

U

Exegesis in the Targum with
Special Reference to
Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy.

Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Rabbi:

David Lefkowitz, Jr.

Class of 1937.

INTRODUCTION

לאנכי

The Historical Background, the Date,

סורי בחכמה כננה

and the Authenticity of the

וכיראת שמים

Textual Edition.

INTRODUCTION

The Historical Background, the Date,

and the Authorship of the

Targum Onkelos.

The Targum has an exceedingly important place in Hebrew literature. It is the inseparable companion of the Hebrew Bible in all those editions which contain commentaries—the only exceptions to this being the books of Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah for which we do not possess a Targum. Thus, it is not astonishing that tradition has ascribed great age to the Targum Onkelos, the official Targum to the Pentateuch. Like the Oral Law, it was given to Moses on Mt. Sinai.¹ To Rashi, who handed down this tradition to us, the Targum did not offer any problem as to its origin. It was the sacred heritage of Moses passed down to and fixed in writing by Onkelos the Proselyte. Rather early, however, critical scholars started to study the history of the Targum. The time of its birth was remote, and the sources about its creation were scarce and contradictory. Therefore, hypotheses were formed, contradicted, and reestablished—so that, even now, the question as to the origin of the Targum has not been finally settled. As early as 1571, Asariah de Rossi, in his Meor Marim, discussed the identity of Onkelos the Proselyte and his relation to Aqylas, the Greek translator of the Bible. He was followed in the eighteenth and in the beginning of the nineteenth century by several Jewish and Christian scholars who devoted part of their work to this problem—among whom are Eichhorn, Jahn, Lander, and Lamsatto. The historians of the second half of the nineteenth century, like Graetz and Schurer, could not leave aside the question of the Targum's origin. They discussed it in certain chapters of their historical writings; while other scholars, Dayenport, Herzfeld, Frankel, Zimm, Geiger, Berliner, and Friedmann, busied themselves with its solution in their lectures, in complete books, and even in private letters.² The scholars agreed about some points, differed from each other

about others. All possible source material has probably been accumulated by their labors; but a final solution of the problem, however, has not yet been found.

The word, 'Targum', in modern terminology has a definite and a restricted meaning. It is: the translation, and, if not determined by an adjective denoting a language other than Aramaic, it means the Aramaic translation of the Bible. Two kinds of Targumim are known, e.g. literal translations such as the Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch and that of Jonathan b. Ussiel to the Prophets; and there are also Aramaic versions of the Hebrew text such as the Jerusalem Targum, wrongly called the Targum Jonathan, and the Fragmentary Targum.

In the later Biblical period, however, the noun תרגום, and the respective verb תרגם did not yet have this fixed connotation; and in the Mishnaic and early Talmudic periods, they were subject to fundamental changes in meaning. In the Book of Ezra, תרגום is used synonymously with פירוש.³ It meant: "the explanation of a difficult text by words of either the same or a different language." Already in the Mishnah, the term is used for translations from Hebrew to a foreign language.⁴ But, soon, its meaning was restricted to the translation into the Aramaic, and was transferred to the Aramaic language itself. In the Mishnah (Yad.4:5) the word, Targum, is used also for the Aramaic passages of the original Bible text.⁵

Rav, in Meg. 3a, interprets the word, פירוש, in Nehemiah 8:8 as meaning Targum— i.e. the portions read by Ezra were translated into Aramaic for the people. Berliner admits that this term, פירוש, includes the conception of both explanation and translation.⁶ In this case, the verse in Nehemiah serves as a proof that the Talmud is right when it states

Ezra

in Megillah 3a that an Aramaic translation of the Torah was made in the time of Ezra. It only was forgotten in the following period, and had to be reestablished at a later date. Such a translation had become necessary because, since the Exile, the language of the people was Aramaic and no longer Hebrew. Already in the time of Hezekiah, Aramaic was the language used in diplomatic circles, at the court, and in the high strata of society—like French in eighteenth century Europe. The development was spread among the mass of the people and was completed through exile in an environment speaking a language so closely related to their own.⁷

Ezra, seeing that the people were more familiar with the Aramaic than with the Hebrew, translated the Torah into Aramaic.⁸ Friedmann even holds that Ezra wanted to give the Torah to the people only in Aramaic, but that he was forced to include the original.⁹ Probably the people, although they no longer used to hear and talk Hebrew, could understand the text if it was explained to them by an Aramaic commentary.¹⁰

In this way may be understood the origin of an institution which flourished in early Mishnaic times. The Torah was to be read to the people.¹¹ In order that they might understand the Hebrew text, someone had to explain or to translate into Aramaic that which was read from the scroll.¹² The man holding this office as translator was known as the Meturgeman. The way in which the reading and translating of the Law in the service had to proceed was exactly prescribed in Babli Megillah. After each sentence read from the scroll, the Meturgeman had to translate. (In the lesson from the prophets, where a literal translation was not quite so important, the interpreter translated three sentences at once.) The Meturgeman had to stand beside the reader in a respectful attitude. He was not supposed

in this particular instance (2 Kgs 18.26) it indicates that the people did not understand Aramaic

all this is quite work on the part of the authorities at the time

is a considerable part of the population

to make any mistakes, though a text was not to be used. He was not allowed to look into the Hebrew text nor could the reader prompt him.¹² However, if the Meturgeman made a mistake in translation, the members of the congregation were to correct him by acclamation (as in the case of a mistake in the Torah reading), and he had to translate that verse over again.¹³ Although this law ascribes the same importance to the translation as to the reading of the original, the interpretation was not so essential that the absence of a Meturgeman would have stopped a congregation from reading the Bible in the service.¹⁴ In a congregation of scholars, who knew Hebrew well, the translation was not recited.¹⁵

The Meturgeman had to translate true to the sense of the Hebrew original, while having, at the same time, complete freedom as to the form of his translation. That is how we must understand the statement of Rabbi Judah: "He who translates literally is a liar; he who adds words is a blasphemer."¹⁶ Some passages of the Torah, either with reference to shameful events or inspiring awe, were not to be translated at all.¹⁷ It was not without reason that the rabbis restricted the Meturgemanim by these detailed rules. For there were strong tendencies among the Meturgemanim to change the sense of the Bible text, to omit some parts and to add to others. The interpreter desired to give a personal note to his translation. Therefore, he embellished it by explanations in the form of Aggadoth and Halakhoth. These interpretations of the law naturally reflected the individual opinion of the translator. If he was a true pupil of the rabbis, his explanations would not contradict their doctrines. However, if he was a member or even a sympathizer of a Christian sect, he would insert christological references—such as accounts about the Messiah applying to Jesus.¹⁸ Despite the strict prohibitions of the rabbis, it

*is there not a possibility
that passages somewhat similar
to passages in the N.T. may have
been recited very early & then
suppressed both by Jews & in the N.T.*

does not seem that the Meturgemanim abandoned their way of translating. Both the Palestinian and the Fragmenten Targum contain a whole treasure of Aggadoth and scriptural paraphrases; and among them we find some of the very transgressions against which the rabbis were struggling.^{19.}

One of the rules for the translators was that they were not to use a text. The free translation, however, was a source of many errors; and also the voluntary changes by the Meturgemanim were rendered possible by the lack of a standard Aramaic version of the Pentateuchal text. To provide for that standard and to give, to the translators, a means of preparation— an acknowledged translation had to be set down in writing.^{20.} According to Friedmann, it was then that the rabbis established the text of the authorized Targum and imposed it on the people. The people, however, had liked the colorful translations of the Meturgemanim.^{21.} The result was that, together with the literal translation, the interpreter became unpopular in the Palestinian synagogues. The Meturgeman disappeared, and the Darshan, the commentator with his Midrashim, took his place.

It seems to be beyond any doubt that, in the time of the early Tannaim, the text of the Targum Onkelos was at least 'in statum nascendi'. Some scholars hold that the text was completed even if not set down in writing— during the time of the Second Temple; because the Targum does not contain any reference to the event of its destruction.^{22.}

The rules of exegesis applied in the Targum Onkelos are those fixed by the school of Rabbi Akiba.^{23.} The connection between the translation and Akiba's generation of Tannaim is undisputed. There is, however, no agreement among the scholars as to exactly what the connection is. Berliner suggests that the Targum contains aggadic and halakhic elements found with Akiba's predecessors and teachers, with Akiba himself, and with his older

pupils. He, therefore, concludes that the translation was created shortly after Akiba's time, and that Akiba was the chief instigator of the work.²⁴ Friedmann, on the other hand, tries to prove that the Targum was not composed after the time of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiba, but that these rabbis worked out some ideas which they found in the existing Aramaic translation.²⁵ These reflections would trace the origin of the Targum Onkelos back to Palestine in the time of the first or the second generation of Tannaim.

The influence of the Greek language in the Targum seems to confirm this. "The Greek words in the Targum entitle us to place the Targumist into the time in which the Greek language was so predominant in the life of the people that they did not deem it necessary to choose Aramaic expressions."²⁶ In fact, ritual objects (the names of which were used in every-day conversation) are translated by Greek expressions in the Targum Onkelos.²⁷ Both Friedmann and Berliner agree in dating these Greek terms as early as the Syrian period.

Other expressions used in the Targum help us to find out its age. In Num. 3:32, the term ܐܠܗܝܢ is used to translate the Hebrew, אֱלֹהִים . This meaning of the word is more original than the sense in which it is used in Babli Horaioth 13a, in Tosef. Hor. II (Zuckermann edition, p.476), and in the Targum Jerushalmi.²⁸ In the translation of Gen. 25:27, the hunter, Esau, is called by the term ܐܝܬܐܢܐ . This same expression is found for Esau in the manuscript of the Syriac Targum to the Book of Job in a post-script of the LXX.²⁹ While these two quotations, like the Greek terms, point to pre-Mishnaic times- a third seems to place the origin of the Targum into the Roman period. In Num. 24:24, the Hebrew בְּנֵי is rendered by ܒܢܝܝ . This

Good terms in Targum suggest he was living after Greek domination in Palestine. Taking in the Roman period. Greek words in Targum.

always meant the last mighty power to the interpreters of the Bible. Therefore, the LXX translated the term as meaning 'Greeks'; the late Targum Jerushalmi gives כנן כננת (Byzantium) and the Fragmenten-Targum reads כננת כננת³⁰. However, this translation of כננת by 'כננת' does not necessarily contradict the early origin of the Greek quotations.³¹ For the nucleus of the Targum Jerushalmi is considered to be as old as that of the Targum Onkelos despite the late mentioning of the Roman Empire. It is, however, a proof that the text was not yet finally fixed before the Roman period.

Hebrew was apparently better known in the time of the Targum Onkelos than in the time when the Targum Jerushalmi and the Boraithoth of the school of Ishmael originated. While these works give independent Aramaic words for all or most of the kinds of locusts mentioned in Lev. 11:22- Onkelos translates two of them with the Aramaized form of the Hebrew. Friedmann concludes that the Targum Onkelos is the oldest of the quoted works, and he comes to the same result by comparing the different translations of the bird names in Leviticus and Deuteronomy.³²

Berliner finds further confirmation about the age of the Targum in its attitude toward anthropomorphisms. "The systematic and methodical striving to avoid anthropomorphisms and other apparently unfitting expressions certainly does not belong to the later Talmudic period in which (according to Frankel and Geiger) the redaction of this Targum took place. The LXX and also certain Greek translations show a similar striving."³³

Friedmann compares the Targumim with the Boraithoth. He finds many parallel passages which prove the connection between the Targum Onkelos and the school of Akiba and, furthermore, that the differences with the Massoretic text are similar in the Targumim and in the Boraithoth.³⁴

He comes to the conclusion that the "Targumim are, at any rate, older than the Massoretic text and not younger than the Mekhilta and the Siphre."

Though the Targumim may come from the same sources, the Targum Onkelos certainly got its final form earlier than both the Palestinian and the Fragmenten-Targum. The Palestinian Targum seems to be based on the Targum Onkelos, and even its oldest fragments are later than the final redaction of the Targum Onkelos.³⁵ The Fragmenten-Targum cannot have undergone revision before the seventh century, for it mentions Mohammed's wife. The latest addition which can be traced in the Fragmenten-Targum is after 1453; for it is ^{refers to} ~~the account of~~ the fall of Constantinople to the Turks.

The errors and the voluntary changes by the Meturgemanim made necessary an authorized, written text already in early Tannaitic times. Though the interpreter was not allowed to use the text in the public service, he could have used it for his preparation. There were, however, strong objections against the existence of a fixed text written besides the Hebrew original. The rabbis were afraid that the translated text would become a second Torah, a document better known and more important to the people than the original. In Mishnah Meg. 1:8, Rabbi Simon b. Gamliel prohibits any written translation except Greek. He seemed to have considered the Greek language alone able to render the sense of the Hebrew correctly. Whether or not there was reason for the rabbis' anxiety is not quite clear. Some scholars, like Eichhorn, Geiger, and Hersfeld believe that the Torah was read in Greek only in the Hellenistic synagogues while another, Frankel, even holds that there was no reading at all. While they grant reason to the rabbis' fear for the Torah, Friedmann denies it by his

statement that only for a very short time were the Greek synagogues without Hebrew reading.³⁶ Rabbi Simon b. Gamliel is not the only one who prohibited written translations. Massekhet Sophrim 1:6-8 states that the Torah can be read only in Hebrew; and Jer. Meg. 1:9, while allowing the existence of translations, bars anyone except the Meturgemanim from using them.

Despite the prohibitions, there were Aramaic texts of parts of the Bible already in the time of the Second Temple. While there is no definite proof of the existence of a written Pentateuchal translation under Esra, the Talmud tells about an Aramaic translation of the Book of Job in the time of Gamliel I.³⁷ It might have been used for the reading of the High Priest on the night of Yom Kippur; for the later Sadducean High Priests were supposed by some to have been unable to read Job in Hebrew. This translation is reported to have been buried by Rabban Gamliel. His grandson, Gamliel II, however, is said to have read a Targum of the Book of Job. While Krochmal believes that this Targum was Syriac and Gœtz believes it to have been Greek; Berliner³⁸ concludes from the use of the expression, 'Targum', that the book was an Aramaic translation. He also assumes that, in the time of Gamliel II, Targumim of Biblical books besides Job existed.³⁹ In other places, too, it is obvious that attempts were made to make written translations of the Bible.⁴⁰ Meturgemanim may have translated some passages or whole books for their preparation or information.⁴¹ There is no definite proof either for the existence or for the non-existence of a written Targum text in early Mishnaic times. The statement, that Rabbi Akiba studied Bible and Targum⁴², may refer to a book as well as to translating proper; and even the rule that the Torah should be read twice and the Targum once⁴³, may mean oral translation.

