



Targum's Layout in Ashkenazic Manuscripts. Preliminary Methodological Observations

Elodie Attia

► To cite this version:

Elodie Attia. Targum's Layout in Ashkenazic Manuscripts. Preliminary Methodological Observations. A. Houtman, E. Staalduine-Sulman, H.-M. Kirn (éd.). A Jewish Targum in a Christian World, Brill, pp.99-122, 2014, 978-90-04-26782-4. hal-01404874

HAL Id: hal-01404874

<https://amu.hal.science/hal-01404874>

Submitted on 12 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Élodie Attia. Targum's Layout in Ashkenazic Manuscripts. Preliminary Methodological Observations. A. Houtman, E. Staaldwine-Sulman, H.-M. Kirn (éd.). *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World*, Brill, pp. 99-122, 2014.
<https://brill.com/view/title/24836>

[version finale, sans mise en page éditeur / final version, without Editor's Layout]

Introduction

According to the current scholarly consensus, the Targum is an important philological and exegetical source in the field of biblical studies; yet it has not received the kind of attention to its material transmission, its configuration and its layout in medieval Hebrew manuscripts that could shed light on its use and influence in the Middle Ages.¹ A systematic overview describing every *mise en page* for each period and each geocultural area where Jewish communities flourished is still a *desideratum*. This is, however, not easy to do, since it requires dealing with sources that are numerous, heterogeneous and not always easily accessible.²

While at this phase of research we cannot confidently come to any general conclusion, an initial study has been made of global statistical data concerning Ashkenazi manuscripts, the aim of which was to verify if the Talmudic prescription of 'twice Mikra and once Targum' (BT Ber 8a) was followed in Ashkenaz from the thirteenth till the fifteenth century (Peretz 2008). However interesting these general statistics are, some of the results, in our opinion, should be complemented by additional data and analysis. The aim of this paper is to encourage study on Targum layouts per geocultural area by making a case study on Ashkenaz, and in so doing to make visible the underlying methodological problems of qualitative and quantitative approaches.

For the present study, an inductive approach from materiality to theory has been chosen. Specific observations on dated Ashkenazi Targum manuscripts are presented and

* The author wishes to express her warm thanks to Judith Olzsow-Schlanger, Alberdina Houtman and Eveline van Staaldwine-Sulman for their creative comments and constructive criticism during the writing of this article.

¹ See the contribution of E. van Staaldwine-Sulman 'A Variety of Targum Texts' in this volume.

² The 1,600 Cairo Genizah fragments that contain Targum have been identified (Klein 1992) but still need to be dated. Layouts and geocultural attributions have also been made available (Klein 1992). The *European Genizah Fragments* project has recovered hundreds of fragments (see the *Books within Books* project, <http://www.hebrewmanuscript.com>). The hundreds of dated and undated manuscripts found in various European libraries have not always been well described in the catalogues that were produced generally at the end of the 19th century. Actually, two catalogues provide descriptions with precision on targumic layout with a relatively high level of consistency: the catalogue of Parma Library and that of the Vatican Library.

compared with available quantitative data. We begin our inquiry with Targum layouts in fourteen dated Ashkenazi manuscripts, which serves to indicate how complex these layouts could be. The small corpus has been chosen according to three criteria: (a) palaeographical data that allow us to differentiate between French and German scripts up until the middle of the fourteenth century, when the expulsions from Northern France forced the Jews to emigrate, making palaeographical differentiation much less clear after 1350; (b) an even distribution over the period from the end of the twelfth century to the middle of the fifteenth century; and (c) variation of the layouts.

We begin by presenting descriptions of possible layouts of manuscripts that are dated and situated in Ashkenaz, in order to obtain a representative sample of the variability in the Targum's transmission process in Ashkenaz. In this paper Ashkenaz not only refers to England, Northern France and Germany, but also to Northern Italy, in case an Ashkenazi manuscript has its roots there. Half of the manuscripts produced in Italy are Sephardic or Ashkenazi due to strong migrations towards the Peninsula (Attia 2012, 116). Secondly, the paper explores the features of Ashkenazi layouts by comparing our results with other quantitative studies based on Ashkenazi manuscripts and with a statistical survey on the Targums preserved at the Palatina Library in Parma and at the Vatican Apostolic Library. The latter survey is incomplete, and is used as a check in order to afford a broader overview of two other cultural areas of European Judaism, namely Sepharad and Italy. By comparing our results with other Ashkenazi Targum manuscripts that are kept there, we can better evaluate how representative our sample is. The final section of this paper examines Ashkenazi rabbinical discourses about the 'liturgical use of the Targum' during the period between the twelfth-fourteenth centuries. Here we can test certain theoretical explanations against the material evidence provided by our sample of Targum layouts.

Layouts in Ashkenazi Manuscripts (End of the Twelfth– Mid-fifteenth Century)

Description of the Manuscripts

For the purpose of this book, we have of course selected manuscripts that contain the Targum. This group constitutes more than half of the Ashkenazi biblical manuscripts. Peretz concluded that among the 218 Ashkenazi biblical manuscripts, 132 items also contain the Targum (Peretz 2008, 57). That is a much higher percentage than is found in the Cairo Genizah collection, which contains c. 25,000 biblical manuscripts without the Targum, and c. 1,600 manuscripts that include Targum texts (Klein 1992, ix).

The manuscripts chosen for this study are described below.³ They are explicitly dated and documented, with the dates extending from 1189 till 1447. Two manuscripts that are less documented are no. 8 (dated 1311, probably from France) and no. 12 (from Ashkenaz, with an estimated date circa 1350). The manuscripts nearly all contain Targum Onkelos along with the Hebrew biblical text except for one case in which only Targum Onkelos is provided (no. 5). Some provide parts of Targum Jonathan to haftarot, and other Targums. For the description of the size I use the sum of the length and the width (Attia 2012, 75, note 3). Large refers to more than 670 mm, medium-large to between 455 and 670 mm, medium-small to between 322 and 455 mm, small to under 322 mm.

1 Ms London, Valmadonna Trust, 1 (England or Normandy?, 1189) The manuscript is a large parchment codex of 241 folios measuring 375–378 × 308–374 mm. It contains the Pentateuch (from Gen 45:13 onward), haftarot, and the five Megillot. The codex contains the Targum to the Pentateuch, to the haftarot for Pesach and Shavuot (hereafter P/S), and to the Megillot. Megillat Esther is followed by the *Dream of Mordechai*. Vowels, accents and Masorah are provided. The text is laid out in three columns, each column containing biblical verses and Targum, alternating verse by verse, written in an Anglo-Norman square script.

