

Exegesis in the Targum of The Psalms



GORGAS DISSERTATIONS

28

BIBLICAL STUDIES 1

Exegesis in the Targum of The Psalms

The Old, the New, and the Rewritten

TIMOTHY EDWARDS



GORGAS PRESS
2007

First Gorgias Press Edition, 2007

Copyright © 2007 by Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

Published in the United States of America by Gorgias Press LLC, New Jersey

ISBN 978-1-59333-432-1

ISSN 1935-6870



GORGias PRESS

46 Orris Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Edwards, Timothy M. (Timothy Mark), 1968-

Exegesis in the Targum of the Psalms : the old, the new, and the rewritten / Timothy Edwards. -- 1st Gorgias Press ed.

p. cm. -- (Gorgias dissertations ; 28) (Biblical studies ; 1)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Bible. O.T. Psalms. Aramaic--Versions--Targum. 2. Bible. O.T. Psalms. Aramaic Targum--Criticism, interpretation, etc. 3. Bible. O.T. Psalms--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BS1430.52.E43 2007

223'.2042--dc22

2007026504

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standards.

Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	v
Preface.....	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
Abbreviations	xvii
Journals, Publishers, and Reference works	xvii
Biblical and Rabbinic Texts	xvii
Manuscripts	xviii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Tg.Ps. and the Targum Tradition	4
1.1a The Language of Tg.Ps.	8
1.1b The Style of Tg.Ps.	9
1.1c The Date of Tg.Ps.....	11
1.1d Tg.Ps. in Rabbinic Literature	12
1.1e Tg.Ps. and Medieval References	13
1.2 The Manuscript Tradition of Tg.Ps.	14
1.2a Manuscripts used for this Study.....	15
1.3 Past Research into Tg.Ps.....	16
1.4 Scope of this Study	19
1.4a Psalms Selected for Research	19
1.5 Methodology	21
1.6 The Structure of this Study.....	23
2. Tg.Ps. and Early Bible Translations	25
2.1 Possible Dependence upon Earlier Translations	28
2.1a Tg.Ps. 92:13–15 and Aquila	28
2.2 Shared <i>Vorlage</i> Differing from the Masoretic Text.....	34
2.2a Tg.Ps. 2:2 and the LXX.....	34
2.2b Tg.Ps. 45:4 and 118:6,12.....	36
2.2c Tg.Ps. and Qumran Biblical Texts	38
2.2d Summary	39
2.3 Shared Traditions of Translation.....	39
2.3a Tg.Ps. and Symmachus.....	39
2.3b Tg.Ps. and the Peshitta.....	46
2.3c Tg.Ps. 82:1 and Aquila.....	48
2.3d Tg.Ps. 2:7a Aquila, Theodotion, Jerome and the LXX	49

2.3e Tg.Ps. 137:3 Symmachus and Jerome.....	50
2.3f Summary	52
2.4 Conclusions.....	53
3. Tg.Ps. and the Targum Tradition	55
3.1 Tg.Ps. and the Targumim of the Torah.....	58
3.1a Tg.Ps. 24:4 and FT Ex 20:7	58
3.1b Tg.Ps. 48:3 and TO Lev 1:11	60
3.1c Tg.Ps. 80:16 and the Targumim of Gen 49:11	62
3.1d Tg.Ps. 81:6, Targum Onkelos, and Ps.Jn. Gen 41:45.....	66
3.1e Tg.Ps. 81:7, TN Gen 40:18, and Tg.Ps.Jn. Gen 37:17	68
3.1f Tg.Ps. 81:10 and the Targumim of Deut 32:12	70
3.1g Tg.Ps. 93:2 and TN Gen 1:1	71
3.1h Tg.Ps. 118:14 and the Targumim of Ex 15:2	72
3.2 Tg.Ps. and the Targumim of the Prophets	73
3.2a Tg.Ps. 68:28 and TJ 1 Sam 15:17.....	73
3.2b Tg.Ps. 110:3 and TJ Judges 5:2.....	79
3.2c Tg.Ps. 137:7–9 and TT Isaiah 21:6.....	80
3.3 Conclusions.....	84
4. Tg.Ps. and Rabbinic Literature.....	87
4.1 Tg.Ps. and Parallel Rabbinic Traditions	88
4.1a Tg.Ps. 1:3 and BT <i>Avodah Zarah</i> 19a	88
4.1b Tg.Ps. 1:5 and m. <i>Sanhedrin</i> 10:3.....	91
4.1c Tg.Ps. 68:10 and BT <i>Shabbat</i> 88b.....	96
4.1d Tg.Ps. 81:4 and BT <i>Rosh Hashanah</i> 34a.....	98
4.1e Tg.Ps. 82:1–2 and <i>Tanhuma משפטים</i> 6.....	100
4.1f Tg.Ps. 82:6–7 and <i>Sifre Devarim</i> 306.....	104
4.1g Tg.Ps. 92:1 and <i>Qobeleth Rab.</i> 1:2	106
4.1h Tg.Ps. 137:3–5 and <i>Pesikta Rabbati</i> 136a	108
4.1i Summary.....	111
4.2 Tg.Ps. and Creativity within Rabbinic Traditions	113
4.2a Tg.Ps. 68:6–7.....	113
4.2b Tg.Ps. 68:13–14.....	117
4.2c Tg.Ps. 68:15.....	119
4.2d Tg.Ps. 80:1.....	120
4.2e Tg.Ps. 81:6.....	121
4.2f Tg.Ps. 93:3–4.....	124
4.2g Summary.....	126
4.4 Conclusions.....	127
5. Unique Traditions in Tg.Ps.	129
5.1 Tg.Ps. 24:7–9	129
5.2 Tg.Ps. 48.....	134
5.3 Tg.Ps. 80:4,8, 20	144
5.4 Tg.Ps. 94:9–10	145

5.5 Conclusions.....	148
6. Tg.Ps. and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i>	149
6.1 Parallel Interpretations Unique to Tg.Ps. and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i>	151
6.1a Tg.Ps. 2:7 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 2:9.....	151
6.1b Tg.Ps. 110:1 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 110:5.....	155
6.1c Tg.Ps. 68:12 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 68:6	157
6.1d Tg.Ps. 81:7 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 81:7	159
6.2 Test Case: Tg. Ps.82 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 82—A Detailed Comparison	161
6.2a Tg.Ps. 82:1 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 82:1	164
6.2b Tg.Ps. 82:2–4 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 82:2	165
6.2c Tg.Ps. 82:5–8 and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i> 82:3	167
6.2d Ps 82 in Tg.Ps. and <i>Midrash Tehillim</i>	167
6.3 Conclusions.....	168
7. Tg.Ps., the New Testament, and Early Christian Exegesis of the Psalms.....	169
7.1 Tg.Ps. and Contemporary Exegesis	170
7.1a Tg.Ps. 68 and Ephesians	171
7.1b Tg.Ps 118 and the Rejected Messiah	174
7.1c Tg.Ps. 80, the ‘Son of Man’ and the Messiah	183
7.1d Summary	184
7.2 Tg.Ps. and Reactionary Exegesis	184
7.2a Tg.Ps. 45 and the Messiah	185
7.2b Tg.Ps. 2 and the Begotten Messiah.....	192
7.2c Tg.Ps. 110, the Messiah, and David	196
7.3 Conclusions.....	204
8. Conclusions	217
8.1 The Old—Tg.Ps. and Existing Interpretive Traditions on the Psalms.....	217
8.2 The New—Tg.Ps. and Unique Interpretations on the Psalms.....	220
8.3 The Rewritten—Tg.Ps. and the Creative Adaptation of Tradition	220
8.4 The Date, Style and Manuscript Tradition of Tg.Ps.	221
8.4a The Date of Tg.Ps.....	221
8.4b The Manuscript Tradition of Tg.Ps.....	221
8.4c The Style of Tg.Ps.....	222
8.5 Future Research on Tg.Ps.....	222
8.6 Conclusion	223
Appendix: Texts, Apparatus and Translation of Psalms Studied	227
Psalms	227
Apparatus.....	227

Translation.....	228
Psalm 2.....	228
Apparatus.....	229
Translation.....	229
Psalm 24.....	229
Apparatus.....	230
Translation.....	230
Psalm 45.....	231
Apparatus.....	232
Translation.....	232
Psalm 48.....	234
Apparatus.....	234
Translation.....	234
Psalm 68.....	235
Apparatus.....	237
Translation.....	238
Psalm 80.....	242
Apparatus.....	243
Translation.....	243
Psalm 81.....	244
Apparatus.....	245
Translation.....	245
Psalm 82.....	247
Apparatus.....	247
Translation.....	247
Psalm 92.....	248
Apparatus.....	248
Translation.....	249
Psalm 93.....	250
Apparatus.....	250
Translation.....	250
Psalm 94.....	250
Apparatus.....	251
Translation.....	251
Psalm 110.....	253
Apparatus.....	253
Translation.....	254
Psalm 118.....	255
Apparatus.....	256
Translation.....	256
Psalm 137.....	258
Apparatus.....	258
Translation.....	259

Bibliography	261
A. Primary Sources	261
1. Bible.....	261
2. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Second Temple Literature	261
3. Rabbinic Sources	262
4. Aramaic Targum Texts.....	262
5. Church Fathers	263
B. Secondary Sources	265
C. Electronic resources.....	277
D. Dictionaries, Concordances, Grammars and Indices	278
General Index	279
Index of Ancient Sources.....	281

PREFACE

The Psalter has been, and continues to be, one of the most loved books of the Hebrew Bible both amongst Jews and Christians. Whether it is Rabbi Joshua ben Levi stating that whoever utters a psalm in this world will merit and say it in the world to come (BT *Sanhedrin* 91b), or Athanasius, who describes it as luxurious fruit garden containing the fruit from every other book of the Hebrew Bible, the Psalter has been read, sung, memorized, studied and chanted throughout its long history. Targum Psalms however has not achieved such heights, either in the religious or scholarly world, and was, in fact, never intended to do so. It was not a 'new world' wine that we are encouraged to drink alone, rather an old world red designed to accompany fine food and complement it. Targum Psalms was intended therefore to accompany the Hebrew Psalter not replace it. It is in such a context that we should read Targum Psalms, a context that is developed and expanded upon in chapter one and which lays the foundations for appreciating this traditional, yet creative part of the Targum tradition.

Targum Psalms was also part of the wider world of Jewish biblical exegesis and translation and cannot be understood apart from it. This study reads Targum Psalms not only in connection to the Hebrew text, but also this wider context. Chapter 2 focuses on other early translations of the Psalter examining possible textual traditions different to the Masoretic Text, and shared translation and interpretive traditions. Despite the presence of shared traditions of interpretation and translation between the various translations, the essential independence of Targum Psalms as a translation is asserted.

Chapter three examines the influence of the Targumim to other parts of the Hebrew bible on Targum Psalms and shows various points of relationship that suggest that Targum Psalms assumes a knowledge of the broader Targum tradition amongst its readers and relies on that in proffering particular interpretations that would be difficult to follow without such knowledge. Chapter four examines the relationship between Targum Psalms and rabbinic literature and clearly places the Targum in the rabbinic world, yet also highlights its creativity within that tradition. Chapter five examines those traditions that are unique within Targum Psalms, but the uniqueness is explained by the creativity of the

author, not be a dependence upon unattested midrashim, which is the common solution to such questions. Chapter six compares Targum Psalms with *Midrash Tehillim*, and suggests that there is no reason to assume any direct dependence or relationship between the two, other than coming from the same rabbinic context and being based on the same book of the *Tanach*. Such intertextuality is necessary when researching the world of early biblical interpretation, as will become clear. Yet the world of early biblical interpretation does not respect ethnic or religious boundaries and thus chapter seven compares Targum Psalms with early Christian interpretation asking if it is possible to use it in research of the New Testament, the answer being no; or if there is any reactionary exegesis within the Targum. This latter enquiry being more fruitful, but only, it seems, in the origins of some interpretations found in the Targum and not necessarily in the Targum itself.

This study is representative in nature not comprehensive and as such only directly refers to the fifteen Psalms studied, however as is argued in the introduction the representative nature of the psalms selected allows me to project, tentatively, the findings onto the whole of the Targum and hopes that they will stimulate others to take up this long neglected part of the Targum tradition and thus shed more light on the many questions that remain to be answered.

Timothy Edwards

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is an updated version of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the faculty of Oriental Studies, university of Oxford in 2003 and examined by Sebastian Brock and Philip Alexander. I would like to express my thanks to them for their careful reading of the text and the helpful suggestions they made. I have taken account of their comments as well as work that has been published since 2003. Despite the slight change in title and the updating, the work is essentially the same. I would like to thank Gorgias Press for accepting it for publication, and in particular Dr. Katie Stott for her patient editorial work. Thanks are also due to the Hebrew and Jewish Studies Unit at Oxford University for funds towards preparing my dissertation for publication.

As is the case for any individual's work there are a great many people whose influence and help rank as indispensable. Particular mention, therefore, should be made of my teachers. My parents brought me up to love both the God of Israel and scriptures of Israel, without which I would never have embarked on any such course of study. Specific mention should be made of Isaiah Gafni from whom I learnt as much outside of the classroom as I did in it, and who has remained a source of encouragement and inspiration. Menahem Kister gave of himself. The opportunity to sit and read texts with him was a privilege, without which I would not have been able to have even contemplated doing this research. His continued support, encouragement, and interest in my work have been most welcome. Martin Goodman's advice and supervision contributed greatly to any clarity that there may be in the argument. Alison Salvesen deserves particular thanks for her insightful, gracious, and ever encouraging supervision of my work. She has never tired, and has gently directed me to greater precision and detail, for which I am very grateful.

Finally, Anna, my wife—Thank you! My research began weeks before the birth of our fourth child, and was submitted to the publisher not long after the birth of our sixth. To tolerate me spending many hours every week in dusty old books required much grace. I would not have wanted to do it without you or the olive shoots around our table.

לא לנו ה' לא לנו כי לשמך תן כבוד על חסדך על אמתך (תה' קטו א)
לא מטולתנא ה' לא מטול זכוותנא ארום לשמך הב איקרא
מטול טובך ומטול קושטך (ת"ת קטו א)

ABBREVIATIONS

JOURNALS, PUBLISHERS, AND REFERENCE WORKS

<i>BDB</i>	<i>The Brown Driver Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i>
<i>CSIC</i>	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>HUC</i>	Hebrew Union College
<i>IOTS</i>	International Organization for Targumic Studies
<i>JAB</i>	<i>Journal of the Aramaic Bible</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft Judentums</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PWCJS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigilae Christianae</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC TEXTS

<i>BT</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>Dev. Rab.</i>	Deuteronomy Rabbah
<i>Ex. Rab.</i>	Exodus Rabbah
<i>FT</i>	Fragment Targums
<i>Gen. Rab.</i>	Genesis Rabbah (Theodor-Albeck)
<i>GT</i>	Geniza Targum Fragments
<i>Lev. Rab.</i>	Leviticus Rabbah (Margulies)
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>m.</i>	Mishnah

MT	Masoretic Text
Num. Rab.	Numbers Rabbah
PT	Palestinian Talmud
ST	Samaritan Targum
t.	Tosephta
Tg.Ps.Jn.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TN	Targum Neofiti
TO	Targum Oneklos
TT	Toseftot Targums

MANUSCRIPTS

N	Cod. Solger 6.2 (Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, 1291).
V	Cod. Urbinati-Vaticano 1 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome, 1294).
P110	MS heb. 110 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1455).
VA	MS Villa-Amil n.5 (as published by L. Diez Merino, Targum de Salmos 1982).

1. INTRODUCTION

וא"ר ירמיהו ואיתימא רבי חייא בר אבא: תרגום של תורה אונקלוס הגר אמרו מפי ר' אליעזר ור' יהושע תרגום של נביאים יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו מפי חגי זכריה ומלאכי ונזדעזעה ארץ ישראל ארבע מאות פרסה על ארבע מאות פרסה יצתה בת קול ואמרה מי הוא זה שגילה סתריי לבני אדם עמד יונתן בן עוזיאל על רגליו ואמר אני הוא שגיליתי סתריך לבני אדם גלוי וידוע לפניך שלא לכבודי עשיתי ולא לכבוד בית אבא אלא לכבודך עשיתי שלא ירבו מחלוקת בישראל ועוד ביקש לגלות תרגום של כתובים יצתה בת קול ואמרה לו דייך מ"ט משום דאית ביה קץ משיח:

R. Jeremiah said, or others say R. Hiyya bar Abba, "The Targum of the Torah, Onkelos the proselyte said it before R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, the Targum of the Prophets Jonathan ben Uzziel said it from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, and the land of Israel shook for 400 square miles. A *Bat Kol* burst forth and said, 'Who is this that has revealed my secrets to the sons of men?' Jonathan ben Uzziel stood and said, 'I am he who revealed your secrets to the sons of men. It is revealed and known before you that I did not do this for my glory, nor for the glory of my father's house, but I did this for your glory, so that disputes would not multiply in Israel.' He also sought to reveal the Targum of the Writings. A *Bat Kol* burst forth and said to him, 'Enough!' For what reason? Because in it is the time of the Messiah."¹

This oft cited pericope from BT *Megillah* 3a clearly communicates divine displeasure at the prospect of Jonathan ben Uzziel producing a Targum for the Writings of the Hebrew Bible.² If one assumes that such a story

¹ All translations are my own unless indicated otherwise.

² C.f., PT *Megillah* 1:9, 71c where we find the following:

ר' ירמיה בשם ר' חייא בר בא תירגם עקילס הגר התורה לפני ר' אליעזר ולפני ר' יהושע וקילסו אותו ואמרו לו יפית מבני אדם...

R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Hiyya bar Ba, Aquila the proselyte translated the Torah before R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and they praised him and said, You

represents rabbinic ideology concerning the Targumim, and in particular Babylonian ideology,³ then we could simply view this as an attempt to censor any unauthorised Targumim, i.e., any Targum of the Writings, plus any Targum other than Onkelos for the Torah and Jonathan for the Prophets.⁴ The fact that we have a Targum for every book of the

are more beautiful than the sons of men...⁷

The similarity between the two traditions is clear, the passage from the Yerushalmi being the original tradition connected to the Greek translation of Aquila (note the pun on יפת [The ancestor of the Greeks] in יִפְיִית [you are beautiful] from Ps 45:3). It would seem that the Bavli has adapted the tradition to fit with the authorised Aramaic translation it is seeking to promote. Also see BT *Baba Metz'ia* 59b for a similar use of Jonathan ben Uzziel's response concerning God's glory and disputes arising in Israel, but in this case it is placed in the mouth of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, and is not associated with the translation of the Bible. Note also how the oral nature of the Targumim is highlighted by the use of the root אָמַר.

³ This is the only occasion that this aggadah is found (although see above note). The fact that the sages to whom the tradition is attributed are Babylonians who had emigrated to *Eretz Israel* does not detract from the point made, and neither do the parallels cited in n.2

⁴ The historical value of this passage is minimal when taken at face value. However, fiction can serve the historian, and thus this particular piece of fiction sheds historical light on the Babylonian concern for control over the Targumim that were read. The fact that the passage in the Yerushalmi does not contain any mention of a translation of the Prophets, whereas the revised Babylonian tradition does, also serves to highlight the purpose behind this 'fiction.' The details concerning the history of these two Targumim are not directly pertinent to this study, but, the fact that they both ended up as the 'official, authorised Targumim' for the Babylonian community is part of the scholarly consensus (see, BT *Kiddushin* 49a where we find the phrase תַּרְגָּם דִּין that strongly suggests the notion of an official translation, also see W. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden, Brill, 1995, pp.42–68 for a thorough discussion on the history of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the literature relating to it). One should also point out that the presence of a Targum of Job is recorded in t. *Shabbat* 13:2 and BT *Shabbat* 115a, and thus the proposal that this passage is concerned with censorship is supported; i.e., the sages were aware of other Targumim to the Torah and the Prophets as well as Targumim to the Writings, but wanted to discourage their use as they had not been given the 'stamp of approval.' Whether the reason given in BT *Megillah* 3a for the ban on translating the Writings (i.e., that they contain the time of the Messiah) is of historical value is difficult to ascertain, as the ban could serve to encourage the eschatologically curious, and not deter them. Interestingly, Rashi comments on this

Bible (except Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah, which already contain some Aramaic) proves that this attempt failed to a certain degree, although with Targum Tehillim (from now on Tg.Ps.) it appears that such divine displeasure has resonated in subsequent generations so as to deter any who would try to unlock its secrets! Thus we approach the study of Tg.Ps. today without any critical edition,⁵ and with so few studies completed on it,⁶ that Bacher's 1872 article, in *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft Judentums*⁷ is still referred to as one of the more significant essays on the text.⁸

With such a background in mind this study will set out to research the exegetical aspects of Tg.Ps. through a detailed analysis of fifteen Psalms,⁹ and the relationship of that exegesis to both Jewish and Christian traditions. However, we must first view Tg.Ps. in the overall context of the Targumim in general, before proceeding to the specific details of the research.

passage that the time of the Messiah is found in Daniel, a book for which no Targum exists.

⁵ We do have an unpublished critical edition of the first two books of the Psalter (1–72) completed by E. White, *A Critical Edition of the Targum of Psalms: A Computer Generated Text of Books I and II* (Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1988). This edition appears to be incomplete, based on the details in W. Smelik, *Extant Manuscripts of the Targum of Psalms* (unpublished paper, my thanks to W. Smelik for giving me a copy of this paper). Note that White's edition is completely in transliteration and is therefore not easily accessible. It therefore remains a desideratum for a complete critical edition (using Hebrew characters) to be produced.

⁶ A full discussion of the secondary literature on Tg.Ps. appears later in this chapter (section 1.3).

⁷ W. Bacher, "Das Targum zur den Psalmen," *MGWJ* 21 (1872), pp.408–416, 463–473.

⁸ Bacher summarises this German article in his entry in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* vol 8, 1908, p.62. The paucity of work done on Tg.Ps. since his study is highlighted in the contents of all subsequent encyclopaedia articles, all of which summarise his conclusions, see B. Grossfeld, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* vol.4, (1972), pp.848–849; Y. Komlosh *מקראית אנציקלופדיה* vol 8, p.756; P. Schäfer, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* vol 6, 1980, p.223 and P. S. Alexander, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol.6, (1992), p.326. In light of these articles it seems safe to conclude that research into Tg.Ps. was in a state of stagnation from 1872 until 1992. As the discussion on secondary literature will show, this stagnation appears to be ending.

⁹ See ch.1.4a for details on the Psalms selected for research and the criteria used for the selection.

1.1 Tg.Ps. AND THE TARGUM TRADITION¹⁰

In a 1983 paper on the Targumim, P. S. Alexander asserted that, 'correct interpretation of any literary work depends on an understanding of its *Sitz im Leben*.' ¹¹ Just two years later R. Kasher described such a quest as the 'most intricate and complex question in the field of Targum research.'¹² Targum scholarship today continues to discuss this question, particularly in light of developments in our understanding of the linguistic context in which they arose, i.e., a multi-lingual environment in which Hebrew was still used in daily life.¹³

Traditionally, scholars have placed the Targumim in a liturgical context, i.e., the public reading and translating of the weekly Torah cycle and *haphhtarah*, as well as specific readings from other portions of the Hebrew Bible during specific festivals.¹⁴ This is not surprising in light of the numerous discussions in rabbinic literature surrounding the correct *halacha* connected to such events. However, can we use discussions

¹⁰ This section is not intended as a comprehensive discussion of the Targumim and the literature related to them, rather an overview relating to the place of Tg.Ps. within the Targum tradition. Readers are directed to the secondary literature cited for a fuller discussion and more comprehensive bibliographical record.

¹¹ P. S. Alexander, "The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum," p.14, in J. A. Emerton (ed.) *Supplement to Vetus Testamentum Series 36, Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp.14–28.

¹² R. Kasher, "The Aramaic Targums and their *Sitz im Leben*," in M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem 1985). Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988, pp.75–85 (p.75).

¹³ See most recently, S. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third–Sixth Centuries," in L. I. Levine (ed.) *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* New York and Jerusalem, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, pp.253–286; W. Smelik, *Ibid.*, pp.2–10 (although he seems to have modified his views more recently, see "Language, Locus and Translation Between the Talmudim," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.199–224); A. Tal, "Is there a *raison d'être* for an Aramaic Targum in a Hebrew-speaking Society?" *Revue des Etudes Juives* 160.3–4 (2001), pp.357–378.

¹⁴ See A. Shinan, *אגדתם של מתורגמנים* Jerusalem, Hotsa'at Makor, 1979, pp.30–38; and *תרגום ואגדה בו* Jerusalem, Magnes, 1992, p.12 where we find the following statement:

עיקר תפקידו וחיותו של התרגום הארמי היו בבית הכנסת, שם הוא נאמר
בצמוד לקריאה בציבור של טקסטים מן המקרא: התורה ובמידה פחותה מזה
חמש מגילות וההפטרות:

of an *halachic* nature to reach conclusions on the Targumim and their *Sitz im Leben*? Clearly for the rabbis there is nothing of greater importance, yet it does not necessarily follow that such a quantity of passages inevitably leads to a definitive synagogal context and *raison d'être* for the Targumim. I am not disputing the clear and indubitable liturgical function that the Targumim played, and the influence that such a role had on the Targum texts we now have in our possession,¹⁵ I do however question the scholarly 'assumption' that is drawn from these facts in relation to their original development. In fact, as W. Smelik has pointed out,¹⁶ the evidence for the early use of the Targumim in such a liturgical context is slim and there is no reason, therefore, to assume that this is the defining role behind their development.¹⁷ Scholars have highlighted, therefore, the literary structure of the Targumim as well as the issue of multilingualism in the centuries that spawned the Targumim.¹⁸ Such research has deepened our understanding of the Targumim and their use.

The Targumim were never designed to replace the Hebrew Bible (and never did),¹⁹ as happened with the LXX in the Greek Diaspora,²⁰

¹⁵ See, A. Shinan, *Ibid.*, 1979, and R. Kasher's recapitulation of the evidence in "The Aramaic Targums and their *Sitz im Leben*," *Ibid.*, pp.75ff.

¹⁶ *The Targum of Judges*, pp.31–39.

¹⁷ A. Shinan, "The Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean Jewry," in L. I. Levine *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, pp.241–251 asserts again that the Targumim were productions of the synagogue, but adds that this 'cornerstone of targumic studies' is sometimes, 'somewhat romanticized and oversimplified' (pp.243–244). He remains, however, firmly on the side of a liturgical context for the Targumim.

¹⁸ See A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums* Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1992, pp.1–3 for a discussion on the import of the literary structure of the Targumim *vis à vis* the oral origin hypothesis.

¹⁹ I.e., they were to be read in conjunction with and not instead of, the Hebrew Bible. In this regard the MT will be quoted alongside quotes from Tg.Ps. throughout this study, c.f., P. S. Alexander, *The Targum of Canticles. Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 2003, who presents the Targum in conjunction to the Hebrew text as preserved in the majority of Targum manuscripts.

²⁰ In recent years the possibility of the LXX originating for a bilingual audience has been put forward, see A. Pietersma, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other GREEK Translations Usually Included Under That Title: The Psalms* Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York, 2000, pp.viii–xi, and "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance for the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in J. Cook (ed.) *Bible and Computer*.

and later in the predominantly Gentile Christian Church.²¹ This connection with the Hebrew text, which afforded the translator the freedom to stray far and wide from the original,²² also suggests an educational function.²³ Thus today one must take seriously the possibility of the Targumim as educational texts in discussing Targumic context.

As has been mentioned, scholars have paid little attention to Tg.Ps. M. Bernstein has suggested that the size and 'discreet nature of

the Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference: proceedings of the Association internationale Bible et informatique, "From alpha to byte," University of Stellenbosch, 17–21 July, 2000 Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp.337–364.

²¹ This fact, alongside the combination of translation and commentary that is found in all the Targumim marks them out as unique amongst early Bible translations. This uniqueness has caused Samely, *Ibid.*, pp.158–180 to discount 'translation' as an appropriate term to describe the Targumim, and provides his own, lengthier, definition: 'Targum is an Aramaic narrative paraphrase of the biblical text in exegetical dependence on its wording' (p.180).

²² See S. P. Brock, "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.) *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992, pp.301–338 (especially p.321); M. Bernstein, "The 'Righteous' and the 'Wicked' in the Aramaic Version of the Psalms," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.5–26 (especially pp.5–7).

²³ See S. P. Brock, *Ibid.* and "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20.1 (1979), pp.69–87. The educational function of the Targumim was first explicated in a meaningful way by A. D. York, "The Targum in the Synagogue and the School," *JSJ* 10 (1979), pp.74–86, and his thesis has recently been taken up by S. Fine in an article dedicated to him, "'Their Faces Shine with the Brightness of the Firmament' Study Houses and Synagogues in the Targumim to the Pentateuch," in F. W. Knobloch (ed.) *Biblical Translation in Context* Bethesda, University Press of Maryland, 2002, pp.63–92. S. Fine concludes his study with the following: "Having surveyed the occurrences of study houses and synagogues in the Pentateuchal Targumim, we are now in a position to respond to the tentative assertion of Anthony York with which we began this study. York's comment may be restated with certainty: 'in discussing the origin and purpose of the Targum we SHOULD widen our horizon to include the school as well as the synagogue as the *raison d'être* for the Targum'" (p.90, emphasis original). See also P. S. Alexander, "How did the Rabbis Learn Hebrew?" in W. Horbury (ed.) *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben Yehuda* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, pp.71–89. A. Van der Kooij, "The Origin and Purpose of Bible Translations in Ancient Judaism, Some Comments," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1.2 (1999), pp.204–214 reaches even stronger conclusions, i.e., the Targumim were intended 'primarily' for a scholarly milieu.

its elements' has inhibited potential researchers.²⁴ He also candidly states: "We cannot even be certain why the Targum of Psalms came into existence" (p.327). Diez Merino, suggests that it 'is considered too modern.'²⁵ These reasons have undoubtedly played a part in deterring scholarly research into Tg.Ps. However, I would suggest the undue emphasis on the liturgical context of the Targumim has had a significant impact, in that the Psalms were never read publicly in the synagogue service,²⁶ and thus Tg.Ps. was devoid of a context in which to place it.²⁷

²⁴ M. Bernstein, "Translation Technique in the Targum to the Psalms: Two Test Cases. Psalms 2 and 137," (n.1, p.326), in E. H. Lovering (ed.) *SBL Seminar Papers 1994* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1994, pp.326–345.

²⁵ Diez Merino (p.131), "Haggadic Elements in the Targum of Psalms," in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A The Period of the Bible*, Jerusalem, 1982, pp.131–137.

²⁶ The *baraita* in BT *Megillah* 21b implies that the *Hallel* is read and translated, thus implying that there was at least a Targum of Ps 113–118 recited publicly. However, in the three manuscripts other than the printed version (London IraH 8055, Munich 95, and Gottingen 3), the reference to the *Hallel* is missing altogether (see, Rabinowitch, **דקדוקי סופרים** and the *Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank* The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, Jewish Theological Seminary 1998). It would therefore, appear dubious to posit a specific liturgical context for Tg.Ps. from this passage. Note, however, that Y. Komlosh in his article in **אנציקלופדיה מקראית** vol.8, p.756 quotes this passage as evidence for the existence of a Targum to the Writings, and specifically states concerning the *Hallel*: 'apparently this is the book of Psalms.' I know of no justification for relating this term to the whole of Psalms, but only to Pss 113–118. E. White, *Ibid.*, pp.12–14 also points out that Rashi crosses out the reference to the translation of the *Hallel* in this passage. White then accepts wholesale the argument of R. Joel Sirkes (17th Century) concerning why: The Talmud has already ruled out the possibility of a Targum of the Writings in BT *Megillah* 3a. However, as White also points out, the Tosaphot to this passage disagree with Rashi and acknowledge the presence of a Targum of the Writings. L. Rabinowitz, "Does Midrash Tillim [*sic*] reflect the triennial Cycle of Psalms," *JQR* 26 (1936), pp.349–368 claims there is sufficient evidence to posit the public reading of the Psalms alongside the Torah and haftarah in the synagogue, and even goes so far as listing which Psalms might have been read and when. The evidence, however, is at best suggestive, and cannot support the claims made. J. Mann, *The Bible as read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* New York, KTAV, 1971, pp.12 and 111 (n.107a) also hints at such a possibility. B. Zion Wacholder, "Prolegomenon," *Ibid.*, pp.xi–lxxxvi presents the readings from the Karaite synagogue of Damascus, which includes readings from the Psalms (pp.lxix–lxxxvi), and comments that the inclusion of the

However, if one posits a specific educational context for the Targumim, then Tg.Ps. can be viewed as part of this world, especially since this is the only context in which such a text would have any function. In fact the very existence of Targumim to books that have no liturgical function whatsoever points strongly to an educational context for all the Targumim, perhaps even as their primary function. In this context it is important to remember that the earliest record of a Targum in rabbinic literature is that of Job (t. *Shabbat* 13:2, BT *Shabbat* 115a), a book that has no liturgical function whatsoever.

It is only after having outlined such a context for Tg.Ps. that one can proceed and discuss more specific issues relating to Tg.Ps. and the Targumim, such as its language, style, and date.²⁸

1.1a The Language of Tg.Ps.

Tg.Ps. has been grouped linguistically with the Targum of Job and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch, under the heading of 'Late Jewish Literary Aramaic.'²⁹

Psalms 'appear to be a unique Karaite invention' (p.lxix), but later voices the possibility that it may be ultimately based on 'Rabbinite customs.' At present, the evidence still suggests that the Psalms were not read publicly alongside the Torah and the Prophets (see m. *Shabbat* 16:1 and BT *Shabbat* 116b), as the inclusion of verses from the Psalms in the homiletical Midrashim cannot infer a public reading without additional evidence.

²⁷ A. Samely, *Ibid.*, p.2 makes a similar point concerning Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, although in comparison to Tg.Ps. this Targum has received far greater attention in scholarly research.

²⁸ Issues relating to its integrity and textual transmission will be discussed in section 1.2.

²⁹ See E. M. Cook "The Psalms Targum: Introduction to a New Translation with Sample Texts," in P. V. M. Flesher (ed.) *Targum and Scripture. Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in memory of Ernest G. Clarke*, Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp.185–201, especially pp.186–189, and S. Kaufman, התרגום המיוחס, in M. Ben Asher, M. Garsiel, D. Dimant and Y. Maori (eds.) *ספר זכרון למשה גושן*, Givat Ram, Bar Ilan University Press, 1993, pp.363–382, and "Dating the languages of the Palestinian Targums and their use in the Study of First Century Texts," in D. Beattie and M. McNamara (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 1994, pp.118–141. It appears that both Cook and Kaufman reached the same conclusions independently of each other.

