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THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF TARGUM JONATHAN

The Aramaic rendering of the Prophets belongs to the earliest translations of the Bible which have come down to us. Its importance for the textual investigation and early Biblical interpretation cannot be overestimated. While the targumist makes little display of critical study in rendering intricate passages, and while he does not pretend to present a minutely literal translation of the Hebrew text, his reverence for the letter and transmitted reading of the text must be far have exceeded that of the Greek and Syriac translators. At the same time his translation is doubtlessly based on a sounder and exacter understanding of both the etymology and usages of the Hebrew language. Again, its value may be said to rest in the fact that, forming a distinct and independent rendering of the text, it presents a helpful source in establishing the principles pursued in the early translations. A good many emendations and assumed violations of the Hebrew text on the sole basis of the translations, so eagerly sought by the modern Biblical scholar, would thus be completely done away with. It is also a mine of Agadic exegesis, to which, in most instances, parallels are preserved in the extant sources. It cannot fail to be of considerable importance for the history of that vast literature, giving in this connection new and vivid emphasis to the religious, national and political state of mind of that age in Palestine.

The authorship of the Targum to the Prophets has been the object of protracted and diverse discussion. Tradition ascribes it to Jonathan b. Uziel, the most prominent disciple of Hillel, of the first century. This single mention in the Talmud of the authorship of Jonathan and the mystic manner in which it is related, can hardly help solve the problem. There is, furthermore, the astounding fact that in the parallel passage in the
Yerushalmi 1) there is complete silence of this tradition of the Babli. 2) Had this tradition been common, there could have been no possible reason for the Yerushalmi to ignore the work of the distinguished and holy Jonathan, who "when he discussed the law, a bird flying near him would be burned". 3)

The Talmudic tradition mentions Aquila's translation. Both Talmudim have set monuments to the Seventy. Is it because the Targum was originated on Palestinian soil, extensively used and known in Palestine, forming even a necessary part in the worship, that they failed to be impressed by it?

So the inference was drawn that the Aramaic version of the Bible fell in disfavor with the authorities in Palestine who, however, were distinctly pleased with the Greek translation, particularly the Greek version of Aquila. 4) The alleged reasons for

1) Y. Megilla 1, 9.

2) Babli Meg. 3b. Blau's contention (J. Q. R., v. 9, p. 738) has no foundation. Cases of disagreement in assigning the author of a saying are numerous. It needs no explanation and consequently cannot be made a basis for a new theory.

3) Suk. 28a; Baba Bathra 134a; Y. Nedarim 5, 6.

4) Berliner (Onkelos 108-110) has even the idea of a complete suppression of the official Targumim in Palestine. Weiss (Dor Dor etc., v. 1, 200) even knows exactly the time when this suppression took place and its author. It was Rabban Gamliel, of whom it is said (Shab. 115a; Tosef. 13 (14) and with some changes in Sof. 5, 15; Y. Shab. 16, 1) that he hid the Targum to Job. So then it was he who put the ban also on the official Targumim. And it was not until the time of R. Akiba that the ban was lifted. This conjecture is read by Weiss into the phrase מַאֲלָה פֵּהוּ כְּלָלִי אָדָם. It is evident that the whole supposition hinges on the mere finding that Rabban Gamliel forbade the use of a certain particular Targum. That the express mention of the Targum should be taken to indicate that the other Targumim were spared this interdiction seems to have escaped their observation. Furthermore, their theory is exposed to a dangerous contradiction. If the Targum was restored in the time of R. Akiba, what sense could there have been to the contention of R. Chalafta with Gamliel the younger, a contemporary of R. Akiba, with regard to his license with the Targum, and his reminder of R. Gamliel the Elder? They should not have overlooked the remarkable coincidence presented in the story of Gamliel the Elder and his grandchild. In both instances it was the Targum to Job that evoked disfavor.
such a departure will hardly stand their ground. But aside from other considerations, this assertion is flatly contradicted by the very fact that the Aramaic version was not ignored by the Palestinian authorities. Both Onkelos and Jonathan are quoted in the Yerushalmi and Midrashim,\(^5\) while, on the contrary, the genuineness of the quotations from Aquila is doubtful.\(^6\)

It was, then, clearly this Targum which was hit by Rabban Gamliel the Elder, and which was still regarded as forbidden.

There is little to be said of Finn’s conjecture (v. 1, 56. \(רברי חומך\)) that the suppression of the Targum to the Pent. was due to the introduction of the Samaritan Targum with its dangerous divergencies from the Hebrew text. This he attempts to discover in the obscure saying of Mar Zutra (San. 21b).

It needs only to be mentioned that there is not the faintest hint in the Talmud of a suspension of the Targum-reading in the worship, as he would have us believe. Rosenthal (Beth Ha-Midrash 2, 276) takes the view that the reverence in which Aquila’s translation was held in Palestine was due to the fact that Greek was spoken more than Aramaic in Palestine. It is pure imagination.

5) The reader is referred to Zunz G. V., p. 67, Notes b, c. It should be remarked that the list of citations given by Zunz represents by no means an exhaustive research. It is not my present task to cite the numerous cases which, for some reason or other, he does not cite. Suffice it to state that citations from Onkelos alone in Genesis r. exceed considerably the number of citations from Aquila taken together. Com. Lerner, An. u. Quellen d. Breishit Raba 63-65. His view that the respective citations may not represent actual quotations from the Targum, is open to question. One would be at a loss to explain the identity of these citations with the rendering in the Targum. For one of the mind of Geiger, who makes the general assertion that citations from the Targumim are not to be found except in the latter Midrashim, it will be of interest the following remark in ורא אתを行י ל’:reqem b’כמה ספומכט דא דרךגומ במרב בשם: to Gen. r. 45;7: ספומכט שמש התחרוגומ חוזאית משומכט גודי בךולא יוול. This is just as true of other cases.

6) Com. Field Hex. XVII. Of all the 12 respective citations, one, on Is. 5, 6 (Eccl. r. 11, 7) belongs to Jonathan, and yet carries the name of Aquila. Luria l. c. would emend Jonathan but admits Jonathan is never mentioned in the Midrash. Einhorn (ad loc.) would have here Aquila agree with Jonathan, so Herzfeld (Geschichte II, 63). Equally, Weiss’ assertion (Dor, v. 2, 123) that this implies Aquila must have made use of Jonathan needs no refutation. Another Aramaic quotation referring to Prov. 25, 11 (Gen. r. 93, 3) is partly taken from the Targum to Prov.
Yet they are not traced to their respective translators. Such is also the case in Babli, where this tradition of Jonathan’s authorship is told. In all the many quotations from Targum Jonathan there is no single reference to Jonathan. These facts combine to show that both in Babylonia and Palestine this tradition was otherwise understood, and not until a comparatively late period did it succeed in gaining currency.

Aquila’s authority, then, in these cases is a mistake. One other case, namely that referring to Lev. 19, 20 (Y. Kid. 1, 1 end) deals with a Halakic exposition. In the first place, it implies in no way a translatory interpretation. Further, the authority of Aquila given in the name of Jochanan is contested by Chiya who refers it to R. Laser, changing only the reference for evidence. On the other hand, in the Babli (Krithoth 11b) no authority is cited for the same interpretation. If the authority of Aquila was correctly quoted, then Rabboni’s should be interpreted in its general sense as אֲבָא תוֹרָה is used in the Babli. His translation was not meant, and all assumptions by De Rossi (Meor Einaim, Ch. 49) and Krauss (Steinschneider Fest. 153) in this case deserve little consideration. The case of Dan. 8, 13, where Aquila is cited (Gen. r. 21, 1; Jalqut Dan. l. c.) in Hebrew, is instructive. There can be no question that the words דִּבְרֵי מְנַכֶּשׁ are an interpolation. It is Rab Huna’s interpretation played on a particular form of the word and the contracted דִּבְרֵי מְנַכֶּשׁ; it should read דִּבְרֵי מְנַכֶּשׁ. It admits of no other explanation.

It is not necessary to enlarge upon these four non-Greek citations. It is scarcely necessary to state that none of these citations is to be found in the Hexapla. But of no more valid authenticity are the remaining eight Greek citations. The citation of Lev. 23, 40 (Y. Sukka 3, 5 Gem.) is a misquotation. As Field and others remarked, such a rendering is fundamentally foreign to Aquila. Besides, in Babli (Sukka 35a) this is recorded as said by Ben Azai, and deduced by the method. In Yerushalmi, again, R. Tanchuma is citing Aquila: אֱלֹהֵי אֲבָא תוֹרָה, אַמְלָאֵי אֲבָא תוֹרָה אֶלֹהֵי אֲבָא תוֹרָה. This is striking. Aquila is always cited plainly. In the Midrash, however (Lev. r. 30, 8; Jalqut l. c.), the name of R. Tanchuma is omitted. At the same time Ben Azai is cited in the Midrash as the authority of the saying דִּבְרֵי מְנַכֶּשׁ while in Babli l. c. R. Abbahu is mentioned as the author, and in Yerushalmi (l. c.) R. Levi is the one who said it. It appears that Ben Azai’s authority was particularly intended for the last part of the saying, namely the citation from Aquila, as if Ben Azai were citing Aquila. A reconciliation of the Babli and Yerushalmi on this point would appear to have been in the view of the compiler. That might have been the case in the Yerushalmi. According to one report, R. Tanchuma was the author of this exegetical note, just as Ben Azai is
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Furthermore, Targum Jonathan is quoted in Babli, in many instances, in the name of Rab Joseph, the president of the Pumbeditha Academy, who flourished in the fourth century. Even as late as the author of a commentary on Taharoth, for a long time ascribed to Hai Gaon (flourished in the 11th Century), quotations from Targum Jonathan are given in the name of Rab Joseph, which led Zekaria Frankel, Schürer, Buhl, Winter u. Wünsche, Graetz and many others to take Rab Joseph as the

named as its author in the Babli; according to the other, it was Aquila’s (interpretation, not translation). And both reports were united in the form it reads in the Yerushalmi. Either B. A. or R. T. made use of the semblance of the respective Hebrew word to the Greek word, a method pursued extensively by the Agadists (Com. Shab. 63b; Gen. r. 99, 7; com. Shorr מדרש טור, 12, 6.). It is not Aquila’s translation which is quoted. Zipper’s Theory (Krauss l. c.) as well as Rappaport’s fine suggestion (קנין מדרש, 153) employed by Krauss (l. c. 153) in this case, are superfluous. Of a similar nature is the interpretation attributed to Aquila in Lev. r. 33, 6 on Ez. 23:43. This curious explanation could hardly have found a place in the literal translation of Aquila. It does not belong to Aquila.

With reference to the allegorical interpretation of Prov. 18:21, attributed in Lev. r. 33, 1 to Aquila, it was justly characterized by Field (l. c.) along with Lev. 23:40 as “Omnino absurdae et ridiculae sunt”. Com. Tanchuma Lev. ירושית 4, where practically the same idea is expressed without resorting to this Greek expression.

Questionable is the quotation from Aquila on Ps. 48, 21, cited in Y. Meg. 2, 4; Y. M. K. 3, 7. In the first place, Aquila renders ל♀ מַעַשְׂרֵי מָצָא Ps. 46, 1 by לַעֲשָׂרָהוֹ בָּרָהוֹ. So also in 9:1 לוּשָׂן. It stands to reason that 48, 21 was similarly rendered by him and not by the alleged דָּשַׁנְתָּא. This would agree with the T. rendering דָּשַׁנְתָּא יִשְׁתָּא which is also indicated in the Y. (l. c.), namely לַמְּשָׂא מַעִית. It should also be noticed in passing that one other interpretation given there תִּשְׁתָּא יִשְׁתָּא agrees with the Lxx, which renders it לִכְכַלָּא תִּשְׁתָּא, which is also imp lied in Cant. r. 1, 22. The Syriac Hex., as well as Jerome (Field XXVI), would lend support to such a rendering by Aquila. The rendering דָּשַׁנְתָּא cited in Field (l. c.) under column Ed. Prima, ought not to be taken in serious consideration for obvious reasons. To all intents, this rendering of לַמְּשָׂא is so Midrashic that it would not find its way even into a less rigorous translation than Aqu.

The quotation in Y. Shab. 6, 4 from Aq. on Is. 3:20 is not found in the Hex. The case of Ez. 16, 10 (Lam. r. 1, 1), containing a double rendering, may even be a quotation from Jon. The Lxx might as well
real author of the T. Jonathan. But Rashi and Tosaphoth are unqualifiedly right in their common explanation of this curious occurrence. It should be borne in mind that Rab Joseph himself often cites the Targum Jonathan with the introductory phrase מִבְּרֵית הַגּוֹבֵל, which clearly signifies he had the Targum before him. Furthermore, Rab Joseph also cites Onkelos. On the other hand, we have a citation from the Targum to Esth. 3, 1, ascribed to Rab Joseph, where it is clear from the Greek names it contains that we have a Palestinian Targum before us. Again, some of Rab Joseph's interpretations fail to coincide with those in the Targum Jonathan.

be meant, which here, as also in Ex. 27:16, agrees with Aqu. as recorded in the Hex., and also disagrees, just as Aqu., with its version in the Midrash. Similarly, the citation from Aqu. on Gen. 17:1 in Gen. r. 46, 2; in this case also there is no telling which Greek translation was meant, for the Lxx contains also such a rendering (com. Field Hex., l. c.). The ascription, again, to Aqu. of citations from other sources was demonstrated above. This might have been the case with the quotations from Aqu. on Dan. 5, 5 (Y. Joma 3, 8 Gem.) and Esth. r. 6. In the former, Aqu. is preserved in the Lxx only.

7) Keilim 29, 30 on Judges 3:16; IS. 3:23, 13:21; Ex. 17:7; Oholoth 18 on Is. 49:22. It is interesting that the Aruch יבצאל המכרותל cites the Targum from Hai, refraining from mentioning the source, by the same direct reference to R. Joseph מְבִית הָגְוֵל יְרֵמוּן.

Com. Schürer, Geschichte, VI, 149 (4th German ed.); Z. Frankel, Zu d. T., 10:12; Buhl, Kanon, 173; Winter u. Wünsche, Jüd. Lit. 1, 65.

Winter u. Wünsche, ib., would interpret the tradition as pointing to the authorship of Jonathan of the fragmentary Targum to the Prophets in Codex Reuch. Com. also Weiss, Dor, 1, 200; 2, 123.

8) Rashi, Kidushin 13a; Tos. Baba Kama 3a דָּרֵיתָנָה.

9) San. 94b; Moed Katan 28b; Meg. 3a.

10) Shab. 28a; Exod. 25:5, 64; Num. 31, 50; Nazir 39a; Num. 6:9; Sota 48b: Deut. 1:49, the latter ascribed to Rab Shesheth in another recension.

11) As to the existence of a Targum to Esther at a comparatively early date, com. Megilla 17a, Mishna and Gemara 18a; Y. Meg. 2, 1. As to the assumption of Rab Joseph being the author of the Targum to Hagiog., com. Tosafoth Shab. 115a יבצאל and Megilla 21b הבשלה pointing out that the Targum to Hag. dates back to the Tanaitic age, while Rashi Megilla (l. c.) asserts שָׁאוּל הַזִּקְוָן יְשִׁירֵהוּ כַּנהֲבוּיָם.

12) Here are some illustrations: Aboda Zara 4a, R. Joseph's in-
in the instance of the Targumic citation on Is. 33:21 put in the mouth of R. Joseph in Jomma 77b, it is given in the name of Rab in Rosh Hashana 23a, and on no authority in Shek. 6, 2, Gem. It may be further stated that in some instances the authority of R. Joseph is omitted; these are introduced by the impersonal verb רומרים. Again, it should be noticed that Onkelos to Genesis 49:27 and Gen. 30:14 is said in the name of Rab and Levi (Zebachim 54a) and San. 99b on Gen. 30:14 without מוחה, and still this would not constitute sufficient evidence to place the name of Rab on Targum Onkelos. The evidence in question presses in the direction of an entirely different conclusion, and that is, that so general was the ignorance of the authorship of the official Targumim that quotations from them were permitted or had to be recalled on the authority of the one citing them.

There is no need to dwell at length on the fanciful hypothesis first formulated by Drusius and later set forth in his peculiar way by Geiger and supported by Karpeles, connecting Jonathan with Theodotion.13 According to this theory, the Targum Jonathan is founded on the Greek translation of Theodotion, while Targum Onkelos is based on Aquila.14 But the Theodotion version, which is rather a revised version of the LXX than an independent rendering, and whose Pharasaic origin is open to question, and whose author shows a scant knowledge of Hebrew, could hardly become the groundwork for the Rabbinic Targum Jonathan. There is not the remotest agreement between them, either as to the principles employed or as to the rendering, except in the names of the translators, and only a

13) Geiger, Ursch. 163; Carpeles, History (Heb.) 159.

14) Com. Rapaport מראות ליאורונים 3; Luzzatto 214; Adler חכמת ערב Introduction.
highly powerful imagination would be taken by its suggestive-ness.

With the collapse of these theories; with the tradition in complete silence over the name of the author of the official Targum to the Prophets, and in utter lack of other evidence leading to the establishment of a tenable hypothesis, there is no use in further attempts to solve the riddle. There was no single author to impress tradition, and in so far as the name of the author is concerned, the discussion should be considered as concluded. But there is another question closely allied with this problem, which calls for consideration. Many writers on this subject speak of a revised redaction of the official Targumim. Some assert that the revision was stimulated by a missionary desire to supply the Gentile world, speaking an Aramaic dialect, with a correct rendering of the Torah, as Luzzato, supported by Rapaport, would put it. Others would look for its cause in the careless handling by the early Aramaic translators of the Hebrew text. Berliner and Geiger adhere to the theory that the revision was brought about by the necessity of furnishing the congregations in the Diaspora, particularly in Babylonia, with a unified and carefully redacted Aramaic version of the Bible.

It should be first borne in mind that these theories start from the viewpoint that these Targumim were, so to speak, rejected in Palestine and consequently found elevation to general reverence in Babylonia. This theory of Palestinian disregard for the Targum is already shown to be erroneous. On the whole, however, this theory will, on full examination, prove to be perplexing. The question arises, how is it, that the redactors permitted renderings to remain in the Targum which unmistakably signify a different reading from the Masoretic text?

---

15) Luzzatto, Oheb, VIII: Rapaport l. c.
16) Meor Enaim, Ch. 45.
18) Com. chapter on textual variations, group A. As to Onk.,
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It is further assumed that the revision was made necessary in order to make the Targumic interpretations conform to current Halakic exposition. If this were the case, we should expect to find the Targum in complete harmony with current Halaka. But this is far from being the case. Onkelos presents a long list of cases where it differs from the formally accepted Halakic interpretations and decisions. So are the renderings of Exod. 21, 24 and Lev. 24, 19, 20 against the accepted Halaka, "transmitted from Moses and so seen at the court of every generation from Joshua and on" (Maimonides 1, 6) that a monetary and not a corporal retaliation is meant (Baba Kama 83b, 84a); Lev. 19:32 disregarding Baraita Kidushin 32; Deut. 23:18 against Halaka. Sifri l. c.; San. 54b; Abodah Zara 36b. (com. Maimonides א', א'ZA and Magid Mishna l. c.). In all of which the Targum undoubtedly has preserved an afterwards superseded Halaka. 19)

The same may be said, in a certain measure, of the Agada. Many are the cases both in Jonathan and Onkelos where the popular interpretations are ignored but which could hardly be ignored by a later redaction. 20) Pseudo-Jonathan and the Frag-

19) It is instructive to notice the rendering of the respective cases in Ps. Jonathan, which conform with the Halaka. This betrays the hand of a later day editor. The Ps. Jonathan, as is generally known, contains some Halakic interpretations conflicting with the current Halaka, which led some writers, among them Geiger, to regard it as a mine of early, Sadducean Halaka. Com. Revel, Karaite Halaka, p. 18.

20) Some examples: Is. 17:8; Kethuboth 9b; Ezek. 1:14; Hagiga 13b; com. also the singular rendering of vv. 5, 6. Com. Hag. l. c.; Kid 72a, referring to 2K 18:11. Both official Targumim abound with such cases.

Yανωτον (v. 9, 254-264) is the author of a novel theory, namely, that Rab Joseph was the redactor of both Onkelos and Jonathan, as it is evident from the Targumic citations in the Talmud which are quoted in his name. These Targumim have originated from the Greek translation of Aquila, which was translated into Aramaic.
mentary Targum may serve as instructive illustrations. Finally, there are many inconsistencies in reference to certain principles followed in the Targum (com. groups B and C in the chapter on textual deviations), which would not have occurred had it proceeded from the hand of a single redactor. Nothing, again, can account for the silence in the Talmudic sources over an act of such magnitude and importance. The tradition of the Babi of the official Targumim can hardly be taken in any degree to contain the historical kernel of a single authorship. It might be assumed, on the other hand, that it does not, in substance, imply that Jonathan was the author of the extant Targum or of one lost, but points to the fact that this great Rabbi was preeminently skillful in the interpretation of the Prophets. Targum would then be used in this case in its acquired and more general sense. Targum as a quality is counted among the merits of the fellow student of Jonathan, Rabban Jochanan b. Zakkai.\textsuperscript{21}

What has been said of Jonathan is true of Onkelos. There could not have been a revised redaction of the magnitude the sponsors of this theory maintained. The corruptionist hypothesis rests on the doubtful foundation that the unofficial Targumim, as Pseudo-Jonathan, to which unfavorable references are supposedly made in the Talmud, preceded the official Targum. But just the reverse may be true, namely, that these extra-Targumim were built upon the official Targum. Suffice it to say that the existence of “Our” Targum, stated by Tanaitic authorities, implies the fact that the other Targumim existed along with the official Targum.

Rab Joseph edited and put them in final shape. Hence the name of Aquila (Onk.) on the Targum of the Pentateuch and also of the Prophets (namely, the citation in Eccl. r. 11, 3 from Jonathan Is. 5:6, which was considered above) and of Rab Joseph on the Targum of the Prophets and also of the Pent. (the citation in Sota 48b). It is the queerest of theories propounded on the question of the authorship of the Targumim. Ingenuity must fail when one identifies the literal Aquila with the interpretative Jonathan.

\textsuperscript{21) Soferim 16, 8: אמו אליו על לרבי ויתן ב קמא שלול לחוכ הראש, which is omitted in the modified version of this saying in Sukka 28a and Baba Bathra 134a. So also in Midr. Rabb. Shir. 179: לָמִּינָן יְהוּדָה יִרְאוֹת, מַלְּמִינָן שֵׁמוֹרָה מִבְּעִי לַיְוִי מַכֶּה, מַרְאֵה מַכֶּה לַיְוִי הָנִיחוּ הָרְגֵּנוּ מַכֶּה לַיְוִי מַשְׁנֵה.}
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But this does not imply that no change was introduced in the existing official Targumim. Certain traces in the Targum carry unmistakable evidence of a Babylonian recast, which was, however, of a very limited scope.

This will be discussed later. The substance was left untouched. Consequently, we may rest assured there was no unified authorship even to the extent of a thoroughgoing redaction. But before advancing other views with regard to the authorship, we might well direct our attention to evidence preserved in the Targum.

It should be noticed at the outset that tradition assigns an early origin to the official Targumim. The same tradition which vaguely ascribed the Targum to late authorities is sponsor of the statement that they originated far back of the age of these authorities. Of Jonathan the tradition makes clear that he “said” the Targum from the mouths of the Prophets Haggai, Zachariah and Malachi. With regard to Onkelos the tradition explains that Onkelos only restored the Targum, which originated with Ezra. The latter was inferred, in the name of Rab, from the interpretation of Nehemiah 8:8, according to which מַהְוָה (R. Judan, Nedariim 37a; Gen. r. 36, end). Making all allowance, the Targum Jonathan contains evidence pointing to a comparatively early date. Evidence of a general character consists, first, of the textual deviations which abound in Jonathan as well as in Onkelos. The same may be said with reference to the unacceptable Halaka, found in Onkelos. This fact points to a date when these matters were still in the balance. Why, however, they were permitted at a later age to remain in the Targum can easily be explained. There was first of all the tradition referring the Targumim to the last Prophets and Ezra, which cast a halo over them, and none would venture either to question the propriety of the ren-

22) Rosenfeld’s long list of supposed deviations from the M. T. in Talmud (Mishpachoth Soferim, Vilna, 1883) will be found on closer examination to present no contradiction to this statement. With minor exceptions, nearly all the adduced cases are of a Midrashic nature and should be regarded as such.
dering or attempt to emend them, just because they appeared amazingly striking.

There was no cause for general alarm. The Targum was read verse for verse with the Hebrew Text, which would bring home to the reflection of the hearer the established reading.23) Still, precaution was sought to exclude a possible impression that the Targum represents the right reading. I am persuaded to interpret the causes for the limitations placed upon the reading of the Targum in the light of this supposition.24)

The elimination of anthropomorphisms, so persistently carried through in the official Targumim, goes back to an early period. It is a tendency which has its roots in the movement that gave rise to the 18 Tikune Soferim (Mek. Ex. 17, 7) and to the substitution of descriptive appellations (Adonai, Heaven, etc.) for the name of God.25) In the later part of the Amoraic age a reaction set in against this tendency, which did not reappear until the Arabic Era. This principle would not have been so singularly stressed in the 4th century in Babylonia, not to speak of the 7th century. Numerous anthropomorphic substitutes were eliminated in the official Targumim by the latter redactors, to whom, it would seem, the anthropomorphic expression was no longer terrifying and repugnant.

It will be of some interest in this connection to note the relaxing of this principle in the Targum to Hagiog., which is certainly later than the Targumim to the Pent. and Prophets. This targumist does not hesitate to render literally such expressions as God laughs (Ps. 2:4; 37:13), God sees (Ps. 33:13; 35:17, 22 etc), God's eyes and eyelids (Ps. 11:4; 33:18), God's hands

23) Com. Meg. 23b; Tos. Meg. 3; Rosh Hashana 27a.

24) Com. Sota 39b and Y. Meg. 4, 1 Gem. The alleged reason becomes more sensible if interpreted to mean that the public should not suppose the Targum version to correspond to the established reading.

25) It was this tendency which influenced both the Aramaic and the LXX versions. Com. Z. Frankel, Vorstudien, p. 175; Einfluss, pp. 30, 82, 130; Palaeast. u. Alex. Shrift., 21 et seq.; Zeller, Philosophie d. Griechen, v. 3, 11; 3, 255.
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

(Ps. 119:73). This reveals the notions of a later generation, which would undoubtedly have come to the surface in the official Targumim, had they been its production.

The term מוש, employed in the Targumim to cover anthropomorphic expressions, strikes me also as of early origin. It should be noticed at the outset, what a good many have missed to observe, that there is nothing in it to imply Greek influence. It represents no identity. It disavows the slightest implication of an agency. It is merely a term of speech adopted to disguise anthropomorphic presentations, for the awe-inspiring exaltation of God, hiding the face, like Moses, for fear "to look up to God". It was intended not so much to interpret or explain as to remind and evoke a higher reaction. It is fully employed in the same sense as ספירה ריב or מוש is used in the Bible, in which image מוש was certainly cast. In a later age, under the influence, it would seem, of the Greek Logos, this term acquired the meaning of a definite essence, an embodied heavenly power approaching an intermediary agency. The calls to Moses; it visits, surrounds and kisses. In the Book of Wisdom, probably of Palestinian origin, the all-powerful word of God leaps down from heaven, "a stern warrior into the midst

26) L. Ginsburg in the Jewish En. Anthropo. seemingly failed to take notice of this distinction when he made the unqualified statement that the earlier Targumim retained in translation such expressions as the hand, finger, eye etc. of God. This is true of the Targum to the Hagiographa. only. In Jonathan an evasive substitute is always employed in such cases. As to the hand of God, com. Joshua 22:31; 1S 5:7; 1K 18:46; Is. 9:25, 9:11, 11:11, 15:31, 3; Jer. 1:9 etc. As to finger, com. Exod. 8:15 with the exceptions of Exod. 31:18 and its parallel in Deut. 9:10, in which case, it seems, the substitute was eliminated, as in the creation story, in order to avoid an explanation that the tablets were given by some inferior power, or to escape the danger of allegorizing the fact of the tablets. Com. further Exod. 33:12, 13; 1 Kings 8:29; Is. 1:15; 43:4; Jer. 7:30.

27) In Ps. 33:6, 9; 107:20; 147:15, 18; 148:8 אב אל is a descriptive term for the action of God, while in 119:89 it is descriptive of the Torah.


29) Lev. r. 1, 4.

30) Cant. r. 1:13.
of a doomed land". The term מים then, could not have originated in a period when it might be taken to signify a distinct God-like power. In its use in translation it would have the effect of investing the מים with all activity, God being inactive—and nothing could be more horrible to the non-Hellenistic Jew than a transcendentalism of the Alexandrian mould. As was noticed before, the later Babylonian redactors have limited in the Targum the use of the מים. It is remarkable that in the creation story all anthropomorphic expressions are, contrary to principle, literally rendered. In most of the parallel cases in Ps. Jonathan מים is inserted. The reason for that might be found in the new significance which this term had assumed, so that the application of this term in the creation story would carry the implication that some other power, separate from God, was the author of the act of the creation.

The Targum to the Prophets is not wanting in more specific evidence, although this sort of evidence is admittedly scant. This T. is far from being Midrashic. It is primarily a translation, and the chief concern of the translator is to find the right meaning and the interpretation of the word and phrase; it is not seeking to explain the exigencies of the age, or to propound the mysteries of the generations. It does, however, in a few cases make use of allegory. In the allegorical interpretation unmistakable allusions were preserved to events which can be placed. The events extend over many periods, which furnish us the clue to the historical origination of the Targum.

Direct historical reference is made in the Targum to Hab. 3:17: כי חנה אֶת וֶלֶדֶם אֶזֶר יְהוָה נִפְסִיק, חֲנַח מִשְׁמָה היה ... The Targum interprets this to refer to the four Kingdoms אשר הוּא אֶלֶף יַר, יְהוֹאֵשׁ וְרְאוֹשׁ סְלָכִית But referring to Rome, the version reads ישועו ורומאיי סְלָכִית

32) Com. On. Gen. 3:9, 22; 5:2; 6:3. In all these cases Ps. Jonathan has מים inserted. In Gen. 8:1 there is a complete agreement in the translation between On. and Ps. Jonathan, except that the latter has מים. No explanation can plausibly account for that, except the supposition that a later redactor, out of fear for a possible misleading inference, and who would not feel irritated over an anthropomorphic expression, eliminated מים in the respective cases.
33) The reading of the extant editions
This emphasis on the tribute by the targarumist is remarkable. None of the barbarities committed by the Romans inflamed his rage as did the tribute. This reference then, must have been coined at a time when the chief agitation of the people gathered around the problem of the tribute. The targumist meant the census instituted by the second Procurator Quirinius (6-7 C. E.), which aroused rebellion, being regarded by the people as bondage. Had the destruction of the Temple taken place at the time of this reference to Rome, this act would have certainly been recorded instead of the census.  

IS. 28:1: He translates allegorically: 

וי יהי תקרת עירא משלמה והיה עירא משמרת רבים יר_Mskי משלמה וירשקע משלמה והיה יישבע וחוסת יצא. In the same way also vv. 3, 4. Allusions are here made to the deplorable state of the High Priesthood. The reference may go to the Sadducean Hasmonean rulers, particularly to Alexander Jannaeus, who incurred the deadliest hatred of the people. This hatred of the “sinners who rose against us”; who “laid waste the throne of David in tumultuous arrogance” (Ps. of Sol. 17, 4-8); who “utterly polluted the holy things of the Lord (1, 8) and had profaned with iniquities the offerings of God” (2, 3). 

Reference to John Hyrcanus is made in Ps. Jonathan to Deut. 33:11, according to Geiger (Ur. 479), which, however, may also be equally applicable to the father of Mattathias, John, whom later authorities, mistakenly, took for a High Priest. The failure, however, of the targumist to allude to the Kingship of the sinful High Priest, speaks against this supposition. It is a safer supposition that the Herodian High Priests or the state of the High Priesthood under the Roman Procurators, when this most sacred dignity became a salable article, is here

is a later emendation, probably to escape the rigors of the censor. It should read with Lagarde.

34) Com. Ant. XVII. 21. As to the date of the Census, com. Schürer, Geschichte, 4th German ed. VI, erste Anhang. Com. also Haurrath N. T. Times (Eng. ed.) v. 2, pp. 74-83. It was this state of mind from which emanated the curious rendering of המותבעות (Is. 3:6) חמצובות, taxation, against the Agadic interpretation to mean the Law (Chag. 14b; Gittin 43b). Com. also Is. 55:5.

meant. I am persuaded to believe that the targumist had in mind particularly the appointment by Herod of Annanus to the High Priesthood, which by right and general expectation was to belong to Aristobul III.

