
Codex M 1106 in the collections of the Wrocław University Library was given on September 19th, 1703, by Wit Ferdinand Mudrach to the Gymnasium library of the Evangelical church of St. Magdalene in Wrocław (Breslau) and it was transferred in 1865 to the city’s Municipal Library. Then, in 1947, it was passed on to the Wrocław University Library. The colophon states explicitly that the manuscript was copied by Meshullam, a cousin of Rab Yosef, son of Kalonymus, and that it was vocalized and provided with the masorah by Yosef, son of Kalonymus, who completed his work in [4]998, i.e. in 1237/8 A.D. The codex contains the Torah with the Targum Onqelos, the haftarot without Aramaic version, the Five Megillot, the Psalms, the Book of Job, and the Book of Proverbs, all with their Targum, then the Book of Daniel, the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah, and the Chronicles, without any Targum. The description of the codex, which was never published, is given by M.I. Baraniak in an article written in English, “Advertite animum lectores – hic Deus habitat”. The Manuscript M 1106 from the Collections of the Wrocław University Library, “Studia Judaica” 13 (2010), pp. 221–235, and in the book under review (pp. 84–98).

The critical edition of the Targum to the Song of Songs with its full vocalization (pp. 108–172) is a unique achievement in recent Polish Semitics. It is preceded by a history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs (pp. 15–46), by a presentation and discussion of the Targumic practice, of the aim of the Targums, of the translation techniques, and of the relation between the Targums and the Christian exegesis of the Bible (pp. 46–71). The chief characteristic of the Targums to the Five Scrolls, the Song of Songs in particular, is their extensive use of periphrases and comments. We certainly should not impose our criteria of proper translation upon the ancient translators, especially when they offer an allegoric reinterpretation of the original work.

The Targum to the Song of Songs is known in two traditions. The Western one is recognizable by the Palestinian genitive particle dy and by the accusative mark yt. It is closer to the original version, which was most likely Palestinian. A text belonging to this tradition was already published by Jacob b. Hayyim in Bomberg’s Rabbinic Bible (1524–1525) and by Paul de Lagarde, Hagiographa chaldaice, Leipzig 1872, pp. 145–163. An edition of the Paris BN Hébr. 110 was issued by C. Alonso Fontela, El Targum al Cantar de los Cantares, Madrid 1986, and a facsimile edition of the Codex Urbinati 1 was provided by E. Levine, The Targum of the Five Megillot, Jerusalem 1977. The Eastern tradition is represented mainly by Yemenite manuscripts from the 14th or 15th century with supralinear vocalization.

M.I. Baraniak deals with the history of the Targums to the Song of Songs, listing and classifying the various manuscripts and editions (pp. 73–83). Then he describes the
codex (pp. 84–98) and presents the parallel versions of the Targum in the Paris manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Hébr. 110, in the Ms. Or 1302 and Ms. Or 2375 of the British Library, in the Urbinates Ebr. 1 of the Vatican Library, and in de Lagarde’s edition in Hagiographa chaldaice (pp. 98–106). A short explanation of the diacritical signs in the printed text (pp. 106–107) precedes the edition with a full *apparatus criticus* referring to the manuscripts presented on pp. 99–104 and to the de Lagarde’s edition (pp. 108–172). Baraniak’s edition is followed by a detailed study aiming at classifying the Targum of the codex *M 1106* (pp. 173–186). It belongs undoubtedly to the Western tradition, generally different from the Yemenite one. The Author places it in the *stemma codicum* before Urbinates Ebr. 1.

The third part of the book offers a Polish translation of the Targum with a rich commentary presented in the footnotes (pp. 187–253). Finally, the phenomenon of the Targum to the Song of Songs is discussed at large and the allegoric interpretation of its various parts is explained (pp. 255–325). A detailed examination is not possible here and would be pointless. The Targum, as it stands in *M 1106*, appears as a literary composition rather than a simple writing down of an oral, synagogal tradition.

An important question is the date of the Targum. M.I. Baraniak notes that all the commentators situate the Targum to the Song of Songs between the 5th and the 8th century A.D. However, the opinion of authors is no scientific argument, what some young historians of Antiquity do not seem to grasp. One ought to examine the validity of the reasons why a determined opinion is formulated. M.I. Baraniak thus examines the external and internal arguments, philological, religious, literary, and historical (pp. 269–273). The *terminus ante quem* at the end of the 11th century is provided by a quotation in the Aruch of Nathan ben Jehi’el of Rome and by the use of the Targum by Tobias ben Eliezer of Castoria (Bulgaria) in the midrash *Leqah tōb*, both from the early 12th century. A *terminus post quem* is suggested by the synagogal reading of the Targum, attested among the Karaites in the 8th century, but its earlier use is quite possible.

The linguistic argument is not used by the Author, because he considers the language of the Targum as a late, mixed Aramaic dialect (pp. 263–265). However, a detailed and systematic analysis is required here, what was not done until now, although Philip S. Alexander rightly noticed that the text is basically written in Galilean or Palestinian Aramaic. Author’s grammatical observations on pp. 184–185 do not characterize the dialect.

The probable reference to the Talmud in 1:2 may allude to the Palestinian Talmud, achieved toward the end of the 5th century. If the Babylonian Talmud was meant, a *terminus post quem* ca. 800 A.D. should be proposed. The loanwords may be useful for establishing the chronology, if they appear to be borrowed recently. The Author refers to them on pp. 265–267, but without examining their first appearance in Aramaic. Now, some borrowings go back to the first millennium B.C. Arabic loanwords are more significant, but they are concentrated in 5:14 (p. 267, cf. pp. 279–293), with a possible case in 1:12. It is a weak basis for the dating of the whole composition. Also religious and literary subjects like the mention of the Messiah, son of Ephraim, and of the Messiah, son of David (4:5), may come from earlier traditions. Only the reference to Jewish wanderings