Bibliography: Beit-Arié 1993; Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1999, ms 85, 82–87; Olszowy-Schlanger 2003, 238–242.

2 Ms Vatican, Vatican Apostolic Library, Vat. Ebr. 482 (Northern France, La Rochelle, c. 1216, by Hayim ben Isaac)

The manuscript is a medium-large size parchment codex of 547 folios, measuring 370 × 270–288 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Writings, with vowels, accents and Masorah on every book. The codex only presents the Targum to the Pentateuch. The Hebrew biblical text is written in two columns. The Targum is laid out separately within the external margins. All texts are written in the same square script, but the Targum is written in a smaller script.

Bibliography: Richler 2008, 417f.; Sirat 1994, III. 12, 30f.

³ It has not been possible to examine every manuscript kept in the collections we consulted. The information was collected from catalogues (Richler 2008, Richler 2001) and online descriptions (<http://aleph.nli.org.il>), and checked on available reproductions or those provided by the IHMH of Jerusalem, except for Ber. Or. Qu. 9 and Vat. Ebr. 14, which were examined at their libraries (see the sub-project B04 of the Collaborative Project Center SFB 933 'Material Text Cultures', Heidelberg University, in collaboration with the Hochschule für Jüdische Studien).

3 Ms Breslau Univ. Lib. M 1106 / Wrocław Bibel (Germany, 1237/8, by Meshulam ben Josef)

The manuscript is a large parchment codex of 466 folios, measuring 488 × 360 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, haftarot, the five Megillot—Megillat Esther being followed by the *Dream of Mordechai*—and other books from the Writings (Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, and Chronicles). The Masorah (Parva and Magna) appears in all books. The manuscript contains the Targum of the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, Psalms, Job and Proverbs, but not that of the haftarot (Metzger 1994, 19 n. 40). The main text is laid out in three columns, each column containing biblical verses with Targum alternating in the same square script.

Bibliography: Metzger 1994; Falenciak 1986.

4 Ms Vatican, Vatican Apostolic Library, Vat. Ebr. 14 (Northern France, Normandy, 1239, by Elijah ha-Naquadan)

The manuscript is a medium-large parchment codex of 310 folios, measuring 295–309 × 240–245 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot, and is presented with vowels and accents. The Masorah (Parva and Magna) is provided only for the Pentateuch and the Megillot. The codex only contains the Targum to the Pentateuch. The text is written in three columns, each column containing biblical verses alternating with the Targum. Both are written in a square script.

Regarding the Aramaic translation, the codex offers the Targum of Onkelos fully vocalized and accented according to the Tiberian system. Several irregularities can be observed with respect to the alternation of Hebrew and Aramaic, e.g. the leaving out of targumic verses in lists of names to avoid a repetition of the names (Van Staaldouine-Sulman 2002, 54–57). There are also other irregularities: First, on f. 9r, a hole in the parchment would have disrupted the reading of the Hebrew. The scribe decided to copy the Hebrew verse 8:17 directly after 8:16. The Aramaic verses on 8:16–17 follow exactly where the material disruption occurs. Small letters *alef* and *bet* signalize this singularity in the margin. Second, the Targum is not written verse by verse in the traditional poetical passages of the Bible. For instance, at the beginning of the *parashat Haazinu* (Deut 32:1–43, ff. 239r–240r), the Hebrew verses are laid out in two columns while the Targum has been left out. Only after the Hebrew verse 32:43 does the layout recommence in the three-column format with all the Aramaic verses copied by the scribe consecutively to represent the Hebrew passage he had just closed. After Deut 32:43, in the last column of the f. 240r,

the scribe returns to writing alternatively Hebrew and Aramaic. The same pattern occurs in *Shirat ha-Yam* (Exod 15:1–18, f. 79v). The scribe wrote the Hebrew text of Exod 15:2–19 in ‘chessboard layout’, that is by inserting blank spaces between certain groups of words. The Targum on these verses follows afterwards, arranged in three columns. The alternation between Hebrew and Aramaic crops up again in Exod 15:20, at the bottom of the first column of f. 80r.

Ms Vat. 14 was copied by Elijah ha-Naqdan in 1239, who was also the scribe of ms Ber. Or. Qu. 9 (Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin), realized in Rouen in 1233 (Golb 1976, 123 and 141). Nevertheless, the latter only provides the Targum Jonathan of the haftarot of P/S, mostly in the style of three verses in Hebrew followed by three verses in Aramaic in the first verses of each section, then alternating verse by verse.

Bibliography: Richler 2008, 9–11; Golb 1976, 121–123, 142–144; Golb 1985, 240–244, 340–343; Golb 1998, 328–333, 434–439.

5 Ms Parma, Palatina Library, Parma 2981 (Ashkenaz, France, 1263/4, by David ben Joseph)

The manuscript is a medium-large parchment codex containing 197 folios and measuring c. 275 × 206 mm. It only contains the Targum to the Pentateuch, with vowels. The text is arranged in one single column, according to a lemma layout: the first word of the Hebrew verse is written, followed by the entire Aramaic verse.

Bibliography: Richler 2001, 88.

6 Ms Paris, BNF, hébr. 5 (Germany, 1294/5, by Shelomo Cohen) The manuscript is a large parchment codex of 306 folios, measuring 532–539 × 375–379 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot, Masorah (Parva and Magna in a figurative layout). The codex only presents the Targum to the Pentateuch. The text of the Pentateuch is laid out in three columns, each column containing biblical verses and Targum, alternating verse by verse, in square script.

Bibliography: Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1972, I.20; Barco 2011, ms 5.

7 Ms Paris, BNF, hébr. 36 (France, Poligny-Foulenay, 1300) The manuscript is a large parchment codex of 364 folios measuring 508–514 × 350–355 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot, Job, and Masorah (Parva and Magna in a figurative layout). The codex contains the Targum to both the Pentateuch and the haftarot of Pesach (ff. 317r–323r) and Shavuot (ff. 327v–330r). The text is largely arranged in three columns

except for ff. 363v–364v, at the end of the manuscript. This part is written in two columns and then in one. Each column of the Pentateuch contains Hebrew and Targum alternating verse by verse. In the haftarot, the main text is disposed in three columns but where the Targum appears, only two columns remain: the Hebrew text in the right column and the Targum in the left one. The Hebrew and the Aramaic texts are written in the same square script.