IS. 64:11: שָׁעַרְתָּא הַתָּמָּם is so rendered as to give vent to the general excitement of the time. It runs: יִרְבּוּ אֲרֵבָּא לְרִשּׁוֹעִים רְשֵׁמְתֵיהֶם, וּלְשֵׁם בֶּן אֵלָא. Likewise Hab. 3:1. The wicked are the rulers over the people. They are not the Gentiles, Romans, whom the T. would call either by name or by the general appellation עָפָר, אֲרוֹם; whereas this is applied to the wicked of Israel only. I am inclined to think the allusion is made to the Herodian rulers rather than to the later Hasmonean rulers. The expression אֲרֵבָּא אֲרֵבָּא could hardly have been intended for Alexander Jannaeus, whose rule was not too long, being then followed by the just rule of Alexandra. The targumist would, at the same time, place the beginning of the Herodian rule in the early days of the Antipater's political ascendency. There are other references to the Herodian rulers.

Hos. 4:13:על כן מונינאי, על כן חונינא, וגו'. הבניתי רחואנ זָכַר עֵמֶיךָ וָלְחַנְתָּו יָדֵךְ וּכְנֶבֶדִית שֵׁם מָמָּא מַעָּמֶה.

36) Com. Ant. XX, 8, 8; Pesachim 57a; Tos. Menachot end. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן, אֵין לֹא בָאָתָן, אֵין לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹא מָאָלְתָן. אוֹי לֹא בָאָתָן, אוֹי לֹаָלְתָן.

Also Lev. r. 21, 5; Y. Yoma 1, 1:

... ולא כהנים כהנים, ולא שופטים שופטים, ובו "ה" כהנים. ושופטים... כהנים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, א"ר שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים, שופטים.

37) Ant. XV, 2, 4. This reference might also be applicable to the High Priest Simon the son of Boethus, whose daughter Herod loved and married, and, in order to augment the dignity of the family, conferred upon him this high honor (Ant. XV, 9, 3). Although a priest of note, his elevation to office in this manner and the overthrow of Jesus the son of Phabet, his predecessor, brought upon him the indignation of the people and the hatred they entertained for the Herodian dynasty.
This is certainly an early T.; v. 14 is interpreted literally. Had it been the intention of the T. to soften some harsh expression flung against the morality of the Jewish daughters, it would have been followed in the other v. But the former deals a rebuke to the Herodians, who have intermarried with Gentile rulers. Herod married a Samaritan woman (Ant. 12, 2, 19); his son Alexander—Glaphira, daughter of Archelaus, King of Cappadocia (Ant. 16, 1, 2); Drusilla, the sister of Agrippa II, was prevailed upon to transgress the laws of her forebears and to marry Felix, the procurator (Ant. 20, 7, 2), while her former husband, the heathen King of Emesa and the second husband of her sister Berenice, the King of Cilicia, though circumcised, would hardly be regarded as a proselyte. The latter renounced his conversion as soon as Berenice left him (Ant. ib.). The cohabitation of Berenice with Titus (Dio Cassius 66, 15) is a further instance. It was the general reaction towards this open violation of the Law which the Rabbi would express in the only safe way through the exposition of some Prophetic utterance.

Of a more pronounced nature is the reference contained in the T. to Is. 56:4 ריבון ביתא יישיב חרביהו בני תורהו '高档'. ריבון מפריר חרביהו עט פורי בני אינישא יי. It is a valuable historical statement of the erection of Tiberias. Herod Antipas built it on a site strewn with sepulchres. This was resented by the orthodox Jews, who would not, on account of uncleanness, settle there, even after the sepulchres had been removed. Herod was on that account impelled to bring pressure to bear on the first settlers, a great many of whom were strangers, poor people and slaves. (Com. Ant. 18, 2, 3; Gen. r. 23, 1). The whole incident was soon to be forgotten, as the city came to assume great eminence in the Great Rebellion, although the more scrupulous would still hesitate, until the time of R. Simon Ben Jochai (com. Shab. 34a) to settle in certain parts of it. So that this indignation of the talmudist must emanate from the very time of the act of Herod. This T. belongs to 28 C. E.

I am inclined to think that the T. to Am. 6:1 חפכ רואיתית refers to the Herodians and their followers, who would give themselves foreign names, and were not known, like the Hasmoneans, by the Hebrew double. As it is well known, Jews during the Hasmonean rule
would unhesitatingly give themselves Greek names. But this practice grew abominable in the sentiment of the people in the days of the Herodian rulers. There are many references to this effect in the Agada (Exod. r. 1, 30; Lev. r. 32, 3; Tan. Balak 25, etc.), all of which, I suppose, emanated from that period. Com. also Hos. 8:12.

The reference in T. to Ez. 39:16 to the destruction of Rome is interesting. It suggests that the T. took Rome as נון. As Gog is the Messianic foe of Israel, one feels that in the time of either the Great or the Bar-Kochba Rebellion, the revolutionaries, in their pious and Messianic mood, would take Rome as the prophetic נון, so that its overthrow is sure to come. Hence the source of the targumic interpretation. I am also led to believe that this was the reason why the T. turns the gloomy and miserable description of the “Servant” (Is. ch. 53) into a most glorious presentation. The targumist, living in a time when the Messiah stood at the head of warring armies, could hardly have conceived those objectionable features in a literal sense. V. 5 points clearly to Bar Kochba.

The T. changes the simple meaning of the words and renders them this way:

גאשטיים Москве́ה ינני מניון יָאָבְרֵי הָרִיְהוֹת (9). גאשטי עָרָר חֲמָא מַשָּׁרֶךְ יָאָבְרֵי חַסִיפָא (10). גאשטיים יאָבְרֵי יָאָבְרָא חַשָּׁרֶכְךָ (12).

This is a curious rendering. The second half of v. 12 is rendered literally. All other references in the Prophets to the idolatry of Israel are rendered literally by the T. But the T. in these verses is construed to give expression to the popular resentment of the act of Herod to construct heathen cities in Palestine, and the erection in them of temples and statues.

Another allusion to a contemporary situation is found in the Targum to Judges 5:11. The interpretation reads: מַשָּׁרֶךְ וּרְכָה. אֲנָכָּיו נָפְסֵנִי דְבָרִיָּהוּ בָּיְת מָכְנַת לְפֶסֶם מָשָׁרָא. There is here the twofold reference to the robber and to the publican. In both aspects the hint is to the last days of Jerusalem. The ab-
horrence for the publican, who was considered an outlaw, was
was general among the people in those troublesome days. Regard-
the implication seems to be of the activities of the Sicarii under the Procuratorship of Felix or Festus, parti-
Judea was afflicted by robbers while all the villas were set on
The targumist is setting the
mark on the facts against which his generation most vehemently
The interpretation of the T. of (Is. 15:4)
is also suggestive of an event preceding the
destruction of the Temple which is told in the Talmud of
that wishing to know the number of the people
while avoiding its prohibition, he asked the High Priest to count
the Paschal sacrifices. I would not, however, stress this
evidence. A later targumist might as well have used for exe-
getical purpose a current Agada.

Of more historical suggestiveness is the Targum to Ze. 11, 1
interpreted to refer to the heathen peoples and
the destruction of their cities. This verse was interpreted by
Rabban Jochanan b. Zakkai to imply the pending destruction of
the Temple, which was generally accepted. Why a targa-
and the Sicarii who, to all intents, were robbers of the
vilest sort and employed by Felix for the purpose of inflaming unrest
to screen his outrages.

The Targum, however, also contains evidence pointing to
a period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. Is. 54:1

38) Com. B. Kama 113a, Mish.; Shab. 39a; San. 25b.
39) Ant. XX, 9, 10. The distinction should be drawn between
the patriots and the sicarii who, to all intents, were robbers of the
vilest sort and employed by Felix for the purpose of inflaming unrest
to screen his outrages.
40) Pesachim 64b; Tosefta 4. Com. Wars 6, 9, 3. There are
strong reasons for assuming that it was a historical reality.
41) ים קדשים בם ורגז גוזכרشكل יבש ומקו מוניפא יאדו 结ית יבש ומקו מוניפא בק
れות יבש ומקו מוניפא יאדו יבש ומקו מוניפא בק
Yoma 39b, and in Yerushalmi in a somewhat
modified version, 6, 3 end.
the Targum interprets ari me yehow, to render: 'in the Targum is rendered in the Targum to Is. 25:12 meaning by Rome, and Ez. 39:16. Com. also Targum Is. 32:14. The targumist lived in a period following the destruction but not too far away. Mi. 7:11 is interpreted in the T. to refer to the cessation of the persecutions of the nations: bar Kochba. The targumist had in mind the persecutions of Hadrian. It is hardly appropriate to the political repressions of the Roman Procurators. It might be well applied to the persecutions of the Byzantine rulers which, however, could hardly have found room in the Palestinian Targum, known and used in Babylonia in the third century. A less pronounced indication of a post-Destruction age is suggested in the T' to Malachi 1:11 rendering: The conception implied here that the prayer replaced the sacrifice is an outgrowth of the age following the destruction of the Temple, after the cessation of sacrifice. The sacrifice was regarded with so much holy reverence by the Rabbis, that such a conception would be considered an attempt at the divinity of the sacrifice. 

Finally, the Targum to Is. 21:9 may also be of historical contents. Here the Targum reads דצלת המלך לאמר אליעזר בן מאיר. The wish is here expressed for the downfall of Babylonia. This suggests an age of persecution in Babylonia against the Jews.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Babylonia in an earlier period was looked upon with admiration by the Jews. It was only after the fanatical Sassanides had established themselves on the throne of Persia that the large Jewish population of Babylonia began to experience the same tribulation which their brethren in Palestine were undergoing under the Roman rule. After the new departure in the ruling dynasty, Babylonia, like Rome, incurred the bitter resentment of the Jews. Before the Chebarin (Magii) came to Babylonia, we are told in Gittin 17a, the saying of R. Chiya: “God knew that Israel could not bear the persecution of the Edomites, so he led them to Babylonia” was true, but after their arrival Rabbi Bar Bar Chana was right in his utterance: רבמה וא נבז ביבר ארבו עבר ישכ למבוטא ביבר יש. This period is implied in the Targum to Is. 28:20 ושלחנה בקול מיען — והמשכיה Ezra נחתנמ 20 ימי מלוא.

On the other hand, the fall of Babylonia is with the author still a desire, a fervent expectation. The overthrow of Babylonia by the Arabians is not yet in sight. There is no other allusion in the Targum to the Arabs. So that this allusion to Babylonia affords us a terminus ad quem.

To check up the findings, the scant evidence preserved in the Targum to the Prophets falls apart in different groups. Some

43) Com. Saying of Rab. תונו ותוני פָּסָחָה יומא 17א also Pesachim 54א. בהר ובכבר יב unanim כּוּ בּ רחֵב גֵּזַע תֶּלַח 맞ה... מלכות טַמְשִׁית מָעְעָל. There is a striking parallel interpretation in Ps. Jonathan Gen. 15:12 referring to Persia: יִחֹרֵד יִתְּנַשְׁבֶּל רוֹתִחְלוֹ וְאֵצָּל תַּתְּלֹא or in the version of the Frag. דַּיָא אָני מַלְעַבְּתָא דַּרְבּוּאְיוֹ יִתְּנַשְׁבֶּל תַּתְּלֹא יְדֻתְּוָא יִתְּנַשְׁבֶּל תַּתְּלָא לְתָהָוָא. It should be remarked that Ps. Jonathan introduces here the Messianic conception of the Four Kingdoms of the Exile, the Fourth being Edom or Rome. The targumist in this instance dismisses Rome, placing in its stead Persia-Babylonia. In the Midrash (Gen. r. 44, 2), on which this interpretation is based, נָלַח תְּלַח is referred to Edom with the parenthetic note: יְזַרְּוָא נָלַחְוּתָא נָלַחְוָא וְאֶבֶן דַּרְבּוּאְיוֹ פָּאָלוֹ הָאָרָבָא. It is clear that both in the Midrash and the Ps. Jon. Babylonia (or Persia) had come to be regarded as worse than Rome, as fully expressed in the saying of Rab. At the same time, it is made clear in the Midrash that the interpretation of נָלַחְוָא as referring to Babylonia is based upon Is. 21:9, consequently the Targum to Is. 21:9 was either known to them and used by the Ps. targumist or that the interpretation in the respective cases was simultaneously originated. The former assumption, however, is the more plausible one.
are pointing to a pre-Destruction date, some to a period immediately following the Destruction, some, again, to a still later period. But they do not lead to contradicting results. The evidence demonstrates in a most excellent manner the progressive composition of the Targum until it assumed its present form. During this long time, the Targum was submitted to changes of different natures, when finally, before the Arabic invasion of Babylonia, it was indorsed in the shape in which it has come down to us.

We shall now devote our attention to a study of the relation between the official Targumim. There is a conspicuous affinity between Onkelos and Jonathan. Most of the early writers on this subject were struck by it but failed to realize its extent, which consequently lead them to different conclusions. So, while De Rossi and Herzfeld were certain that Onkelos knew the Targum to the Prophets, Zunz took the view that Jonathan had Onkelos before him, whom he quoted in Judges 5:26; 2 Kings 14:6; Jerem. 48:46.\(^{44}\) Herzfeld would consider all these citations as later interpolations.\(^{45}\) But on closer study of the official Targumim the cases of agreements between them will be found to be so numerous and of such a nature that they can be explained neither on the hypothesis of interpolation nor on the assumption of one having made use of the other. The reader will first be referred to the chapter on general peculiarities of Jonathan. The peculiar treatment by this T. of certain expressions, to distinguish between the holy and profane; Israel and other peoples; the belief in a second death for the wicked, all are found in Onk. Besides, there are numerous other cases in which both Targumim agree. I will cite here the Ps. Jonathan only to show that there could be a different rendering in the respective cases.


\(^{44}\) De Rossi Meor Enaim l. c.; Herzfeld, Geschichte l. c.; Zunz, G. V. l. c.

\(^{45}\) l. c.
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46) Kohut's suggestion on these renderings (Aruch סֵפְרַוִים) will only serve the point in question.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

57) זילוגת.

Ps. Jon. זילוגתננה— railways.

1K. 18:28; 5:16 Targum יתדהו. Also Jerem.

Ps. Jon. פויו.

ib. 6:19 Targum כבורת ארץ. So Onk. Gen.


ויינו.

ונת ילגריון עבריו. So Onk. ב Alps.

Ps. Jon. עבוותי עבוי.

6:5. Ps. Jon. בכם ממון.

IS. 3:20 Targum ויריו הליה. So Onk. Num. 31:50
Ps. Jon. ויריו הליה.
Jerem. 7:24 etc. Targum ובנהום למ. So Onk.

47) Ps. Jon. agrees with On. and Jon. in Gen. 16:7; 20:1.
Onkelos renders bols רכוב בד בד (ibid 16:14) presumeably influenced by 20:1 
בוז כוכב בוב שור. Cases of this sort are numerous in Onkelos. Similar cases in Jonathan are cited
in the chapter on textual deviations. But as to Ps. Jon., the rendering also of אולライフ in 16:7: 20:1 was presumably in 28:18, in which the
Fragmentary concurs. Evidence for this is presented in Gen. r. 45, 9:
על עיר יימוי בואות הדולות. Also Ps. Jon. to Exod. 15:22. Grone-
mann's (Pent. Üb. p. 20) argument on this is thus a miscalculation.
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ib. 28:13 Joel Targum אָן סְפִּדָּה יִרְכָּה תְּמַלֵּט שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל. So Onk. Exod. 28:17, 18, 19, 20. But not so Ps. Jon. and F.


These cases are of special interest also for determining the nature of the relation between Onkelos and the non-official Targumim. But of equal importance are the cases of agreement between the official Targumim in which the non-official Targumim concur. They also belong to Onkelos. I do not intend to raise the question of the origin and history of the non-official Targumim to the Pentateuch. I have my own view of them, differing appreciably from those offered. But whether we assume with Bacher that in the Fragmentary is preserved a relic of the ancient and original Palestinian Targum on which were based both Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan which form stages of the same Targum, or whether we choose the simpler view enunciated by Traub u. Seligson, that Ps. Jon. and the Fragmentary are to some extent a critical revision of Onkelos, there is the general recognition of the common ground of these Targumim and Onkelos. The fact, therefore, that they agree with Onkelos cannot be construed to impart to the cases in question a different character.

Josh. 10:11; 14:6, 7 Targum יִשְׁבֵּץ בְּרֹעַ. So Onk. and Ps. Jon. Num. 32:8 etc.


48) This is true only when it is spoken of profanation of God (Is. 48:11; Ez. 20:9, 14; 22:36; 27:33); profanation of the Sabbath (Is. 56:2, 6; Ez. 20:16, 21, 24, 38). But when it is spoken of profanation of the land and temple מִשְׁמַר is employed.

49) Z. D. M. G., v. 28, 60-63.

50) Frankel's Monatschrift, 1857, 101 et seq. Gronemann (Pent. Übersetzung, p. 8, note) also thinks that the Fragmentary and Ps. Jon., especially the latter, have expanded Onkelos.
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ib. 11:2; 12:3 consecutive. So Onk. and Ps. Jon. Num. 34:11 etc.


There is also agreement between them with regard to the belief in a second death for the wicked in the Messianic Age. So Jon. Is. 65:6; Jerem. 51:39. Both Onk. and Frag. render Deut. 33:6; "and the wicked shall be consumed. - the righteous, and the wicked shall not be..."; Frag.: "and the righteous shall consume the wicked, and the righteous shall consume the wicked...", indicating direction (Is. 9:19; Ezek. 21:21; Zech. 12:6) are rendered by Onk. and Ps. Jon. Gen. 13:9. Is. 14:9. So Onk. and Ps. Jon. Gen. 15:20. Chayjoth in Anir. Bkhal. 53 has brought to notice the remarkable change in the rendering of עָרָיו by Onk. Everywhere in Gen. it is rendered עָרָיו but beginning with Exod. 49:8 is the rendering. The motive for that might be the exegetical saying of R. Simeon b. Jochai on Gen. 49:8:

---

51) Cited also in Gen. r. 33, 2.
52) Page 8.
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In that Ps. Jon., with a single exception, agrees. (Gen. 43:32). But Exod. 21:2 and Deut. 15:20; 13:12 both Onk. and Ps. Jon. have in order, it would appear, to avoid the misinterpretation: the slave of an Israelite (com. Mechilta l. c.). Jonathan as a rule renders שֶׁמֶץ יִתְנָה—עֵבְרִים 15:3, 17; 14:11, 21; Jonah 1, 9. But Jerem. 34:9 (also 14:14) and Targum Jonathan reading שֶׁמֶץ יִתְנָה—עֵבְרִים. The T. follows Onk. and Ps. Jon. rendering שֶׁמֶץ יִתְנָה—עֵבְרִים.


This comparative list could be extended appreciably. But the number of cases presented are sufficient to show the real nature of the problem. There could be found sound explanation for the similarity between Onk. and the Frag. and Ps. Jon. even were we not to proceed along the lines of the theories offered, for they are exploiting the same field, the Pentateuch. Why, however, should an author of a Targum to the Prophets seek harmony with Onkelos in many comparatively unimportant details of rendering, will hardly be possible to explain. Could not the Targum to the Prophets have its own way of rendering in the respective cases? Neither could it be the way of a redactor. But this Targum, like the Mishna, Tosefta, Talmudim and Midrashim, had no single author: there was no single revision. The inference will yield the only possible conclusion that there was a common source for the official Targumim. They were originated in one and the same time; in one and the same way, under one and the same circumstances and share a common history.

They were the product of the Aramaic rendering of the portion from the Law and the Prophets read in public worship. The Lxx had a similar origination, although later generations, actuated by propaganda motives, formed a different notion of the act.53) The official Targumim are the work of genera-

53) This view is held by most scholars. “Sie verdanken nicht der Wissenschaft sondern dem Relig. Bedürfnisse” (Frankel, Vorstudien,
tions. They were formed and reformed through many centuries, gradually, invisibly. They were not a new attempt, supplanted none, but are the continuation of the Targumim used in the service.

Hence also the remarkable balance between the paraphrastic and literal so skilfully maintained in the official Targumim. That formed a necessary condition with the regulations of the reading in early as in later ages.

The Lxx assumed the same course. There was sought an exact rendering, a simple and ground understanding, as close to the original as possible. Literalness was insisted upon and expository rendering would only be tolerated in difficult or poetical passages, or where the danger of a misinterpretation had to be averted. I completely disagree with Zunz, Geiger, Bacher 54) and others, who insist on the priority of the Midrashic Targum to the literal. Their theory is wrong. It is built upon, it would seem, the doubtful foundation that the poetical and difficult passages were first to be rendered.55) But as they can furnish no evidence it is just as safe to assert that the simpler passages involving a literal rendering were rendered either first or at one time with the poetical ones. Invoking again the Lxx, the literalness is the conspicuous feature in them and not the paraphrastic. The exposition of the Law and the Prophets held on the Sabbaths in the synagogue in Alexandria left little trace in the Lxx. Nothing approaching the Philonian exposition has


54) Zunz, G. V., 344; Geiger, Ur., 425. Com. Frankel, Über d. Zeit etc., Ver. Deut. Orient, 1845, 13. Bacher ib. 64, after asserting that the literalness of Onkelos was a later and Babylonian tendency, is not in the least disturbed when, following this assertion, he draws a list of cases in which Onkelos is expository while the Frag., the original and oldest, according to his view, is literal. Com. also Ps. Jon. Deut. 33:26 rendering the v. literally, while Onk. and Frag. are exegetical.

55) Com. Steinschneider, Jewish Lit. (Heb.) 20. He also takes the view that the Targum in essence was not different from the Midrash, assuming that the Targum originated from single translation of difficult words. Like Geiger and Bacher, he asserts (ib. 190) that from these (Midrashic) Targumim resulted the simpler and exacter understanding of the Bible. It is certainly a curious and queer process.
found room in the translation. It was the knowledge and not the exposition of the Bible which formed the prime necessity for instituting the reading of the translation. These writers have exaggerated innocent sayings in the Mishna reproaching renderings of certain targumists, which are found in Ps. Jonathan. Because they are cited in the Mishna and because they were rejected, they came at once to be regarded not only as belonging to an early Targum but to the earliest. Consequently, the exposition preceded in point of time the literal which marked a new departure and had been accomplished in Babylonia. But these citations could as well belong to a later Targum. On the contrary, the way they are quoted clearly signifies the existence of another Targum upon which these new Targumim had attempted to encroach.

Again, it should be borne in mind that the Agada had been the product of a generation subsequent to the simple exposition of the Soferim and the Zugoth. The exegetical element in the Targumim was influenced, and on occasion determined, by the Halaka, which also had a progressive history. But the Targum existed before the new tendencies made their appearance.

The official Targumim thus represent the early as well as the later recognized Targumim used in public worship. Through common use there had been a continuous interchange of influence between them. It is customary to consider the T. to the Pentateuch as older than the T. to the Prophets. This opinion rests on a questionable argument. There can be no doubt that the introduction of the Targum in public service dates back to a comparatively early period. But in my judgment it had not originated before the Maccabean age. There is sufficient evidence in support of the view that Hebrew had not

56) Y. Berakoth 5, 3: מראות ודרות על תהלים. The other citation in Megilla 25a reads: מראות ודרות על תהלים which carries the same implication.

57) Com. Z. Chajothon on Megilla 25a.

58) It is interesting to note that later tradition also assigns to the Targum to Pent. an earlier date. Com. Sifri beginning דואת תורה, Com. Maimonidas יממה תורת הקדוש תוהיה משחרטב לעב תהלים, רב ממסדר הכותב ראות; of the T. to the Prophets he proceeds only to repeat the regulations appearing in the Mishna.

only been well understood in Palestine in the time of Ezra and Nehemia, but that it had been the vernacular tongue.\footnote{Frankel, Paläst. Ex., 208, 280, consistent with his literal interpretation of the tradition that the Targum originated with Ezra, accepts the genial but useless theory put forward by De Rossi (l. c.) that Onkelos was consulted by the Greek translators. But unlike De Rossi, Frankel would not consider the Aramaic version—a corrupted rendering of the original. Rapaport, נבון לן סתואים, Let. 3, takes the same view, and it should be followed by all others of the same mind as regards the date of the origin of the Targum. To overlook the difficulty arising from an assumption that either the Targum had not been carried to Egypt, or, being in use, that it exercised no influence on the Lxx, would certainly be unforgivable.}

There is, on the contrary, no positive evidence either that Aramaic had been in those early days the vernacular among the Jews in Palestine or even that the general ignorance of the Jews of the Aramaic tongue of the period of the Kings had entirely passed. What use would that generation have for an Aramaic version of the Law?

But whether it had been introduced in the period immediately preceding the Maccabean uprising or in the early days of Maccabean rule, it is certain that when the need of the Targum arose there had already been established the custom of reading in public service from the Prophets as a supplement to the reading from the Law. As the reading from the Law goes back to Ezra,\footnote{The Karaites ascribe the reading of the Haftora to Ezra (com. Neubauer, Aus Petersburger Bibliothek, p. 14); Abudraham placed its origin in the persecutions of Antiochus. But whatever cause one may unearth (com. Büchler J. Q. R. v., p. 6 et seq.), one outstanding cause was the institution of the reading of the Law in public service. The reading from the Prophets served the purpose of administering an admonition as to the holiness and observance of the Law. I completely agree with Büchler that the introduction of the reading of the Pentateuch had its origin in the festivals (J. Q. R., v. 5, p. 442). Thus the Sifra to Lev. 23:43; Sifri to Deut. 16:1; Meg. 4a, 32a. The Law was read by Ezra on the festivals of the New Year and Tabernacles (Neh. 8:2, 8, 18; 9:3). The reading on Saturday appears to have arisen later, when synagogues arose outside Jerusalem. Hence the supposition that the selection of definite portions for each festival preceded the definite apportioning of the Sabbatical reading. I disagree, however, with the motive to which Büchler attributes the origin of both the Pentateuchal} and because of the greater interest in the knowledge
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of the Law, the necessity of an Aramaic translation of the Law might have been earlier appreciated than that of the Prophets. But no sooner was the reading from the Prophets instituted than the necessity of an Aramaic rendering became apparent. Although the Greek translation of the Pentateuch leads all other books of the Bible in point of time, not even a century passed before the Prophets “and the other writings” were to be found in the Greek tongue.

As far as the general ordinance is concerned, no distinction is made between the Targum to the Law and the Targum to the Prophets. Accordingly, it is said in Soferim 18:4 חתונא חלפנ אלניש ותונימאונא קל מר רבודע נבון ק 받아ג התאורא התורה. In the Mishna Meg. 21a, 23b; Yerushalmi 4, 1, 5, the Targum to the Prophets is discussed alongside with the Targum to the Law, the limitations on the reading of the former being less rigid than the latter for other reasons דלא נפסא מנייה תורהו. Again in Mishna 25a; Tosefta 4 (3); Y. Meg. 4, 11 a list of passages both from the Law and the Prophets is given which were not to be translated. Both were not considered obligatory, so that their omission in the service would not call for repetition, as it is made clear in Y. Meg. 4, 6 היו אינון משכון? אימר רב

and Prophetical readings, which would place their institution at nearly the same date. One should not resort to the magical Samaritan influence in order to find the cause for such an ordinance when it is readily presented in Nehemia: “And on the second day there gathered themselves together unto Ezra, the expounder, to obtain again intelligence of the words of the Law. And they found written in the Law that the children of Israel should dwell in booths during the feast in the seventh month. And (they ordered) that they should publish... throughout all their cities and through Jerusalem saying, go forth unto the mountain and fetch leaves to make booths, as it is written (13-15).” It was the ignorance of the people of the ordinances of the festivals which formed the cause of the reading from the book of the Law. These passages present sufficient ground for ascribing the ordinance of the reading from the Law to Ezra. This might also be implied in the tradition ascribing it to Moses. Com. B. Kama 82a. The Haftora is much later, and dates to the end of the third century or the beginning of the second century B. C. Direct and positive evidence cannot be furnished. Early tradition is silent over it. But what has been said above and the fact that a Greek translation of the Prophets had already been made at that time, and also the mention of the Prophets in Ben Sira in a manner suggesting general acquaintance with them by the people, lend support to this view.
This is in substance implied in the saying of R. Chalafta b. Saul, Meg. 24a, as interpreted in Tosefoth l. c.

But the reading from the Law and from the Prophets in the Sabbath service had not been definitely set as late as in the time of the composition of the Mishna. The selection was left to the discretion of the individual community. Any portion from the Prophets, as from the Law, would be read. The readings were translated. Hence the rise of a Targum to all the Prophetic books. The author of the official Targumim was the congregation. The Targum in its first stages had no definite shape. The reader framed the translation at the reading of the original. Every reader had his own choice of words and his own way of rendering. He was only conditioned to present a close and exact rendering.

But with the persistence of the Targum and its growing significance the free translation progressed by various degrees to a definite and unchangeable form. Anything which endures

62) Com. Maimonides, p. 384; B. M. 30b; Tosefoth l. c. The same may be applied to the reading of the Law. Only the reading on the festivals, including the New Moon, Purim and Chanuka, the Four Shabbaths, Maamodoth and days of fasting, are indicated (Babli, Meg. Mish. 30b; Y. Mish. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7). There is no hint of a definite Sabbatical reading. The words תורין לכסדרן (Y. Meg. 3, 5, 7; Babli 29a, 31a) should not be taken literally. The interpretation of R. Ami and Jeremia Meg. 30b refers to a time when there was a definite reading both from the Law and P. Had there been definite portions for the Sabbatical readings from the Law, there would certainly be also a definite selection of parallel Prophetic readings. There could be no reason why there should be a discrimination against the Prophetic reading. I am fully convinced that there existed a definite Prophetic reading for each festival enumerated in the Mishna. It is true, that in both Y. and B. the reading from the Law is given while no mention is made of the Prophetic readings. But the Tosefto, while registering for the festival only the readings from the Law, is, however, indicating for the Four Sabbaths the Prophetic readings side by side with the reading from the Law. If there had existed definite Prophetic readings for the Four Sabbaths, there had certainly been definite Prophetic readings for the more important festivals, and yet no mention of them is made in the Tosefto. The reason may be simple: it mentions
in humanity, as in the universe, tends to shape. It had become necessary to lay down certain rules to regulate the translation. How is the verb or adjective of a collective noun to be rendered: in singular, as in original, or in the plural? Is the literal sense to be considered or the implied meaning? How about the anthropomorphic expressions, shall they be rendered literally to the annoyance of the worshippers or explained away, and how? There are passages involving a Halakic interpretation of great importance, or a controversial point between the parties; shall such passages be left over to the intelligence of the reader, who might not be trained in the Halaka? A way of rendering had to be early devised, which the reader was to follow. The first attempts at uniformity were directed towards single phrases or words. Gradually they spread to include the less dangerous regions. The Rabbis, by concerted authority at each time, were responsible for the change. An excellent illustration is furnished us in Y. Meg. 4, 1 and Bik. 3, 4. In one case it is the rendering of מֵאָל (Deut. 26:2). The targumist rendered מֵאָל, but R. Jona, holding it to be improper to present the first fruits in any other receptacle than a basket, objected to this rendering and insisted upon the rendering of אֹלָה as the Targumim to the Pent. have it. Another case was מַעַת וּרְאוֹרוֹת (Exod. 12:8), which the targumist rendered פִּיָּיוֹת עַל יִרוֹנֹן; the rendering יִרוֹנֹן being

the more important, the Pentateuchal reading. The same may be said of the Mishna also.

But we know that there were no definite Prophetical readings for the Sabbath. The Mishna points out certain portions from the Prophets which are not to be read. Y. Meg. 4, 11 מְרָכֵז; דֵּרֵד זְבוֹלְעָם Y. Meg. 4, 12; Babli 29a, while according to R. Eliezer נַבּוֹתִי אָפֶר וּרְאוֹרוֹת (Ex. 16) should not be read.

Had the passages represented a definite Sabbatical reading, a substitute reading would be indicated which should be read instead of the interdicted ones.

It should be borne in mind that all these portions from the Prophets cited in the Tosefta (ibid), with the exception of Ezek. 1, have not found a place on the calendar of the Haftora. The attempt of Büchler to discover the early divisions of the readings from the Law and the accompanied readings from the Prophets is highly hypothetical. Again, the definite mention of the Targum in the Mishna and Tosefta shows that the Targum was introduced before a definite order of the Sabbatical readings had been introduced.
misleading as to the proper kind, Jeremiah would force the targumist to retranslate it in a different way. The third case concerned the rendering of "חָרֵיתָּה בְּנֵי יְוָנָה" (Lev. 5:7), and R. Pineas would not allow to render פְּסִינָּה by חוֹרִים. These cases demonstrate the peculiar manner in which the composition of the T. was accomplished.