The above statement, of R. Joshua b. Levi however, is at least proof of the fact that 'Targum' had become a definite term; and that it had gained authority besides the original Hebrew text- in the time of the oldest Palestinian Amora'im.

From the early fourth century, we have definite reports that the Targum existed in written form. Samuel b. Isaac saw in Palestine the Targum being read from a book. In the second half of the fourth century, Jose b. Abin⁴⁴ reproaches readers of a Targum which has a biased emphasis on God's mercy--e.g. the Targum to Lev.22:28. This translation may be found in a portion of the Palestinian Targum- still extant.

The number of quotations in early Palestinian literature, agreeing with the modern text of the Targum Onkelos, give reason enough to believe with Friedmann in an early written fixation of the Targum Onkelos in Palestine. The Prayer of the High Priest in Yoma 55b is identical with the Targum Onkelos to Gen. 11:10. Aramaic words in Tannaïtic statements and in Josephus agree with the language of the Targum, and the kind of exegesis, found in the New Testament, is that of the Targum.⁴⁵ The fact that the Church Fathers, Origen⁴⁶ and Jerome, do not mention the Targum Onkelos is no proof against the great popularity which the Targum enjoyed in Palestine. In Christian circles, a Syriac translation from Galilee was in use, while the Targum Onkelos originated in Judea.⁴⁶

Friedmann makes this assumption that the Targum originated in Judea on the basis of a linguistic comparison.⁴⁷ He states that the language used in Judea was Western Aramaic influenced by Hebrew and, through the continual contacts with Babylonian Jews, by Eastern Aramaic. On the other hand, in Galilee, people spoke a pure Western Aramaic- the Syriac of the Peshitta. In reality, the source of the language of the Targum Onkelos

cannot be quite clearly defined. Even Friedmann has to admit⁴⁸ that there are as many philological reasons for pointing to Babylonia as there are speaking for Palestine as the country of origin. Furthermore, the whole theory, about the country of origin of the Targum Onkelos on the basis of the dialect in which it is written, is not infallible. For the identification of the dialect is greatly dependent on the very late vocalization of the Targum text. This vocalization was originally fixed in Babylonia; and was changed to the sublinear system when the Targum was brought to European countries.⁴⁹ Thus it is not surprising that we find, among the scholars, divergent opinions about the relation between the language of the Targum Onkelos and its country of origin. Geiger finds that the vernacular of the Targum Onkelos is equivalent to that of the Babylonian Talmud.⁵⁰ But Hildeke is of a different opinion. He states that the dialect of the Targum is "a younger development of the Palestinian Aramaic used in some books of the Bible".⁵¹ He finds, however, a Babylonian influence which is caused by the redaction of the text in Babylonia. Dalman agrees with him. He calls the language of the Targum Onkelos- Palestinian Aramaic written in good style.⁵² Though the linguistic research does not back the assumption of different scholars that the Targum Onkelos originated completely in the Babylonian schools- it shows that the text was probably brought to Babylonia before it was finally established. Berliner does not even admit this as a fact. He denies the possibility of recognizing the differences between the Aramaic dialects at that early time.⁵³ It is possible that the Targum Onkelos originally was identical with the Palestinian Targum, and that the differences between both translations were caused by the fact that the Targum Onkelos was carefully revised according to subject matter and to

the expressions used, and that it was written in the Babylonian academies.⁵⁴ The identity of both Targumim still exists in some passages.⁵⁵ The development under different circumstances made the two translations more and more divergent. The Palestinian and the Fragmenten-Targum changed by addition, the Targum Onkelos by revision. Thus, in the late Palestinian translations, scholars trace passages which seem to be older than the corresponding phrases in the Targum Onkelos; while on the other hand, parts of the Fragmenten-Targum appear to be marginal glosses on the Targum Onkelos.⁵⁶ A similar theory was propounded by Bacher.⁵⁷ He postulates the existence of an old translation on which both the Targum Onkelos and the Palestinian translations are based.

Before Friedmann, scholars believed that the Targum Onkelos was very unpopular in Palestine, and that it might have been forgotten had it not been accepted as the official Targum in the Babylonian schools. Berliner does not know of the quotations in the Jerushalmi mentioned above. The first Palestinian citations he knows are in Gen. Rabba.⁵⁸ Despite Friedmann's discoveries, however, it is quite obvious that the Targum Onkelos was, by far, more popular and more in use in Babylonia than in Palestine.

In the Babylonian schools, the Targum Onkelos was generally accepted as the official Targum.⁵⁹ The connection between the academies and the Targum became so close that they took it as their own—forgetting its Palestinian origin. They called it תרגום דבבלי "our Targum"⁶⁰ also in order to contrast it with the Palestinian Targum. Whenever the Targum Onkelos is referred to in the Talmud Babli, the quotation is introduced by the word, תרגום דבבלי, 'as we translate'.⁶¹ This method of quotation by the Babylonian Amoraim led many scholars to think of Babylonia as the country of origin for the Targum Onkelos. They are,

① so in Berliner

however, contradicted by most of the more recent writers who interpret this claim of ownership of the Targum by the Babylonians- only as a sign of great popularity.⁶²

The quotations in the Talmud help us to determine the time when the text of the Targum had finally to be settled. We may conclude that, owing to the form in which the Targum is quoted and the authority which it enjoys with the Amoraim, the final redaction must have been completed in the period of the early Babylonian Amoraim. Furthermore, there is a Massorah of the Targum text which dates from the beginning of the third century. Therefore, the redaction must have been accomplished before this date.

However, as to how much earlier the redaction took place, the scholars are not unanimous in their opinions. Zuns and Luzzatto put it as early as the first century, and give Palestine as its place of origin. Berliner dates the final form of the text from the second century- while Frankel and Hamburger give Babylonia of the third century as its birth place.⁶³ Geiger even transgresses the third- century limit and says that the Targum text originated from an older source, and was finally established in the fourth century.⁶⁴ The name "Targum Onkelos" originated in the post-Talmudic period, and the statements using this name are probably based in Meg. 3a.⁶⁵ In the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 38, the Targum Onkelos to Gen.45:27 is quoted with the remark-'Onkelos has translated'.⁶⁶ Targum Onkelos is first quoted by this name by the Gaon, Sar Shalom who died in 859 C.E.⁶⁷

The recognition of the Targum Onkelos as an authoritative translation in post-Talmudic times is not subject to any doubt. The fact that it was considered worthy of a Massorah places it on almost as high a level as the Torah itself.⁶⁸ Gaon Sar Shalom states that God performed a miracle through

Onkelos, and that his translation is the only sacred one.⁶⁹ Natronai Gaon, who died in 869, stated that the "Targum de rabbonon" cannot be replaced in the synagogue by any other one.⁷⁰ Maimonides calls Onkelos the bearer of ancient exegetical traditions, and a thorough master of Hebrew and Aramaic.⁷¹ Since early times, the Targum Onkelos accompanied the text of the Pentateuch, and served as the authoritative reference work for all commentators.

The question about date, language, popularity, and the authority of the Targum Onkelos- however- puzzled the scholars far less than another problem: i.e. the problem of the authorship of the Targum Onkelos. For tradition, this question existed as little as that of the dating. Rabbi Hiyya b. Abba stated(Meg.3a) that the Targum of the Torah is that of Onkelos Ha-ger. When the question was put, whether it was not as old as the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the answer was found immediately: וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח -'they forgot it, they repeated it, and the reestablished it'. For the critical scholars, this statement was not authoritative. Was the translation really made by one man, or was it the work of a group, or even a tradition developed through several generations? Was Onkelos only a name given to the translator or was he a real personality? If he existed, with which of the mentioned persons bearing this name is he identical? Is he the same as Akylas, the Greek translator of the Bible- Onkelos being merely a corruption by the Babylonian dialect? These questions themselves are confusing, and the paucity of the sources is made evident by the many and varied solutions offered by the scholars.

The name, Onkelos, appears at different times in the Babylonian Talmud. Abodah Zarah 11a tells of a certain proselyte Onkelos b.Kalonimos or b. Kalonimos. He was arrested for being a Jew; but he escaped because

of his persuasive manner of speech. He even converted to Judaism the soldiers who wanted to arrest him. A second time, an Onkelos b. Kalonikos is mentioned in Gittin 56b. There, he is the son of Titus' sister. He intended to become converted to Judaism and asks, for advice, the spirits of his uncle Titus, of Balam, and of Jesus. The two former ones are opposed to his joining Judaism; but upon the advice of the latter, Onkelos becomes a convert. According to Graetz, both these quotations in Abodah Zarah and in Gittin refer to the same person.⁷² Other quotations prove the existence of a Tanna by the name of Onkelos. He also is a proselyte; for he is referred to by the name, Onkelos ha-Ger, the same one to whom tradition (Meg. 3a) ascribes the authorship of the Targum Onkelos. The following passages of the Talmud throw some light upon the personality of this Onkelos ha-Ger.⁷³ Tosef. Demai 6 reports that he threw the heritage from his heathen father into the sea in order not to profit from anything connected with idolatry. Tos. Hagiga 3:1 tells that he observed the laws of levitical purity very strictly and, similarly, Tos. Mikva'oth 6 records that once, together with Rabban Gamliel, he bathed in the sea because he did not consider the existing ritual baths as clean enough. According to Tos. Sabb. 8, Onkelos arranged the burial of Rabban Gamliel and burned many treasures over his body. While the statement in Mikva'oth clearly refers to Gamliel II., Sabb. reads

וְכָל הַיּוֹדֵעַ אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה רַבִּי גַמְלִיֵּל בֶּן יוֹסֵף . . . Most of the scholars emend this passage by eliminating the וְכָל הַיּוֹדֵעַ. According to them, Onkelos is a younger contemporary of the Patriarch, Gamliel II.

The passage in Meg. 3a אֲלֵיָּעוֹר וְר' יְהוֹשֻעַ says that Onkelos was a student of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua or was at least advised by them. The agreement of the Targum Onkelos with Akiba's method

of exegesis suggests that he might have been a pupil of Akiba's. Friedmann does not agree with this interpretation. He reads the passage in *Tos. Sabb.* as it stands. For him, Onkelos ha-Ger was a pupil of the older Patriarch, Gamliel, and he really arranged his burial. His relation to the generation of Gamliel II. was that of an older associate, and as such he accompanied the younger Patriarch. He is the author of the Targum Onkelos because the Talmud calls him so- since no definite proof against his authorship can be brought forth. Furthermore, a statement of the Tanna, Onkelos', about the nature of the Cherubim (quoted in B. Bathra 99a) stands in agreement with the Targum Onkelos. Onkelos was hardly connected with Rabbi Akiba, and the agreements with him are purely coincidental. That he did not follow Akiba's rules, Friedmann proves by showing contradictions between the Targum Onkelos and Akiba's method. To show that Onkelos worked independently, Friedmann quotes some passages in the Targum Onkelos which have no parallels in rabbinic literature-- e.g. Deut. 23:18. The connection to Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua is a closer one; however, not that of master and student. Onkelos, in his Aramaic translation, made use of Eliezer's and Joshua's rules of exegesis--(therefore 'גל נ"ג 'ED). He agreed with them in their chief premises, and where they disagreed- he adopted a middle course. As to the date of the Targum Onkelos, Friedmann concludes (from this relation to Joshua and Eliezer) that it appeared during Onkelos' old age-- i.e. about 100 C.E. Friedmann is backed in this opinion by the statements of Luzzatto and Zuns- according to whom the translation was made by Onkelos in the time of Gamliel I.⁷⁴

The chief argument against Onkelos' authorship- and even against the existence of the person, Onkelos ha-Ger- is the fact that most of the legends told about Onkelos in the Babylonian sources have parallels in Palestinian literature- in the name of Akylas.

The name of Akylas (Greek: *Axvλas* usually transliterated Aquila) appears both in Jewish and Christian writings in different places; and probably- also referring to different persons. Strangely enough, they are all proselytes. Friedmann differentiates between the three men with the name of Akylas. The first appears in *Pesikta Rabbati* 116b as *אֲכִילָא* ⁷⁵ *אֲכִילָא*, and in *Gen. Rabba* 1:2 as *אֲכִילָא* or *אֲכִילָא* ⁷⁵ The second is a Jew who turned Christian- according to *Romans* 16:3 and in *Timothy*. Though he is said to be from Pontus, he is not supposed to be identical with the translator, Akylas, whom *Sifra Behar* 1:9 mentions as coming from Pontus.⁷⁶ The identification of this place, Pantus, presented a difficult problem to the scholars. Friedmann holds it to be a place in the Lebanon, but he is refuted by Rosenthal.⁷⁷ According to the Christian sources, the Church Fathers-Epiphanius and Jerome-Akylas comes from a wealthy heathen family in Synope on the Pontus. He is a relative of the Emperor Hadrian. In this, the Christian and the Jewish sources agree. They state, however, in different places that he was the father-in-law, the brother-in-law, or the nephew of Hadrian.⁷⁸ In 117 C.E., he was sent by Hadrian to Palestine to build up *Aelia Capitolina* on the ruins of Jerusalem; and he was probably the first administrator of the new city. The legend about his conversion is told in *Tanchuma Mishpatim*.⁷⁹ Akylas asks Hadrian how he can become rich. The Emperor answers that he shall go on a journey and buy what is low in price. He could be sure that the price would rise again. After some years, he came back and reported that he had become converted to Judaism and had studied the Torah. He had found nothing considered so low, and therefore- nothing with more chance to rise higher than Judaism. Hadrian objected to his being circumcized, but Akylas answered with the question: Do you pay

a soldier who does not carry arms? So one cannot expect to learn Torah without being circumcised."⁸⁰ In Jer. Hagigah 2(beginning), a story mentions Akylas in connection with Hadrian. By a zoological illustration, he proves to the emperor the importance of air in sustaining life. This legend is considered to be a defense of Judaism- since air is the symbol of the spirit, of religion.⁸¹

In Palestine, Akylas first became a Christian, and then a Jew.⁸² According to Friedmann, Akylas' conversion took place as early as the reign of Trajan or Domitian- before Hadrian was emperor.⁸³ The fact that he became a convert in Palestine agrees with the story of his origin in Pontus. The reason given for his conversion in Christian sources is, that they expelled him because he did not give up his heathen beliefs in astrology. According to another source, he fell in love with a Jewish girl.⁸⁴ The reasoning usually followed by the Jewish scholars is that, through the Christian teachings, Akylas became interested in the Old Testament and the Jewish laws; and liked them well enough to accept them for himself. Gen. Rabbah lxx:5 tells that Akylas came to Rabbi Eliezer and to Rabbi Joshua to ask what his reward would be for becoming a Jew. Eliezer thought this question arrogant and repelled him with a curt reply, but Joshua was tolerant and patient enough to explain to him all the advantages he would have by being a Jew. This story is considered as evidence that Akylas did not become a convert to Judaism at once.⁸⁵ After his conversion, Akylas studied with Eliezer and Joshua⁸⁶ and with Akiba.⁸⁷ Jer. Meg. 19 tells that Akylas translated the Torah before R. Eliezer and R. Joshua.