Bibliography: Zotenberg et al. 1866, 4; Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1972, I, 24. Reproduction: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9002993p.r=h%C3%A9breu+36.langFR>

8 Ms Parma, Palatina Library, Parma 2003–2004–2046 (Ashkenaz, France?, 1311)

The three-volume manuscript is a medium-small parchment codex containing 341, 291 and 202 folios, and measuring 184 × 144 mm. The mss 2003–2004 contain Pentateuch, ms 2046 the five Megillot, haftarot, and Job. The biblical texts are provided with vowels, accents and Masorah (Parva and Magna). The Targum to the Pentateuch and the haftarot on P/S are supplied. The Rashi commentary is provided in the margins of all books. The commentary on Job 40:25–41:26 is by Jacob b. Saul ha-Nazir.

The text is arranged in two columns, the inner one containing the Bible and the Targum in alternating verses in square script, the outer column containing the commentary in semi-cursive script. The same arrangement is followed in the haftarot of P/S.

The colophon on f. 283r in ms 2004 indicates that the Targum was copied from a manuscript with Babylonian supralinear vocalization, and that the vowel points were transcribed according to the Tiberian system.

Bibliography: Richler 2001, n. 74, 18f.; Bernheimer 1924, 218–220.

9 Ms Paris, BNF, Hébr. 40 (Northern Italy,⁴ 1335, by Matatyah ben Isaac)

The manuscript is a medium-small parchment codex of 293 folios measuring 240 × 180 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the haftarot, the five Megillot, and is provided with vowels, accents and Masorah (Parva and Magna). The texts are arranged in two columns. In the Pentateuch (ff. 1r–225r), the inner (larger) column displays the Hebrew text and the outer

⁴ In Sfar Data (<http://sfardata.nli.org.il>) the provenance is referenced as French because of the preparation of the parchment and the script; in NLI's description (<http://alpeh.nli.org.il>), the type of script is not specified. In the extended notice from Gallica.fr (url mentioned above), Northern Italy is specified as the location, and in our view the paleographic features show Northern Italian script.

(smaller) column gives the Aramaic verses. In the haftarot of Pesach (ff. 277r–282v) and Shavuot (ff. 282v–284v), Hebrew and Targum alternate verse by verse. The scribe uses a square script for the Hebrew text and the Targum. The square script of the Targum is slightly smaller than the one for the Hebrew verses, both in the Pentateuch where the Targum is in the margin, and in the haftarot, where the Hebrew alternates with the Aramaic. An Italian cursive script is used for the Masorah.

Bibliography: Zotenberg et al. 1866, 5. Reproduction: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b90030200.r=h%C3%A9breu+40.langFR>

10 Ms Jerusalem, Makhon Ben Zvi 2 (Ashkenaz, 1341, by three scribes) The manuscript is a medium-large parchment codex of 378 folios measuring 320 × 233 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot (ff. 1r–350v), and provides the Masorah. The manuscript contains the Targum of the Pentateuch. Rashi's commentary is supplied for all books up until f. 350r. The text is organized in three equal columns. In each column of the Pentateuch, the biblical verses alternate with the Targum verse by verse in square script. The Rashi commentary has been added afterwards in the margins by another hand, in semi-cursive script. The same layout appears in ms Oxford, Bod. Lib., Opp. 14 (copied in France in 1340).

Bibliography: Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1972, I, 37.

11 Ms Jerusalem, Israel Museum 180/94 (Ashkenaz, 1344) The manuscript is a large parchment codex of 420 folios measuring 462–466 × 325–327 mm. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot, and also provides the Masorah (Parva and Magna). The manuscript contains the Targum to the Pentateuch. The text is arranged in three columns. In each column of the Pentateuch, biblical verses alternate with the Targum. The Rashi commentary alternates verse by verse in the Megillot and the haftarot. The Targum script is written in an equal size to the biblical text. The Rashi commentary is written in a small square script, but is still twice the size of the script used to write the Masorah (a semi-cursive script).

Bibliography: Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1986, III, 101*.

12 Ms Parma, Palatina Library, Parma 2820; 2830 (Ashkenaz, mid- fourteenth century)

This two-volume manuscript, containing 365 and 115 folios, is a medium-large parchment codex measuring 267 × 223 mm. Both codices contain lacunae. The manuscript contains a partially preserved Pentateuch, haftarot, and Megillot, with vowels and accents, as well

as an incomplete Masorah. It contains only the Targum to the Pentateuch, vocalized and placed as centred text in the inner margins, displaying decorative layout. Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch, haftarot and Megillot appears in the outer margins in a cursive script. The Hebrew text is laid out in a central column, in square script, while the Targum Onkelos in the inner margin appears in a smaller square script.

Bibliography: Tamani 1968, 54; Richler 2001, 111.

13 Ms Parma, Palatina Library, Parma 2818 (Northern Italy?, 1411) The manuscript is a medium-small parchment codex measuring 258 × 191 mm, containing 318 folios. It contains the Pentateuch, the five Megillot, haftarot, with vowels and accents, and is without Masorah. The text of the parashot is laid out in two columns: the central larger column contains the biblical verses and the inner, smaller column contains the Targum. The outer, upper and lower margins contain the commentary of Rashi in semi-cursive script. The Targum on the Pentateuch is written in a smaller vocalized square script. The manuscript also contains the Targum on the haftarot for P/S, with the Hebrew verses alternating with the Aramaic.

Bibliography: Richler 2001, 139.

14 Ms Paris, Séminaire israélite de France, 1 (Northern Italy?, 1447, by several scribes)

The manuscript of 505 folios is a medium-large parchment codex measuring 273–274 × 193–198 mm. It contains the Pentateuch and the Targum to the Pentateuch, haftarot on festivals, the five Megillot, with Masorah (Parva and Magna), and several commentaries. The Hebrew text of the parashot is laid out in the central larger column, while the Targum is displayed in the inner smaller columns. Each parashah of the Pentateuch is followed by its haftarah, in the central column without Targum or commentaries (see ff. 113v–114r). Abraham Ibn Ezra's commentary is copied in the upper and lower margins, and the super-commentary on it by Samuel Ibn Motot in the external margin. A smaller square script is used for the Targum, and a semi-cursive gothic script is used for the commentaries. The *mise en texte* is complex, including decorations, coloured ink for headers, and red ink in the first line of the Targum.