Although the official Targumim were in a definite shape in the time of R. Akiba, the process of transformation had been still going on to a comparatively late date. It affected both the literal and exegetical rendering. Some older exegetical renderings were rejected and replaced by others. Of the rejected, some have been preserved in the Ps. Jonathan, which in itself is an Aramaic Jalqut comprising also later Agadic material. Rejected paraphrases of the Targum to the Prophets might be those which appear on the margin in the Codex Reuch., and in some early editions. Although the notes preaced ירצה א contain Agadic material of a later date, they contain elements which might have been first incorporated in the Targum but rejected later as not to be read in the service. The same may be said of those ascribed to although being on the whole an attempt to simplify and to supplement the extant T. Again, the duplicate renderings which are found both in Jonathan and Onk. can be explained by the fact that one formed the older explanation while the other represents a more recent one but which for some reason had not succeeded in dispossessing the older one. This explains also the curious renderings of certain verses, one half retaining one rendering while the other half contains a remnant of a different rendering. As rejected paraphrases may be considered the Targum to Micah 7:3, quoted in Rashi, and another quoted in the name of Jehuda of Paris on 2S 6:11.

63) Com. R. Akiba's homily on Zek. 12:1 (Moed Katan 28a), which shows that R. Akiba knew the Targum to this verse. Com. R. Jehuda's saying referred to above; also Beraitha Baba Kama 17a

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The same can be said of the selection of words in the rendering. It should be noticed at the outset that the remarkable unity exhibited in the official Targumim is strongly emphasised also in the wording of the translation. Once the Aramaic word was set for a Hebrew word, you are certain to find it in each case where this Hebrew word occurs. An illustration of this amazing fact is presented in the rendering of the names of peoples, countries and cities. Other instances can be picked up at random. It demonstrates in a most emphatic way the scrupulous rigor with which the work of the Aramaic rendering had been accomplished. If, therefore, a word is rendered in one place one way and another way somewhere else, we are certain to have two different Targumim of the word in question. But apart from cases of this sort which are contained in the official Targumim, variations have come down to us from different sources. Concerning Onkelos variations are contained in Ps. Jonathan. In some cases in which Ps. Jonathan has a different Aramaic word for the Hebrew from that contained in Onk., the Fragmentary will be found to correct it, replacing it by the one used in Onkelos. There is, however, no means enabling us to discover which of the two represents the earlier form. They might have had their origin in the same time. Two communities might have coined them at the same time. Instructive instances are presented in the different renderings given by Rav and Levi of Gen. 49:27 (Zebachim 54a); ib. 30:14 (San. 99a), Onkelos agreeing with that of the former; R. Jehuda and Nehemia—of Gen. 18:1 (Gen. r. 42, 6). Variations of this kind are not wanting also in the Targum to the Prophets. Some have been preserved in Jonathan. A good many others are contained in Talmud and Midrashim and in the marginal notes in the Codex Reuch., under the names of ח"י, ס"א, א"א, פ"א, א"י ורמזר. In a few cases of the latter the variant will be seen to agree with Ps. Jonathan and Fragmentary. This fact lends new support to the view of the common source of all Targumim. The former cases shall be considered first.

Joshua 19:8 מישר—א"א; בֵּעֶלְתָּהּ Targum... בֵּעֶלְתָהּ. So is the T. of the Targum (ib. 11:17; 12:7) (Jud. 3:3) (Jud. 20:33) etc.

Judges 6:38 Targum מִכָּן אֲרוֹרָים; וַחֲסָמָא晦וֹס הָסָּמָא.
(ib. 5:25) Targum גזעך בכריו. The latter is the rendering of (Num. 7:13) סטיית כמה in Ps. Jon.; Onk. מצתה.

Judges 8:21 Targum השחרים; in Is. 3:18 it is rendered by מַעַן the latter is given to Judges by א"" in Cod. Reuch.

1S. 19:13, 16; Ez. 21:26; Za. 10:2 Targum עָבְרָי. Judges 18:17, 18, 20 א"" has רבָּי while א"" has א"" עָבְרָי. ib. 16 Targum נָּחָר אֲרוֹרִי. But א"" has נָּחָר אֲרוֹרִי. This is the rendering of (2K 8:15) בְּמַכָּר Com. Kimchi l. c.

1K 22:49 Targum אָסַיֵּים. So Jer. 10:9; Jonah 1:3, But Is. 2:16; 23:1, 14; Ezek. 27:12 אָסַיֵּים.

2K 5:23 מַחְאֶמוֹ תַּרְגֻּמֶת. Is. 3:22 פָּרָסִים. Jerem. 31:28 כְּמוֹ תַּרְגֻּמֶת. The same was certainly the rendering of כִּפְרַח which is found in א"". Here is a case of a rejected Anthropomorphism of a latter time.

Ezek. 27:6 Targum אִסְפָּלִים or אִסְפָּלִים. Everywhere else it is rendered כַּנְעַן (Is. 23:1 etc.).

Ezek. 27:21 Targum וְרָמַר. Otherwise (Is. 21:16, 17; 42:11; 60:7. So T. to Ps. 120:3.)

Ezek. 27:23 Targum וּרְבוּ. This is the rendering of עָּרְבָּי (Jerem. 51:27).

Ezek. 40:19 Targum תַּרְגֻּמֶת. So is the rendering of תַּרְגֻּמֶת in v. 18.

Ezek. 45:2; 48:17 וְרָמַר; T. וְרָמַר. As Ps. Jon. and F. Lev. 25:34. On. וְרָמַר.


Com. further Kimchi Ezek. 40:16.

To these cases may be added the following cases, which Cod. Reuch. is at variance with the extant Targum, the latter being supported by א"".

Jerem. 17:7 Targum מִכָּמָה. So in extant T.

Ez. 9:10 Targum אֲרוֹרִי; in the extant T.
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Micah 3:11 גְּזֹעַתּוֹ יִשְׂעֵנוּ Targum — רַוְיִישׁו; So in the extant T.

Cases in which the marginal variations follow the Ps. Jon.: Jud. 8:11 תַּנְעָמָה Psalm — הָלֹחֵנהוּ Targum; So Ps. Jon. Gen. 22:24, Onk. agreeing with Jon.

Other cases of variants:
Joshua 9:5 נְבֶרֶה Targum — אֲדֹנִים. יִשָּׂעְמָה Targum מְזַמְּנָה; So Ps. Jon.
Jud. 3:19 יִשָּׂעְמָה Targum וּמֶשֶׁכֶים. 1S 24:8 יִשָּׂעְמָה; So Targum וּמֶשֶׁכֶים.
1S 30:16 נְבֶרֶה Targum; So נְבֶרֶה Targum.
2S 18:14 נְבֶרֶה Targum נְבֶרֶה. אֲדֹנִים Targum אֲדֹנִים.
IS. 3:23 נְבֶרֶה Targum נְבֶרֶה; So נְבֶרֶה Targum נְבֶרֶה.

Another case involving the Greek σταζωλαγόν Targum — נְבֶרֶה. Lat. specularia. Here is presented a case, where seemingly a Greek word was replaced by its Aramaic equivalent. The same was the case with Onkelos. Bacher (ib.) has made this point clear by a comparison between Onk. and Ps. Jon. and the Frag. That is true to some extent also of Jon., which is demonstrated in the Greek and its Aramaic substitute of יִשָּׂעְמָה in the verses cited above. Still, Jonathan appears to have been more immune to such an attempt than even Ps. Jonathan. Here is an instructive case: יִשָּׂעְמָה (Ez. 4:10) is rendered by the Greek σταζωλαγόν while all—Onk., Ps. Jon. and Frag.—render it by נְבֶרֶה (Num. 7:13 etc.).

IS. 51:17 נְבֶרֶה Targum נְבֶרֶה.
Ez. 44:20 נְבֶרֶה Targum נְבֶרֶה.

Two cases, one in אֲדֹנִים, the other in נְבֶרֶה, vary with Jon. in anthropomorphisms: הלֹחֵנהוּ (Jerem. 31:38) T. — אֲדֹנִים; so קְלֵם יִשָּׂעְמָה (ib. 16:11) T. — יִשָּׂעְמָה; So נְבֶרֶה. These cases and the case of Jerem. 31:27 cited above reinforce the view set forth above that later usage eliminated some anthropomorphic substitutes from the T.

The following are cases of variations found in the Talmud and Midrash.
Joshua 16:8 יִשָּׂעְמָה Targum יִשָּׂעְמָה. Y. Meg. 1, 12 אֲדֹנִים וְגָזַע יִשָּׂעְמָה.
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IS. 21:5. — Targum ייוניו תַּחְלִית. — מַה שַׁלֵּשְׁתָּן כְּפַתְעִית סֵפֶר מַה שַׁלֵּשְׁתָּן;
Gen. r. 63, 9 מַה שַׁלֵּשְׁתָּן: וְנַגְּמָה יָדָהָ. A relatable expression, because of its rhythm and its commentaries. They agree with Jon. only in the rendering of סֵפֶר מַה שַׁלֵּשְׁתָּן. The citation from Cant. r. contains two recensions. The rendering agrees with Cod. Reuch. and is identical with the marginal note headed " therein.

Pscichta Lamentation r. on Is. 22:1, 2 — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כִּלֹל הָנוֹת - והַאֲנָוִים פְּרִימוּּת הַגְּלַוד; זַרְי הַמַּעֲבָרֶרִים - מַחֲפִיתָם וְיִנָּבֵרִים - יִמְעַרֶרִים, יִמְעַרֶרִים - גְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים.
But T. — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כֵּלָל הָנוֹת - והַאֲנָוִים פְּרִימוּּת הַגְּלַוד; זַרְי הַמַּעֲבָרֶרִים - מַחֲפִיתָם וְיִנָּבֵרִים - יִמְעַרֶרִים, יִמְעַרֶרִים - גְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים.

ib. IS. 22:8 — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כֵּלָל הָנוֹת - והַאֲנָוִים פְּרִימוּּת הַגְּלַוד; זַרְי הַמַּעֲבָרֶרִים - מַחֲפִיתָם וְיִנָּבֵרִים - יִמְעַרֶרִים, יִמְעַרֶרִים - גְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים.

ib. on Ez. 24:6 — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כֵּלָל הָנוֹת - והַאֲנָוִים פְּרִימוּּת הַגְּלַוד; זַרְי הַמַּעֲבָרֶרִים - מַחֲפִיתָם וְיִנָּבֵרִים - יִמְעַרֶרִים, יִמְעַרֶרִים - גְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים.
Cant. r. 1:1 on Am. 8:3 — שַׁמַּחְתָּהּ וְיֹלֵכָה — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כֵּלָל הָנוֹת - גְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים; Targum מָרֶה.

Y. Shabbath 6, 4 on Is. 29:1 — יִכְּלֶמֶנֶן כֵּלָל הָנוֹת - הגְּלַוד בְּדַגֵּלִים; Targum מָרֶה.
Cant. r. 47:2 on Is. 47:2 — Targum מָרֶה; מָדֵבָה, מְשִׁיךְ בַּעַרְבּ.

Shochar Tob 32, 2 (com. Y. San. 10, 1) on Mi. 7:8 — רַבָּה בְּשָׁבְיָה — וְצָלַלְתָנָה כָּפַר מֶשֶׁכָּבָה. Jon. ייוניו תַּחְלִית. — וְצָלַלְתָנָה כָּפַר מֶשֶׁכָּבָה.

Similar cases are: Lev. r. 5, 2; Num. r. 10, 5 on Am. 6:4 and Lev. r. 6, 2 on Zech. 5:1, all of which represent, undoubtedly, a different and rejected Targumic rendering. The following case is to my mind an interesting relic of a rejected rendering. This
is in Frag. Deut. 32:1:  "...אוම הא ינורא תשרוי ומי פאעפי ..." The rendering in Jon. is as follows: "...ויבאמה ינורא שרי שמי בתנ"א מי". The rendering in the F. is literal. We cannot determine which is the earlier rendering.

The process of alteration had been going on until a comparatively late date but not so late as the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud. That was made especially possible by the fact that the T. was recited in the worship by heart. Reading the Targum from a written copy was prohibited. This interdiction is indicated in Tanchuma Gen. 18:17:

This passage is quoted in the Pesiqta (ed. Friedmann), p. 28. Does it imply an interdiction to put the Targum into writing?

This question was the cause of much contention. Rashi inclined to an extreme interpretation of the prohibition to write down all belonging to traditional exposition. So with regard to the Mishna which, he insists, was not written down by Rabi (Ketuboth 19b). Com. Rashi Erubin 62a, beginning also Taanith 12a. He takes the view that the Targum had not been allowed to be written down. Commenting on the Mishna Shabbath 115a he says: "...ושאריה ופי תורן בכי קלב קמער אנהבי כי אלא אוכלאי, וד".

According to Rashi's teachers, with whom he disagrees, not only was the T. to the Prophets written down, but also allowed to be read in the service in written form; for, as Rashi himself remarks, one is dependent upon the other. For this reason it was seemingly his teachers who would interpret the contention between Rab Huna and Rab Chisda as referring only to the
Hagiographa, as according to the interpretation of the Gemarot they only differ on the view of those who prohibit the reading from a written Targum. Rashi, however, makes capital of the expression in the Babli Meg. 3a אומן הגר אופר as does Luzzatto (O. G. IX). But as the saying of R. Jeremia is also quoted in the Yerushalmi, it is just as well to take אופר as an innocent substitute for הגר of the Yerushalmi version, which does not carry this implication. The main source of Rashi's contention is the prohibition contained in the saying of Rabban Simon b. Gamliel, Y. M. 1, 9; Babli 8b אומן הגר אופר אומן הגר ש işletב אלא לעיגה. But there are the tête-métis (ib. and Shab. 119b) who differ with him, and as it is said in Soferim 15,2 אומן הגר אומן הgré אופר. Furthermore, there is no implication in R. Simon b. Gamliel's saying of a prohibition to write down the T. He only meant to say that the reading from a written T. in service does not fulfil the required Aramaic rendering. Consequently, as Rab Porath, quoted in Tosafot (Shab. ib. אופר) rightly put it, because it is not allowed to read it, is equivalent to reading the Torah by heart and לא תסומא בבלフラ. The question raised there is it thus well answered. Com. also Tos. Sota 33a פך. There is certainly not the slightest ground for an inference that no written T. to the Prophets existed. Witness the interpretation (in Babli ib.) of R. Jehuda הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטינו הרובוטино ascribed by Luzzatto (l. c.), Zunz (G. V. 65) and others to the prohibition, namely, that the T. containing some Halakah, was regarded on one plane with the הרובוטינו הרובוטино which was not to be written down (Temura 14b, Gittin 60b). Had this been the reason, how was the Lxx sanctioned by all the Rabbis, containing as it does so many Halakic interpretations? (Com. Z. Frankel רוכי הפשע 10 and Über d. Einfluss l. c.). It should also be noticed that the reason given for R. Simon b. Gamliel's interdiction of other than the Greek translation is
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and not because it belongs to the

On the other hand, it is well known that in spite of the interdiction on the written Halaka, the Rabbis did not hesitate to write down for private use Halakic decisions and intercourses. It will also be remembered that in the time of Rabban Gamliel the Elder there was already in existence a Targum to Job. That the interdiction passed by him on this Targum was not due to the fact of its being written was shown above. Again, Esther had also been translated, as it appears from the Mishna Meg. 17a: והאר אַלַּעֲנָה פְּרָא תְרֵגָּמָה בְּכָל שֵׁשֶׁנָּא קִיאָו אֵלֶּה רַיִּית הַרְּגָּמָה. The reason is pointed out, for it is written: בָּלָהוּ אֶלֶּה צְוָאֵי הַרְּגָּמָה. But there could be no more reason for considering the T. to the Prophets שב"ע rather than the T. to Esther.

It is clear then that the prohibition against the written T. had only been instituted against the public reading in the service. The reason for that was mainly to avert sharing by the T. the same sanctity with the original. This is in essence the very reason given for R. Simon b. Gamliel’s view. And this prohibition, it would seem, was enforced even at a date when the Mishna was already written down and allowances were made for the written Agada (com. Gittin 60b). Rapoport (נכתב) well expounded the case of the written Halaka when he said that the prohibition was directed mainly against the public discussion and was not intended to exclude it from private use. Berliner (On. 89) rightly applied this view to the T. This view might be substantiated by Tanchuma (ib.) מָשָׁרָה מַמָּטָה בְּרֵבִּם בַּכּוֹחַ. which Friedmann (Pesiqa ib.) is inclined to emend מַמָּטָה בְּכּוֹחַ. The implied indication is that a written T. may be permitted for private use.

There certainly were in existence written copies of the Targum, which were restricted to personal use. One such copy a targumist would employ in public worship and was hindered by R. Samuel b. Isaac telling him: וְרָפְּרוּי יְצֵאמָר וְסָמא — מָסָא וְרָפְּרוּי יְצֵאמָר וְסָמא — מָסָא (Y. Meg. 4, 5). What he meant amounted to saying that the T. should be read by heart, just as the original is to be read from the written only.
Targum Jonathan was used by later targumists. It was pointed out above that Targum Ps. 18 is a copy with minor modifications, notice of which will be taken in the chapter on Other Targumim, of the Targum to Samuel 22. T. Jonathan was used by the targumist of Chronicles.

The T. to Chronicles exhibits pronounced and independent characteristics. It pursues, on the whole, its own way of exposition and translation. It is more Midrashic than the official Targumim. He will not, in most cases, let himself be influenced by the official Targumim. In some instances he will neither follow Onkelos nor Ps. Jonathan. Yet, even this targumist made definite and considerable use of the Targum Jonathan. The cases in question are of a typical nature, which do not admit of an incidental agreement. I will quote them in order of Chronicles.

1 Ch. 13:7 יָרְכָּב אַחַת אָדוֹן . Jon. 2S 6:3.
1 Ch. 14:1 חָרְרִינוּ מַדְגָּנִים Targum Jon. 2S 5:11.
Jon. 2S 5:18 reading יָרְכָּב . וְיָרְכָּב Targum Jon. 2S 5:12.
1 Ch. 14:11 מִשְּׁרֵעַ פַּרְעֹה Targum Jon. 2S 5:20.
ib. Jon. ib. 2S 6:11 מִשְּׁרֵעַ פַּרְעֹה Jon. ib. 2S 6:11.
1 Ch. 14:15 אַדְּוָן וְאַדְּוָן Targum Jon. 2S 5:24.
Jon. 2S 5:24. מַלְאָכָה מִן וְיָרְכָּב יָרְכָּב וְיָרְכָּב מַלְאָכָה יָרְכָּב יָרְכָּב.
1 Ch. 16:3 יָרְכָּב Targum Jon. 2S 6:19.
1 Ch. 17:1 כּוֹכָב אִורֵי Targum Jon. 2S 7:2, 7.
ib. Jon. 2S 7:2. כּוֹכָב אִורֵי Targum Jon. 2S 7:2.
1 Ch. 17:7 נְהָרָה כּוֹכָבָה Targum Jon. 2S 7:8. The usual rendering of נְהָרָה כּוֹכָבָה is כּוֹכָבָה אַדְּוָן (1 Ch. 11:2) (1 Ch. 13:1).
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1 Ch. 17:9 Targum ושמתון מקומ. Jon. 2 S 7:10.  
1 Ch. 17:16 ולית את אנו כמימד Targum כנなく איני יאלחיה Jon. 2 S 7:18.
1 Ch. 17:17 ותבדרוسفות Targum ותבדרוسفות Jon. 2 S 7:19.  
1 Ch. 17:20 כלל וים הם ושענו ינשבים Jon. 2 S 7:22.
1 Ch. 17:21 וקנאו יהורא וגהיר באורים Jon. 2 S 7:23.  
1 Ch. 17:25 ומכחו ספם כנה Jon. 2 S 7:27.
1 Ch. 18:2 ויטל פרת Targum ונשף פרת Jon. 2 S 8:2, 6.  
1 Ch. 18:3 ונתינה תחפושה Jon. 2 S 8:3 כותיב ויהי.  
1 Ch. 20:3 ויסר ויוהו Jon. 2 S 12:13 ויסר ויוהו Jon. 2 S 12:13...
2 Ch. 1:14 וגו לוחה בכל תְּוִי Targum וגו לוחה בכל תְּוִי Jon. 1K 10:26.  
2 Ch. 2:9 ותמי פרגוס Jon. 1K 5:25 ספם כנה.
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS IN JONATHAN

Jonathan, like Onkelos, deviates in many cases from the Masoretic reading to which allusion was already made in the previous chapter. There is a way to differentiate the paraphrastic from the literal sense. Out of the obscurity of the exegetical expansion there comes forth the simple, written phrase on which it rests. The Targum Jonathan, although, on the whole, far from literal adhesion to the text, is unmistakably careful to transmit both the sense and version of the text. The literal predominates in the historical portions of the Prophets. Any rendering, then, not in accord with the Masoretic reading constitutes a deviation from the reading.

This fact was noticed by the rabbinical authorities. Rashi, while for the most part overlooking them and even following them in evident belief that they were merely of an exegetical nature, could not escape the impression that Jonathan had a different reading. Kimchi and Minchat Shai did not hesitate to point out in the plainest language some of these deviations. They have engaged the attention of later rabbinical writers as well as the modern biblical student.1)

On close examination the deviations will be found to con-

1) However, Abrahm Ibn Ezra, critic as he was, would not accept such a possibility. Thus he remarks in Safa Berura (9, 11, ed. Lippmann): וּדְרַכְךָ אֵית הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן: כֵּי אֵלָה חֹזֵה וְאֵלָה חֹזֵה הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵلָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה נַבְּהֵרָה וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא לְהָקֵם וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא לְהָקֵם וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא לְהָקֵם וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא לְהָקֵם וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא לְהָקֵם וּנְפוּדָה בְּנֵי צֵדָן. וּמִי אֵלָה שַׁלֵּחַ הָעָלָה Нא L

It is an unsuccessful attempt on his part to explain away renderings that represent a different reading.
sist of three distinct categories. Some of them represent an unquestionably different reading. With minor exceptions, they do not admit of being explained away. The preponderate number of these deviations consists of a difference in the pointing. Differences of this kind are found in great numbers in MSS. claiming the Masoretic sanction. They emanate from a period when doubts still existed, as to the reading of certain words. Even the scrupulously literal Aquila version contains variations from the text. The Talmud presents abundant testimony to them.2) On the other hand, many of these deviations are either followed by the Lxx and P or they appear in them in a different form. Deviations of this description are here classed under heading "A". There is another class of deviations of a mere grammatical character. There is a noticeable tendency on the part of the translator to eliminate the more striking discrepancies either in the number or in the person of the substantive in the sentence. So the translator renders them in either one or the other way. Sometimes he subordinates all the forms of the sentences to the last in order.4) In some cases the reverse is true 5) and in some instances all follow the one in the middle.6) This principle is observed by the Lxx and P. to some extent. But it does not appear to have been consistently followed by the targumist. The number of exceptions by far exceeds the number of the cases where this principle is enforced. Thus it is impossible to determine the basic rule of this principle. It takes the appearance of an arbitrary and haphazard device. At any rate, this group of variations does not involve a different reading. They appear under heading "B".

There is another body of deviations which are very instructive for the biblical student. The targumist made it a rule to render sentences which resemble one another, but differ in some

2) Amor. 3: "חיות, ישפתחו את אלים את קרום כי מבוים רוחים"
   3: "או רוחות א"ו רוחות: שְׁנֵי"ו אָו אָו רוחות, נִבְרָת בְּנֵי שֵׁרָה תְּהֵר מִלָּה מִלָּה, לֵיהֶה מְשַׁפְּרוּ Mish. Aboda Zara 29b. Com. also Gen. r. 94, 4: בִּאָו הָאֵו כֹּל בּוֹא אֵו הָאֵו

4) Jerem. 9:5; 11:12.
5) Ezek. 11:19
6) Is. 26:8.
particulars occurring in different parts, in one and the same way. A similar process had been pursued by the Rabbis. It is the LXX of Hillel and R. Ishmael b. Jose, which forms the seventh Mida of the 32 Middoth enunciated by R. Eliezer. But while in the Halakha and Agada the conformation is sought mainly in the circumstances or in the legal conditions of the cases involved, the targumist is interested in the wording. The Samaritan text, as it is well known, will often change a phrase to agree with a similar phrase somewhere else. The LXX in some instances and the P. to a larger extent follow the same rule. (Com. Frankel, Pal. Ex., p. 166.) There can be little doubt that the author had been actuated by reflection. Rendering a phrase, the recollection of the other similar phrase flashed through the mind of the translator to leave its stamp upon his rendering. Mental activity of this sort accounts for many misquotations from the Bible found in the Talmud. But this practice could not have originated from a mere unconscious play of recollection. The translator must have been moved by something which he considered an imperative necessity. It will be observed that in most instances treated this way the author was concerned in eliminating an outstanding divergence in the version of the narrative of one and the same fact. Whether or not the translator pursued a definite rule in applying this principle is difficult to determine. For the most part the author is seen to make the passage second in order to conform the one preceding it.

This kind of variation is placed under heading C. They are of an interpretative nature. They do not point to a different reading, as they were taken by many biblical students. I have

8) Com. R. ifm., Meshib Dabor (Wien, 1866).
9) Com. Kircheim, p. 37 et seq.
10) Com. Aboda Zara 24b, citing IS 15:15 שער הולח נקע לים מים יבש וה潸ים זכרו בהוסעי : מים הולח נקע שער נקע מים לפי סעפצ קנהו אגנה שירפ קנהו אגנה שירפ נקע מים according to v. 9, and San. 49a, citing 2S 3:27 ויהו של מים אגנה A
omitted all deviations of a doubtful character or consisting of an unrendered or added Waw or change of the preposition, which might be due to the distraction of a copyist or the Aramaic idiom.

GROUP A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua 2:7</td>
<td>לע יושבכרות</td>
<td>וע́</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>וּר הָנְבֹרֲנָה</td>
<td>רַ חֲיָבֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>וּר הָנְבֹרֲנָה</td>
<td>רַ חֲיָבֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>וּר הָנְבֹרֲנָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11:17; 12:7</td>
<td>דָּבָר יָבָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13:16</td>
<td>דָּבָר יָבָא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judges 3:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) So P. and in marg. Syro-Hex. Com. Field Hex. and also Arab. Kimchi’s explanation lacks force. Dillmann’s contention (Handbuch), “dass bloße Vervolgen passt zu dieser Wirkung nicht”, missed the order of the narrative—as did Herrheimer’s objection that “der Verlust von 36 Mann ist keine Zertrümmerung”. The same could be said with much greater force of Joshua’s overpowering fright (vv. 6-9). But the current interpretation that the defeat at the descent is identical with the loss of the 36 in killed told in the beginning of the v., is not at all impressive. It is rather to be assumed, which the reading of the T. unquestionably implies, that the loss of the 36 gave cause to the ensuing defeat at the descent, where the loss, it would appear, was sufficient to cause anxiety. I am inclined to believe that the reading of the T. was כְּלֵי יָרְקָם. The form in itself wouldn’t appear strange to the targumist, as cases of this nature are numerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) So P. A. Com. Field Hex., l. c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) So Sebirin. Many MSS. of Kenn. and De Rossi and extant editions follow the reading of the T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) So P. Lxx read יָבָא .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Probably influenced by v. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Felt by Kimchi. So Sebirin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M.T. Targ. R.

19:9 ויהי כנע הננה קייו נא הננה
והנה הוהים

20:34 מרדומים לנדמה נמר קנבנה
וניר הים שמע אחור

21:10 וטוח ודרק הורה בחר
והנה בימה

7:2 ויהי יום הוהי אחד

6:3 עוד בארץ משלתיים אמא שלתיים את ארץ

12:21 ואל תਪוקומ מתבר אל תפורי יאני
ולתחתיו אל תמלחי

15:32 בבונה רמזים יאני סַרָּא מַהַּ

22:14 ורב על מעשהך ור אל מעשהך

2S. 1:21 דרשיה כרבשה יאני בַּלָּי מַיִשׁ יִבְשָׁה

1) Com. Kimchi. Lxx מַלֵּנָה vacant. In one of the MSS. of De Rossi the Keri is מַלֵּנָה and Ketib מַלֵּנָה and in two others ולָשֵׁנ is the Ketib.

2) So Lxx Lag., otherwise these words are vacant. P. קורונא מתבר vacant. The T. does not render קורונא.

3) Minchat Shai: בַּלָּי מַיִשׁ יִבְשָׁה. So in many MSS. of Kenn. and De Rossi.

4) Com. Onk. Exod. 21:10. Com. Minchat Shai. This reading is found in many MSS. of Kenn. and De Rossi.

5) The second reading is rendered קורונא דָּרָי. The conjecture that this word is the same as וּדָרָי in Kenn. MSS. 30, is hardly tenable. It would seem that the T. considered this phrase to refer to דָּרָי מַלֵּנָה. Com. Ehrlich Randglossen
and Thenius Sarn., to which the expression מתבניא points. On the other hand, it is possible that the T. took מָשָׁא to mean anointing, from root מָשָׁא PS. 92:11. Ehrlich’s assumption (ibid) that the T. read instead of לָדָי — שְׂרִי תְרֵמוּת is founded on a misunderstanding of the T.

1) Probably influenced by 1 CH. 14:2.
3) So Lxx. P.
4) וַתִּמָּשֵׂא is omitted in many MSS.
5) This is the reading in PS. 18:44. As the T. to PS. renders this word in accordance with the reading here, it is obvious that he intended to correct the rendering of Jonathan. The rendering of the T. is supported by P. and Lxx Lag.
7) So Lxx, P. and 250 MSS. Kimchi: רִבִּי מַתְמַסֵּס מָשָׁא בְּחַת. From the context it is clear that R. Shmuel is speaking of the נֵרָה which is lit. וַתִּמָּשֵׂא מָשָׁא, לבַּל רָאִית אֲנָא אֲנָא כָּל הַנֵּרָה מְסֻפָּה מִשְׁרֵי נַפְרוֹדִים וַתִּמָּשֵׂא מָשָׁא מָשָׁא. נֵרָה וְנֵרָה נֵרָה מִשְׁרֵי נַפְרוֹדִים מְסֻפָּה מִשְׁרֵי נַפְרוֹדִים לָא נַפְרוֹדִים לָא נַפְרוֹדִים מְסֻפָּה מְסֻפָּה מְסֻפָּה.
8) But com. T. to v. 33; 7:5. Felt by Kimchi.
9) So Lxx P.
10) So P., in accordance with 2 Chronicles 6:21.
11) So Lxx P.
12) Lxx omit the whole phrase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;13:12</td>
<td>וראי את הרה</td>
<td>וראי את הרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;16:9</td>
<td>יג בן בתו</td>
<td>יג בן בתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;16:24</td>
<td>והנה את התה שומר</td>
<td>והנה את התה שומר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;20:33</td>
<td>הנגשה מנה</td>
<td>הנגשה מנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;21:8</td>
<td>אשר באור</td>
<td>אשר באור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;21:13</td>
<td>והנה</td>
<td>והנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;22:30</td>
<td>انا משתחוות ועを利用 התהשש לא</td>
<td>انا משתחוות ועを利用 התהשש לא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2K: 2:14 | סביאת בניו | סביאת בניו |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;3:25</td>
<td>רע אברהם עלי אשתו</td>
<td>רע אברהם עלי אשתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;17:11</td>
<td>זכרון דרורי דע</td>
<td>זכרון דרורי דע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;17:13</td>
<td>ביים הסר</td>
<td>ביים הסר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) So Lxx P. Kimchi: המתייחסים ככ.Headers במחThemeProvider ומเถניק

2) Com. Lxx P.

3) So he renders יבכ את התה יבכ את התה (ib), but is rendered literally. It might, however, be interpretative suggested by the text, for the city—not the mountain—was called by this name. Why should the T. to Am. 3:9 render יבכ את התה literally while the T. to Am. 4:1; 6:1, although we find יבכ את התה (1K 13:32) as well, would admit of no such explanation. Cases, however, of this sort are found in the T. Kimchi (followed by Gersonide) infers from the T. that there really was a city there and Omri just strengthened it.

4) So P.; according to the Maarabai this reading is the Keri while the Masoretic reading is the Ketib.

5) Com. P. Lxx omit יבכ את התה.

6) So P.

7) So Lxx P. Felt by Kimchi. Probably interpretative suggested by what follows in the verse.

8) ויה (Com. 2K 20:3). Probably for anthropomorphic reasons.

9) So Lxx P. Having read והנה and taking it to refer to ושנה the targumist changed the number.

10) Probably interpretative.

11) P. has both in plural, so that the T. might have been influenced by זה את התה.
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

1) Com. Rashi and Kimchi. It is so quoted by the R. Josi, Shab. 56b. This reading is found in one MS. Kenn.


3) So Lxx P. Rashi and Karo follow the T. without taking notice of the deviation. Kimchi noticed it in the T. Hitzig, Ehrlich and Krauss would read here צו מות (Com. Onk. Deut. 32, 34), which would, however, not agree with this rendering.

4) Kimchi seems to have noticed it. Though the absolute מלת is always rendered literally by the T. Com. Gray Is. In. Com. As to see Dill P. Ehrlich IS.

5) Lxx P. omit המות and have part of הבמות.

6) So Lxx P. In general the T. is apt to such an interchange, as will appear in the sequel.

7) So Lxx P. V. Kimchi also noticed it in the T. This reading of the T. was adopted by Hitz., Cheyne, Guthe and Kn.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

1) So in many MSS. Com. Kimchi and Seder Eliahu r. 2, 24.