A new translation of the Bible into Greek had become necessary because of the corruption of the old LXX. Since the rise of Christianity, many christological references had been inserted into its text, and it could no longer be used in Jewish services-- i.e. unless one wanted to introduce

Christian propaganda into the synagogue.⁸⁸ Akylas wanted to teach the true sense of the Bible to those who did not understand Hebrew. Consequently, he created a Greek translation keeping exactly to the text.⁸⁹ He followed Akiba's rules of exegesis closely— e.g. he translated the particle DN by Sew . Jer. Kidd. 1:1, which tells that he presented his translation of DNBN in Lev. 19:20 to Akiba, proves at least a connection between the translator and Akiba. Whether Akylas used the Tanna's rules as his pupil or whether they discussed the method of translation as friends is not presented clearly by the legend.⁹⁰ The problem is similar concerning the influence of Rabbi Elieser and Rabbi Joshua. While the passage from Jer. Meg. is usually interpreted to mean that the two rabbis controlled the Greek translation just as teachers watch the work of their pupil— Friedmann explains that Akylas only went to both Elieser and Joshua to have them approve of his translation.

The latest possible date for Akylas' translation is given by the appearance of Irenaeus' "Adversus Haereses" where it is referred to. As this work dates from 177 C.E., Akylas must have edited his translation before that year. Epiphanius dates the translation in the twelfth year of Hadrian— i.e. 129 C.E.⁹¹ Eichhorn does not trust Epiphanius' dating very much; but he also gives the same approximate deadline for Akylas' translation— as the year, 130 C.E.⁹²

The translation proved to be a success. Therefore, a second edition was written, which was readily accepted in Asia Minor.⁹³ When Origenes edited his Hexapla (ca. 250 C.E.), he included Akylas' translation in it. As the most literal translation, it took the third column, after the Hebrew and the Greek transliteration. In the fourth place, there was Symmachus' translation, in the fifth place the LXX, and in the sixth Theodotion's translation.⁹⁴

Fragments of the Hexapla have been collected by Christian scholars, and with them parts of Akylas' translation have been preserved. With the exception, however, of a newly discovered piece— the text itself has been completely lost (i.e. Akylas'), and besides the fragments in the Hexapla, we know only passages of the translation which are quoted either in the Jerushalmi or in various Midrashim.⁹⁵ According to Eichhorn, not even these few words and sentences are really from the original Akylas. As they do not give a literal translation, they must originate from a different Akylas or they are late Greek aggadot which were ascribed to Akylas.⁹⁶

Akylas' translation was generally accepted by the Jews. The rabbis were delighted with it, and they applied Ps. 45:3, נ'ב'ב' , 'exceeding beauty' to him, the נב'] , the Greek. It was in use in the synagogues until the sixth century.⁹⁷ It was also appreciated by the Christians. This is proved by its inclusion in the Hexapla. Besides, it was used by Jerome; and some phrases of Canticles, of Ecclesiastes, and of Ezekiel even entered into the late Mss. of the LXX.⁹⁸

The passage from Jer. Meg., quoted above, is almost identical with the passage in Babli Meg. 3a— referring to Onkelos. Even the transmitter of the tradition is the same— Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba. Similarly, a passage in Jer. Dem. 25a corresponds to the story quoted from Tosef. Demai about Onkelos— in which Akylas throws away the money inherited from his parents. In these legends, and in all other instances where either of the two names is mentioned, Akylas is found only in Palestinian, Onkelos only in Babylonian writings. From these few facts, which form a connection between the two figures Onkelos and Akylas, the scholars created their theories as to the relationship between the historical personalities—Onkelos and Akylas.

The earliest scholars identified Onkelos with Akylas because of their ignorance of the latter's translation.⁹⁹ De Rossi, the first one to do intensive research on the subject, came to the conclusion that there were two distinct persons. He writes: "Both Onkelos and Akylas existed at the same time. Only the former was an old colleague, the latter a younger student of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and Akylas followed the traces of Onkelos."¹⁰⁰

Eichhorn still has two distinct personalities. Akylas lives in Palestine and Onkelos in Babylonia. (The Targum is considered to be written in Babylonian Aramaic because of its similarity to the language of Daniel and Ezra.) However, as the Babylonian rabbis had forgotten the biography of their translator, they ascribed to him the traditions they heard about the Palestinian Akylas.¹⁰¹

The same agreement of the biographical fragments in Babli and Jerushalmi make Landau identify Akylas and Onkelos as the same person, a pupil of Eliezer and Joshua, who made both the Greek and the Aramaic translation. The difference of the names, he explains in the following way: "The hellenic pronounciation of the α brought the sound of the √ before the X. The Hebrew Ayin expressed this sound naturally. Consequently, they transliterated not D7'PK but D7'PY, and in Babylonia, D17PJ1K.¹⁰² A very similar method of identification is followed by Hausdorff.¹⁰³

Rappaport develops two theories which, though not making Akylas the same as Onkelos, posits a causal relation between the Greek and the Aramaic translations. The Targum is, for him, an Aramaic translation created according to the same method of literal translation- as the Greek translation by Akylas.¹⁰⁴ It was created either by Akylas himself, or- more probably- by his pupils, in Palestine; and it was brought to

Babylonia later. The academies in Babylonia lacked a literal Aramaic Torah translation, and they needed the help of a Greek translation because they had to render, in Greek, terms for which they did not have Aramaic words. They made their Targum after the pattern of Akylas' second edition, and therefore called it Targum Onkelos. The reasons for the second assumption are: the quotations by "we translate" and not "Onkelos translates" in the Babli; the fact that the Targum Onkelos is not quoted in the Jerushalmi and by the Church Fathers; the name 'Targum Babli'; the Babylonian expressions appearing in the text.^{105.}

Geiger gives an almost identical hypothesis, and he is followed by Waxman. The Targum originates in Akiba's school among those who want to fix a standard translation against the Meturgemanim. Akylas' Greek translation brought the chief impetus to the work. When the translation was brought to Babylon, the name Akylas was changed to Onkelos.^{106.}

Berliner follows the same line of argument. Onkelos is the Babylonian form of Akylas.^{107.} But, although Akylas' literal translation may have been the first and greatest impulse for the fixing of a similar Aramaic Targum, the Jews did not need a proselyte for that work.^{108.}

The opinion, that the Targum Onkelos originates not from a single man but from a school or a group of people who worked in accordance with Akylas' style and therefore named their creation after him, was quite common. Hamburger finds proof for this assumption in the strange use of the plural in Meg. 3a.^{109.}

The theory of the dependence of the Targum Onkelos upon Akylas' translation was first contradicted by Frankel. He compared the fragments of Akylas' Greek translation with the corresponding passages of the Targum; and he stated that they are not in agreement.^{110.} The Targum Onkelos was made in the school of Rav in the third century in Babylon, based on pieces

of older Palestinian translations. It was given the name Onkelos because the translators wanted to be anonymous; and it came out at about the same time that Rav reported on the work of the Greek translator, Akylas.¹¹¹ Hersfeld admits the existence of a Tanna, Onkelos. However, he states that the passages naming Onkelos in connection with the Targum refer to Akylas, and that a true tradition about the author or authors has not come down to us.¹¹²

There is, however, some difficulty in treating as identical the names Onkelos and Akylas- in all the traditions about them. Onkelos is a contemporary of Gamliel who died after Hadrian's accession, while Akylas is connected by legend with Hadrian.¹¹³ It is for this reason, and because of his hesitation in changing the traditional reading of the Talmudim, that Friedmann returns to practically the same theory as De Rossi's. Two different proselytes existed. There was Akylas, the well-known Greek translator, younger contemporary of Eliezer, Joshua, and Akiba; and there was the Tanna, Onkelos, pupil of Gamliel I, and older friend of Gamliel II. This Tanna was the author of the official Aramaic translation to the Pentateuch; and by this translation, he may have had some influence upon this younger Akylas.¹¹⁴ The reason why the scholars identified the names Akylas and Onkelos, was, that they were amazed by the same ending of the two names, Onkelos (also Ankilas, as they assumed) and Akylas. Furthermore, they might have been misled by the fact that both were proselytes; that both were translators of the Torah; that the same Amoraim reported about them; that both were nephews of a Roman Emperor; and finally- that both were pupils of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua.¹¹⁵

Friedmann, too, does not take the rabbinical scriptures quite as they stand. He admits one mistake in writing in the account of the heritage in Jer. Demai. There it should read Onkelos instead of Akylas.¹¹⁶

Besides, he eliminates as unhistorical the legends about the son of Kalonikos and about the conversion of Akylas.¹¹⁷ The reading of the rest of the passages is correct and in agreement with his theory. The similarity of statements in Jer. and Babli Meg. is due to the incident that the same Amoraim, who during their stay in Palestine reported about the Greek translation, gave a report about the Aramaic Targum after their return to Babylonia.¹¹⁸ As regards the fact that Onkelos is not named and his Targum hardly quoted in the Jerushalmi, Friedmann explains that popular scriptures are never quoted by their author. He assumes that the Targum Onkelos was 'at home' and was popular in Palestine while the Babylonian Talmud, interested in the Palestinian writings as something foreign, gives more important information about this literature.¹¹⁹

With Friedmann, the circle of theories and hypotheses about Onkelos and his Targum seems to close itself. He is practically back to the solution of De Rossi who lived more than 400 years before. Modern scholars, after Friedmann, have disproved most of his arguments; and returned to the opinions of the preceding writers whom Friedmann intended to refute. Yet, none of them dug up much new material, and the place of the man—who might finally solve the problem of Akylas-Onkelos—is still open.

As a result of the translating and exegetical activity which had been carried on in Palestine for centuries, a number of Aramaic versions of the Pentateuch came to light. Among these were (1) the version known as the Targum Chertan, (2) the Targum Onkelos, also known as Targum Neofiti, and (3) the fragmentary Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. The version of Onkelos was brought forth in Palestine, but since the need for an Aramaic translation was far greater in Babylonia it was immediately taken over there as the official version. It is called in Hebrew "Targum" and they quoted it every day in the Synagogue.

Targumic Exegesis

in

the Targum Onkelos

to

Deuteronomy.

The Targum of Onkelos is a work of great value, having not only literary value, but exegetical value as well. On the whole it follows closely to the text and the translator took great care to include all necessary Jewish interpretations and sometimes also additions though very sparingly. The author of the Targum to Deuteronomy seems to have had the problem of presenting a lucid version of the Pentateuch to the people--in which the sacred material would be handled in a most reverent and dignified manner. The underlying principle in the exegesis of Onkelos is to maintain the sanctity of all great conceptions of God (where He is referred to as "He" and in questions). In addition to this tendency, the author of Onkelos is careful to protect the honor of the patriarchs, as well as that of the people, Israel. He is also careful to give the laws a character of a law given to the people of the Hebrew text might be difficult for the people to understand.

Here, in general, is the general tendency of the Targum Onkelos as regards its exegesis. But for any more detailed study and analysis of

As a result of the translating and exegetic activity which had been carried on in Palestine for centuries, a number of Aramaic versions of the Pentateuch came to light. Among them were (1) The version known as the Targum Onkelos, (2) the Jerusalem Targum, also known as pseudo-Jonathan, and (3) the fragmentary Jerusalem Targum. The version of Onkelos was brought forth in Palestine, but since the need for an Aramaic translation was far greater in Babylon- it was immediately taken over there as the official version. They called it תרגום אונקלוס, 'our Targum', and they quoted it many times in the Talmud.

The Targum of Onkelos was a great piece of work, having not only literary value, but exegetical value as well. On the whole it clings closely to the text and is literal, yet the translator took great care to include all necessary Halachic interpretations and sometimes also Agadic- though very sparingly.¹ The author of the Targum to Onkelos seems to have had the problem of presenting a lucid version of the Pentateuch to the people-- in which the sacred material would be handled in a most reverent and dignified manner. The underlying principle in the exegesis of Targum Onkelos consisted in the elimination of all gross conceptions of God (where He is compared to man in body and in emotions). In addition to this tendency, the author of Onkelos is careful to protect the honor of the patriarchs, as well as that of the people, Israel. He is also careful to give the true meaning of a law whenever the sense of the Hebrew text might be difficult for the people to comprehend.

Here, in general, is the general tendency of the Targum Onkelos as regards its exegesis. But for our more detailed study and analysis of

this translation, it would be better were attention centered on one specific book of the Pentateuchal version- namely that of Deuteronomy. In this book, there can be found traces of nearly all the types of exegesis which the author of Onkelos employs. However, in order to limit our study of the material, I have chosen to center this section of the work around certain major headings. These headings might well be grouped in five divisions; namely, (1) Avoidance of anthropomorphisms; (2) Avoidance of anthropopathisms; (3) Interpretive exegesis; (4) Place names; and (5) Lexicography.