Bibliography: Sirat, Beit-Arié & Glatzer 1986, 109*; Sirat 1994, III. 15, 36f.

Codicological Questions

The layouts in the codices that we have listed, raise many questions. For example, are the layouts in Ashkenaz stable, or, on the contrary, is there a tendency to change from the Targum alternating with the Hebrew to the Targum laid out in a separate column? Are there characteristic codicological differences between Germany and France? Is the Targum column always in smaller script than the Hebrew one? Does the size of the book influence whether the Targum will be included or not? Why are there so many instances of Targum Onkelos as compared to Targum Jonathan? Is there a trend towards adding more commentaries after Rashi's commentary has been added? Is Rashi invariably the initial commentary or are others used as well? Not all questions will be answered here, but some suggestions can be provided.

The following table summarizes our findings concerning the elements of the manuscripts. The word Ashkenaz is used for the origin of those manuscripts that cannot be specifically situated.

TABLE 1 Features of the described Ashkenazi manuscripts⁵

Ms	Date	Location	Size	Contents	Mise en page	Targum's layout	Scripts
1	1189	England or Normandy	Large	P, H, 5M	3 columns (equal)	Alternating on Pentateuch, and on haftarot (only for P/S) and on the Megillot	S script
2	1215 /1216	France La Rochelle	Medium-large	P, Proph., Writings	2 columns (equal)	Targum on Pent. separated, in the external margins	Smaller S script
3	1237 /1238	Germany	Large	P, H, 5M, some of Writings	3 columns (equal)	Alternating on Pentateuch, Megillot, Psalms, Job and Proverbs, not on the haftarot.	S script
4	1239	Northern France [Rouen?]	Medium-large	P, 5S, H.	3 columns (equal)	Alternating on Pentateuch and Megillot, not on the haftarot	S Script
5	1263 /1264	France?	Medium-large	Targum only	Long lines	Lemma layout	S Script
6	1294 /5	Germany	Large	P, 5M, H + Mp,	3 columns (equal)	Alternating on Pentateuch only	S script

⁵ The following abbreviations are used: P = Pentateuch, H = haftarot, 5M = Megillot, , TO = Targum Onkelos, P/S = Pesach and Shavuot.

				Mm figurati ve			
7	1300	Poligny France	Large	P, 5M, H, Job	3 columns (equal)	Alternating on Pentateuch	S script
					Two columns	On the haftarot of P/S, Targum in a separate column at the left of Hebrew Text	S script
8	1311	Ashkenaz – France?	Small- mediu m	P, 5M, H, Job with comm.	2 columns, inner (larger) and outer	Alternating Targum on Pentateuch and on haftarot (P/S)	S script
						Rashi in the margins	SC script
9	1335	Northern Italy	Small- mediu m	P, H, 5M	2 columns (inner larger than the outer)	Targum in the outer column on Pentateuch	Smaller S script
						Targum alternating on haftarot of P/S	
10	1341	Ashkenaz	Mediu m-large	P, 5M, H	3 columns (equal)	Alternating Targum on Pentateuch	S script
						Rashi in margins	SC script
11	1344	Ashkenaz	Large	P, 5M, H	3 columns (equal)	Targum and Rashi alternating verse by verse on Pentateuch	Square script for Targum, smaller square script for Rashi.
12	Circa 1350	Ashkenaz	Mediu m-large	P, H, 5M	3 columns (one larger central; inner, outer columns)	TO inner margin,	Small S script
						Rashi, haftarot and Megillot outer Margin	C. script
13	1411	Northern Italy?	Small- mediu m	P, 5M, H	3 columns (one larger central; inner, outer columns)	Inner margin: Targum on Pent.	S script
						Haftarot (P/S): alternating	
						Outer margin: Rashi	SC script
14	1447	Northern Italy?	Mediu m-large	P, H, 5M	3 columns (one central, inner, outer columns)	On Pentateuch, Targum in inner columns	Smaller S script
						Outer column for Ibn Ezra and super commentary of Ibn Motot	SC script

This first codicological investigation underlines three patterns: (a) a variety in the Targum's *mise en page* in Ashkenaz, i.e. alternating, in the margins, or in a separately ruled column; (b) the variety of Targum layouts within a volume, which implicitly poses problems for a statistical treatment that takes manuscripts as a base unit; and (c) the occurrence of an

isolated Targum in Ashkenaz.

Concerning (a) the variability of the layout, in our sample the oldest dated Ashkenazi manuscript (no. 1, Valmadonna 1, 1189) displays an alternating layout, in three columns, in which the square script in Hebrew and in Aramaic is identical. This layout seems to be used till the fifteenth century (see nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and even no. 13, dated 1411). This element seems to be a standard feature in Ashkenazi manuscripts (Peretz 2008, 57). Peretz's statistical results can be summarized as follows: among the 132 mss with Targums, 67% had alternating Targum versus 33% with a separate Targum column. The 132 manuscripts can be chronologically arranged as follows:

- 36% are from the thirteenth century (a third putting the Targum in a separate column, the other two thirds alternating the Hebrew and the Aramaic);
- 48% are from the fourteenth century (a quarter with the column format and the remaining three quarters alternating);
- 15% are from the fifteenth century (one half with the column format, the other half alternating).

In our limited sample, the Targum was copied in the margins only in fourteenth century manuscripts (nos. 9, 12, 13, 14).⁶ In these cases, the Targum is always written in smaller script than the Hebrew text, but still in square script (i.e., never semi-cursive or cursive). The size and type of script express the relative importance of the texts—for example, Hebrew Bible and Targum in square script, commentaries in semi-cursive or cursive scripts.

Concerning (b), the haftarot, especially the haftarot for the P/S festivals, are frequently accompanied by Targum (nos. 1, 7, 8, 9, 13). Targum Jonathan to the Prophets is rarely copied in its entirety in Ashkenazi Bibles, because these Bibles generally follow a liturgical structure (Pentateuch, Megillot, haftarot), which means that not all the Prophets are included, but only *capita selecta*. What is more, the layouts can vary between the Pentateuch and these specific haftarot in one and the same codex. For instance, nos. 7 and 8, the former coming from France (Poligny or Foulenay, 1300) and the latter from Northern Italy (dated 1335), show opposite design choices. No. 7 alternates the Hebrew and Targum verses in the Pentateuch, but gives the Targum on the haftarot for P/S in a separate column, creating a two-column layout instead of the more usual three. In no. 9, Targum Onkelos is placed in the outer ruled column in a smaller square script, but the haftarot on P/S alternate the Hebrew and Aramaic in the same smaller square script as mentioned. On the other hand, no. 1 (dated 1189) consistently alternates Hebrew and Targum in Pentateuch, Megillot and haftarot for P/S.