This dialect is a purely literary creation, and contains a mixture of forms grouped by Kaufman as follows:³⁰

- a. General Aramaic (ארמית כללית)
- b. Jewish Literary Aramaic (ארמית יהודית ספרותית)
- c. Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (ארמית יהודית של ארץ ישראל)
- d. Babylonian Aramaic (ארמית בבליית)
- e. Hebraisms ("עברית")
- f. Archaic/ambiguous (ארכאית או מעורפלת)
- g. Specific/Syrian (מיוחדת/סורית)

Kaufman (1994) has also pointed out that linguistically there is 'no reason to assume a Palestinian origin for any of these texts written in this dialect' (p.125), a factor that has to be borne in mind when assessing the provenance of Tg.Ps.³¹ The literary nature of the dialect may suggest that it arose when Aramaic was no longer a spoken language, and therefore language is an important factor to be borne in mind when discussing the date of Tg.Ps.

1.1b The Style of Tg.Ps.

Tg.Ps. is first and foremost a literary translation of the Hebrew original,³² and as a rule sticks very close to its 'parent' text.³³ In some passages, however, it departs quite radically from the Hebrew, and inserts significant blocks of midrashic material. Note in this respect that the Sephardi 'family' of manuscripts contain lengthier insertions of midrashic material than the others. These 'departures' and 'additions' are incorporated into the text to present a smooth render-

³⁰ S. Kaufman, *Ibid.*, (1993), pp.364–365. I have translated Kaufman's terms, but included the original Hebrew in brackets for greater clarity. Note that all these characteristics can be found in Tg.Ps., thus placing it in this 'language' group is appropriate.

³¹ E. White, *Ibid.*, pp.17–20 concluded that Tg.Ps. was written in a Palestinian dialect, a conclusion based on a comparison between Tg.Ps. 18 and Targum Jonathan 2 Samuel 22. Clearly, White would not have had access to either Cook's or Kaufman's studies, which have increased our understanding on the development of languages and Aramaic dialects.

³² Despite Samely's opposition to the use of the term 'translation' (see n.21) and his own somewhat lengthy definition, I have used and will continue to use 'translation' in order to simply convey the Targum's inseparable connection with the Hebrew text.

³³ M. Bernstein in his articles on Tg.Ps. stresses this point and the importance of it with regard to one's methodology.

ing/interpretation of the original. The question remains though as to the mixture of styles within Tg.Ps. in comparison to other Targumim that either stick to a close correspondence with the Hebrew (Onkelos and Jonathan), or consistently produce expansive 'translations' (Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan). This 'mixture' of styles will be returned to at the conclusion of this study, although it is not so unusual when compared with the other Targumim to the Writings.

Another feature of Tg.Ps., along with Targum Job and other Targumim, is multiple renderings on different verses, marked in different manuscripts by either **ת"א** **תרגום אחר** or **ל"א** **לשון אחר**.³⁴ These are not only found in the margins, but are incorporated into the text,³⁵ and as such have been compared in function to the **דבר אחר** in rabbinic Midrashim.³⁶

J. Kugel has pointed out in his work on biblical poetry that rabbinic biblical interpretation, based upon what he describes as 'omnisignificance,' does not take poetic structure into account.³⁷ Likewise Tg.Ps., despite its literary character, does not attempt to reproduce the poetics of the Hebrew original. The 'poetic form' of the original is not important for the translator; the message is all-important, although not perhaps the original message of the biblical text.³⁸ Thus, through translation of the original and supplements grafted into the text, the transla-

³⁴ Tg.Ps. contains fewer 'multiple renderings' than the Targum of Job, and there are even differences within the manuscripts themselves, c.f., L. Diez Merino, *Ibid.*, (1982), p.132 where the number of **תרגום אחר** in MS Villa-Amil n.5 is compared to the Lagarde text.

³⁵ For a concise summary of past scholarship on this feature see J. de Moor, "Multiple Renderings in the Targum of Isaiah," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.161–180, especially, pp.161–163.

³⁶ C.f., P. S. Alexander, "Targum," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol.6, pp.328–329.

³⁷ J. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1981, pp.96–109.

³⁸ The term 'original message' is a modern construct that would not be understood in the world of late antique Jewish (and Christian) exegesis. For the rabbis there is 'no before and after' in Torah, which itself is said to have 'seventy faces.' Thus the Targumim do communicate an original message, as all interpretation is in a sense 'original' as the oral Torah itself was revealed on Sinai. See W. G. Braude, "Midrash as Deep Peshat," in S. Brunswick (ed.) *Studies in Judaica, Karaitica, and Islamica, Presented to Leon Nemoy on his Eightieth Birthday* Givat Ram, Bar Ilan University Press, 1982, pp.31–38.

tor makes the Psalms communicate a specific message relevant to his readers and coincident with his worldview.³⁹

1.1c The Date of Tg.Ps.

The dating of any Targum is fraught with difficulty, especially as the manuscript tradition for all the Targumim is medieval.⁴⁰ As such one is forced to accept the probability that the texts will not have remained the same through the long process of textual transmission. Thus one is faced with the need to date traditions within each Targum as well as the corpus as a whole.⁴¹ For such dating to proceed on a stable footing one must consider linguistic,⁴² and exegetical issues alongside external evidence.⁴³ Such a stance assumes (justifiably) that the Targumim as we have them today resemble an archaeological tell, and thus need careful excavation to expose the various layers.⁴⁴

With regard to Tg.Ps. the situation is no different. One can trace early traditions,⁴⁵ as well as uncover later additions to the text, and in-

³⁹ A. Samely, *Ibid.*, p.183 helpfully places this Targumic exegesis in the context of a theology of 'revelation,' and thus the Targumim bring 'to the surface, not what the [Hebrew] words *say*, and not even what they (usually) *mean*, but what they (in the situation of revelation) *imply*.' (Emphasis original.) Such a conclusion confirms Targumic exegesis as a part of the wider world of rabbinic exegesis, in which the Torah has seventy faces.

⁴⁰ A. D. York, "The Dating of Targumic Literature," *JSJ* 5.1 (1974), pp.49–62, has dealt with the issue of dating Targumic literature, and has a thorough critique of the thesis of P. Kahle (and others who followed him), and the case for an early date for the Palestinian Targumim.

⁴¹ See A. Shinan, *Ibid.*, (1992), p.244.

⁴² Issues relating to the form of Aramaic, its grammar, and the translation technique are all included in the term 'linguistic.' W. Smelik, *Ibid.*, pp.638–642 has shown the importance of 'consistency' within any given Targum as a tool for dating them.

⁴³ See A. Salvesen, "Symmachus and the Dating of Targumic Traditions," *JAB* 2 (2000), pp.233–245.

⁴⁴ See R. P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets* Leiden, Brill, 1994, p.152; and B. B. Levy *Targum Neophyti 1 a Textual Study* Lanham, University Press of America, 1986, p.131. Although note D. Golomb, "Methodological Considerations in Pentateuchal Targumic Research," *JSP* 18 (1988), pp.3–25, where he argues for assuming Targumic coherence on the basis of its midrashic character.

⁴⁵ E.g., ch.7.2c

terpretive traditions that possibly come from the medieval period.⁴⁶ Scholarly opinion (scant as it is) is divided between an early date (4–5th century),⁴⁷ and a later post-Talmudic date.⁴⁸ It would seem therefore that the safest way forward is the two-fold dating highlighted above, based on all the criteria above, which could perhaps provide a *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem* within which to work. This issue of dating will need to be revisited at the conclusion of this study.

1.1d Tg.Ps. in Rabbinic Literature

Apart from the references already discussed from BT *Megillah* 3a and 21b (see pp.1 and 7 n.26), we should note that BT *Shabbat* 115a discusses whether one is obligated to save Targumim that are not read publicly from a fire. Such a discussion may simply be an exercise in halachic reasoning with little bearing on ‘reality,’ yet more likely it evinces the existence of Targumim to the writings, including Psalms, many of which were not read publicly.

The only other possible reference to Tg.Ps. in rabbinic literature is found in *Tanbuma* פקודי 1. Here an Aramaic translation of Ps 122:3 is given as תרגום ירושלמי and partly coincides with the text we have of Tg.Ps.⁴⁹ However, as E. White has pointed out, this passage does not occur in Buber’s edition.⁵⁰ Such ‘silence’ is taken by White to indicate that Tg.Ps. was ‘a relatively late Targum’ (p.14). It should be pointed out however that ‘silence’ does not preclude knowledge of Tg.Ps., and

⁴⁶ E.g., ch.4.1b, 7.1b, and n.53 below.

⁴⁷ See, W. Bacher, *Ibid.*, (1872), *Ibid.*, (1906); L. Diez Merino, “Haggadic Elements in the Targum of Psalms,” pp.136–137. The basic argument for the early date is based upon a reference to Rome and Constantinople in Ps 108:11 and Rome in Ps 69:3,15–16, the use of Greek and Latin loan words, and an affinity with a non-MT *Vorlage* used by the LXX and Peshitta.

⁴⁸ P. Churgin, תרגום כתובים New York, 1945, pp.59–62; and E. White, *Ibid.*, pp.19–20, both date it as post-Talmudic but prior to the Muslim conquest.

⁴⁹ The two translations are as follows:

פקודי א: ירושלים דמתבניא ברקיעא כקרתא דאתחברת כחדא
תרגום: ירושלים דמתבניא ברקיעא היך קרתא דאיתחברא לה כחדא

Note that Nachmanides, when quoting Tg.Ps. 45 (see n.53) refers to it as Targum Yerushalmi, as does this passage in *Tanbuma*.

⁵⁰ E. White, *Ibid.*, p.14: he doesn’t, however, note the difficulties with Buber’s edition of *Tanbuma* and the dating of its manuscripts, which according to J. T. Townsend, *Midrash Tanbuma vol.1*, New Jersey, KTAV, 1989, pp.xi–xii, cannot be dated before the ninth century.

thus other factors must be brought to bear alongside before one interprets the 'silence.'

1.1e Tg.Ps. and Medieval References

Post Talmudic quotations from Tg.Ps. are also scarce. E. White has pointed out that the *Aruch* of Rabbi Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome (1102) is the first source to quote extensively from Tg.Ps.⁵¹ Nachmanides appears to have quoted from it on two occasions, once in his commentary to Ex 30:34,⁵² and once in his *Novellae* to *Ketubboth*.⁵³ On both these occasions he quotes from Psalm 45.

⁵¹ E. White, *Ibid.*, p.17.

⁵² The quote is from Ps 45:9, although E. White, *Ibid.*, p.16 suggests that the quote may well be from Canticles 4:14, and thus there is no proof that Nachmanides knew Tg.Ps.

⁵³ The quote is as follows:

תרגום כל כבודה בת מלך פנימה כל שפר ארג נכסי פלכי ואוצרי מלכיא
 דמטמרין מלגו יקרבון קורבניהון קדם מלכא ודורונין לכהניא דמרמצין בדהבא
 סנינא לבושיהון:

All glorious is the king's daughter within, is translated, All the best and choice possessions of the regions and treasures of the kings that are hid inside, they will offer sacrifices to the king and gifts to the priests whose clothing is entwined with pure gold.

(Note the textual differences with the Targum manuscripts recorded in the Appendix.)

The authenticity of this quote of Tg.Ps. 45:14 is unclear. Rabbi Shimon ben Tzemah Duran (1361–1444) in *ספר תשב"ץ* (פ"ג שא), Amsterdam 1738 fol, refers to this quote found in the *Novellae* of Nahmanides. However, it appears that it is only present in one manuscript (British Museum MS no. 27185), published by A. Jeruchen, *Obel Rachel*, New York, Sinai, 1942, where the quote is found at the end of the *masechta*, just as R. Shimon ben Tzemah Duran said. However, it appears unconnected with anything that has gone before and thus may well be a later addition to the text. Also note that the phrase **כל שפר ארג נכסי** is found in various *Ketubboth*, and interestingly has been shown by M. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine* vol.1, pp.461–462 to be an innovation of the *Rishonim* (also see, See M. Friedman, "תעודות ותשובות מן הגניזה", *Tarbiz* 43 (1974), pp.166–198, esp. n.68, pp.181–182). Tg.Ps. appears to have the exact formula in this verse, which does not appear in rabbinic literature, and thus this phrase in its current form appears to come from the medieval period. Note also that on both occasions it is Ps 45 that is being quoted, which may cast doubt on White's scepticism (see n.52).

1.2 THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF Tg.Ps.

In the absence of a complete critical edition an accurate picture of the manuscript tradition behind Tg.Ps. is impossible to paint.⁵⁴ The work that has been done by scholars thus far lacks agreement on the number of manuscripts. E. White used sixteen manuscripts in his doctoral dissertation,⁵⁵ as well as the *Biblia Rabbinica* produced by D. Bomberg in Venice (1516–1517). M. Wilcox states that ‘there are in fact some 18 Aramaic manuscripts... and we have in addition two Polyglot Bible texts’ (p.154).⁵⁶ W. Smelik⁵⁷ lists nineteen complete manuscripts, as well as various other manuscripts that contain fragments of Tg.Ps. in them.⁵⁸ M. Bernstein who has been working on Tg.Ps. for a number of years now, mentions sixteen manuscripts.⁵⁹

As for the grouping of these manuscripts in ‘families,’ both M. Wilcox and E. White agree on a threefold division.⁶⁰ White describes this threefold division geographically: Group A being the Sephardi manuscripts, group B, the Ashkenazi manuscripts, and Group C the Nürnberg manuscript. D. Stec also has a threefold division, although he has only grouped six different manuscripts.⁶¹

⁵⁴ At present there are three printed texts, P. de Lagarde, *Hagiographa Chaldaica*, Leipzig, 1873, which is taken from the first *Biblia Rabbinica*, but is corrected. The resultant text, according to M. Wilcox, “The Translation of the *Targum of Psalms*: A Report,” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997), pp.153–157 is very similar to MS Solger 6.2 (p.153). L. Diez Merino has published Ms. Villa-Amil n.5, *Targum de Salmos: Edition Principe del Ms. Villa-Amil n.5 de Alfonso de Zamora*, Madrid: CSIC, 1982. Most recently Bar Ilan University has published MS P¹¹⁷ in, M. Cohen (ed.) *מקראות גדולות הכתר*, Jerusalem, Bar Ilan University, 2003.

⁵⁵ E. White, *Ibid.*, see pp.36–60.

⁵⁶ M. Wilcox, *Ibid.*, p.154. Wilcox was preparing his translation for the *Aramaic Bible* series but never completed it. D. Stec also lists eighteen manuscripts in the introduction to his recent English translation of Targum Psalms in the Aramaic Bible series, *The Targum of Psalms* The Aramaic Bible vol.16, Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 2004.

⁵⁷ W. Smelik, “Extant Manuscripts of the Targum of Psalms” (unpublished paper).

⁵⁸ W. Smelik acknowledges that he has not checked each manuscript *in situ* and thus some errors may remain.

⁵⁹ M. Bernstein, *Ibid.*, (1994), p.11.

⁶⁰ C.f. M. Wilcox, *Ibid.*, (1997), p.155 and E. White, *Ibid.*, p.59.

⁶¹ D. Stec, *Ibid.*, p.22. McNamara’s claim in “Melchizedek: Gen 14,17–20 in the Targums, and in Rabbinic and Early Christian Literature,” *Biblica* 81

On a number of occasions the differences between the manuscripts are quite substantial. This raises the question of whether there was an original Targum, or whether we should speak in terms of Targums of Psalms.⁶² White (pp.59–60) disagrees with Wilcox's suggestion of Targums, and concludes that all the manuscripts reflect the same text, but in different recensions. Although no definitive answers can be arrived at until a full critical edition of Tg.Ps. is published,⁶³ this study proceeds on the basis of White's assertion that we are dealing with one Targum and not multiple Targums.⁶⁴

1.2a Manuscripts used for this Study

Any research undertaken on Tg.Ps. has to take into consideration the lack of any critical edition, at least for Pss 73–150. Therefore every attempt to utilise the necessary manuscript information to support the conclusions must be made. Time restraints made the collation of all the manuscript information impossible, and thus a decision was made to follow the three-fold division of this tradition as outlined by Wilcox and White (see above) and select manuscripts from each 'family' to consult. I selected MS 1106, University Library, Wrocław (1237–1238); Cod. Solger 6.2, Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg (1291); Cod. Urbinati 1, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (1294); MS Heb 110, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (1455); Ms. Villa-Amil n.5 (as published by Diez Merino). This selection provided the information from the earliest manuscripts in each 'family,' which is why they were chosen in preference to the others.

MS 1106 was consulted both on microfilm⁶⁵ and *in situ* in Wrocław,⁶⁶ as was Cod. Solger 6.2.⁶⁷ Cod. Urbinati 1 and MS Heb. 110 were

(2000), pp.1–31, especially pp.19–21, that D. Stec is also preparing a critical edition of Tg.Ps., is a mistake.

⁶² M. Wilcox raised the question of 'Targums,' and intended to present his translation in three blocks on occasions. See, *Ibid.*, (1997), pp.153–155, and "The Aramaic Targum to Psalms," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A The period of the Bible* Jerusalem, 1981, pp.143–150.

⁶³ In this respect, the decision reached at the IOTS congress in Basel, Switzerland in August 2001, to undertake the project to create scholarly editions of all the Targumim is to be welcomed and encouraged.

⁶⁴ This issue is returned to in the conclusions.

⁶⁵ My thanks to the staff at the *Institute of Microfilmed Manuscripts* in Jerusalem for their assistance during my visit in April 2002.

⁶⁶ My thanks to the staff of the University Library, Wrocław for their assistance whilst visiting the manuscript in September 2002.

consulted on microfilm only.⁶⁸ I have followed White in making MS 1106 my base text.⁶⁹

These manuscripts fall into the following ‘families’:

1. Ms. 1106. Codex Urbinati 1.
2. Ms. Heb 110. Ms. Villa-Amil n.5.
3. Codex Solger 6.2.

In the strictest sense, until the publication of a full critical edition, the conclusions of this research will only be applicable to those manuscripts used. However, because they represent all the manuscript families, the extension of my conclusions to the Targum as reflected in all the manuscripts is not wholly unwarranted.

1.3 PAST RESEARCH INTO Tg.Ps.

Despite its limited scope and brevity all studies on Tg.Ps. build upon the foundational study by W. Bacher, “Das Targum zu den Psalmen” in *MGWJ* 21 (1872) pp.408–416, 463–473. Bacher examines the nature of Tg.Ps.,⁷⁰ covering issues of lexicography, translation technique (syntax, additions, etc) and exegesis (in particular aggadic additions), as well as differences with the MT and issues of date and provenance. As such Bacher has provided an overview, but this article should not have become the definitive statement that it seemed to become,⁷¹ at least until 1992.

L. Techen published a short monograph in 1896,⁷² which sought to furnish the scholarly world with an apparatus for Lagarde’s edition of Tg.Ps., although he only used polyglot texts. He also gave an overview,

⁶⁷ My thanks to the staff at the Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg for their assistance whilst visiting the manuscript in August 2002.

⁶⁸ For a detailed description of all these manuscripts see E. White, *Ibid.*, pp.36–60. Note that White only consulted the microfilms for his edition.

⁶⁹ Seeing at present this is the only critical edition available to scholars it seemed appropriate to coincide with his base text for this study. See White, *Ibid.*, pp.26–28 for the reasoning behind his selection.

⁷⁰ The nature of the article is such that no claim to comprehensiveness is made, especially in the selective nature of the examples given in each section.

⁷¹ This is not to downplay the importance of this contribution, but to put it into perspective. The fact that Diez Merino could write in 1982 that ‘although this article is more than a hundred years old it is still the best work to date’ (“Haggadic Elements in the Targum of Psalms” *PWCJS* Division A, 1982) highlights the stagnation in research more than the comprehensiveness of Bacher’s article.

⁷² L. Techen, *Das Targum zu den Psalmen* Wismar, 1896.

with examples, of the translation issues. The motivation behind his work, however, appears first and foremost to be focussed upon providing the basis for using Tg.Ps. in text critical work on the MT. P. Churgin, in 1945, also produced a short monograph on the Targum of the Writings, which includes a section on Tg.Ps.⁷³ Again, as with Bacher's article, Churgin sought to provide an overview (albeit at greater length and with a more comprehensive list of examples) of the features of Tg.Ps., including issues of translation, exegesis and exegetical method, relationship with Midrashim and earlier translations, as well as a discussion on date and provenance. Churgin's article was the last published research that attempted to deal with the nature of Tg.Ps. as a whole,⁷⁴ until Diez Merino's publication of MS Villa-Amil n.5 in 1982.⁷⁵

Along with the Aramaic text and Alfonso de Zamora's Latin translation, Diez Merino discussed the general characteristics of Tg.Ps., according to the manuscript being published. Included in his discussion are issues of translation and language, date and provenance, as well as exegesis and aggadic themes.⁷⁶ E. White's dissertation (see n.5) clearly focuses on the production of his critical edition on the first two books of the Psalter, although he also touches briefly on issues covered in the works cited above. The most striking feature of all these studies is that they repeat much of the previous work and as a result lack a specific and systematic focus. Unsurprisingly, therefore, we have not progressed very far in our understanding of this part of the Targum tradition.

Alongside these general overviews, individual studies have appeared on specific issues. H. Preuss wrote briefly on the Psalm superscriptions in the Targum and Midrash,⁷⁷ and Peters made a comparison between Tg.Ps. and the Peshitta Psalter.⁷⁸ J. Schunary wrote on anthro-

⁷³ P. Churgin, *תרגום כתובים* New York, 1945, the section on Tg.Ps. is found on pp.17–62.

⁷⁴ Except Y. Komlosh, *קווים אופייניים בתרגום תהלים* in J. Grintz, J. Liver (eds.) *ספר סגל*, Jerusalem, 1964, pp.265–270. However, six pages are insufficient to cover the whole of Tg.Ps., and Komlosh only repeats aspects of Bacher's and Churgin's research with specific examples.

⁷⁵ L. Diez Merino, *Targum de Salmos*, 1982.

⁷⁶ The aggadic themes were also discussed by Diez Merino in "Haggadic Elements in the Targum of Psalms" in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A The Period of the Bible*, Jerusalem, 1982, pp.131–137.

⁷⁷ H. Preuss, "Die Psalmenüberschriften in Targum und Midrasch," *ZAW* 71 (1959), pp.44–54.

⁷⁸ C. Peters "Peshitta Psalter und Psalmentargum," *Le Muséon* 52 (1939), pp.275–296.

pomorphisms in Tg.Ps., and the way it dealt with them.⁷⁹ We have already highlighted M. Wilcox's work on a translation of Tg.Ps.,⁸⁰ and more recently W. and M. Smelik have published a detailed assessment of Tg.Ps. 18 and Targum 2 Samuel 22.⁸¹ Alongside these we now have an English translation published on the Internet, by E. M. Cook,⁸² as well as D. Stec's.⁸³ The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon website also provides a search facility for Tg.Ps.⁸⁴ As already mentioned Bar Ilan University have just published the Psalms in their series **מקראות גדולות הכתר**, using MS P¹¹⁷ as their Targum text.⁸⁵ All these studies and resources will aid future research.

Finally, one should mention the ongoing work of M. Bernstein, who has already published five papers on different aspects of Tg.Ps.⁸⁶ and has presented numerous others.⁸⁷ The fruits of his research will hopefully be published in a monograph soon that will significantly en-

⁷⁹ J. Schunary "Avoidance of Anthropomorphisms in the Targum of Psalms," *Textus* 5 (1966), pp.133–144.

⁸⁰ M. Wilcox, "Aramaic Targum to Psalms," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, pp.143–150, and "The Translation of the Targum of Psalms: A Report," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997), pp.153–157.

⁸¹ W. Smelik and M. Smelik, "Twin Targums: Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22," in A. Rappoport-Albert and G. Greenberg (eds.) *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts* Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 2001, pp.244–281.

⁸² http://www.tulane.edu/~ntcs/pss/tg_ps_index.htm. See also his introduction (n.29) to this translation that includes some discussion on specific aspects of language and exegesis, "The Psalms Targum," (2002).

⁸³ See n.56. E. M. Cook "The Psalms Targum" mistakenly mentions two translations in preparation, D. Stec's and K. Cathcart's. In fact D. Stec produced a translation for the *Aramaic Bible* series of which Cathcart is the editor.

⁸⁴ www.cal1.cn.huc.edu/

⁸⁵ M. Cohen (ed.), **מקראות גדולות הכתר** Jerusalem, Bar Ilan University, 2003. See pp.9–10 for a discussion on the Targum text and the reasons for their selection of this manuscript for the edition.

⁸⁶ M. Bernstein, "Translation Technique," pp.326–345; "Torah and Its Study in the Targum of Psalms," in J. Gurock and Y. Elman (eds.) *Hazon Nahum: Studies in Honour of Dr. Norman Lamm on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Hoboken, Yeshiva University Press, 1997, pp.39–67; "The Righteous and the Wicked in the Aramaic Version of Psalms," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.5–26; "A Jewish Reading of Psalms: Some observations on method of the Aramaic Targum" in P. W. Flint and P. D. Miller (eds.) *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* Leiden, Brill, 2005, pp.476–504.

⁸⁷ See his comment, *Ibid.*, (2001), p.9 n.6.

hance our understanding of the theological worldview communicated in Tg.Ps., and the targumic method utilised in the translation.

1.4 SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

In the light of past research, as well as that which is ongoing, a reasonable argument could be made for undertaking almost any aspect of research into Tg.Ps. However this study will specifically focus on the exegesis of the Psalms in Tg.Ps. and the relationship of that exegesis to other interpretive traditions, both Jewish and Christian, i.e., how did the Targum interpret the biblical Psalms, and in what way is it related to other interpretive traditions? This study is therefore focussed on the interpretation of whole Psalms, rather than on the presence of exegetical themes throughout the Targum. Specific Psalms will be selected and analysed in detail,⁸⁸ as would be done in a commentary. Only after a thorough analysis has been made of how the Targum interprets each Psalm can any comparison be made with other interpretive traditions, and any relationship between them delineated. Comparison will be made with all early translations of the book of Psalms; classical rabbinic texts and Christian interpretations connected to the Psalms.⁸⁹ A specific comparison will also be made with *Midrash Tehillim*. Thus this study will seek both to present specific interpretations found in Tg.Ps. and place Tg.Ps. in its exegetical context.

1.4a Psalms Selected for Research

As the title suggests, no claim is made to comprehensiveness for this study. The nature of the research precluded a detailed examination of each psalm, a task that awaits the commissioning and publication of a commentary. Therefore strict criteria needed to be employed in order for the selection process to be both objective and representative. In this light, the following criteria were used:

⁸⁸ See next section for a discussion on the process of selection and the criteria used.

⁸⁹ With regard to classical rabbinic literature, this study will focus on both Tannaitic and Amoraic texts, although recourse will also be made to medieval traditions where necessary. Christian authors will be limited to the first four centuries, and those appearing in the index, *Biblia Patristica: index des citations et allusions biblique dans la littérature patristique* vols. 1–5, Paris, Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, pp.1975ff.

1. The selection had to cover the whole Psalter, and thus should come equally from each of the books found in the Psalms.
2. The selection was to include an historical grouping of Psalms.⁹⁰
3. Psalms that had significance in Christian exegesis were to be included.
4. Psalms within the Targum that demonstrated exegetical expansions were to be included.

After a close reading of the whole Targum, a group of fifteen Psalms was selected for study: Pss 1, 2, 45, 68, 80, 118, and 137, and an historical grouping of Psalms, Pss 24, 48, 82, 94, 81, 93, 92 that were sung in the Temple on successive weekdays.⁹¹ Altogether this small corpus fulfilled the criteria for a study that would be as representative and objective as possible.

Confining the research to a selection of Psalms necessarily confines the conclusions to those Psalms selected. However, the representative nature of the selection allows for a cautious projection of the findings onto the whole of the Targum. Therefore in the conclusions I will draw at various points in this study, I will write in terms of the Targum as a whole. The reader should not read this as a departure from the caution urged above, rather as the necessary conclusions drawn from a representative study, which will hopefully provide both stimulus and a foundation upon which others can build. The reader is therefore urged to note the representative nature of this study and bear it in mind as they read.

⁹⁰ In other words a grouping of Psalms that was recognized or portrayed as a distinct group in antiquity.

⁹¹ See m. *Tamid* 7:4 and the superscriptions to these Psalms in the LXX (except Pss 81 and 82). The agreement between these two sources, despite the difficulties with the text of m. *Tamid* 7 (see J. Epstein, **מבוא לנוסח המשנה כרך ב** Tel Aviv, Magnes Press, 1948, pp.978, 986, and 994, where mishna 4 is described as a later addition) confirm the historical nature of this group and their use in some form in the Temple service during the Second Commonwealth. For an alternative view see, A. Pietersma "Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," in B. A. Taylor (ed.) *The Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Oslo 1998* Atlanta. SBL, 2001, pp.99–137. Here Pietersma argues that the content of the Psalms in connection to the days of creation week was the stimulus for these titles rather than their place in any liturgy, thus undermining claims to an historical value of these titles.

1.5 METHODOLOGY⁹²

The fundamental methodological fact that must be borne in mind at every turn in Targum scholarship is that the Targumim are inextricably bound up with the Hebrew text.⁹³ No Targum, I believe, was intended to be read or heard in isolation from the Hebrew, and thus its function was to both render the Hebrew text in Aramaic and to interpret that text for its readers/hearers. In one sense, therefore, they were a bridge that linked the written Torah with the oral Torah,⁹⁴ and so without the written Hebrew text they lose their *raison d'être*. Any research must therefore deal with the Targumim in association with the Hebrew text, and must analyse the translation carefully before attributing ideas or beliefs to the Targum that are simply Aramaic representations of the ideas and beliefs of the Hebrew original.⁹⁵ This research is therefore founded upon a thorough analysis of the translation of each Psalm, highlighting any departures from a consistent translation technique, or additions to and departures from the Hebrew text. Once those 'differences' have been highlighted, they themselves will be subjected to close examination in comparison to the Hebrew text, so as to understand what could have prompted them, i.e., are they prompted by the Hebrew text, or not?⁹⁶ Thus, for example, it is necessary to fully assess the nature of the additions utilised in Tg.Ps. before reaching conclusions as to their significance.

⁹² This section only seeks to present an overview of the methodological assumptions and obstacles that will be present throughout this study. Each successive chapter will deal in more detail with its own methodological issues as they arise.

⁹³ This point is illustrated in the way the Targumim are always written either alongside the Hebrew text (i.e., the Hebrew is written and then the Targum, as in MS 1106, Breslau, and Cod. Solger 6.2, Nürnberg) or with an introductory word or phrase from the Hebrew text (as in MS Heb. 110, Paris).

⁹⁴ See S. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views," (1992); and "Scripture, Targum and Talmud as Instruction: A Complex Textual Story from the *Sifra*," in J. Magness and S. Gitin (eds.) *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1998, pp.109–122, who delineates this pedagogical role very clearly.

⁹⁵ M. Bernstein, has expressed this methodological imperative clearly in his published work on Tg.Ps. (see n.86), and his work reflects a careful outworking of it.

⁹⁶ Such a position is especially important with Tg.Ps. due to the poetic nature of the Hebrew text that often includes many difficult Hebrew words while also leaving much unsaid.

From the fifteen Psalms studied the additions found can be grouped into seven categories (although some may fall into more than one category).

i. 'Chronological': The insertion of a time frame that is not found in the Hebrew text, most commonly 'the world to come' or 'forever.'

ii. 'Personality': The insertion of individuals not found in the Hebrew text, most commonly the Patriarchs, Moses or the Messiah.

iii. 'Historical': The insertion of events from Israel's past not found in the Hebrew text, most commonly the events connected with the Exodus.

iv. 'Action': The insertion of actions not found in the Hebrew text, e.g., singing, killing, praying, etc.

v. 'Location': Insertions of geographical places or buildings not found in the Hebrew text, most commonly Jerusalem and the Temple.

vi. 'Amplification': Insertions that seek to amplify the meaning (either the 'original' or 'revealed' meaning) of the Hebrew text.

vii. 'Clarification': Insertions designed to clarify difficulties in the text.

These last two groups are more general and include contextual as well as 'midrashic' additions. It is also true to say that many of the first five categories also fall into one of the last two. With all these types of additions one must always uncover each particular stimulus, i.e., are they textually stimulated or not, either through double meaning (e.g., different nuances contained in the same root) or poetic brevity. Only those aspects that can be demonstrated as changing or departing from the language and message of the Hebrew text can be used to illustrate Targumic ideology/interpretation.

Once conclusions have been reached as to the interpretation of each Psalm, attention must be given to comparing those findings with other traditions. Care is needed in discussing issues of dependence and relationship.⁹⁷ With regards the relationship between the Targumim and Midrashim, it has been a scholarly commonplace to consistently attribute precedence to the Midrashim. However, each text and tradition being compared must be analysed without prior assumptions giving preference to one 'genre' over another. At the same time, one must be aware that the biblical text itself can provide the impetus for similar traditions: one cannot assume that such similarity indicates contact or dependence.

⁹⁷ See the influential essay by S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962), pp.1–13.

This is important with regards comparative Christian traditions, and thus one must be able to demonstrate sufficient proof that traditions are either ‘shared’ or ‘polemical,’ rather than springing separately from the same source, the Hebrew Bible, or even, on the Christian side, from earlier Christian authors.⁹⁸

1.6 THE STRUCTURE OF THIS STUDY

The research undertaken will not be presented in commentary form, but each chapter will focus on the different traditions with which Tg.Ps. is being compared. Any areas of comparison will be examined in detail and the extent and type of relationship will be delineated. Those areas of interpretation that are unique to Tg.Ps. will also be uncovered, as well as those passages that evince adaptation of existing traditions.

In order to prevent repetition, aspects of relationship between Tg.Ps. and rabbinic tradition that have a very specific relation to Tg.Ps. and Christian exegesis will be discussed in chapter 7, and thus although conclusions will be drawn at the end of each chapter, the reader will have to wait until the end for the final conclusions on all the aspects discussed.

⁹⁸ D. Satran’s critique in *Tarbiz* 52.1 (1980), pp.145–153, of J. Braverman, *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel. A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible* outlines very clearly the need for methodological exactness when undertaking such a comparative study, and especially the need to be aware that earlier Christian authors may be the source for those teachings which seem to rely on Jewish traditions.

