסָּא רַבָּנָה). S repeats M's form.

2) 9:4

| MT       | וַּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ | וַּשְׁמַעְתָּהּ
| M        | מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה מְתָנִיל | מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה מְתָנִיל
| A        | מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה בְּפַקְדָּה | מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה בְּפַקְדָּה |

k) This term also is present in P, RB, and B, though in all of these recensions, the Hebrew is rendered מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה in contrast to מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה in A, which is a much more literal form. Cf. further also 9:27 where מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה in M is changed to מְשַׁמֶּעְתָּה in A, reflecting a form also used in P, B, and RB.
III. The Nature of the Text in A

A. Cuts in A without Add in M

1) 5:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מבר kéא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) This addition is also present in P, RB, B, and S.

2) 6:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בלילÉא חתני סליפיק...יאאשורשים</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m) This lengthy, Aggadic section is also contained in B, P, and S, whereas RB’s Aggada is different and far more elaborate here.

3) 9:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>והפק זוז</td>
<td>ראית המק סמיא בוגב ווחא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n) Also in P, RB, and S, while B simply has אתחמק.

B. A’s Corrections of M

1) 3:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מתמה</td>
<td></td>
<td>מתמה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ö) So also P, RB, and B; whereas S still has the error.

2) 4:14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בות אביכ</td>
<td>גניסע ב יאוחיכ</td>
<td>גניסע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ö) In B, the correction is correct, so the error is not present.

p) So also, P, RB, and B, whereas S = M.

3) 8:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אמשילטשמ</td>
<td></td>
<td>אמשילטשמ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q) In S, Zamora still reproduces this error. B, P, and RB have the correct form as in A. In 9:3, however, M has the correct form as well. In S we still find the error.
4) *ibid.*

MT

דָּמָתַנְה

M

דָּמָתַנְה

A

דָּמָתַנְה

5) So also in P and RB, whereas B lacks it entirely. In S Zamora continues the error of M.

5) 8:13

MT

דָּו

M

גֹּזִירָה

A

גֹּזִירָה

6) M contains a suspended construct which in the other main witnesses—RB, P (and even in B)—is followed by the genitive אֶרֶץ. A simply corrects it to the emphatic. Or did the Masius MS have an emphatic here? S is identical to M.

C. A's own error

3:4

MT

דְּעֶמְוָה

M

זָעְקִיםָה

A

זָעְקִיםָה

1) The masculine subject of this predicate is דָּבְרֵי מְרַדְרֵכִי. Could this be a printer's mistake, perpetuated in the Paris Polyglot?

D. A's own addition

7:1

MT

טָמְרָא

M

A

טָמְרָא

u) P and B as well as S also have it, whereas RB, ironically enough, does not. Yet M in the Latin translation has *vinum* here.

Conclusions

The above study leads us to the following conclusions:

1. The Antwerp Polyglot text is an artificial Targum. The editors really created a new Targum text "never seen before" (cf. n. 31). In the words of Prof. Goshen-

44 Our conclusions practically agree with those of Díez Macho in his study of Tg Job in A and M/S (Zamora's manuscripts): "that Tg Job had been corrected by Arias Montano...one can deduce from a collation of the text of Tg Job with that of S or M: The agreement is constant but the variants introduced by A. Montano are also frequent, either to accommodate that Targum to the Hebrew text, or to follow the Tg of the Rabbinic Bible, or that of other manuscripts" (above, n. 14) 553-4.
Gottstein.45 “The ‘Third Targum of Esther’ does not represent a genuine medieval Targumic recension...it is nothing but an amazing exercise of Biblical philology by sixteenth-century Humanists.”

2. The main intention of the editor(s) was to rid the text of the additions and to go back to the Hebrew text, retaining only those which might be helpful for Christians to understand the content of Scripture.

3. The editors of A definitely used a text prepared by A. de Zamora, but occasionally made use of other manuscripts in their task, mainly correcting this text in relation to the MT.

[Finished June 1986]

45 Above, n. 3, 329.