⁶ Peretz, in his survey of the 218 Ashkenazi manuscripts written between the thirteenth and the fifteenth century (2008, 57) gives no information concerning the methodology he employed, referring only to his unpublished PhD dissertation (2007/2008). Questions remain, such as: how many manuscripts are dated, undated and/or estimated with regard to date? There is no differentiation between a margin and ruled column, an important codicological element partly because the script in the margin could have been added later. Which scripts does the term 'Ashkenaz' designate? And how are we to explain certain anomalies, such as an alternating Targum on the Pentateuch followed by a Targum in a separate column on the haftarot in the same volume?

Finally (c), there is one case that seems completely different: no. 5, which presents a manuscript with Targum alone, dated 1263/64. This phenomenon is rare and the reasons for it remain to be discovered. A systematic study will have to be made on these isolated Targums, discovering how many were produced in Ashkenaz and in other geocultural areas. Perhaps this book was meant to complement a Pentateuch that did not offer Targum? Pentateuchs without Targums comprise almost half of the Ashkenazi manuscripts (106 out of 238, according to Peretz 2008, 57). Or could it be that this book was part of another tradition, in which Aramaic was studied from a separate codex?

Rashi Alongside Targum

The introduction of the commentary of Rashi alongside of, or as a substitute for, the Targum also requires further enquiry. According to Peretz's results, only a quarter of the 132 manuscripts including Targum also host Rashi. The presence of both is a phenomenon that occurs mostly in the fourteenth century (Peretz 2008, 60). No. 8 (dated 1311) is the earliest manuscript that presents Rashi in semi-cursive script in the margins alongside the Targum. Other cases with Rashi are nos. 11 (dated 1344), 12 (dated c. 1350), and 13 (dated 1411). No. 11 is a particularly interesting case where Hebrew, Targum and the Rashi commentary all alternate: the Targum here is written in the same script as the Hebrew, whereas the commentary by Rashi is written in a smaller square script. A similar configuration in the dated ms Oxford, Bod. Libr. Opp. 14 (1340, France, written by Salomon Eliezer Hayim ha-Cohen). According to Peretz, this could be a sign of the halakhic influence of the *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol* by Moses ben Jacob of Coucy (Peretz 2008, 60; see further below).

Sharit Shalev-Eyni suggests that there may be a difference in the way the Targum and Rashi functioned within the Northern French and German Jewish communities: 'The main difference between French and German traditions relates to the Aramaic Targum. Pentateuchs produced in France sometimes appear without the Targum or have Rashi commentary in their margins' (Shalev-Eyni 2010, 9f.). This subject, however, requires a larger, systematic analysis of the sources. At the moment, these are not all equally preserved, correctly identified, or easy to locate. As regards the square calligraphic scripts, it is difficult to differentiate the manuscripts that are similar in terms of period of production but come from some specific parts of Ashkenaz, and thus to distinguish clearly the French manuscripts from the German or the English ones (Olszowy-Schlanger 2003, 11).

Size of the Books in Relation to the Presence and Use of the Targum

On this purely material basis, assumptions concerning the relationship between the sizes of the codices and the texts they present can be made. According to some scholars, the large or even giant Bibles (nos. 3, 6, 7, and 11) and other illuminated manuscripts (such as ms Munich 5) were not produced for public readings of the Pentateuch, but for study of the Bible during private reading sessions at a wealthy patron's house (Metzger 1994, 19 nn. 39–40; Shalev-Eyni 2010, 8). The medium-sized and small codices may possibly have been used by worshippers to follow the public reading during the service. The small Bibles, such as no. 8 (dated 1311) and no. 11 (dated 1411), display both Targum and Rashi's commentary in the margins. Their design suggests that these Bibles were used during travels. The pocket Bibles such as ms Paris BNF hébr. 33 do not contain any Targum on the Pentateuch (Sirat 2002, III. 25), while ms Ber. Or. Qu. 9 encompasses Targum Jonathan on the haftarot for P/S. One may assume that for those Jews who travelled frequently for professional reasons, these Bibles were useful most of all for performing a weekly reading of the parashah in a synagogue or even in a private setting when, for some reason, a minyan could not be found.

Statistics and Particularities

At this state of the research, our inductive approach leads us to particular and meaningful elements that statistical results necessarily overlook. Nevertheless, both approaches have their own advantages and limits. Inductive study points to some details that should be further studied, such as the internal difference of targumic layouts in one and the same codex, the absence of commentary in the very large codices, and the proportion of separate Targum manuscripts in Ashkenaz.

Concerning statistics, they are useful for discerning broad patterns, but tell us little about the complexity of the practical life in which the manuscripts were used. Statistics are necessarily the servant of research on Hebrew palaeography, and not the master. For instance, the facts that the undated manuscripts are more numerous than the dated and documented ones, and that the calligraphic Ashkenazi script is very stable during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries render any conclusions about a change of layouts at this period tentative.

In reality, the manuscripts present numerous irregularities. Some manuscripts are dated only in part, for instance ms Vienna 20, where parts by one scribe are dated 1403, but other parts are undated. In other manuscripts some parts, e.g. Rashi's commentary, have been added later, for instance in ms Vat. Ebr. 18, dated 1273–1274 in Germany, where a later hand added the Rashi commentary in a fourteenth century semi-cursive script (Richler 2008, 12). The classification required for statistics often forces the cases into a

simplifying category.

Furthermore, our sample mainly focuses on Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan on the haftarot. This highlights another question: how well-known were the other Targums, such as Targum Yerushalmi or Targum Esther Sheni, within the Ashkenazi communities? This question is beyond the limits of the present contribution.

Is there a Specific Ashkenazi Layout?

It seems that about half of all the Ashkenazi Bible manuscripts included Targum, but the lack of comparisons with other geocultural areas makes any conclusion on the larger meaning of this phenomenon premature. Apart from the Aramaic versions of Qumran, the oldest targumic fragment identified so far is from the Cairo Genizah, originating in 9th/10th century Egypt.⁷ This fragment shows a lemma layout: no Hebrew verses, only the first Hebrew word of the verse followed by the Aramaic verse. Peretz points out that the alternating layout exists in a slightly more recent Babylonian fragment (Oslo- London, Martin Schoeyen 206) estimated to date from the 10th/11th century (Peretz 2008, 58). A specific study should be devoted to the entire question of the Oriental codices.