2. TG.PS. AND EARLY BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

Although the Targumim are translations of the Hebrew Bible along with the other examples of biblical translations in antiquity (LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Jerome's *iuxta Hebraeos* and the Gallican Psalter, and the Peshitta), they remain separate from them in that they never replaced the Hebrew original (see ch.1.5).⁹⁹ This uniqueness does not exclude comparing them with the afore-mentioned translations, which themselves were known and utilised in both Jewish and Christian exegesis.¹⁰⁰

Particular mention should be made concerning the importance of Aquila and Symmachus. Both of these translations date from the second century CE,¹⁰¹ have a Palestinian origin,¹⁰² as well as numerous parallel interpretations in rabbinic literature and the Targumim. It is

⁹⁹ The original intention and use of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion remains unclear, although their use amongst Jews who did not know Hebrew is a possibility.

¹⁰⁰ There are numerous passages in rabbinic literature that quote translations by Aquila (עקילס), e.g., PT *Megilah* 2.3, 73b; *Gen. Rab.* 93.1; *Lev. Rab* 11.9; 33.1.6. I am unaware of any occasion when a translation of Symmachus is quoted, although see A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* Manchester, University of Manchester, 1991 for a thorough examination of his exegesis and translation, and the numerous parallels in rabbinic literature, as well as the possibility of Symmachus being identified as R' Meir's disciple סומכוס. In Christian exegesis the examples of their use are too numerous to note. Suffice to say that the Church and not the Jews preserved the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

¹⁰¹ Late second and very early third century for Symmachus, see A. Salvesen, *Ibid.*, pp.294–296.

¹⁰² It is widely accepted now that Onkelos is Palestinian in origin and was adopted by the Babylonian community and revised there. See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Language of Targum Onkelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic," *JNES* 37 (1978), pp.169–179; and E. Y. Kutscher, "The language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon': A Preliminary Study," in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds.) *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4, 1958, pp.1–35.

more probable therefore that the author(s) of Tg.Ps., if they had access to traditions of interpretation (oral or written), would have known Symmachus and Aquila over and above other examples of Bible translation in late antiquity.

The transmission process of such traditions is complex. Both oral and written traditions may have influenced the Targumim directly, yet it is also possible that early translation traditions were transmitted via Midrashim, homilies, or even polemical discussions with 'the other.' Such a situation makes any comparative study fraught with methodological pitfalls that must be avoided.

This chapter will therefore outline those areas of relationship that exist between Tg.Ps. and other early translations, as well as examine the nature of the relationship. In other words it is insufficient simply to quote the relevant examples and suggest that a relationship exists, without exploring all possible reasons or stimuli that may have produced similar 'translations.' This is especially important when dealing with texts that are based (however loosely) upon the same source text, which itself may generate similar renderings in utterly separate texts.¹⁰³ Two examples of different problems will suffice to illustrate the need for such methodological exactness. Firstly, Tg.Ps. 110:1 translates the Hebrew **חַלֵּף דִּיתִיבִית לְאוֹלָפָן אוֹרִית יְמִינִיה אוֹרִיךְ עַד... שֶׁב לִימִינִי** with **חַלֵּף דִּיתִיבִית לְאוֹלָפָן אוֹרִית יְמִינִיה אוֹרִיךְ עַד... שֶׁב לִימִינִי**. The Targum has utilised a double translation of the Hebrew root **יִשַׁב**, firstly with the perfect form **יִתִּיבִית** (you sat) and secondly with the imperative **אוֹרִיךְ** (wait). This latter translation is also found in Symmachus' translation: **προσδοκῆσαι τὴν δεξιάν μου** (wait expectantly for my right hand). Clearly the Targum has translated/interpreted the verse differently from Symmachus, as the additions of Torah study and the idea of reward for that study demonstrate; yet, the correlation in the use of the verb 'wait' could point to a shared translation tradition, or even dependence of one text upon another. However, the Hebrew root **יִשַׁב** is used in the biblical text with a meaning of 'wait' (c.f. Gen 22:5, where Onkelos translates with **אָרַךְ**, and Jer. 3:2 where both Targum Jonathan and Symmachus translate with 'wait'), therefore one must assume that both translators reached their translations independently of each other (c.f., *Midrash Tehillim* 110:5 where we find the following comment on this phrase in Ps 110:1: **וְאִין שֶׁב אֵלָא הִמָּתָן שְׁנֵאמַר שֶׁבּוּ נָא בִּזְהָ**

¹⁰³ What M. Weitzman has termed as 'polygenesis,' *The Old Testament in Syriac* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, p.90. Weitzman uses this term in relation to translations into similar dialects. I see no reason why it cannot be extended to translations into different languages.

(במדבר כב יט) There is no 'sitting' but 'waiting' as it says: 'wait now this [night]' (Num 22:19).

Secondly, Tg.Ps. 48:8 translates ברוח קדים with בקידום תקיף. כאשא דמן קדם ה' is unique. Out of the ten occasions the phrase occurs in the MT, every one except this one in Ps 48:8 is translated by the Targumim with the full phrase ברוח דקדומא (with some orthographic differences).¹⁰⁴ This phrase, however, partially appears in Onkelos Num 21:28 (ארי קידום), and more fully in Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan to Deut 32:22 (תקיף כאשא נפק מן קדמי). Interestingly the Targum is similar in part to the LXX that translates: ἐν πνεύματι βιάω (in a strong wind), and the Peshitta: כוּמַחַ חַנְנֵלָא (in a strong wind). One should also note that the Peshitta renders the other occurrences of רוח קדים, with כוּמַחַ חַנְנֵלָא seven times, and לוּמַחַ חַנְנֵלָא once (Ezek 41:16). The LXX translation is also unique although the variety of other phrases given in the other passages diminishes its significance here. Jerome has *vento uredinis* (burning wind), which is the same as Aquila's πνεύματι καύσωνος. It would seem that our Targum communicates both strength, as with the Peshitta and the LXX, alongside the concept of burning (כאשא דמן קדם ה'), as with Aquila and Jerome. One should remember in light of this last tradition that an East wind in the Middle East comes from the desert and is hot, hence the connection with burning.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, although a superficial reading of these similarities might suggest shared traditions, a more reasoned conclusion is that the Targum has specifically utilised the earlier Targum traditions, and any similarity with the other translations of this verse spring from a shared concern to communicate the meaning of the Hebrew text based upon its wording. Thus the Hebrew stimulated the similarities, but via other Targum traditions.¹⁰⁶

The need for methodological exactness is clear, and thus in any discussion of potential comparisons below numerous texts will be in-

¹⁰⁴ Note two manuscripts of Tg.Ps. also translate with ברוח קידום: VA and P¹¹⁰.

¹⁰⁵ C.f., *Sifre Devarim* 306 p.340, where the four winds of heaven are described. The East wind is described as 'always hard/difficult' (... מזרחית לעולם קשה).

¹⁰⁶ *Contra*, C. Peters "Peshitta-Psalter und Psalmentargum," *Le Muséon* 52 (1939), pp.275–296, where Ps 48:8 is cited as portraying a relationship between the Peshitta and Tg.Ps.

cluded in order to shed as much light as possible on any potential relationship between Tg.Ps. and other Bible translations in antiquity.¹⁰⁷

2.1 POSSIBLE DEPENDENCE UPON EARLIER TRANSLATIONS

Dependence of one text upon another is perhaps the most difficult relationship to convincingly demonstrate. One must rule out all other avenues that could potentially produce the similar reading before dependence is ascertained.

2.1a Tg.Ps. 92:13–15 and Aquila¹⁰⁸

MT Ps 92:13–15

צדיק כתמר יפרח כארז בלבנון ישגה:
שתולים בבית ה' בחצרות אלהינו יפריחו:
עוד ינובון בשיבה דשנים ורעננים יהיו:

The righteous will flourish like a Palm, as a Cedar in Lebanon he will increase.

Transplanted in the house of the Lord, in the courts of our God they will flourish.

They will still bear fruit in old age, they will be succulent and fresh.

Tg.Ps.

צדיקא היך דיקלא ילבלב פירין היך ארזא בליבנן יסגא ויעביד
שרשין:
בנוי יהון שתילין בבית מקדשא דה' בדרת אלהנא ילבלבון:
תוב כאבהתהון יעבדון בנוי בשיבו דהינן ורטיבין יהון:

The righteous will produce *fruit* like a Date Palm, like a Cedar in Lebanon he will increase *and produce roots*.

¹⁰⁷ The following sources are used: LXX, *Septuaginta, vol. X Psalmi cum Odes* Göttingen, 1979; Hexapla, F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* I–II, Oxford, 1867–74, rep. Hildesheim, 1964; Symmachus, J. R. Busto Saiz, *La Traducción de Simaco en el Libro de los Salmos*, Madrid, CSIC, 1978; Peshitta, The Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta* Leiden, Brill, 1972ff; Jerome, R. Weber, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* I–II, Stuttgart, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.

¹⁰⁸ Only the specific verses of the Targum are quoted and translated at the beginning of each section. The reader is referred to the 'Appendix of Texts and Translations' at the end of the study for a complete copy of each Psalm with an apparatus.

His sons will be transplanted in the Temple of the Lord, in the courtyard of our God they will sprout forth.

[Once] again, *like their fathers*, they will *produce sons* in old age; they will be succulent and fresh.¹⁰⁹

Aquila Ps 92:15

ἔτι γεννηματίζοντες ἐν πολὺ.

They will still produce offspring in old age...

The point of comparison between Tg.Ps. and Aquila has been highlighted: the unique Aramaic phrase **יַעֲבֹדוֹן בְּנֵין** and the unusual Greek verb, γέννηματίζω. However, before discussing any possible relationship it is necessary to examine the interpretation in Tg.Ps. for all these verses.

The reward of righteousness described in vv.13–15 is interpreted by Tg.Ps. as a reference to the blessing of children, to sons in particular.¹¹⁰ The additions of ‘fruit’ and ‘roots’ in v.13 are interpreted in v.14 as the descendants of the righteous man, who themselves, like their fathers (a likely reference to the patriarchs), produce ‘sons’ in old age and remain strong.¹¹¹ How does such an interpretation compare with other Jewish interpretations connected to Ps 92:13–15?¹¹²

Ben Sira 50:12ff alludes strongly to these verses in his description of the High Priest and his assistants administering the sacrifices in the Temple.¹¹³ In contrast, *Genesis Apocryphon* col. 19:14–16 alludes to these

¹⁰⁹ Aramaic over and above a 1:1 representation of the Hebrew text is in italics.

¹¹⁰ Such an interpretation is consistent with the biblical idea of the blessing of children, c.f., Pss 127 and 128, Deut 7:12–13.

¹¹¹ It is likely that the ‘righteous’ in v.13, although used with a singular verb, should be viewed as a collective noun, hence the shift to plural verbs in vv.14–15. Note, however, that this difficult change from the singular to plural has been interpreted here in the Targum by the addition of **ויעבדו שרשין** at the end of v.13 and the addition of **בני יהוין** at the beginning of v.14. I deliberately use the term ‘interpreted’ here, as the difficulty was not perceived as a problem, but rather as an opportunity to uncover fresh meanings in the text.

¹¹² Most Christian interpreters of these verses either use them to describe the blessed state of the righteous in heaven or the life of the faithful on earth who bear spiritual fruit, and thus there is no point of comparison with the Targum.

¹¹³ The connection clearly comes from the presence of the Temple and the courts of the Lord in vv.13–15.

verses in reference to Abraham and Sarah.¹¹⁴ However, none of these early interpreters refer to the offspring of the righteous. Rabbinic passages pick up on the fruitfulness of the righteous man in old age and liken it to biblical figures who had sons in their old age.¹¹⁵ None of them provide any real comparison to our Targum other than in the general concept being communicated except the passage below from *Tanbuma* (Buber) שמיני 4:

ויהי ביום השמיני (ויקרא ט א) זש"ה צדיק כתמר יפרח וגו' (תה' צב יג) זה אהרן שנאמר (ופרח) [ופנה פרח] מטה אהרן (במדבר יז כג) כל האילנות נוטעין אותן והן עולין לעצמן אבל התמרה הזו נוטעין אותה ומעלה שרשין מכל צדדיה כך היה אהרן נטע ועלו שרשים אלו בניו של אהרן אלעזר בנו פנחס בנו אבישוע בנו (דה"א ו לה) צדיק כתמר יפרח היכן נטע שתולים בבית ה' (תה' צב:יד) ומפתח אהל מועד לא תצאו (ויקרא ח לג) לכך נאמר ויהי ביום השמיני:¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ It is quite probable that the כאבהתהון in v.15 is a reference to the patriarchs, thus making a link between this tradition and those in rabbinic literature connecting v.15 with Abraham. The Dead Sea Scrolls Psalms scroll 4QPs^b also seems to connect these verses with Abraham in the addition of the word טובה in v.15, which seems to be a reference to Gen 15:15.

¹¹⁵ See *Gen. Rab.* 26 in relation to Noah; *Ibid* 61:1–2 in relation to Abraham.

¹¹⁶ The rabbinic traditions surrounding these verses in Ps 92, are somewhat complex, especially in the reasons for comparing the righteous to two different trees, the Palm and the Cedar of Lebanon. BT *Ta'anit* 25a–b records a tradition attributed to R' Hiyya bar Lulyani, that the Cedar does not bear fruit but does produce shoots when cut down to a stump, whereas the Palm produces fruit but no shoots when cut down to a stump. Thus the righteous are compared to both and produce fruit and remain alive and fruitful when reduced to a 'stump.' This passage clearly contradicts the botanical description in the *Tanbuma* passage quoted above, as does BT *Baba Batra* 82a where a discussion occurs over the difference between a shoot (גזע) and a root (שרש), and if the purchasers of a tree own the new shoots. Also compare *Tanbuma* (Buber) 9 לך לך where a discussion on the choice of these two trees includes the claim that the shoots from both trees do not 'take' in the ground for many years and only after much work, and *Tanbuma* (Buber) 17 במדבר where it specifically states that the uprooted or cut back Cedar does not send forth shoots (אינו מחליף). The intention of these last two passages clearly is to communicate the loss to the world when a righteous man dies, and the difficulty of replacing him. All these contradictions surround what happens to the stumps/shoots of the Cedar and the Palm, and it may well be that R' Hiyya bar Lulyani and his

On the eighth day (Lev 9:2) this is what is written, The righteous will flourish like the Palm (Ps 92:13) this is Aaron as it says, [and behold] the rod of Aaron [had blossomed] (פרח) (Num 17:23) All the trees which one plants grow for themselves, but this Palm¹¹⁷ one plants and it produces roots from all sides;¹¹⁸ just so Aaron! He was planted and produced roots, these are the sons of Aaron, Eliezer his son, Pinhas his son, Avishua his son (1 Chron 6:35) The righteous will flourish like the Palm, where is it planted? Planted in the House of the Lord (Ps 92:14) Don't leave the opening of the tent of testimony (Lev 8:33), therefore it says, and on the eighth day.¹¹⁹

compatriots lacked the necessary botanical knowledge. However, it seems as if the complexity of the halachic discussion in the Bavli concerning who owns the shoots of a tree bough and in what circumstances this occurs, etc, generated the difficulty and it may be that R' Hiyya bar Lulyani has in mind a different circumstance for the Palm tree than the other interpreters. One should note that the mature female Palm does produce coppice shoots from the base of the trunk that can be used to propagate new trees, which indicates it would produce shoots if cut back to a stump, yet it would be very unusual if a cedar once cut back to a stump produced coppice shoots. The most likely result would be that the tree would die. (Thanks to S. Cox of Poole Council for this botanical information.)

¹¹⁷ Note that the 'rod' in Numbers 17 produced Almonds, and thus wasn't a Palm!

¹¹⁸ The translation of the root עלה alongside שרש is not straightforward. J. T. Townsend, *Midrash Tanhuma*, vol.2, Hoboken, N.J., Ktav, 1997, p.223 translates with, 'sprouts came up.' I am unaware of any occasion where שרש can mean 'sprouts' (c.f. BT *Baba Batra* 82b where the question is asked as to how to distinguish between a גזע and a שרש, clearly implying a difference.) My translation 'produce roots' does not translate עלה literally, but according to the sense given in the context. This translation is confirmed by the printed version of *Tanhuma* 3 שמיני where the reading for the section on Aaron reads עשה עשרים instead of עלו עשרים. Such a reading is significant when compared to Tg.Ps. 92:13 and the phrase יעביד שרשין. Note the discussion in n.116 regarding the differences with other passages.

¹¹⁹ The reason for making the Palm feminine is to imply that it refers to his wife who is fruitful (and is in keeping with the fact that there are male and female Palms that one needs to artificially pollinate for them to bear fruit). This seems to contradict Ps 92:13 that has a righteous man and a male Palm tree! Interestingly in the *Genesis Apocryphon* col. 19 Abraham is referred to as a Cedar and Sarah as a Palm, although there is no reference to having children in this

Again, as with the other examples given on our discussions on v.13, this passage seems to be related to our Targum yet is different in the detail. Here the midrashist has made the link between the Palm in v.13 and Aaron's rod in Num 13:23 because of the root פרח, he then interprets the roots produced by this rod in relationship to Aaron's offspring. The Targum has the same illustration with the same meaning but in connection with the Cedar and the description of fruitfulness in vv.14–15.¹²⁰

Tg.Ps. clearly belongs within this lively interpretive tradition surrounding the comparison of the righteous to a Palm and Cedar, although the addition of 'roots' to the cedar by Tg.Ps. doesn't appear in any other passage.¹²¹ Tg.Ps. therefore appears to display elements of creativity in its translation/interpretation of these verses, yet from a firm position within an interpretive tradition.¹²²

The question that remains to be discussed is the relationship between Tg.Ps. and Aquila. Is the Aramaic phrase יעבדון בנין a result of the interpretive tradition discussed above, or a result of some form of dependence upon Aquila?

Aquila translates the Hebrew יָנוּבוֹן with γεννηματιζω, 'produce offspring.'¹²³ Origen also lists this translation¹²⁴ in the fifth column

passage. This passage in *Tanbuma*, however, may have roots (no pun intended!) that reach back to the Second Temple period and that are reflected in this use of Ps 92:13.

¹²⁰ The much older *Psalms of Solomon* also connects righteousness with having lots of children (see 1:3); however, Deut 7:12ff seems to be the source for this interpretation and not Ps 92:13–15.

¹²¹ *Midrash Tehillim* 92:11 also has a similar interpretation that Buber has included in the main body of the text although it is not present in all the manuscripts which he used, and immediately follows the tradition differentiating between 'fruit' and 'shoots.' This passage talks about the roots of the Cedars of Lebanon that keep the tree upright despite strong winds, and thus Israel is likened to this tree, in that it continues even in exile. It is possible that Tg.Ps. has used 'roots' in its translation under the influence of such a passage, although the context and point of each interpretation is very different, thus making any relationship unlikely.

¹²² C.f., the discussion and conclusions to chs. 4 and 5.

¹²³ Aquila also uses it in Is 55:10 to translate the root צמח. Note the same 'botanical' connection as in our Psalm. Also note the uniqueness of this Greek expression—a search on *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* failed to produce any examples of this word between the 5th century BCE and 5th century CE.

(*Quinta*) of his Hexapla on the Psalms.¹²⁵ Venetz has questioned the significance of this 'witness'.¹²⁶ His discussion surrounds internal evidence, i.e., Aquila's translation technique, manuscripts and other Greek versions, yet does not cite the evidence of the similar expression in Tg.Ps. The existence of this similar interpretation in Tg.Ps. suggests that his scepticism concerning the reading of Aquila and the *Quinta* is unwarranted.¹²⁷ The Aramaic **עֲבֹדוֹן בְּנִין** does reflect the meaning of the Greek verb quite accurately especially as the root **עבד** when used in a horticultural context can mean 'to produce' (c.f., v.13 of this Psalm).¹²⁸ The only other comparable text is in Tg. Isaiah 27:6 where **תְּנוּבָה** is interpreted/translated with **בְּנֵי בְנִין**, which demonstrates the possibility that the translation in Tg.Ps. may have arisen out of the same thinking that produced this translation, i.e., 'produce fruit' can be understood, in the context of human life and blessing, as 'children.' However, such thinking would not necessarily have produced the unique Aramaic phrase we have in Tg.Ps. unless the translator sought to create a literary connection with v.13 and the phrase **יַעֲבִיד שְׂרָשִׁין**.¹²⁹

Outright dependence upon Aquila, or perhaps the text represented in Origen's *Quinta*, despite the possibilities discussed above remains the most probable explanation for the unique phrase that we find in Tg.Ps., as all other solutions fail to adequately explain why such an unusual Aramaic expression was utilised. How such dependence on Aquila came about is impossible to determine, although both oral and written trans-

¹²⁴ I use the term translation, although clearly it is not literal, as the Hebrew root **נוב** only refers to produce fruit.

¹²⁵ For discussion on the nature of the *Quinta* see, N. F. Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context* Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp.155–158; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968, pp.118–124; H. J. Venetz, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta und Hexapla Forschung*, Hildesheim, Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg, 1974.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.149–153. Venetz cast doubt on the trustworthiness of the attribution to both Aquila and the *Quinta*.

¹²⁷ P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," in K. Aland and F. L. Cross (eds.) *Studia Patristica 1* Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1957, pp.343–353, cites this example as proof that the *Quinta* and Aquila 'have much in common' (p.351).

¹²⁸ The three other occasions that **נוב** is used verbally in the Hebrew Bible, all produced different Aramaic equivalents, none matching our example in Tg.Ps.: see Ps 62:11, Prov 10:31 and Zech 9:17.

¹²⁹ Such literary devices appear very rarely in Tg.Ps. although the possibility remains.

mission are possible. One assumes that the numerous occasions that the rabbis quote a translation by Aquila, first in transliteration and then in translation/interpretation indicate that the Jewish world had access to some of his translations, possibly in written form.

2.2 SHARED *VORLAGE* DIFFERING FROM THE MASORETIC TEXT¹³⁰

The examples below will illustrate the occasions where Tg.Ps. agrees with other earlier versions in a way that possibly suggests the use of either the same consonantal Hebrew *Vorlage* or the same vocalization tradition, differing from the MT we have today.

Comparing any early translation with the MT remains problematic in that it is clear that the biblical text remained ‘fluid,’ to a degree, in the centuries during and after the Second Commonwealth. Tg.Ps. however was composed later (no earlier than the 5th Century) when the text was more established, although comparison with the MT must still proceed cautiously.

2.2a Tg.Ps. 2:2 and the LXX

MT

יתיצבו מלכי ארץ ורוזנים נוסדו יחד
על ה' ועל משיחו:

¹³⁰ This topic has been touched upon by numerous authors, most of whom posit numerous instances suggesting that Tg.Ps. evinces a different *Vorlage* along with other earlier versions, see: M. Wilcox, (*Ibid.*, [1997], p.155) who describes a ‘notable kinship’ between Tg.Ps. and the Peshitta, citing Ps 68:19 as his example (discussed in detail in section 7.1a). W. Bacher, (*Ibid.*, [1872], pp.463–465) discusses readings in Tg.Ps. that differ from the MT but agree with the LXX and the Peshitta, indicating a similar *Vorlage*. In fact this is one of the ‘proofs’ he brings in giving it an early date. C. Peters, *Ibid.*, (1939) specifically posited an Aramaic Targum text behind the Peshitta Psalter that had survived occasionally in citations in various authors (M. Weitzman, “The Origin of the Peshitta Psalter,” in J. A. Emerton and S. C. Reif [eds.] *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible, Essays in Honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp.277–298, has dealt with the examples cited by Peters and concludes: “Thus the Targum that Peters imagined to underlie the Peshitta Psalter and to survive occasionally in citations proves illusory” [p.283]. He does, however, acknowledge the possibility that his evidence does suggest Jewish influence.) F. Baethgen, “Der Textkritische Werth der alten Übersetzungen zu den Psalmen,” *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* 8.

The kings of the earth took a stand, and the princes gathered together,
Against the Lord and against His anointed one.

Tg.Ps.

קימין מלכי ארעא ושלטוניה יתחברון כחדא למרדא
קדם ה' ולמנצי עם משיח[ה]:

The kings of the earth are standing and the rulers join together as
one *to rebel*
before the Lord *and to quarrel* with his Messiah/anointed one.¹³¹

LXX

παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τὸ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

The kings of the earth took a stand, and the rulers gathered themselves together against the Lord and against His anointed.

The comparison highlighted above between the root **חבר** and the Greek verb **συνάγω** appears quite normal. However, the use of **חבר** to translate **יָסַד** is unique, not only to Tg.Ps. but to all the Targumim, and as M. Bernstein has pointed out, may be connected to the translation of Ps 48:5,¹³² where a similar phrase (**אִיתְחַבְרוּ עִבְרוּ כַּחֲדָא**/[the kings] grouped together, they passed through as one) is used. This possibility seems to be confirmed by the LXX who translates with **συνάγω** in both verses. It may have been this that caused Lagarde to suggest emending **נוסדו** in Ps 2:2 to **נועדו** (See BDB p.414a). The question that concerns us here is the validity of such a proposal: does this comparative material indicate a shared *Vorlage*, or simply a shared translation tradition?

¹³¹ D. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, consistently translates **משיחא** with 'anointed' as opposed to 'Messiah,' (except for Ps 61:7, 9) see p.30 n.3, which is somewhat confusing when 'Messiah' is a category in his section entitled 'Midrashic and Aggadic Additions.'

F. Baethgen, "Der Textkritische Werth der Alten Übersetzungen zu den Psalmen" in *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882), pp.593–667, also included the Targum in his study on the text-critical value of the early Bible translations on the book of Psalms. E. White, however, rejected any significant comparisons with the earlier Bible translations in connection with discovering a different *Vorlage* (*Ibid.*, pp.126–135), putting possible similarities down to interpretation.

¹³² M. Bernstein, "Translation Technique," p.332.

There remains one other possibility and that is interpretation. Throughout rabbinic literature Psalm 2 is connected to the war of Gog and Magog on Israel,¹³³ and although such an interpretation is not explicitly inserted into the Targum it is not ruled out. Ps 48, however, is interpreted by the Targum both historically and eschatologically—as God has delivered Israel in the past so He will in the future (see section 5.1b). It is interesting to note that Rashi, commenting on Ps 48:5 and in particular the phrase **וְנוֹעַדוּ הַמְּלָכִים** writes: **לְהִלָּחֵם עִלָּיהָ בַּמִּלְחָמָה גּוֹג**: ‘to wage war against it in the war of Gog and Magog.’ Thus we have a late tradition that relates Ps 48:5 to Gog and Magog. Is it possible that the Targum has translated Ps 2:2 in the same way as Ps 48:5 because of the interpretive connection between them in relationship to the war of Gog and Magog on Israel?¹³⁴ It is impossible to decide with certainty between these possibilities. A shared *Vorlage*, considering the discussion above, appears more doubtful. It is most likely that ‘coincidence,’ either through the preservation in the Targum of an early translation tradition, or through the interpretive connection suggested above, is the safest way to explain the similarity.¹³⁵

2.2b Tg.Ps. 45:4 and 118:6,12

MT Ps 45:4a

חגור חרבך על ירך גבור...

Gird your sword on the thigh O mighty one...

Tg.Ps.

זריז סייפך על ירכך¹³⁶ גברא...

Gird your sword on *your* side o mighty one...

ירכך as found in N,P¹¹⁰,V and VA agrees with the LXX, Symmachus and the Peshitta with regards the second person singular suffix absent

¹³³ E.g., BT *Berachot* 7b; *Avodah Zarah* 3b; *Lev. Rab.* 27:11.

¹³⁴ The fact that the Targum does not interpret this verse in Ps 48 in relationship to Gog and Magog does not affect this argument, as the Targum would, along with other interpreters of the biblical text in antiquity, hold to the view of the ‘polyphony’ of the Bible, or in rabbinic terminology the ‘seventy faces of Torah.’

¹³⁵ I tend towards the latter, as it seems closer to the world of the Targum than the preservation of early translation traditions, although both options need not be mutually exclusive.

¹³⁶ Reading from apparatus.

from the MT, and could derive from a different *Vorlage*. It may however, simply be an addition made to clarify the text,¹³⁷ as it is necessary for the clause to make sense, and it is not beyond the realms of possibility that the other early translators made the same ‘addition’ independently of each other.

MT Ps 118:6a

ה' לי לא אירא...

The Lord is for me I will not fear...

Tg.Ps.

מימרא דה' בסעדי לא אידחל

The *Memra* of the Lord is my *help* I shall not fear

בסעדי is an addition amplifying the poetic brevity of the MT, although the similarity to the LXX (καὶ ἔξκαυσθῃσαν ὥσει πῦρ ἐν ἀκάνθαις) and the Peshitta (ܡܝܡܪܐ ܕܗܝ ܒܫܥܕܝܐ) may indicate a different *Vorlage*.¹³⁸ However, the influence of v.7, where the Hebrew has **בעזרי**, seems a preferable solution, especially in light of Jerome's translation of v.6 without the addition.

MT Ps 118:12

סבוני כדבורים דעכו כאש קוצים...

They encompassed me like bees, they are extinguished like fire [in] thorns...

Tg.Ps.

אקפוני היך זיבוריתא דלקון היך אשתא בכובין...

They have encompassed me like bees, burning as a fire in thorns...

דלק seems more of an antonym of **דעך** than a translation,¹³⁹ but it agrees with the LXX (καὶ ἔξκαυσθῃσαν ὥσει πῦρ ἐν ἀκάνθαις), which translates with **ἔκαλω** ('set on fire').¹⁴⁰ Note also how both the Targum and the LXX (but not Symmachus and Jerome) add a preposition, **ב** and **ἐν** respectively. All these similarities point to the possibility of a

¹³⁷ See ch.1.5 for a discussion on additions in Tg.Ps.

¹³⁸ Jerome however has *Dominus Meus*, thus translating ה' לי.

¹³⁹ It is the only occasion where this root is used to translate **דעך** in the Targumim.

¹⁴⁰ Jerome however translates with *extinctus* (extinguished).

shared *Vorlage* at variance with the MT, although such a proposition is difficult to prove with such limited evidence.¹⁴¹

2.2c Tg.Ps. and Qumran Biblical Texts

We have already noted the interpretive tradition surrounding Tg.Ps. 92:15 that also appears partially in the Qumran Psalms scroll (see n.114, p.30), although no direct relationship can be posited between the two texts. The example below, however, is the only case in the Psalms studied where any possible witness to the *Vorlage* of Tg.Ps. is found at Qumran.

2.2c i. Tg.Ps. 118:8 and 4QPs^b xxxvi:14

MT

טוב לחסות בה' מבטח בנדיבים

It is better to seek refuge in the Lord than to trust in princes

Tg.Ps.

טב למתרחצא במימר[א] דה' מן למירחץ בבר נש

It is better to trust in the *Memra* of the Lord than to trust in man

4QPs^b xxxvi

טוב לבטוח בה' מבטח בנדיבין

It is better to trust in the Lord than to trust in princes

Note how the Targum uses the one root (רחץ) to translate two different roots in the MT (חסי/בטח),¹⁴² while 4QPs^b xxxvi (*DJD* xvi) has Ps 118.8 with the root בטח in both clauses. It is possible that this text from Qumran reflects the *Vorlage* of both the Peshitta and the Targum

¹⁴¹ It is possible that the LXX and Tg.Ps. had in mind that a fire burning in thorns does not last very long, and thus their translation is not too far removed from the idea expressed in the Hebrew.

¹⁴² As does the Peshitta (אבד), whereas the LXX uses a different verb in each verse (πείθω in v.8 and ἐλπίζω in v.9). Jerome uses the same verb for both verses (*spero*), whereas the Vulgate follows the form of the LXX. Note also that the use of one root to translate two different verbs isn't unusual in Tg.Ps.

for this verse, although there are no other similarities between Tg.Ps. and 4QPs^b xxxvi,¹⁴³ and thus the connection is only found in this verse.

2.2d Summary

From the fifteen Psalms studied only two examples suggest the possible use of a different *Vorlage* to that represented by the manuscript tradition of the MT, and even in those examples the proof is far from conclusive. Such findings, although from a small selection of Psalms, cast doubt on the value of pursuing a study of Tg.Ps. simply for evidence of variant readings and manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible.¹⁴⁴ It should also be noted that Bacher's suggestion, that the relationship of Tg.Ps. with the LXX and the Peshitta as a witness to a non-MT *Vorlage* was evidence of its early date (see ch.1.1c, p.12 n.47), should be treated with caution.

2.3 SHARED TRADITIONS OF TRANSLATION

This section begins with an exploration of possible relationships with specific early translations, and then proceeds to some examples where a relationship may exist across a broader range of translations.

2.3a Tg.Ps. and Symmachus

2.3a.i Tg.Ps. 2:6

MT

ואני נסכתי מלכי על ציון הר קדשי:

I have installed my king upon Zion my holy hill.¹⁴⁵

Tg.Ps.

ואנא רביית מלכי ומניתיה על ציון טור מקדשי:

¹⁴³ C.f., v.9 where Tg.Ps. continues to use the same verb in both clauses but 4QPs^b agrees with the MT.

¹⁴⁴ See D. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, pp.15–18, for a more comprehensive treatment of the topic. He concludes that Tg.Ps. ‘for the most part’ agrees with the MT, and where it differs and agrees with another version it is most commonly with the LXX or the Peshitta.

¹⁴⁵ I have followed the traditional translations in using ‘install;’ however, note the interpretation given by Amos Hacham, ספר תהלים Jerusalem, Mosad haRav Kook, 1990, who interprets with, יצקתי שמן על ראשו. The most recent proposal is ‘I created’ put forward by J. Tigay, “Divine Creation and the King in Ps 2:6,” in *Eretz Israel* 27 (2003) 246–251.

But I have anointed My king and *appointed him* on Zion My holy mountain.

Symmachus

καὶ γὰρ ἔγχρισα τὸν βασιλέα μου...

And I have anointed my king...

The possible relationship between Tg.Ps. and Symmachus is clearly highlighted: the use of ‘anointed’ to translate the Hebrew נִסְכָּחִי. The Hebrew root נִסַּךְ usually means ‘pour out,’ although in this verse having ‘my king’ as the direct object makes such a meaning potentially difficult, hence the meaning ‘install’ taken from its use nominally elsewhere with the meaning ‘prince’ (Jos.13:31). However we must assess the translation in Tg.Ps., as well as other related texts before the possibility of a shared tradition is discussed.