I. Avoidance of Anthropomorphisms.

The Dictionary defines 'anthropomorphism' as- "The ascription of human attributes, feelings, and conduct to spiritual beings, especially God or any diety." 2. It is just this tendency which the author of the Targum Onkelos desires to avoid, and he does it in several ways. For the sake of conciseness, I have placed these avoidances of anthropomorphisms under several sub-headings; as follows- (a) Regular avoidances; avoidances under the expressions (b) שכן נחמ ; (c) ד'סרמ ; and (d) דחלמ .

A. Regular Avoidances of Anthropomorphisms.

Perhaps, the most frequently recurring device in this section is the use of דק for purposes of circumlocution. In one place, it might refer to 'before' God rather than the Diety Himself; while in another verse, it might be used to mean 'before' the people (when speaking of God's actions)-

thus eliminating any reference to an actual physical "presence". Below are appended the verses in which the applications of this principle are illustrated; and as an aid in understanding them, the rendering of the Targum will be placed to the left of the original. Throughout this work, references will be indicated in like manner.

- 1) החולך---דמוכר קדמיכון. Here, the anthropomorphism is avoided by a change of verb. Instead of saying that God actually 'goes' before them, the Targum says "who leads on before" the people. (1:30).
- 2) ו'שמע יהוה---ושמיע קדם יי. Here it says, not that God heard but that 'it was heard before God'. (1:34; 5:25).
- 3) ו'שבוע-----קים. Here, God (as a physical being) did not 'swear' but he "established". (1:34).
- 4) ד' יהוה-----סחא סן קדם יי. The rendition of the Targum, that "the plague from God", was used to remove the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew- i.e. the 'hand' of God was among them. (2:15).
- 5) ב' תדרשנו--ארי חכעי סן קדמוהי. Instead of implying bodily substance to Him, the Targum writes "when you seek before Him". (4:29).
- 6) לכוא--לאחולאה. The anthropomorphism is removed by saying that God will reveal Himself- instead of implying the coming of a physical being. (4:34; 33:2).
- 7) פנ'ם בפנ'ם-ססלל עם ססלל. The Targum uses "Word with word" for the 'Face to face' of the Hebrew- thus removing the very evident anthropomorphism. (5:4).
- 8) ללכת בודכ'ו-נארוהן דחקנן קדמוהי. The Targum removes the anthropomorphic reference of a 'path' on which God's feet might possibly tread. (8:6; 11:22; 19:9; 26:17; 28:9; 30:16).

- 9) רָאִיתִי--נִלִּי קִדְמִי Where the Targum says: "this people was revealed before Me" to eliminate the anthropomorphism of the original— i.e. רָאִיתִי . (9:13; 26:7; 32:19, 20, 36).
- 10) הֲרַף מִמֶּנִּי--אֲנִי בְעוֹתֶךָ קִדְמִי To avoid the Hebrew's reference to God's substance, the Targum says: "Cease thy prayer from before Me". (9:14).
- 11) אֵלֹהִים לֹא יִשָּׂא פָנִים--דִּי לִיה קִדְמוּהִי מִמֶּנִּי אֲפִין The Targum avoids the anthropomorphism by saying: "for there is no partiality before Him". (10:17).
- 12) בְּכִרְי--מִתּוֹמִי נִבְּוֵאִי The reference to God's words, implying speech, a mouth, and therefore a body, is avoided by the Targum's saying: "the matters of my prophecy". (18:18).
- 13) וְלֹא יִרָא אֱלֹהִים--וְלֹא דָחַל מִן קִדְמִי The Targum does not say that the people did not fear God (His physical being); but that they 'were not afraid from before God'— thus eliminating the obvious anthropomorphic reference. (25:18).
- 14) וְאִין עוֹלָדִים קִדְמוּהִי עוֹלָא לֹא נִפְס The Hebrew implies a Being (substance) who is not iniquitous; but the Targum eliminates all the possibilities of anthropomorphic references by saying: "for from before Him iniquity does not go forth." (32:4).
- 15) כִּי אֵשׁ קִדְמָה בְּאִפִּי--אֵרִי קִדְמוֹ חֲקִיף כְּאֵשׁ נִפְס מִקִּדְמִי The Hebrew's anthropomorphic reference to God's 'nostrils' is avoided by the Targum which says: "behold, a burning strong as fire went forth from before Me." (32:22).
- 16) וְלֹא יְהוָה פָּעַל כָּל זֹאת--וְלֹא מִן קִדְמִי הוּא כָּל דָּא Instead of imputing to God a body which did or did not do certain things, the Targum says: "and not from before God had all this come to pass." (32:27).
- 17) בִּידִךְ--כֹּחַ נִבְּוֵאִי The obvious anthropomorphism of God's "hand" is rendered by the Targum as 'might'. (33:3).

- 18) צדקת יהוה עשה-זכרון קדם יי עבר
ומלא ברכת יהוה-ומלא ברכון מן קדם יי

The Hebrew implies a body for God to which righteousness(v.21) might belong; or to which blessing (v.23) adheres. The Targum removes this implication by saying that the merit and the blessing come from before God— not from Him. (53:21,23).

B. שכנתא

Shekinah is defined as "the majestic presence or manifestation of God which has descended to 'dwell' among men."³ The word, itself, is taken from such passages as speak of God dwelling either in the Tabernacle or among the people of Israel.⁴ Like מ'סרא and י'קרא, the term was used by the Targumist in place of 'God' where the anthropomorphic references in the Bible were no longer regarded as proper. Wherever the person, the dwelling, or the remoteness of God is mentioned, the author of Targum Onkelos paraphrases it by the use of שכנתא.⁵ Also, wherever the Name occurs, he substitutes שכנתא for it.⁶ —'presence' and 'face' being translated the same way.⁷ Subsumed are both the readings of the Hebrew and their rendition by the Targumist— all of which avoid the evident anthropomorphisms of the original by the use of שכנתא.

- 1) כי אינני בקרבכם- ארי ליה שכנתא שריא ביניכון (1:42).
- 2) אשר מי אל בשמים ובארץ-די אח הוא אלהא דשכנתא בשמיא (5:24).
- 3) האלהים בשמים-הוא אלהים דשכנתא בשמיא (4:59).
- 4) לשום שמו שם-לאשראה שכנתא חסן (12:5,21;14:24).
- 5) לשכן שמו שם-לאשראה שכנתא חסן (12:11;14:23;16:2,6,11;26:2).

6) יהוה אלהיך מזהלך--יי אלהך שכנחה מהלכא (23:15).

7) והסתרת פני--ואסלק שכנחי (31:17;32:20).

8) כי אין אלהי בקרבי--הלא מדליה שכינת אלהי ביני (31:17).

9) 'סכבנהו--אשרנון סחור סחור לשכנתה (32:10).

10) כי אלא אל שמים ידי--ארי אחקניה בשמיא ביה שכנחי The

removal of the anthropomorphism consists in changing the introductory part of the oath from a reference to God's 'hand'— which the Targum does by

saying: "For as I have prepared in the Heavens, the abode of My Shekinah. (32:40).

11) ובין כחפיו שב--וכארעה חשרי שכנחא (33:12).

12) ורצון שבני סנה-רעי לה דשכנחה בשמיא ועל משה אחולי באסנה The

Targum here removes the anthropomorphism by saying: "and the favor of Him whose Presence is in the Heavens, and who was revealed to Moses at the Bush. (33:16).

13) ורכב שמים בעזרך--דשכנחה בשמיא בסעודך (33:26).

מִימְרָא c.

In the Targum, the Memra figures constantly as the manifestation of the Divine power, or as God's messenger in place of God Himself, wherever the predicate is not in conformity with the dignity or the spirituality of the Deity.⁸ Its real meaning is 'The Word' in the sense of the creative or directive word or speech of God manifesting His power in the world of matter or mind.⁹ It is used especially by the author of Onkelos when an anthropomorphic expression is to be avoided.

1) ותמרו את פי יהוה--ומרכחון על גזרה מימרא דיי (1:26)

2) אינכם מאמינים ביהוה אלהיכם--ליחבון מהמנין במימרא דיי (1:32)

- 3) Here, the anthropomorphism is removed by saying: "The Word of the Lord your God will fight for you"—instead of letting God Himself do the fighting. (1:30; 3:22).
- 4) יהוה אלהיך אש אלה--אלהך מיסרה אשא אכלא (4:24).
- 5) ויצאך-----ואפקך במיסרה (4:37).
- 6) אנכי עמד בין יהוה--הויתי קאם בן מיסרא דיי (5:5).
- 7) קול יהוה-----קל מיסרא דיי (5:22; 18:16).
- 8) קול אלהים-----קל מיסרא דיי (5:25).
- 9) פי יהוה-----מיסרא דיי (8:5).
- 10) אש אלה הוא-----מיסרה אשא אכלא הוא (9:5).
- 11) פי יהוה-----נזרת מיסרא דיי (9:23).
- 12) אנכי אדרש-----מיסרי יהנע (18:19).
- 13) יהוה אלהיך עמך-----מיסרה במעודך (20:1).
- 14) ושב מאחריך--ויהוב מיסרה מלאומבא לך (23:15).
- 15) ושמעת בקול יהוה--ותקבל למיסרא דיי (27:10).
- 16) בקול יהוה-----למיסרא דיי (28:1,2,15,45,62; 30:8,10).
- 17) בקולו-----במיסרה (30:2,20).
- 18) הוא עבר לפניך-----מיסרה יעבר קדמך (31:5).
- 19) הוא יהיה עמך-----מיסרה יהי במעודך (31:8).
- 20) מעלתם בי-----שקרתון במיסרי (32:51).
- 21) According to Adler, ומזחת זרעת עלם--במיסרה אתעבד עלמא the anthropomorphic reference lies in the fact that, underneath God is the world; and as this would ascribe body ('arms') to Him--the Targum avoids this by saying "and by His Word the world was made".¹⁰ (33:27).

ד. דחלתא

In a great many sources on the Targumim the third expression, by which

the author avoids anthropomorphic references, is יקרא "Honor, Power, or Majesty". The author of the Targum does make use of this circumlocution in his translation of the Pentateuch. Peculiarly enough, however, in the book under consideration, namely Deuteronomy, no such term is employed. What seems to have taken its place is quite a different term—i.e. דחלחא. This word means, literally, 'fear'—and in the connection in which we find it used in Deuteronomy— the "fear of God". By the frequent use of this term, the Targumist avoids many anthropomorphisms in the book. For example, whenever it mentions 'cleaving to God' or 'forgetting God'— the Targumist renders it by "cleaving to the fear of God" or "forgetting the fear of God".^{11.}
^{12.}

- 1) מלא אחרי יהוה--אשלים בחר דחלחא דיי (1:36).
- 2) ואחם הדבקים ביהוה--ואחון דאדבקתון בדחלחא דיי (4:4).
- 3) ואחבם לקח יהוה--ויתכון קריב יי לדחלחא (4:20).
- 4) יהוה אלהיך-----דחלחא דיי (4:29).
- 5) חשבח את יהוה--דילמא תנשי יה דחלחא דיי (6:12; 8:11, 14, 19).
- 6) ובו תדבק-----ולדחלחא הקרב (10:20).
- 7) ולדבקה בו-----ולאתקרבא לדחלחא (11:22; 30:20).
- 8) אחרי יהוה-----בחר דחלחא דיי (13:5).
- 9) תמים תהיה עם יהוה--שלים תהי בדחלחא דיי (18:13).
- 10) אשר עזבתני-----דשבתא דחלתי (28:20).
- 11) מעם יהוה-----סדחלחא דיי (29:17).
- 12) ועזבני-----וישבקון דחלתי (31:16).

(NOTE)

באצבע אלהים--באצבעא דיי (9:10). It is peculiar that there was no attempt made to remove the anthropomorphism here. But Adler says that it was probably allowed to remain in order to lend added sanctity to the 10 Commandments.^{13.}

III. Interpretive Exegesis.

In the foregoing discussion on the exegesis in the Targum Onkelos, the emphasis was placed on two types—i.e. the avoidance of anthropomorphisms and the removal of anthropopathisms. Now, however, we come to a new type of exegesis which goes beyond the elimination of unsavory expressions regarding the Deity. Here, various tendencies are manifested by the author— the most prominent of which being the desire to clarify, for his readers, vague and obscure passages in the Hebrew original. In a similar spirit, he reinterprets other passages in order that they might have more meaning to the people of his day. These are, in the main, the most striking tendencies of the Targumist, in this section. There are several other minor tendencies which, though they appear but seldom, are nevertheless important. For example, there are several places where the Targum enlarges on the Hebrew in order to make more remarkable the work of God, and to add greater Glory to His name. Then, there are a few scattered passages in which some grammatical twist of the Targumist produces an entirely different interpretation. Lastly, there are a number of individual passages, spread widely throughout this book, which might give us some idea of the thoughts with which the Targumist and his group were toying at the time this translation was composed. These latter references, although they are interesting to us, do not warrant being put into a special group; and for this reason— they will be included in an appendix or note to the section on the passages reinterpreted by the Targumist.

A. Passages clarifying the Text.

1) ומשלם לסנאוהי סבן די אנון עבדין
 קדמוהי בחייהון לאובדיהון לא
 מאחר עבד סב לסנאוהי סבון די אנון
 עבדין קדמוהי בחייהון משלם לחון:

ומשלם לשנאיו אל פניו
 להאכידו לא יאחר לשנאו
 אל פניו ישלם לו:

Here, the Targum enlarges on the Hebrew, and makes clear what is meant. It seems to me that the Targum has a bit more humane view of retribution- as we may see from its rendering of the verse: "And He repays them who hate Him the good which they have done before Him- in their lives; to destroy them(in the world to come). He does not delay to do good to His enemies for the good they may have done before Him, in their lifetime, to repay them." (7:10).