However, our data sample exists in the European context, and for that reason we propose to compare our findings with a survey of 80 manuscripts containing the Targum kept at the Palatina Library of Parma and at the Vatican Library. Pragmatically, this allows us to compare our sample to these two larger collections of manuscripts. The manuscripts of Parma and Vatican City reflect the main Occidental areas, namely Sepharad (including Northern Africa), Ashkenaz and Italy. The Byzantine, Yemenite and Oriental manuscripts are not represented in these collections. The collections cover an extended period of time and are very well described and indexed in new catalogues (Richler 2001; Richler 2008).

The Targum appears as well in manuscripts that are classified as 'Bible' in the catalogues (498 items in Parma and 103 in the Vatican). One item recorded as 'biblical commentary' includes Targum (ms Parma 3075/76, dated 1514). Prayer books and collections of *piyyutim* are excluded from our statistics, but they should be included in further, large-scale research.

Table 2. Proportion of Targum in both Libraries

⁷ Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms heb.e.43/f.57–65; Neubauer and Cowley 1886–1906, shelfmark 2e.2610/16. See the Friedberg Genizah Project <http://www.genizah.org>.

	Bible	Targum and isolate Targum
Palatina Library of Parma	499 100%	62 ⁸ 12%
Vatican Apostolic Library	103 100%	18 ⁹ 17%

This broader overview confirms the general impression that Ashkenaz produced more Targum than other areas. Among the biblical codices kept in Parma or in the Vatican, fewer than 20% contain Targum (see Table 2). Among the manuscripts including Targum from both institutions, 66.25% are composed in Ashkenazi script, that is, scripts from France, Germany and Northern Italy, while 16.25% are in Italian script and 17.5% are in Sephardi script (see Table 3).

Table 3 *Distribution of Targum according to cultural area*

	Targum and isolate Targum	Targum in Ashkenazic script	Targum in Italian script	Targum in Sephardic script
Palatina Library of Parma	62 100%	42 68%	11 18%	9 14%
Vatican Apostolic Library	18 100%	11 61%	2 11%	5 28%
Average proportion from both institution	79 100 %	53 67%	13 16,5%	14 17,5%

Let us now

turn to the possible evolution of the layouts we observed in our sample on the basis of the next table:

Table 4 *Layouts according to areas and periods*

Number of items with Targum: 80	Layouts	Distribution according to area	Chief period of use	Shelfmarks apart the Ashkenazic manuscripts
Parma, Palatina Library	Verse by verse: 21	Ashkenaz: 18	Begin in the late 12th – above all 13th, some in the 14th century	Richler nos. 37, 43, 57, 58, 60, 63, 67, 70, 74, 116, 120, 121, 221, 223, 240, 247, 292, 327

⁸ Sixty-two manuscripts, including six fragments and eight separate Targum texts called ‘translations’. This list provide Richler’s catalogue numbers: Richler nos 35, 37, 40, 43, 45, 49, 56, 57, 58, 60, 63, 67, 70, 74, 75, 82, 89, 97, 109, 111, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 133, 135, 139, 140, 144, 148, 153, 165, 169, 171, 174, 175, 176, 180, 192, 211, 221, 222, 223, 240, 247, 292, 326, 327, 328, 385, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 686.

⁹ Manuscripts, including one fragment and three separated Targum: MS Vat. Ebr. 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 432, 448, 480, 482, 503, 530, 608; Neofiti 1; Urb. Ebr. 1, 3; Barb. Or. 161.

62		Spain / Provence: 1	Fragment, estimated 13th century	Richler no. 211, fragment of Isaiah.
		North Africa: 1	1514	Richler no. 686, Sephardic script.
		Italy: 1	13th century	Richler no. 45.
	Margins: 25	Ashkenaz: 13	Beginning in the 13th century, second half of the 14th century -15th century	Richler nos. 49, 56, 111, 115, 139, 148, 175, 180, 192, 222, 328, 385
		Italy: 7	Late 14th-15th century	Richler nos 75, 89, 135, 140, 144, 153, 169.
		Sepharad: 3	14th-15th century	Richler nos 133, 165, 176.
		Italy-Sepharad: 2	15th century	Richler nos 171, 174.
	Columns:1	Ashkenaz:1	(Writings)14th century	Richler no. 326.
	Separate Targums:8	Ashk., Italo-ashk.:4	1263, 14th- 15th century	Rchler nos 485 (see Case n. 5 <i>infra</i>), 489, 491, 492.
		Italy-Sepharad: 2	15th century (1407)	Richler nos 488 and 490.
		Italian: 2	14th century	Richler nos 486-487.
	Unclear:7	Ashk. :6 Ital.: 1	-	Richler nos 35, 40 (<i>Targum in red ink; probably verse by verse?</i>), 82 (<i>Italian script?</i>), 97, 109, 117, 119.
Vaticana Library 18	Verse by verse:11	Askhenaz:8	14th century	Vat. Ebr. 13, 14 (dated 1239), 18, 439, 530, Ubr. Ebr. 1, 3, Brab. Or. 161-164.
		Sepharad:3	11th century	Vat. Ebr. 448, Sephardic script with Babylonian vocalization.
			14th century	Vat. Ebr. 19 (with alternating Targum and Arabic translation resembling our examples where Hebrew alternates with Targum and Rashi) and 21.
	Margins: 1	Ashkenaz, France: 1	1216	Case no. 2 in this article
	Columns:3	Ashkenaz: 2	14th century	Vat. Ebr. 480 and 608.
		Sepharad: 1	15th century	Vat. Ebr. 503.
	Separate:3	Italy: 2	14th – before 1517	Vat. Ebr. 16 (14th century) and Neofiti 1 (before 1517, Palestinian Targum on Pentateuch).
		Sefarad: 1	13th-14th?	Vat. Ebr. 432.

On the basis of these data the following conclusions can be drawn:

- A. The oldest European Targum on the Pentateuch takes an alternating form, whereas in the haftarot it has a column layout (England 1189, no. 1). At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Targum in Ashkenaz is most frequently of the alternating type (18 and 8 items).