רַבִּיית... וּמִנִּית, I would suggest, is a double translation of the Hebrew נִסְכָּחִי.¹⁴⁶ Firstly the root is either taken as סִוַּךְ ‘anoint’ as Churgin has already suggested,¹⁴⁷ or the usual meaning of נִסַּךְ is applied more loosely as ‘poured out in anointing.’¹⁴⁸ Either way the use of ‘anoint’ is clearly an old tradition as evinced by Symmachus. Secondly Tg.Ps. views this ‘anointing’ as representing the ‘appointment’ or ‘enthroning’ of this king and thus adds מִנִּית. This latter ‘translation’ may also have

¹⁴⁶ M. Bernstein, “Translation Technique,” p.335 sees this as only a ‘slight possibility’ because the words do not occur side by side. It would seem to me that he is imposing a principle upon a text that displays an exception to that rule, thus giving preference to the principle above the text. The principle may well be true, but that should not blind us to exceptions, purely on the basis of probability.

¹⁴⁷ P. Churgin, תרגום כתובים, p.27. It must be pointed out, though, that the MT cannot be read as using this root, and thus such a translation should be considered more interpretive, which is supported by the presence of such an interpretation in *Midrash Tehillim* (see discussion later). Note also Churgin’s suggestion (p.24) that the use of the root רִבִּי for ‘secular’ anointing is a ‘later’ development over and against the regular use of this root by Onkelos and Targum Jonathan in the context of ‘sacred’ anointing.

Another possible explanation for this ‘interpretation’ is the presence already in the Psalm of the root מָשַׁח (v.2), and that the king appointed is being specifically identified with the Messiah/anointed one by the Targum, c.f. Symmachus’ translation as recorded in the Sryo-Hexapla: **ἁγιασθέντα βασιλέα μου.**

¹⁴⁸ I tend towards the latter option, although it is impossible to confirm either option definitively.

arisen from the use of this root as ‘prince’ (see Josh 13:21).¹⁴⁹ The fact that the translator has rendered either according to two possible roots of the verb, or two meanings of the same root indicates an intentional double translation.¹⁵⁰ Such a doublet maintains the meaning of the Hebrew by expressing the fullest meaning of the text in the target language.

Having discussed the translation in the Targum we must now discuss other texts. *Midrash Tehillim* 2:8 gives various solutions to the meaning of v.6:

ואני נסכתי מלכי. אמשחתיה, כמה דאת אמר וסוך לא סכתי
(דניאל י ג) דבר אחר אתכתיה, כמה דאת אמר עגל מסכה (שמות
לב ד) דבר אחר גדלתיהו, כמה דאת אמר ושמונה נסיכי אדם
(מיכה ה ד) וכתוב שמה נסיכי צפון (יחזקאל לב ל) והיכן גדלתיהו,
על ציון הר קדשי:

I have set my king. I anointed him, as it says: And I didn't anoint
(Daniel 10:3), Another interpretation, I made him firm (lit. cast), as
it says: molten calf (Ex 32:4), another interpretation, I raised him
up, as it says: eight princes of men (Micah 5:4), and it is written:
there the princes of the North (Ezek 32:30), where shall I raise him
up? On Zion my holy hill.

This passage is interesting on two levels. Firstly it parallels the translation in the Targum with regards the idea of anointing, but it is perhaps more important to note the way in which the Midrash deals with the interpretation of this verb, giving three possible options based on the use of the same or similar root in the Bible. This is the same method that the Targum has used in its double translation.¹⁵¹ This comparison however, in no way suggests dependence or direct relationship between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*, but serves to illustrate the process that led the Targum to its translation. For both passages the biblical text served as the impetus for the interpretation.

¹⁴⁹ Ibn Ezra, *ad loc.* interprets נסכתי as meaning ‘to enthrone as king’ (המלכתי) comparing Num 31:8 where five ‘kings’ are mentioned, with Josh 13:21 where these same kings are referred to as נסיכי סיחון.

¹⁵⁰ C.f., the possible double translation in Ps 68:19 where the Targum translates one word semantically and contextually, and Ps 81:4 where there is a double translation, one according to the text and the other from the vocalisation.

¹⁵¹ It is interesting to note that Rashi also translates נסכתי with מניתי.

The text below from Acts 4:27 also sheds light on our discussion. Peter and John have returned to ‘their own company’ and reported back on their arrest and subsequent discussions with the religious leaders, they then pray quoting Psalm 2:1–2, commenting immediately after the quote:

Συνήχθησαν ... ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου
Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας...

They gathered together... in this city against your holy Servant
(Son) whom you anointed...

It is important to note the way the comment after the quoting of vv.1–2 picks up on the content of the Psalm. I would suggest that, ‘in this city,’ and ‘anointed’ are deliberate references to the **על ציון הר** **קדשי** and **נסכתי** of Psalm 2, and as such would suggest that even at this early stage **נסכתי** was being interpreted as ‘anointed.’¹⁵²

It would seem therefore that Tg.Ps., Symmachus and Acts all read the Hebrew text in the same way, although Tg.Ps. with its double translation sought to bring a fuller rendering of the possibilities inherent in the Hebrew. Does this mean that they are all inheritors of an early tradition? It is possible, although they all may simply share the same exegetical method, which lead them to the same reading of the same Hebrew text.

2.3a.ii. Tg.Ps. 1:1

MT Ps 1:1

ובמושב לצים לא ישב:

...who does not sit in the seat of scoffers.

Tg.Ps.

ובסיעת ממיקני לא אסתחר:

...nor sat at table with the company of scoffers.

Symmachus

...καὶ ἐν καθέδρα ἐριθετῶν οὐ κεκοινώνηκε.

¹⁵² It is possible, however, that the presence of ‘Messiah’ in the text generated the ‘anointed’ of Acts 4:27, although the fact that both allusions are to v.6 supports the former proposal. Also note Mk.1:11 and Luke 3:22 where Ps 2:6 is alluded to at the baptism of Jesus, the occasion when he was ‘anointed’ with the Spirit.

... and has no fellowship with the seat of plotters.

There is clearly a similarity between Symmachus and Tg.Ps. in this verse, particularly in the way that they have translated the Hebrew **ישב**. Symmachus' translation is the only occasion that *κοινωνέω* is used to translate **ישב** in the Greek translations, and as such indicates a specific interpretive agenda. **איסתחר** (lit. recline around a table) in Tg.Ps. translates **ישב** as it does on three other occasions.¹⁵³ The translation 'to sit at table' is based upon its use throughout Targum literature when translating the Hebrew root **ישב**. On the fourteen occasions that it is used it is found in the context of eating eleven times.¹⁵⁴ The point in this verse, as with Symmachus, is to emphasize the closeness of acquaintance, an intimacy not explicitly expressed by the Hebrew root **ישב**.¹⁵⁵ The Targum seems to be adding to the meaning of the text in such a way as to suggest a development in the level of association with the unrighteous variously described in the text as wicked, sinners and scoffers. Such an interpretation is found in other sources that refer to this verse. Firstly, in BT *Avodah Zarah* 18b we find this exposition attributed to the third generation Palestinian Amora Shimon Ben Pazzi:

דרש ר"ש בן פזי מאי דכתיב אשרי האיש אשר לא הלך בעצת
רשעים ובדרך חטאים לא עמד ובמושב לצים לא ישב (תה' א.א.)
 וכי מאחר שלא הלך היכן עמד ומאחר שלא עמד היכן ישב ומאחר
 שלא ישב היכן לך [אלא] לומר לך שאם הלך סופו לעמוד ואם עמד
 סופו לישב ואם ישב סופו ללוץ ואם לץ עליו הכתוב אומר אם
חכמת חכמת לך (ואם לצת) לבדך תשא: (משלי ט יב)

R. Shimon ben Pazzi expounded, 'Why is it written Blessed is the man that doesn't walk in the council of the wicked nor stand in the way of sinners nor sit in the seat of the scornful (Ps 1:1)? How after he has not walked can he stand and after not standing can he sit, after not sitting how can he scorn? It says to you that if he walks it will lead (lit. its end) to standing and if he stands it will lead to sit-

¹⁵³ Pss 26:4,5; 106:13.

¹⁵⁴ Gen 27:19 (TO, Tg.Ps.Jn.); 37:25 (TO); 43:33 (TO); 50:15 (Tg.Ps.Jn.), 20 (Tg.Ps.Jn. addition); Ex 32:6 (TO, Tg.Ps.Jn.); Num 22:8,19 (Tg.Ps.Jn.); Judges 19:6; 1 Sam 20:5,24,25; 1 Kings 13:20; Jer 16:8 (TJ).

¹⁵⁵ The poetic structure of the verse, however, can be read as signifying a development with the progression from walking to sitting, and the final clause utilising the same root **ישב** both verbally (**ישב**) and nominally (**במושב**). Such a deliberate structure indicates both a process and an ever increasing closeness with those the righteous are encouraged to avoid.

ting and if he sits it will lead to scorning and if he scorns it is written about him saying If you are wise you are wise for yourself, if you are a scoffer you bear it alone (Prov 9:12).¹⁵⁶

R. Shimon ben Pazzi here takes the scriptural verse further than the text explicitly goes. In the MT the man who does not sit with scoffers is blessed, whereas for R. Shimon ben Pazzi the progression does not end in 'sitting with scoffers' rather with 'becoming a scoffer' (סופו ללזין).¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ C.f., *Midrash Tehillim* 1:7 where the same passage appears with little variation. Interestingly, this exposition by ben Pazzi is immediately followed by a discussion on the seriousness of the sin of scoffing, a discussion that R. Eliezer concludes with: קשה הוא שתחילתו יסורין וסופו בלייה (It [scoffing] is grievous in that it incurs affliction at first and destruction at last). This quote closes this section nicely especially with the repeat of סופו that occurs in the exposition of ben Pazzi. This ending also fits in well with the structure of Psalm 1 that also ends with the destruction of the 'way of the wicked' and thus the wicked as well. (N.B. this last phrase does not appear in ms. Munich 95 or ms. Abramson.)

¹⁵⁷ We are given no clue as to the identity of the wicked, sinners, and scoffers in this passage, although the implication is that it is gentiles (or assimilated Jews). The association between this passage and the gentiles is strengthened when examining passages that explicate the identity or location of these three excluded areas/activities. In fact on the same page ben Pazzi is attributed with another exposition on this verse that identifies the wicked as theatres and circuses (as does Tertullian *De Spect.* 1, *Strom.* 2:68, and Clement of Alexandria *Ped.* 3.76:3), the sinners as shows containing wild animals, and the scoffers as evil company (תחבולות). This last identification is of interest in that Symmachus translated the Hebrew 'scoffers' as ἐπιθετῶν (plotters), which provides an interesting comparison with ben Pazzi's evil company. In fact in two manuscripts it is not ben Pazzi that gives this exposition but ben Azzai (a second generation Tanna), which if accurate would provide an interesting chronological relationship; however, the weakness of the manuscript evidence and the fact that ben Azzai is rarely called 'rabbi,' alongside the ease with which one could confuse the פז in a manuscript for an פ all strongly suggest that ben Pazzi is the correct reading. All this simply serves to suggest that it is gentiles and not unfaithful Jews that are not to be associated with in this case. In 4Q174 this verse is used in an eschatological Midrash, linked with other passages of scripture, but here the identity is clear—the unfaithful Jews from whom the righteous community have had to depart. For the Church Fathers, however, this verse, on occasions, is used to describe the Jews who where in-

The second source we need to examine is from the collection of Aramaic poems **שירת בני מערבא** 43:5–8:¹⁵⁸

געה ואמר \ טובוי לגוברא
 דעבד רעותיה \ דקדיש ועירה
 דלא הלך \ בעיצה דרשיעי למתחברה
 ולא אתחבר\ במייתוב[ית] ליצני חבורה¹⁵⁹

Burst forth and say / blessed is the man
 Who has done the desire / of the Holy one and the ‘watcher’
 Who has not walked / in the counsel of the wicked to be an associ-
 ate of it
 And has not been associated / in the sitting of the scoffers’ associa-
 tion¹⁶⁰

Here we have a similar tradition of interpretation that brings out the development of ever-closer links between an individual and the wicked.

These two lines of interpretation, along with Symmachus’ translation indicate that there was a common tradition connected to this verse that simply extends and amplifies the meaning of the text itself. Our Targum with its unusual translation of common words can be firmly placed within this tradition; nevertheless there are no linguistic reasons to specifically link the Targum with any one of the above-mentioned sources. In fact we must conclude again that the Hebrew text itself provided the impetus for each of the traditions.

volved in the trial and death of Jesus, e.g., Justin Martyr *Apology* 1:40, Tertul-
 lian, *Adv. Marc.* 4:42.

¹⁵⁸ **שירת בני מערבא** J. Yahalom and M. Sokoloff (eds.), Jerusalem, The Is-
 rael Academy of Science, 1999.

¹⁵⁹ The poem clearly uses the root **חבר** as the functional equivalent of the
 Hebrew **ישב**, which is of interest in comparison to Symmachus’ use of
 κοιωνέω, a word that is used to translate the Hebrew root **חבר** on three
 occasions in the LXX (2 Chron 20:35, Job 34:8, and Eccl 9:4), although we
 have no examples of Symmachus translating it this way.

¹⁶⁰ The importance of this source is that it is in Aramaic and thus provides
 an interesting comparison to the language in the Targum. It is interesting,
 therefore, to see that the Targum departs from the language of the MT more
 than the poem, although it has refrained from adding ‘content’ to the text by
 additional words. The Targum seems to have sought a way to interpret the
 verse by deliberate translation rather than by simple addition. The poem how-
 ever, has communicated a similar interpretation but has employed the use of
 additional words rather than a change in vocabulary.

2.3b Tg.Ps. and the Peshitta

2.3b.i Tg.Ps. 81:8:

MT Ps 81:8

בצרה קראת ואחלצך אענך בסתר רעם...

In distress you called and I delivered you, I answered you in a secret place of thunder...

Tg.Ps.

בעידן עקת דמצרים קרית ופציתי יתך עניית (צמית)¹⁶¹ יתך באתר
טמיר בית שכינתיה דאכליית קדמוי גלגילין דנור...

In the time of the distress *of Egypt* you called and I saved you, I answered you in the secret place of *his*¹⁶² *Shekinah where fiery wheels cry out before him*...

Peshitta

כחלצך פוג הפגלח הפגלח בפגלח וגל, מצבא...

In distress he called to me and I saved him, and I covered him in my glorious shelter...

The potential relationship here is between the Peshitta and N. **צמית** יתך is problematic if one accepts N at face value, as ‘I afflicted you’ does not fit the context in any way whatsoever,¹⁶³ although it does render one meaning of the Biblical Hebrew root עני¹⁶⁴. The Peshitta’s, ‘and

¹⁶¹ Reading from N (Cod. Solger 6.2).

¹⁶² 3 Mss have ‘my,’ which is clearly the better reading, c.f., D. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, pp.158–159, where he corrects the final ‘him’ to ‘me.’

¹⁶³ All other manuscripts checked have עניית, which seems to be the correct reading. However, how one gets צמית from עניית is problematic in this context despite being semantically acceptable to one meaning of the root. One possible solution is if the root is צמת (and not צמי) and one posits its use as a *Pael* but with a scribal error leaving out the first person singular perfect ending, due to the presence of the *yod* and *tav* already—thus giving ‘I gathered you.’

¹⁶⁴ The Internet site for the *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* project (www.cal1.cn.buc.edu) lists צום (fast) as one possible rendering. This is even less likely than the root צמי and does not fit contextually or grammatically with the direct object immediately following. E. Cook also translated with ‘I made you fast.’

I covered him in my glorious shelter,¹⁶⁵ provides an interesting comparison with the Targum and especially the proposed emendation (see n.163) to 'I gathered you.'¹⁶⁶ 'My glorious shelter' in the Peshitta parallels the Targum's addition/translation of **באתר טמיר** with **סתר רעם** **בית שכינתיה דאכליית קדמוי גלגילין דנור**, thus producing a remarkable likeness, with both adding the possessive pronoun and the idea of glory. It seems possible that a common tradition lies behind these renderings.¹⁶⁷ However, before reaching a conclusion we must discuss the possible meanings of **צמי** discussed in n.166.

The suggestion of 'hear' for **צמי** does fit the context, and elsewhere when Tg.Ps. translates **עני** with such a meaning it uses **קבל צלותי** (or equivalent).¹⁶⁸ Such a suggestion, therefore, departs from the general translation technique evinced in the texts as we have them. Taylor's suggestion of 'guard' warrants further discussion, especially in light of Tg.Ps.Jn. Ex 17:8–9 where as we have already noted the 'cloud of glory' acts as a protective shelter (n.166). This text does not however, contain any similarities linguistically with our Targum verse, although it is similar in idea to the translation we have noted in the Peshitta. It is possible that N has used the root **צמי** with the meaning of 'guard,' and if so no emendation of the text would be necessary,¹⁶⁹ but it should be noted

¹⁶⁵ Note how the Peshitta uses the third person singular in place of the second person singular.

¹⁶⁶ D. G. K. Taylor, in a private comment, mentioned that the root **נטר** in a medieval lexicon has the meaning **נטר** (See *Thesaurus Syriacus* vol.2, p.3413). G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud, und Midrasch* Frankfurt a. Main, J. Kauffmann, 1922; Levy, *Chaldäische Wörterbuch über die Targumim* Leipzig, 1867, and Brockelman, *Lexicon Syriacum* Halis Saxonium, Sumptibus M. Niemeyer, 1928, all cite this verse and translate with 'hear,' citing the *Aphel* use of this root in Syriac, again from medieval lexicons. I will return to these possibilities below.

¹⁶⁷ Contra M. Weitzman, *The Old Testament in Syriac*, who cites this passage in the Peshitta, alongside others, to suggest that the translator used the root **צבנ** as a 'drudge word,' thus concluding that it was "...obvious that the translator was guessing," p.41. Also compare T.g.Ps.Jn. Ex 17:8–9 where the cloud of glory acts as a protective shelter for faithful Israelites.

¹⁶⁸ E.g., 18:42, 22:22, 118:5.

¹⁶⁹ The fact that this meaning is only found in medieval lexicons is not a problem, as Tg.Ps. as we have it today is medieval, although this would be the only Aramaic source that I am aware of that reflects this meaning for the root **צמי**.

that the connection with the Peshitta would remain, as the idea being conveyed has not really changed.

2.3c Tg.Ps. 82:1 and Aquila

MT Ps 82:1

אלהים נצב בעדת אל...

God stands in the divine assembly...¹⁷⁰

Tg.Ps.

אלהא שכינתיה שריא בכינשת צדיקיא דתקיפין באוריתא

God, His Shekinah dwells in the congregation of the righteous who are mighty in the law

Aquila

θεὸς ἔσται ἐν συναγωγῇ ἰσχυρῶν...

God stands in the assembly of the mighty...

עדת אל is an *Hapax Legomenon* and has been translated in a variety of ways due to its uniqueness and the potential theological difficulties it might present.¹⁷¹ The problem facing the translators is the identity of אל. Clearly both Symmachus and Jerome (in the *iuxta Hebraeos*) have taken the literal approach and translated it in the singular, and in doing so identify אל with God. The four other translations use a plural alternative,¹⁷² with only the LXX (followed by the Gallican Psalter) retaining the 'divine' aspect of the original, but disallowing identifying אל with God. Aquila seems to keep to a specific translation policy in his use of ἰσχυρός, which he uses for the term אל on a number of occasions. The translation in the Targum is similar to Aquila in the use of the term

¹⁷⁰ עדת אל could also be translated as 'assembly of El'

¹⁷¹ C.f., the Peshitta: כְּנֶסֶת וְהַלְלָהּ (the assembly of angels)

LXX: συναγωγῇ θεῶν (assembly of gods) and the Gallican Psalter (in *synagoga deorum*)

Symmachus: σύνοδος θεοῦ (assembly of God)

Jerome: *in coetu Dei* (in the assembly of God). Note, however, Jerome's comment in the *Commentarii* where he quotes the Gallican Psalter and interprets it as God standing amidst angels.

¹⁷² This possibly indicates a different *Vorlage*, although the variety of the translations and the exegetical nature of some of them argues against such a conclusion in this case.

‘mighty,’ but appears different combined with the additions to the text.¹⁷³ The Peshitta interprets the term and inserts the idea of angels,¹⁷⁴ which cannot be justified linguistically but it does appear to preserve the biblical context of the Psalm. The question remains therefore as to the nature of the relationship between Tg.Ps. and Aquila. Is the Targum dependent upon Aquila? Do they reflect the same interpretive tradition, or have they reached their respective translations independently of each other? It is possible that the Targum has utilised Aquila’s translation of this verse, although such a conclusion is impossible to prove, especially as **אל** can mean ‘mighty’ in certain contexts, but the similarity in translation does, I believe, necessitate some form of relationship between the texts be it a shared tradition or dependence.¹⁷⁵

2.3d Tg.Ps. 2:7a Aquila, Theodotion, Jerome and the LXX

MT Ps 2:7a

אספרה אל חק ה' אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום ילדיך...

I will declare the decree, the Lord said to me, ‘You are my son to-day I have begotten you’...¹⁷⁶

Tg.Ps.

אישתעי אלקא קיימא ה' אמר חביב כבר לאבא לי אנת זכאה
כאילו יומא דין בריתך:

I will declare the Lord is *God* of the covenant (or: the God who exists), He said you *are beloved to me as a son to a father, righteous as if I created you* this day.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷³ If one were to remove **צדיקין באוריתא** and **צדיקין** from the verse one would be left with Aquila’s translation exactly. Note that on four other occasions the Targum uses the root **תקף** in its translation of **אל** when Aquila uses the term **ἰσχυρός** (see 29:3; 36:7; 50:1; 80:11).

¹⁷⁴ This is not the usual word used by the Peshitta to translate **אל**, which generally preserves the form found in the Hebrew: **אלהם**.

¹⁷⁵ Dependence is difficult to prove when common words are being used, and when ‘mighty’ is semantically acceptable.

¹⁷⁶ Or: ‘I will declare the decree of the Lord, He said to me...’

¹⁷⁷ The problem with translating **אלקא קיימא** as ‘God of the covenant,’ is the emphatic state of **אלקא**, which disallows a construct relationship, thus giving the reading ‘the God who exists.’ Bernstein, “Translation Technique,” p.337 n.29 has discussed this issue and the various readings that are found in the manuscripts. He clearly sets out the argument for the original reading being

All the manuscripts of the Targum consulted have taken the first preposition **ל** as a reference to God, and have placed it in conjunction with **קיימא**.¹⁷⁸ Interestingly Jerome attaches this part of v.7 to the end of v.6, and translates in a similar fashion: *adnuntiabo Dei praeceptum*,¹⁷⁹ although he then attaches the Tetragrammaton to the next clause by translating *Dominus dixit ad me*, ‘The Lord said to me,’ which is different syntactically to the way the Targum has split the verse. The LXX translates more impersonally: διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου, Κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με ... ‘declaring the command of the Lord, the Lord said to me,’ yet here God is inserted in construct to the translation of the Hebrew **ק**, as in the Targum and Jerome. Aquila also translates in a similar fashion, ἀναγγέλλων ἰσχυροῦ ἀκριβασμόν, ‘announcing a command of the mighty,’ utilising his normal translation of the Hebrew nominal form **ל**, which is similar to Theodotion’s translation, ἰσχυροῦ πρόσταγμα, ‘a command of the mighty.’¹⁸⁰ It would seem therefore that the Targum is continuing with a translation tradition that read the preposition **ל** as ‘God,’ which may be a reflection of an early reading tradition different to that used by the Masoretes.¹⁸¹

2.3e Tg.Ps. 137:3 Symmachus and Jerome

MT Ps 137:3

כי שם שאלונו שובינו דברי שיר ותוללינו שמחה שירו לנו משיר
ציון:

‘God of the covenant,’ with the ‘God who exists’ being a secondary development. It seems that it is possible that this secondary development arose out of a misreading or misunderstanding of the ‘original’ translation. In light of the following discussion, such a view seems probable.

¹⁷⁸ The Peshitta translates the Hebrew as a preposition, but changes it: **ל** **מ** **ל** **מ**, adding a pronominal possessive suffix; it then includes the Tetragrammaton in the next clause.

¹⁷⁹ The Gallican Psalter removes the reference to God from the end of v.6.

¹⁸⁰ Origen’s ‘seventh column’ likewise takes **ל** as a reference to God and also translates it as a participle: καταγγέλλων εἰς θεὸν διαθήκην, ‘declaring to God the covenant.’

¹⁸¹ Note how the use of a participle by the LXX, Aquila, and the translation in Origen’s seventh column, differs from the cohortative verb found in the MT. Such a change seems to make v.7a an introduction to the decree in v.7b.

For there our captors asked us for words of a song, and those who wasted (?) us [asked] mockingly: 'Sing us a song of Zion.'

Tg.Ps.

ארום תמן שיילו יתנא בבלאי די שבו יתנא למימר מילי דשיריא
ובזונא על עיסק חירוה (חדוה) אמרין שבחו לנא מן שירתא
דהיתון אמרין בציון:

Because there, *the Babylonians* who had taken us captive, asked us to say words of songs, and our plunderers for fun (lit. on account of joy)¹⁸² said, give praise for us from the songs you used to say in Zion.

ותוללינו שמחה¹⁸³ ובזונא על עיסק חדוה. Bernstein,¹⁸⁴ has suggested that this translation of תוללינו "seems to be based not only on the parallelism [with שובינו], but on an etymology which sees an Aramaized root תלל* parallel to standard Hebrew שלל, "plunder," a term which is often employed in the Bible side by side with בזז."¹⁸⁵ Such an explanation seems correct, although I would add that the Targum has also translated this clause contextually by absorbing the sense of the Hebrew root תלל, "mock," into the addition על עיסק before חדוה.¹⁸⁶ Such a translation technique is very sophisticated and

¹⁸² Reading from apparatus.

¹⁸³ Reading from apparatus.

¹⁸⁴ M. Bernstein, "Translation Technique," p.339.

¹⁸⁵ See also Kugel, *In Potiphar's House* Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mss, 1994, p.187.

¹⁸⁶ Such a reading of the text runs counter to the translations of Cook, Stec, and Bernstein, but seems to be the best way of reading the text so that it makes sense and does not require additions: "...plunderers because of [their] joy" (Cook and Stec) and "plunderers [made demands] concerning matters of joy" (Bernstein). The Hebrew שמחה has the nuance of "mockery" on occasions (see BDB p.970b, as well as H. Lenowitz, "The Mock *simba* of Psalm 137" in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* pp.149–159, E. Folis (ed.), Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 1987, and thus such a reading is linguistically acceptable. In this regard the comment by Theodoret of Cyrrhus on v.3, in his Psalms commentary, is interesting:

Mocking us and heaping on our misfortunes they bade us to sing and charm them with songs, not to get any benefit there but to make fun of our situation.

Such comments have a striking resemblance to the way the Targum has dealt with this verse.

seeks to draw out the fullest possible meaning of the Hebrew text, and should be viewed as a double translation.¹⁸⁷

Symmachus' translation is of interest in this regard:

...καὶ οἱ καταλαζονεύόμενοι ἡμῶν εὐφροσύνην¹⁸⁸

...and those boasting against us with mirth

It seems that he has picked up the sense of 'mocking' as well (but not 'plundering'), although the process by which he arrived at this is clearly different to that of the Targum (c.f., Jerome's *Iuxta Hebraeos: et qui affligebant nos laeti* who clearly takes the Hebrew שמהה adjectively, whereas the Gallican Psalter translates nominally with *hymnum*.¹⁸⁹ Is there evidence to suggest a shared tradition? Possibly, but again the Hebrew text itself can be read in this way without knowledge of any prior interpretive tradition, and thus it seems safer to conclude that the Hebrew stimulated the similarities independently of each other.

2.3f Summary

This section has examined numerous examples where shared traditions of translation may be found in the text of Tg.Ps. On occasions it was clear that the Hebrew text itself, combined with the use of similar exegetical methods, generated similarities between Tg.Ps. and other early translations, thus emphasising the need for caution in positing relationships between texts based upon the same source text.

There were texts however, that clearly evinced a shared tradition of translation. These traditions appear in Tg.Ps. as well as a variety of early Bible translations, and spring from (i.) Reading traditions different to those preserved in the MT as we have it today, and (ii.) Interpretive traditions that appear to have been preserved within the confines of 'translation' traditions as opposed to the exegetical traditions found in both the Jewish and Christian worlds.

¹⁸⁷ Such sophistication is stimulated by the difficulty of the Hebrew, and as such is similar to Midrash that thrives on difficulties and incongruities in the text.

¹⁸⁸ This reference is from the Syro-Hexapla. The reading 'mirth' comes from, רגועות.

¹⁸⁹ See also Kugel, *op. cit.* for a discussion on other solutions given by ancient authorities to the difficulty of translating תוללינו.

2.4 CONCLUSIONS

The research discussed above enables us to reach conclusions concerning the relationship between Tg.Ps. and other early translations of the Psalter with respect to the fifteen Psalms studied. Overall, despite specific examples of dependence and shared traditions, it remains true to state the essential independence of Tg.Ps. as a translation *vis a vis* the other biblical translations. Such a conclusion does not negate the value of the research, or the need for a comprehensive study outlined at the end of this section.

Specifically, only one likely incidence of dependence upon an earlier translation was uncovered (Tg.Ps. 92:15 and Aquila), but only after all other possible stimuli for the unique Aramaic phrase were ruled out. Concerning the possibility of the presence of shared traditions amongst the early translations it was shown that on numerous occasions similarity in translation/interpretation could be simply be put down to either the Hebrew text itself or to a similarity in exegetical technique, which independently produced similar results in different texts. There were examples however that suggest a shared interpretive tradition, and even a shared reading tradition different to that of the Masoretes, nonetheless these are in the minority.

With regards the use of a shared *Vorlage* different to the MT (text and vowels), very little evidence was found that unequivocally supports the view of Bacher (and others) that Tg.Ps. often shares the same *Vorlage* with the LXX and Peshitta. Most of the examples discussed in this chapter prove inconclusive in this regard.

These results demonstrate the need for methodological exactness when comparing ancient translations, as well as the value in such a comparison. The extension of such research to the whole of Tg.Ps. remains an important area of research to be undertaken with all early translations, but especially that of Aquila and Symmachus where any relationships that might be uncovered seem most likely to be to be found.¹⁹⁰

¹⁹⁰ See discussion at the beginning of the chapter.

3. Tg.Ps. AND THE TARGUM TRADITION

The previous chapter outlined the relationship between Tg.Ps. and other early translations of the book of Psalms, and demonstrated with regard to the Psalms studied, the essential independence of Tg.Ps. with respect to the other early Bible translations, despite some examples of shared traditions and one possible example of direct dependence. This chapter will explore the relationship of Tg.Ps. with other Targumic traditions, i.e., did Tg.Ps. draw upon other Targumim, or other Targumic traditions?¹⁹¹ Did Tg.Ps. influence other Targumim in the way they translated other books?

Churgin is the only scholar thus far to deal with the relationship between Tg.Ps. and the other Targumim in any meaningful way.¹⁹² He lists various examples of comparative material between Tg.Ps, Onkelos and Jonathan. The material mainly covers aspects of translation technique,¹⁹³ and highlights the similarities in character between Tg.Ps. and Targum Yerushalmi on particular issues.¹⁹⁴

Methodologically one should not attribute relationships between texts that appear similar but are simply a result of polygenesis, described by Weitzman as inevitable coincidences that arise ‘when the same text

¹⁹¹ Obviously there are cases of traditions appearing in Tg.Ps., other Targumim, and in rabbinic literature, and therefore a thorough investigation needs to be undertaken to ascertain any lines of influence (if any). One must not assume that one type of literature always has precedence over all others.

¹⁹² P. Churgin, **תרגום כתובים**, pp.21–27. E. White, (p.11) briefly mentions that Tg.Ps. ‘bears resemblance’ to the Yerushalmi Targums, in a discussion focussed on the date of Tg.Ps. On the basis of two examples he claims that they were unaware of Tg.Ps.

¹⁹³ In contrast to this study where the interpretive character of Tg.Ps. is the focus, and therefore interesting aspects of translation that do not contribute to this specific end will not be discussed.

¹⁹⁴ I will specifically discuss those occasions where Churgin provides examples that coincide with the Psalms studied in this thesis, and save general comments and conclusions for the end of this chapter.

presenting the same difficulties is translated into two dialects of the same language.¹⁹⁵ Therefore, only departures from the normal translation technique of Tg.Ps. that have a parallel in a different Targum should be explored for the possibility of relationship, although even these will require testing.¹⁹⁶ Other fruitful areas of research are additions to the text that introduce interpretive nuances, and that have parallels in other Targumim.¹⁹⁷

Before proceeding, a brief example of the need for methodological exactness is needed to illustrate the discussion above. Tg.Ps. 24:4 in comparison to TO Ex 20:7 provides a good example:

MT Ps 24:4

...אשר לא נשא לשוא נפשי...

‘...who has not taken a false oath by My life...’¹⁹⁸

Tg.Ps.

...דלא אומי על שקרא לחייבא נפשי[ה]¹⁹⁹...

...and has not sworn falsely, thus condemning himself...

MT Ex 20:7

לא תשא את שם ה' אלהיך לשוא כי לא ינקה ה' את אשר ישא את שמו לשוא:

Do not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who takes His name in vain.

TO Ex 20:7

לא תומי בשמא דה' אלהיך למגנא²⁰⁰ ארי לא יזכי ה' ית דיומי
בשמיה לשקרא:

¹⁹⁵ M. Weitzman, *The Old Testament in Syriac* Cambridge, CUP, 1999, p.90. Clearly he uses the term when comparing the Peshitta with the Aramaic Targumim. The principle remains, even when comparing the Targumim of different books of the Bible.

¹⁹⁶ C.f., ch.1.5.

¹⁹⁷ See ch.1.5 for a discussion on the types of additions found in Tg.Ps.

¹⁹⁸ Translation from the *JPS* translation.

¹⁹⁹ Note the change from נפשי in the MT to נפשיה in Tg.Ps. The third person suffix is also found in some manuscripts of the MT.

²⁰⁰ A. Sperber *Ibid.* has למגנא, which must be a printing error; hence the correction in my text.

Do not swear falsely in the name of the Lord your God, because the Lord will not justify him who swears falsely in his name.²⁰¹

The point of comparison between Tg.Ps. and Onkelos is highlighted: the translation of the Hebrew idiom נִשְׁבַּע לַשׁוּא. This same idiom appears in Ps 139:20, and the Targum translates it in the same way as in Ps 24:4. This idiom was well known due to its appearance in the Ten Commandments, and thus there seems no reason to posit direct dependence upon Onkelos or any other Targum.²⁰² In fact it is simply an example of what M. Klein has called associative translation,²⁰³ which he describes as being ‘unwittingly introduced’ (p.134).²⁰⁴

This chapter will first discuss the relationship between Tg.Ps. and the Targumim to the Torah,²⁰⁵ followed by Tg.Ps. and the Targumim to the Prophets.²⁰⁶

²⁰¹ P. Churgin (p.21), compared this translation with Tg.Ps. 24:4, implying some form of relationship that he doesn’t explicate.