2) The. ארץ זית שמן ודבש-ארעא דזיתא עבדן משתא זיתא
 עבדא דבש.
 Targum is much more intelligible than the Hebrew. It here explains the text, as Rashi does later, interpreting ארץ זית שמן as 'olives' which yield oil. (8:8).

3) The Targum adds פן יאמרו הארץ-דילמא ייסרון דירי ארעא.
 the word, דירי, "those who dwell(in the land)"- to make clear the meaning of the Hebrew. (9:28).

4) Here, the Targum explains the Biblical text which, in itself, is none too clear. The Targum says: 'Put away the foolishness of your heart'- for as Adler says-" Man sins only after the spirit of folly has entered into him."¹⁶ (10:16).

5) Here, the Targum gives a better meaning to the Hebrew: "from the time when the sickle is first put to the standing corn" by saying 'when the Omer, which is intended for the wave offering, is first reaped with the sickle. (16:9).

- 6) וְנֹעַמְךָ מִכַּחַשׁ סוֹרֵרוֹ. Here, the Targum is more explicit than the Hebrew by telling the nature of the plague—i.e. leprosy. (17:8).
- 7) וְכָרִי רִבְתָּ פְחוּמֵי פְלֹנְחָא דִּינָא. The Targum adds the word, פְלֹנְחָא, to make clear what was meant by the Hebrew: "matters of controversy". For as Rashi and Nahmanides say in their comments on this verse—'the local scholars of the city (judges) differed in their opinions on the various matters mentioned in this verse— i.e. some declared a thing clean, and others declared it unclean.' (17:8).
- 8) לְבַד מִסְכְּרֵיוֹ עַל הָאֲבוֹתָיו כִּי מִסְכְּרָתָא דִּי יֵהִי בְשִׁבְתָּא בְּכֵן אַחְקִינוּ. אִכְהֵתָא. The Targum here expands upon the Hebrew text to make perfectly clear what was meant. (18:8).
- 9) וְהָיָה עָלֶיךָ דְּמִים-וִיֵּהִי עָלֶיךָ חֹבֶנָה דִּין דְּקָטוֹל. Here, the Targum adds a few words to clarify the vague statement of the Hebrew: "and so blood will be on you". The Targum renders it: 'that the guilt of murder may not be on you'— as if the Hebrew read וְהָיָה עָלֶיךָ עֹנֶשׁ דְּמִים. (19:10).
- 10) וְנִבְעַרְתָּ דֶּם הַנִּקְיָה וְחַפְלֵי אֲשֵׁרֵי דֶם זָכִי. Here, the Targum clarifies the meaning of the Hebrew saying that— instead of removing innocent blood from Israel— "you shall remove the shedding of the innocent blood. (19:13; 21:9).
- 11) כִּי תֵבֵא אֶרֶץ חֲחֹר. The Targum makes clear for what purpose the person goes into the vineyard— i.e. as a worker for hire, (אֹרֶר). (23:25, 26).
- 12) כִּי נֶפֶשׁ הוּא חֲבֵל-אֶרֶץ בְּהוֹן מִחֶעֱבֹד לְכָל נֶפֶשׁ. Here, the Targum explains in what way the millstones are the life of the people— the Hebrew here not being clear. (24:6).

13) כל הנחלשים-כל דהוו סתאחרין כתרך. The translation of the Targum is more specific and may be read: "all those who tarried in your rear because of weariness"—instead of reading as does the Hebrew: 'those who were enfeebled in your rear'. (25:18).

14) נחשת--חסינא כנחשא סלאחחא ססרא.
ברזל--תקיפא כפרזלא סלמעכר פרין

The Targum explains more fully the figures of 'brass' and 'iron'. It says about the heavens: "they shall be strong as brass in withholding rain", and about the earth: "hard as iron in producing no fruit". (28:23).

15) ועבודת שם אלהים אחרים--וחפלה תמן לעססיא פלחי סעווא. Here, the Targum says that instead of serving other gods (as in the Hebrew), they will serve those people who practice idolatry. (28:36).

16) שרש פרה ראש ולענה--נכר סהרחר חסאין או זדון. Here, the Targum makes clear what is meant by the figurative expression of the text. It translates it as: "a man who devises wickedness and presumptuous acts". (29:17).

17) למען ספוח חרוה את הצמאה--חמאי שלוחא על זדווא. The Targum helps here to clarify the vagueness of the Hebrew: "that the watered be swept away with the dry" by saying 'multiplying sins of ignorance with those of presumption'. The Hebrew is quite corrupt, and the Aramaic version may well be the correct reading since its meaning is clear. (29:18).

18) 'סצאחו באדן סדכר--ספס צרכיהון בארעא סדכרא וכיה צחונא.
אחר די ליה סיא. By enlarging on the text, the Targum gives better sense to the verse. (32:10).

19) 'בוננהו--אלפנון על פחומי אוריחא. The Targum explains more fully what is meant by the Hebrew. It tells along just what lines He caused him to obtain knowledge--i.e. in matters of Torah. (32:10).

- 20) ארי כפרענוה עמא דסדום פרענוהו
ולקוהו בעם עמרה, סחתהו בישין
כריש חוין וחלמח עובדיהו
כמררהו:

כי סנפן סדום נפנם
ומשדח עמרה ענבמו
ענבי רוש אשבלות
סדרת למו:

The whole verse is a prosaic rendition of the Hebrew- which helps to clarify the meaning of the text. (32:32).

- 21) הלא הוא כמס עמדי חתום באוצרת-הלא כל עובדיהו נלן קרמי
גניזין ליום דינא באוצרי:

The Targum gives meaning to the figurative expression of the Hebrew. (32:34).

- 22) כי אזלת יד ואפס עצור ועזוב-דבעון דחקק עליהו סחח סנאה
יהו סמלמלין ושביקין.

The Targum again helps to explain and clarify a vague Hebrew sentence by saying: "In the time when the stroke of their enemies would prevail against them, they will be wavering(as those who) are forsaken." (32:36).

- 23) The מראש פרעות או יב-לאעדא כתרין מריש סנאה ובעל דכבא

Targum strengthens and clarifies the Hebrew by saying: "I may take the crowns from the head of the foe and the enemy." (32:42).

- 24) מימינו אשדת למו-כתב ימיניה סנו אשתא אוריחא יהב לנא

Through its additions, the Targum helps to clarify the Hebrew. (33:2).

- 25) By adding קול יהודה-צלוחה דיהודה כמפקה(באנחא) לקרבא

to the Hebrew, the Targum tells on what special occasions God should listen to the voice (prayer) of Judah. (33:7).

- 26) מסוד שמים ממל ומתהום רבצת תחת-ענדא מנדנים ממלא דשמיא
מלעלא ומטבועי עינן דננדן
ממעסקי ארעא מלוע:

The Targum, as usual, clarifies the Hebrew by saying: "Let it make fruit by the dew of the heavens from above, and from the fountain springs and the depths which flow from the abysses of the earth beneath."

(33:13,14).

27) The ב' שם חלקת מחקק ספון-ארי חסן באחסנתה משה ספרא רבא
 ר' ישראל קב"ר.
 Hebrew is not clear-i.e. "for there the portion of the ruler was reserved".

The Targum clarifies it by saying: 'For there, in his inheritance (Gad's),
 was Moses the great Scribe of Israel buried.' (33:21).

28) The Targum says:
 ומכל בשמן רנלו-ויחרכי בחפנוקי מלכין
 "and he shall be nourished with the dainties of kings"- which is a much
 clearer way of expressing a hope that his lot will be of the best. The
 Hebrew expresses it more naively. (33:24).

B. Exegesis in the Targum (Interpretive).

כמדבר בערכה מול סוף--אוכח יתהון על דחבו ועל דארניזו כמישרא
 ב'ין פארן וב'ין הפל לקבל ים סוף כפארן דאחפלו על סנא
 ולבן וחצרות וד' זהב וכתצרות דארניזו על כשרא ועל דעברו
 ענל דרהב:

The Targum doesn't mean that God reproved them at each of the places
 named, but rather do the names indicate the places where they had sinned.
 (1:1).

2) אולפן. The Targum adds this word, and the sentence means
 "he began the teaching of the Law-i.e. in all of its details. (1:5).

3) לבנון. Here, as elsewhere in the Bible, הלכנו-כ'ית סקדשא
 is used in a figurative sense for the Sanctuary. (3:25).

4) The אלהים קרבים אל'ו-אלהא קריב לה לקבלא צלותה בעדן עקתה
 Targum here gives as its reason why God will be near man- i.e. to hear
 his prayer when he is in trouble. (4:7).

*Better to say always verbatim with the Targum:
 "What great people has such a good ruler in
 near to it to hear their prayer in
 times of distress."*

- 5) **אלהים- לעמם פלח מעותא** . Rashi explains the reason for the Targum's change in this manner: 'Since you serve those who worship them, it is as if you serve them (i.e. the **אלהים מעשה** **יד' אדם**). The Targumist doesn't want it to sound as if the people actually would serve idols. (4:28).
- 6) **בני-בנין סרדין... כד משלמין בניה למחמי כתר אבהתהון** . The Targum here adds the word 'rebellious'— meaning that God will visit the sins of the fathers on those rebellious children who continue sinning in the same way their fathers did.¹⁷. (5:9).
- 7) **הפלין** . Rashi explains the rendition of the Targum by saying that the **Totafot** are the **tefilin** of the head. (6:8).
- 8) **וכתבתם על מזוזת ביתך- וכתבתנן על מזוזין ותקבענן** . The Targum adds the last three words— i.e. you shall not only write them on your door posts, but should fix them on. Luzzato says that **מזוזין** in this verse actually is equivalent to **פד** in the same verse; but here, he thinks that this means **מזוזין** in our sense.¹⁸. (6:9; 11:20).
- 9) **אלהים אחרים- מעות עמם** . The Targum translates **אלהים** as **מעו** "idols". (4:28; 6:14; 7:4).
- 10) **במסה- כנסיהא** . Adler says that the Targum translates not as a place name, but because of that which happened at that place (i.e. temptation).¹⁹. (6:16).
- 11) **כח- עצה** . The Targum uses the term, **עצה** , 'knowledge' or 'counsel', in place of **כח** , 'strength or power'— for as Adler says: God's interest was not to give power to obtain riches by force or violence, but the ability to acquire wealth in an honorable way.²⁰. (8:18).

12) הַבְּרִכָּה-----סִבְרָכִיא .

הַקְּלִלָּה-----סִלְטָטִיא

The Targum interprets הַבְּרִכָּה to mean 'those who pronounce the blessing on Mount Gerizim, and הַקְּלִלָּה as those who pronounce the curse on Mount Ebal. (11:29).

13) לֹא תוּכַל-לִיָּהּ לֶךְ רֶשׁוּ. Here, the Targum interprets the Hebrew to mean not 'you shall not be able' but rather "you do not have permission"- thus making this a negative commandment. (12:17;21:16).

14) לֵילָה--וַעֲבַד לֶךְ נִסִּין בַּלַּיִל . In reality, as Rashi says, the people went out of Egypt in the daytime (מִסְּחָרָה הַפֶּסַח); but since permission was given at night by Pharaoh because of the miracles which God had wrought- it is counted as if the redemption, נִאֻלָּה, began at night. (16:1).

15) צֹאן וּבָקָר--בְּנֵי עֵנָא וְנִכְסֵי קוֹדֶשִׁיא . As Adler points out, the Targum explains that the Paschal offering is to be from the sheep, and the peace offerings (customarily offered on the Festival) are to be taken from the oxen.²¹ (16:2).

16) אֵל שַׁעֲרֵי-לַחֲרֵעַ בֵּית דִּינָךְ. The Targum translates as 'entrance to the court'- since the judges sat at the gates of the city (Ruth 4:1,2). Adler points out that an approximate dating of Onkelos might be gained from this reference.²² (17:5;21:19;22:15;25:7).

17) בִּי הָאָדָם עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה-אֵרִי לֹא כְּאִנְשָׁא אִילָן חֶקְלָא . As Rashi and, later, Adler point out, the "כִּי" is used in the sense of 'perhaps'- making of this a question: "Is a tree of the field perhaps a man to come against you in siege (that you should cut it down as a measure of war)". However, the Targum is more positive and says: 'for the tree of the field is not like a man to come against you in siege (and therefore, you should not cut it down).²³.

(20:19).

18) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. The same statement is found in Mishna Sota(p.46) and it is told in the מַלְוָה הַלְוָה that this expression in the Targum comes from this; and to Adler, that is proof that the Mishna in Sota is older than Onkelos.²⁴ (21:8).

19) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. The Targum adds 'כִּי' , meaning: 'one who is castrated or ruptured shall not be permitted (i.e. he is not pure enough or worthy) to enter into the congregation of the Lord'— i.e. he cannot marry a Jewess. Also in 23:5,4-'כִּי' is used in referring to a bastard or an Ammonite. (23:2).

20) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. It seems that the Targum is more strict here than the Hebrew. Whereas the Hebrew prohibits prostitution in the sanctuary, the Targum goes as far as to prohibit the marriage of an Israelite woman to a slave— saying that such a marriage would leave her free to indulge in unlawful sexual intercourse.²⁵ (23:18).

21) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. The Targum here interprets the meaning of the Hebrew rather than gives a strictly literal rendition. (25:2).

22) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. The Targum renders the less elegant expression of the Hebrew into more decent language. (25:11).

23) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. The Targum doesn't use either כְּדִלְרָבָא or כְּדִלְרָבָא (which would usually be used for translating כִּי)— because these would also include some Israelites; but here it speaks of those who are actually uncircumcised(i.e. hostile foreigners).²⁶ (28:43).

24) כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא כְּדִלְרָבָא. Here, the Targum interprets the Hebrew as meaning: "and which(referring to strange gods) could do them no good". (29:25).

25) שחת לו לא בניו מומם-תבילו להון לא לה בניה די פלחו ^{למעותה}. The

meaning of the Targum is "their wickedness is from themselves, not from God" which is also the meaning of the Hebrew. Yet the Targum adds just what is the children's blemish- i.e. idolatry. (32:5).