2) Cort would have מָשָׁא so Krauss, which would have the support of the T.; still, it is not improbable that the rendering is explanatory.

3) So P. V.

4) Lxx also omit מָנָר; Lxx and P. read לָא מָשָׁא. There is no reason to suppose that מָנָר was omitted for anthropomorphical reasons.

5) This is suggested by the parallel; but it may also be explanatory. Graetz and Klost. amend עליה which would have the support of the T.

6) Com. Lxx P. V.

7) So Lxx. (Com. San. 64b: וָהֹל בֵּיתָךְ אֲלֵךְ בֵּיתָךְ אֲלֵךְ בֵּיתָךְ).


TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

M. T.  Targ.  R.
58:3  בַּכּלּ עָבוֹכֵּךְ נַנְגָּנֹת  אֲחֹֽאָן  מָשְׁבַּרְתָּן
59:18  בַּכּלּ מֵפַּלְלָתָךְ  מָרִי  נְפָלָא
61:3 וְכַּמָּהּ חַֽלְתָּף  חַֽלְתָּף  רְחוּ  בַּחַֽלַּף
65:1  רוֹחֵב  מַעֲלֵה  בֵּשְׁמָי  רוֹחֵֽאָן  אֵֽל  נַגְּי  אֵֽל  בֵּשְׁמָי

Jer. 6:14  אֲחֹֽאָן  אֵֽל  תִּכְנָשׁ  עַל  רְקֵמָת  יִוְרִֽנֶֽה  אֱֽר  בֵּֽכָּשְׂפָּמָת
10:24  יָכְלַֽה  לְכָנָשׁ  עָכְמָת  יִוְרִֽנֶֽה  אֱֽר  בֵּֽכָּשְׂפָּמָת
11:12  וְכַּמָּהּ חַֽלְתָּף  חַֽלְתָּף  בַּכּלּ מֵפַּלְלָתָךְ  מָרִי  נְפָלָא
11:14  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  בַּכּלּ מֵפַּלְלָתָךְ  מָרִי  נְפָלָא
15:14  הָֽעָבָֽרָה  הָֽעָבָֽרָה  הָֽעָבָֽרָה  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת
23:26  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת
27:8  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת

2) But Is. 63:7 כֻּלּ כֵּלָל כָּלַֽם  רַשָּֽׁר  literally.
3) It is possible to explain the rendering of the T. as suggested by the parallel הָֽעָבָֽרָה  רוּחָֽנֹת  רוּחָֽנֹת, and would smoothen the difficulties felt by the commentators on this point.
4) So Lxx P.
5) They might, however, have been influenced by 8:11.
6) So Lxx. Com., however, chapter General Peculiarities.
7) So Lagarde. The same MS. was also before Kimchi, but in the copy of the Minchath Shai and many others the reading is מָשְׁבַּרְתָּן.
8) So Lxx. Com. P.
9) Lxx P. A. and many Hebrew MSS. Otherwise the T. might have been influenced by v. 12: וְזָהָֽבָרָּה  לְזָחָֽבָרָּה  רוּחָֽנֹת.
10) So Lxx P. Kimchi noticed it in the T. and remarks that he found this reading in many MSS. See also Kittel: Gusebrecht. Still, it is not impossible that the T. was influenced here by 17:4 וְזָהָֽבָרָּה  לְזָחָֽבָרָּה  רוּחָֽנֹת  and hence the reading of the Lxx P.
11) So Lxx P.
12) So P.; also noticed by Gusebrecht and Cor., but it may also be interpretative.
M. T.  
29:12 וּמַרְאַתָּא אֲלֵיךָ אֵלֶּהָלָה יָאִם
       עצותּוֹת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ מְחַשְּׁבָהָלָה
       וּמַרְאַתָּא אֲלֵיךָ אֵלֶּהָלָה
31:39 וּלְכָלַי הָדְוָרָה אֲלֵיךָ אֲלֵיהָ
        וּלְכָלַי הָדְוָרָה אֲלֵיךָ אֲלֵיהָ
        וּלְכָלַי הָדְוָרָה אֲלֵיךָ אֲלֵיהָ
49:3 אֲלַחַשְּׁמַת בָּשָׁלָהָלָה בְּנֶרֶדָה
51:3 אֲלַחַשְּׁמַת בָּשָׁלָהָלָה בְּנֶרֶדָה
        אֲלַחַשְּׁמַת בָּשָׁלָהָלָה בְּנֶרֶדָה
Ez. 1:7 וּכְפָלַת רַעִילָה מָנֲגָלָהָלָה כּוֹה הַרֶנֶיָּה בְּכּוֹה
5:11 וּכְפָלַת רַעִילָה מָנֲגָלָהָלָה כּוֹה הַרֶנֶיָּה בְּכּוֹה
        וּכְפָלַת רַעִילָה מָנֲגָלָהָלָה כּוֹה הַרֶנֶיָּה בְּכּוֹה
4:7 וּכְפָלַת רַעִילָה מָנֲגָלָהָלָה כּוֹה הַרֶנֶיָּה בְּכּוֹה
10:6 אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה
10:29 אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה
12:12 אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה
        אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה
        אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה
        אֲשֶׁר הָיָה לְכָלָה

1) Probably was omitted in the text of the T. P. also
    2) Lxx omits the entire portion and begins with
    3) Lxx has here the Ketib. P. omits it entirely. The reading
        4) So Lxx codd. 88, 106, P. In some MSS. אָלָא is the Keri.
        5) So A. Rashi follows it.
        6) So P. Sym. Vulg. This is the Ketib to Madnech, but this
        7) Noticed by Kimchi.
        8) So P., so Toy. was probably influenced by V. 15.
        9) So Lxx P.
        10) So P. Probably both of them read לְכָלָה (Com. Is. 18:9 etc.).
On the other hand, we find this case לְכָלָה Ketib and לְכָלָה Keri (Com.
        אֲשֶׁר הָיָה LXX 16:12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;13:11</td>
<td>ויהי וָאֵֽהָּלֵֽכֶּנָּהוּ אָלֵֽכָהֵֽמֶּנָּו</td>
<td>אָלֵֽכָהֵֽמֶּנָּו אֵֽהָּלֵֽכֶּנָּהוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;13:21</td>
<td>אָנָֽהוּ בְּתוֹמַֽנְוַה</td>
<td>יִנְּשַׁמְּנַה בְּתוֹמַֽנְוַה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;14:8</td>
<td>בַּרְּשָׁתָהּ עִלְּרַתָּהּ</td>
<td>בַּרְּשָׁתָהּ עִלְּרַתָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;14:22</td>
<td>בְּכָבְרֵי יִבְּרַתָּהּ</td>
<td>בְּכָבְרֵי יִבְּרַתָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;16:15</td>
<td>אִֽשְׁנֵיָֽו הַשָּׁמֶֽרֶתְוַה</td>
<td>אִֽשְׁנֵיָֽו הַשָּׁמֶֽרֶתְוַה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;16:36</td>
<td>עַל אֵֽלֶּהָֽו וּלְיִתָּהּ</td>
<td>עַל אֵֽלֶּהָֽו וּלְיִתָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;17:21</td>
<td>בְּכָבְרֵי הוֹדֵֽו בָּרֵֽו</td>
<td>בְּכָבְרֵי הוֹדֵֽו בָּרֵֽו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;18:17</td>
<td>מַסְמָֽכְּנָֽו אֲאָהָֽו מָֽכְּפָּֽרְתָּהּ</td>
<td>מַסְמָֽכְּנָֽו אֲאָהָֽו מָֽכְּפָּֽרְתָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;19:7</td>
<td>וּזְרִֽוְיָֽו</td>
<td>וּזְרִֽוְיָֽו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;21:19</td>
<td>הָרָֽבְתָּהּ</td>
<td>הָרָֽבְתָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;21:21</td>
<td>הַחָֽאוֹרְיָֽו וּפְרָֽי</td>
<td>הַחָֽאוֹרְיָֽו וּפְרָֽי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:21</td>
<td>הַשְּׁפִּֽי</td>
<td>הַשְּׁפִּֽי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Minchat Shai: וָאֵֽהָּלֵֽכֶּנָּהוּ אָלֵֽכָהֵֽמֶּנָּו Kimchi remarks that he found this reading in a MS.

2) So in some MSS. Caro 1. c.

3) So Lxx, Syro Hex. and in five MSS. of Kenn. and De Rossi.

4) Noticed by Rashi and Kimchi; so also in Ald. Codd. 42, 68.

5) So P. and in some De Rossi MSS.

6) So P. and Vulg. and a great number of MSS.; the Afudi, ch. 14, remarks: בְּכָבְרֵי חוֹרְתָּה (וָאֵֽהָּלֵֽכֶּנָּהוּ אָלֵֽכָהֵֽמֶּנָּו) וּזְרִֽוְיָֽו הוֹדֵֽו בָּרֵֽו (בְּכָבְרֵי חוֹרְתָּה). 7) Probably interpretative, making the following א referring to מַסְמָֽכְּנָֽו אֲאָהָֽו מָֽכְּפָּֽרְתָּהּ; also Lxx; so 28th middah of R. Eliezer. See Eliezer of Beaufs, who puts an explanation of מַסְמָֽכְּנָֽו אֲאָהָֽו מָֽכְּפָּֽרְתָּהּ as "He called the lights". Com. Heller על חִזְּבֵהוּ. 8) So A. aliter et dimit palatium eorum. So EW. Toy "כָּבְרֵי חוֹרְתָּה" Com. Kimchi. His point, however, is not clear. The T. rendering of Jud. 8:16 is毫无疑ה ובָּרֵֽו or ובָּרֵֽו as Kimchi had it or as in Lag. or as cited in Menachem b. Solomon. 9) So Lxx P. A. Vulg. was noticed also by Kimchi.

10) So is rendered as וָאֵֽהָּלֵֽכֶּנָּהוּ אָלֵֽכָהֵֽמֶּנָּו (v. 15). John d. Buch Ez. assumes it represents a Syr. Ith. form.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

M. T. Targ. R.

24:26 כאскийותיך הבורא את العليים ואליך כהשמעותיך הוואר

26:2 והעת הנה הורח אספאה התדברה

26:20 הבראה בחרבת

27:6 רプラス לאשכון ובאשכון

27:23 יאורים והנתון יאורים והנתון

30:12 אושר יבגלה עליים אושר יבגלה כל מי

34:26 ואאשר ירחש את כבשנה את כבשנה א_travel יאנו כן ונס שעון נס עין המותנה

39:16 כבשנה ונס שעון נס עין המותנה

Hos. 4:18 יש שיגון בבראשית כדתא

6:5 ונהי קרן עניים ושפכתי אחר זא

7:12 על דשם בבראשית הבשמת צערתם

8:5 עמה בהערה עילא עגלו שמרור

9:1 אם היהון לא זא‡ להcirן בבראשית

11:7 ולא עקל ירחיא

12:1ureka ועוד לא עמא יאורה לעיד אלープ רחאל,ואנגן

13:10 זו‡ והפילון כדרי כמך...ımız

1) So Lxx P.
2) So Lxx; accepted by Co. Seeg. Gratz.
3) So Lxx P.
5) Felt by Kimchi.
8) So P.
9) So Lxx P.
10) So P.
11) So Lxx P. Kimchi: "ECN2 כמך עמא קרייתו איי מלויב".
12) So Lxx P.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. 5:10</td>
<td>הנבזזו... משליים</td>
<td>ירמאַ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asher עט מוברער גיבא</td>
<td>מוסרמא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi. 4:9</td>
<td>נקנה למד אע                                              מטתת_ary</td>
<td>הירמאַ (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>המאת קמה תריעי רע</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6:11</td>
<td>הל🕊נה                                               נאגרה_ברשל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum 2:3</td>
<td>תרותיך ציואר                                               נאגרה_כרחי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3:6</td>
<td>קמעי כי חור                                               נאגרה_קרך</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zef. 3:18</td>
<td>וי עחלים... אספת ימך וי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ze. 9:13</td>
<td>תורותיך ביך ציו                                               גַּוזרה (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אנבר בך ציו                                              גַּוזרַה (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 12:5</td>
<td>שמשא ציוץ                                               אשתכת פרק פִּיתבי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אָשָׂאְתָהּ יִשְׁרָאֵל וְרוֹמֵם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 14:5</td>
<td>יוסמה נא heroin                                             יוסמה (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אָשָׂאְתָהּ אָללוּאָהּ נא heroin יִשְׁרָאֵל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יורה הורנה                                               יורה הורנה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. 2:5</td>
<td>יוהבית                                               אשתכת קרמ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אשתכת קרמ                                               קרמ (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) So in some MSS. and Lxx P.
2) So Lxx, though in a different sense.
3) So Lxx P.
4) So Lxx P.
5) So Lxx P.
6) The reading of the T. was probably found in many MSS. See Min. Shai.
9) So Lxx P.
GROUP B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>Following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua 7:8</td>
<td>מַכֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל דִּעָה</td>
<td>מַכֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל דִּעָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:14</td>
<td>יְבִינָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לָא יָדַע</td>
<td>יְבִינָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לָא יָדַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>תֹהֵת מַכֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>תֹהֵת מַכֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:9</td>
<td>בְּֽכִלָּה דִּעָה</td>
<td>בְּֽכִלָּה דִּעָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges 2:14</td>
<td>בִּד אֶרֶבֶּכְּוֹ</td>
<td>בִּד אֶרֶבֶּכְּוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:22</td>
<td>אָרָךְ דִּעָה</td>
<td>אָרָךְ דִּעָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:37</td>
<td>יָסָר אֲרוֹרֵבּ אֲחוּי אֲחוּי</td>
<td>יָסָר אֲרוֹרֵבּ אֲחוּי אֲחוּי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יִרְשָׁמָא</td>
<td>יִרְשָׁמָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S. 2:29</td>
<td>לֵהָֽבְּרַאְסָא</td>
<td>Implied 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>יִכְּסָא אֶחָד כֵּלָם</td>
<td>7) יִכְּסָא אֶחָד כֵּלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>בְּכֵלָּה בָּדוּ</td>
<td>8) בְּכֵלָּה בָּדוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S. 3:15</td>
<td>מְסָח יאָשָׁה</td>
<td>9) מְסָח יאָשָׁה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>יָכְּל בֹּטֵה</td>
<td>10) יָכְּל בֹּטֵה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1K. 8:46</td>
<td>בֵּעֲלָה בֵּבְּדָהוֹ</td>
<td>בֵּעֲלָה בֵּבְּדָהוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:18</td>
<td>תֹהֵת</td>
<td>תֹהֵת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:11</td>
<td>אֲרוּבָ דִּלְּקָנָא</td>
<td>אֲרוּבָ דִּלְּקָנָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2K. 19:4</td>
<td>מְפָרָּת</td>
<td>מְפָרָּת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>יִמְּפָרָּת</td>
<td>יִמְּפָרָּת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 10:8</td>
<td>יִנְּשָׁמָא</td>
<td>implied by context 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:2</td>
<td>מִבְּרָה מְחָרֵשָא</td>
<td>מִבְּרָה מְחָרֵשָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:20</td>
<td>מְסָפָא מְהָלִים</td>
<td>מְסָפָא מְהָלִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>Following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 21:14</td>
<td>כותם ראתון</td>
<td>החニー</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אכלין</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 23:13</td>
<td>חותמה</td>
<td>ארמניה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26:8</td>
<td>המרביכו</td>
<td>ו☁יתך משמך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>לאויכך תאו נשמא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26:9</td>
<td>נפש אורותך</td>
<td>איה רוחך בברך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>אשתך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>מבראך כל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26:19</td>
<td>תחוי רכונך, נרמ נבלתך</td>
<td>יפים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30:11</td>
<td>חפורה מנה דך</td>
<td>אספונה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>הנפי כיון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>אברלאנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30:13</td>
<td>כמשר נפל שכור ממקה</td>
<td>בחמה שבנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 33:2</td>
<td>תגונת חוף ... לי נוגע</td>
<td>הוא דרימו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>לאו ועל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 33:3</td>
<td>ספוקה מנוח</td>
<td>מברך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>מברכת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>אח שמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 34:7</td>
<td>תורני אתע久しぶり</td>
<td>תוערנו מברכתי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>רועתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 40:26</td>
<td>כלך בשם ירא</td>
<td>בושתך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 44:7</td>
<td>הנאותי והצליחה רדך</td>
<td>הוושתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 46:1</td>
<td>הו ערכיה的部分</td>
<td>נטושתך</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) So P. Lxx. Rashi, Kimchi, Karo fellow this explanation.
2) So P.
3) So P.
4) So Lxx (see the difficult explanations of Kimchi).
5) So P.
6) P. puts for the same purpose in the 2nd p.
7) So Lxx. P. in מחל only.
8) Lxx P. render in pl., influenced by Ps. 147:5.
9) So Lxx P.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
<th>Following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42:6</td>
<td>לַא יִכְלֶם מְמַשָּׁה</td>
<td>נָפְסָה</td>
<td>וְמָזַעְנַעְתֶךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:15</td>
<td>וְגָמַעְתָּ נַעְקָר</td>
<td>וּמָזַעְנַעְתֶךָ</td>
<td>יָנַעְקָר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:8</td>
<td>רְאֵי יִכְלָנָא יַעֲקָב</td>
<td>יְרַבַּעֲבָל שָׁש</td>
<td>לַא יָשָׁקֶר יָשָׁקֶר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57:15</td>
<td>דָּרַחַי יְהוָה</td>
<td>סְפַר תוֹרֵשְׁא</td>
<td>מְרוֹם תֹּוֹרֵשְׁא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58:14</td>
<td>יֹאֵשׁ הָעָבְרוֹן</td>
<td>תּוֹכָלְכֵיכֶנָה</td>
<td>implied by context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jer. 2:27 | אֶל פָּרָיָא אָבֶד | מַרְחֹנו | אֶל פָּרָיָא אָבֶד |
|          | הַמַּעֲבָדָה | מַעֲבָדָה | מַעֲבָדָה |
| 7:24     | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בִּירָעָתָן | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בִּירָעָתָן | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בִּירָעָתָן |
| 9:6      | יִהְיֶה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בַּשָּׁקֶר | יִהְיֶה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בַּשָּׁקֶר | יִהְיֶה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בַּשָּׁקֶר |
| 10:4     | יְמַעְרָד הָעָבְרָה | יְמַעְרָד הָעָבְרָה | יְמַעְרָד הָעָבְרָה |
| 11:14    | בִּכְרִית | בִּכְרִית | בִּכְרִית |
| 11:22    | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא | בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא |

Ex. 11:19 | נְתַתֵּה הָעָבְרָה | נְתַתֵּה הָעָבְרָה | נְתַתֵּה הָעָבְרָה |
| 11:22    | וְרָחַשֵּׁה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא | וְרָחַשֵּׁה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא | וְרָחַשֵּׁה בָּשְׁרֵי יִכְלָנָא |
| 22:10    | עָלָי | עָלָי | עָלָי |
| 22:30    | עָשָׁה נְלֻכֶּם עָלָי | עָשָׁה נְלֻכֶּם עָלָי | עָשָׁה נְלֻכֶּם עָלָי |

1) Lxx P. render them all in absolute.
2) So P.
3) So P. Lxx seem to have had an entirely different reading.
4) So Lxx.
6) So Lxx Sym.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.T.</th>
<th>Targ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23:40</td>
<td>יראה יarih ויאכר אכלן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:11</td>
<td>カーיא תמר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:8</td>
<td>יאיית ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:10</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:20</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos. 10:1</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 2:3</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi. 5:4</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Za. 14:5</td>
<td>יאהר ויהיוות</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) It is not necessary with Cor. (D. B. Ez.) to suppose a different reading by the T. Suggested by the text, the T. would not hesitate to render it as if it were in Hiph.

2) So P.; so also in Ez. 20:38; 23:44; Jerem. 51:36; Mi. 7:12, noticed by Min. Shai. In Masoreth Seder Sh'lah this is considered among those that are written in sing. and the Sebirin in pl. That the T. follows in a good many cases the Sebirin as well as the Madnechah was noticed by the Min Shai. (Com. Ez. 5:11; 13:17; 14:19; Min. Shai Jerem. 49:36; Mi. 7:12). In Ps'icha Lam r. א לא יהי תרי קרא משה מ用地 שך etc. ויברשנא אלא ויברשנא אלא זכיבך etc. So in many Kenn. MSS.

3) Lxx make conform to מנהנה. P. follows it closely.

4) So P. Lxx put all in the 3rd person. The reading of קנה is found in many MSS.

5) So Lxx P. noticed also by Kimchi.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

M. T.  
Targ.  
Following

Mal. 2:15  ונששת ונזרוerala ...  
ינבר
נשרתמה1
cי"ע ...  
ברוחה...  
ולא תכמי הפשת  
כינא שלילה ...  
כלהת  
כלהת2
cכמלוש

GROUP C

Joshua 1:9 Ąא והיה ולא תNumberFormatException  
According to Deut. 31:8 Ąא והיה ולא תNumberFormatException  
According to On. Ąא והיה ולא תNumberFormatException  
According to v. 6

Joshua 6:6 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to v. 8

Joshua 6:8 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to v. 7

Joshua 9:4 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to v. 12

Joshua 12:8 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to 12:13

Joshua 18:7 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to 13:33

Joshua 22:24 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to vv. 25, 27

Judges 5:8 Ąא והיה לא תNumberFormatException  
According to Deut. 32:17

1) So Lxx.
2) So Lxx.
3) Lxx in both places have ἐξεσπέσἰν. Com. Jalqut l. c.
4) So P.
5) So P. V. and 4 MSS. and in 3 Kenn.
6) Many Kenn. and De Rossi MSS. read. So Lxx P.

Felt by Kimchi
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS


1S 4:13: Targum והנה עלה עלי גם הוא ואחר. According to v. 18.

1S 4:21: Targum ויתי unterstützen und tatsächlich Textformen. According to v. 19.


1S 14:16: Targum והנה ההמנון נופל. According to v. 19.


1) So P. In some MSS. of the T. the words are omitted.

2) So R. In Lag. also is omitted.

3) P. omits.


5) Com. LXX.

6) So LXX and many MSS.

7) So LXX P.

8) In Lag. also.

2S 11:6 Targum יישלח יואב את אזוריאן ור דה. According to the precedingו ואת אזוריאת החתים.

2S 12:21 So P. and in 2 LXX, P. Com. Ehrlich, Randglossen.


2S 15:17 Targum יושב מלך וכל דברים. Accroding to v. 16: So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

2S 18:12 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

2S 22:13 So P. Lag. סדרת יושב מלך בכלACA. According to v. 9: So P. and in 2 S 14:11. LXX here only.

1K 1:48 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 1:52 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 9:8 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 12:16 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 13:9 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 13:34 So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.

1K 22:31 So is the T. to 2S 14:11. So P. here and in 2 S 14:11. LXX here only.

1) So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.
2) So LXX, P. Com. Ehrlich, Randglossen.
3) So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.
4) In Lag. So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.
5) So LXX, P.
6) So P. Lag. Περίποτε σήμερον εκ τῶν συνεκρήματος μοι
7) So is the T. to 2S 14:11. So P. here and in
8) Com. P.
9) In Lag. So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.
10) In Lag. So P. and in 2 Mss. Kenn.
11) Literally in Lag.
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

2K 4:19 Targum אומץ כאה ורברות. According to v. 20.

2K 4:42 Targum מוכת עמדו לשהה. entsprechend 1S 9:4.

2K 9:19 Targum קוה יומת ואבד שום. According to v. 18.


2K 23:22 Targum בהל איגו ייחו ויפי ביבלים. According to 2 Ch. 34:3.

2K 24:3 Targum ים יתא מת. According to v. 20.


IS. 26:1 Targum בונא והיה ישיבת שכוא. According to 42:10.


1) So P. Com Lxx.

2) Com. P. Lxx el ארקה.

3) So Lxx P. דחיה is omitted in Lag.

4) Com. Lxx. Both are rendered in Lag.

5) So Lxx. Com. P.

6) The whole phrase is omitted in Lxx and P.

7) In Lag. אומץ.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

IS. 33:11 — Targum ורהים אל תבלושם. According to 40:24
1 ומערה כתש תושם — מים כעלוותא פקשה.
2 ומעריה כעלוותא פקשה.

IS. 41:4 — מתי עשת ורהים מרוש לא יזרו אופי אביו... אotope ביהו ויהו
3 וחוגת תרנום אנוכי והאpcmאר את atos י사업 עיפה עלפי רדיל איגון בר כנני
4 ויהו. According to 44:6
5 — ויהו אופי אנוכי ומכלתא יא אלאה
6 — והאpcmאר את atos י 사업 עיפה עלפי רדיל איגון בר כנני
7 ואנה אופי אנוכי ומכלתא יא אלאה...
8...

IS. 42:18 — Targum ורהים אנוכי הלכו לא יזרו אופי אביו...
1 ומערה כתש תושם — מים כעלוותא פקשה.

IS. 44:12 — Targum ובםובית ממכית גיהנה. According to Jer. 10:4
1 ובםובית ממכית גיהנה — (ובםובית זוהי)
2 יא לבבל ומכית
3 ויהו האpcmאר את atos י 사업 עיפה...
4 תושם עיפה עלפי רדיל איגון בר כנני
5 ויהו אופי אנוכי ומכלתא יא אלאה...
6...

IS. 47:7 — Targum סכתי ממקןלא הוה אופי אביו...
1 סכתי ממקןלא הוה אופי אביו...
2...
3 אופי אנוכי
4 ו Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit.
5 ...
6 ...

IS. 50:8 — Targum ורהים אל תבלושם. According to
1 ומערה כתש תושם — מים כעלוותא פקשה.
2 ...
3 ...
4 ...
5 ...
6 ...

IS. 63:5 — וא yaptığı והאpcmאר את atos י 사업 עיפה... ממקןלא הוה אופי אביו...
1 וא يؤدي הממקן לא אופי אביו...
2 ...
3 ...
4 ...
5 ...
6 ...

Jer. 6:11 — Targum אופי אנוכי ממקןלא הוה אופי אביו...
1 אופי אנוכי ממקןלא הוה אופי אביו...
2 ...
3 ...
4 ...
5 ...
6 ...

Jer. 8:15 — Targum סכתי ממקןלא. According to
1 סכתי ממקןלא — מים כעלוותא...
2 ...
3 ...
4 ...
5 ...
6 ...

1) It renders this way Is. 41:16: צמים הממקן לא אופי אביו...
1 ובםובית ממכית. In Lag. קפסא is omitted.
2) So the T. renders Is. 40:12, seemingly for their similar beginning and contents.
3) So, for the same reason, it renders 43:10: זיא האpcmאר את atos י 사업 עיפה...)
4) See Jerem. 10:4. The rendering there was influenced by the sequel, but the influence in this case might have been reciprocal, so that the v. was put in the same p. in accordance with the verse here.
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

Jer. 10:4: Targum הבכשא וברכתא חפיי לוהי תבכשא ובוכז יפים.
According to Is. 40:19 מפקת ה' ורצה בוות כי🤧ונגו תג.

Jer. 10:4: לשא וזילופי Targum ולא היו עשפ
According to Is. 40:20 דל אל איולפ — לא ימשפ
d. Jer. 30:15 Targum סמעעו בתהיכי Accordingly to v. 12 סמעעו בתהיכי — דלשת בכקר.

Jer. 31:9 Targum ברחתם נגיאו בתכ בובה בוחנתםו אוכלים תג. Accordingly to Is. 54:7 ברחתםי — בורחתםי והולכים וברחתםי
 ?><

Jer. 32:35 שאר אל צדוחו ולא עלויה על כל תג. Accordingly to 7:31 אשור אל צדוחו ולא עלויה על כל תג — דל פסירת הבארית

Jer. 33:3 Targum ואניהם קר נחרתה הבורית. Accordingly to Is. 48:6 גניבור — גניבור ולא יידעתי

Jer. 41:15 גאוס הסמטי פייה Targum ואילך אל בני שמואל
According to v. 10 גאנס הסמטי פייה אל בני שמואל

Jer. 46:8 Targum ואנלא אפשת א_stamp
According to 47:2 יבגון אפשת הומא — ישמפי אראס כלואמה

Jer. 48:4 Targum נסחב המואב. Accordingly to 48:25 מאבל המואב — דנעה טר מואב

Ex. 11:19 Targum גזחי כל יחוORN ותור וחות חות כרבמצד
According to 36:26 כל צדוח — כל צדוח וחות חות כרבמצד

1) So P. Rashi; Kimchi etc. curiously combine both readings.
F. Perles in J. Q. R., v. 18, p. 388, would read here צדוחו and refers to Is. 30:22; so Kittel, both of whom refer to the T. not appreciating the principle followed in this case. So also in Jerem. 10:19, and curiously enough, P. there renders ורתבע in the same way as צדוחו.


3) Lxx read there רויתו as here.

4) Minchat Shai sees another reading by the T. and goes so far as to think that Rashi, who follows the T., has also had the same reading. But Rashi does it in numerous instances where such an assumption is out of question. Kimchi remarks: רויתו רבתי ערב ליו, יהי קורא תכתי ו凳ון

7) Also 18:31. So P., felt by Minchat Shai. Curiously, this reading appears also in the com. of Eliezer of Beaugency (published by Posnansky, 213). So is the reading in 3 Kenn. MSS. and 1 De Rossi.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

Ez. 17:5 Targum ייחנהוิน בחשח ורש. According to v. 8 בחשלוין — אל שרה עובד. 2

Ez. 29:3 Targum ייחי מחלתוה אשתו יראה וחיתוינ בשיחת. According to v. 8 מחלתוה — ירא ורא כמותו (6) דיר茂名 אשתו.

Ez. 29:6 סמר סניא רעייתו לשון יהוה משה הענה. According to Is. 36:6 סמר סניא רעייתו — התנהו הרוחם.

Ez. 30:18 Targum ייחי ענש יבשה אשתו. According to 38:16 ענשה — ענשו כלוחו הארי (8) דעלסית ופעם היה אשתו.

Ez. 31:14 תרגום ייחי פעם בני יאכלה. According to 32:18, 24 עardi ופיירו ברו.

Ez. 31:15 Targum ביות אחוהוין ביות רחל שאולתי. According to v. 16 אחוהוין היה — בורויריו שאולתי.

Ez. 32:5 Targum ייחנהוין מפרשים יגוגו. According to v. 6 מפרשים — אפרשים יבמות.

Ez. 32:17 Targum ייחנהוין אשתו אמהו. According to 31:14 אשתו אמהו — אהיו אחוהוין.

Ez. 32:24 Targum אשתו חוסר נсходו התהום. According to v. 23 אשתו חוסר נсходו התהום.


Ez. 36:12 Targum והולכת עליום. According to vv. 10, 11 והולכת עליום — ורתיבה עליום ארום.

Ez. 41:17 Targum דע אותם לעמל התהום. According to v. 20 דע אותם לעמל התהום.

1) As to the change in person, com. De Rossi V. L. V. T., L. e.
2) P. reads ירא : Lxx have v. 9 as in v. 3.
3) It also influenced Jer. 46:8.
4) Lxx have in v. 6 as in v. 5. Kittel wonders if the reading was not רמלה.
5) So 26:20 ב תורה התהום.
6) Lxx have in 37:24 as in 34:24. Lag has here רמלה. However, in 37:25 the T. stands alone.
7) Ehrlich Ez. finds support in this rendering of the T. that it is used here in the sense of increase, as in Jerem. 12:2. Equally wrong is Jahn, ascribing a different reading to the T.
TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

Ez. 43:10. Targum ימשוּה יִתְנָסַפֶּה יִתְנָסַפֶּה וּמְדֹרָה אַתָּה מְדֹרָה אַתָּה הַבַּיִת הַבַּיִת הַכָּנִين הַכָּנִינ. According to v. 11.

Mi. 2:8. Targum סֵסְמָכַת סֵסְמָכַת נַחֲלָה Нַחֲלָה נַחֲלָה שֵׁלֶם שֵׁלֶם יָדִידָה יָדִידָה. According to 3:3 ובֵית ובֵית — בֵּית מִשְׁפַּה מִשְׁפַּה מַעֲשֵׂה מַעֲשֵׂה חָיוֹת חָיוֹת מְנַחְמִים מְנַחְמִים.

Ze. 3:10. Targum קָהָלָת קָהָלָת אוֹרָה אוֹרָה אַלָּה אַלָּה תַּחַת תַּחַת אֲנָשָׁא אֲנָשָׁא נַחֲלָה נַחֲלָה אוֹרָה אוֹרָה תַּחַת תַּחַת. According to 1K 5:5 מִשְׁפַּה מִשְׁפַּה מַעֲשֵׂה מַעֲשֵׂה חָיוֹת חָיוֹת חָיוֹת מְנַחְמִים מְנַחְמִים.

Ze. 9:8. Targum וְהָיְתָה וְהָיְתָה כָּנִית כָּנִית מֶצוּבָה מֶצוּבָה אוֹרָה אוֹרָה. According to 2:9 כְּשֶׁר דְּאָשֶׁר מִשְׁפַּה מִשְׁפַּה מַעֲשֵׂה מַעֲשֵׂה חָיוֹת חָיוֹת מְנַחְמִים מְנַחְמִים.