²⁰² Interestingly, A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* vol.1, Cambridge, CUP, 1901, points out that the words of v.4 are “an echo” of Ex 20:7, but dismisses the relationship as “forced” due to the need to take God as speaker, and “my soul” as being a substitute for “my name” (p.129).

²⁰³ See M. L. Klein, “Associative and Complimentary Translation in the Targumim,” *Eretz Israel* 16 (1982), pp.134–140, who brings numerous examples including those from different books of the Bible, as is in our case. This example, however, differs a little from his model as Tg.Ps. does not bring Ps 24:4 into complete conformity with Ex 20:7, but does clearly understand it in the light of the latter passage.

²⁰⁴ Interestingly the Peshitta Psalter also made the link between the two passages:

Ex 20:7 לֹא יִשְׁבַּע בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי יִשְׁבַּע בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

Ps.24:4 אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

The beginning and the end of the verses are the same (as one would expect), however, the translator has changed the word order of the MT in placing **בְּשֵׁם** after the verb, and has added the prepositional **בְּ** in front of it because it occurs in the verse from Exodus with which he is making the link. Thus in this case we are able to see a deliberate conforming of Ps 24:4 to Ex 20:7, something not found so explicitly in Tg.Ps. 24:4.

²⁰⁵ The Targumim studied are: Targum Onkelos (TO) A. Sperber *The Bible in Aramaic: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos* Leiden, Brill, 1959; Targum Neophiti (TN) L. Diez Macho *Targum Neofiti I* vol.2, Madrid- Barcelona, CSIC, 1970; Targum Pseudo Jonathan (Tg.Ps.Jn.) E. G. Clarke *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* Ktav Pub. House, Hoboken, N.J., 1984.; The Samaritan Targum (ST) A. Tal, *תרגום השומרוני לתורה* Tel Aviv,

3.1 Tg.Ps. AND THE TARGUMIM OF THE TORAH

3.1a Tg.Ps. 24:4 and FT Ex 20:7

MT Ps 24:4

נקי כפים ובר לבב אשר לא נשא לשוא נפשי ולא נשבע למרמה:

He who has clean hands and a pure heart, and who has not taken a false oath by My life,²⁰⁷ or sworn deceitfully.²⁰⁸

Tg.Ps.

דכי ידיא ובריר רעיונא דלא אומי על שקרא לחייבא נפשי[ה] ולא קיים לניכלא:

He who has pure hands and clean thoughts and has not sworn falsely, thus *condemning* himself, and does not take an oath deceitfully.

F^rT_p Ex 20:7

לא תשא: עמי עמי בית ישראל לא תימי בשמא דה' אלהך למגנא ולא תשתבע בשמי ותשקר דאנא הוא ה' אלהכון רבא פרען דעתיד לאתפרעא ממאן דמשקר בשמי ארום בשמי רבא אתברי עלמא וכל מאן דמשתבע בשמי ומשקר גליא קדמי דבחובוי אחריבנא ליה וכל מאן דמוטר נפשיה ולא משתבע לשיקרא גליא קדמי דזכותיה מתקיים עלמא וכל מאן דמתקיים עלמא בדיליה טיבו ליה בעלמא הדין ולעלמא דאתי:

Don't take: My people, My people the house of Israel, do not swear in the name of the Lord your God for nothing/lightly and do not take an oath falsely (lit. and lie) in my name for I am the Lord, your great and avenging God who will punish whoever lies in my name, for by my great name the world was created and whoever takes an oath falsely in my name will be revealed before me, on account of his sins I will destroy him, and he who guards his soul and does not

1980; Fragment Targums (F^rT_p, F^rT_v) M. Klein *The Fragment—Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources* vol.1, Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1980; Genizah Targum mss. (GT) M. Klein *Geniza Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum* Cincinatti, HUC Press, 1986, and the Tosephtot Targum (TT) R. Kasher, *תוספתות תרגום לנביאים* Jerusalem, Israel Academy of Sciences, 1996.

²⁰⁶ In particular Targum Jonathan (TJ); Fragment Targums, and Tosephtot Targums (as in n.205).

²⁰⁷ Some manuscripts have 'his life' (c.f. n.199).

²⁰⁸ Translation from the *JPS* translation.

swear falsely it has been revealed before me that on his merits the world is established and each one, on whose account the world is established, to him will be bounty/blessing in this world and the world to come.

FT_p, which is related to the later *Mahzor Vitry* recension of Ex 20:7 expands Ex 20:7 with references to creation and judgment alongside that of false oaths. Such expansions are interesting when compared to Tg.Ps. 24 that retains and expands slightly the 'creation' focus of v.1, but also adds the concept of judgment with the addition לחייבא alongside נפשיה in v.4. Is it possible that some form of relationship exists between Tg.Ps. and FT_p Ex 20:7? These points alone cannot demonstrate any relationship as Ex 20:7 may be interpreted as containing a threat of judgment in the phrase ... 'כי לא ינקה ה', although this does not explain the similarity between מנטר נפשיה and לחייבא נפשיה. The reference to creation could come from v.8 where it is specifically mentioned in relation to the Sabbath commandment. In attempting to answer this it is important to note that the manuscript of the FT is MS P¹¹⁰, which was bound to a copy of the Targum to the Hagiographa.

We have already noted that Tg.Ps. had not drawn upon earlier Targumim in its translation of 24:4, so is it possible that in this case the influence is in the other direction? We have already seen the conceptual similarities between the two texts, yet there is one other striking similarity. Along with FT_p to Ex 20:7 there is also found in the same manuscript a poem relating to this verse. The first line of this poem is very interesting:

לא תשא: אמר משה כד סליקית למרומא איתפתחו לי תרעי שמיא
וחמית מה בעיליא:

Don't take: Moses said, when I went up to the heights the doors of heaven were opened for me and I saw what is in heaven.

The reference to the gates of heaven being opened to Moses in connection to this verse is very interesting, especially as we have the gates of the Garden of Eden being opened in our Psalm in v.9. It is true that the texts use the phraseology in different ways; however, the coincidence, alongside the other points of connection, is too striking to be dismissed.

It would seem that the association of Psalm 24:4b, and as a consequence the whole Psalm, with Ex 20:7, and the translation/interpretation given it by Tg.Ps. may have exerted an influence on the later Targum tradition connected to Ex 20:7 as found in MS P¹¹⁰. If

the connection I have described is correct then the possibility voiced by S. Kaufman and Y. Maori,²⁰⁹ who question the claims that the Hagiographic texts in Ms Paris 110 P are unrelated to the FT manuscripts of the Pentateuch, are given further weight. Such suggestions are very tentative as the evidence is not conclusive, although the possibility should not be dismissed.²¹⁰

3.1b Tg.Ps. 48:3 and TO Lev 1:11

MT Ps 48:3

יפה נוף משוש כל הארץ הר ציון ירכתי צפון קרית מלך רב:

Beautiful in elevation, the joy of all the earth is mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great king.

Tg.Ps.

שפיר היך חתנ[א] חדות כל יתבי ארעא טורא דציון שידא דציפונא
קריתא דמלכא רבא:

Beautiful as a *bridegroom*, joy of all those dwelling in the earth, mount Zion, the side of the north, the city of the great king.

MT Lev 1:11

ושחט אתו על ירך המזבח צפנה לפני ה' וזרקו בני אהרן הכהנים
את דמו על המזבח סביב:

And he shall slaughter it on the north side of the altar before the Lord, and the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall pour out its blood on all sides of the altar.

TO Lev 1:11

ויכוס יתיה על שידא דמדבחא צפונא קדם ה' ויזרקון בני אהרן
כהניא ית דמיה על מדבחא סחור סחור:

And he shall slaughter it on the North side of the altar before the Lord, and the sons of Aaron the priests, will pour out its blood upon all sides of the altar.²¹¹

²⁰⁹ "Aspects and Implications of the Targum to Ex 20" *Textus* 16 (1991), pp.13–78 (especially p.29 n.49).

²¹⁰ Both Targumim may be drawing upon a common tradition; even so there remains a relationship between these texts within that tradition.

²¹¹ C.f. TJ 2 Kings 16:14.

שידא דצפונא translates the phrase ירכתי צפון, which occurs five times (including Ps 48:3) in the MT.²¹² Tg.Ps. differs from Tj on the other four occurrences, all of which use the phrase סיפי ציפונא. The comparison above however, with TO Lev 1:11 is of interest and suggests that some form of relationship may exist.²¹³ However, other comparative traditions must be discussed before an accurate picture can be built up.

Rabbinic literature consistently interprets this ‘problematic’ phrase (ירכי צפון)²¹⁴ in light of Lev 1:11 and the altar, and thus the joy that Jerusalem brings is forgiveness from sins obtained in the Temple, as is illustrated by this quote from *Midrash Tehillim* 48:2:

וכי בצפון הוא, והלא אינו אלא בדרום, ומה ירכתי צפון, בצפון הוא
עומד ומקריב חטאתו ונשחט בצפון, שנאמר על ירך המזבח צפונה
(ויקרא א.יא.)...

Why is it in the north? Since isn't it in the south? And what are the sides of the north? In the north he stands and offers his sin offering and it is slaughtered in the north as it says: on the sides of the altar [in the] north (Lev 1:11)...²¹⁵

Is Tg.Ps. related to this exegetical tradition? The uniqueness of the translation of this phrase in Tg.Ps., and the resemblance to the similar phrase in TO Lev 1:11 in light of the above midrashic tradition suggests that Tg.Ps. read this Psalm in the light of Lev 1:11, and translated the problematic phrase in accordance with TO in order to make that connection clear.²¹⁶ However, although a unique translation of this phrase, it is semantically acceptable, and does render the Hebrew quite well.²¹⁷ Thus, although there is a link between Tg.Ps. and TO, and the same connection is made in the Midrashim, there remains a doubt as to a specific reliance upon TO Lev 1:11, it may simply be polygenesis. The

²¹² Is 14:13; Ezek 38:6,15; 39:2.

²¹³ Note also Tg.Ps. 128:3 where the root ירך is translated with שידא.

²¹⁴ The phrase is problematic in that Jerusalem, situated in the centre/south of Israel, is described here as on the ‘sides of the north.’ Modern interpreters/translators suggest that צפון should be taken as a reference to the mythological mountain *Zaphon* where the gods were meant to dwell, c.f., the JPS translation of this verse.

²¹⁵ C.f., *Ex. Rab.* 36:1; *Num. Rab.* 8:1.

²¹⁶ The link has to be with TO as TN and Tg.Ps.JN both translate ירך with the root שפל, as does the Peshitta.

²¹⁷ C.f., TO Ex 40:22,24 and Num 3:29,35 where the same construction, ירך... צפון is translated in the same way.

translator may have expected his readers to make the link through their knowledge of the midrashim, but at present such a conclusion cannot be proved. In this respect we should note that the translation in Tg.Ps. does not ‘solve the problem,’ as the text does not explicitly refer to the forgiveness of sins, and thus there may well be no links whatsoever with the midrashim or TO.

3.1c Tg.Ps. 80:16 and the Targumim of Gen 49:11²¹⁸

MT Ps 80:16

וכנה אשר נטעה ימיןך ועל בן אמצתה לך:

And the stock your right hand planted, and over the son that you strengthened for yourself.

Tg.Ps.

ועוברא די נציבת ימיןך ועל מלכא משיחא דחיילתא לך:

And the branch that your right hand planted, and *the King Messiah* whom you made strong for yourself.

Two aspects of this verse in Tg.Ps. are of interest. Firstly, **עוברא** translates the Hapax Legomenon **כנה**. This is the only occasion in Tg.Ps. that this word is used. Secondly, the use of ‘King Messiah’ in v.16, replacing the Hebrew **בן** requires a thorough examination,²¹⁹ being the only occasion that this word is directly associated with the Messiah. This uniqueness is accentuated when one considers that no such interpretation is found in rabbinic literature connected to this verse.

Levey notes that this association between the Messiah and ‘son’ is ‘precarious... theologically,’²²⁰ but goes on to explain that ‘son’ in v.16 parallels ‘stock’ (**כנה**) in v.16, and ‘vine’ (**גפן**) in vv.9 and 15 and thus cannot mean ‘son.’ He then claims that **בן** should be taken as ‘branch’ as it is in Gen 49:22, and thus according to Levey it is equated with **צמח**, which is a popular messianic type in the Targumim. Such an explanation is somewhat convoluted, especially towards the end, where **בן** suddenly is associated with **צמח** and thus the Messiah. **צמח** does not

²¹⁸ The relationship between this text in Tg.Ps. and the Christian ‘Son of Man’ tradition will be discussed in Ch.7.1c.

²¹⁹ The LXX has **υἱον ἀνθρώπων** and the Peshitta **ܒܢ ܢܥܡܪ** thus making this clause in v.16 match the same clause in v.18.

²²⁰ See *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* New York, HUC Press, 1974, pp.119–120, although one should note that in Ps 2 we find both ‘son’ and ‘Messiah’ referring to the same individual.

occur in Ps 80 or Gen 49:22 and thus the jump seems much too big to adequately explain the association.²²¹

We noted earlier that this verse is the only occasion that Tg.Ps. uses **עוּבְרָא** and thus the use of this word in other contexts might therefore be instructive. **עוּבְרָא** is used as an addition in TJ Hosea 14:6, and in TJ Ezekiel 17:3 to translate **צִמְרָת**. In Ezek 17:6,7 it is used to translate **דְּלִית** and **פֶּאֶרָה** respectively. It is also used in TN and the FT_v Num 13:23, and TN and FT_p Gen 49:22 where it is an addition to the MT. TN and FT_p Gen 49:22 also talk of Joseph 'sending out his roots into the land' and his boughs 'conquering all the trees,' all of which have reminiscences in Psalm 80 (see vv.2,10–11), and as such it seems sensible to suggest that Ps 80 has influenced these additions to the text in Gen 49:22. Does this association between Gen 49:22 and Psalm 80 strengthen Levey's suggestion? I would suggest not, as TN has clearly read Ps 80 as referring to Joseph, whereas our Targum has read it as referring to a prayer of Israel for an end to the exile. Both Targumim are utilising the same Psalm but with very different interpretive conclusions, and as such evinces, again, the rabbinic dictum of 'the seventy faces of Torah.'

There is however one reference that is more fruitful in our research: ST Gen 49:11.²²² I have listed below the MT, TO, ST and one manuscript (M²) of ST.

MT: **אֲסִירִי לִגְפֶן עֵירָה וְלִשְׂרָקָה בְּנֵי אֲתָנּוּ** (Binding his foal to the vine, and his ass' colt unto the choice vine)

TO: **יִסְחַר יִשְׂרָאֵל לְקִרְתִּיהָ עֲמָא יִבְנֹן הִיכְלִיהָ** (He [the Messiah] leads Israel round to his city, the people will build his sanctuary)²²³

ST: **סֶאֶר לִגְפִנָּה קִרְתָּהּ וְלִרְיקָה בְּרֵי עֲמוּקָה** (His town strays to Gaphna, and sons of his valley to emptiness)²²⁴

²²¹ Note also that Gen 49:22 is not messianic in any specific way, and that no Targum translates the Hebrew **בֶּן** as **צִמְחָה** or an equivalent. Modern translators, however, find 'son' in Ps 80:16 problematic and translate with 'stock,' relegating 'son' to a footnote.

²²² This excludes the occurrence of this word in the Christian Palestinian Aramaic translation of John's gospel ch.15, where it occurs three times.

²²³ See M. Aberbach and B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis*, Denver, KTAV, 1982, pp.286–287 for a detailed discussion of this verse.

²²⁴ See comment by A. Tal, in *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* Leiden, Brill 2000, vol.1, p.156a under **גִּפְנָה**, where he explains this Targum as a derogatory Midrash against Jerusalem.

ST M²: אסירי לגפנה חילה ולעוברא ברי עמוקה (He binds his strength to the vine and the sons of his might to the bough)²²⁵

The fact that we have an Aramaic text, albeit Samaritan, that uses עוברא in this passage is significant for our study of the association of the Messiah with our verse in Targum Ps 80:16.²²⁶ Ps 80 was used in rabbinic midrashim in connection to Gen 49:11 and the work of the Messiah,²²⁷ and his role in leading the exiles back to Jerusalem, as Onkelos' translation/interpretation makes clear. It seems possible therefore that considering the context given to the whole Psalm by the Targum, and its use in rabbinic midrashim in connection to Gen 49:11, that the Targumist inserted this unusual word עוברא into v.16 in order to make the connection with Gen 49:11, and thus the reference to the Messiah was justified in this way.²²⁸ This connection, therefore, suggests that the manuscript (M²) of the ST may have origins within the Jewish world (see n.226) and that Tg.Ps. knew of it and translated in such a way to make that connection clear. Such a solution provides both linguistic and exegetical grounds for the unusual reference to the Messiah in this Psalm.²²⁹

In this respect the text below from Theodoretus Cyrensis Episcopus, *In Psalmos*, on Ps 80:16 is of interest:

Ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἐκεῖθεν βλάστησιν τοῦ Δεσπότης διδάσκει Χριστοῦ. Ἰκετεύει γὰρ ἐπιμελείας ἀξιοθῆναι τὴν ἄμπελον, διὰ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθησόμενον ναὸν ὃν Υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου σαφῶς προσηγόρευεν.²³⁰

Here he teaches the springing up of Christ the Lord. He begs that the vine be given care because of the Temple—clearly called the Son of Man—to be assumed from it.

²²⁵ עמוקה is translated with 'strength' in this verse as opposed to 'valley' as in the manuscript above, due to the parallelism with חילה.

²²⁶ The fact that this manuscript tradition of the ST does not have the polemical translation of the other manuscripts and appears to be a different tradition, suggests that it is earlier and retains a translation that could have been known by the Jews, or even used by them at some point.

²²⁷ See *Tanbuma* ויחי 10; *Gen. Rab.* 99:8.

²²⁸ Note also that the Hebrew גפן appears in Gen 49:11 and Ps 80:15. Such a link is sufficient to interpret the two passages in light of one another.

²²⁹ This point raises the question of whether Tg.Ps. expected his readers/listeners to be familiar with other parts of the Targum tradition and thus make the connection themselves.

²³⁰ Greek text from *Patrologia Graeca* 80, Paris 1864.

This text clearly takes its cue for a messianic interpretation from the LXX. However, the association of the Temple with this verse is interesting in the connection with Gen 49:11 where we have the Temple inserted by TO.²³¹ Such a link, although from sources separated both chronologically and geographically, indicate that the link between Ps 80:16 and Gen 49:11 is perhaps older and more pervasive than one might first expect.

Thus the impetus for the 'insertion' of the Messiah into this verse in Psalm 80, came from an association with Gen 49:11, a link that Tg.Ps. highlighted by the use of the Aramaic עֹבְרָא, found also in ST (M²) Gen 49:11, to translate the Hebrew כְּנֶה. Such a link between the Ps 80 and Gen 49:11 was pervasive in late antiquity and Tg.Ps. picked up on this tradition. The exilic context given to the Psalm by the translator, a theme clearly evinced in TO Gen 49:11, was the reason for linking the two texts.²³² Such a conclusion stills leaves the 'problematic' association between 'son' and 'King Messiah,' as the Targum would have been read in conjunction with the Hebrew. However, the assumption that this translation is 'problematic' appears to be based on an undue emphasis on Christian Christological interpretations affecting Jew-

²³¹ For Onkelos the association of the Temple in this verse probably comes from comparing אֶתְנֹ in Gen 49:11 with שַׁעַר אֶתְמֹן in Ezek 40:15 (as described in *Tanbuma* ויחי 10); whereas for Theodoret the route is somewhat more circuitous and problematic, and we need to ascertain why he made the link between Ps 80:16 and the Temple, before we use this text in support of the relationship between Ps 80:16 and Gen 49:11. He associates Jesus with the 'son of man,' and seeing Jesus spoke of his body in terms of the Temple (see John 2:19) he possibly made the link. However, this route does not fit his interpretation, which seems to start from the assumption that 'son of man' refers to the Temple in the text, but should be seen as a reference to the Messiah. Such an assumption is difficult to follow. Why should 'son of man' refer to the Temple? It seems as if he is relying on an inherited tradition of interpretation, re: the Temple, and has built upon it. Such a tradition may have been derived from the association of this verse with Gen 49:11 and the interpretation given to that verse by Onkelos. As such, although the point of stimulus appears different, it is quite conceivable that Theodoret has inherited a Jewish tradition (unwittingly) and incorporated it into his exegesis. This being the case, the relationship between Ps 80:16 and Gen 49:11 is possibly further supported by this text.

²³² The other Targumim to Gen 49:11 contain explicit messianic interpretations, but not specific reference to his role in the return of the exiles to Jerusalem.

ish exegesis. It should be stressed that this verse was never a basis of Jewish-Christian polemic, and in fact was never a common source for Christological interpretation. Combine this with the fact that the structure of the verse indicates that **בן** and **כנה** are parallel terms,²³³ and the ‘problematic’ nature of the verse is significantly reduced, if not eliminated.

3.1d Tg.Ps. 81:6, Targum Onkelos, and Ps.Jn. Gen 41:45

MT Ps 81:6

עדות ביהוסף שמו בצאתו על ארץ מצרים...

He placed it a testimony on Joseph on his going out over the land of Egypt...

Tg.Ps.

סהדותא על יוסף שוויה דלא קריב לאיתת ריבוניה ביה ביומא נפק
מבית אסירי ושלט על ארעא דמצרים...

He placed it, a testimony on Joseph *who did not touch his master's wife, on the very day* he went out from jail and *ruled over* all the land of Egypt...

Note the change in particles in the Targum, highlighted below:

MT: ...בצאתו על... עדות ב...

Tg: סהדותא על... נפק מ... ושלט על...

The purpose of the changes appears to be to clarify the meaning of the verse, as read by the translator. The MT, as it stands, could be read as God or Joseph going out over Egypt, and the question remains, what does ‘go out over’ mean.²³⁴ The Targum solves these questions, making the subject of the clause Joseph, and, in typical targumic method, provides a new object for the verb and a new verb for the object. Thus Joseph goes out *from jail* and *rules* over all the land of Egypt.

The particles in the MT also caused problems for other early translators, and the choice of translation indicates how they read the verse, as the renderings of the second clause given below illustrate:

²³³ C.f. the use of **בן** in Gen 49:22.

²³⁴ One expects to go out ‘from’: C.f., Ps 114:1 where Israel leaves (**בצאת** **ישראל** **from** Egypt (**ממצרים**)). This would be the normal construction, hence the oddness of **על**.

LXX: ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (In his going out **from** the land of Egypt)²³⁵

Aq/Sym: ἡνίκα ἐξήλθεν εἰς γῆν Αἰγυπτου (at the time he went out **into** the land of Egypt)

Peshitta: **בְּ** **בֹא** **לְ** **אֶרֶץ** **מִצְרַיִם** (when he came out **to** the land of Egypt)

Iuxta Hebraeos: cum egrederetur terra Aegypti (when he went out **from** the land of Egypt)

Clearly, the Peshitta, Aquila, and Symmachus have refrained from linking the clause with the Exodus from Egypt, as has our Targum, whereas the LXX and Jerome refer it to the Exodus and the departure from Egypt, and thus Joseph was probably seen as a synonym for Israel. Here again it appears that the way of reading the Hebrew text is similar (i.e., ‘Joseph’ means Joseph and not Israel²³⁶) although this may have been inherited and thus should be classed as a shared tradition.

However, there are other texts that shed light on Tg.Ps’ translation: TO and Ps.Jn to Gen 41:45

MT Gen 41:45

...וַיֵּצֵא יוֹסֵף עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם...

...And Joseph went out over the land of Egypt

TO and Ps.Jn. Gen 41:45

...וַיֵּצֵא יוֹסֵף עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם: ²³⁷ אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם:

...And Joseph went out, ruling (or ruler) over the land of Egypt.

It appears clear that the phrase in Psalm 81:6 **בְּצִאתוֹ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם** is dependent upon Gen 41:25. TO and Ps.Jn clearly felt the need to add to the text in order to clarify its meaning, and it appears that Tg.Ps. has drawn upon this earlier example in its translation, although not in a slavish manner, as the addition of ‘jail’ makes clear.²³⁸

²³⁵ The same in the Gallican Psalter.

²³⁶ As it does in Tg.Ps. 80:2, and Targum Neofiti’s reading of Ps 80 in Gen 49:22 (see ch.3.1c).

²³⁷ At least one manuscript of TO adds **כָּל** here. C.f., the Peshitta.

²³⁸ The LXX ignores this phrase, whereas the Peshitta adds the word ‘all’: ‘and Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt.’ TN also adds ‘all’ and changes the preposition from **עַל** to **בְּ**: And Joseph went out into all the land of Egypt.

3.1e Tg.Ps. 81:7, TN Gen 40:18, and Tg.Ps.Jn. Gen 37:17

MT Ps 81:7

הסירותי מסבל שכמו כפיו מדוד תעברנה

I removed his shoulder from the burden, his hands freed from the basket

Tg.Ps.

אערייתי²³⁹ משיעבודא כתפיה ידוי מן למירמי טינא בקידרא
איסתלקן:

I removed²⁴⁰ his shoulders from enslavement, and his hands were taken up *from throwing clay for pots*.

The MT appears to be referring to the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, and that is exactly how it is interpreted in rabbinic literature.²⁴¹ It is possible to read it the same way in Tg.Ps. However, with the previous verse so clearly having Joseph as the subject it makes more sense syntactically for Joseph to become the object of this verse. This verse, therefore, gives us some detail as to the conditions that Joseph was delivered from on his release from jail. However, such a reading could be problematic in that there are two aspects of the translation of this verse that seem to be designed to connect these verses with the sufferings of Israel in Egypt: שיעבודא translates סבל, and is a unique translation in the Targumim,²⁴² as is טינא for דוד.²⁴³ The link between these translations and the Exodus is clear from the passages below: TN, using Ex 1:12 as its source, places the following interpretation of a dream in the mouth of Joseph in Gen 40:18:

MT Gen 40:18

ויען יוסף ויאמר זה פתרנו שלשת הסלים שלשת ימים הם:

Joseph answered and said, "This is its interpretation, the three baskets, they are three days.

Jerome translates: *egressus itaque Ioseph ad terram Aegypti*: and so Joseph went out to the land of Egypt.

²³⁹ אערייתי – V,VA,N אעדיתי.

²⁴⁰ Reading from apparatus.

²⁴¹ See BT *Rosh Hashanah* 11a–b, where this verse is used to claim that the slavery of Israel in Egypt ended on Rosh Hashanah.

²⁴² The Targumim usually use פלח or ניר when translating סבל.

²⁴³ In Jer 24:1–2 the Targum uses סלא; in 1 Sam 2:14 and Job 41:12 the respective Targumim use דודא.

TN

וענה יוסף ואמר דן פתרונה דחלמא תלתי סליה תלתיה שעבודיא
 תקיפיה דעתידין ישראל למשתעבדא בארעא דמצרים בטינא
 ובליבני ובכל פלחין באפי ברא...²⁴⁴

Joseph answered and said, "This is the interpretation of the dream; the three baskets are three harsh enslavements of the future by which Israel will be enslaved in the land of Egypt, in clay (mortar) in bricks and working the face of the open fields..."

Both words that are unusual translations in our verse are found here, as additions to the Hebrew, in a description of the suffering of Israel in Egypt. It is possible therefore that the Targumist used these words in his translation of Ps 81 to connect the sufferings described in v.7 with those of Israel in Egypt.

How does this fit in with Tg.Ps. having Joseph as the subject? The answer could lie in Tg.Ps.Jn. Gen 37:17 where an individual tells Joseph, on his way to meet his brothers, that they have moved to Dothan:

ואמר גברא נטלו מיכן ארום שמעית מבתר פרגודא דהא אישתרי
 מן יומא דין שיעבוד מצראי...

And the man said they left from here, because I heard from behind the curtain (of heaven) from this day the Egyptian slavery has started...²⁴⁵

The text clearly links Joseph's sale into the hands of the Ishmaelites as the beginning of the enslavement in Egypt. If the enslavement of Joseph was seen as the beginning of Israel's bondage then it is fitting that he would be seen to have suffered in a similar way to those who suffered under Egyptian bondage after he had died. The Targum therefore has, through specific vocabulary selection, ingeniously interpreted 'Joseph' in Ps 82:6 as referring both to the individual Joseph of the Genesis narrative and to 'Israel' at the same time.

Such findings suggest that there is a shared interpretive tradition surrounding Joseph and the Exodus in TN Gen 40, Tg.Ps.Jn. Gen 37 and Tg.Ps. 81, a tradition that has, as far as I am aware, no parallels elsewhere.²⁴⁶

²⁴⁴ The comparative material with our verse in Tg.Ps. has been underlined.

²⁴⁵ I am unaware of any parallel interpretation to this in rabbinic literature.

²⁴⁶ Y. Zakowitch, "And You Shall Tell Your Son..." *The Concept of the Exodus in the Bible* Jerusalem, Magnes, 1991, suggests that Gen 47:12–26 is a secondary element in the Joseph narrative that put the blame for the Israelite enslavement

3.1f Tg.Ps. 81:10 and the Targumim of Deut 32:12

MT Ps 81:10

לא יהיה בך אל זר ולא תשתחוה לאל נכר:

No strange god shall be in you and you shall not bow down to a foreign god.

Tg.Ps.

לא יהוי ביניכון פלחן טעוותא נוכראה ולא תסגדון לטעוות חילונאי:

There shall *not be among you the worship of* foreign idols, and you shall not bow down to profane idols.

The phrase **לא יהיה בך אל זר** in the MT creates the problem of the meaning of 'in you.' Rabbinic interpretations picked up on this problem and linked the 'foreign god' that was 'in you' to the evil inclination that would eventually lead the individual who followed it to idolatry.²⁴⁷ Tg.Ps. clearly interprets this phrase in a different way, as the context of the passage demands. It is the 'worship of foreign idols' that is not to be 'among' the community of Israel.

Such an interpretation is interesting in comparison to the Targumim of Deut 32:12. The MT describes how God led Israel alone, and that 'there was no foreign god with him' (**וְאֵין עִמּוֹ אֵל נֹכֵר**). TN below is one example of how the Targumim translated this verse:

...ולא הווי בניהון פלחי פולחן נוכריי:

...And there was no worship of foreign idols among them.²⁴⁸

Although the 'problem' in this text is different from that in Ps 81:10, the similarity in the solution is striking, and either indicates dependence of one text on another or the adoption of a common tradition by different texts.²⁴⁹ The link between Ps 81:10 and Deut 32:12 is

on Joseph for mistreating the Egyptians when he ruled over the land. The LXX and Samaritan rendering of v.21, which have 'enslave' as opposed to 'moved,' support his claim. Such an interpretation suggests that the linking of Joseph to the bondage in Egypt may have a long history behind it. Although note that Tg.Ps. is doing something different from the discussion above, as it places no blame on Joseph.

²⁴⁷ E.g., BT *Shabbat* 105b and parallels.

²⁴⁸ C.f., Tg.Ps.Jn., FT_v which translate in the same way, whereas there is slight variation in the vocabulary of TO.

²⁴⁹ The latter option being the most likely.

clear in the Hebrew: the presence of the phrase **אל נכר** in both verses. Such a connection is sufficient for Tg.Ps. to make the connection and utilise an earlier example of Targumic exegesis. Whether such ‘utilisation’ occurred or not is impossible to prove definitively, however there seems no doubt that some form of relationship exists between these texts.

3.1g Tg.Ps. 93:2 and TN Gen 1:1

MT Ps 93:2

נכון כסאך מאז מעולם אתה:

Your throne is established from of old, You are from everlasting.

Tg.Ps.

מתקן כורסייך מלקדמין מן עלמא את הוא אלהא:

Your throne is established from beforetime; from eternity You are God.

מלקדמין is a unique translation amongst all the Targumim of the Hebrew phrase **מאז**.²⁵⁰ This phrase strongly suggests a link with Gen 1:1 (c.f., TN Gen 1:1 where **בראשית** is translated with **מלקדמין**). Thus Tg.Ps. by utilising such an unusual translation communicates the idea that God’s throne was established from before creation.

The uniqueness of the use of **מאז** with **כסא** in the Hebrew, as well as the second clause of the verse using the time frame **מעולם** in reference to God (a fact made explicit by the addition of **אלהא** by the Targum) could provide adequate textual stimulus to encourage such a translation. However, it should also be noted that Psalm 93:2 was the common proof text to show that the Throne of Glory was created before the creation of the world,²⁵¹ precisely for the same reasons highlighted above. Whether the Targum arrived at this interpretation because of contemporary rabbinic interpretations or independently cannot be answered definitively, yet it is important to note the association with

²⁵⁰ The only other occasion that **מאז** is used in the Psalms, Tg.Ps. translates with **מעידן**. The closest translation to that found in Tg.Ps. is found in the Targum of Ruth 2:7, where **מקדם** is used.

²⁵¹ See BT *Nedarim* 39b, *Tanbuma* (Buber) נשא 19, *Tanbuma* נשא 11, *Midrash Mashelei* 8:9 (all of which list seven things that were created before the world); and *Gen. Rab.* 1:4 (which lists two things created before Gen 1:1, and four that were thought of), *Midrash Tebillim* 93:3 (which lists six things that were thought of before Gen 1:1).

Neofiti, which is quite possibly an exegetical device employed specifically to encourage the reader to make the link with Gen 1:1 and the interpretation that God's throne was created before creation.²⁵⁰

3.1h Tg.Ps. 118:14 and the Targumim of Ex 15:2

MT Ps 118:14

עזי וזמרת יה ויהי לי לישועה:

The Lord is my strength and my song and He has become my salvation.

Tg.Ps.

תוקפי ותושבחת דחיל על כל עלמא ה' אמר במימר[יה] והוה לי
לפריק:

My strength and my praise is *the awesome one of all the world, the Lord spoke by His Memra*, and He was for me a redeemer.