- B. From the end of the thirteenth century, the outer margins are more frequently used for Aramaic materials (13 and 1 items in Ashkenaz) as well as for Rashi's commentary (Olszowy-Schlanger 2012, 34–35).
- C. The ruled column, which entails a more elaborate page layout, must be distinguished from the margins layout. In the former, the place of each ruled text is planned from the very beginning of copying. This poses a problem to the researcher, because the catalogues tend not to be very precise in respecting the difference between the two. According to the catalogues, ruled columns appear in Ashkenaz in the fourteenth century (3 items), to which we should add the example of the column of Targum to the haftarot in ms Valmadonna 1 (case 1). The catalogues also indicate a Sephardi example from the fifteenth century.
- D. Separate Targums occur in Ashkenaz in 1263 (case 5), but are recorded for the fourteenth or the fifteenth century, most frequently in the Italian context (at Parma Library) as well as one example in a Sephardi context (ms Vat. Ebr. 432).

Rabbinic Discourses on the Liturgical Use of Targum (Twelfth–Fourteenth Centuries)

The first counsels about the public liturgical uses of the Targum occur in the Mishnah and the Babylonian Talmud (BT Ber 8a). We later see Rashi, living in the 11th century in Northern France, making an extensive use of the Targum for exegetical purposes (Viezel 2012, 1–19). It is unclear whether the Targum was always read by a meturgeman during Ashkenazi public office in the thirteenth century or not, although the structure of most medieval Ashkenazi Bibles reflects a regular liturgical use (Pentateuch, Megillot, haftarot), and the alternating layout seems to directly express the Babylonian custom ('twice Mikra, once Targum'). What were the purposes, then, of the Bibles mentioned above? Were they used during public office to follow the main reader from the Scroll? Did they replace the meturgeman by a silent reading? Were these books meant for private recitation at home or even for study?

The change from alternating to margins or ruled column layout during the thirteenth century needs to be analyzed within the frame of the medieval Ashkenazi textual tradition concerning liturgical use of the Targum. Some rabbinical texts seem to indicate a progressive discarding of the Targum, either due to preference or imposed by the praxis in the liturgical process.

In Germany, among the *Hassidei Ashkenaz*, Eliezer of Worms (c. 1176–1238) defends the knowledge of the Targum and stipulates in his *Sefer ha-Roqeah* that one must read the weekly parashah twice in Hebrew and once in Aramaic for the shaharit of the Shabbat (*Sefer Roqeah*, *Hilkhhot Shabbat*, § 53). Isaac of Vienna (1189–1250) claims that he saw his masters R. Judah he-Hassid and R. Abraham performing a silent private reading of the Targum during the reading of the Sefer Torah by the cantor (*Sefer Or Zarua*, part. 1, *Hilkhhot Keriyat Shema*, part. 11; Shalev-Eyni 2010, 9, n. 47).¹⁰ This touches a new issue: these medievals are asking about the material conditions under which to perform such reading, i.e. they are asking about the proper use of books.

The permission to perform silent reading of the Targum from codices is what is put in question in the *Sefer Minhagim* from Meir of Rothenburg (c. 1215–1293). Quoting a *responsum* of Provençal sages, he states that the translation should be made together with the Torah reading, on the condition that an Aramaic translator is present (*Sefer Minhagim*, *Keriyat Be-Humashim*, § 2).¹¹ However, Meir's further remarks imply that this was not often the case, because he specifies that, to fulfil the Talmudic prescription of reading the Hebrew twice and the Targum once, the Targum is to be read 'at home', after attending the public reading in Hebrew. He seems to discourage the silent reading mentioned by Isaac of Vienna, considering it more important to follow with attention the reading of the Sefer Torah during the service.¹²

In France, Moses ben Jacob of Coucy (1200–1270) in his *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol* (מועיל) concerning the rule of Ber 8a states that the commentary is more useful than the Targum (Peretz 2008, 59, n. 28, quoting *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, *Mitzvot Taase*, 19; Shalev-Eyni 2010, 9, n. 50). The fact that reading the Targum during the public service was not the norm anymore is confirmed by the Northern French *Mahzor Vitry*, written by Simcha of Vitry (d. 1105), a pupil of Rashi. This mahzor clearly states that Targum was only read twice a year (*Mahzor Vitry*, 158, n. 166; cf. Goldin 1995, 21; Shalev-Eyni 2010, 9, n. 43). However, it was also permissible to precede the reading of the Torah with an individual reading at home (Shalev-Eyni 2010, 9, n. 48). Isaac of Corbeil (1210–1280), a pupil of

¹⁰ וראיתי את מורי הרב רבי יהודה החסיד זצ"ל ואת מורי הרב רבי אברהם זצ"ל בן הרב ר' משה 10 זצ"ל שהיו קורין שנים מקרא ואחד תרגום בשעת קריאת שליח צבור את ספר תורה ואומר אני: כי זה מותר לכ"ע הואיל דבאותו ענין קא עסיק

¹¹ כי בקריאת ספר תורה אחד קורא ואחד מתרגם אחד קורא הפסוק פעם אחת ואם יש מתרגם 11 יתרגם על ידו

¹² אבל מי שמשלים פרשיותיו עם הצבור ואומ' שנים מקרא ואחד תרגום אף על פי ששומע קריאת 12 התור' מפי הקוראים חייב להשלים . I thank Judith Schlanger for our discussion of this prescription .

Coucy, goes further than this, and argues that 'if the reader does not know how to read Aramaic, he will read the commentaries'. He also raises the possibility of asking someone to read the Targum or to postpone this reading until the weekdays (*Sefer Mitzvot Katan*, Introduction; see Peretz 2008, 59; Shalev-Eyni 2010, 15).¹³

In the fourteenth century there were Tosafists who wanted to reject the Targum from the liturgical readings altogether as is made clear in their comments to BT Meg 23b.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this paper was to show the benefits of a close study of the Targum's layout according to specific geocultural areas. We produced a case study on the Ashkenaz textual community and highlighted the methodological limits of both empirical and statistical surveys.

In the present state of research, but knowing that it is totally obscure whether the selection of manuscripts that have been preserved is representative of the total amount of manuscripts that has once been produced in Ashkenaz, we may assume that (a) Ashkenaz, according to the codices that have come down to us, maintained the presence of the Aramaic Targum along with the Hebrew text in the European cultural area, while Targum circulated through another form in Sepharad and in Italy; (b) by the end of the thirteenth century, a change of layout from alternating verses to marginal layouts had taken place, which was not entirely uniform or consistent; and (c) the halakhic opinions confirm a progressive discarding of the Targum, which began with a restriction of its use in haftarot of Pesach and Shavuot, and then, over time, was neglected entirely. These discourses justify the development of new books that only included Targum Jonathan to the haftarot, which probably had a liturgical use for those who followed Isaac of Vienna's prescriptions in Germany, but lost that use in Northern France.