Ze. 11:17. Targum וְיִרְאוּ וְיִרְאוּ אֲדֹנֵי אֲדֹנֵי עֲבָדָא עֲבָדָא. According to v. 15 עֲבָדָא עֲבָדָא — עֲבָדָא עֲבָדָא — רְעֵה רְעֵה אֲוֹלִי אֲוֹלִי.

1) So P.

2) Lxx read in 2:8 עָוֹר as in 33. So P.
THE EXEGESIS IN JONATHAN

The exegetical nature of T. Jonathan is in a conspicuous manner emphasized in the report of the Talmud: "Said R. Jeremia, others say R. Hiyya b. Abba, Targum to the Prophets Jonathan b. Uziel said it. And Eretz Israel trembled 400 parasangs. A Bath Kol said: Who is the one who revealeth my mysteries to the children of men? Rose Jonathan b. Uziel and said: I am the one who revealeth Thy mysteries to the children of men. It is revealeed and known unto you that... I did it for Thy sake in order that strife may not abound in Israel." To the question why no such occurrence accompanied the act of the Targum to the Pentateuch, the answer is given: "The Pentateuch is clear while the Prophets contain things some of which are clear, while others are obscure." 1)

Framed as this report is in the characteristic phraseology of the Agada it serves not only to demonstrate the prevalent view of the age as to the principal characteristic of the T. to the Prophets, its main value resting in the exegesis, but is instructive also in that it manifests the worshipful reverence in which the exegesis was held. It was regarded as mysteries which should not, except for a weighty reason as alleged by Jonathan, he disclosed to the uninitiated in holiness. It does, however, in no way indicate the nature of the exegesis. There is nothing of the mystical in it. It is governed by rules and based on principles of a kind placing it in the domain of logical hermeneutics.

The general underlying principle in the exegesis of T. Jonathan consists in an attempt to render intelligible to the fullest possible degree that which is obscure. To accomplish this the targumist does not resort to the undersense. It is the sense, the explicit and simple, which is fundamental in the exege-

1) Meg. 3a; Yerushalmi 1, 10.
sis. The object of the targumist was to translate the poetical mind of the Prophet into the lay-mind behind it. In other words, to the targumist the implication rather than the surface literalness of the passage or word involved is of chief consideration. It is, on the one hand, a desire to correctly understand the prophet, and on the other hand, to make the author intelligible to others. Passages which are untouched by the exegesis of the targumist, the reason is to be sought in the assumption that the passage in question was not obscure to the generation of the targumist. In determining the general nature of the exegesis of this Targum a few salient points call for recording at the outset. In the first place, the targumist in no way dismisses any passage or word unrendered due to its embarrassing nature as is frequently the case in the Lxx and P. Whether or not the targumist is assured of having found a plausible escape or is resorting to some hopelessly obscure paraphrase, he is not evading it. On the other hand, it should be noticed that the T. appears entirely unaffected in his translation. He is not preoccupied with any particular thought, or hypothetical idea, "which assumes a connection in the train of thought which does not appear on the surface"; as was the case with the Agada, Philo and the Church Fathers. The aim he set for himself was translation; nothing beyond it. The targumist is inclined, however, in certain cases to parallelism of circumstances, as is the case with the Agada.

One thing, however, stands forth as peculiarly remarkable. It would appear the targumist had little regard for the historical reality of the prediction. With few exceptions he manifests no interest in the particular historical period or event of the prophecy. There is a strong inclination on the part of the targumist to shift the predicted reality to the Messianic age whenever the contents admit of such a presentation. He is this way interpreting the prophecies of "consola-

2) Com. Scheleiermacher, Hermenutik, etc. (ed. 1838), p. 3.
4) The case with the Agada needs no illustration. It constitutes one of its fundamental bases (com. particularly Maimonides preface to Seder Zera’im end 2nd part). As to the Apostles, com. Epistle of James 2:21; Rom. 10:17.
tion” which his age of national depression and political de-
jection would hardly regard as already accomplished. 6) In
addition, there is the poetical side of the prophecy, its
overflowing richness of expression and exuberance of color in
portrayal which are not susceptible of realization, but which
were, in the belief of the people, unaware of this fact, to be
inevitably translated into reality. Hence the tendency to
interpret the glowing description of the “consolation” in
Messianic terms. 8) The Messianic tone is made audible
also in the prominence given in his exegesis to the
“righteous ones”. In a good many instances no other reason
except to give Messianic sense to a phrase, is evident. 7) But
of significance is also the introduction of the wicked side by
side with the righteous. In this way the Messianic
description is complete. The Messianic epoch, as is generally
known, is in its final form rather religious and individual than
political, national. The righteous and the wicked, not the
nation and nations, are the object of its justice. Finally, the
Messianic tendency has found its expression in the targumist
references to Gehenna. In the chapter on “General Peculiarities”
it will be pointed out that the Gehenna referred to by this Targa-
rum is the Messianic doom.

The major principles of the exegesis of the Targum can
be placed under four headings; namely, the allegorical, the
metaphorical, the complement and the lexical. The allegorical
shall be considered first.

The allegorical method was employed in the Agada and
by Philo, and to a larger extent by the Apostles and latter
Church Fathers. 8) But it is to be noticed that the targumist

5) Com. Am. 9:1; Ze. 11:7-11, particularly v. 10. On the other
hand, com. Ze. 6:5—the “four kingdoms” are not called by name.
6) Com. Is. Ch. 9, 11, 12, 6:5; Jer. 23:3-9; Hos. 6:1-4; 14:15,
etc.
7) Com. Is. 24:19-18; 25:4-5; Ch. 32; 33:13; Jer. 23:28; Hab.
2:4; 3:2, etc.
8) The two former need no illustration. With regard to the N. T.,
Jesus himself was addicted to it (Com. Mat. 21:42, Luk. 4:16-22). With
regard to Heb. Ch. 8, Riehm (Lehrb. p. 204, ed 1867) remarks: “The
author leaves out of consideration the historical meaning of Old Testa-
ment passages.”
confines the application of this method to passages which garb an implication. Whether or not he strikes the right point he is distinctly approaching it. He is making no strange and artificial combinations. In most cases his exposition falls in line with the Agadic interpretation.

The larger portions treated allegorically by the T. are Ez. 16, Hos. 1:2, 5, 6, 8; 3, 1-4. Ch. 16 in Ez. is turned by the T. into a reahersal of the History of Israel: "... your habitation and your birth was in the land of the Canaanites, there I was revealed to your father Abraham between the pieces (Gen. 15:9-18) and I announced to him that you shall descend into Egypt, (and that) I (shall) deliver you with an uplifted arm, and on account of your anseorors I (will) expell from before you the Amorites and destroy the Hitites. And then your ancestors descended into Egypt, inhabitants in a land which is not theirs, enslaved and oppressed. ... The eye of Pharaoh did not pity you, to render unto you one generous act, to give you respite from your bondage, to have mercy on you, and he decreed concerning you ruinous decrees to throw your male children in the river to destroy you, while you were in Egypt. And the rememberance of the covenant of your ancestors came before me and I was revealed to deliver you, for it was divulged before me that you were oppressed in your bondage, and I said unto you by the blood of circumcision I will pity you, and I said unto you on account of the blood of the Passover (sacrifice) I will redeem you. And I was revealed unto Moses in the bush, for you, and I put off your sins and swore to deliver you as I swore to your ancestors, in order that you shall be a people serving before me. And I delivered you from the bondage of the Egyptians. And I lead you (forth) in freedom. And I clothed you with painted garments from the riches of your enemies (Exod. 14:21) and I sanctified priests from your midst to serve before me. ... And I reformed you in the reform of the words of the Law written on two tablets of stone and (which) I gave them through Moses. And I gave in your midst the Ark of My covenant and the cloud of My Glory on you and an Angel sent from before Me leads at your head. And I gave My Tabernacle in your midst fitted out with gold... and you be-
came very rich and very powerful and you prospered and ruled over all kingdoms.”

Whether this exposition is right is open to question. The portion beginning with v. 7 may refer to the Kingdom of Solomon as well. But that it was allegorically framed is evident, and the T. only follows the current interpretation trace-able in the Agada. On the other hand, it should be noticed, the targumist asserts the dependence of his exposition on the text. On the whole, however, it runs like a Midrashic treatise. The phraseology is free in the use of parenthetical phrases and synonyms. The textual form is paid little heed.

Hosea, 1:2-5, 8; 3:1-4, comprising the command of God and the action on the part of Hosea to take to himself “a wife of whoredom”, are interpreted in the T. allegorically. Accordingly, the rendering is put in this way: “Go and prophesy on the inhabitants of the city of the idols who increase in sin (v. 2). And he went and prophesied to them that if they repent they will be pardoned, and if not they will fall like the falling of the leaves of a fig tree (and they increased and committed evil deeds (vv. 3, 6, 8) and their generation, exiled among the peoples, were not acceptable (in their deeds. And God spoke to me again: Go and prophesy on Israel who resemble a woman who is beloved of her husband and betrays him (3:1). And I redeemed them on the fifteenth of Nisan, and I put the Shekel as atonement

9) The interpretation of the T. as a whole is in full agreement with the Agada. It is generally accepted that this passage refers to the deliverance from Egypt (com. Sota 11b). V. 6, which the targumist refers the repeated דם בשמים to the blood of circumcision and Passover, is so interpreted in Seder Eliahu r. 25 (p. 138 F.); Mechilta 21,5; Pesqta r, 15 F. (Com. Note 46). On the other hand, the interpretation of v. 10 as referring to the booty of the drowned Pharaoh is applied by the Agada to v. 7 (Mechilta), while v. 10 is interpreted as referring to the priestly garments and to the Mishkan (com. Jalqu t. c.). To the latter the T. refers v. 13, while it agrees with the former. In the interpretation of v. 11 the T. is in accord with the Agadaist (ibid).

10) Com. particularly vv. 4, 7.
11) Com. vv. 4, 5, 6, 10.
for themselves and I said that they shall bring before Me the Omer of the offering from the produce of barley.” (v. 3).12)

The allegorization in this case is somewhat peculiar. The text requires the literal conception of the act which, in its fulfillment, carries both the situation and reality of the prediction. It was taken in the literal sense by the Agada.13) That some agadist, however, would have it allegorically interpreted and that the T. is following his interpretation is fairly certain.14) The reason, however, for the exposition can only be the horror the targumist must have felt at the supposition that the prophet would be told by God to take a harlot to wife. The absence of such a cause is probably the reason why Zech. 6:1-9 is rendered literally.

The Servant of God is by the T. identified with the Messiah, whose approaching appearance has been expected by his contemporaries. That being the case, the allegorization on the same lines of Is. 53 must follow as a self evident result. This had been the case with all those adhering to the allegorization of the Servant of God. But the targumist is strikingly

12) Com. Chull 92b: “And I bought her for me for fifteen pieces of silver”, R. Jonathan said: ... for fifteen (means) this is the fifteen Nissan, when Israel was redeemed from Egypt.” So Pesiqta 15. On the other hand, the latter part of the verse is interpreted differently (ibid).


14) Com. Jalqut l. c.
singular. Assured that this prediction is about the Messiah, the targumist reverses the simple meaning of the words, transforming the gloomy portraiture of the Messiah into an image of magnificence and splendor, unlike the Agadist contemporaries, who would rather play thoughtfully on the humbleness and sufferings of the Messiah. He was influenced by the great national movements of his time, which assumed a Messianic character. So, while he would, seemingly with this end in view, change in 52:14 the p. only as if Israel and not the Messiah is the object, he actually rewrites ch. 53, replacing it by one bearing no resemblance to the original.

Instead of the Messiah being regarded as of no form, no comeliness, of no beauty (v. 2), he becomes one of extraordinary appearance, differing from the appearance of the former Davidic Kings, his terror unlike that of the profane king; for his countenance will be a holy countenance. Whoever will see him will gaze at him (v. 3). Describing how he was despised, rejected and a man of sorrow, he makes it refer to the kingdoms whose glories will be destroyed by the Messiah. So, the rendering of the T. runs: “For our sins he will supplicate and our transgressions will be pardoned on account of him. We are considered stricken and oppressed from before the Lord.” Note the rendering of v. 5: “And he will build the Temple, which was desecrated through our sins, delivered to the enemies for our transgressions, and through his teaching peace will abound for us, and by our gathering of his words our sins will be forgiven to us.” In this spirit the rendering is carried on to the end of the chapter.

THE METAPHOR

Prophecy is clothed in the magnificent form of poetry. It directs its thoughts in a superfluity of imagery. The overcoming force with which the prophet perceived his vision and the vehemence with which, “like a fire,” it is impelled to come forth, make the metaphor the instrumentality of prophetic

15) Com. San. 98a, Pesiqta Rabati 36.
speech. It is addressed in terms of nature and natural phenomena, leaving the emphatic to the layman to unveil and distinguish. The targumist made it a principle to render not the metaphor but what it represents, the event described and not the description. It is the purpose which is of chief import to him. In a way this is with him rather a principle of translation, as in most cases there can be no claim to exegetical examination.

The parabolic metaphor is the prophetic parable which resolves itself less in event than in metaphorical presentation. The T. instead of giving the literal rendering of such a parable renders its underpoetical parallel, thus stripping it of its parabolic nature.

Except for the substitution of the simple for the metaphorical, the T., as a rule, in these cases keeps closely to the text stylistically as well as grammatically and synthetically. Exceptions to this rule are Is. 5:1-3; 5:7. The substitute is the one made obvious by the text, with the exception, again, of the parable in Is. 5, where somewhat far-fetched substitutes are used. Otherwise the T. will introduce its equivalent by the short phrase אֲשֶׁר דְּחָשׁ “which is equal”, and insert, where such is required for better understanding, a complementary word or phrase.

A few verses of each case of the parabolic metaphor will sufficiently illustrate the application of this principle. This will best be accomplished by placing the rendering of the T. side by side with the original.

Ez. 19:3, 6

V. 3

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{T.} & \quad \text{H.} \\
\text{And she brought up one of her children, he became a king, and he learned to kill, killing, men he killed.} & \quad \text{And she brought up one of her whelps, he became a young lion, and he learned to catch the prey, he devoured men.}
\end{align*} \]
And he went up and down among the kings, he became a king and he learned to kill, killing, men he killed.

And he went up and down among the lions, he became a young lion; and he learned to catch the prey; he devoured men.

Ez. 23:2, 5

Son of man prophesy on two cities which are like two women who were the daughters of one mother.

Son of man, there were two women, the daughters of one mother.

V. 5

And Ohlah erred from my worship and she was wilful to err after her lovers, the Assyrians, her near ones.

And Ohlah played the harlot when she was mine, and she doted on her lovers, on the Assyrian warriors.

Ez. 31:3-15, however, is rendered by the T. in a more detached manner. This is due to the fact that while it constitutes a similitude it is framed as a comparative metaphor. Assyria is here likened to a cedar in Lebanon, around which turns the entire description. The T., translating it as a description of the greatness and strength of Assyria according to the implication, had to change the p. as well as the number. Otherwise it keeps the rendering in line with the original.

The poetical metaphor, forms of expression given in objects of nature, is treated in the same manner by the T., namely, the object represented by the description is rendered. In this case also closeness to the original is observed, while a circumscription of phraseology is predominantly maintained. But, as if it were a concession on the targumist's part to the poetical element in prophecy, the insertion, "it is equal", "like", is, with few exceptions, not employed in such cases. Ex-
amples of this sort are: Is. 2:13: "And upon all the cedars of Lebanon that are high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan." The T. renders it: "And upon all the princes (רבי') of the strong and powerful and upon all the tyrants (מרונים) of the lands (мяדיא); or Is. 9:9: "The bricks are fallen, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamores are cut down, but cedars will be put in their place." T.: "The chiefs were exiled but better ones we will appoint, property (נמלים) was spoiled, and more excellent we will buy." Other examples of this sort are: Is. 10:18, 19; Ez. 9:4, 5; Hos. 7:9; Joel 2:25 etc. Finally, the targumist is not consistent in the selection of the substitute figures. (Com. Ez. 2:8; Ze. 11:3 rendered by מְלַכֵי, while in Ez. 34:2, 5, 7 etc., it is rendered by רַבִּים ) The rendering of the T. of the comparative metaphor, i.e., the metaphor employed expressly for comparison, rests on the same basis, but it is effected in a different way, namely, both the literal and the implied rendering of the metaphor in question is given. An illustration of this sort of rendering is Is. 28:2: "Behold, the Lord hath a mighty and strong one. As a storm of hail, a tempest of destruction. As a storm of mighty waters overflowing, that casteth down to the earth with violence," which the T. renders: "There is a mighty and powerful stroke coming from the Lord as a storm of hail, as a tempest, as a storm of mighty waters overflowing so will peoples come upon them and will exile them in another land for their sins." Other examples are Is. 8:6, 7; 17:6; Jer. 2:24. In this particular instance the T. introduces the necessary complement which the poetical language implies.

In other cases the T. assumes a comparative metaphor and renders it accordingly, the literal is then put after the implied one and the comparative and כ or כ is inserted. Instances of this sort are numerous. Com. Ez. 2:6; Hos. 8:7; 10:71, 16; 12:2 etc.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\) As to the scope of the application of the metaphorical principle it should be noticed that although applied in full measure of persistency, it still has a multitude of exceptions. These exceptions occur particularly in those parts of the Prophets where the T. is predominantly
The symbolic expression is rendered in the T. in its simple sense, as the text would indicate. No comparative is employed. Instances of this sort are Is. 6:6; Ez. 2:8; 3:1, 2, 3. Some metaphorical expressions are rendered allegorically by the T., in which the T. is following a Midrashic course. The rendering is free in every respect. An instructive example of this sort is Am. 4:14: "That maketh the morning darkness and treadeth upon the high places of the earth." Targum: "To set light to the pious like the light of the morning, which is setting, to bring darkness to the wicked, to break the wicked of the land." Other examples are Is. 42:11, 57:16; Am. 8:13.

A principle extensively applied in the T. is one that may be described as the exegetical complement. This, in the first place, was intended to fill the gaps created by the poetical contraction of the prophetical style. In some cases a complement is dictated by the sense of the passage. This will be fairly well demonstrated by the following passages:

Mal. 1:4: "Whereas Edom saith we are impoverished but we will return and build." The sense of this passage requires some linking word between "impoverished" and the rest, as being impoverished, it is impossible to build. In order to fill this gap, the T. renders it this way: "We are impoverished now we are enriched we will return," etc.

Jer. 17:4: ינשפת יבר ינחלת the shortcomings of this passage need not be pointed out. (Com. Lxx and particularly P. on this v.). The T. supplies both יבר and ינחלת with complements to fill the gap, rendering: "And to you I shall render a punishment of judgment until I shall exile you from your inheritance." Com. also Is. 10:15; Hos. 2:15; Ez. 7:13; 16:29; 38:14 etc. In other cases the passage is supplemented by the T. with a view to simplify it where such a step is considered necessary. Here are some examples: Ez. 20:29: "What is the high place whereunto ye go," which is supplemented in the T.: "whereunto ye go to make yourself foolish" (worshipping the idol). Hos. 2:1: "The number of the children of Israel

literal. Com. Jer. 51:13; Ez. 34:4; Joel 2:2, 3; 3:6; Am. 3:12, 15; 5:19; Mi. 4:7, and a few others.
THE EXEGESIS

shall be as the sand of the sea.” The T. inserting a complement renders it: “Shall be numerous as the sand,” etc. Other cases of this category are: Ez. 20:9; 33:24; 44:19; Hos. 2:11, 16; 8:1 etc. The T. again is inclined to provide the substantive for the pronoun in cases where it is not sufficiently obvious. Three passages from Ez. will serve the purpose of illustration. Ez. 1:4: “And out of the midst thereof.” This pronoun the T. substitutes by the noun rendering: “And out of the midst of the cloud and out of the midst of the whirlwind” (both of which are mentioned in the v.). Ibid v. 13: “It went up and down” etc. The T. replaces the “it” by the fire. Ibid. 29:5: “Upon the field shall it (taking the 3rd p.) fall.” Targum: “Thy corpse shall be thrown.” (Com. also Ez. 45:8; Jer. 6:1.)

Repetition of the same word or of identical words, considered as one of the principles governing the exegesis of Philo, affords the targumist a cause for introducing an exegetical complement, thus transforming the single word into a clause. The obvious reason for this, it would appear, is the disregard of the targumist of the poetical chord of prophecy so persistently insisted upon by the T. in each exegetical turn. He was unable to resist the conviction, so effective with the Halaka and Agada, that each of the repeated words must possess independent significance and carry independent implication. However, he is not explaining it but complementing the repeated word, heading, as a rule, the clause. Here are a few illustrations: Is. 6:3: “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts.” Targum: “Holy (is He) in the high lofty heavens, the house of His Shekina; holy on the earth the work of His strength; holy in the world of worlds.” Jer. 7:4: “The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these.” Targum: “Before the temple

17) An interesting case presents Is. 28:10. The complement is supplied in an ingenious way to obviate the difficulty in this verse. The rendering runs: “For they were commanded to observe the Law and they were commanded (to do) they wanted not to do, and prophets prophesied to them . . . and the words of the prophets they did not accept.” Observe: יְהִי is treated thus יִהַי and so with יִהַי.

18) Com. Siegfried, Philo, etc., p. 168, put by Briggs (Biblical Study, p. 306) in group II.
of the Lord ye worship, before the temple of the Lord ye sacrifice, before the temple of the Lord you bow three times through the year." Com. Is. 2:19; Jer. 22:29; Ez. 16:23; 21:14; 36:3. As to identical words, com. Is. 1:2; 33:22; 43:12.

Finally it should be noticed, that though the principle pointed out in the foregoing instances is Midrashic in nature, the complement is simple, concise, and in considerable measure keeping within the boundaries of the text.

On one plane with the metaphorical principle rests the lexical. This principle affects singular words or expressions which, though not metaphorical, bear a poetical stamp, and in reality convey more or less the idea of the meaning than the meaning itself. Such words or expressions, instead of rendering them according to their surface meaning, the targumist takes them by their underlying value as suggested by the text. Instances of single verbal words: Ez. 12:13: "And I shall bring him in Babel." Targum: "I shall exile him" etc. So also v. 16; 36:20 etc. ibid. 23:10: "they took", Targum: "they captured"; Hos. 4:3: "Therefore doth the land mourn." Targum: "Therefore shall the land be laid waste". Ibid. 13:5: "I did know thee in the wilderness" — "I supplied your needs in the wilderness." Instances of nouns: "And I will appoint over them four families" — "four calamitous afflictions." In Mi. 2:3: "On this family" — "generation; Ez. 24:8: "I gave her blood" — "I revealeth their transgressions"; ibid. 21:37: "they blood" etc. — "the sin of your murder." Ez. 34:2: "Prophesy on the shepherds of Israel" — "on the leaders (אבירים) of Israel." Instances of expressions: "And they shall do with thee in hatred" — "and shall revenge from thee" etc. Ez. 16:16: "not coming and not being (so)" — "not as required nor proper; Ez. 13:17 etc.: "put thy face" — "accept prophecy". Examples of all categories are numerous.

In drawing a comparison between this Targum and Onk., as well as other translations with respect to the exegetical principles, it will appear that Onk. pursues the same principles. This point was well elucidated by Luzzato in Oheb. Ger. 31. As regards the other translations, some exceptions must be made. The allegorical principle as well as the metaphirotical,
as applied by the Targum, are to be found neither in the Lxx nor in P. On the other hand, the principle of the exegetical complement is followed by the Lxx in Pentateuch\(^{19}\) and in a lesser degree also by the P. Illustrations are: Gen. 25:22: "And she said: 'If it be so, wherefore am I,'" which the Lxx render: σὺ ναύστος μοι μέλλει γίνεσθαι etc. Gen. 40:16: "in my dream" κάνγω ὅδεν ἐνύπνιον

In the Prophets this is evident to a lesser degree. It found, however, application in this part also. Com. Zech. 14:7: "And there shall be one day which shall be known" etc. Lxx ἕσθαν μᾶν ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα ἑκεῖνη γενέσθαι etc. So. P. Com. also P. Hos. 2:11 (8).

The lexical principle also was pursued to some extent by the Lxx, and in a lesser degree by P. Com. Gen. 13:2: "And Abram was very heavy." Ἀβράμ se ἐν πλούσιος So P. 15:2 ἐν πλούσιοι So. P. (Onk. agreeing in both instances). But com. Lxx T. Jer. 22:30, 49:3: רָאָשְׁתָי אֶת וֹאָּמַר רְשֵׁי צֶּכַּנְו (P. lit. Onk. Alleg.) v. 10: — שְׁפַם וֹאָּמַר (P. lit. Onk. Alleg.) etc. Is. 8:4 בְּכֶסֶף Lxx ἐν τῇ ἐφή πόλει

Apart from these major principles there is an element of commentary in the exegesis of Jonathan. At the first glance it becomes clear, that the tendency of this commentary is merely to explain away the harassing difficulty. No heed is exhibited to the text, no effort to fit it into the phraseology of the respective passages. So Mi. 2:8: ... "My people is delivered because of their sins; because of them existing peoples will inherit them." Compare also Is. 10:32, 32:19, 33:6; Jer. 4:9; Hos. 10:11; Mi. 2:11; Hab. 3:2; Mal. 1:11. But while this sort of commentary is somewhat of the nature of a homily, there is another phase of the exegesis resting on definite principles. The T. usually changes the interrogative into the categorical. This happens particularly with such interrogative phrases which, in the first place, imply a definite answer, and, in the second place, the implied answer is not given in any form. It should be observed that the Lxx in Pentateuch also employs such a

\(^{19}\) A most elucidative treatment on these points in the Lxx is found in Z. Frankel's "Uber den Einfluss" etc. See particularly pp. 4, 9, 73.
The following are examples: Is. 66:9: "Shall I bring to birth and cause to bring forth? Shall I that cause to bring shut the womb?" Targum: "I (am) the God who created the world from the beginning. I created all men and I spread among the people. I shall gather thy exile." Jer. 18:14: "Doth the snow of the Lebanon fail from the rock of the field? Or are the strange cold flowing waters plucked up?" Targum: "Behold, as it is impossible that the water snow running down the fields of Lebanon shall cease, so will not cease rain coming down and welling water from the source." Compare also Ob. 1:12, 15. Another interesting characteristic device of the commentary is the turning of one part of the verse into a complement of the other part. Some examples will well illustrate this point. Is. 5:20: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil, that change darkness into light and light into darkness, that change bitter into sweet and sweet into bitter." Targum: "Woe who say to the wicked ye are good, and unto the humble be said you are wicked, behold when light will come to the just will be dark for the wicked, and sweet will be the words of my Torah to those observing them, and bitterness will come to the wicked." Am. 5:12: "Ye that afflict the just, that take a ransom." Targum: "Ye that afflict that just in order to take mammon of falsehood." Compare also Ze. 11:8.

---


21) The T. turns a comparative phrase into a resultant, treating דַּעַת כֹּל הָאָדָם. So Jerem. 22:28. Here the T. follows another principle, namely, turning one phrase of the v. into a comparative to the preceding one. Com. Is. 8:2, in which case an Agadic interpretation is involved (Mak. 24a); 42:2.
II.

The interpretative rendering of single words or phrases is of a positive value. The interpretation is characteristic of the early Palestinian exegesis. With little exception, they are found in the Agada.

Joshua 7:1 Targum יומָעַלּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִפְּלָעֵל שָׁמָּרָה. So Sifri Num. 7: שָׁמָּרָה מִפְּלָעֵל (בָּדַרְבַּר, ה) אֵינָי מִפְּלָעֵל שָׁמָּרָה.

בָּלָּלָּם אָלֶא שָׁמָּרָה. תָּוְרָּם מִפְּלָעֵל מִפְּלָעֵל בָּדַרְבַּר.

Onkelos l. c. and v. 6 has a similar rendering.

Joshua 10:13 (also 2 S 1:18) מַעַרְבּ אֶפְרָאִים Targum ראָבְדָה.

Com. Aboda Zara 25b. Also Y. Sota 1, 18.

רֵאֵי מַעַרְבּ אֶפְרָאִים (אִּמְתָּא) מַעַרְבּ אֶפְרָאִים תָּוְהָא אֶפְרָאִים רֵאֵי.

 Judges 5:10 רֶבֶכֶוּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא עַל אָמָה הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֶפְרָאִים רֵאֵי.

So Erubin 54b מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא עַל אָמָה הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.

עַל אָמָה הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.

55 מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא עַל אָמָה הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.

בָּדַרְבַּר מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא עַל אָמָה הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.

1 Sam. 1:1 מִלְמוּכְרֵהוֹ תָּוְרֹאָרִים רִבְיָא רַגְאָרִים.

So Meg. 14a מִלְמוּכְרֵהוֹ תָּוְרֹאָרִים רִבְיָא רַגְאָרִים.

The Targum assumed to be in const. state while as a descriptive noun as did P. Com. Lxx.

So is the Targum to 1 S 9:15 בָּדַרְבַּר מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.

(ib. Targum אָפְרָאֵים.

siders Eli to have belonged to the Levites (1 Chronicles 6:18).

(1 R. Jochanan Jalqut l. c.) The were given a portion on the Mountain of Ephraim (Josh. 21:21). The Targum in other cases (Judg. 12:5, 1 K 11:26) merely transcribes it.

Com., however, Berachoth 31b.

IS 6:19 מְפִסָּוָה יִרְדוּ נַבְרֵי מִפְּלָעֵל כְּבוֹד הַיָּוָה אֶפְרָאִים מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא. Thus the discrepancy in the number is eliminated. This interpretation agrees with Y. San. 2, 4.

רֵאֵי מַעַרְבּ אֱכְלִית נִירְבָּא.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS


Also Tanchuma וינש 8 on the same verse.


both Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan render סימן יישאר The T. identified it with the root, יישאר. Com. Is. 21:5
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Both Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan render סימן יישאר The T. identified it with the root, יישאר. Com. Is. 21:5
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In the text of the Targum, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The Targum interpretation is given as follows:

6:20 The Targum interprets the word as empty, naked. Com. Jalqut i. c.

The interpretation of the word in the Targum is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.

In the commentary on Sukka, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The interpretation of the word in the commentary is given as follows:

21:19 The interpretation of the word in the commentary is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.

In the Shocar, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The interpretation of the word in the Shocar is given as follows:

18:5 The interpretation of the word in the Shocar is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.

In the R. Channel, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The interpretation of the word in the R. Channel is given as follows:

23:4 The interpretation of the word in the R. Channel is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.

In the Moed Katan, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The interpretation of the word in the Moed Katan is given as follows:

16b The interpretation of the word in the Moed Katan is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.

In the Pesiqta, it is stated that the original text was interpreted in a manner that preserved the original text and included some alterations. The interpretation of the word in the Pesiqta is given as follows:

r 11. The interpretation of the word in the Pesiqta is based on the understanding of the text in the earlier work.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

ib. 24:15 Targum So Berakoth 62b מַעִיֶּרֶדֶתְּנֵיכֶם מְזֻכֶּר עִנְעַת. The translation and in the name of R. Chiyya in Pesiqta r. 11.

IK 7:26 אֶלָּפִים בַּת צִיּוֹן Targum So Erubin 14b, Sifri Num. 42. The name of the month of Nisan is based on a verse in Targum Jonathan. In the Talmud (Rosh Hashana 11a) R. Eliezer would interpret it to refer to the “Aboth”. The T. is based on this interpretation. At the same time it intends to account for the change of the order of the months following Josephus (Ant. 1, 3, 3) that it was Moses who appointed that Nisan should be the first month for their festivals. Com. PS Jonathan Exod. 12:2.

ib. 8:2 תָּרְגֻּמּוּ לבִּית אֲבָלוֹן Targum Rosh Hashana 11a, Y. Rosh Hashana 2, 8 תָּרְגֻּמּוּ. In the Talmud (Rosh Hashana 11a) R. Eliezer would interpret it to refer to the “Aboth”. The T. is based on this interpretation. At the same time it intends to account for the change of the order of the months following Josephus (Ant. 1, 3, 3) that it was Moses who appointed that Nisan should be the first month for their festivals. Com. PS Jonathan Exod. 12:2.

ib. 16:34 Targum בֵּית אֵמוֹ יַסְפָּד So P. Com. San. 113a

2K 2:3 תְּמָרִים נָבִיאֵת Targum וּשְׁנֵא בָּנֶיהָם So ib. 5, 7, 15; 4:1, 38, 6:1). Com. Sifri Deut. 131: the vegetables are not the same as the vegetables that are adults in the Talmud. The T. is based on this interpretation. At the same time it intends to account for the change of the order of the months following Josephus (Ant. 1, 3, 3) that it was Moses who appointed that Nisan should be the first month for their festivals. Com. PS Jonathan Exod. 12:2.

ib. 12 תָּרְגֻּמּוּ אֶרֶב. Com. Sifri l. c. תָּרְגֻּמּוּ. The name of the month of Nisan is based on a verse in Targum Jonathan. In the Talmud (Rosh Hashana 11a) R. Eliezer would interpret it to refer to the “Aboth”. The T. is based on this interpretation. At the same time it intends to account for the change of the order of the months following Josephus (Ant. 1, 3, 3) that it was Moses who appointed that Nisan should be the first month for their festivals. Com. PS Jonathan Exod. 12:2.