The Hebrew עזי וזמרת יה ויהי לי לישוע is also found in Ex 15:2 and Isaiah 12:2. The fact that Tg.Ps. translates the name יה with דחיל על כל עלמא, a unique translation for this Targum,²⁵¹ indicates that the translator utilised a known phrase. However, when comparing Tg.Ps. with the other Targumim to all these verses, it is unclear which if any the translator utilised. The latter part of the first half corresponds to Tg.Ps.Jn. Ex 15:2 exactly, whereas the second half of the verse corresponds to TO Ex 15:2 and TJ. Is 12:2:

²⁵⁰ This again raises the question of how much knowledge of other Targumim is expected, c.f., n.229.

²⁵¹ The translation, or not, of the name יה in Tg.Ps. is complicated, and inconsistent throughout the manuscript tradition, thus in MS. Breslau the name is retained on 12 of 19 occasions, whereas in VA it is only retained on one occasion. P¹¹⁰ retains it on 8 occasions (the manuscript is unclear on two occasions), and VA retains it on 11 occasions. The text used by Lagarde retains it 11 times. The reason(s) for such inconsistency is hard to establish, but it seems clear that Churgin's tentative suggestion that the retention of the name may be a 'novel,' 'late tendency' (תרדום כתובים p.25), does not fully take into account the inconsistencies both within and between the manuscripts. VA is the only manuscript that seems to have consistently translated the name, although he forgot on at least one occasion, whereas P, which belongs to the same family as VA is thoroughly inconsistent.

Tg.Ps.Jn. Ex 15:2

תוקפן ורב תושבחתן דחיל על כל עלמא ה' אמר במימריה והות לי
אלקא פרוק

TO Ex 15:2

תוקפי ותושבחת דחילא ה' אמר במימריה והוה לי לפריק

Either the translator knew both, and in so doing created a unique rendering of a well-known Hebrew verse, or he may have translated from memory and got mixed up!²⁵⁴ Whatever the solution it seems clear that the translator is dependent upon an earlier translation (oral or written) in his translation of this verse in the Psalm.²⁵⁵

3.2 TG.PS. AND THE TARGUMIM OF THE PROPHETS

3.2a Tg.Ps. 68:28 and TJ 1 Sam 15:17

MT Ps 68:28

שם בנימן צעיר רדם שרי יהודה רגמתם שרי זבלון שרי נפתלי:

There little Benjamin rules them, the princes of Judah their heap.²⁵⁶

Tg.Ps.

תמן בנימן זעיר בשיבטיא מן שירוויא נחת לימא מטול היכנא קביל
מלכותא מן שירוויא ובתריהון נחתו רברבי יהודה רגמו יתהון
שבטי[א] אבנין וקבלו רבנותא בתריהון דבני זבולון הוו תגריהון
דבני נפתלי הוו גיבריהון:

There, Benjamin least of the tribes, from the beginning (first?) went down to the sea, because of this he received the kingdom from the beginning, and after them the princes of Judah went down, the tribes stoned them with stones and they received greatness after them, the sons of Zebulun became their merchants, the sons of Naphtali became their mighty men.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴ Another (very unlikely) possibility is that the translator had a different version of Onkelos from the one we have and utilised it in his translation.

²⁵⁵ C.f., P. Churgin, *תרגום כתובים*, p.23.

²⁵⁶ See n.261 below for a discussion on this translation.

²⁵⁷ The verse according to the Sephardi manuscript tradition is translated as follows: There Benjamin the least of the tribes from the beginning, and after them the princes of Judah went down, the tribes stoned them [princes of Judah] with stones, and from after Saul, King David from the tribe of Judah, and the princes of Judah were dressed in purple to serve him, the princes of

The Targum has read the Hebrew רדם as the root רדה with the third plural suffix, and thus has translated with קביל מלכותא,²⁵⁸ although it has ignored the pronominal suffix,²⁵⁹ as well as reading it as ירד as seen in the presence of נחת (c.f. the passage from the *Mekilta* below).²⁶⁰ בשיבטיא מן שירויא ... לימא מטול היכנא קביל is an addition that explains why Benjamin received this position of authority. The Hebrew רגמתם is unclear, being an Hapax Legomenon, and appears to be 'their crowd' (lit. heap).²⁶¹ The Targum uses the same root but in a verbal form and thus, along with the addition שבטיא אבנין, has the tribes stone Judah for going down into the sea before them, but they too receive a reward after Benjamin.²⁶²

Such an interpretive addition is of interest in relationship to similar rabbinic traditions.²⁶³ The passage below from the *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בשלח 5 (pp.104–105) provides an interesting parallel:

ויבאו בני ישראל בתוך הים ביבשה (שמות יד כב) ... ר' מאיר
אומר בלשון אחד כשעמדו שבטים על הים זה אומר אני יורד
תחלה לים וזה אומר אני יורד תחלה לים מתוך שהיו עומדין וצוהבין
קפץ שבטו של בנימין וירד לים תחלה שנ' שם בנימם צעיר רודם
שרי יהודה רגמתם שרי זבלון שרי נפתלי צוה אלהיך עוזך עזה

Zebulun were their merchants and the sons of Naphtali provided food for them from their inheritance.

²⁵⁸ C.f., Ps 72:8 where the Targum uses שלט and 110:2 where the Targum uses the same root.

²⁵⁹ C.f., the Peshitta that seems to have read the root as רדם (sleep) and thus translated with כנענא, whereas the LXX has ἔκστασις (ecstasy/astonishment/trance), and Aquila has ἐπικρατέω (rule over) and maintains the pronominal suffix (ἐνδεδωκεν).

²⁶⁰ This should therefore be viewed as another example of a double translation (c.f., Tg.Ps. 2:7).

²⁶¹ It is translated this way by the *ASV* (1901) and the *RV*, whereas the *AV* has council, and the *JPS* translation has 'command them' without explanation. However, the whole Psalm is prefaced in *JPS* with the disclaimer that 'the coherence of this Psalm and the meaning of many of its passages are uncertain' (p.1182).

²⁶² Thus taking the subject of קבילו as the princes of Judah, and the pronominal suffix in בתריהון as the tribe of Benjamin.

²⁶³ Churgin (pp.39–40) lists this verse alongside the passages below from the *Mekilta* and TJ 1 Sam 15:17, but without any specific comment other than his prefatory points on p.31 that 'many midrashic expansions [in Tg.Ps.] are preserved in the aggadah and Midrashim, and many of them in *Midrash Tehillim* and *Midrash Shober Tov*.'

אלהים זו פעלת לנו (תה' סח כח) אל תקרי רודם אלא רד ים התחילו שרי יהודה מרגמין אותם באבנים שנ' שרי יהודה רגמתם (שם) ... כך אמר הקב"ה מה שכר יטלו בני בנימן שירדו לים תחלה שרת שכינה בחלקו שנ' בנימן זאב יטרף (בר' מט כו) ואומר לבנימן אמר ידיד ה' ישכן לבטח עליו וגו' (דב' לג יב) ומה שכר נטלו שבטו של יהודה שהיו רוגמין אותם יהודה זכה למלכות שנ' שרי יהודה רגמתם (תה' שם) ואין רגמה אלא מלכות שנ' באדין אמר בלשאצר והלבישו לדניאל ארגונה והמניכא דדהבה על צואריה והכריזו עלוהי די להו שליט תלתא במלכותא (דניאל ה כט) ...²⁶⁴

And the children of Israel went amidst the sea on dry ground (Ex 14:22) R. Meir gave one interpretation, when the tribes stood by the sea one said, 'I won't²⁶⁵ go down first into the sea,' and another said, 'I won't go down first into the sea,' whilst they were standing and arguing (lit. being defiant) the tribe of Benjamin jumped up and went down into the sea first, as it says: There is little/young Benjamin their ruler, the princes of Judah their company, the princes of Zebulun, the Princes of Naphtali, your God has commanded your strength, strengthen o God that which you have worked for us (Ps 68:28–29) Don't read their ruler, but 'descend to the sea,' the princes of Judah began stoning them with stones, as it says: The princes of Judah stoned them.²⁶⁶ ... So God said, 'What reward shall the sons of Benjamin receive who went down into the sea first? The Shekinah will dwell on his portion,' as it says: Benjamin is a wolf that tears (Gen 49:26) And of Benjamin he said, the beloved of the Lord will dwell in safety upon him (Deut 33:12) And what reward did the tribe of Judah receive who stoned them, Judah earned the kingship, as it says: the princes of Judah their company (Ps 68:28) and there is no company other than kingship as it says: Then commanded Belshazar, and they clothed Daniel with purple, and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning

²⁶⁴ C.f., *Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai* pp.62–63; BT *Sotah* 36b–37a; *Mid. Tehillim* 68:14. The same tradition also appears in the *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael*, *Ibid.*, p.106; *Tosephta* ברכות 4:18, and BT *Sotah* 36b, (also c.f., *Mid. Tehillim*. 76:2) but on these occasions 'Nachshon son of Aminidav' jumps in first and his tribe (Judah) after him, and thus Judah is rewarded with the kingship.

²⁶⁵ 'I won't' reads the Hebrew אני as איני, which seems to be the original and correct reading, see S. Lieberman, (חלק א) *תוספתא כפשוטה סדר זרעים*, p.70 n.89.

²⁶⁶ Following the interpretation given by R' Meir.

him that he should be the third ruler in the kingdom. (Dan 5:29)...²⁶⁷

The similarities and the differences with the Targum are clear, although it is difficult to reconcile the differences that seem so fundamental. For clarity they are outlined below.

Mekilta and parallels	Tg.Ps.
Benjamin receives the reward of the Temple Mount being on his portion of the land	Benjamin receives leadership over the other tribes (interpreted as the kingship of Saul in 3 manuscripts)
Judah stones Benjamin	Judah is stoned by the other tribes
Judah receives the reward of kingship for stoning Benjamin	Judah receives the reward of greatness (after Benjamin) for going down into the sea after Benjamin. (Interpreted as the kingship of David and his descendants in 3 manuscripts, + Judah's descendants would wear purple in the same manuscripts.)

²⁶⁷ All the details of this midrash cannot concern us here, although the double use of the term רגמנתם is of interest (also note the double meaning of רדם that is exploited here, as in the Targum). The first occurrence is used in connection with the verbal use of the root—‘to stone,’ whereas the second seems to be used metaphorically as company/council with the possible connection to ruling. Lauterbach, in his edition of the *Mekilta*, suggests the link between Ps 68:28 and Daniel 5:29 is based around the closeness in the root רגם with רגן in the word ארגונה (purple). This is not a satisfactory solution, although a possibility. (Interestingly Horowitz in the notes accompanying his edition confesses ‘ignorance’ as to what lies behind the double use of this root in this passage.) It is important to note at this stage that the Sephardi manuscripts of Tg.Ps. adds that the reward for Judah going down into the sea after Benjamin was the appointment of David as king after Saul and that the princes of Judah would serve him wearing purple. Clearly this is related to the *Mekilta* passage, although it is separate in that the wearing of purple is an additional reward on top of the monarchy passing to their tribe, whereas in the *Mekilta* it seems that the wearing of purple is the sign that the monarchy has been given to the tribe of Judah.

Mekilta and parallels

Zebulun and Naphtali are given the future prospect of miracles being done by their hand through Barak and Deborah²⁶⁸

Tg.Ps.

Zebulun and Naphtali became merchants and mighty men respectively

Clearly the Targum is doing something slightly different in its translation, whilst remaining close to the structure and content of this interpretive tradition. In fact it appears that two streams of this tradition are being combined, which although related, have different interpretive agendas in mind. The passage below is from TJ 1 Sam 15:17:

MT 1 Sam 15:17

ויאמר שמואל הלא אם קטן אתה בעיניך ראש שבטי ישראל אתה
וימשחך ה' למלך על ישראל:

And Samuel said, 'Even though you are little (insignificant) in your own eyes, you are head of the tribes of Israel, for the Lord anointed you king over Israel.

TJ

ואמר שמואל הלא מן שריותך הויתא שיט וחלש בעיני נפשך ברם
זכות שבטא דבנימין אבוד היא גרמת לך דבעא למעבר בימא קדם
בני ישראל בדיל כין רביך ה' למהוי מלכא על ישראל:²⁶⁹

And Samuel said, 'Has it not been *from your youth* (*lit. your beginning*) that you were despised and weak in your own eyes, *but the merit of the tribe of Benjamin, your father, has strengthened you, who desired to pass over in the sea before the sons of Israel. Because of this* the Lord has raised you up to be king over Israel.'

It would seem that the purpose behind this insertion into the text is the justification for Saul becoming king despite being from the tribe of Benjamin. Importantly for us though is the fact that it is found in the context of the story surrounding king Agag and Saul's failure to carry

²⁶⁸ This part of the midrash was excluded from the quote for reasons of space.

²⁶⁹ Note the addition of the root גרם here, is quite possibly related, through the rabbinic אל תקרא model, to our verse in Ps 68:28 where we have the root רגם.

out God's instructions completely, resulting in the kingship being removed from him and given (in the next chapter) to David.

The Midrash quoted above however, provides (one) justification as to why the Temple Mount was on Benjamin's territory in the land of Israel and why the monarchy was given to the tribe of Judah.²⁷⁰ The

²⁷⁰ There has been much discussion concerning the origins and development of this midrashic tradition, J. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible, A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era* Cambridge Mss, Harvard University Press, 1998, suggests that Ps 106:7, "...they [our fathers] rebelled at the sea, at the Red Sea" is the starting point for the different versions of this tradition. He points out that the question that this text leaves is to what rebellion is it referring, and why specify the Red Sea in such a way? The midrash surrounding the dispute between the tribes, a tradition with numerous variations (Pseudo-Philo LAB 10:3 has three groups disputing at the edge of the sea, one group suggesting returning to Egypt, one to fight, and the other to dive into the sea and die; TN Ex 14:13–14, has a similar tradition with 4 groups, one suggesting return, one to fight, one to cry out and thus confuse the Egyptians, and one to fall into the sea; also c.f. *Tirbat Marque* 217a, and Josephus *Ant.* 2:327) seeks, according to Kugel, to answer this question. J. Heinmann, however (אגדות ותולדותיהן) Jerusalem, Keter, 1974, pp.78–84) makes a case for Ps 68:28 being the starting point for this tradition, and specifically claims that the Targum to this verse is 'the most faithful version to that which is hinted at in the [biblical] text, it is guided only by what is in it [the text] and does not insert into it foreign elements' (!) (p.81). There are problems with both these positions; Kugel seeks to find the impetus for the tradition in a text that (as far as I can ascertain) doesn't appear as an integral part of that tradition. Heinmann, however, lays too much stress on the Targum, which he doesn't quote but only summarises in a somewhat abbreviated form, with the explanation 'in the Targumic version simple errors have occurred which do not affect our topic' (!) (p.81). He then implies that this targumic version may well be the earliest form of the midrash. Clearly, Heinmann's use of the Targum is somewhat suspect, and as a result his suggestion that Ps 68:28 is the source for this tradition lacks any foundation. It seems to me that there is no need to look beyond the biblical text in Exodus for the source for this tradition. Ex 14:12–14 provides sufficient impetus for such exegetical elaborations. Combine this with the obvious questions relating to the reasons why Saul, from the tribe of Benjamin, became King, and then David from the tribe of Judah, then you have adequate material for the development of the tradition. Thus the quarrelling at the edge of the sea as described in Ex 14 gave rise to the intra-tribal disputes, which in turn was used by later rabbinic sages as a context to place the doctrine of ancestral merit relating to the kingship and allotment of the Temple Mount in Benjamin's territory. The Targum therefore, has not preserved the original early form of this tradition but has

exegetical insertion in Tg.Ps., as is made clear by the specific references in the Sephardi Tg.Ps. tradition to the kingship of Saul and then of David, contains details from both streams of this tradition and explains why Saul became king and was then removed and David, from a different tribe, became king after him. Such a context makes it very close to TJ 1 Sam15:17, as does the possible linguistic connection highlighted in n.269. Thus we have another example of Tg.Ps. being related specifically to rabbinic traditions, although more closely to an existing Targum tradition, but seemingly exercising creative freedom within those same interpretive traditions in order to produce a coherent ‘story’ within the biblical text of Ps 68.

3.2b Tg.Ps. 110:3 and TJ Judges 5:2

MT Ps 110:3

עמך נדבת ביום חילך...

Your people are volunteers on the day of battle...

Tg.Ps.

עמך ישראל דמתנדבין לאוריתא ביום אגחות קרבא...

Your people Israel who give themselves willingly *to Torah*, on the day of fighting *a battle*...

מתנדבין translates נדבות thus changing the nominal predicate form in the MT to a verbal form,²⁷¹ whilst retaining the same root.²⁷² לאוריתא is an addition to the MT. M. Bernstein²⁷³ notes the comparison with

utilised the existing elements of the tradition in a way that fits the text with which he is working.

²⁷¹ C.f., Tg.Ps. 109:4 where the nominal predicate is also changed to a verbal form in Tg.Ps.

²⁷² This is the only occasion in Tg.Ps. that the root נדב is used. The Peshitta uses the root צבט, which according to Weitzman (*The Old Testament in Syriac*, p.41) is a ‘drudge word.’ The Targum may well have had the same difficulty but has solved the problem differently. The LXX used ἡ ἀρχή (dominion), and Symmachus’ ἡγεμονικός (command, rule) both seem to come from נדיב (prince); whereas Aquila and Jerome translate as in the Targum, with ἑκούσασμός (willing) and *spontanei* (willing) respectively. Both Jerome and the Targum may have taken their cue from Aquila on this occasion, although it cannot be confirmed, as all the examples exhibit a relationship to the meaning of the Hebrew root.

²⁷³ “Torah Study” (1997), p.49 n.18

Targum Judges 5:2, 9, in the connection between the root נדב and Torah study. However, it is important to note in addition to this that in TJ Judges 5:2 the connection with our Psalm is also found in the idea that God's people will be successful in battle if they are obedient to Torah.²⁷⁴ Such a connection between the two Targumim may go some way to explaining the use of ביום אגחות קרבא to translate ביום חילך. This is the only occasion in the MT where these words are found in construct, and this is the only occasion in Tg.Ps. that the Hebrew חיל is translated in this way.²⁷⁵

With regard to the connection between these two 'translations' there is a midrash found in the *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בשלח דשירא 6 (and its parallel in *Tanbuma* בשלח 16) that interprets Ps 110 with regard to past deliverance by God of his people, and included is the deliverance in Judges 4 from Sisera, who also appears (as an addition to the MT) in Targum Judges 5:2. In light of this the relationship between these two Targumim seems to be very clear.

3.2c Tg.Ps. 137:7–9 and TT Isaiah 21:6

MT Ps 137:7–9

זכר ה' לבני אדום את יום ירושלם האמרים ערו עד היסד בה:
בת בבל השדודה אשרי שישלם לך את גמולך שגמלת לנו:
אשרי שיאחז ונפץ את עלליך אל הסלע:

Remember O Lord the sons of Edom on the day of Jerusalem who said, 'Rase! Rase! To her foundations.'

The daughter of Babylon the despoiled, blessed is he who pays you according to your actions against us

Blessed is he that takes and shatters your infants against the rock.

Tg.Ps.

אמר מיכאל רבה דירושלם אידכר ה' לעמא דאדום ית יומא דחריבו
ירושלם דאמרין צדו צדו
עד שיתאסא בה:

²⁷⁴ For a full discussion on this passage see W. Smelik, *Targum of Judges* Leiden, Brill, 1995, pp.392–396, although he does not make the connection with Tg.Ps. 110:3.

²⁷⁵ חיל appears 18 times in the Psalms; on 11 occasions the Targum uses the same root, on two occasions it uses ממונא (49:11, 62:11), on two occasions תוקף (33:17, 59:12), and once it uses נכס (49:7), בית מקדש (84:4), בית מדרש (84:4).

אמר גבריאל²⁷⁶ רבה דציון לאומא בבליית [א] בזויתא טב ליה די
 שלם לך ית גמלך ביש די גמלת
 לנא:
 טב ליה דאחיד ומרטיש ית טלייך על כיפא:

Michael prince of Jerusalem said, "Remember O Lord the people of Edom on the day that they destroyed Jerusalem saying, 'Destroy! Destroy unto her foundations.'"

Gabriel²⁷⁷ the prince of Zion said to the Babylonian nation, the plunderer, 'Blessed is he that repays you for the evil deeds you did to us. Blessed is he who takes hold and smashes your children against a stone.'

The addition of Michael and Gabriel as the speakers in vv.7–9 is of interest here,²⁷⁸ and, as Bernstein has pointed out, is unparalleled in rabbinic literature.²⁷⁹ These angels first appear in Daniel 8:16; 9:21; 10:13,21; 12:1. In these passages Michael is described as שר and Gabriel איש; whereas Tg.Ps. uses רב for both of them in Ps 137.²⁸⁰ In rabbinic literature both angels also appear and are cited as appearing with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the furnace.²⁸¹ There is also a debate whether Michael or Gabriel is the 'protector of Israel,'²⁸² which is of interest with regard to the manuscript variations to v.8 and the possible deliberate repeat of Michael in the Breslau manuscript. Such a possibility remains extremely unlikely, but should be kept as one possible explanation.

²⁷⁶ Reading from apparatus.

²⁷⁷ Reading from apparatus. It seems that the repetition of Michael is a scribal error caused by the similarity with v.7, although see below for a discussion on the manuscript differences.

²⁷⁸ For a thorough list of rabbinic passages on these angels (and others) see, R. Margalio, מלאכי עליון, Jerusalem 1945.

²⁷⁹ "Translation Technique," p.343, 1994.

²⁸⁰ רב is used to translate the Hebrew שר in Tg.Ps., although it is not clear that this is why Tg.Ps. uses it here.

²⁸¹ Gabriel in BT *Pes.* 118a; and Michael in *Gen. Rab.* 44:13/16.

²⁸² *Ex. Rab* 18:5.

On 40 occasions angelic beings are referred to in Tg.Ps.,²⁸³ but this is the only occasion where angels are named.²⁸⁴ Such a picture needs to be related to the other Targumim. A. Shinan,²⁸⁵ has clearly set out the way the Targumim of the Pentateuch deals with angels, with Tg.Ps.Jn. inserting them into the text far more than any other Targum, as well as naming angels far more frequently. He suggests that such a situation indicates a 'literary and conceptual relationship' between the Targum and non-rabbinic literature, as opposed to a late date of composition.²⁸⁶ R. Kasher,²⁸⁷ points out that the Tosephtot Targum inserts angels into the text far more frequently than Targum Jonathan. Thus it would seem that Tg.Ps. is more closely related to those Targumim (Ps.Jn. and Tosephtot) that are happy to insert references to angels into their translations.

²⁸³ The word מלאך appears 18 times, 6 occasions translating the same word in Hebrew, 34:8; 35:5,6; 91:11; 103:20; 148:2. Twice it translates אלהים 8:6; 82:6. Once translating אבירים 78:25. Once translating בני אלים 89:7, and twice as an addition paralleling בני אלים 29:1; 89:8. On 4 occasions it is an addition stemming from the Hebrew שמים. Twice it appears as a simple addition 65:2 (not in VA); 68:11. The term מלאכא דמותא occurs on three occasions (89:49; 91:5; 140:12). The transliteration אנגלי occurs on 9 occasions (4 times as an addition stimulated by the Hebrew שמים 50:4,6; 89:6; 97:6. Once it appears as an addition stimulated by the Hebrew מרומים 148:1. Once it is translating אלהים 86:8. Once it is translating בני עליון 82:6. Once it replaces the Hebrew שנאן 68:18, and once as a simple addition 96:1). The term בריתא קדישא that seems to be referring to angelic beings, occurs once as an addition stimulated by the Hebrew שמים in 148:1. On three occasions the Hebrew צבאות/צבא is translated by the root חיל in a context/way that assumes angelic beings 33:6; 89:9; 148:2. On three occasions the Hebrew כרובים occurs in the Psalter and is retained by the Targum (18:11; 80:2; 99:1). The phrase שמשוי תקיפין (Ps 104:4), which from the context seems to imply angels. In addition to these occurrences we have our verses in Ps 137 where the angels Michael and Gabriel are mentioned (although it needs to be noted that this is the only occasion that angels are named in Tg.Ps.).

²⁸⁴ Diez Merino only lists 32 occasions in his summary of haggadic material in VA of Tg.Ps., *Targum de Salmos*, pp.358–359.

²⁸⁵ "The Angelology of the Palestinian Targums on the Pentateuch," *Sefarad* 43.2 (1983), pp.181–198.

²⁸⁶ For Tg.Ps. such a conclusion appears not to hold, as it is clear that it has a close relationship with rabbinic literature (see ch. 4 and ch.8).

²⁸⁷ "Angelology and the Supernal World in the Aramaic Targums to the Prophets," *JSJ* 27.2 (1996), pp.168–191.

We have noted above that there are numerous occurrences of angelic beings in Tg.Ps., but this is the only occasion when the Targum names angels. The question that concerns us is why Tg.Ps. chose to insert them here? Bernstein²⁸⁸ has suggested that ‘theological concerns’ are the motivating factor, with the Targum viewing the cry for vengeance ‘more appropriate in the mouths of angels where they can be understood to represent a judgment on a higher plane, a verdict very different in nature to a human cry for vengeance.’²⁸⁹ This may well be the case. However, we need to research this issue further to see whether there is a related tradition and/or if the Targum has drawn stimulus from other traditions. In this respect a marginal gloss in the Tosephtot Targum to Isaiah 21:5 is of interest:

סדרו פתורא קדם בלטשאצר מלכא דבבל אדליקו בוצינא אכולו
ושתיאו קומו מיכאל וגבריאל תרין רברביא איתפרעו מן מלכותא
דבבבל והבו מלכותא לכורש ודריש מלכיא דפרס ומדי:

Order the table before Beltschazzar king of Babylon, light the candle, eat and drink, Rise up O Michael and Gabriel the two great ones, make retribution on the king of Babylon and give the kingdom to Cyrus and Darius, kings of Persia and Media.²⁹⁰

Clearly the Targumist in this passage has given Michael and Gabriel a specific role in the overthrow of the Babylonian empire, specifically mentioned as an addition in this verse, but explicitly mentioned in the MT in v.9.²⁹¹ Is it possible that this midrashic exegesis, based on

²⁸⁸ “Translation Technique,” p.343.

²⁸⁹ Bernstein also notes the comparative material in *Midrash Tehillim* 121:3 where v.9 is placed in the mouth of God, although the Midrash interprets this Psalm quite differently from Targum.

²⁹⁰ Text from, R. Kasher, *תוספתות תרגום לנביאים*, 1996, p.157. The marginal note found in the manuscript describes the passage as ‘Targum Yerushalmi.’ Also see R. Kasher, “Angelology and the Supernal World in the Aramaic Targums to the Prophets,” *JSJ* 27.2 (1996), p.186 for a brief discussion on this passage. The presence of Michael and Gabriel in connection with this verse also appears in *Gen. Rab.* 63, although without mention of retribution on the king of Babylon. (C.f., *Song of Songs Rab.* 3:2 for an alternative interpretation.)

²⁹¹ It is interesting in this regard to note the Coptic midrash mentioned by M. Seligsohn in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* vol.viii, pp.535–538; where Michael is also given a specific role in the freeing of Israel from their Babylonian captors. An examination of his source (E. Amelineau, *Contes et Romans de L’Egypte Chrétienne* ii. 142ff, Paris, 1888) indicates that in this tradition Michael is portrayed

the presence of שרים in v.5 and its use in Daniel is related to Tg.Ps. 137:7–9? Such a possibility seems likely in that the root שדד appears in both passages (Is 21:2, and Ps 137:8).²⁹² Clearly Tg.Ps. is placing calls for retribution in the mouths of the two angels, whereas in the TT they are encouraged to implement it, as perhaps is Michael in the Coptic Midrash cited in n.291. This does not take away from the relationship however, and it seems safe to suggest that all four texts (including *Gen. Rab.* 63) belong to the same interpretive tradition. The fact that there is a clear exegetical impetus for the insertion of Michael and Gabriel in TT Is 21:5 (and *Gen. Rab.* 63), and not in Tg.Ps. 137:7–9 makes it more likely that TT Is 21:5 is the original version of the tradition and that Tg.Ps. has incorporated it in its translation because of the link made by the root שדד. Thus the inclusion of these angels in Tg.Ps. 137 is a later development of the tradition found in the TT and *Gen. Rab.*

3.3 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has uncovered various points of connection between Tg.Ps. and other parts of the Targum tradition.²⁹³ A number of shared traditions, some unique to the Targumim and others with parallels in rabbinic literature, have been discussed, and on occasions the form of the tradition in Tg.Ps. is more closely related to the stream preserved in the other Targumim than in rabbinic literature.²⁹⁴ The areas of relationship were not confined to one part of the Targum tradition, but links have been exposed with all the differing Targumim, be they Babylonian or Palestinian, of the Torah or the Prophets. Interestingly no specific traditions were shared with other Targumim to the Hagiographa, de-

more as God's agent of salvation ("Je suis aujourd'hui venu vers toi pour sauver ton peuple, car Dieu m'a envoyé pour cela," p.144) rather than retribution as in the Targum above. However, this salvation is also compared to the Exodus from Egypt and thus retribution may be hinted at. It should be noted that no reference is made to Psalm 137 in this text.

²⁹² *Midrash Tehillim* 137:3 contains a midrash that involves angels seeking to comfort God who is crying because of what is happening to the exiles in Babylon, and their subsequent descent to help them carry their burdens. This does not seem to be related in any way to the additions in the Targum or the traditions in TT Is 21:5.

²⁹³ With respect to Churgin's study, this research highlights that comparative material between Targumim needs to be analysed extremely carefully before positing any form of relationship.

²⁹⁴ Whether this is due to genre, knowledge, or preference is difficult to say.

spite the accepted similarity in style and outlook between Tg.Ps. and the Targum of Job. This chapter has also raised the possibility that the author(s) of Tg.Ps. assumed a level of familiarity with other parts of the Targum tradition from his readers, and has thus raised the need for that area of Targum scholarship to be researched on a systematic basis. Only one occasion was posited as a possible example of Tg.Ps. influencing another Targum tradition, which may suggest that it was one of the later Targumim to be translated.

Such a study has highlighted the value of, and need for a comprehensive comparison between Tg.Ps. and the other Targumim.

4. Tg.Ps. AND RABBINIC LITERATURE

This chapter will focus on those parts of Tg.Ps. that display some form of relationship with classical rabbinic literature.²⁹⁵ The discussion will focus upon the nature of the relationship between Tg.Ps. and rabbinic literature, asking whether one can describe it more accurately in terms of targumic subservience, or a creative partnership? Such a question is vital if we are to place Tg.Ps. in its proper exegetical and historical context. Such an analysis will also contribute to the issue of dating Tg.Ps., both as a whole and according to the individual traditions contained within it.

Again as with the previous chapters, there is a need for methodological exactness in suggesting a specific relationship between a Targum and any specific rabbinic text.²⁹⁶ M. Bernstein sets out this requirement, stressing the need to remember that the Targumim are ‘translations’ first and ‘interpretations’ second,²⁹⁷ and thus literal translations cannot be used to suggest relationships with other types of literature.²⁹⁸ Every

²⁹⁵ Included in this study are the Mishna, Tosephta, halachic, and aggadic Midrashim (Tannaitic and Amoraic), and both Talmuds.

²⁹⁶ The simple fact that both types of literature are the results of a complex redactional process, and that the dating of each individual text is fraught with difficulty, should introduce a level of caution to any study.

²⁹⁷ This is not to say that translation is not interpretive even in literal translations, but that one cannot necessarily posit a deliberate translation designed to link in with interpretations found in other types of literature, when that translation is in simple ‘one to one’ correspondence with the Hebrew original.

²⁹⁸ See, M. Bernstein, “The Aramaic Targumim: The Many Faces of the Jewish Biblical Experience,” in G. J. Brooke (ed.) *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp.135–165. See particularly p.149 (n.29) and his discussion on Ex 21:23, TO, and R. Eliezer’s interpretation in BT *Baba Qama* 84a, where he states: ‘I believe that methodologically we should assume that literal translations by a Targum or any other translator should be ascribed to the fact that he is a translator first and a legal exegete second. In other words, if Onqelos intended the view of R. Eliezer to be implied by his translation, we can never know it.’ Such a position is methodologically sound

verse, therefore, in Tg.Ps. must first be analysed in relation to the Hebrew, and in light of any consistent translation technique within Tg.Ps., before any relationship with rabbinic literature can begin to be explored, thus where necessary each section will begin with a brief analysis of the translation given in Tg.Ps.

4.1 Tg.Ps. AND PARALLEL RABBINIC TRADITIONS

This section focuses on those examples from Tg.Ps. that have parallels in rabbinic literature. The examples cited do not simply belong to the same stream of interpretation, but are genuine parallels, i.e., the form of the tradition found in Tg.Ps. does not differ from the example(s) given from rabbinic literature.²⁹⁹ Such particularity is important as too often parallels are cited between texts that point to a similar tradition but are not ‘parallels’ in the true sense of the word.

4.1a Tg.Ps. 1:3 and BT *Avodah Zarah* 19a

MT Ps 1:3

והיה כעץ שתול על פלגי מים אשר פרו יתן בעתו ועלה לא יבול:

And he shall be like a tree transplanted by stream of water who brings forth its fruit in its season and whose leaf does not wither.

Tg.Ps.

ויהי כאילן חיי דנציב על טרופי מוי די אנביה מבשל בעידנה
ואטרפוי לא נתרין וכל לולבוי די מלבלב שגרגר ומצלח:³⁰⁰

and important, although there are occasions where ‘literal’ translations that depart from the normal translation technique of the particular Targum are exegetically significant, and thus the principle outlined by Bernstein cannot be applied universally.

²⁹⁹ Words such as ‘dependence’ are avoided as they communicate a particular concept of relationship that should not be assumed; see pp.113–115 for a discussion of this issue.

³⁰⁰ The addition of חיי (missing in VA and P¹¹⁰), specifying the type of tree to which the righteous is likened, may be designed to emphasize the blessing that comes from a life devoted to Torah. However, it may also be explained in association with a tradition in *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A.34 which describes ten things that are called life, the third being a righteous man:

צדיק נקרא חיים שנאמר פרי צדיק עץ חיים: (משלי יא:ל)

A righteous man is called life, as it says the fruit of the righteous is a tree of life (Prov 11:30).

He will be like a tree *of life* that is planted on channels of water;
whose fruit ripens in season and whose leaves don't fall and every
blossom that sprouts produces berries and succeeds.