26) עם נכל ולא חכם-עמא דקבילו אוריתא ולא חכים. Adler says that נכל is the interpretation of חכם, and that, in reality, they are one expression.²⁷ The Targum explains in what way they were not wise:- the people received the Torah, but were too indolent to study it and to establish its precepts- not realising(being wise) that it was for their own good. (32:6).

27) תנובת שדי--כוח סנאיהון

דבש מסלע--כוח שליסי קרוין

ושמן מחלמיש צור--ונכסי יחבי
כרכין חקיפין.

These references and other similar ones in v. 14. are translated by the Targum as representing the spoil and booty taken from their enemies.

(32:13).

28) לא שערום-לא אחעסקו בהון. To give greater glory to the patriarchs, the Targum says that, not only did they not dread these idols but that they took no part in their worship. (32:17).

29) מו' רעב ולחמי רשף-נפיתי כפן ואכולי עוף וכתישי. The Targum interprets the sense of the Hebrew by saying: "they shall be swollen

with hunger, and eaten by the fowl, and be vexed with evil spirits." (32:24).

30) א'מה--חרות מוחא. The Targum gives additional meaning to the Hebrew. Not only will there be terror within, but there will also be the agony of death. (32:25).

31) The Targum emphasizes the meaning of the Hebrew by saying 'I would make my anger remain upon them and consume them.' (32:26).

32) Here, the Targum explains what the result will be when their foot slips— they will be exiled from the land. (32:35).

33) יחי ראובן ואל ימות ויהי מתיו מספר יחי ראובן לחיי עלמא ומדא
תנינא לא ימות ויסקלון בנוה
אחמיהון בסנייהון
Here, the Targum renders the sense of the Hebrew rather than gives the literal rendition. (33:6).

34) האמר לאביו ולאמו לא ראיתיו דעל אבוהי ועל אמה לא רחם בד
ואת אחיו לא הכיר ואת בניו חבו וסן דינא ואפי אחוהי ובנוה
לא ידע כי שמרו אמתיה ובריתך לא נסיב ארי נסרו מסרה מיסוך
וקיסך לא אשניו:
ינצרו:

This seems to refer to the incident of the "Golden Calf" where the tribe of Levi, on God's side, slew their erring relatives. (33:9).

35) בצאתך--נמפקך לאנחא קרבא על בעלי דבבך.

באהליך--נמהכך למעבד זמני מועדיא בירושלם

The Targum continues to interpret for what purposes Zebulun would go out, and Issachar would remain at home (i.e. to set times for special observances in Jerusalem, and to render decisions). In I Chron.12:33,34— it gives a similar characterization of the pair. (33:18).

36) זרוע-----שלסונין.

קדקד-----סלכין

The Targum here compares the sultans(which Gad conquered) to the arm, the most powerful of the limbs- and the kings, to the head through which life is maintained in the body. (33:20).

37) The Targum interprets it to mean: "his land(Dan's) is watered by streams coming from Bashan." (33:22).

38) כְּרוֹךְ מִבְּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי-כְרוֹךְ מְבֹרָכָה בְּנֵי אֱשֶׁר . According to Sifre and Bashi, Asher is not only blessed by God, but also by his brothers—this being parallel to יְהִי רָצוֹן אֲחֵינוּ . (33:24).

39) עֵין יַעֲקֹב-כַּעֲיִן בְּרַחֵם דְּבִרְכָנוֹן יַעֲקֹב אֲבוֹהוֹן . The Targum interprets the Hebrew's vague expression to mean: "and they were to dwell in safety, according to the blessing with which their father, Jacob, blessed them." (33:28).

40) עַל בְּמוֹתֵינוּ תִּדְרֹךְ-עַל פְּרִיקָה צוֹאֵרִי מִלְכִּיהוֹן תִּדְרֹךְ . Here, the Targum interprets בְּמוֹתֵינוּ to mean: "the necks of those who are in high places. In this interpretation, the Targum follows Josh.10:24 quite closely." (33:29).

41) וְלֹא נִם לַחֵה-וְלֹא שָׁנָא זֵינוּ יִקְרָא דְאַפּוּהִי . Here, the Targum illuminates the Hebrew. It is really a liberal translation of the Hebrew; for as Adler says—"In other people, death brings about a drying out and a shrinking of the features."²⁸ Whereas, in Moses, this process did not take place, and his body retained its moisture—or as the Targum has it: "the beautiful radiance of his face had not changed"—i.e. it had not shrunk. (34:7).

42) אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעוּ יְהוָה פְּנֵי אֵל פְּנֵי-דִי אֲחֻלִּי לֵה . As Adler points out, it is peculiar that here, the Targum does not remove the anthropomorphic reference as he does in V:4 by מְסַלֵּל עִם מְסַלֵּל . However, he says that this might be taken care of by דִּי אֲחֻלִּי לֵה . (34:10).

C. Notes on Interpretive Exegesis.

As was mentioned previously in the introduction to this section, there

were several scattered references which- since they were not numerous enough to deserve a special heading- were to be appended to the foregoing discussion on Exegesis in the Targum. These references appear- as follows:

- 1) עִנִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּה-עִנִּי יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּה. The Targum has the same expression as the Hebrew, as Adler points out, in order to emphasize God's Providence in regard to Palestine.²⁹ (11:12).
- 2) לֹא מִשְׁפָּט הַבְּכֹרֶה-לָהּ חַיָּא דִּינָא דְּבִכְרוּתָא. Here, Adler seems to have had a different text of the Targum, for neither our text nor the Sabioneta edition has this reading. Adler's text adds אֵלֶּיךָ as the rendition of מִשְׁפָּט, which is the usual translation. Adler's text is better than ours here- for ours reads לָהּ חַיָּא דִּינָא דְּבִכְרוּתָא-which is not the full rendition of מִשְׁפָּט הַבְּכֹרֶה.³⁰ (21:17).
- 3) לֹא יוֹמְתוּ אֲבוֹתָ עַל בְּנֵיהֶם-לֹא יִסְוּחוּן אֲבָהִן עַל פִּי בְנֵיהֶם. Here, the Targum translates as Rashi later explains: "the fathers shall not be put to death because of the testimony of the children." This is a mistranslation of what is undoubtedly meant in the Hebrew- i.e. עַל יָד or עַל דִּי. This is a reference to the doctrine of individual responsibility, advanced for those times, and the Targum evidently erred here- for it is not often that the Targum presents a retrogression from progress.³¹ (24:16).
- 4) וְכִשְׁלֵי יֶתֶד-וּבִזְעֵר כְּנָחָא. The Targum here uses "small children" instead of 'placenta' to eliminate an indelicate phrase. (28:57).
- 5) כְּשַׁעֲרֵיהֶם עָלֵי דְשַׁא-כְּרוּחֵי מִסְרָא דְנִשְׁכִּין עַל דְּחָתָא.
וְכִרְבִּיבִים עָלֵי עֶשֶׂב-וְכִרְסִים מִלְּקוּשָׁא דִּי עַשְׂבָּא

Here, an unusual interest in natural phenomena is displayed. The Targum compares the words of Moses to the various rains- i.e. with regard to their efficacy. Just as the first growth needs a light shower, and the latter

growth is satisfied by a copious rainfall- so the words of Moses. To all people, in all circumstances, he is praying that his words might be received. (32:2).

יְהוָה בְּדָד יִנְחֵנוּ וְאֵין עִמּוֹ אֵל נִכְרִי בְּלַחְדוּהִי עֲחִיד לְאִשְׁרֵינוּ וְהוּא
בְּעֵלְמָא דְּהוּא עֲחִיד לְאַחְתְּרָא וְלֹא
יַחְקִים קְדֻמוֹהִי מִלַּחַן מַעֲוִין:

Here, the Targum enlarges on the Hebrew in what seems to be a possible reference to the Millenium or Messianic Age- when God, alone, shall rule. (32:12).

D. Grammatical Notes.

1) The Targum אֲדָם אִכְלָא אֶבְרָאָה בְּעָא לְאוֹבְדָה יְהוָה אִכְלָא bases its interpretation on the fact that אִכְלָא is a transitive verb and that אִכְלָא must be the object of this verb. And since Laban considered pursuing Jacob to destroy him, it is accounted unto him as if he did. ^{32.} (26:5).

2) לְרֹאשׁ וְלֹא לְזִנְבִי-לְחֻקִּי וְלֹא לְחֻלְשִׁי. In this portion, the Targum uses the adjective 'strong' for the head which rules over the limbs of the body- and the adjective 'weak' for the tail which is affixed behind and which has little, if any, strength. (28:13).

3) וְשָׁבָנוּ וְיִתְחַבֵּן. The Targum uses the Kal instead of the Aphel, for according to Adler and Bashi- when Israel was redeemed, God was to return with them- which sense could not be gotten from יִתְחַבֵּן which is the equivalent of the Hebrew וְהָשִׁיבָנוּ. ^{33.} (30:3).

4) אִם שְׁנוֹתַי בְּרֶקַע חֲרָבִי-אִם עַל חֵד תְּרִין כְּחֹזֵן בְּרֶקַע מְסוּף שְׁמִיא וְעַד מוֹף
שְׁמִיא חֲחֹלִי חֲרָבִי.

The Targum doesn't take שְׁנוֹתַי from שָׁן 'to polish', but from the root meaning 'two'-e.g. אִם עַל חֵד תְּרִין ; and therefore it reads: "When my sword is revealed like the sight of two-fold lightning". (32:41).

E. Passages giving Greater Glory to God.

- 1) ידע לכתך-- ספק לך צרכך כמחכך. According to Adler, this lengthened expression "He has given thee sufficient for thy needs in thy going about" was used to give additional glory to God. Instead of just knowing their way, as in the Hebrew, He gave them provisions for the way.³⁴ (2:7).
- 2) או הנסא אלהים-- או נסין די ענד יי. This seems to be an attempt to give greater glory to God- mentioning the miracles he wrought rather than the questioning the people whether they had known of another god doing the great things JHVH did. (4:34).
- 3) יהוה הוא נחלתו-- סתנן דיהב לה יי אנון אחסנתה. The Targum here adds "the gifts which the Lord gave him, they shall be his portion"-- all this to ascribe still greater glory to God. (10:9; 18:2).
- 4) צור ילדך חשי-רחלא תקיפא דכראך נשיחא. The Targum here enlarges slightly upon the text, to give greater glory to God, by calling him "the Fearful and Omnipotent One". (32:18).

IV. Place Names.

In the Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy, notably in the earlier chapters, several references are found which are of interest and importance. These

references are those which give the names of places- the location of which would be difficult to determine from the original Hebrew reading. Some of these places, the Targumist refers to in a figurative sense-- such as calling Senir, a part of Mount Hermon, a "mountain of snow". Other places are merely given the Aramaic equivalent of their original readings- or the names to which the earlier ones were changed. And then, there is another type of reference which does not always render the name literally, but rather does it describe the event which occurred at that particular place.

- 1) פָּרָן---נִפְתָּרָן אֲחַפְּלוּ עַל סֵנָה. The Targum says that Paran is the place where they 'scorned the manna'. (1:1).
- 2) חֲצֵרוֹת---וּבְחֲצֵרוֹת אֲרֻנוֹן עַל בִּשְׂרָא. The Targum says:"where they provoked to anger because of the flesh". But in the Book of Numbers, they demanded flesh at Kibroth-Hataavoh, and not at Hazeret.³⁵ (1:1).
- 3) לָבָן. This is a place name only here. The Targum doesn't translate it. Does this imply that the manna was white? (1:1).
- 4) דִּי מוֹאב. Probably on the border of Moab. The Targum takes the "דִּי" as the Aramaic 'of'. (1:1).
- 5) קִדְשׁ בְּרִנְעֵי---רִקְמָה נִיֵּא. Levy holds that this implies that brightly colored spots on the field was the reason that this place resembled "fine embroidery work".³⁶ (1:2;2:14;9:23).
- 6) בָּשָׁן-----סְחָנָן. This is similarly rendered in Nu.21:33. But Jastrow gives for a different reading- the words בִּנְחָנִים, בִּנְחָנִים, בִּנְחָנִים -all meaning 'Bashan', the country east of the Jordan. He identifies this with בַּטְנֵא "Batanea"- a town and district east of the Jordan which was reputed for its large commercial fairs.³⁷ (1:4).

- 7) עִיר לְחֵי . A fortress in Moab. (2:9).
- 8) חֲצֵרֵי רֶפַיִם . Southernmost border town of Palestine. Adler also gives us the readings of חֲצֵרֵי , "unwalled places" and חֲצֵרֵי .³⁸
(2:23).
- 9) חֲבֵל אֲרֻנֶּכֶת--כִּי פֶלֶךְ טְרַחֲוֹנָה . Town and district, east of the Jordan-- i.e. Trachona. (3:4).
- 10) שֵׁנִיר--טוֹר חֲלֹנָה . Senir was a portion of Mt. Hermon, and was called by the Targumist 'Mountain of Snow' because of the snow which lay on its slopes.³⁹ (3:9).
- 11) מַעֲכָת--מַפְקִירוֹס . Place in Trans-Jordania. (3:14).
- 12) אֲרָם נְהָרֵי--אֲרָם דִּי עַל פֶּרַח . Here, the Targum is more specific where it says "Aram which is by the Euphrates" instead of the Hebrew's reading of 'Aram of the Rivers'. (23:5).
- 13) בְּמַדְחָה--בְּנִדְחָה . Here again, the Targum does not give the name of the place, but that which occurred at that spot. (6:16;33:8).

V. Lexicography.

A section on lexicography in this type of work might not seem, altogether, to be in place. After all, one might ask, just how does a discussion of grammatical points and variations fit it with a treatise on Targumic exegesis? Several reasons might be given for having included this section. Among them being- that several of the inconsistencies of the Targumist might be brought to light and thus make all the clearer certain of his general practices.