Over time, the Targum and the commentary of Rashi were more frequently copied in the margins, probably due to the influences of Moses of Coucy and Isaac of Corbeil. Thus, the alternating layout could signal a reminiscence of the Babylonian tradition, but was not of any practical use. The irregularities in the alternation (see above no. 4, dated 1239) highlight the fact that the Targum could not have been strictly read verse by verse in this early stage, reflecting its displacement from a liturgical use to an object of private study. This could also explain the appearance of commentaries in the margins, because these texts were considered in halakhic *compendia* as valuable texts that could replace the

¹³ ומי שאינו יודע לתרגם יקרא הפירושים ואם אינו יודע ישאל למי שגדול ממנו ואם לא יוכל 13. להשלים ביום א' או ב' יחלקנה לשבע

Targum.

Taking into account all of these findings, we suggest that further research needs to be devoted to the place of the Targum in the Oriental codices— Babylonian, Yemenite, Byzantine and other Oriental items—as well as in fragments discovered in the European Genizas. Concerning Ashkenaz, the difference of the Targum's layout in the Pentateuch and haftarot among German and Northern French manuscripts should be evaluated in specific codicological and palaeographical research.

Bibliography

Editions

Mahzor Vitry, Simḥah ben Samuel, Simon Hurwitz and Heinrich Brody (eds), Brooklyn (N.Y.) 1959.

Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, Moses ben Jacob of Coucy, A.P. Farber (ed), Jerusalem 1990/1991 (digital copy available at <http://www.hebrewbooks.org/21359>).

Sefer Mitzvot Katan (= *Sefer Amudei Golah*), Isaac ben Joseph of Corbeil, with annotations by Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil, Jerusalem 2005.

Sefer Or Zarua ha-Shalem, Isaac ben Moses of Vienna, Avraham Marinberg, and Shalom Y. Iain (eds), Jerusalem 2001.

Sefer ha-Roqeah, Eliezer of Worms, Brooklyn 1998. *Sefer Minhagim*, Meir of Rothenburg, I. Elfenbein (ed), Jerusalem 1967/1968.

Secondary Literature

Attia, E., *Les manuscrits de Raphaël de Prato: Une bibliothèque privée juive italienne du XVI^e siècle*, Berlin Studies in Judaism 2, Turin 2012.

Barco, J. del, *Manuscrits en caractères hébreux conservés dans les bibliothèques de France: catalogues. Volume 4, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 1 à 32, manuscrits de la Bible hébraïque*, Turnhout 2011.

Beit-Arié, M., 'The Valmadonna Pentateuch and the problem of pre-expulsion Anglo-Hebrew manuscripts—MS London, Valmadonna Trust Library 1: England (?), 1189' in: M. Beit-Arié (ed.), *The Makings of the Medieval Hebrew Book: Studies in Palaeography and Codicology*, 129–151, Jerusalem 1993.

Bernheimer, C., *Paleografia ebraica*, Firenze 1924. Falenciak, J., *Hebrew Bible from the XIII Century in the Manuscripts of the University*

Library in Wrocław, cod. M 1106. Komunikat / Biblioteka Uniwersytecka we Wrocławiu

1, Wrocław 1986. Golb, N., *Toledot ha-Yehudim be-ir Ruan bimei ha-benayim*, Tel-Aviv 1976. ———, *Les Juifs de Rouen au Moyen Âge: Portrait d'une culture oubliée*, Mont-Saint-

Aignan 1985. ———, *The Jews in Medieval Normandy: A Social and Intellectual History*, Cambridge

1998. Goldin, S., 1985, 'The Synagogue in Medieval Jewish Community as an integral

Institution' *Journal of Ritual Studies* 9/1: 15–39. Klein, M.L., *Targumic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*, Cambridge /

New York 1992. Metzger, T., *Die Bibel von Meschullam und Joseph Qalonymos: Ms. M 1106 der*

Universitätsbibliothek Breslau (Wrocław) (Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte

des Bistums und Hochstift Würzburg, XLII), Würzburg 1994. Neubauer, A. & A.E. Cowley, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian*

Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford, Oxford 1886–1906. Olszowy-Schlanger, J., *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale: Étude*

historique et paléographique, Paris / Dudley 2003. Peretz, Y., 2008, 'Shnaym Miqra' we-Ehad Targum', *Tallelei Orot* 14: 53–62. Richler, B. (ed.), *Hebrew Manuscripts in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma*.

Catalogue. Palaeographical and Codicological Descriptions [by] M. B.-A., Jerusalem 2001.

Richler, B., *Hebrew Manuscripts in the Vatican Library: Paleographical and Codicological Descriptions from M. Beit-Arié in collaboration with Nurit Pasternak*. Studi e testi 438, Città del Vaticano / Jerusalem 2008.

Shalev-Eyni, S., *Jews among Christians. Hebrew Book Illumination from Lake Constance*, London / Turnhout 2010.

Sirat, C., *Du scribe au livre, les manuscrits hébreux au Moyen-Age*, Paris 1994. ———, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, Nicholas de Lange (trad.), Cambridge

2002. Sirat, C., M. Beit-Arié & M. Glatzer, *Manuscripts médiévaux en caractères hébraïques por-*

tant des indications de date jusqu'à 1540—Tome I, Paris-Jérusalem 1972. ———, *Manuscripts médiévaux en caractères hébraïques portant des indications de date*

jusqu'à 1540—Tome III, Paris-Jérusalem 1986. ———, *Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Codices hebraicis litteris exarati quo*

tempore scripti fuerint exhibentes: Tome II: de 1021 à 1079, Monumenta palaeograph-

ica medii aevi. Series Hebraica II, Turnhout 1999. Staalduine-Sulman, E. van, *The Targum of Samuel*, SAIS 1, Leiden 2002. Tamani, G., *Elenco dei manoscritti ebraici miniati e decorati della "Palatina" di Parma*,

Firenze 1968. Viesel, E., 2012, 'Targum Onkelos in Rashi's Exegetical Consciousness', *Review of*

Rabbinic Judaism 15/1:1–19. Zotenberg, H. et al., *Catalogue des manuscrits hébreux et samaritains de la Bibliothèque impériale*, Paris 1866.