נציב is a unique translation in the Targumim of the root שתל (although the Peshitta uses this root as well). Such a translation asserts that the tree was planted and not transplanted,³⁰¹ which on the surface appears a minor change of little significance. Its uniqueness, however, encourages a closer investigation, and a comparison with BT *Avodah Zarah* 19a–b suggests the Targum is taking a stance on an issue that surrounds the interpretation of this verse:

והיה כעץ שתול על פלגי מים (תה' א ג) אמרי דבי רבי ינאי כעץ
שתול ולא כעץ נטוע כל הלומד תורה מרב אחד אינו רואה סימן
ברכה לעולם אמר להו רב חסדא לרבנן בעינא דאימא לכו מלתא
ומסתפינא דשביקתו לי ואזליתו כל הלומד תורה מרב אחד אינו
רואה סימן ברכה לעולם שבקוהו ואזיל קמיה דרבא אמר להו הני

Such an association between the righteous man and a tree of life is rare (although see Psalms of Solomon 14:2–3) and it would appear that some manuscripts of Tg.Ps. 1:3 may belong to this tradition. However, Eusebius in his commentary on Psalms, PG 23, p.77, also connects this verse with a tree of life but utilises Prov 3:18 as his proof text. He makes the link by stating that the meditation of the righteous man would lead to an increase in wisdom, which is described in Prov 3:18 as a tree of life to those who take hold of it, and thus if the righteous man is wise and is likened to a tree that gives fruit he also can be described as a tree of life (also c.f., Jerome's *letters* 53:3 and the *Commentarioli ad.loc.* for a similar association, although Jerome specifies The Tree of Life, and not a tree of life). A similar line of thinking may have been the impetus behind Tg.Ps. adding this word, but the link with the tradition above from *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* seems more likely. E. White, *Critical Edition* Part 2, p.319 cites *Midrash Tehillim* 1:19, and PT *Berachot* 1:1, 2c as parallels to Tg.Ps., neither of which compare the righteous to a tree of life and thus do not shed light on the use of this phrase in Tg.Ps. P. Churgin (p.32), however, cites Tg.Jn. Isaiah 65:22 as a parallel, where the 'days' of God's people are likened to the 'days of the tree of life.' The comparison between the people of Israel and the tree of life may well serve as a comparative text to Tg.Ps. 1:3, although the association is not certain and is less clear than the link discussed above with *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan*.

³⁰¹ שתל both in biblical Hebrew and Aramaic can mean 'transplanted,' as is clear from the Talmudic passage below as well as its use in m. *Maaserot* 5:1; whereas נטע allows for the possibility of 'planted' only. The translation of the parallel verse to this one in Jer 17:8 where the root שתל is preserved in TJ, highlights the probable interpretative nature of our Targum.

מילי סברא אבל גמרא מרב אחד עדיף כי היכי דלא ליפלוג
לישני:³⁰²

He will be like a tree [trans]planted by streams of water (Ps 1:3)
Those of rabbi Yannai said, 'Like a tree transplanted and not like a tree planted, anyone who studies Torah from one teacher will never see blessing.' Rav Hisda, said to his rabbinic students, 'I want to tell you something, but I am afraid you will go and leave me, anyone who studies Torah from one teacher will never see blessing.' They left him and went before Raba who said to them, 'For logical deductions, but for Gemara it is better from one teacher, so as not to fragment opinion.'³⁰³

Here the view of the school of Jannai, that one should learn Torah from more than one teacher, is based upon the root שתל i.e., the righteous man is one that has been transplanted (from one teacher to another) and not one planted (נטע) with one teacher. Tg.Ps., which on occasions has preserved the root שתל in its translation³⁰⁴ has avoided it here in Ps1:3 and used (uniquely) the Aramaic root that it usually uses

³⁰² Both ms. Munich 95 and the Abramson manuscript have Raba 'angry with Rav Hisda' (איכפד רב חסדא).

³⁰³ C.f., *Midrash Tehillim* 1:19 where this line of interpretation is hinted at, although in a positive light: ר' שמואל היה שותל עצמו מחבורה לחבורה לקיים מה שנאמר מלמד השכלתי (תה' קיט צט) R. Samuel used to transplant himself from one (study) group to another, thus fulfilling what it says, I have gained understanding from my teachers (Ps 119:99). Also c.f. *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A.8 where we have the phrase ... שיעשה לו את רבו קבע (...one should provide for himself a fixed teacher); however, no proof text is given in support of this statement, as is true for BT *Eruvin* 53a where we find: בני יהודה גמרו מחד רבה. נתקיימה תורתן בידם בני גליל דלא גמרו מחד רבה לא נתקיימה תורתן בידם. The sons of Judah studied from one teacher and their teaching was established in their hands; the sons of the Galilee did not study from one teacher and their teaching was not established in their hands, (thanks to A. Tropper for this reference). Also see *Midrash Tehillim* 1:11 where the same distinction is made between the two roots but for a completely different and unrelated reason. This last passage from *Midrash Tehillim* has a parallel in m. *Avot* 3:17, although Jer 17:8 is used as the proof text. C.f., M. Aberbach, p.2, "The Relations Between Master and Disciple in the Talmudic Age" in H. J. Zimmerli and I Finestien (eds.) *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* Soncino Press: London, 1967, pp.1–24.

³⁰⁴ Pss 92:14, 128:3. Interestingly, both Aquila and Jerome (*iuxta Hebraeos*) translated Ps 1:3 with 'transplant.'

to translate the Hebrew נטע.³⁰⁵ Such a translation, I would suggest, may well be designed to side with the conclusion attributed to Raba, or more simply, to direct its readers away from reaching a conclusion from this verse similar to the school of Jannai, or R. Samuel or the residence of the Galilee, all of whom it appears studied with numerous teachers, and thus did not see blessing or their teaching established.

4.1b Tg.Ps. 1:5 and m. *Sanhedrin* 10:3

MT Ps 1:5

על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט וחטאים בעדת צדיקים:

Thus the wicked will not stand in the judgment nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.

Tg.Ps.

מטול היכנא לא יזכון רשיעי דינא וחייבין בסיעת צדיקא:³⁰⁶

Thus the wicked will not be acquitted in the judgment, or sinners in the company of the righteous.

The only unusual translation in the Breslau manuscript quoted above is זכי for קום and as a result the verse does not read smoothly as this root does not carry over into the second clause as well as קום. The other manuscripts retain the root קום as well as the root חטא, and add an explicit reference to the Day of Judgment.³⁰⁷ Such a link to the Day of Judgment is far from clear in the Hebrew and thus other traditions of interpretations should be explored.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁵ Pss 44:3; 80:9,16; 94:9; 104:16; 107:37.

³⁰⁶ Note the differences in the apparatus: v.5 יזכון – V,P¹¹⁰ קיימין, VA וחטאי – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ דינא רבא; ביום דינא – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ דינא; ויקומון – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ דינא רבא; וחייבין – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ דינא רבא.

³⁰⁷ The Breslau manuscript may well be referring to the Day of Judgment, although it is far from explicit, in fact one could translate דינא with 'the court.'

³⁰⁸ E. White, *Critical Edition*, p.78 describes the root זכי as a 'technical court term,' and suggests that the Breslau manuscript has sought to avoid 'hyperliteralism.' Taken in isolation from all the other manuscripts and from the interpretive traditions surrounding this verse (see below) such conclusions may be valid. However, it does not solve the problem of how this 'technical court term' carries over to the second part of the verse, or how it relates to the other manuscripts and the midrashic traditions relating to the end time judgment.

The passage below from m. *Sanbedrin* 10:3 (Kaufmann manuscript)³⁰⁹ is of interest in discussing the translations in Tg.Ps:

דור המבול אין להם חלק לעולם הבא ואין עומדים בדין שנ' לא ידון
רוחי באדם לעולם בשגם הוא בשר (בר' ו ג) אנשי סדום אין להם
חלק לעולם הבא אבל עומדין בדין רבי נחמיה א' אלו ואלו אינן
עומדין בדין שנ' על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט (תה' א ה) זה דור
המבול וְחַטָּאִים בַּעֲדַת צְדִיקִים (תה' א ה) אלו אנשי סדום אמרו לו
בַּעֲדַת צְדִיקִים אֵינָן עוֹמְדִין עוֹמְדִין הֵן בַּעֲדַת רָשָׁעִים:

The flood generation have no part in the world to come and do not stand in judgment as it says, My Spirit will not judge³¹⁰ with man forever since he is to flesh (Gen 6:3) The men of Sodom have no part in the world to come but they stand in the judgment. R. Nehemiah says, 'Neither of them stand [in the judgment] as it says therefore the wicked will not stand in judgment (Ps 1:5a) this is the generation of the flood; and sinners in the congregation of the righteous (Ps 1:5b) these are the men of Sodom.' They said to him, 'They don't stand in the congregation of the righteous but they do stand in the congregation of the wicked.'³¹¹

³⁰⁹ The Kaufmann manuscript appears to be the more original form of the Midrash. The printed additions add a section on the generation of the division (at the tower of Babel) between that on the flood generation and the men of Sodom. Such an insertion breaks up the flow of the midrash, and especially R. Nehemiah's dispute with the Sages. It would seem (see n.311) that the addition is due to a desire to harmonise the number of 'generations/peoples' that appear in the related traditions.

³¹⁰ I have translated the Hebrew ידון as it is used in this midrash. What the original meaning was is unclear, although the most common translation amongst those in late antiquity was 'dwell.' See BDB p.192b for a brief discussion on this point.

³¹¹ This passage is part of an extended cluster of midrashim that begins in 10:1 with: ...ואילו שאין להן חלק לעולם הבא. (Kaufmann ms.). I have only quoted that part of the tradition that has a bearing on our Targum verse. The midrash also appears in Tosephta *Sanbedrin* 13.6ff, although in a more consistent and structured form with each example beginning with אין להם חלק לעולם הבא, and אין חיינן לעולם הבא, thus there is no reference to anyone missing out on the judgment or to Psalm 1:5 and the dispute surrounding its meaning in this midrashic context. Also see BT *Sanbedrin* 107b–109b; PT *Sanbedrin* 10:1, 27c and *Lev. Rab.* 4.1 where aspects of this tradition are repeated, although without specific mention of Psalm 1:5. Only in *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* A 36 does the dispute reappear:

Before we can assess the relationship between this midrash and the different manuscript readings for Tg.Ps. 1:5, we need to outline the salient points of the passage and its structure. The generation of the flood have no part in the world to come and will not appear in the last judgment, conclusions based on the appearance of רוח and the root דין in Gen 6:3.³¹² The men of Sodom have no part in the world to come, although no text is given to support this statement in the Kaufmann

אנשי סדום לא חיין ולא נדונין שנאמר ואנשי סדום רעים וחטאים לה' מאד (בר' יג יג) רעים זה עם זה וחטאים הגילוי עריות לה' זה חילול השם. מאוד שהיו מתכוונין לעבירות דברי רבי אליעזר. רבי יהושע אומר באין הן לדין שנאמר על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט וחטאים בעדת צדיקים (תה' א ה) בעדת צדיקים אינן עומדין אבל עומדין הן בעדת רשעים. רבי נחמיה אומר אפילו בעדת רשעים אינן באים שנאמר יתמו חטאים מן הארץ ורשעים עוד אינם (תה' ק"ד לה):

The men of Sodom neither live [in the world to come] or are judged as it says the men of Sodom are wicked and very sinful before the Lord (Gen 13:13) 'wicked' towards one another (lit. this with this), 'sinners' in uncovering nakedness, 'before the Lord' this is desecrating the name, 'greatly' they purposed to transgress, the words of R. Eliezar. R. Jehoshua says, 'They come to the judgment as it says Thus the wicked will not stand in the judgment nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous (Ps 1:5) They don't stand in the congregation of the righteous but they do stand in the congregation of the wicked.' Rabbi Nehemiah says, 'Even in the congregation of the wicked they do not come as it says Sinners will disappear from the earth and the wicked will be no more (Psalm 104:35).'

Here the dispute over the fate of the men of Sodom is taken a little further. In the passage we find a conflation of both the Mishnaic passage and the Tosephta version of the tradition, along with the specific naming of R. Nehemiah's partner in the dispute (see BT *Sanhedrin* 109a for the association of this mishnah with R. Jehoshua). We also find that R. Nehemiah gives a further reply to the counter interpretation of Psalm 1:5 that we had in the Mishnah. The printed version of the Mishnah, along with the Tosephta have seven groups in this part of the tradition, in line with the midrash in 10:2 that describes four kings and three commoners that don't have a part in the world to come. Both the Kaufmann manuscript and *Aroth de Rabbi Nathan* only have five in their respective lists, but not the same five! For a discussion on this tradition in *Aroth de Rabbi Nathan* see M. Kister, עיונים באבות דר' נתן: נוסח, עריכה ופרשנות, Jerusalem, Hebrew University and Yad ben Zvi, 1998, p.26. *Midrash Tehillim* 5\9 also belongs to this tradition and has 3 kings and 4 commoners who don't stand in the judgment.

³¹² This is not specified in the Kaufmann manuscript although it would be clear to those familiar with rabbinic hermeneutic.

manuscript, whereas Gen 13:13 is used in the printed addition, as it is in *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan*. R. Nehemiah then gives another opinion concerning the men of Sodom, and uses Psalm 1:5 to prove his position.³¹³ It is important to note here that Ps 1:5b refers to the men of Sodom and 1:5a to the flood generation. The sages disagree with his use of Psalm 1:5b to show that the men of Sodom will not stand in the judgment, as it only says that they will not stand with the righteous, and thus they will stand with the wicked and therefore will be in the judgment. It does however accept the association between Psalm 1:5a and the flood generation. Thus the whole dispute is around the interpretation of the root קום when carried over from v.5a to 5b.³¹⁴

Is Tg.Ps. related to this midrashic tradition and the debate over the interpretation of Ps 1:5? Firstly, the addition of 'the great day of judgment' in some manuscripts indicates that, as with the mishnah above, this verse refers to the end time judgment. This point needs to be stressed as on no other occasion in Tg.Ps. is משפט translated as the eschatological Day of Judgment. This uniqueness indicates a relationship between some manuscripts of the Targum and this tradition in the Mishnah.³¹⁵

The Targum manuscripts, as we have pointed out, differ from one another in their respective translations not only in the translation of קום but also in the words used to translate חטאים (see n.306).³¹⁶ Thus we are left with a somewhat strange situation, with one manuscript evincing no specific connection with a tradition with which the other manuscripts seem to be closely allied.³¹⁷ How can such a situation be ex-

³¹³ The use of Psalm 1:5 in this context is clearer from the printed addition as it picks up on the use of חטאים from Gen 13:13 which also has the same word, to conclude that neither the flood generation nor the men of Sodom will stand in the judgment.

³¹⁴ We have already noted in n.311 that the debate carries on in *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* with R. Nehemia bringing Psalm 104:35 to back up his interpretation of Psalm 1:5. Again, the presence of חטאים gives rise to the association.

³¹⁵ It is important also to realise that the Hebrew in itself does not hint at the end time judgment as the term 'justice' is used in parallel conjunction to 'assembly of the righteous.'

³¹⁶ The use of חיבין in the Breslau manuscript suggests a departure from the way this verse is interpreted in m. *Sanbedrin* 10:3 as it loses any connection with Gen 13:13. However, it should be noted that Onkelos uses the root חוב in Gen 13:13, and our Targum may have this in mind.

³¹⁷ This is extremely important. On every other occasion when Tg.Ps. translates the nominal form of חטא all the mss agree with each other, either

plained? It appears that some editorial activity has taken place in some manuscripts of Tg.Ps. with the purpose of conforming the text to the tradition found in the Mishnah.³¹⁸ Thus we are left with one group of manuscripts giving a translation that reflects the midrashic tradition concerning the fate of the flood generation and the men of Sodom,³¹⁹ whereas one manuscript appears to lack any association with this line of interpretation at all.³²⁰

retaining the same root or using חייב. The mss differences for this verse are even more striking when compared to v.1 where all mss agree by translating the root חטא with חייב.

³¹⁸ To suggest that the editorial activity took place in the manuscripts not associated with the tradition in the Mishnah seems to me to be highly unlikely.

³¹⁹ It is also important to point out at this juncture that the rabbinic dispute is over the fate of the men of Sodom and the generation of the flood, in relationship to the last great day of judgment, and in particular over the interpretation of Psalm 1:5b. Psalm 1 is just a tool to be used to justify each point of view in the midrashic context. The Targum manuscripts seem to have adopted positions on this issue and translated the verse accordingly, without adding the midrashic context and thus the verse of the Psalm is transformed into a general statement concerning the fate of all the wicked and not just the men of Sodom.

³²⁰ J. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1994, in his discussion of the LXX version of this verse, has utilised Tg.Ps. and m. *Sanhedrin* 10.3 in his discussion surrounding the verb ἀνίστημι, which appears in the imperfect tense (intransitive) in this verse. Schaper draws from this that it ‘clearly confers the idea of “rising from the dead,” “be resurrected” ... the idea of a last judgment is implied in the Greek of Ps 1,5’ (p.47). Tg.Ps. 1:5 is used to support this conclusion and m. *Sanhedrin* 10:3 is used to support his conclusion on p.47 that ‘...Psalm 1 was regarded as a perfect basis for eschatological speculation.’ It seems that the evidence, both linguistic and textual, brought to support these conclusions do not provide sound basis for such certainty. The LXX may refer to some form of eschatological scenario where the wicked are not judged because they have not been resurrected. However, as the discussion of the related texts above has shown one cannot draw upon them to support such a conclusion for the LXX. In fact Schaper used the Lagarde text that specifically states that the wicked will be judged, a conclusion different from his interpretation of the LXX verse.

Interestingly Aphrahat in his Demonstrations 9 (p.432 in Wright’s edition) juxtaposes this verse with Ps 9:18 and concludes that the wicked are not brought to judgment but are raised only to descend directly to Sheol. Some western Church Fathers, however, stress that the wicked are judged before the great judgment because this verse suggests that they do not stand in the great

4.1c Tg.Ps. 68:10 and BT *Shabbat* 88b

MT Ps 68:10

גשם נדבות תניף אלהים נחלתך ונלאה אתה כוננתה:

You provided³²¹ abundant rain O God, You established your weary heritage.

Tg.Ps.

כד שמעו בית ישראל] ית קל גוברתך פרחו נפשיהון מן יד
אחיתתא עליוהון טלין דתחיותא ומיטרין דרעי ארימתא אלהא על
אחסנתך וכנישתא דאישתלהית אנת אתקנתה:

When the house of Israel heard the voice of your might their souls flew away, immediately you caused the dew of resurrection to descend upon them, You raised up O God choice rain upon your heritage and the congregation that was weary you established.

כד שמעו בית ישראל ית קל גוברתך פרחי נפשיהון מן יד אחיתתא דרעי, על is an addition to the Hebrew, as is טלין דתחיותא and כנישתא. The Targum has split the verse up differently from the Hebrew, by connecting 'his heritage' to the previous clause. In doing so the idea of 'congregation' is added to the second half to provide it with a subject.³²²

This verse includes a fascinating insertion concerning the effects of hearing God's voice on the Israelites: they 'die' (פרחו נפשיהון) and are then immediately 'brought back to life' by God. The association of this verse with the dew of resurrection is found in rabbinic literature,³²³ and

judgment. This verse clearly posed theological problems for its Jewish and Christian interpreters, all of which stemmed from an association between this verse and the last judgment.

³²¹ The meaning of the root נוף is unclear here, although the sense is clear, hence the translation.

³²² Such an addition is both in keeping with the historical context given to the Psalm by the Targum, as well as the biblical understanding of God's נחלה (heritage), which incorporates both the idea of the land of Israel and the people of Israel. Thus although an addition to the Hebrew in terms of language, it is justifiable in terms of theology, see S. Loewenstam, 'נחלתה', in *From Babylon to Canaan. Studies in the Bible and its Oriental Background* Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1992, pp.322–360.

³²³ BT *Hagigah* 12b, Also see discussion by H. Sysling, *Tehiyat Ha Metim*, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1996, pp.158–161 on the 'midrash of the four keys' and the properties of rain and dew in the Bible and rabbinic literature.

the specific occurrence as related in our Targum is found in BT *Shabbat* 88b:

ואמר ר' יהושע בן לוי כל דיבור ודיבור שיצא מפי הקב"ה יצתא נשמתן של ישראל שנא' נפשי יצאה בדברו (שה"ש ה:ו) ומאחר שמדיבור ראשון יצתה נשמתן דיבור שני היאך קיבלו הוריד³²⁴ טל שעתיד להחיות בו מתים ותחיה אותם שנאמר גשם נדבות תניף אלהים נחלתך ונלאה אתה כוננתה: (תה' סח:)

R. Joshua ben Levi said, 'Every time God spoke (lit. every speech that left the mouth of God) the souls of Israel departed, as it says My soul left at His speech' (Song of Songs 5:6) If after the first speech their souls left how did they receive/accept the second speech? [God] caused Dew that will raise the dead in the future to descend and bring them back to life, as it says God shed abroad abundant rain, You established your weary heritage (Ps 68:10).³²⁵

We have noted the linguistic aspects of this midrash and that of the Targum (n.325). However, note how the Targum, in contrast to the text above, retains the presence of 'rain' in the text, but in doing so separates it from the preceding addition concerning the dew of resur-

³²⁴ Ms. Munich 95 has הקב"ה here, which provides a subject for the verb הוריד.

³²⁵ Also see *Pesikta Rabbati* (ed. Ulner) 20:20. The association with dew in this verse of Psalms is initially confusing as the Hebrew only mentions rain. However, the last part of the verse, which speaks of a 'weary heritage' being established seems to be the impetus for the idea of resurrection, which is clearly linked with dew in rabbinic literature (see n.323). In addition, it is interesting to note that the root נזף in Ethiopic has the meaning of 'distil, drop like dew' (*BDB* p.631b). Combine this with its unusual use in this verse, and we may have another impetus for this interpretation (i.e., if the Ethiopic preserves a meaning of this root which was known to the rabbis, and that this meaning was being employed here). The root נזף was also employed by Ben Sirah in 43:17 in association with snow: יניף שלגו וכארבה ישכון דרתו; however, it is important to note that in the later Hebrew text of Ben Sirah found at Masada we have: כרשף יפרח שלגו. Tg.Ps. has, however, translated with the root רום, which is somewhat unusual when one thinks that rain usually comes down, although it is a usual translation of the root נזף (see for example, TO, TJ Ex 29:24,26; Num 8:13). In the addition to the text we find both פרח and נחת and so the translator may, in utilising this interpretive tradition, also be seeking to communicate the underlying meanings and words of the Hebrew as much as possible. If this is the case then it is a good example of the sophisticated nature of the translation.

rection. In fact the structure of the Targum of this verse could be seen as interpretation + proof text, similar to the structure of the midrash above, but without the named authority, the proof text from Song of Songs, and the discussion surrounding the tradition. The translator has clearly been able to include an existing tradition into his translation that contributes to the overall context and interpretation that he is providing for the whole Psalm.

4.1d Tg.Ps. 81:4 and BT *Rosh Hashanah* 34a³²⁶

MT Ps 81:4

תקעו בחדש שופר בכסה ליום חגנו:

Sound the Shofar in the new moon, on the set time for the day of our festival.³²⁷

Tg.Ps.

תקעו בירחא דתשרי שופרא בירחא דמתכסי יומי חגי'א דילנא:

³²⁶ C.f., S. Loewenstamm, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1992, pp.44–52 for a discussion on this Psalm in its biblical context, and in particular its relation to the Exodus tradition, a link clearly developed in its own way by Tg.Ps.

³²⁷ כסה is difficult, as the root means cover, yet it is vocalised as in כסא in Prov 7:20, which is commonly translated as ‘full moon’ (although this is an Hapax Lagommenon). I have followed a traditional interpretation found in BT *Sanhedrin* 96b where Ps 81:4 is cited as a proof text to illustrate that כסא in Prov 7:20 means ‘time’: אין כסא אלא זמן (also see Rashi and Ibn Ezra to Ps 81:4 where כסה is translated as a determined time/date: יום מועד קבוע). C.f., the AV translation: ‘Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day.’ It appears clear that the New Moon festival of the seventh month is referred to here (see. Lev 23:23–25, Num 29:1–6, and Neh 8:1–12) as this is the only new moon festival that requires the sounding of the Shofar. Thus to translate כסה in the subsequent clause as ‘full moon’ is confusing, and ignores both the context, and the juxtaposition with חדש in the first clause that would indicate the same festival is being referred to. S. Freehof, “Sound the Shofar—‘Ba Kesse’ Psalm 81:4,” *JQR* 64 (1973–4), pp.225–228 has suggested the following translation: ‘Sound the Shofar on the New Moon; in the dark of the moon for (fixing) the date of our festivals.’ Such an attempt seeks to solve the difficulties, but in doing so has departed from the Hebrew text, although the meaning may not be far from the original context of the Psalm. C.f. M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985, p.149, who argues for 2 distinct lunar phases.

Sound the Shofar in the month *of Tishrei*, when the moon that is *concealed*, the days of our feasts.³²⁸

דְּתִשְׁרִי is an addition to the Hebrew that identifies in which month to blow the shofar.³²⁹ בִּרְחָא דְּמַתְכְּסִי translates בכסה.³³⁰ This translation, therefore, contains both an etymological translation based on the root כסה (to cover, conceal) and one ‘traditional’ meaning of the word based on both the context of the verse and the parallelism within it that juxtaposes חדש and כסה (c.f., n.327).

The reference to the month of Tishrei in v.4 comes from the Psalm itself, in that the new moon festival in the seventh month is the only one in which the Shofar is blown (see Lev 23:23–25, and n.327). Rabbinic literature also makes this identification in interpretations of this verse. The text below from *Rosh Hashanah* 34a clearly illustrates this connection:

תקעו בחדש שופר בכסה ליום חגינו (תה' פא ד) אי זהו חג
שהחדש מתכסה בו הוי אומר זה ראש השנה...³³¹

Sound the Shofar on the new moon, on the set time for the day of our festival (Ps 81:4), which is the festival on which the new moon is concealed? As it says, this is Rosh Hashanah...³³²

³²⁸ D. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, translates this verse: Blow the trumpet *in the month of Tishri, in the month when the days of our feasts are concealed*: The verb here (concealed) is in the singular, and therefore month/moon needs to be its subject; this becomes clearer when this verse is compared to rabbinic interpretations surrounding this verse (see below).

³²⁹ The LXX has: ἐν νεομηνίᾳ (new moon), as does the Peshitta (ܠܝܠܝܬ ܕܢܝܚܐ), the Gallican Psalter, and Jerome (*in neomenia*); whereas both Aquila and Symmachus have: ἐν πάσῃ νεομηνίᾳ (in every new moon) all of which lack the specificity of the Targum.

³³⁰ The Peshitta has ܠܝܠܝܬ ܕܡܢܚܐ (full moons), Aquila and Symmachus have πανσελήνῳ (full moon), Jerome has *medio mense* (middle of the month), whereas the LXX and Vulgate have εὐσημῳ (conspicuous) and *In insigni* (marked out) respectively, which is interesting when compared to the discussion above in n.327.

³³¹ Also see *BT Sanhedrin* 11b, *Betzā* 16a, *Lev. Rab.* 29:6, *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* 23:6. This verse is also repeated in *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* דפסחא 14, and *Tanhuma* בא 9 where the future redemption of Israel is said to take place in Tishrei.

³³² This phrase, ‘the moon is concealed,’ refers to Rosh Hashanah because this festival falls at the beginning of the month at the time when the majority

Clearly this interpretation has influenced the Targum, specifically in the use of the passive form of the root כסה alongside the addition of בירחא. It would seem fair to conclude that בירחא דמתכסי is the Targum's way of including the phrase שהחדש מתכסה בו, found in the rabbinic question above. Tg.Ps. however develops the following verses in a somewhat different way from other traditions as will be seen in section 4.2e.

4.1e Tg.Ps. 82:1–2 and *Tanhuma* משפטים 6³³³

MT Ps 82:1–2

מזמור לאסף אלהים נצב בעדת אל בקרב אלהים ישפט:
עד מתי תשפטו עול ופני רשעים תשאו סלה:

A Psalm of Asaph, God stands in the divine assembly³³⁴ in the midst of gods He judges.

How long will you judge unjustly, and favour the wicked?.

Tg.Ps.

תושבחה על ידא דאסף אלהא שכינתיה שריא בכינשת צדיקא
דתקיפין באוריתא במצע דיינין דקשוט ידון:
עד אימתי רשיעיא תדונן שקר ואפי רשיעיא תסבון לעלמין:

Praise by the hand of Asaph: God, *His Shekinah* dwells in the congregation of *the righteous who are mighty in the law*; in the midst of judges *of truth* He will judge.

How long O wicked will you judge falsely and favour (lit. lift up the face of) the wicked? (forever).

Verse 1 in the Targum clearly states that God's Shekinah dwells amongst two groups of people: Torah scholars and judges of truth (i.e., truthful judges). Such additions are not wholly text-generated and thus one must examine the many parallels in rabbinic literature, to see where Tg.Ps. fits in the interpretive tradition.

of the moon is completely concealed from sight. All other festivals that are celebrated in the month of Tishrei occur later in the lunar cycle when the moon is not particularly concealed from sight. Jerome, *Homilies in Psalms*, relates Ps 81 to the feast of Tabernacles.

³³³ For a detailed study on the Jewish interpretation of Psalm 82 see my M.A. Thesis *The Jewish Interpretation of Psalm 82: A Study in the Origins and Development of Midrash* Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000 (unpublished).

³³⁴ אל עדת אל could also be translated as 'assembly of El'

Tannaitic and Amoraic literature associate **עדת אל** with those who study Torah, and **אלהים** with judges. The examples below are from the *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* (Horowitz and Rabin) 11, and *Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai* 20:

מכאן אמרו כל עשרה בני אדם שנכנסין לבית הכנסת שכינה עמהם, שנאמר: אלהים נצב בעדת אל. (תה' פב:1) ומנין אפלו שלשה שדין שנאמר: בקרב אלהים ישפט. (תה' פב:1) ומנין אפלו שנים שנאמר: אז נדברו יראי ה' איש אל רעהו (מלאכי ג:16) ומנין אפלו אחד שנאמר: בכל המקום אשר אזכיר את שמי אבוא אליך: (שמות כ:24)

From here they said, 'Every ten men that enter the synagogue, the Shekinah is with them, as it says: God stands in the divine assembly (Ps 82:1). And from whence does it say with even three that are judging? In the midst of gods He judges (Ps 82:1). And from whence does it say even with two? Then those who feared the Lord spoke one with another (Malachi 3:16). And from whence does it say even one? In every place that I³³⁵ cause my name to be remembered I will come to you (Ex 20:24).'

אמר ר' חנניה בן תרדיון מנ' לשלשה שיושבין ועוסקין בתורה שהשכינה שורה בהם שנ' אלהים נצב בעדת אל. (תה' פב:1) ר' חלפתא איש כפר חנניה אומר משמו מנ' לשנ' שנ' אז נדברו יראי ה' (מלאכי ג:16) אחד מנ' שנ' בכל המקום אשר אזכיר את שמי... (שמות כ:24)

Hananiah ben Tradion said, 'From whence does it say that when three are sitting and studying Torah, the Shekinah dwells with them? God stands in the divine assembly (Ps 82:1).' Rabbi Halphta from the village of Hananiah said, 'From whence does it say two

³³⁵ C.f., TN, FT_v, GT (p.271), and the Peshitta to Ex 20:24, all of which have the second person, whereas the MT has the singular form. Y. Maori, *Jerusalem, Magnes*, 1995, p.82 suggests the source for these 'readings' is the uncommon interpretive technique of changing letters in complete words. In doing so he rules out the possibility of an interpretive tradition influencing the transmission of the text or the possibility of a different textual version. A simpler solution would be that the phrase 'I cause my name to be remembered' was interpreted as God causing individuals to remember his name, and thus it was transmitted as 'you remember...' Therefore the understanding/interpretation of the text eventually became the text in these 'translations' (c.f., Tg.Ps. 68:19 and the discussion in ch.7.1a).

[studying]?' Then those who feared the Lord (Malachi 3:16). From whence does it say one? In every place that I cause my name... (Ex 20:24)³³⁶

One cannot explicitly associate the Targum with either one of these passages (or their parallels),³³⁷ despite their obvious influence. The Targum however, has clear links with a variety of traditions (midrashic and otherwise) in coming to the translation it has.³³⁸ We have already noted the similarity between the Targum and Aquila,³³⁹ yet this description of those 'mighty in Torah' does not appear in any of the rabbinic traditions surrounding this verse.³⁴⁰ As for the concept of the Shekinah dwelling with 'judges of truth,' this is not found in the passages above or their parallels. In fact these passages affirm God's presence with all judges, as do other passages using Ps 82:1 in a judicial context.³⁴¹ Amoraic literature however, interprets this verse conditionally, as the passage below from *Tanhuma* משפטים 6 clearly demonstrates.

א"ר שמואל בר נחמני אמר רבי יונתן כל דיין שדן דין אמת לאמתו
משרה שכינה בישראל שנאמר אלהים נצב בעדת אל. (תה' פב:)
וכל דיין שאינו דן דין אמת לאמתו גורם לשכינה שתסתלק שנא'
משוד עניים מאנקת אביונים עתה אקום וגו'... (תה' יב: 6)

³³⁶ Also see: *Avoth* 3:5 (Kauffman and Albeck), *Avoth* 3:2 (Kauffman), BT *Berachot* 6a, *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* p.36. The passage from *Avoth* 3:5 (Albeck) seems to be the later version of this tradition; for a full discussion on the tracing of its development see M. Kister, נוסח, עריכה, נתן. עיונים באבות דר' נתן, pp.146–149. Also see *Gen. Rab.* 48:7 and *Tanhuma* (Buber) 4 וירא p.86 for other connections between this verse and those who study Torah.

³³⁷ This is patently clear when one notices that the only two versions of the tradition that include the Shekinah dwelling with judges (*Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* and BT *Berachot* 6a) do not include the concept of God's Shekinah dwelling with those studying when referring to Ps 82:1a.

³³⁸ I envisage an individual aware of a variety of oral traditions, not written ones.

³³⁹ See ch.2.3c.

³⁴⁰ In fact the passage from *Tanhuma* (Buber) 4 וירא, has God's Shekinah standing over those as young as three and four, who clearly can not be considered as being mighty in Torah yet.

³⁴¹ Tosephta (Liberman) *Sanhedrin* 1:8 quotes Ps 82:1 as a warning that judges should remember that God is present with them when they are judging. There is, however, in this passage, no distinction made between good and bad judges, but rather that all judges should remember who it is that is present when they judge.