IS 1:23 Targum אֲרֻמֵי בֶּן קָהָרָה אֲשֶׁר יִרְדְּסֶהָם. Com. Pesiqta 3:4:4 תָּרְגֻּמּוּ. This interpretation in a Messianic sense agrees with San. 92b.
The exegesis

ib. 51:8 אַשְׁרֵי הַנֵּבֵי אֲשֶׁר דָּגוֹם כָּם הָיוּ הָלְיוֹדִירִים

Com. Lamentation r. 2, 3 and Menachoth 53a. מִפְּלִיאָה לָבָרָא מִכָּה הָלוֵית

ib. 10 אֲרוֹן חַבָּוָה דָּגָה יֵהוָה טָמְיָא יָכְרוּן בַּאֲדָמָה מְבוּשַׁרֵיָה. Com. Pesiqta D'Rav Kahana, —שֶׁרְבָּה נַעֲשָׂה מְבוּשָׁרֵיָה.


ib. 18 וְיִדְחָקָה תְּמַחְּף וְגֶבֶרֶת כָּנַיָּה וּמָנוּשָׁה בָּרָא. Com. Suk. 52b, San. 99a וְיִדְחָקָה תְּמַחְּף וְגֶבֶרֶת כָּנַיָּה וּמָנוּשָׁה בָּרָא.

Also R. Akiba, Gen. r. 22, 2; Sifri Num. 112.


This is exactly the interpretation of R. Akiba Makkoth 24b:

This is exactly the interpretation of R. Akiba Makkoth 24b:

This is exactly the interpretation of R. Akiba Makkoth 24b:
The interpretation is based on the transposition of the two last letters of פֹּרֶשׁ. On the reading of the T. rests also the saying of R. Meir, Tos. Sota 3: 'ויהי רבי אייר אומר מני שבכרדה שאומר: 'מדרי מדריך ותאמרו זומר כו נל סמואל' בכיש. Otherwise the inference is hardly explicable. Apparently, the T. identifies כיש with אשא שאמר. This was apparently the underlying reading of the rendering of the Lxx, while P. and I presume, also, Sym. read the same way and rendered it accordingly.

The Targum interprets the phrase in the terms of the current Agada that, for the purpose of rendering the miracle of the destruction of the army of Senacherib more pronounced, God caused the bodies of his host to be burned within the raiments which were left intact. Com. the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 63, 8: "And at that time I burned their bodies within but their raiment and arms I preserved outwardly, in order that still more wonderful deeds of the Mighty one might appear, and thereby His name might be spoken of throughout the whole earth." It was, it would seem, a current Agada. Com. Tanchuma, Beshaloth Gamor, 18:21, and also Lekach Tob, Noach 9, 23. Com. Shab. 113b (and Rashi l. c.), San. 94a א"ר יונתן התבהר א"ל אנוהי מימות מלחמה כיהן ויהי י公开招聘 חלים כהנה וסתא. Com. Tos. San. 52a.

Asahb Targum אֲנָוִי אֲנָוִי מִסְמִית מִסְמִית אֲוֹר הַמָּלְאָךְ תֶּることו רַבּוֹי וַיֶּהָני. Com. also 32:2: In all other cases the rendering of these two words is literal. Here the translation was influenced by the Messianic nature which the targumist assumes for this prophecy. The T. takes אֲנָוִי to imply the observer of the law following R. Jeremiah (Sifra Lev. 18, 5):

However, it is mentioned in the Targumישינא שִׁנְיָא יִקְרָא, Com. Sifri, Deut. 218: that the Law is fulfilled in the Targum, Lev. 5, 1 וְיֵלְדֵי יוֹתֵר כּוֹלֹת שִׁנְיָא שָׁבַעַת לִבְנֵי בֵיהָרִים וַיֶּהָני. Com. 13:21

In the Prophets, Targum אֲנָוִי שִׁנְיָא יִקְרָא שֵׁם, Com. Sifri, Lev. 5, 1 וְיֵלְדֵי יוֹתֵר כּוֹלֹת שִׁנְיָא שָׁבַעַת לִבְנֵי בֵיהָרִים וַיֶּהָני.
The targumist evidently took as based on the noun dross (Isaiah 1:25). Com. Lev. r. 18, 3. בֵּית שְׁמֵנְתִּי אָחָנוּ וַיְפֹלְׁחֻם פֹּלָתָה בָּמוֹר אֲשֶׁר יָקְמוּ צֶּבָּתוֹ צְבָּיָהוּ. ib. 19:25 Targum בֵּית שְׁמֵנְתִּי אָחָנוּ וַיְפֹלְׁחֻם פֹּלָתָה בָּמוֹר אֲשֶׁר יָקְמוּ צֶּבָּתוֹ צְבָּיָהוּ. The targumist would not accept the literal and obvious meaning of this verse placing the Egyptians and Assyrians on one footing with Israel. In his view, therefore, the whole verse refers to Israel. So was the view, apparently for the same reason, of the Greek and the Syriac rendering of the verse.

Eliminating the insertions, this interpretation is found in Hebrew similarly Cant. r. 21:1 מִשְׁמַרְמֹר בְּשֵׁם מַרְבָּר יִשְׁרָאֵל Targum מִשְׁמַרְמֹר בְּשֵׁם מַרְבָּר יִשְׁרָאֵל. Similarly Cant. r. 21:11, 12 שֶׁמֶר מְכַלְכֵּי שֵׁם מְכַלְכֵּי שֵׁם יִשְׁרָאֵל Com. Y. Taanith 1, 1 and •• בַּעֲשָׁהוּ רבָּנָה יִשְׁתַּחֵט הַשֵּׁם יִשְׁתַּחֵט. Com. also Pesachim 2a on 28:3:4.

ib. 22:1 מִשְׁמַרְמֹר בְּשֵׁם מַרְבָּר יִשְׁרָאֵל. This agrees with R. Johanan (Pes. sichta Lam. r. 24:1) וְיָנָּהָהּ מִשְׁמַרְמֹר יָנָּהָהּ מִשְׁמַרְמֹר. While Beraitha Taanith 28b would interpret it to refer to the Tepml. Rashi, however, would place the Beraitha in harmony with the interpretation of R. Johanan.

ib. 8 על פי בֵּית נָגָי מַסֵּרָא. The T. was evidently prompted to this interpretation by IK 10:17, where it is called interpreting to mean the Temple, as he rendered 37:24 (2K 19:23), which coincides with the explanation in Joma 39b.
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b. 17 Targum בכר formul[. omitted] Com. San. 25b
formul[. omitted] form[. omitted] in the Targum אסגור.

ib. 18 הלמות תחתו בכש על ראה קהל בית אדוניה Com. San. 1. c. קהל בית אדוניה.
הנה און בכש קהל פלשת אין בית רבו
ירדנו הלמות תחתו בכש קהל פלשת.

ib. 23 The targumist was the opinion that only מך[. omitted] was transferred to Eliakim. Accordingly, he renders רכמא די פומנ ע[. omitted] ח' The T., however, to v. 18 would point to the opposite view, that Shebna was a High Priest. (Com. T. 28:1). The T. to v. 18 has all the appearance of a Midrashic T., a portion of which was incorporated here.

ib. 27:5 וא הלמות תחתו בכש קהל פלשת Com. San. 99b קהל פלשת כל התולים בכש קהל פלשת שמע שמע
בחלקה כבר מתואר עובד בלמרות קהל פלשת.

ib. 27:8 הhound מצעמא נא תחתו תחתו תחתו תחתו תחתו תחתו תחתו Com. San. 100a So Sota 8b, San. 111b משפחה שיאמרו יקראו כו"ם יקראו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמרו כו"ם שיאמר[. omitted]

ib. 28:7 זמן רומא[. omitted] So Meg. 15b, San. 111b יוצאי פophilia[. omitted]
יאור[. omitted]

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.
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The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.

The Targum interprets to mean repentance and rendering the following as a resultant phrase. It agrees with R. Eliezer, Y. Taanith 2, 8; San. 37b.
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.. 33:17 Targum Eliahu r. 14 (p. 168 F.) Com. Seder Eliahu r. 17 (p. 171 F.)

יה יכד שכנעה מא关于我们 לעלם ופשך אتصف והיה עלי...

.. 40:8 Targum. Mitzvah r. 10 (ed. Buber) and citation in Jalqut:

אבר את הנקה אשר ית▷ הנגה...

.. 40:10 Targum Eliahu r. 17 (p. 84 F.)

אבר את הנקה אשר ית▷ הנגה...

.. 40:31 Targum Eliahu r. 17 (p. 84 F.)

אבר את הנקה אשר ית▷ הנגה...

.. 41:2 Targum Eliahu r. 17 (p. 84 F.)

אבר את הנקה אשר ית▷ הנגה...

.. 42:11 Targum Eliahu r. 17 (p. 84 F.)

אבר את הנקה אשר ית▷ הנגה...
The Exegesis

ib. 21 Targum ישראלי
The T is followed by the Pesqta 40.
ib. 23b, Mish.: ר"י ונכון ב"אר ו"ש י"ר התם א"תון ר' הדב físico ח"כ דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"わかる דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישראלי קרכו ב"学习贯彻 דותא את ישรา

ib. 43:4 Targum אמרי שולחני So Mechilta
ib. 12 Targum אמרי חצרית ויתняти והשתעיית

ib. 44:9: The interpretation approaches the Midrashic explanation of the verse to refer to four estates of the righteous ones. Abot of R. Nathan 36: The interpretation that every righteous man is a portion of the world. And in a different way in Mechilta (סמכתא דנוקית)

Seder Eliahu r. 18 (p. 105 F.) is following Abot of R. Nathan

ib. 27 Targum אמרי_above_5 שולחני
Com. Y. Berakoth 4, 1; Zebachim 113a; Shab. 113a; Lam. r. Pesichta 23 (Buber)

ib. 45:18 Targum ישראלי It is so interpreted in the Talmud as implying the obligation of human reproduction. Com. Jebamoth 62a; Gittin 41a, etc.

ib. 46:11: It is so interpreted in the Talmud as implying the obligation of human reproduction. Com. Jebamoth 62a; Gittin 41a, etc.
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The belief is here expressed that the death of the righteous one is a signal of an approaching calamity to escape which he is taken away from life. This was a prevalent belief derived from the interpretation of this verse. Com. Baba Kama 60a: חכם ושומע קומתא... זא דא אלא שפחתא?

San. 113a... ידיעי נמרות المشהו דהוא קולב שומר אולר... But com. Enoch 81, 9.

Com. San. 98b חכם ושומע קומתא... זא דא אלא שפחתא?

Esther r. 1.

So Gen. r. 54, 1 ויהי דריה זא אביהו. Com. San. 91a and Pesachim 68a. The interpretation of the T., however, agrees with Gen. r. 26, 3.


Jerem. 2:2 וחרת תכ העד טו הקד שמחך בלאך תכף. Similarly Gen. r. 12, 5; Num. r. 13, 4. Lxx has a similar interpretation. Com. T. PS. 1:3:4 אולר זא — בך שמחך.

כשא ראשה תכ יאני תכ רוזא בתכשא Com. also Shab. 63a; Exod. r. 45 end;
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105

בלח תתיו שלישים בתות מסה אוחין יובכל אחרון בבאנה ראמכחים סני בleine וריי。
Com. Mechilta
3:17. Com. Tanchuma Num. 2
אמסי שימיני נה תות רעי קשות ופיו
ורפסאר
יאמך קשות בית פסייש וסיגתת ב).(איה רועי אנקוה
שבר
ויי:ו)
ib. 22:6 Targum
גנער ذاتת פי ראש הקבון
Com. Mechilta
2:17, והפלק
נבר רוא התנהלא ת intel מסמל מירוא
יבס קרואת את בנס הפיש והורה, שנסמר את הגנער
ויאזגל עץ-
ינוי הממון שומיר
יבט הפיש שומיר
גנער ذاتת פי.
ib. 28:17 Targum
ויימ תוניה הנביה בכנעא חותא בשמהו החלה והתחדשה
Com. Y.
San. 11, וו
ינוי תוניה הנביה... שמה אוחין החלה, בה האמאך כנ.
וא BLE שתקי בברך ארוש השנה והבח את בינך את בניה
חקסאי או הדב, שייהו חואת ר"ה המשיב עשת הנואחו
שה菲尔 פיש.
Com. also v. 16.
ib. 32:18 Targum
ומשמל חזרו
Com. Moed Katan 16b
אובאת הנביה קהה דר משלים ותמותו
Likewise all Targumim to Exod. 34:7 making that the suffering sons are subject to punishment also on their own account. This explanation is that assumed in Berakoth 7a
אורי וקביעת מלך עון אבות על בני יים
נוכי карן ואיתו במתו על אבות רכסי קריאדרי משלים לא ניסיא
והא משי אורו והיתוך בייתיא, והא שומיאי אוחינו.
The reference is to San. 27b.
ib. 38:7 Targum
ויישמ עבד רמלה
Com. Moed Katan 16b
כיצא בברך את אוחין יישמ עבד
But Sifri Num. 99
(mentioned anonymously by Rashi) would interpret it to refer to Baruch b. Neriah.
Ez. 1:1 Targum
ויהו וישם שנים לימים
This numerical interpretation is given in Seder Olam.
Com. Jalqat l. c.
ib. 3...
והי הו
Targum...
This numerical interpretation is given in Seder Olam.
Com. Jalqat l. c.
Also Rab Chisda Moed Katan 25a.

ib. 24 Targum of the homily in Gen. r. 65, 5: שיוואט שאומרי השם יראת המלך אחרון ותשלום המדים. Its repetition in the v. 25 is interpreted by the T. in the same way, the silence preceding the word of prophecy descending upon the prophet.

ib. 2:10 Targum of the homily in Gen. r. 31, 1, as interpreted rightly in Com. Gen. Jalqut l. c.; Esther r. 6.

ib. 13:5 So Pesiqta 33. The targumist, however, would interpret as referring to the High Priest.

ib. 11 So Pesiqta 33.

ib. 12 So Tanchuma Gen. 19 (Buber) על נאם עוזית התחלתי והם בסך הכל הזה 있습니다. So Baba Bathra 77a. אֶרֶץ רַעָה אֵם רַפְּאָה מְשֹאָב מָלֵךְ וּמְרַגֵּשׁ בִּזְרַעְנָיו וְלֹא לֹא אֵם לֹא רַעָה מְשֹאָב מְרַגֵּשׁ בִּזְרַעְנָיו. אֶרֶץ תָּמִיר בָּשָׁלֵט בִּזְרַעְנָיו.

ib. 45:11 Targum: "םובס חתת מאיי: סימן מתכלה תמר הבת יתמה. Com. Menachoth 77a משג יתמה מאיי: סימן מתכלה תמר הבת יתמה. The T. to v. 14 is literal. The specification here of the number of kors is because it forms the source for the inferente of the measure of the epha.

Hos. 2:1 Targum: "ויהי בובוס אושר יאמר כי המת אפיי: חהל. This interpretation agrees with Sifri Num. 131. And Pesiqta 11. R. Meir, however (Kidushin 36a), would not draw such a distinction.

ib. 2:1 Targum: "יך גוזי וים וויירא". So Pesachim 88a "אמר יתומ גוזי וים וביית גוזי וים שיאמר כי גוזי וים וויירא.

ib. 7 Targum: "נהביה פֶּלֶפֶטִי. The T. explains ויהו הרבות והרבות as of the root to teach. It was so taken by others. Com. Deut. r. 2, 2: "אך שפלני חכמי כי נתה אמס והרבה הרבות. And the version in Jallcut l. c. אמר י. שפלני חכמי: הרחום מוביאש ברicha. בנגל עם האריות בצ'רנים, נפוא אמס רמך כי נתה אמס..."

ib. 65a Targum: "רשויי. Com. Ketuboth. רביהוشنא שמתשהフト עלולות מהא וננה כתשימי."

ib. 4:7 Targum: "כם ואהניא בלו רעוז סימן מיהא מים רעון ביה סזר סום. Deut. r. 2, 2. In a similar way Lxx.

ib. 2:2 Targum: "חיינו כים ת ומתה עדתי וירה. The Messianic interpretation of this v. was a current one. Com. San. 97a; Rosh Hashana 31a. Com also Seder Eliahu r. 6: חיים מימין זה הולך הזה והימנה המשה: עירו שלישי יוימין זה הולך הנה.

ib. 7:4 Targum Jon. ועֲלָה דָּוִד וַעֲלֵיהּ סְגוֹלָה בֵּצֶע פְּרָיָהּ וַעֲלֵיהּ מִשְׁפָּטָוּ קְיָם יָרוּחַ וַעֲלֵיהּ סְגוֹלָה בֵּצֶע פְּרָיָהּ וַעֲלֵיהּ מִשְׁפָּטָוּ קְיָם יָרוּחַ. This sense is not found in any Targum.

ib. 8:4 Targum Jon. וְסִיסְתַּרְנָה רַבָּתָוּ נַגְּדֵה קְנָּיָה בֵּצֶע כְּפֶסֶם וּוֹתֵם. Cf. Com. Gen. r., 28, 7: Targum, inter alia, interprets in the same way Ez. 7:19.


So Eliahu r. 22.

Am. 4:12 Targum Jon. So Shab. 10a (Com. Rashi). Also Berakoth 23a.

ib. 7:2 Targum Jon. וּבֵיתוֹ אַגְּפֵר. Cf. Com. Lev. r., 33, 2: The Targum understands that the place of the sacrifice was in the house, not in the temple, as is generally understood.

ib. 9:1 Targum Jon. וּמֹס מְנַרְנָה אָתָּא אָמְרָה. Cf. Com. Lev. r., 33, 2: That is, the sacrifice is not for the whole community, but only for one person.


Jona 1:3 Targum Jon. וְכִסָּה הַנּוֹשָׁא הַר שָׁם לְחָדָשׁ אֲלֵךְ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ אֶל כְּפֶסֶם וּוֹתֵם. The targumist desired to thus eliminate the difficulty to explain the flight of the Prophet. Com. Mechilta, vol. 1, p. 26: אֲלֵךְ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ אֲלֵךְ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ אֲלֵךְ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ. The taurgumist, however, has struck a plain and genital interpretation by putting a complement to כְּפֶסֶם וּוֹתֵם.
Mi. 2:13 Targum: This interpretation seems to have been held by r. Simon b. Aba (Gen. r. 73, 3)

Mica 4:5 Targum: Instead ofCod. Reuch has (Y. 9,10).

Hab. 3:9 Targum: This interpretation is implied in Mishna Sota 47a.

ib. 7:1 Targum: אינא שאבניא אבאר (Cod. also Sifri Deut. 117, 14).

Com. Shochar Tob 1, 20 Targum: Com. also Sifri Deut.

Com. Gen. r. 47, 1 ד"ה אפור תחא ת"ב א"b. Com. also Sifri Deut.

ib. 14 Targum: Com. Mechilta 2:5 עשה נא אור עד שיאבאה על על פי הארץ ומכותיהם...

Zef. 2:5 Com. Cant. אינא ד ]]ו ל ת"כ לא עשה נא א"ב א"ב א"b. Com. also Sifri Deut.

Zef. 3:8 Com. Cant. אינא ד ]]>ו ל ת"כ לא עשה נא א"ב א"b. Com. also Sifri Deut.

Zech. 3:3 The Agadist also took 'to mean, from the root', תער. Com. also Exod. r. 17 end שבתקיר קלא והו נומד ואל שאלום בק-disc... והכית באל קל א"ב א"ב א"b. Com. also Sifri Deut.

ib. 8 Targum: אינא ד ]]>ו ל ת"כ לא עשה נא א"b. Com. also Sifri Deut.

Exod. r. 9, 1
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

וְרָמַשׁ חֹבַּהּ קְפָרֶהָ מַשָּׁהָ בִּית Com. Cant. 1:12 סֶלֶפֶסֶךְ וְרָמַשׁ מַנְחָה.

This rendering is at the foundation of this Agada as well as that of R. Jehuda, who finds in it the implication of the thirty righteous ones among the Gentiles who exist by their virtue.

וְרָמַשׁ חֹבַּהּ קְפָרֶהָ מַשָּׁהָ בִּית Com. Suk. 22a יָדוֹ בְּרֵיהּ ו֮ קְפָרֶהָ מַשָּׁהָ בִּית

כֹּלָהָּ אֶרֶם הַקָּדוֹשׁ בֵּית וְגֵרֵיהֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדָשָׁה קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן בַּשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם بָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם הַשָּׁהָתָהוֹן שֵׁם קְדִישָׁה מִצְמִיתָם שׁוּמָּם בָּאָרֶם H סלפים קודות וחוזיות מגוון שPlayable מחוזה גוזר ויהלום מגורים ויהלום שמתים סלפים קודות וחוזיות מגוון Shab. 55b פה.י. 55b מתיי יי. כה.י. ויחו לöyle חכמים עוזה הצופרים ואחר

יבר יי. 11 כה.י. ויחו לוי כל מתים מחוזה.
GENERAL PECULIARITIES

The Targum Jonathan reflects many interesting peculiarities which arose primarily from the state of mind of the age which produced the Agada and the Apocryphal literature. The Targum was read in public worship, and the translator would have to take full account of the susceptibilities of the worshipper. On the other hand, in the homiletic portions ample expression is to be found of the believes, expectations and views of that generation.

The targumist made it a principle to differentiate between the holy and the profane. Words which are equally applied to the holy and unholy are rendered by the targumist by distinct words to maintain the difference. The Masorites follow a similar way. So that when א is followed by the name of God it is vocalized with a patach (1S 20:3, 2S 12:15 etc.). While followed by a profane it is vocalized with a zeire. Genesis 42:15. (Com. 1S 28:26) The same tendency was made evident in the vocalization of א two words and in such forms as in the compound א and ב (Joshua 10:13) and א (Judges 1:5, 6, 7). The targsmist carried the principle to an extreme application.1)

The distinction between them rendering the profane —

1) Com. Geiger p. 3. Such a distinction has its parallel in the Talmud. So it is said (Shabbath 32a): “For three transgressions are women dying. Others say because they call the א (box); R. Ishmael b. Elazar says: ‘For the transgression of two things are the amei ha’ara’azoth dying; for calling the א and the Beth Ha-K’neseth is called Beth Am.” No doubt, despite the unanimity of the commentators that Arna and Beth Am are derisive, and for this reason their application to holy subjects was condemned, they desired to separate the holy from the profane. It would appear that this was urged only as a sort of mannerism. For the Talmud does not follow this distinction; in many passages Arna is employed in the sense of קור . (Com. Berakoth 47b).
This scrupulousness of the T. is strikingly illustrated by his treatment of this term applied to idolatrous divinity, which is made by the context to inevitably express godly divinity. So Judges 6:31 אֶת־אֲדֹנֵי־אֲדֹנֵי־בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יִהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל: This rendering which, it would appear, was suggested by such passages as Is. 44:10; Jer. 2:8 etc., he applies also to 2K 19:18; Is. 37:19 רֹעֵץ אֲדֹנִי אֲדֹנִי, "the useless one"; also Ez. 28:2, 9, in all of which the divine sense of אלוהים is obvious. But the targumist is anxious to avoid even an innocent profanation of this sort. On the other hand, when this profane אלוהים is not employed in the sense of incrimination but as a fact the rendering is "fear" 2).

So for instance 2K 18:33; 34:35; Is. 36:18; 37:12 חַטָּאת אֲדֹנִי חַטָּאת, or Jerem. 2:28; 11:13 כְּמוֹפָר אֵלִי אֲדֹנִי "fear" 2), 

2) The Talmud also employs its Hebrew equivalent וּרְאָה so San. 64a, 106a. Also Y. Kedushin 1; P'siqta of Rab Koha p. 65.

On the other hand, אָדֹנִי is employed in the divine sense also. See Proverbs 1, 7: יִשְׂרָאֵל וּרְאָה and F. Deut. 32:13 וִיהי הָעָם לִשָּׁמָע אֲדֹנִי and Is. 2:6 יִשְׂרָאֵל וּרְאָה.
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So also Jona 1:5, דְּרַחֲמֵיהּ מִשְׁפָּעָתָו אֶל הָאָרֶץ. Here it was only meant to state the plain reality. Com. also Ex. 28:2, 9.

In the case of the first two instances the targumist has merely identified the profane עַלְכָּם with the special name given to idols in the Bible, namely אַלְכָּםָא and דְּרַחֲמֵי, both of which he renders by מַעֲשֶׂה with the exception of the latter, which is in the most cases added to מַעֲשֶׂה. Com. Is. 8:8, 18, 20; 19:1, 3; Ez. 14:3; 18:6 etc. In this tendency the T. Jonathan is followed by Onkelos and the other Targumim only. With one exception, namely אַלְכָּם אֲרָיוֹת in the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:3; Deut. 5:7), in which case Onkelos would not sidetrack the meaning, rendering them by אַלְכָּם אֲרָיוֹת פָּרָנָה (Ps. Jon. following On.). In all other cases On. also renders the profane מַעֲשֶׂה אַלְכָּם (Exod. 23:24; 34:15; Deut. 12:2) and goes even with Jon. to render מעשה אַלְכָּם. Of the other early translations no such distinction is noticeable, neither in the Pentateuch nor in any other part of the Bible, except in two cases in Lxx. These are: Num. 25:2. Com. Frankel, Über d. Ein., 175.

Usually is rendered by the targumist by the Aramic מַרְבָּחא. But this rendering is applied only to the holy, to God’s altar. Whenever it refers to the profane, referring to the idol either in stative or implied sense, it is rendered by אַנְגָּיָא, the pile. Ez. 6:4; Hos. 8:9; גָּיוֹרִים — וֹנֶסֶם מְבוֹשִׁיתוֹ; Is. 17:8; 27:9; Jer. 11:13; 17:12; Ez. 6:4, 6 etc. Accordingly יִמְשָׁר פֶּן מְבוֹשֵׁהוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְעֵד אֱלֹהִים (Is. 36:7) the former is rendered by מְרַבֵּחַ אֱלֹהִים and the latter by מְרַבֵּחַ אֱלֹהִים.

In this case also, the Lxx and P. are making no such distinction. The only exception is the Targum Onk. and the other Targumim. They draw the same distinction and employ the same terms. Com. T. Exod. 34:13; Deut. 12:3; 7:5 etc. 3.

3) So the rendering by Onkelos יִמְשָׁר פֶּן מְבוֹשֵׁהוּ (Genesis 31:46) is usually used to denote the worship of a false cult (Noeldke, Zeit. für Asur. v. 20, p. 131). This distinction, it would appear, was not known to the Jews in Egypt in the fifth century B. C. The temple or shrine or altar of the Jews in Yeb is called אַנְגָּיָא (Sayce Aram. Pap. E. 14, 1). However, in Pap. 3 instead of אַנְגָּיָא the term em-
A distinction of this kind is traceable also in the Talmud. There is no particular name in the Talmud for the profane altar. But it has, however, special appellations for objects connected with the altar, one of which has a derisive air. So a sacrifice to an idol is called קִרְבָּנָה קִרְבּוֹן; Chullin 13b, 24a. But while the Targum to the Pentateuch reserves קִרְבָּנָה for the profane offering, the holy offering being rendered by קְרָבָּנָה קְרָבָּנָא, קְרָבָּנָא is the judicial term, applied to idolatrous sacrifice in the Talmud using however קִרְבָּנָה to denote present. Com. Nedarim 20a; Ab. Zara 64b. So does also T. Jonathan. 5) Com. Hos. 12:2, although Korban is joined by the Tetragramm (Menachoth 110a, Sifra Lev. 2). Sometimes the idolatrous sacrifice is called נְחֵי פִּסְמָה (according to PS 106:28) Aboth 3, 3; Aboda Zara 29b; 32b.

Instead of the usual verb for sacrificing, the Talmud in several places uses the verb לוּב to manure. 6) Aboda Zara 18b; Y. Berakoth 9, 1; Pesiqa r. 6.

__

I am tempted to assume that this was prompted by this very desire of differentiating the holy from the profane temple. Here, the writer is a Jew and the writing was intended for Jews, and therefore he would not use the profane name קְרָבָּנָה for the holy temple. The others are documents of an official nature intended for the consideration of a Persian official or court. The current name of a temple would be used in such a case. Sachau’s assumption (ib. p. 29) that קְרָבָּנָא was somewhat the intimate appellation among the Jews of the synagogue (p. 12) is not impressive. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the priest of the temple is called קֹוָן קֹוָן וּבַּכָּה (Pap. 11), while the idolatrous priest is called קומָר קומָר שְּרָפֵי אַלּות אֲשֶׁר (P. 1 and Sayce E. 15). However, there is not sufficient ground in this to justify the assumption that even then the Jews would observe a distinction to which later generations adhered. The writer might simply have used the appellation by which the Jewish priest was commonly known.

4) קִרְבָּנָה is the abbreviated form of קָרְבָּנָה. The Targum renders by it הספר (Genesis 32:13; 20:21; Is. 18:7; Jer. 51:59 etc.).

5) It would seem that T. Jonathan did not follow at all such a distinction. So טוּבֶּשׁ קֹוָנָה (Ex. 20:28) is rendered by T. Jon. קֵרְבֶּנֵו עַל מִשְׁמֹת קְרָבָּנָה unless the translator understood it in a holy sense.

6) In Tosefta Ab. Zara 2 there is קָרְבָּנָה instead of קִרְבָּנָה, although in Pesiqa r. 6 קְרָבָּנָא אִיּוֹן וּיְבִלְוָל קַיְלִוָל. The version in Sota 36b is
Moved with this spirit, the Targum is also differently rendering Kohan according as the reference is to an Aaronite or a priest of an idol. The latter is rendered by כרמ (So Jer. 48:7; 49:3) or, which is the usual rendering, by יהוה אימל (2K 10:19; 17:32 etc.) which is considered by some scholars to be a translation of the Persian Aθarman, the priest of the fire-worshippers. (See Aruch, Kohut כרמ). Both of them are found in the Talmud and the Agada. The priest of the idol is called מַשֵּׁרְת (San. 63b, 64a). In one passage both of them are used side by side, namely Erub. 79b. כרמ however is the usual connotation for the Kohan of the idol. But 2S 8:18: Now the rendering is רַבְרָבָּא; bn קְנֶה דָּוִד הָעָלָם... (Com. Mech. רַבְרָבָּא כְּנֶה דָּוִד הָעָלָם... 1, נְחָת. Com. Mek. 1.c.) כְּנֶה מְרֵי; רַבְרָבָּא אֱלֹהִים כְּנֶה דָּוִד... יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה; כְּנֶה מְרֵי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה כְּנֶהָה סְנַמְר נְחוֹתָה סְנַמְר נְחוֹתָה כְּנֶה מְרֵי יִשְׁמַע יְהוָה. This is the name of the chief priest in the church of the Gentiles. (Com. also Cant. r. beginning and Gen. r. 87,3. The T. Jon. in general does not favor any distinction in this case. Thus 1K 11:8: and other places. So Onk. Num. 24:2 Deut. 32:17: בֵּית נַחֲלָה בֵּית נַחֲלָה This principle found application in the Bible. בֵּית נַחֲלָה בֵּית נַחֲלָה. This might have been the reason for the peculiar vocalization of מָשֶׁרֶת (Ezek. 7:24), which is otherwise hardly explicable. (Com. Kimchi l. c.; Ew. Gramm. 215 Jahn, Das Buch Ez. l. c.). The reference here is to the idolatrous shrines (so Rashi, Kratesschmar and many others) and was so understood by the Masorites. They therefore changed the pointing as a mark of distinction. Similarly בשיריה (Ezra 10:2; Nehemia 13:23) instead of בשיריה. As in the judgment of the writer intermarriage is an enormous violation of the Law, he would hesitate to use the word commonly used for the act of taking to a wife.