Another is that a better understanding of the Aramaic text might be gained through a knowledge of the ways in which words from the Hebrew are almost invariably rendered by the Targumist. Yet another reason, and perhaps a still more valid one, is that through a discussion of the grammatical lapses and inconsistencies of the Targumist, a clearer light will be shed on the text, and the author's meaning will become much more apparent. Although many such references appear in the Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy, I have included here only the most outstanding--which are appended below:

- 1) דליל-----ליל. This rendition of the Hebrew is most usual in connection with a person who is speaking. When God speaks, it is usually rendered דן קדם . Exceptions may be noted in 1:14; 21, 42:3:2,—where דליל is used even when God is speaking. (1:1).
- 2) שבת-----די'תבתון . שבת is rendered in the perfect tense in the Targum while it is an infinitive construct in the Hebrew. (1:6).
- 3) דעל-----לולו . The Targum here uses לולו (ל) "to lift (yourselves) up"—which is generally the rendition of the Hebrew שאל . (1:7).
- 4) לרנ-----לססני . Here, the Targum uses an infinitive construct in place of the noun used by the Hebrew. (1:10).
- 5) ועסקיכון-----ומשאכס . Ordinarily, משא is rendered by סל 'burden'—cp. Numbers 11:11; but here, פד is used where the meaning is probably "strifes, quarrels" as in Gen. 26:20. (1:12).
- 6) וסוכלחנין-----נבונים .
וידועים-----וסנדען

The first rendition of the Targum means "understanding" and the second, according to Jastrow, 'persons well-known'. We see also in 1:15 that the abstract noun is used for the concrete. Here, the feminine plural is used although it means "men of understanding". (1:15).

- 7) כְּקַטְּ כוֹדוֹל חֲשַׁמְעוּן--מִלִּי זַעֲרָא כִרְבָּא חֲקַבְלוּן. The verb, **כְּקַטְּ**, is often used to translate **שָׁמַע**, as in 1:46;6:3- but, here, in the same verse at the end, the same root, **שָׁמַע**, is used. (1:17).
- 8) לְחֹר לְכֻם מְקוֹם לְחִנּוּתְכֻם--לְאַחְקֵנָא. The correct reading is probably **לְאַחְקֵנָא** "to prepare for you a place of rest to make you dwell there"-- although the Warsaw, 1861, edition of the Biblia Rabbinica reads **לְחֵקְנָא**. (1:33).
- 9) תַּעֲשִׂינָהּ-----נִחַן. A better reading is **נִחַן**, the participle of **נָחַן** -"to gush forth, fly forth"; literally to "squirt forth". (1:44).
- 10) חֲשַׁבְרוּ-----חֲזַבְנוּ
חֲבְרוּ-----חֲכְרוּ

In Aramaic, the root **חֲב** is used only for 'dry' articles; while **חֲר** is used for 'moist or wet' ones.⁴⁰ (2:6).

- 11) חֲקַל לִי-----כִנֵּשׁ קִדְמִי. The Targum here uses the Kal in place of the Aphel which we would expect, since the Hebrew uses the Hiphil. (4:10).

- 12) חֲאֲרִץ חֲטוּבָה-----לְאֲרַעָא מְכָא. The Targum uses the masculine adjective; but **מְכָא** should be used for **מְכָא**.⁴¹ (4:21).

- 13) מְרָאִים-----חֲזוֹנִים. Adler gives us the possible emendation of the Hebrew from **מְרָאִים** to **מְרָאִים** "visions". He wonders if there may not be a connection between the roots **רָאָה** and **רָאָה**, which would account for the rendition of the Targum.⁴² (4:34;26:8).

- 14) מְצָרִים-----מְכַחְשִׁי מְצָרִים. Adler says that the Aramaic root, **מְכַח**, is related to the Hebrew **מָכָה**; and that most always are the expressions of **נָנַע**, **מָחַלָה**, or **מָכָה** in the Hebrew rendered in the Aramaic by **מְכַחְשִׁי** "wound, plague".⁴³ (7:15).

- 15) וַחֲנוּכָּהּ וְאֵלֶּה . It is clear that the expression does not mean actually "to eat", but the Targum gives what is really meant by the Hebrew— i.e. 'to destroy'. (7:16).
- 16) לֹא תוֹסֵף וְלֹא תוֹרֵעַ לֹא תוֹסֵפוֹן עָלוּהִי וְלֹא תִסְנְעוּן . The Targum uses the plural throughout, while the Hebrew has it only in the first part of the verse. (13:1).
- 17) יִסְלַכְנָךְ . The Targum here uses סִלַּךְ in the sense of 'to give counsel'— in this case, "wrong counsel". (13:7).
- 18) תִּקְיָךְ . The Targum takes תִּקְיָךְ in the sense of תִּקְיָךְ or תִּקְיָךְ , and the Aramaic for this is תִּקְיָךְ . (13:7).
- 19) תִּתְחַסְמוֹן . Here, the Targum means "to become angry". Adler says that תִּתְחַסְמוֹן is a scribal error for תִּתְחַסְמוֹן , from the root חִסַּם "to mutilate oneself"— which is the correct translation of תִּתְחַסְמוֹן in the Hebrew.⁴⁴ (14:1).
- 20) הַיּוֹצֵא הַשָּׂדֶה דִּימוֹק חֲקֵלָא . The Targum should use the Aphel or יִצִּיחַ "all that thy field causes to come forth". (14:22).
- 21) עֲצוּתָא . Here, the Targum uses the verbal form, "gather yourselves before God"— instead of the substantive form of the Hebrew, 'a solemn assembly unto the Lord'. (16:8).
- 22) תִּרְדּוּךְ . The Targum here reads in the passive voice, but the Sabioneta edition reads with the Hebrew, תִּרְדּוּךְ . (16:20).
- 23) שִׁנְא . The Targum here uses the same verb as the Hebrew, but the Sabioneta edition reads שִׁנְא "loathes". (16:22).
- 24) אֵל שַׁעֲרֵךְ לַחֲרֹעַ בֵּית דִּינָךְ . My text has a marginal note that the redactor had on the side of his text, לַחֲרֹעַ , which is the usual rendering of שַׁעֲרֵךְ , as in Rashi. See 12:15; 17:2. (17:5).

25) פלא . As Rashi explains, the term פלא always denotes 'separation' and 'being at a distance'. Therefore, the meaning here is "that the matter is apart and hidden from thee"—which is the reason for the use of 'פלא'. The Sabioneta edition has here חפרש - which conveys exactly the same meaning which Rashi ascribes to פלא . (17:8).

26) תועבת יהוה-----סרחק
התועבות-----חועבתא

The Targum uses different words here for תועבה in order to avoid repetition.⁴⁵ (18:12).

27) לא יהיה הדבר ולא יבא לא יהי פחוסא ולא יתקיים . Adler says that, ordinarily, the Targum would use 'ה' for ב' - but since he used it for לא יהיה , he uses יתקיים to avoid repetition. He also says that one might have expected the use of אהא for ב' ; but אהא is used only in connection with human(living) beings.⁴⁶ (18:22).

28) והנה עד שקר העד--והא סהיד שקר סהדא . Here, the Targum takes העד in the Hebrew to be a verb and translates it thus; but we know that העד is a noun, and that the "ה" is the definite article. (19:18).

29) עד רדחא-----עד רחבש . The Targum here takes רדחא in the sense of "subduing, subjugation" (רדה); and not from its true root, רר 'to come down'. (20:20).

30) לשמע אל בלעם-----לקבלא סן בלעם . The Targum uses the preposition, סן , instead of the אל of the Hebrew. Just as "ל" or "אל" follow שמע in the Hebrew, so also usually in Aramaic— but here the preposition used is סן . (23:6).

31) מכל דכר וע-----סכל סדעם כ"ש . Usually, the Targum translates דכר by פחום ; but when כל is used, the Targum uses סדעם (as in Leviticus 5:3 and Numbers 31:23). (23:10).

32) וְשִׁפְחוּ!-----וְשִׁפְחוּ! . The Targum here uses the Aphel, but the Sabioneta edition uses the Pael, וְשִׁפְחוּ! . (24:5).

33) וְלֹא יִהְיֶה כֹהֵן-----וְלֹא יִהְיֶה כֹהֵן . Adler says that this word must have crept in from the Targum Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum as evidenced by their rendition of Psalm 139:3.⁴⁷ Jastrow does not have this word. Dalman says that it means "one who is not a priest"- which, obviously, is not meant here.⁴⁸ (25:5).

34) פִּרְיָם הָאֲדָמָה-----אֲנָא דִּארְעָא . Fruits which are still young are called אֲנָא in Aramaic- which is similar to אָנָּה in Hebrew- i.e. 'young shoots, fruits'. (26:2).

35) לֹא בָלוּ שְׁלֹמֹתֵיכֶם-לֹא כְּלִימָה כְּסוּחֹכוֹן .
וְנִעְלָךְ לֹא בִלְתָּה-וּמִסְנֵךְ לֹא עִדּוּ

In Aramaic, according to Adler, the verb בִּלִּי is not used in connection with 'shoes' (as it is for garments), and so the Targum uses עִדִּי "to wear away".⁴⁹ (29:4).

36) שִׁפְעָא יְמִימָא-----נִכְסִי עֲדָמָא . The Targum here is based on a corrupt text, which probably read שִׁפְעָא עֲדָמָא . (33:19).

NOTES on the
INTRODUCTION.

1. Bashi to Kiddushin 49a. (Quoted in Encyclopedia Judaica, p. 570).
2. For a history of Targumic research, cf. Friedmann op. cit., pp.105ff.
3. Esra 4:7,17.
4. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, p.57.
5. Under the influence of the Meturgumanim, קדש was often used in the sense of "to recite", and קידש in the sense of קדש - exegesis. cf. Friedmann, op. cit., p.57.
6. Berliner, op. cit., p. 74. *you do not previously cite any title Berliner's work, hence "op. cit" is out of place*
7. Blau holds that the Aramaic, spoken by the Jews, originated in Palestine and was not brought from Babylon. (J.Q.R., vol. ix, 1897, p.731). Whatever the reason was, Hebrew became merely the "Lashon ha-Kodesh", the language for prayer and ritual. Even the inscriptions of the Temple were in Aramaic. (Friedmann, op. cit., pp.57ff).
8. Yet, Hersfeld holds that Aramaic was not yet spoken by the Jews of Esra's time- therefore, no Targum was necessary. Proof for the fact that the mass of the people understood Hebrew are the Books of Haggai and Chronicles. (Quoted in Friedmann, op. cit., p.129).
9. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 58ff.
10. *ibid.*, p. 13.
11. The reading of the Torah in the service dates from Esra's time. It became a regular thing in earliest Mishnaic times, before the Prophets were collected into a canonical book. (Isamar Elbogen, cf. Jüdisches Lexicon, vol.5, pp.993f).
12. Megillah 32a.
13. Jer. Meg. 4:1. Statement of Rabbi Jonah.

14. Jer. Megillah 4:1. Statement of R. Jose.
15. *ibid.*, 74d.
16. Tosef. Meg., end.
Kiddushin 49a,
(Berliner, *op.cit.*, pp.86ff).
17. For a list of references and other details of the rules for the
Meturgemanim, cf. Friedmann *op. cit.*, p.83.
18. In Jer. Ber. 5:4, a prohibition can be found against a paraphrase of
Lev.22:28 which still exists in the Targum Jerushalmi. It gives, to
God's quality of mercy, an interpretation in many ways like that of
the New Testament. (cf. Berliner, *op. cit.*, pp.85ff).
19. Friedmann, *op. cit.*, p.61.
Berliner, *op. cit.*, pp. 114ff.
20. Weinberg interprets the passage in Meg. 3a, "It was forgotten and was
reestablished": The Targum originally existed as a literal translation.
It was overrun with aggadot, and was reconstructed by Onkelos in its
original simple form. (Weinberg, "Zur Geschichte der Targumim" in the
Festschrift für Jakob Rosenheim, 1931, pp.238ff).
21. Friedmann, *op. cit.*, p.85.
22. Jüdisches Lexicon, vol. 1, pp. 1006 f. art. "Biberübersetzungen"
by B. Kirschner.
23. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.12, "Targum", p.59.
24. Berliner, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff.
25. Friedmann, *op. cit.*, pp.66f.
26. Berliner, *op. cit.*, pp.103f.
27. Friedmann, *op. cit.*, p.73.
28. Berliner, *op. cit.*, p.105.
29. *ibid.*, p. 106.
30. *ibidem*.
31. Lagarde, Targum Onkelos von Berliner, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen,

31. (cont'd.) vol. 1886, p. 873.
32. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 74f.
33. Berliner, op. cit., p. 102.
34. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 64f.
35. Jewish Encyclopedia, "Targum", vol. 12, pp. 59-60.
36. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 25f.
37. Sabb. 115a
Tosef. Sabb. 14.
Jer. Sabb. 15c.
Masseketh Sophrim 5:15.
- Blau, Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift, p. 79.
38. Berliner, op. cit., pp. 89f.
39. He is upheld in his opinion by the statements in Sabbath (Babli, and Tosef).
The existence of Biblical books in Aramaic is there taken as a fact.
40. Mishnah Yadaim 4:5
Jer. Meg. 74d.
41. Berliner, op. cit., p. 89.
42. Aboth de Rabbi Nathan (ed. Schechter, p. 24).
43. Ber. 8b.
44. Jer. Ber. 9c.
45. Berliner, op. cit., pp. 81f. For quotations in Baraitoth, cf.
Friedmann op. cit., pp. 64f.
46. Nestle tries to prove that the Bible was known in its Aramaic version
in the time of Jesus, and he gives as an example the words in Ps. 22-
spoken at the cross. Mathew 27:46 reads $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\alpha\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \chi\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
which is almost like the Aramaic in the Psalms-Targum: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܢ
 ܕܥܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܢ .
47. Friedmann, op. cit., p. 128.
48. *ibid.*, pp. 134 f.

49. Berliner, op. cit., p.110 and pp.133f.
Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, p.59.
50. Geiger, Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, ix, 1871, p.85.
51. Nöldeke, Alttestamentliche Literatur(Quoted Berliner,op.cit.,pp.110f).
52. Dalman, Aramäische Grammatik,p.9.(Quoted in Encyclopedia Judaica,
"Bibelübersetzungen" , vol.4, p.573.
53. Berliner, op. cit., p.111.
54. Jewish Encyclopedia, "Targum", vol. 12, p.59.
55. Leviticus 6:3,4,6-7,9,11,18-20,22,23.
56. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.12, pp.59,61.
57. Bacher, Wilhelm; quoted in Encyclopedia Judaica, vol.4, p.572.
58. Berliner, op. cit., p. 109.
59. Weinberg suggests that the Targum was made authoritative in Babylonia
by pupils of Akiba who fled to Babylonia after the Bar Kochba revolt.
(Weinberg,"Zur Geschichte des Targum" in Festschrift für Jakob
Rosenheim, 1931, p. 246).
60. Kidd. 49a.
61. Berliner, op. cit., pp. 112f.
Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 92f.
Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, "T.Onkelos",p.1187.
62. The Palestinian Targum (Onkelos) is called our Targum in Babylonia just
as the Mishna of Akiba is called 'our Mishna'.(Weinberg, op. cit., p.246).
63. Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie, p.1187.
Luzzatto, Ohev Ger (Philoxenus).
Zuns, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge,p.66.
64. Geiger states this opinion (Zeitschrift,vol.9,1871,pp.85f) on the basis
of the language in Targum Onkelos. In his Urschrift,p.163, he held that
the Targum was established in connection with Akiba's school in Palestine,
and that its name was changed to Targum Onkelos in Babylonia(cf.Friedmann
op. cit., pp. 123-124.

64. (cont'd.) Berliner, op. cit., p.111.
65. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.12, p.58.
66. ibid., p.59.
67. Encyclopedia Britannica, "Targum", vol.21, p. 810.
68. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, vol.1, p.114.
69. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, p.59.
70. Catholic Encyclopedia, "Targum", vol.14, p.455.
71. Bacher, Die Bibelerkennung Moses Maimunis, pp.38-42. (Quoted in the Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 12, p.59.)
72. Friedmann, op. cit., p.98.
Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.2, p. 37.
73. Quoted in Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie, p. 1185.
74. Luzzatto, Oheb Ger.
Zuns, Gottesdienstliche Vorträge, p. 66.
Friedmann, op. cit., 79,80,98-105.
Jewish Encyclopedia, "Onkelos", vol. 9, p. 405.
Encyclopedia Judaica, "Aquila" vol. 2, p.34.
75. Zuns identifies this Akylas with the translator while Ginsberg doubts their identity.(cf. Jewish Encyclopedia, "Aquila", vol.2, p.36).
76. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 30f.
Krauss, "Akylas der Preselyt" in Steinschneider Festschrift, 1896, p.148.
77. Rosenthal, Monatsschrift, xli, p. 93.
78. Jüdisches Lexicon, "Aquila" vol.1, p. 407.
Encyclopedia Judaica, "Aquila", vol.2, p. 22.
Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 2, pp. 36f.
79. Tanchuma, ed. Buber, pp. 81-82.
80. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 36f.
Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 2, p. 37.
Encyclopedia Judaica, vol. 2, p. 29.
81. Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 34f.
Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 2, p. 37.
82. Epiphanius, "De mensuris et ponderibus", Chapo.14,15. Quoted in the Encyclopedia Judaica, "Aquila", vol.2, p.29.

83. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.2, p.36.

Similarly, Krauss holds that Akylas was a Jew, already at home; for he tries to convert his parents(Jer. Demai 25d), yet he admits the possibility of a return to Pontus.(Krauss' article in Steinschneider Festschrift, p. 149).

84. The 'Jewish Girl' is interpreted to mean the Torah by De Rossi. (cf. Friedmann op. cit., p. 32.)

85. Koh. R. 7:8
Ex. R.19:4. (cf. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.2, p.37).

86. Jer. Meg.19. (cf. Encyclopedia Judaica, vol.2, p.30 and the Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.2, p.36.)

87. Jer. Kidd.1.
Irenaeus 3:24.
Jerome to Is.8:14.(cf. Encyclopedia Jud. and Jew. Encyc., ibid.)

88. Frankel even holds that the translation was to serve as a means of Jewish propaganda among the Christians.(Jahresbericht,1872,p.5). His opinion is refuted by Friedmann, op. cit., p.48.

89. Margolis, The Story of Bible Translations, p. 40.
Krauss' art. in Steinschneider Festschrift, p.151.

90. Friedmann, op. cit.,pp.33, 38.
Krauss, ibid, p. 150, footnote.

91. Epiphanius, De Mensuris et ponderibus, chaps.7-14. *Quoted in Herzog-Hauck, Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, vol.3, pp. 235, 22.*

92. Eichhorn- quoted by Friedmann, op. cit., p. 32.

93. Jerome. (cf. Jew. Encyc., vol.2, p.34 ; and Friedmann, op. cit., p.50).

94. Encyclopedia Judaica, "Bibelübersetzungen", vol.4, p.566.

95. For a list of quotations in the Talmud and Midrash, cf. Friedmann, op. cit., pp.44f; and Krauss, Steinschneider Festschrift, pp.151-163.

96. Eichhorn- quoted by Friedmann, op. cit., p. 50.

97. Encyclopedia Judaica, vol. 2, p.30. Also cf.
Blau, J.Q.R., vol.9, 1897, p. 729.
98. Jwd. Lex., vol.1, p.407.
Encyc. Jud., vol.2, p.30.
99. Friedmann, op. cit., p. 103.
100. De Rossi, Maor Enayim, 1571, chap.45. (Quoted by Friedmann, op.cit., p.103).
101. Eichhorn, Einleitung in die Bibel, (Quoted by Friedmann, op.cit., p.107).
102. Landau, Einleitung zum Arukh, 1819. (Quoted by Friedmann, op.cit., p.111).
also cf. Krauss, pp.148f and footnote on p. 148.
103. Ency. Jud., vol. 4, p. 572.
104. Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie, p. 1172.
Berliner, op. cit., pp. 94f.
105. Rappaport, Keren Chemed, pp.50f. (Quoted by Friedmann, op. cit., pp.117f).
106. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, p.114. also cf.
Note #64 on Geiger.
107. Berliner, op. cit., p. 98.
108. ibid., pp. 99,101.
109. Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie, p.1187.
110. Frankel, Jahresbericht, pp.5-6. Berliner follows Frankel on this
point(cf. Berliner, op. cit., p. 99).
111. Frankel, ibid., pp. 6,9.
112. Hersfeld-quoted by Friedmann, op. cit., pp. 130f. The J.E.(vol.12,p.58),
after reviewing the Akylas and Onkelos passages in the Jerushalmi and
Babli, states that the name, Targum Onkelos, is erroneous. The existing
Palestinian traditions about Aquila's translation were applied in
Babylonia to the Aramaic Targum.

112. (cont'd.) Similarly, the article on "Onkelos" (vol.9,p.405) says that the legends gathered around Akylas in Palestine were transferred to the Tanna, Onkelos.
113. Jew. Encyc., vol.2,p.37. The differentiation between the translator, Onkelos-Akylas, and the Tanna solve this difficulty. So does the conservative, Friedman's, theory of placing Akylas' relations to Hadrian into the time before his accession. Also the usual emendation of Gamliel ha-Zaken, in the account about the burial, would be a sufficient proof for Onkelos' living longer than Gamliel II. Therefore, he had plenty of opportunity to come into contact with the Emperor, Hadrian.
114. Friedmann, op. cit., p. 134.
115. *ibid*, p. 132.
116. *ibid*, p.40 and p.132(Nota 1).
117. *ibid*, pp. 132f.
118. *ibid*, pp. 42, 134.
119. *ibid*, pp. 89ff.

NOTES on the Section,

Exegesis in the Targum.

1. Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature, vol.1, p.114.
2. Funk and Wagnalls, New Standard Dictionary, p.121.
3. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 11, p. 258.
4. Ex.25:8; 29:45-46.
Num. 5:3; 35:34.
5. Num. 14:14; 16:3; 35:34
Deut. 1:42; 3:24; 4:39; 6:15; 7:21; 23:16; 31:17.
6. Deut. 12:5,11,21.
7. Ex. 33:14-15.
Num. 6:25.
Deut. 31:17-18.
8. J.E. vol.8, pp.484-485.
9. ibidem.
10. Nesinah la-Ger, by Nathan Adler, in the Vilna Edition of the 'Orim Gedolim', vol. 5, p. הנפ
11. Deut. 4:4.
12. Deut. 6:12.
13. Nesinah la-Ger, pp. הנפ
14. Funk and Wagnalls, Dictionary, p. 121.
15. Maybaum, Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos, p. 16.
16. Nesinah la-Ger, p. הנפ
17. Ex. 20:5.
18. Luzzatto, Philoxenus, p. 19.
19. Nesinah la-Ger, p. הנפ
20. ibid, p. הנפ

21. Nesinah la-Ger, p. 40

22. Ibid., p. 40. Quoting Ketubot 45b he says that, when the city is populated mostly by non-Jews, a condemned person was stoned at the entrance of the Bes Din- thus we know that Onkelos lived after the Destruction of the Temple; since he mentioned that place as the place of execution.

23. Ibid., p. 47

24. Ibid., p. 48

25. Ibid., p. 23

26. Ibid., p. 77

27. Ibid., p. 77

28. Ibid., p. 77

29. Ibid., p. 77

30. Ibid., p. 40

31. Yebamot 79a.
Baba Kamma 88a.
Sanhedrin 27b-28a.

International Critical Commentary, 'Deuteronomy', p. 277.

Ezekiel 18:20.

32. Genesis 31:23.

33. Nesinah la-Ger, p. 167

34. Ibid., p. 1

35. Numbers 11:34.

36. Levy, Chaldaisches Wörterbuch, p. 436.

37. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, p. 151.

38. Nesinah la-Ger, p. 21

39. Ibid., p. 16

40. Nesinah la-Ger. p. ' 1
41. ibid. p. 3
42. ibid. p. 23
43. ibid. p. 31
44. ibid. p. 11
45. ibid. p. 27
46. ibid. p. 37
47. ibid. p. 13
48. Dalman, "Aramaisch-Neuhebraisches Handwörterbuch", p. 147.
49. Nesinah la-Ger. p. ק'פ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Nathan, Megillah la-Gez, in the Vilna edition of the "Orin Gedolim", vol. 5, 1912.
2. Berliner, A., Targum Onkelos, herausgegeben und erläutert von Dr. A. Berliner, Zweiter Theil, Berlin, 1884.
3. Blau, Ludwig, Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift, in "17. Jahresbericht der Landesrabbinerschule", Budapest, 1894.
-M. Friedmann's 'Onkelos and Akylas', in the Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. ix, 1897, pp. 727 ff.
4. Catholic Encyclopedia, "Targum" by F. Schühlein, vol. 14, New York, 1912, pp. 454-457.
5. Churgin, Pinkhos, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, New Haven, 1927, pp. 89 ff.
6. Dalman, G., Aramaisch-Neuhebraisches Handwörterbuch, Frankfurt, 1901, p. 147.
7. Encyclopedia Britannica, "Targum" by J.F. Stenning, vol. 21 of the 14th. edition, New York, 1929, pp. 809-812.
8. Encyclopaedia Judaica, "Aquila" by Dr. Umberto Cassuto, vol. 2, Berlin, 1928, pp. 27 ff.
-"Bibelübersetzungen" , vol. 4, 1929, pp. 564 ff.
9. Friedmann, M., Onkelos und Akylas, in "III. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt", Wien, 1896, pp. 1-135.
10. Funk and Wagnalls, New Standard Dictionary of the English Language, New York, 1917, p. 114.

11. Geiger, A., Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel, Breslau,
1857, pp. 162-167.
-article in the Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des
Judentums, vol. ix, Berlin, 1871, p. 85.
12. Herzog-Hauck, Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und
Kirche, "Bibelübersetzungen" by E. Nestle, vol. 3,
Leipzig, 1897, pp. 103-110.
13. Hamburger, J., Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, "Targum
Onkelos", vol.2, Strelitz, 1883, pp. 1185 ff.
14. International Critical Commentary, "Deuteronomy", N.Y., 1906, p.277.
15. Jastrow, M., A Dictionary on the Targumim, authorized edition,
New York, 1926, p. 151.
16. Jewish Encyclopedia,-"Aquila" by F.C. Burkitt and Louis Ginsberg,
vol.2, New York, 1902, pp. 34 ff.
-"Asylum" by L. Ginsberg, vol.2, p.258.
-"Memra" by Kaufmann Kohler, vol.8, 1904, pp.464-465.
-"Onkelos" by L. Ginsberg, vol.9, 1905, p.405.
-"Targum" by Wilhelm Bacher, vol.12, 1906, pp.57 ff.
17. Jüdisches Lexicon, "Aquila" by H.Fuchs, vol.1, Berlin, 1927, p. 407.
-"Bibelübersetzungen" by B.Kirschner, vol.1, pp.1006f.
-"Toravorlesung" by Ismar Elbogen, vol.5, pp.993 ff.
18. Krauss, Samuel, 'Akylas der Proselyt' in the Steinschneider Fest-
schrift, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 148-168.
19. La Garde, Paul de, "Targum Onkelos von Berliner" in the Göttingische
gelehrte Anzeigen, Berlin, 1886, pp. 861-880.
20. Levy, J., Chaldisches Wörterbuch, Leipzig, 1867, p. 436.

21. Luzzatto, S. D., Oheb Ger(Philoxenus), Vienna, 1830, p.19.
22. Margolis, M.L., The Story of Bible Translations, Philadelphia, 1917.
23. Maybaum, S., Anthropomorphien u. Anthropopathien bei Onkelos,
Breslau, 1870.
24. Nöldeke, ., Die Alttestamentliche Literatur, Leipzig, 1868.
25. Schefftel, S.B., Biure Onkelos, Munich, 1888.
26. Waxman, Meyer, A History of Jewish Literature, vol. 1, New York,
1930, p. 114.
27. Weinberg, J., "Zur Geschichte der Targumim" in the Festschrift für Jakob Rosenheim, Frankfurt, 1931, pp. 237-259.
28. Zuns, Leopold, Die Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, Frankfurt,
18 , pp. 61-83.