The names of Gods should be changed into derogatory names (R. Akiba in Sifri Deut. 61). Mockery of the idol was the rule with the Hellenistic Jews also. It was for this reason that they applied the גְּנֵטִילֶה to what the גְּנֵטִילֶה called גְּנֵטִילֶה (Diesmann, Die Hellen., p. 5). Likewise the idolatrous festival is called רַבְרָבָּא (Abod. Zara 2a), and Maimonides (in his commentary on Mishnayoth) says: "and it is not allowed to call them (the festivals of the idolators) because they are בְּרִית because they are בְּרִית)." Com. Rab, Aboda Zara 20a. A temple of an idol is called רַבְרָבָּא (Mishna Ab. Zara 29b, 32b). Its underlying meaning is not from רַבְרָבָּא but synonymous with רַבְרָבָּא as Tos. (Ibid 32b beginning תָּחֹנִי).
Also 2S 20:26. The targumist does not consider them priests of any kind, although with regard to the T. is in opposition to the view expressed in the Talmud (Erubin 63b) that he was a righteous priest. On the other hand, 1S 1:3 Targum Meshejrih Tovin tomhah b'chonim 26 obviously because they were sinful priests, as against Samuel b. Nachmani, who would clear them of crime (Shab. 55b). Impelled by the same consideration, the T. renders המה (1S 9, 12, 13, 14, 25) by קסבתא by which he renders מיסקבר (1S 20:18) and אספדיה (1S 9:22) to distinguish it from the bama denoting high places of idolatrous worship which he renders by בַּכּוֹת (1K 13:32; 14:23 etc.), having also the meaning of heaps of ruins. (Ex. 36:2). The targumist appears to decline the talmudic view (Zebachim 112b, 118a) that the ban of bama had been lifted at that time. In order to exonerate Samuel of the sin of bama-worship, the T. rendered המה as denoting the place where gatherings were held with the Prophet. Hence the rendering for אָרָיָה מָטָוָא (1S 9:13) in the essenic sense 7) by המה (Ant. 1, 18, 5; Berakoth 55a), while 1S 16:3, 5 is equally rendered by בָּכּוֹת. For the same reason the T. renders לְקַסְבָּה instead of לְבַכּוֹת which is otherwise the rendering of רעָמִים (So On. Ps. Jon. Gen. 31:19). As well said Levy (Chal. Woer.): “Um nicht einem Jüdischen Priest die Anbetung eines hömlichen götten Bildes zuzuschreiben.” So he differentiates in the rendering of אָפָד. When it is used in a holy sense (1S 2:28) it is rendered אָפָד but in a profane sense (1S 2:18; 2S 5:14) it is translated רְבֻּר. This is the rendering of סְעִילָם (2S 13:18). As regards other translations, the same connotation for the priest of the idol is adopted by Onk. and P., while the Lxx makes no distinction.

Of the same character is the separation drawn by the targumist between משפָּם referring to that of God or Israel and that of the Gentiles. In the former case it is rendered by יְרוּשָׁלָיָה.

7) Abudraham (שֶׁיחָרִית יְשׁאָלָה) cites a Targum Yerushalmi which would seem to be a later recension, this principle being disregarded. The rendering there is: אָרְיָה תַּאֲוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּכָה. 
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Referred to the מַשֶּׁפֶת of the Gentiles or denoting custom it is rendered by the Greek νόμος. So Ex. 5:7 — תִּשְׁמַץ עָמָּיו Targum — והא מַשֶּׁפֶת לא תִשְׁרָר; Ez. 20:18 — ונומדוס דעומית וריא Targum in one verse Ez. 11:12 יְרוּשָׁלַּם בַּא אָה דא אֲלָה דֹּמָנִי מַשֶּׁפֶת לָא תַּעֲשֶׂה תַּנְוָה Targum יד בְּיוֹפֵר אֶל הָלָכָה וּדֹּמָנִי לָא עֲבָדָה מַשֶּׁפֶת. When מַשֶּׁפֶת denotes custom: 1S 2:13 מַשֶּׁפֶת הָבוֹמָה (1S 8:9 מַשֶּׁפֶת הָלָכָה וּרְוִי; (2K 1:7 מַשֶּׁפֶת הָלוֹא מִלָּה מַשֶּׁפֶת) Targum וּרְוִי הָלוֹא מִלָּה Targum. Also Am. 8:14 מַשֶּׁפֶת בָּרֹאָה-שְׁבִיעַ Targum. Applying to the holy laws, commandments or judgment it is rendered דֶּעָם. Of this sort are Is. 1:27; 3:14; 5:7; Jer. 2:12; 22:3; Ez. 20:16; 12:21, 24. Sometimes suggested by Instances of both cases are numerous. On the other hand, מַשֶּׁפֶת the contents truthful, is added. Instances of this kind are Jer. 5:1 מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת וּדֹּדָה מַשֶּׁפֶת So vv. 4, 5; 7:9 מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת Targum מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת. Ez. 18:19 מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת Targum מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת. It appears from the citations that the targumist adds מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת when מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת מַשֶּׁפֶת is the object of מַשֶּׁפֶת, did, or when this is understood by the targumist to be implied. (Jerem. 5:45). It might have appeared to him that to render מַשֶּׁפֶת in these cases by דֶּעָם alone would be obscure, as it might be taken in a profane sense. In this connection it will be noticed that in a single case is מַשֶּׁפֶת rendered by קִימָה, otherwise the rendering of מַשֶּׁפֶת as it will appear presently. This is Jer. 8:7. However, there is also the object of מַשֶּׁפֶת. The Lxx and P. in the Prophets are not following such a distinction. Onk. renders מַשֶּׁפֶת by צִמִּית if it refers to Gentiles. So Lev. 20:23 etc., while otherwise מַשֶּׁפֶת, as is the case with Jonathan, is rendered by כֵּימָה. So Lev. 20:22; 26:3 etc.; the Lxx have for מַשֶּׁפֶת in holy sense προσταταγματος So ibid: 20:22; 26:3 etc.

While the profane מַשֶּׁפֶת ibid 2:23 is rendered by Lxx νομίμος In the Talmud this term is applied to custom, manner, judicial formatlity. (Com. Gittin 43b; 65b).

The same principle the targumist applies to מַשֶּׁפֶת. It is rendered by זִרָה מַשֶּׁפֶת when it refers either to Gentiles or idolatrous
law or order. When, however, it refers to the holy laws, it is rendered by נויר in the Targum (the usual rendering of נויר). Instances of the latter are: Jer. 31:35; Ez. 5:6; 18:9, 10, 19, 21; Am. 2:4; Ze. 1:6; Mal. 3:22 etc. Instances of the former are: Jer. 10:6; 33:25 Targum יורע התוות (the same 33:34 Targum יורע התוות שַׁלֶּשׁ אֲוִיר Ez. 20:18 חַיָּה אֵאֲוִיר 43:18 Targum יורע התוות 44:5 חַיָּה אֵאֲוִיר. In Ez. 33:9 תְּרוּאָה חַיָּה — בֵּית תְּרוּאָה. In this way the T. renders Ez. 20:25 יורע — אֵאֲוִיר, thus eliminating the disturbing nature of this passage. According to this rendering of the T., the assumption is that also their customs (laws) were decreed by God. Concerning the use of יורע it will be noticed that in the Talmud it has the effect of arbitrariness. So there are hard interpretations (Makkoth 24a; Ketuboth 3b; Shab. 145b). A similar interpretation can be recalled, Gittin 59b; Taanith 2 יורע מַהֲרָה וְעָבַרְתָּם וּבְרָאשָׁה תְּרוּאָה; to the targumist it appeared to express profanity. Apart from Jonathan, no other translation adheres in this case to such a distinction.

The same principle is applied by Jonathan to the rendering of נבי. In the case of the true prophet, the one sent by God, it is rendered by נבי, its Aramic equivalent. On the other hand, whenever it carries the implication of either false prophetism or, so to say, professional prophetism, נבי is rendered by מפר. מפר is a term of general currency in the age of the Targum. So it renders Is. 9:14 מפר וְגֹבַע מַרְוֹה שֶׁל יר. 6:13 מפר. מפר in plural: Ez. 32:25 מפר בְּנֵי נבֶיאָה. Ze. 7:3 מפרים נְבֵיאָה — מַיָּה נבֶיאָה. Note 15 15:5 מפרים נְבֵיאָה — נְבֵיאָה נבֶיאָה.

When reference is made to a prophet of another deity, the targumist renders it literally, adding השה false. So Jer. 2:8 בנביים נבֶיאָה 31:5 בנביים — בנביים בְּנֵי נבֶיאָה 22:10 בנביים. To this category belongs also Mi. 2:5. There is another case which is intimately connected with these cases. In the first place the T.

8) Kohut's identifying יורע with עָבַר as suggested by the rendering of the T. (see Aruch) (דָּרֶך) is based on his overlooking the principle of distinction of the T.
applies the same distinction to the verb as well as to the noun. Referring to the true prophet is rendered by the T. נבואה, referring to the false prophet it has a substitute expressing ridicule. So Jer. 29:26 מַסִּמֵּשׁ — ַנְּי יִשְׂרָאֵל מַסִּמֵּשׁ (but v. 27 מַסִּמֵּשׁ). 1K 18:29 אֶתְפָּרִיא — וַיֹּאמֶר רַע כֹּלָּהּ וַיֹּאמֶר

In all these cases the Targum stands alone among other translations in observing such a differentiation.

Special regard has been paid in rendering by the targumist to Israel. In the first place some harsh expressions flung towards Israel is rendered in such a way as to evaporate their sharpness. It should be remarked that in this the Targum is to some extent followed by all the Greek translations as well as the Peshitta. A few cases will be sufficient to illustrate the point.

The Piel from שָׁבַב in the sense of transgression is given a favorable turn when applied to Israel. (Jer. 3:6) is rendered by the T. מַחְתַּתְתִי כָּפַלַחַתָּנוּ Lxx: κατακλύσα. So also P. In the same way T. Lxx P. in v. 8 A. Sym. יִכְפֹּרַה לְאַדָּמָם. In v. 11 the T. and P. are following the same rendering while Lxx omit מַשָּׁבָה. Again (v. 14) T. and P. render as in former cases, Lxx

9) It is generally known that Jewish-Hellenistic writers, led, it would appear, by this principle, applied σήκων to the Gentiles, while retaining לאש for the Jewish people. (So Wisd. 15:14. Com. Cheyne, Encyc. Biblica, Hellen.). The Lxx followed the same division in an opposite way, applying the latter to the Gentiles. Com. Gen. 23:12, 13; 42:10 etc מַחְתַּתְתִי כָּפַלַחַתָּנוּ — לאש רַגְלֵיהם. But Lev. 20, 2, 4 the rendering is רִיקָנָךְ שְׁפֵנוֹ, the reference being to Israel. Com. also 2 Mak. 6:3. In this connection it is of interest to note that Rashi somehow felt this peculiarity in the Targum. However, he is wrong in the illustration. Thus he remarks in Ze. 13:7: "the Targum never renders רָבִיב when they are those of Israel except by לאש וְשָׁבַב and not by שְׁפֵנוֹ. It is first of all to be remarked that the rendering of שְׁפֵנוֹ by רָבִיב is not peculiar to those of Israel. The same is applied to those of other nations also. Com. Is. 16:6; 34:6 (having both renderings used synonymously); Jer. 25:19; 39:3; 46:21, 23, and in many other instances. On the other hand we find שְׁפֵנוֹ applied to those of Israel. So Is. 37:24 etc.

10) This is also the case in Onk. (Com. Deut. 32:6 the rendering of רָבִיב וְרֹאשׁ). See A. Berliner, Onk. p. 120.)
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

having ἀνεπεξεργασθεῖς; Sym. σεμβλθνεῖν. V. 22 

The Hebrew word מְשַׁתְּפָּן, is rendered by T. מְשַׁתְּפָּן, however, is rendered by the Lxx affliction (so that there is no reason to ascribe to the Lxx a different reading; com. Schlesner Lexicon סחבון). Also ib. 5:6, 31:32. Exceptions are: Jer. 2:19; 14:17, where Lxx render in the unfavorable sense. Targum and P. hold to the above rendering.

The same word is rendered in its intended sense when it refers to other nations than Israel. Note Jer. 49:4 (referring to Amon). T. מְשַׁתְּפָּן, Lxx סָפַר, ἀκαθαρτιά audacious. Also Is. 47:10 נַעֲלוֹת — הֲמַהְמָה וָתַתְּפָּן. Is. 57:17 forms an exception, although the reference is made to Israel, the rendering by the T. and Lxx is plain. So strong, it appears, was the force of suggestion of the contents of this particular case that it was felt impossible to make other account of it. 11)

In the following case the T. is followed by Aquila in some measure. Ez. 2:10 נַעֲלוֹת אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה כִּי יִטַּעֲבֵר וּצָה וּרְאֵהנִי, renders: נַעֲלוֹת אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה כִּי יִטַּעֲבֵר וּצָה וּרְאֵהנִי. In this way the gloomy prediction is turned into one of consolation. A., it seems, was also actuated by the same motive, rendering עָנִיּוֹנִים — c r e a t i o n (probably from the root עָנִיּוֹנִים; com. also Is. 28:9; 56:3; Hos. 13:14.

In his regard for Israel the T. goes farther to differentiate them from other peoples. Here are some interesting examples: Jer. 1:10 נַעֲלוֹת אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה וַיְהוָה וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע. The T. divides the phrase, assigning its favorable part to Israel. 11)

11) Kimchi’s Sefer Ha-Sharashim, after enumerating all the cases which the targumist as well as the Greek translations and the P. render them by its favorable meaning, remarks: “all these mean rebellion.” In this point he follows Menachem Ibn Saruck. (Com. Machbereth שׁוֹבִיב). In Machbereth Rabenu Tam (Ed. Pilowsky) p. 36, it is said: Hos. 8:6 שׁוֹבִיב יִחוּד יִבְּכֵי סָפַר וּלְאַהֲבֵי רַבִּית הַשָּׁמְשַׁר וּלְאַהֲבֵי רַבִּית הַשָּׁמְשַׁר כִּי יִחוּד יִבְּכֵי. The sinful man is called שׁוֹבִיב, being removed from the good direction.
GENERAL PECULIARITIES

Nothing but a passionate regard for Israel could have produced such a rendering. Com. Is. 10:25; Jer. 18:7, 12.) This scrupulous passion for Israel is accompanied by a kind of active disregard for the gentiles. It was the product of the catastrophes of the age. Thus the targumist is aghast at the idea that the prophet should be overcome by the calamities of other peoples. For this reason he changes the person, and instead of the prophet agonizing for sympathy, as the text requires, the peoples involved are describing their sufferings. So, for instance, Is. 15:5:

Targum יימוח על פי ממה ימין

Is. 16:11; Jer. 48:36

Targum על פי ממה ימין

Is. 21:3

Targum על פי ממה ימין והיהו

and v. 4: 4

This biblical phrase הוא ימין והיהו

Targum הוא ימין והיהו

ם עשתו על פי ממה ימין והיהו

In some instances he retains the p. but alters the sense. Examples of this sort are:

Is. 16:9; Jer. 48:32

Targum על פי ממה ימין והיהו

עשתו על פי ממה ימין והיהו

But otherwise is such a case treated by the targumist when Israel is meant. The prophet's description of his feelings towards the affliction of Israel is rendered literally. So Is. 22:4:

Targum של נביא מיuments על פי ממה ימין והיהו

The Lxx are in agreement with the Targum in the rendering of Is. 15:5 and Jer. 48:31 and v. 36. The Syriac in all these cases follows the literal meaning. The fact that Aq. and Sym. have instead of the rendering of the Lxx of vv. 31, 36 one which is literal strengthens the supposition that the renderings of the Lxx in these cases were caused by the same motives as lead the targumist to his. However, there is less consistence in the Lxx with regard to this point. Com. Lxx Is. 16:9, 11.

12) Kimchi remarks: "And Jonathan divided this verse—the unfavorable for the Gentiles and the favorable for Israel." In the present Rabbinic text the קָלַע יִשְׂרָאֵל is omitted, evidently by the censor. Com. Exod. r. 45, 1.
On the other hand, this peculiar agreement between the Lxx and the Targum is another case of weight for an hypothesis of a common background of these translations.

However, Geiger (Ur. 245 et seq.), who carried this principle too far, failed to notice these renderings. He was most unfortunate in the choice of examples. Thus his assertion (p. 93) that Jer. 48:47; 49:6, where the restoration of Moab and Ammon is foretold, are not rendered in the Lxx, is erroneous, for the lost renderings are found in Gmg.

Other examples are: Jer. 8:23; 13:17; 14:17; Mi. 4:5 etc. Com. particularly Ze. 8:2. Other agadists would not follow this interpretation. Com. Num. r. 20, 1. The targumist would not have been actuated by a hatred towards the respective peoples; Edom and Moab have ceased to exist at his time. It is more correct to take it as the reaction of the age against the Roman world. It is the deep-seated hatred of the time immediately preceding and following the destruction of the second Temple. It was the Prophetical writings where that generation looked for the signs of the times. The prophecies were interpreted in the terms of that period. The old oppressors of Israel, long dead, were revived in the new oppressors. Edom and Aram become Rome or Persia. Compassion by the prophet towards the biblical enemies would strike them as if their present oppressors were meant. Such would be horrible to them.

The targumist shares in full measure the worshipful veneration of the Torah manifested in the Talmud and Agada. The Torah is given by him prominence in the Prophetical books. The Torah is identified with words descriptive, in the sense they are employed, of qualities representing the will of God. The targumist is again reflecting current views which are to be found in the Agada. עטרה ימי is identified by the T. with the Torah. Is. 40:14 מפריוו דרreuו Targum אורייתא ימי מימי רעה (Hos. 6:6). Connected with it is Am. 3:10 לא ודוה לכל ולא ודוה עשת נבולה; Is. 30:10 לא ודוה כל ולא ודוה עשת נבולה

13) Com. Alef Beitha of R. Akiba A'in: "and she ,the Torah, is called ימי , as it is written" etc.
GENERAL PECULIARITIES

Targum אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה. So also IS. 2:3; Mi. 4:2 אָלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum בּוֹרֵא אֵיבָא מָמָא Targum וּאֵיבָא מָמָא Targum הבּוֹרֵא אֵיבָא מָמָא Targum. Is. 2:5 אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה; ib. 5:12 אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum יְרוּשָׁלָיָה. Hos. 9:5 אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum נֶפֶשׁ יְרוּשָׁלָיָה. Jerem. 4:5 אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum נֶפֶשׁ יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum. אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה (So Hos. 5:9); ib. 27:5 אַלְפֹּתִים יְרוּשָׁלָיָה Targum Jer. 32:6 את תּוֹרָה (Com. Is. 55:1); Ze. 13:1 את תּוֹרָה Targum שְׁמִיר תּוֹרָה Targum שְׁמִיר תּוֹרָה. In their related positions, whether those cases occur in metaphor or are simply conceived, they carry the significance of the all-conceived good which Israel is urged by the Prophet to follow. It was natural for the T., as it was the case with his contemporary agadists, to identify them with the Torah.

The Torah thus gains centrifugal force in the prophecy. On the observances or disregard of its precepts hinges the fate of the nation; they are punished because they transgressed the Torah (Am. 9:1; Jer. 11:16; 5:22 etc.). Other peoples suffer for their failure to accept the Torah (Mi. 5:14). On the other hand, Israel forsaking the Torah ceases to be God’s people (Hos. 1:9; 2:1; Zef. 2:1). Repentance forstalls calamity, but this repentance is the return to the Torah (Is. 12:1; 31:7; Jer. 31:18; Ez. 34:1).

In this connection it is worth while noticing the Halakic element in the T. Jonathan. Of course, compared with the Pent., there is not much of Halaka in the Prophetic writings. But in a few cases, which are especially accessible to Halakic interpretation, the targumist follows the interpretation of the Halaka. All these cases occur in Ez.; the first is Ez. 24:17 מָאָרָךְ תְּבוּשָׁתָם שְׁלֹאָשׁ.

14) Com. Jalqut l. c.: “Who accepted the words of the Torah with fear.”
15) Com. Midrash Shochar Tob (49): “R. Aba says, sweet are the words of the Torah likened to etc.”
16) Com. Jalqut (prov. 8): “By me princes will (prov. 8:16), both the crown of priesthood an kingship come from the power of the Torah.”
18) Com. B. Kama 17a; Canticles r. 1.
The Targum renders—תפילה (Tephilin). This is in accordance with Sukka 25b: “Said R. Aba b. Zabada: A mourner has to observe all the commands of the Torah except Tephilin; for (this is to be inferred) because God said to Ez. מרשס תביה עלייך, you are obliged to observe it while a mourner, but no other mourner is to observe it.”
Ez. 44:17. Targum אַא וּדּוּרִי בּוֹטֶז וָאֶלֶף This agrees with the Beraith Zebachim 18b (end): “They (the priests) do not girt below their loins but against the knuckles.”

Finally there is Ez. 44:22. תְּרֵמָלְמָה אֱשׂר חַיָּה אֲמַלְמָה בְּם וַיַּחֲסִיוּ. Targum אֲמַלְמָה וְיָתַר אֲמַלְמָה שֶׁאֲמַלְמָא וְיָתַר אֲמַלְמָא This interpretation removes the flagrant contradiction which this interdiction presents to Lev. 3:17. It is so interpreted in Kid. 78b מָשָּׁא אֲגָזָא עִירָטַו—בְּמַחְתָּא עִירָטַו.

The Messianic hope occupies a prominent place in the exegesis of this Targum. In addition to the Messianic sense which the targumist is giving to passages admittedly accessible to such a conception, he introduces the Messianic note in many a passage that is scarcely allowing itself of such an implication. The targumist is following the current interpretation of that age of intense expectation.

In his Messianic interpretation the targumist had preserved many of the current ideas about the last days. On the whole, they are identical with the Messianic description contained in the Apocryphal books, Enoch and 4 Ezra and the Agada. The rectification of the evils of the world will be completed on the Day of Judgment. The evil doers are given respite in this world so that they may repent and turn to the Torah (Hab. 3:1, 2; Zef. 2:1, 2). But on the Day of Judgment stern judgment will be meted out to the evil doers. There will be no intercession and no escape (Is. 5:30. Com. 4 Ezra 7, 105; On. Deut. 32:12). After the closing of the decree (the Day of Judgment) there will be no acceptance of repentance (Is. 8:22). The world will be renewed (Jer. 23:23; Hab. 3:2. Com. Ps. Jon. Deut. 32:1). Great wonders and miracles will appear, as in the time of the Exodus from Egypt (Hos. 21:66; Ze. 10:11). The Messiah, who was created from the beginning of the world and who was hidden from the world on account of the sins of the
poople (Mi. 4:8; 5:1; Zech. 4:7; 6:12. Com. Enoch 48, 3, 6; 62, 7) will appear. There will be a resurrection of the death. It seems the targumist expects both the righteous and the wicked to resurrect, the former to receive final judgment. (Com. Is. 38:16; 42:11; 45:8, and particularly 57:16. Com. Enoch 51, 2, 3). The Great Court will sit to judgement (2S 23:7), the wicked will die a second death (IS. 22:14; 65:6; Jer. 51:39, 57; com. Enoch 22, 6-12; the Syr. Baruch 76, 4), they will be thrown in Gehenna (Is. 33:17; 53:9; Jer. 17:13; Hos. 14:10), whose fire is burning always (Is. 65:5). In Jerusalem will the wicked be condemned to Gehenna (Is. 33:14; com. Enoch 90:20). The righteous ones will live the life of eternity (Is. 58:11; Hos. 14:10); they will shine 343 times (7x7x7), as the light of the seven stars in the seven days of creation (Judges 5:31; 2S 23:4; Is. 30:26; the extant edition of the Tanchuma Gen. 6 cites the Targum to Judges 5:31). Com. Tanchuma ed. Buber, Gen. note 143.
INTERPOLATED TARGUM

The composite nature of T. Jonathan has been definitely demonstrated above. The T. did not escape the peculiar fate of the Greek and Syriac versions, which were preyed upon by later editors, forcing into them other material. It was all the more so an inevitable procedure with the T. Its original purpose to be merely an instrument for the instruction of the ignorant; its place in the public worship; its varied history of wandering were strong factors in rendering it susceptible to changes. It was exposed to the irresistible influences of the Midrash, which thrived in the immediate centuries following the destruction of the Second Temple. Later Midrashim crowded into the original, simple exegesis of Jonathan. The new material caused in many cases a mutilation of the original rendering, thus becoming either obscure or an overflowing rhetoric. Such portions contrast sharply with the close, smooth, natural rendering of Jon. The Midrashic incursion is especially remarkable in the first 35 chapters of Isaiah. One need only read the T. to Jerem. or Ezekiel to be impressed by the curious difference. But in most all these cases it is impossible to release the original from the new form. In some instances the translation may represent a completely new rendering which replaced the older one. Few additions can be safely pointed out. Some of them will be found to be two different renderings put side by side. As it is generally known, duplicates of this kind are found in the ancient versions, Onkelos included. We will begin with the major portions, presenting Midrashic portions which have made inroads into the T. Jonathan.

Judges 5:2 — הבסר הפרשיות ביקראת בהנגב כע"ב יישהל בפואות אלה עליהם עמים ומדרגון — זכר תאני #'מעבר אורותא עתנורא אינון על ג' רבינון ותרנין מקל (טולה) תותא אעתא ריזרוא — זכ' על פרשיות תבש מפרסא זכר מיישריה על' נאמ תוראנה
The T. to this verse contains three different renderings to the second half of the v. One interpreting it as implying that when the people return to the Torah they overcome their enemies and expel them from the land of Israel; the other taking it to refer to the overthrow of Sisra; the third to the deliverance from the prohibition on the study of the Law, the targumist having in mind the Hadrian persecutions. It is hardly possible to determine which is the older one. But the latter persisted in v. 9.

Com. Seder Eliahu r. 11 (p. 52): נכרה ורי חותם ברתי וכרתון רומם ית עמא פנותי אוראוה. כמ הכה"ה טימותי הננוי הננוה ית הננוה שלמרח... יהלום? כנין אדומ תשקי משבטינו ומשבטיינו עביה הננוה שלמרח.

ib. 3 שמעת מלכיを与え הסירא סרובה; ושמועה מלכי אצוותו שלם ברי ואגרнием — רוחוUGH עי מטלון בכרוס — ואבישי ניבא אגרנוהו ואמלו על פר קירא.

The two portions following the horizontal line are missing in Cod. Reuch. and in Ant. Polyg. and preceded by a margin in ed. Leira, and appear in brackets in the London Polyg. and in the Basel ed.

ib. 4 אוריאת ריהבהו כישראלו עלה — יי בצאקה משמיעו...

This intrusive character of the portion is obvious. It belongs to v. 2 and is a recension of the first rendering. It is missing in the Ant. Polyg.

ib. 5 מוריא והג ממלדה — מוריא רהבר — הירמ גלב ממנין

Fora רהברון תומא רבשלאו ואמרין די קדשו, די אמרי עלפי השרי — שיכנוהו ולי חוה ולי קדשו אמרי עלפי השרי שיכנוהו ולי חוה — (סמריאת גחלות, אמסטרדם, "ת"), אצירו שכנוהו על הוריא דרויי

It is a shortened form of the Targum on the margin of Cod. Reuch containing a current Agada (Com. Gen. r. 99, 1) cited in Jalquit from Jelamdeno. Reference to this Agada is made in T. to PS 68:16, 17. That it is an interpolation is shown in the
London Polyg., where the whole portion is placed in brackets, while in Cod. Reuch the addition is found in the margin. It is completely omitted in Ed. Leira and in the Ant. Polyg.

8. ib. Do not take its place at the end of the verse, for it is totally out of the argument. The addition is formed of the end of the preceding verse, which is its own subject. It was added to the beginning of the verse to introduce a new subject.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that this Agada was on the margin to v. 2, the end of which formed the subject of v. 1. It is strikingly out of all connection. Witness the beginning of v. 2. It was by a marginal mistake that it was introduced here, where it has no room. As to its source, com. Jalqut l. c. It appears in a shortened form in Cod. Reuch., where the version is as follows:

11. ib. So also to v. 11. It is not to be taken as a subject of its own, for it is connected with the preceding verse. It is a second rendering. It is omitted in Cod. Reuch. In Leira ed. it is preceded by the following addition:

In Ed. Leira it is headed by:

It is a current interpretation in a shortened form. Com. Jalqut l. c. (cited from Midrash Achbar):

This addition is missing in Cod. Reuch., and in the Ant. Polyg.; in ed. Leira it is headed by 'תומך'.

This Targum is cited by Kimchi l. c. and is found in ed. Leira under heading "Tosefta". No other edition has it.

It appears in a different version on the margin of Cod. Reuch. to 12:7. The essence of this Agada is found in Gen. r. 60, 1, holding to the view of R. Jochanan that a vow of this sort should be redeemed by money. This author also condemns Jethah for not going to Pinhas to ask the disavowal. Others think the reverse is true. Com. Seder Eliahu r. 12 (p. 55). This portion beginning בּוּרֵי is found in the Leira ed. headed by "Tosefta" and is missing in the Ant. Polyg.
The additions appear with minor modifications in all editions. In the Basel ed. and the London Polyg., however, they are placed in brackets. As to the interpretation that Hanna was prophesying, com. Meg. 14a.

ib. 2 "... על מתיריה פלכמ ארצה אינכטיה אומת — אין פירוש..." Tannutt הוהי ובל הולכתי על ורשותGoods tells the story of רוחו ובסיפור אינכטיה וירשת: כל תורש... The whole addition is missing in the Ant. Polyg. and appears in the Basel ed. and the London Polyg. in brackets.

ib. 3 "... על מובכרער פלכמ אבב אינכטיה אומת — rew תורש..." אנקהו כ AssertionError רוחו תורשת: כל מוספס ברש"ה; לא טמון
It is missing in the Ant. Polyg. and appears in brackets in the Basel ed. and the London Polyg.

ib. 4 "... על פלכמ ויאינכטיה אומת — תורש — קשת בכרם..." סשה תורש; רוחו שם כ: הקשת בכרם.
In the Basel ed. and in the London Polyg. these portions are in brackets, and are omitted in the Ant. Polyg.

ib. 5 "... על בניהו דריו; אינכטיה אומת: דרו — שבעה בלת..." מדריך אוסטר: כ: לירשלים דרו ובאתה ע_rgba... ו톤וס ספרש — תジー החותר.
In the Basel ed. and in the London Polyg. these portions are in brackets. Instead of דרו in órg, it has an intentional change, for obvious reasons, and are missing in the Ant. Polyg.

The portion is missing in the Targum to Ps. That the portion is a second and different rendering to the second half of the verse, is evident. Its other part to the first half seems to have been included in the first rendering. In the Ant. Polyg., the portion ארחניב ב כי כלבי דריהות is omitted.

As to the rendering of Com. IS 2:2; 2S 22:47, On. Deut. 32:4. And Com. IS 2:1. All of which would lend strength to this supposition.

This part is missing in the Ant. Polyg. This is another indication that the Targum to this verse belongs to a Midrashic T. which was by a later editor incorporated in the T. and which displaced the original T. In the text used by Montanus it appeared in a shortened form. Com. Cod. Reuch., Judges 5:8.

ib. 32... It is an addition. The same appears in a shortened form in the T. to 1S 2:2, which in the London Polyg. is found in brackets. It is missing in the Ant. Polyg.

ib. 47... It is another form of v. 32. Is is missing in the Ant. Polyg. and in the T. to Ps.

1K 4:33... It is a Midrashic interpretation which can in no way be read into the verse. Had it represented the original of the T., the same interpretation would have been applied to the second part of the v. But the latter is rendered literally. However, the original was displaced by the toseftoic rendering. The displaced original is found in the Ant. Polyg.; the rendering there is as follows: 

2K 4:1... אֶשֶׁת אֲחֵלָה מְנַשֵּׁשׁ יֵבִּין גְּבוֹאִים הַכְּלַל מֵאֲבָא מַעֲלָה דְּרָם וְאֶת עִמְּךָ חָמַד. מִן הַכְּלַל מֵאֲבָא מַעֲלָה דְּרָם וְאֶת עִמְּךָ חָמַד.
This Tosefta is found in the edition Leira, which is also cited by Kimchi (l. c.). All editions contain only the beginning of this Tosefta without any indication of any sort to show its toseftic character. Here again an instructive example is presented to show how the toseftic material was handled by later editors. Such can be surmised was the case with other material incorporated in the Targum but whose source we are unable to trace. Com. Otzar Tov, v. 1, p. 10, Berlin, 1878.

Is. 10:32 ἢ ἐστιν ὁ ἐχθρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος βασιλέας

All older Rabbinic editions contain this Midrashic Targum. In the recent editions the part beginning melodies is placed in brackets. It is omitted in Cod. Reuch. and in the Ant. Polyg. It appears on the margin of Cod. Reuch. in an enlarged form.

In a somewhat modified form it is told in San. 95b:
INTERPOLATED TARGUM

Com. also Seder Eliahu r. 8 (p. 45). They represent two versions of a current Agada. But the following portion containing Senacherib's address is also toseftoic. It is cited in the Aramaic in San. 95a. Furthermore, it even has the complementary portion which was dropped at its introduction in the T.

ib. 49:15

It appears from this that a part of this Midrash was dropped by the interpolator. The first and last are remnants of the original Targum. It is omitted in Cod. Reuch. and First Bomberger ed. (Com. Bacher Z. D. M. G., p. 48.)

ib. 24, 25

The latter presents an excellent example of how a combination of this sort was accomplished. The last portion is the original Targum, upon which was built the Midrashic interpolation. Both portions, which unquestionably belong somewhere in the Geonic age, appear in the current editions after the orginal and
l literal rendering under the heading א. They appear on the margin of the Cod. Reuch. under the same name, being omitted in the text; while in the first Bom. ed. they appear in a shortened form in the T. to Is. 66:5 (Bacher, p. 20).

ib. 50:10, 11 ... אמר נביאraphic דורשה ביך — ס פכם ירא ...
            מהתוט על סופם, מכם בוכנו ...
            כן חיר צומית אפורם:" עוד על ...
            רובינון לא אספר לך סופם钡ויתים אביך כי換え אותריה יד עמה
            (לע) עוד קבר באך ורכזת את אפורםיהן בזוייתו ושביעיך (כְּשָׁנָה)
           เกมלחון ומכותיהן בוחא גננה שפילן יהא אלא אספר לך סופם
            ביוותיכם, מטיבל הורשה ביך את אפוריך חוף על א學校 גננה ...

It is a satire particularly on Rome and Persia. Com. Aboda Zara 2b. In most all editions these portions are placed in brackets. They are missing in Cod. Reuch. and First Bom. ed.

Jer. 8:18 על דרי הפלניני חפל נב certs — מקבולית אנפ יונק
            tvbונtimeofday דרי היהונה אוחי עליתן מכם DRIVER עליתן אפרך
            נביא חוף.

It is a toseftoic addition which was probably intended for explanation. It can by itself in no way be read into the verse. It had replaced the original rendering, from which the last words remained. Com. T. to Am. 5:9

ib. 9:22 ולא ישנה תקפן — שלמה בר דוד — א在这ה ממס בבתחה.
            חיכאמ בחתניה ואא ישנה תקפן — שלמה בר ממנת נבך גרוניה, והלא ישנה תעקוף בר עסער תודיה בחנריה.

As regards the reference to Samson, the T. seemingly was influenced by Eccl. r. on 9:11. It appears on the margin of Cod. Reuch. under heading א and is missing in the text.

ib. 10:11 דג את משגח אגרת אישלה — כרותה הא.house קוח
            ירמיה נבא فيه שאר סבי גלולה כי יכלה את דים פנו פניא (ypsumא)
            ראותהikt מקול פButtonType שעתה כי יראה כתב חורב
            הא.house קוח ממון אגרת אישלה קוח סעתה יולה חורב יאנת מ
            שמע אא יכחיל את הא.house מספרא מי אריאчен אא יכחיל את הא.house פגיון
            ופגילון יבדרון מקיבתא ישותרונה ממית תקוע מית תקע פימה אילן.

This rhetorical exposition appears in all editions. In the Cod. Reuch. it appears after the literal Aramaic of the verse. In all other editions the Aramaic is omitted. Its position in the former testifies to its being an incursion, while is position in the latter
demonstrates, as another instance, how the original was forced out by the interpolation.

ib. 12:9 ... We shall explain more fully—by virtue of this verse...

This part appears in all editions after the complete rendering of the v. Hence it is toseftoic. It is found fully in San. 96a: "This verse appears... In other words... In any event it is clear that the intent is that of the above explanation. Good news to the righteous and the righteous to the good news.

Com. also San. 26a, Cant. r. 31:14

with minor changes.

It contains a shortened Agada found in Lam. r. Pesichta, end. That it does not belong here is evident from the two renderings of one being literal, the other expository. Which of them belongs to the original is difficult to determine; probably the former.

Ezek. 1:1

The portion after the horizontal line is missing in the Targum of the Haftora of the first day of the Feast of Weeks in the Machzor Witi. As the Targum to this verse beginning and ending is Midrashic in construction and matter, its partial omission in Machzor Witi lends support to the hypothesis that the whole portion is an interpolation.

ib. 6

The whole portion preceding by the horizontal line is missing in the Ant. Polyg. having instead of the second "and"—"and". It also is a case of shortened toseftoic Targum.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

ib. 8 ...המוהים על האור רשעיו וַּלְכַּבֶּרֶךְ חוֹכָּא — יְרֵי אָדָם এই সত্য সম্পর্কে — বলে তোমাদের সব যে যারা এই দৃষ্টিকোণ থেকে মনে করেন যে তোমাদের সব যে যারা এই দৃষ্টিকোণ থেকে মনে করেন যে তোমাদের সব যে যারা এই দৃষ্টিকোণ থেকে মনে করেন যে 

This addition is found in the Ant. Polyg. only. Com. Pesachim 119a: এই সত্য সম্পর্কে — বলে তোমাদের সব যে যারা এই দৃষ্টিকোণ থেকে মনে করেন যে তোমাদের সব যে যারা এই দৃষ্টিকোণ থেকে 

...אמר והר כנ בְּנִיךָ פָּשָׁט רָמָה יְרוּשָׁלָיִם אָם רַבָּא מַשְׁמִית רָפָא יְרוּשָׁלָיִם אָם רַבָּא מַשְׁמִית רָפָא יְרוּשָׁל

This is found nowhere else.

ib. 28:13 ...כִּלָּה חַדְּבַּה אֱכַלְתָּא וְקָוָה — כִּלָּה אֱכַלְתָּא מַפְּכַּחְתָּא, מֵלוֹן וְחַדְּבַּהְתָּא כְּלָא אֱכַלְתָּא מַפְּכַּחְתָּא, מֵלוֹן וְחַדְּבַּה

The literal translation was preserved in the toseftoic version of this verse found on the margin of Cod. Reuch., entitled, namely,

ib. 34:9 ...בֵּכֵן פְּרְפֵּכִים רְשִׁיתָא — בֵּכֵן פְּרְפֵּכִים רְשִׁיתָא — בֵּכֵן פְּרְפֵּכִים רְשִׁיתָא — בֵּכֵן פְּרְפֵּכִים רְשִׁיתָא — בֵּכֵן פְּרְפֵּכִים רְשִׁית

It is missing in Cod. Reuch.

A Midrashic Targum to 37:1 is found in Machzor Hittori in the Targum to the Haftora of the Sabbath of Passover: This is told in San. 92a; Pirke d. E. 58. It is so interpreted in Ps. Jon., Exod. 13:17.

Joel 2:25 ...וְּבִנָּה אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶּׁר נִשְׁפָּט אֶשֶ

It is a latter Midrash. Com. Seder Eliahu r. 20 (p. 113):...אַלַּי אֶבֶרֶךְ פְּלִיכָּא שֵׁנַהְתָּא בָּשָׁלְקָה אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר

But 1:4 is rendered literally, and such was the case here, which
was displaced by the interpolation from which was left only the last part. This part has scarcely any connection with the interpolated exposition.

Nahum 1:1 — מלך כב רוחם אמשאם הוא אשר שניה — משא כי נינה
ספירים אחרון עליה יהוה בר אמתי נב כפרת את חביתה וברך
ויאמרorna נתתי את היא וינחל עליה נבוא מתעב עליה ויבחר שני
ויריה.

This is toseftaic. It has displaced the original Targum to the second half of the v. It is a late one. Witness the rendering by rabbinic being evidently influenced by the Arabic, the vernacular of the age. In the edition used by Rashi the reading was דבורה אל𬀩וש. Com. the rendering of Mi. 1:1.

Hab. 3:1 — וחלוהו את הכסים בניו כי יהיה אלהינו ויהי על ארבע
והשם יーション את ארצים ויהי על ארבעו כי יהי הים כי ישה
ותו שמות ויהי בחרת אבריאי ספורים כי אבריאי ספורים
והשם יーション את ארצים ויהי על ארבעו כי ישה
ותו בחרת אבריאי ספורים כי אבריאי ספורים.


This Agadic interpolation is found in the Cod. Reuch., of which Buber had no knowledge. It is missing in all other editions. Rashi (Taanith 23a), refers to it: כפרים בחרים שילফת חסיט. The manner in which this reference is expressed would suggest that Rashi refers to the Targum of the Haftora of the second day of the Feast of Weeks, which was customary to read in the communities of Northern France. It is found in the Machzor Witri. On the other hand, it appears that Kimchi had no knowledge of this Targum. Probably the portion beginning ייע ארמא to the end, which is found in all editions, is a part of this T. J., the original being replaced by it.

ib. 2 — י' שממית שמע נורוק — י' שממית שמע דיאית
מה עדבראת בשמא מתברית — וברית; — אוה על מתת פורעתא
דריאית על אינש כפר ראיוניד ספור שמעה ותית י' — כמח
הברית — בני ראיוניד ספור שמעה ותית; — בני לודן...
התרח שלחיו.
These exegetical interpolations are found in the Targum of the Haftora of the second day of the Feast of Weeks in the Machzor Witri. They are not found in any other accessible edition of the Targum. In verse 8 the words "עֶלְּהֵלַיָּה הָוהּ רָגְנַך" which is evidently the rendering of אָא בָּחָרָי אֶאֶל, and which are found in all editions, are missing there.

ib. 3:11
אֲאָה בַּמְשַּׁבֵּר נִנְיָה רְוָאשָׁה — שְׁמֵשׁ ייְ הָעָמִּם בּּכָּלָה
בֵּמֶשְׁר נִנְיָה — כֵּרְאַהְיִהוּ מֵפַלְיוּוֹ וּיְתַמְּחֵתְוָה מִלְכָּא מֶלֶטָא וּרְוָאשָׁה
מֶלֶטָא דַּחַבְיוֹ דַּחַבְיוֹ מִלְכָּא דַּחַבְיוֹ מֶלֶטָא דַּחַבְיוֹ דַּחַבְיוֹ שְׁמֵשׁ מְפַלְיָהְוָוִּי — תְּחַנִּינַיָּה שְׁנַיָּה
The portions following the horizontal lines are found in Cod. Reuch. and in Machzor Witri only. The same Targum was used, it would appear, by the editor of the text of the other editions, who shortened it. That the original rendering was a literal one is evident from the comparison of these two texts.

Zech. 12:10
ואַשְּפָא עֵלָי יוֹדֵע הַיוֹיִניִית יְרוֹשֵׁיָתָהּ וּרְחִי נְבַיָּה
וּלְרִיאָהְוָא ק־וֶשָׁה וּמְבַרְכָּא בֵּרַי אֱפַרְיָהָא קֶנֶאָה עַמֶּה
נִנְיָה יְיָפָלָה וּלְרִיָּהְוָא יְרוֹשֵׁיָתָהּ וּמְמַטְּלָאָוָו יְיָהָא יְיָהָא יָעֲצָא מַחֲסָא עַמֶּה נִנְיָה יְיָפָלָה
אַאָא אַשְּפָא עֵלָי בֵּרַי יְיָהָאָי יְרָוָאשְׁהָא עַמֶּה רְמַתְּרָא עֵלָי בּּכָּלָא.
This Midrashic Targum is found in Kenn., Cod. 154, and on the margin of Cod. Reuch., giving the source as אָאֶרֶי יְיָהָא and in Machzor Witri. It is omitted in all other editions. It will be seen that the Midrashic interpretation is based mainly on the portion אָאֶרֶי יְיָהָא which, according to this interpretation, refers to the violent death of the first Messiah, namely the son of Ephraim or Joseph. On the other hand, the rendering preceding and following it is close to the text but differs slightly from the rendering of the Targum. As to the Midrashic interpretation in general, com. Suk. 52a, Yer. 5, 8.

Two more cases of later interpolation may be added. The first is in Judges 10:16. It is rendered literally. In the Ant. Polyg. the Targum here has the Hebrew text. Maimonidas (Moreh Nebuchim 2, 29) makes it plain that this portion was not rendered by Jonathan for anthropomorphic considerations. The other case is Ezek. 1:26, which Kimchi (l. c.) says that it is not rendered by the T., but all
INTERPOLATED TARGUM

accessible editions do have a literal rendering. It was inserted by a later hand. The same may have also been the case with Ezek. 1:27; 2:8, containing a peculiarly circumscribed rendering.

II.

There is a considerable number of other interpolations which are of an exegetical character. Some are recensions of the rendering of the T. Others aim at a clarification not so much of the text as of the rendering. They have a disturbing effect upon the rendering. Evident interpolations of this category are numerous. I have selected some of the most characteristic instances for the purpose of illustration. Finally I wish to call attention that some of these duplicates were brought to notice by Frankel (Zu Dem Targum d. Propheten, pp. 39, 40).

Duplications

Is. 18:4

One takes while the other would have it as it stands. This passage of the T. is cited in Menahoth 110a; this duplicate then is of a comparatively early date. It was noticed by Frankel (Zu Dem T., 40).

ib. 19:18

According to one the reference is to the absence of the Shekina; the other is a simpler rendering.

ib. 21:5

The latter is an interpolation. It disagrees with the interpretation of the T. of referring to the pious ones. That the entire phrase: is rendered by the latter is evident from the rendering — הֲנָה קָשָׁה.
ib. 66:20 However is missing in Cod. Reuch.

Jerem. 2:3 In the former Israel is likened to the priestly tithe, in the latter to the first ripened of the produce before the offering of the Omer (Com. Rashi and Kimchi l. c.).

ib. 2:16 גוס וקושר — ויוו גוסר — ייוו קושר.

ib. 13:19 לא לשלמה ושלום שבלשים נלן שלם.

In the former is taken in the sense of שבלם — שבלם.

ib. 20:8 אר יאכד יאכד — בכ ימוח — יר מרי אודא אוית.

Ezek. 16:6... נאング קופר תיפלמיהו, אופר גלי תיפלמיהו אופר גלי תיפלמיהו.

ib. 34:9 נבכ יריע — יריע יריע.

The former read יריע; the latter יריע. This was noticed by Kimchi. The T. renders יריע יריע throughout this chapter by יריע יריע. In Lag. יריע יריע is omitted.

Am. 6:8 בית מפורש — רבדה יריע — נאין ייעב.

The last is the rendering in 8:7; the former is a duplicate.

Mica 1:10 יחלוש יחלוש — תוש יריעו — תוש יחלוש.

In Cod. Reuch. יחלוש is omitted.

ib. 11 גול ירחא — עריפי ירחא — ערי יריע.

The latter is more literal.

ibid. עניע ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם — ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם — ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם ינם.

The former renders as a p. n., while the latter as הניע, near. Com. Rashi and Karo l. c.

ib. 12 קוסמבר — קוסמבר קוסמבר קוסמבר — קוסמבר קוסמבר קוסמבר.

ib. 2:13 יסף משיימין — יסף משיימין — יסף משיימין.

The former renders יסף משיימין — יסף משיימין — יסף משיימין.
the former, as in the former days, while the latter understood

as king and

פָּרִים, in their front.

ib. 3:6

לָטָמְמָא — וַאֲוָיָהּ מַכֶּלֶלֶלֶל יְהוָהַה בִּתְיָהָהaron בָּיָה — עִמִּי. The recension, it is obvious, would render this v. in a symbolic
sense. The T. would render it literally. This is evident from
the literal rendering of what follows. On the other hand, the
inserted recension may constitute only a portion of a Toseftaic
rendering.

ib. 12

בָּאָתְנִלִית — בָּאָתְנִלִית שֶׁיָּפֶל עַל מְנַאָי עַפּ — בָּוֹם.

לְמָתְבָּר רֹשָׁי אָרְשָׁא.

Com. Rashi and Karo; as to the rendering of בָּוֹם Com. Ze.
1:12; Mal. 1:4.

זֵכָה. 3:7

אַתָּה קָר נֶגֶלֶל מַחֶלֶלֶל — נֶגֶלֶל מַחֶלֶלֶל מַחֶלֶלֶל

בָּאָתְנִילִית שֶׁיָּפֶל עַל מְנַאָי עַפּ.

The inserted recension would render it symbolically.

ib. 3:8

הָא אַנָּא מֹותִית — וַיְנָגָלֶל — נֶגֶלֶל מַחֶלֶלֶל מַחֶלֶלֶל
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Insertions

IS. 1:24
(ברכז ותרשיעי כן אתחנה) — ויהי אנכיה מ↗ריה
ib. 2:22
אתמטשלו כלב — חרב ומגזר אש נפש נבצב וょう
מלאשנתברא לאשנה המברעה דחלא רמות מי חיות בבאיתה (ארי יוס
ירה חיות ומשחררילית) לכלשא השב ח軟.
ib. 3:15
أمפי שחריא אכלת להות (ויתון) — והני ענייה מתניי
בירגנותי.
ib. 5:3
ותעה ישב ירושלים ואיש יהודה שפם נאparableמקור
כרמי — (נסיך אשר חתונא זה בינה ישראל מワー כל יעקב אשתך)
هامחר
...
The preceding passages of the T. make this rhetoric portion
entirely excessive.
ib. 24:1
ותם בהמה (ען דירבר על אזירה) — ויהי פניה
There is no more necessity for a reason here than there is for
the preceding ותמי ישיבת and the following ותמי ישהית.
ib. 30:25
(תנשל המלחין — ביוו הסעךバル — פסנבלו ביני מופי
לאמשריווהות) ציריד נически
ib. 41:7
(לאו הבנובת יונבורי) דמתתי — ויהוא הרש
There is only one other such case, also evidently an interpolation,
this is Ez. 16:20. The T. as a rule knows of no such rhetorical
prefacing.
ib. 57:20
(ימדו בנתה) — ותרשיעה כי נרש
It is found in Cod. Reuch. only.
Jerem. 1:6
(ובשורהו עסא —.Android אנא — כי נער ancor)
וכל אנאם מחכימי על טמא ורי
ib. 2:10
המתכתל חתא והוה — כי עבר איי הכחיא והוש
(עמשא דנכלו מבך וממשיכה ומשיכנה נפלי ז"ז מעשהו ומם)
חלחו עמותא避けוהו ראיות שין פרסיס יש ובשכינית ומשיכים ייחנהו
... פסנבלו הוה — (אלא כי אומאה)
ib. 2:27
(כמי — בכבירו בשתה אתי עלייהו — מבת רותף
בשכיתו) (1) פסנבלו ארמיי מושם עטלון.
ib. 4:1
החפץ תינבית (עד לא החתמה גויתך) —جلוי תשאן
Com. 31; 17, 20.
The insertion is in fact a duplicate interpretation of the former, interpreting "עֹלָה" to refer to the Chaldeans by the method of Com. Karo, the latter takes it in a more literal sense.

Ezek. 13:19... לָא כְּאַתּוֹת נַפְשָׁם" (כְּאַתּוֹת נַפְשָׁם) וּלְיַסְּרָה נַפְשָׁם רַבָּה וְיָבִינוּ קִפּוּר. Two different interpretations are here obviously incorporated. In the London Polyg. the reading is: יַסְּרָתָן אֲתָנִין מְסִיתִין, דְּהַתְעוֹמִין אֲתָנִין מְסִיתִין. Whether this was a correction by the editor due to misunderstanding or it represents a different reading, it adds emphasis to the fact that the passages in question are insertions.

ib. 16:5 קֶמִּיא אֲתָנִין (קֶמִּיא אֲתָנִין מְסִיתִין יָשַׁר) — קֶמִּיא אֲתָנִין מְסִיתִין יָשַׁר. מְשֻׁבָּרוֹתֵין מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת רִדוֹדֵו.

ib. 16:20 רִדוֹדֵו אֲתָנִין...

ib. 17:4 לָא כְּאַתּוֹת נַפְשָׁם (לָא כְּאַתּוֹת נַפְשָׁם יָשַׁר) וּלְיַסְּרָה נַפְשָׁם רַבָּה...

Hos. 10:11 אָנֵא פָּרָתָי יִרְשָׁא — וְאָנֵא פָּרָתָי על מָכָא לַאֲרָא. מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת — מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת. אֵא פָּרָתָי יִרְשָׁא.

Hos. 3:3 נִבְּאֵא אֵמָא (נִבְּאֵא אֵמָא יִרְשָׁא) — כְּיִמְמִין רְבוּם. וּלְיַסְּרָה נַפְשָׁם רַבָּה (לָא כְּאַתּוֹת נַפְשָׁם יָשַׁר) וּלְיַסְּרָה נַפְשָׁם רַבָּה... מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת — מְשֻׁבָּרוֹת.

The inserted passage has no connection with the rest and renders irritating the whole passage. Com. Rashi on this v.

ib. 12:1 רְבוּתָי יִרְשָׁא — וְיַסְּרָה נַפְשָׁם רַבָּה...

Joel 2:3 וְאִנַּה שָׁוָא אֲלֵיה בֶּן — וְוּסְדִּים אֲלֵיה וַיֵּלֶךְ (וּלְיַסְּרָה).
ib. 4:2

The inserted portion is found in extant editions, but is omitted in all other editions, including the princeps edition of Mikraoth Gedoloth.

Am. 7:14

This portion, intended for the last three words of the verse, is to all intent a different version of a sort of a homily, examples of which are readily presented in the portions of the interpolated Targumim cited above. The original version seems to have been replaced by the interpolation.

Mica 7:1

The inserted passage is merely putting of the T. in other words.

ib. 12

The latter part seems to me to belong to the first half of the v. forming a different rendering, which was incorporated in the T. to the second part of the v. and displaced the original. The former renders as and while the latter, impressed by the sound of the word, would render . Armenia. It was the same case with . Aq. and Theod. follow the first rendering of the T. The Lxx and P. are somewhat following the interpolated rendering.

ib. 7:14

The inserted portion is entirely disconnected with the rest, has no reference to any part of the v. It is explaining or com-
implementing the T. It was inserted with the intention of import-
ing into this v. a Messianic air, while the T. might not have
taken the v. in this sense.

ib. 7:20

(וּקְנֵה עַיִן — חַגָּל אַמָּה לְעַזָּב הַשֵּׁם אֲבוֹרָם)

No reference is made in this v. to יִשְׁתַּק. The interpolator, it
would appear, was anxious to supply this omission.

Nahum 1:6

(כְּרֵא שִׁנִּי בַּרְעָם לְמֵת אָוִירָם — קְרֵא עַזָּב)

It has no connection and makes no sense with what follows.
It can be, however, connected with the preceding v.
It is probably a recension of the rendering of the T. of that
v. and inserted at its end and then misplaced at the begin-
ing of this v.
ADDITIONS

Quotations from Targum Jonathan in Talmud and Midrash, like those from Onkelos, do not carry the name of the author to whom tradition ascribes the composition of the Targum. In most of the instances in Talmud Babli Targum Jonathan is quoted in the name of Rab Joseph. In two cases Rab Joseph himself quotes it, while in other cases the quotations are introduced by אֲדֹנֵי הָעָם . In one case in the Midrash the quotation from Jonathan carries the name of Aquila. In the rest of the cases there is no indication of the source. They are just the same quotations from Jonathan. Incidental similarity cannot serve as a basis for a contrary view, particularly when some of the quotations are of an exegetical nature.

Several quotations in Yerushalmi and Midrash, which I assumed to be a different version of the targumic rendering in the respective cases, were cited above. However, there are at least two cases in which the rendering of the Targum is clearly implied. One is Y. Shekalim 2, 6, with reference to Is. 33:21:

מַכָּא: אֵאָלָא יְקַלֵּל אַל אַךְ אוֹלָהּ לְעָבָר אַל אַכְּלָהּ לְעָבָר אַל אַזָּרָה

אַלָּא יָכְלֵל לְעָבָר בּוֹ מַה מַה צָרָה אָל לְעָבָר.

This implies the rendering of the Targum of וְשָׁב. In Joma 77b the same exposition is accompanied by a quotation from the Targum.

The other case is Mech. יוהו, 9 with reference to Is. 21:9, which was quoted above (p. 29, note 43) from Gen. r., namely,

יִשָּׁהוּ הַמַּחְלֵיָה בּהַר נִפְלָת וְנָפְלָת בּהַר בּהַר נִפְלָת.

It is based on the rendering of the Targum נִפְלָת אָל פְּרַיָּה אָל נִפְלָת בּהַר נִפְלָת בּ. Had it not been based on the rendering of the Targum (which was well known to the scholar), there would certainly have followed a note giving the interpretation of the quotation from Is.

As regards the quotations from the Targum in Babli, it is well to notice that most of them represent interpretations of an expository nature. At least in two cases the quotations represent a different version of the targumic rendering.
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Most of the quotations were referred to by De Rossi, Zunz and Frankel.

Quotations given in the name of Rab Joseph:

Moed Katan 26a on 2K 2:12:

The interpretation of 2S 5:21 is against the rendering there of the Targum. It seems that the Agadist would render יושם ויהי as rendered in the Targum, namely, and David scattered them. Other Agadists would adhere to the extant rendering of the Targum. Hence the quotation in Rosh Hashana 22b. In the instance here, however, the quotation is introduced by כרומתנינו, one of them is seemingly an interpolation.

Joma 32b on Jer. 46:20:

Kiddushin 13a on Hos. 4:2:
Nedarim 38a on Am. 7:14:

The saying of R. Jehoshua b. Levi is based on the rendering of the Targum of this verse, which is: דוהי משכובן בר ומעדם פורה. The quotation here in the name of Rab Joseph agrees in sense with the Targum but not in the wording. This might be explained as being a misquotation. However, the rhetorical prefacing phrase תיבור אוחיו, which is missing in our text, seems to have been in the text of the Agadist. It was this beginning of the rendering which, it would appear, caused the complication with regard to the reference. For what was wanted here was to show that ונמי ומעדם means delay, and the reference here is to the rendering of this particular word in the Targum, namely, דוהי משכובן. But because the Targum of this verse had as the beginning the words תיבור אוחיו the reference was made to as though it was dropped from the Targum.

Kiddushin 72b on Zech. 9:6:

This is also a different version of the Targum to this verse. Our Targum renders it: ייחבון בת יהירה נאישיבי דוהי בה כנכראיאו.

Two quotations are said by Rab Joseph:

Sanhedrin 94b on Is. 8:6:

אד בות אשלמי הוגנוו דוחאי פרע אד הווי ידענא מי ראפרה הלח
ד蔷 סאפ לוח במעכלות דוחי רוז רпанר קינא בזיז מי שיפלאא לקני
בניזא ויאתרטעו ברפני זוכ ראפייה.
ADDITIONS

Moed Katan 28b on Zech. 12:11:

Quotations preceded by מתחברות:

Nazir, last Mishna, according to the version in Ein-Jakov, on 1S 1:11:

Rosh Hashana 22b on 2S 5:21:

Moed Katan 2a on Is. 62:5:

Quotations without reference to the Targum:

Sanhedrin 95a on Is. 10:32:

The portion beginning אֲלֵיהֶם לִשָּׁא הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר מִבָּאוֹר רַבִּי מֵאָבִיב is found in all editions of the Targum, and has been considered above (p. 132). At any rate, the portion beginning אֲלֵיהֶם is the targumic rendering of the verse.

Shabbath 128a on Josh. 7:21:

The rendering of אָרִיהֶה in Targum is אָיִשֵּׁמַא.

A quotation of the Targum to Nahum 3, 8, preceded by מתחברות:

אֵשׁ הַתָּנֵבָה כַּפְּרוּ רֵחֲמֵי הָיִשָּׁרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעָתָןָהּ אֲנָא אַדַּוְּלֵךְ אָמְרוּ אֱ-בָּרַי אֱ-בָּרַי אָמְרוּ אֱ-בָּרַי הֲכָה אֱ-בָּרַי אָמְרוּ אֱ-בָּרַי
Ecc. r. 11, 3 quotes the Targum to Is. 5:6 in the name of Aquila:

Y. Shabbath 6, 4 contains a translation of Is. 5:18-23. Some of the rendering coincide with those in the Targum, namely: נבואות — נבואות, נביאים — נביאים, ו扶贫工作 ו扶贫工作. The rendering of המנהיגים follows the T. Jud. 8:21, to which reference is made (The T. here having agrees with Ps. Rech. to Jud. 1. c. having for דִּרְכֵיהַ יְעַּר). As the rendering of הרבות is the translation in the T. of these verses. There are good reasons for the supposition that this is a version of the Targum to these verses. Com. מנהיגים

Y. Taanith 2, 5: אֲדוּן דְּחָמָה אֲדַמְּךָ אֲפֵמָה רְחִית רְצוּ הָאָרֶץ. The rendering of the Targum in Joel 2:13 is not printed in the Targum (also On. Exod. 34:6; Ps. Jon. having for המנהיגים). Psichita Lam. r. 16 on Jer. 4:18: תווה הספר קלח וְנֵכְבָּשָׁה אֲרֻרַתָךְ יִבְשָׂאָה בְּעַרְבּוֹ יָרוּדָה. This agrees with the Targum except that the latter has instead of מַפְלַקְלוּת — מַפְלַקְלוּת. It is to be noticed that both this and the preceding citation contain exegetical renderings.

Lev. r. 6, 4: מַמְצַר וַחֲמֵלִים יְהוָה אָרָר יִנְהָר. The Targum of Lev. r. 5, 2; Exod. r. 10:5 on Am. 6:4: דְּרַכְּכוּ וְלֹּא נִתַּמְּצֵי דְּרַךְ נִתַּמְּצֵי. Targum on Can. r. 16:61: מָה בֹּנָה יְהוָה דְּרַכֵּה... מָה בֹּנָה יְהוָה דְּרַכֵּה

This is the usual rendering of מַמְצַר in the Targum (com. vv. 46, 48, 49, 57), although in this verse the rendering is אֲדוּן דְּחָמָה. R. Jochanan would have here also the usual rendering.

Finally, there is the use of מַמָּתָה for idols in Yerushalmi and Midrashim. Com. Y. Berakoth 9, 1: מַמָּתָה אֲדוּן וּמַמָּתָהוּ בַּבּוּלָה מַמָּתָה אֲדוּן וּמַמָּתָהוּ בַּבּוּלָה. Y. San. 10, 2: מַמָּתָהוֹ יִהְיֶה אֲדוּן וּמַמָּתָהוּ. As מַמָּתָה is the peculiar rendering in the Targumim of idols, it is reasonable to assume that
this descriptive term came into use in the Yerushalmi from the Targum.

2.

The toseftaic portions which were examined in the chapter on Interpolated Targumim do not represent all the Midrashic additions to Targum Jonathan. Many more are to be found in the commentaries of Kimchi, Rashi and other Rabbinical sources. A great number of fragmentary Targumim are found on the margin of Cod. Reuch. All of which were collected and elaborated by Bacher (Z. D. M. G., v. 28, p. 1 et seq.).

On close examination it will be found that those fragments on the margin of Cod. Reuch, which are headed by פִּמַּא אָדוֹן וְרָוָה כְּפַר אֶדְוֵד and have many characteristic points in common. Hence there is no ground for an insistence on a line of division between them as is held by Bacher. They may have a common source. Or, certain fragments in each group may be assigned to an earlier date and a different source than the rest. It will be noticed that the additions to the Targum of Is. 49:24, 25, which in Cod. Reuch, is referred to והרי ייז is designated in the extant editions.

In the main, the fragments described as והרי ייז, והרי יזraham, and contain current Agadic expositions. But while to the group of והרי ייז belong the larger portions, there is hardly any peculiar characteristic either with regard to material or language to justify its placing in a separate category. Furthermore, all of them exhibit a dependence on Targum Jonathan. So והרי ייז on Judges 12:6 following Jon. ...ern in היחי וכמה לְפָז בְּכָנִיתוֹ יִדָּנָא וַאֲחָסֶר... Com. also 5:4, 5 and on Josh. 14:15. It is quoting Jon. to 1K 8:27 and 2K 21:16 (Yerush. on Is. 66:6). As to והרי ייז and והרי ייז on Jerem. 9:22 and Zech. 11:8: Also on Is. 45:7, which are so rendered in Targum Jonathan.

All these groups contain fragments which either explain or are complementing the rendering of Jonathan.
TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS

on Josh. 22:20 Yerush. ויהודה נברא וד אלה מית הכהנים. Com. also on Judges 1:3.

ויוסף אֵאָה בָּּרְשָׁנִית וְמִסְתַּפֵּא פָּרָשָׁהוּ רִבְרָדַּהוּ on Josh 6:1 which adds כָּה מַחַר הָרְחִית 26:20 פָּרָשָׁה פָּרָשָׁה. Also explaining the Targum Josh 4:19 יִרְשָׁה וֹרֶמֶא הָרְחִית.

So that there is scarcely any foundation for a supposition that they represent three distinct sources. There is equally no basis for a theory of an earlier Targum to the Prophets of which the רָשָׁה or even יִרְשָׁה are remnants.

Certain portions are admittedly late. Such, for instance as Is. 49:24, 25 and its parallel on Is. 66:5 which have made their way into the text of the Targum (the latter is found in the first Bomberger edition). They bear the traces of the Arabic era. The fact also that the יִרְשָׁה on Is 17:8 interpreting יִתְנָה נַמִּישִׁי — which is the rendering in Onk. of Exod. 15:3) would tend to place their origination at a date subsequent to that of the official Targumim.

However, although of a comparatively later date, they have preserved some earlier and later displaced renderings of the Targum. Here are the instances in the Yerushalmi:

on Josh. 5:3 יִרְשָׁה רְאוּמִית; Jon. פָּרָשָׁה Jon. רְאוּמִית. Jud. 3:31 כָּה מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. רְאוּמִית. יִרְשָׁה 4:21 9 יִרְשָׁה יִרְשָׁה יִרְשָׁה 5:4 מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. 2K 11:12 יִרְשָׁה Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָרְחִית Jon. מַחַר הָr

As for those in the com. Bacher l.c.