R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, R. Jonathan said, 'Every judge that judges truthfully causes the Shekinah to dwell in Israel, as it says: God stands in the divine assembly (Ps 82:1) and every judge that does not judge truthfully causes the Shekinah to depart [from Israel], as it says: Because of the oppression of the poor, because of the sighing of the needy, now I will arise...' (Ps 12:6)³⁴²

The equity displayed by Israel's judges either encouraged or hindered God's dwelling with Israel, and thus this passage serves to communicate the considerable responsibility both before God and the nation of Israel, that is given to those who are judges. It is probable therefore that Tg.Ps., which has God dwelling only with truthful judges, represents the intermediate stage in the development of this tradition, which begins with God's presence amongst judges and eventually develops into God dwelling with all Israel on account of truthful judges.

In light of the interpretations and additions to v.1 the translator presented himself with the dilemma of linking vv.1–2, which in the biblical context do not represent a change of characters.³⁴³ This problem is solved by adding 'the wicked' to v.2.³⁴⁴ Thus the Targum presents a

³⁴² Also c.f., BT *Sotah* 47b, where the Shekinah is removed from Israel because of the whisperings that pervert justice in court. Although a similar idea to the *Tanbuma* passage and Tg.Ps., it is not directly related to them. (The parallels in *Tosephta* [Lieberman] *Sotah* 14:3–4, p.236 should be noted, especially as they do not use Psalm 82:1.) One should note the manuscript differences shown below.

משרבו לוחשי לחישות בדן ריבה (רבה—כתב יד אוקספורד) חרון אף
ונסתלקה שכניה מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל. (כתב יד אוקספורד וכתב יד רומי)

Note how the Oxford and Rome manuscripts of BT *Sotah* 47b are clearly related to the Erfurt manuscript of the *Tosephta*, as is the printed version of the Talmud. Also compare *Tanbuma* משפטים 4, p.98, where Psalm 82:1 is used to show that the *Shekinah* departs because of **מכיר פנים במשפט**.

³⁴³ The biblical text is best read as God standing in the divine assembly, judging those gods present in the assembly for the injustices described in vv.2–4. Therefore the assembly within which He is standing is made up of those gods who have executed injustice against the weak and poor who have fallen under their charge. See my M.A. thesis, *op. cit.*, pp.5–9 for a fuller discussion and related bibliography on the biblical context of the Psalm.

³⁴⁴ The Targum therefore presents an interesting assessment of the nature of the wicked and the righteous: the righteous are those who are mighty in Torah, whereas the wicked are those who oppress the poor and do not understand the law. For a thorough treatment of the righteous and wicked in Tg.Ps. see M. Bernstein, "The Righteous and the Wicked in Targum Psalms" *JAB*

picture of God's Shekinah dwelling amongst Torah scholars and just judges judging the wicked who are clearly separate from the assembly of the righteous described in v.1.

Clearly the danger of unacceptable interpretations that could arise from such verses stimulated the proliferation of exegesis surrounding Ps 82:1–2. Tg.Ps. had the same concern and produced a translation that was in keeping with existing traditions surrounding these problematic verses.

4.1f Tg.Ps. 82:6–7 and *Sifre Devarim* 306

MT Ps 82:6–7

אני אמרתי אלהים אתם ובני עליון כלכם:
אכן כאדם תמותון וכאחד השרים תפלו:

I said, 'You are gods, sons of the most high all of you.'
But as man you shall die, and like one of the princes you will fall.

Tg.Ps.

אנא אמרית הי כמלאכיא אתון חשיבין והיך אנגלי מרומ[א] כולכון:
ברם בקושטא היך בני נשא תמותון והיך חד מן רברבניא תיפלו:

I said, 'You are *considered like* angels, all of you are *like* angels on high.'
But *in truth* as humans you will die, and like one of the great men you will fall.

Tg.Ps., through the additions **היך...חשיבין**, and the translation of **אלהים** and **בני עליון** in an angelic context,³⁴⁵ has attempted to direct his readers away from a potentially dangerous literal reading of this verse. In doing so the Psalm no longer speaks of the demotion and death of the divine beings judged by God for their ill treatment of the poor and needy, rather the failure of the wicked and its consequences—instead of being like the heavenly creatures they become like all other men, even great men, and die. Such an interpretation appears strange, as surely the righteous die as well. However, it becomes clearer when compared to a rabbinic tradition connected to these verses. The text below from *Sifre Devarim* 306 presents a view on the ontological nature of man:

3.1–2 (2001), pp.5–26. However, he only briefly refers to Ps 82:1–2 (pp.12 and 14) in relation to Targumic technique and does not develop its significance or relation to rabbinic literature.

³⁴⁵ See ch.3.2c for a detailed discussion on angels in Tg.Ps.

R. Simai used to say, 'Both the soul and body of creatures created from heaven are from heaven. Both the soul and body of creatures created from earth are from earth, except for man, whose soul is from heaven and body is from earth. Therefore if a man fulfills Torah and the desire of his Father in heaven he is like the heavenly creatures as it says, I said 'You are gods and sons of the most high all of you' (Ps 82:6) but if he does not fulfill Torah and the desire of his Father in heaven, he is like the creatures of the earth as it says, Therefore as man you shall die (Ps 82:7).'³⁴⁶

קטעוֹת קטן מן קטעוֹת קטן מן
 ,מִתְחַבֵּר קטן מן קטן מן קטן

The similarity is clear, although there is no reference to Ps 82. Aphrahat, in his Demonstration ‘On the Messiah that He was the Son of God’ has the following comment on these verse:

The name of deity was given as a great glory in the world, and to whom-ever God wishes he bestows it on him.

Aphrahat's interpretation of this verse is striking in its similarity in thought and language to our passage in *Sifre*, as well as rabbinic interpretations concerning Israel and this verse. The fact that Aphrahat and Ephrem relate this verse to humans is surprising when one considers that the Peshitta translates this Psalm with regard to angels and God's judgment upon them. Clearly there is a tradition of interpretation surrounding these verses that has a history inde-

The similarity with Tg.Ps. is clear (specifically the ‘considered like’ of Tg.Ps. and the ‘he is like’ of *Sifre*) and thus it seems safe to conclude that vv.6–7 do not simply reflect a linguistic adaptation of the Hebrew but a theological one based upon rabbinic traditions surrounding the text.³⁴⁷ It would also appear that the translator expected some knowledge of this tradition in his readers, without which the Targum cannot be fully understood.

Interestingly, Tg.Ps. includes the earlier ontological tradition highlighted above from *Sifre*, rather than the development of that idea in discussions surrounding the events at Mount Sinai.³⁴⁸ As such, a coherent interpretation of the whole Psalm was achieved, as is required in the art of Targum.

4.1g Tg.Ps. 92:1 and *Qoheleth Rab.* 1:2

MT Ps 92:1

מזמור שיר ליום השבת:

A Psalm, a song for Shabbat.

Tg.Ps.

שבחא ושירה דאמר אדם קדמאי על יומא דשבת[א]:

The Praise and song *that Adam said about* Shabbat.

דאמר אדם קדמאי is an addition to the Hebrew that clearly attributes authorship of this Psalm to Adam and thus places the Targum firmly

pendent of the context found in the Peshitta text, and that has continued despite the way the Psalm was translated. (For Ephrem, see *Hymnen de Fide* 29:1 and 63:8 where he seems to allude to Ps 82:6 and its reference to humans being called gods.) See my M.A. thesis, *op. cit.*, pp.27–29 for further parallels in Jewish and Christian literature.

³⁴⁷ J. Shunary, 'מלאכים' בתרגומי המקרא הארמיים והפשיטתא, in *ספר מאיר* pp.269–276 suggests (p.275) that there is possibly some influence from the LXX on the Targum for this verse. The link with rabbinic interpretations surrounding this verse, however, seem far more probable.

³⁴⁸ Rabbinic interpretations surrounding these two verses became associated, through the extension of such ontological reflection found in *Sifre*, with the events on Mount Sinai, namely, the acceptance of the law and the worship of the Golden Calf. Israel, on their acceptance of the law, were declared ‘gods’ and ‘sons of the Most High’; whereas on their worship of the calf they once again returned to their mortal state.

within an established rabbinic tradition.³⁴⁹ There is, however, within that tradition, diversity in thought as to the circumstances that surrounded Adam composing this song. The question we shall address is to which, if any, does the Targum relate? *Len. Rab* 10:5 and parallels³⁵⁰ develop a midrash over the conversation between God and Cain in Gen 4:12–17 that has Cain repent and receive only half of his punishment on account of his repentance.³⁵¹ When Adam finds this out he strikes himself because he didn't know the power of repentance and then composed Psalm 92.³⁵² *Pesikta Rabbati* 46.4, however, has Adam composing this Psalm in praise of Shabbat (מקלס לשבת) after he was saved from judgment on account of Shabbat.³⁵³ The passage below from *Qobeleth Rab*. 1.2 is very similar:

א"ר ברכיה כיון שראה אדם שבחו של שבת שהמביא קרבן
מתכפר לו התחיל משורר עליה להקב"ה שבח ומזמור הה"ד מזמור
שיר ליום השבת: (תה' צב א)

R. Berechiah said, 'Because Adam saw the praise/glory of Shabbat he brought a sacrifice that atoned for him. He started to compose about it praise and a psalm to the Lord, as it is written: Psalm a song for the Sabbath day' (Ps 92:1).³⁵⁴

This strand of the tradition appears to be closest to the tradition found in the Targum. The addition of the authorship of Adam in Tg.Ps. is general and unspecific, yet the Targum also replaces the preposition ל

³⁴⁹ *Midrash Tehillim* 1:6 lists Adam as one of ten individuals that wrote some of the Psalms, and in 5:3 it lists Pss 5, 19, 24, and 92 as the ones that Adam wrote (the attribution of Psalm 24 is not in all the manuscripts). Clearly the Targum is not related to this latter tradition as it only attributes Ps 92 to Adam.

³⁵⁰ *Gen. Rab.* 22 (end); *Tanbuma* (Buber) בראשית 10:25; *Pesikta de Rav Kahana*, 24:11.

³⁵¹ C.f., LXX and TN to Gen 4:13.

³⁵² The midrash is based around the ambiguity of Gen 4:12 and whether or not it expresses some sort of remorse; as well as a play on the words *Naf* and *Nod* in Gen 4:12 and 17. The relationship with Ps 92 comes in v.2 where it is read 'confess' and not 'thank.' Some Church Fathers, although in a different context, make the same use of v.2 and the meaning 'confess' (e.g., Origen *In Psalmos* 92; Jerome *Homilies on Psalms* 92).

³⁵³ Also see *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 19.

³⁵⁴ Also see *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* A 1 where the same tradition appears but here three groups of angels descend playing various instruments (c.f., Ps 92:4) and sing the Psalm with Adam.

with על.³⁵⁵ This small change in the particle is significant, thus making Adam sing about Shabbat and not for Shabbat. The passage quoted above has the same specification התחיל משורר עליה. Although only a small similarity it certainly relates our Targum to this stream of the Adam tradition as opposed to the others.³⁵⁶

4.1h Tg.Ps. 137:3–5 and *Pesikta Rabbati* 136a

MT Ps 137:3–5

כי שם שאלונו שובינו דברי שיר ותוללינו שמחה שירו לנו משיר
ציון
איך נשיר את שיר ה' על אדמת נכר:
אם אשכחך ירושלים תשכח ימיני:

For there are captors asked us for words of a song, and those who wasted (?) us mocked, 'Sing us a song of Zion.'³⁵⁷

How can we sing the song of the Lord in a foreign land?

If I forget you Jerusalem, may my right hand forget.

Tg.Ps.

ארום תמן שיילו יתנא בבלאי די שבו יתנא למימר מילי דשיריא
ובזוזנא על עיסק חירוה
אמרין שבחו לנא מן שירתא דהויתון אמרין בציון:
מן יד קטעו ליואי אליגיהון בבכיהון ואמרין הכדין נשבח ית
תושבחתא דה' על ארעא
חילוניתא:
מתב קל רוחא דקודשא ואמרה דאין אנשיינא לך ירושל[ם]
אנשייה ימיני

Because there, *the Babylonians* who had taken us captive, asked us to say words of songs, and our plunderers for fun (lit. on account of joy)³⁵⁸ said, 'Give praise for us from the songs you used to say in Zion.'³⁵⁹

³⁵⁵ The LXX has εἰς τὴν and Jerome has *in die*.

³⁵⁶ I have yet to find any Christian author who attributes authorship of this Psalm to Adam, although Origen in *de Principis* 6.11 says that Adam was also found to have prophesied some things.

³⁵⁷ The meaning of תוללינו is unclear, hence the question mark.

³⁵⁸ Reading from apparatus.

³⁵⁹ See ch.2.3e for a discussion on the Targum's translation of this verse.

Immediately the Levites bit off (lit. mutilated) their thumbs with their teeth saying, 'How can we sing the praise of the Lord on profane land?'³⁶⁰

The voice of the Holy Spirit replies, 'If I forget you Jerusalem may I forget my right hand.'

The exegetical elements in this translation of Psalm 137 will be familiar to anyone who is aware of the various interpretations surrounding this Psalm in Jewish literature.³⁶¹ However, a closer investigation of the Targum text in relation to the Midrashim and other Jewish interpretations needs to be made in order to assess their relationship.

The Targum, in agreement with many rabbinic passages,³⁶² specifically adds the Levites as speakers in v.3.³⁶³ However, the addition of the Levites' self-mutilation in v.4, is only found in *Midrash Tehillim* 137:5, *Pesikta Rabbati* 136a, and the Targum.³⁶⁴ The salient passage from *Pesikta Rabbati* reads as follows:

ושלטו בנפשותם ונתנו אליהם ידיהם לתוך פיהם ומרצעים ומקצעים
אותם:

³⁶⁰ J. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House* Harper, New York, 1990, p.188 has suggested that this can be translated, "in an unholy land," thus solving the potential problem of ruling out singing to the Lord in any foreign land. Note however, that the use of *חילוניתא* to translate *נכר* is only repeated on one other occasion in the Targumim—Ps.81:10. On all other occasions the Targumim use either *עממא* or *נוכרא* (c.f. n.370).

³⁶¹ For a comprehensive study on the development of the interpretive traditions surrounding this Psalm in Jewish literature, see J. Kugel, *op. cit.* Also see R. Kirschner, "Two responses to Epochal Change: Augustine and the Rabbis on Psalm 137 (136)," in *VC* 44.3 (1990), pp.242–262. This latter article is selective in the rabbinic interpretations discussed, and it seems questionable to place them in the context of a response to 'Epochal change' considering the historical development in the interpretations and their interrelatedness as outlined by Kugel in the article above.

³⁶² See *Pesikta Rabbati* 144a and parallels.

³⁶³ Kugel, *op. cit.*, p.208 n.29 notes that many modern exegetes make the same association.

³⁶⁴ It also occurs in *אוצר מדרשים* but this is outside of our field of study. It should also be pointed out that the passage in *Midrash Tehillim* seems to be a conflation of two passages in *Pesikta Rabbati* (136a and 144a). Note that *Midrash Tehillim* chs.119–150 come from a much later period than the rest of the book, and was in part copied from the *Yalkut*. See S. Buber, *מדרש תהלים*, pp.4–5, and so Tg.Ps. pre-dates it.

They mastered themselves, put the thumbs of their hands in their mouths and crushed them and mutilated them.³⁶⁵

On first appearance the linguistic differences between this passage and Tg.Ps. seem to rule out a specific relationship. However, later on in the narrative the Levites show their captors their fingers explaining that they can't possibly play their harps. In this passage the passive form of the root קטע is used, as it is again when God responds to such loyalty in the exposition leading up to v.5. Thus it is quite probable that the Targum is specifically related to this stream of tradition, both contextually and linguistically.³⁶⁶

The addition of the Holy Spirit in v.5 is both in keeping with this tradition and divergent from it. In all the extant interpretations in the Midrashim it is God (הקב"ה) who replies to the Levites' courage, whereas in the Targum it is the Holy Spirit.³⁶⁷ Why this change is made is unclear, although the use of 'voice' and 'Holy Spirit' may have been an attempt to soften slightly the anthropomorphic nature of the Targum.³⁶⁸

In v.4 we have already noted that the Hebrew נכר is translated in a somewhat unusual fashion. This translation has only one other parallel and that is in Ps 81:10, where it is used in a warning to Israel against idolatry. Such a comparison may suggest that the targumist wants the connection to be made, so that the request for a song should be viewed as a request to take part in some form of idolatry.³⁶⁹ Tg.Ps. portrays the Levites' refusal as an act of faithfulness and fidelity to God. If such a scenario is correct it once again suggests a degree of sophistication in the way the translator sought to convey his interpretation of the Psalm, as well as the degree of sophistication expected from his readers.³⁷⁰

³⁶⁵ The passage in *Midrash Tehillim* only uses the verb רצץ and uses עצם in place of נפש, but is the same in all other respects.

³⁶⁶ The Targum, however, only adds those exegetical aspects that serve to expand the text into an understandable narrative, and thus details of the context of the request, which are supplied in various exegetical asides in the midrashim are ignored by the translator.

³⁶⁷ Bacher, "Das Targum zur den Psalmen," *MGWJ* 1872, p.415 notes that the Holy Spirit is also specified in *Yalkut Shimoni* 874.

³⁶⁸ Admittedly, if this was the case it doesn't work, as the text as it stands is as anthropomorphic as any in the Targum.

³⁶⁹ C.f., *Pesikta Rabbati* 144a where Nebuchadnezzar requests they sing before him as they sang before their God.

³⁷⁰ Kugel (*op. cit.*, pp.195ff), makes a similar claim in relation to *Paraleipomena Ieremion* 7:24–35 and the cry of those being crucified—"Have mercy on

All these examples display a clear link with the various streams of interpretation surrounding Ps 137 in rabbinic literature, and it seems that the translator expected some knowledge of these traditions in his readers and thus felt able to refer to them sometimes explicitly, and on other occasions more obliquely.

4.1i Summary

This section has highlighted numerous parallels between Tg.Ps. and rabbinic literature. Two examples were also highlighted where Tg.Ps. seems to specifically side with traditions connected to the Psalms over and against opposing traditions connected to the same chapter and verse. If one accepts the above suggestion then one has to posit a translator, familiar with a tradition, creatively embedding within the text of the Targum a translation that directs his reader in how to read and understand the Hebrew in a very specific way. Such a situation suggests a far more confident and creative role for the translator, and sheds light on how Tg.Ps. could have functioned as a bridge that served as a link between the written and oral Torah, and guided its readers on a very gentle path to tradition.

Such a situation inevitably raises the question of precedence. Historically it has been an assumption among scholars that traditions found in rabbinic literature must take precedence over those in the Targumim, which are portrayed as being slavishly dependent upon rabbinic traditions.³⁷¹ Such a situation lacks any methodological basis and as a result A. Shinan attempted to outline some methodological considerations for such questions.³⁷² He lists characteristic features such as (i.) Literary

us god Zar,” in relation to Psalm 44:11–13. It is interesting in this regard to note that the only other Psalm that contains the phrase **לֹא זָר** is Psalm 81:10. The Targum is clearly doing something different from this text but the similarity of method and texts is interesting.

³⁷¹ This is the case even with those pentateuchal Targumim that may pre-date rabbinic literature, as is clear from the article by A. Shinan, “The Aggadah of the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Rabbinic Aggadah: Some Methodological Considerations,” in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in Their Historical Context* pp.203–217, which is confined to the Targumim of the Pentateuch. More recently we find a similar view expressed in relation to Tg.Ps., when E. Cook describes it as ‘a deposit of exegetical traditions’ (p.209): “Covenantal Nomism in the Psalms’ Targum” in S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo (eds.) *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period* Brill: Leiden, 2003, pp.203–220.

³⁷² See above n.371.

genre common to rabbinic Midrash, (ii.) Un-targumic expansions preceding the translation of scriptural verses, (iii.) Rare use of rabbinic epithets and (iv.) Traditions originally founded upon a word play in Hebrew, that if present in a Targum all indicate that the source comes from rabbinic literature; whereas traditions that are unique to the Targum will probably have arisen from within the world of the translator. The problem with this list is that it only provides a method for asserting rabbinic precedence when a tradition is shared between the two types of literature, and only allows for Targumic precedence when the tradition is unique to a Targum. Therefore we have only progressed a short distance, and yet remain embedded (albeit with a particular methodological framework) in an historical assumption.

Perhaps the problem lies in the question itself, which is based on too strict a division between the world of Midrash and that of Targum. Again the placing of the Targumim predominantly as the offspring of the synagogue and thus more 'lay oriented' may be responsible for such a situation. Once we accept the likely educational function, which was perhaps the 'original' function of the Targumim, such a contrast and prejudice cannot really continue.

Is it not possible to envisage them being partners as opposed to parent and (somewhat embarrassing) child?³⁷³ Such a situation would rule out any inherent need to determine lines of influence, but would simply place them side by side as part of an interpretive tradition, for which stimuli, stages of development,³⁷⁴ and offshoots can be exposed.³⁷⁵

Such suggestions would only be supportable in the case of Tg.Ps. if examples could be found where the Targum evinced aspects of crea-

³⁷³ I use the term 'embarrassing' as the Targumim are often portrayed as second class when compared to the 'purer' art of Midrash. C.f. P. S. Alexander's article on the Targum of Song of Songs, "Tradition and Originality in the Targum of the Song of Songs," *The Aramaic Bible* D. R. G. Beattie, M. J. McNamara (eds.), pp.318–339, where he states 'but it is surely fair to say that within traditional rabbinic circles a clear hierarchy exists in which Talmud takes pride of place, followed by Midrash, with Targum coming up a long way in the rear (p.321).

³⁷⁴ Clearly the dependence of one layer of a tradition upon an earlier layer can be exposed. See J. Heinman **אגדות ותולדותיהן** as a good example of such work. This, however, does not presume precedence of one type of literature over another.

³⁷⁵ In saying this I remain convinced that there are essential differences between Midrash and Targum, as will be demonstrated later.

tivity within traditions that are found in rabbinic literature. The next section will deal with such passages.

4.2 Tg.Ps. AND CREATIVITY WITHIN RABBINIC TRADITIONS³⁷⁶

This section will deal with those occasions where Tg.Ps. demonstrates a degree of creativity in the way it incorporates traditions of interpretation into its translation of the Psalms.

4.2a Tg.Ps. 68:6–7

MT Ps 68:6–7

אבי יתומים ודין אלמנות אלהים במעון קדשו:
אלהים מושיב יחידים ביתה מוציא אסירים בכשורות אך סוררם
שכנו צחיחה:

A father of orphans and advocate (lit. judge) of widows is God in His holy habitation.

God places the solitary in houses and releases the prisoners into prosperity, but the rebellious dwell in a parched land.

Tg.Ps.

אבהון דיתמי ודייניהון דארמלן אלהא במדור בית שכינת קודשה:
אלהא דמזווג זוגין יחידאין לברזוגא כחדא דאפיק בית ישראל דהו
אסירין במצרים על עובדי אבהתהון כשירין בפומבי ברם פרעה
ומשירתיה דסריבו לשלחותהון שרון צחיין:

A Father to orphans and Judge to widows is God in *His Shekinah's* holy dwelling.

God who joins the solitary to wives in marriage as one,³⁷⁷ who, on account of the worthy deeds of their fathers, brought out the house of Israel who were bound in Egypt, in public procession, whereas Pharaoh and his soldiers, who refused to send them, dwelt in drought.

There are four groups of people in vv.6–7 of the Hebrew who are needy and for whom God acts in specific ways. He is a Father to orphans, an advocate to widows; He places the solitary in houses and releases the prisoners. The fact that the solitary (יחידים) is in tandem with the prisoners (אסירים) would indicate that the text implies more than

³⁷⁶ Note that other chapters have contained discussions that are pertinent to this section, e.g., ch. 3.2a, 7.1b.

³⁷⁷ + to build a house from them, in 2 manuscripts.

just lonely individuals.³⁷⁸ The Targum however, inserts the idea of God acting as a matchmaker bringing individuals together in marriage and making them 'one' (כחדא),³⁷⁹ as well as the Exodus from Egypt on account of the good deeds of the patriarchs (על עובדי אבהתהון (כשירין).

The idea of God acting as a matchmaker in v.7 has many parallels in rabbinic interpretations of this verse. Commonly, v.7a is related to the activity of God since creation,³⁸⁰ and the whole interpretation is placed in the context of a Roman matron's question to R. Yossi concerning God's activity since finishing creation, as the text below from *Gen. Rab.* 68:4, relating to Gen 28:10, illustrates:

ר' יודן בר' סימון פתח אלהים מושיב יחידים ביתה (תה' סח:ז)
מטרונה שאלה את ר' יוסי לכמה ימים ברא הקב"ה את עולמו אמר
לה לששת ימים מאותה שעה מהו עסוק אמר לה יושב הוא ומזווג
זיווגין איש לאשה ואשה לאיש אמרה לו אם הדבר קשה יכולה אני
לעשותו...[ר' יוסי] אמר לה אם הדבר קל בעיניך קשה הוא לפני
הקב"ה כקריעת ים סוף מה טעם אלהים מושיב יחידים ביתה מוציא
אסירים בכושרות: (תה' סח:ז)

R. Yudan in the name of R. Simon opened with God places the solitary in houses (Ps 68:7) A Roman Matron asked R. Yossi, 'How many days did it take God to create his world,' he said to her, 'Six days,' [she said] 'Since then what has He been doing?' He said to her, 'He sits and joins couples, a man to a woman and a woman to a man.' She said to him, 'This is not difficult, I can do it...' He said to her, 'The thing is easy in your eyes but in God's eyes it is as difficult as the parting of the Red Sea.' What is the proof, God places the

³⁷⁸ In fact on occasions the sages interpreted this verse in the light of Abraham and God leading him to, and giving him the land of Israel. Thus 'solitary' would mean 'exiled/wanderer,' which is probably closer to the Hebrew, although clearly there is no hint or allusion to Abraham in this verse.

³⁷⁹ כחדא clearly replaces/interprets the Hebrew בית in two manuscripts. In this regard note m. *Yoma* 1.1 and BT *Shabbat* 118b where בית is used as a term for 'wife.' We have already noted the reading in VA and P¹¹⁰ where we find, 'to build a house for them.' Such a translation/addition may have come from desire to maintain the בית of the Hebrew text, and is a sign of the value with which it was held. Note also that בית in Ex 1:21 has the meaning of 'family'/'household.'

³⁸⁰ Also c.f., TN and Fg.Tg. to Deut 32:4; as well as שירת בני מערבא 47.

The relationship between this tradition of interpretation and v.7 in Tg.Ps. is clear. Nevertheless, it is important to note how the Targum, although utilising this already existing tradition, also adds **בחדא**, a detail I have yet to find connected to interpretations surrounding this verse in rabbinic literature. However, the passage below from *Midrash Tehillim* 68:4 may help in explaining it:

God places the solitary in houses (Ps 68:7) this is what is written: It is not good for man to be alone (Gen 2:18), so he built Eve from Adam's rib and returned her in a bride's litter.

Tg.Ps. picks up on the root כשר in the second half of this verse and inserts the idea of ancestral merit as the reason for Israel's release from Egypt.³⁸² The Hapax Legomenon, בכושרות, is the source of this

³⁸² The doctrine of ancestral merit (זכות האבות) appears in Tg.Ps. on five other occasions, 46:6 has Jerusalem benefit from the merit of the prayers of Abraham; 60:6–7 has those who love and fear God receiving a sign because of the honesty of Abraham, they are delivered because of the merit of Jacob and they are redeemed on account of the piety of Jacob; 84:10 has David appeal, in prayer, for God to look upon the merits of the fathers; 132:10 has God accept Solomon entering the Temple on account of the merit of David. The concept of ancestral merit begins in the Bible, where God's oath to the Patriarchs is appealed to (Ex 6:8, 32:13; Lev 26:42; Deut 1:8, 4:31ff, 7:7; 2 Kings 13:23; Mic 7:18–20; Ps 105:41ff); the obedience of Abraham is given as reason for the

expansion, and is also the impetus for rabbinic explanations of this verse.³⁸³ The closest parallel to the interpretation in the Targum, however, is the quote below from the *Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai* בא p.38, which, along with other interpretations also present in the references in n.383, also adds:

...(תה' סח:ז) [ד"א] בבושרות במעשה כשרים שבהן אלו אברהם
יצחק ויעקב:

...(Ps 68:7) [Another interpretation] 'in prosperity,' by the worthy deeds that were in them, that is Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.³⁸⁴

Clearly the interpretation inserted by the Targum is related to this tradition, although it is impossible to say that it drew specifically upon the *Mekilta* at this point. However, as with the translation of the first part of this verse above, the Targum inserts an idea not present in the extant midrashim related to this verse, i.e., the idea of 'public procession' (בפומבי),³⁸⁵ which appears to be inserted as a contrast to the situation described in the next part of the verse,³⁸⁶ i.e., Pharaoh and his

Exodus (Gen 22:16ff, 26:3ff); and finally God's love for the Patriarchs seems to be appealed to (Deut 9:26ff; 4:37; 10:15; 2 Chron 20:6–7). Also Paul in Romans 11:28 seems to appeal in some way to this idea in declaring that Israel remains beloved by God 'for the sake of/on account of the Fathers.' Considering Paul's earlier statement concerning election (9:10–13) it would seem that his statement in 11:28 refers more to God's oaths to and love for the Patriarchs rather than any merit that is gained by their obedience. Tg.Ps. appears to have a mixture of the above categories, although the merit built up by the Patriarch's good deeds is clearly the most common. For a discussion on ancestral merit in the Targumim, see most recently, M. McNamara "Some Targum Themes," *Justification and Variegated Nomism, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* D. Carson, P. O'Brien, M. Seifred (eds.), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2001, pp.303–356 (especially pp.326–331).

³⁸³ See *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בא 16 (p.62) where the verse is explained with reference to the weather, circumcision, Abraham, the good deeds of Israel, etc; Ex. Rab במדבר 3 where this list is repeated and also includes the merit of Jochabed and Amram whom God bought together and thus gave birth to Israel's redeemer—Moses. Also see Tanhuma במדבר 16; Tanhuma (Buber) במדבר p.8b.

³⁸⁴ C.f., *Num. Rab.* 3:6 and *Midrash Tehillim* 68:4.

³⁸⁵ Stressing the 'stately' nature of their Exodus as opposed to an undisciplined flight, which is of interest when compared to the emphasis on the 'haste' of the whole affair in both Exodus and the Passover aggadah.

tion described in the next part of the verse,³⁸⁶ i.e., Pharaoh and his armies being left in drought (שרון צחיין).³⁸⁷ This is the only occasion that I can find where this word (פומבי) is used in connection to the Exodus in Jewish literature, and as such adds an element of individuality to its interpretation of this verse, as with the addition of כחדא discussed above.

4.2b Tg.Ps. 68:13–14

MT Ps 68:13–14

מלכי צבאות ידדון וידדון בית תחלק שלל:
אם תשכבון בין שפתים כנפי יונה נחפה בכסף ואברותיה בירקרק
חרון:

Kings of armies flee, they flee, and she that tarries at home divides the spoil.

When you lie among the sheepfolds it is as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her pinions with yellow gold.³⁸⁸

Tg.Ps.

מלכוותא עם חיליהון איטלטלו מן פלטיריהון דחכימו איטלטלו מן
מרעיהון וכנישתא דישראל מפלגא עדאה מן שמיא:
אין אתון מלכיא רשיעיא שכיבין בין קילקלתא כנישתא דישראל
דדמיא ליונתא מיטללא בענני יקרא מפלגא ביזת מצראי סימא זקיק
וטיסברייטא מליין אובריזין סנין:³⁸⁹

Kingdoms with their armies were exiled from their palaces, sages were exiled from their pastures³⁹⁰ and the assembly of Israel divided the spoil from heaven.

³⁸⁶ This comparison is already present in the Hebrew text with the juxtaposition of the roots אסר and סרר.

³⁸⁷ Amongst the numerous interpretations of כשרות in *Num. Rab.* 3:6, there is one which suggests that it describes the women who came out of Egypt 'in beauty and like princesses' ביפות וכשרות, thus reading the כ in כשרות as a preposition, and the ש as a ש. Although different from Tg.Ps. in detail there is a similarity in meaning.

³⁸⁸ Translation from *ASV* (1901).

³⁸⁹ Rabbinic literature consistently places angels in connection with v.13, see *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בחדש יתרו 9; *BT Shabbat* 88b; *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* B 44; *Ex. Rab.* 33:4; *Num. Rab.* 11:3; *Dent. Rab.* 7:9; *Qohelet Rab.* 9:11; *Pesikta Rabbati* 15:3. Many of these texts seem to evince the use of a different *Vorlage* from the MT, one which has מלאכי and not מלכי. Such a reading, it should be noted, is also found in a number of manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible.

If you wicked kings lie between the dung hills the assembly of Israel that is likened to a dove will fly in the clouds of glory dividing the spoil of Egypt, refined silver and treasure stores full of refined gold.³⁹¹

Tg.Ps. makes numerous additions and ‘changes’ to the difficult Hebrew text, many of which are necessary considering the metaphoric nature of the Hebrew and the historical context (the Sinai revelation) the Targum gives to this Psalm.

We have already noted the difference in the Targum compared to rabbinic interpretations surrounding v.13 (n.95). The question remains however, as to the identification of the ‘kingdoms with their armies’ who were exiled, and the ‘sages’ exiled from their ‘pastures/knowledge’? The context would imply that it is Pharaoh, along with his armies and sages that the Targum refers to, although the plural ‘kingdoms’ does not fit with the singular identification of Pharaoh.³⁹²

We must however take vv.13–14 together, especially in light of the two additions that parallel one another—**מפלגא עדאה מן שמיא** in v.13, and **מפלגא ביזת מצראי** in v.14. These additions betray an influence from rabbinic midrashim surrounding v.14, which relate the phrase **ביזת** to **אברותיה בירקרק חרוץ** and **ביזת מצרים** to **נחפה בכסף** **הים**.³⁹³ Clearly the Targum has not followed this line of exegesis completely as the second phrase (**בירקרק חרוץ**) is related to the spoil of Egypt and not that from the sea; however, the phrase in v.13 (**עדאה מן שמיא**) may in some way relate to this line of exegesis, but it is given a different phrase, ‘spoil of heaven.’ If this is the case then the identifica-

³⁹⁰ ‘Knowledge’ in 3 manuscripts.

³⁹¹ In 2 manuscripts: Targum Aher: If you wicked kings sleep in your theatres that are compared to dung hills, behold the sons of the assembly of Israel who are likened to the face of doves covered with the words of the law that are likened to silver, and the scholars who are likened to the plumage of a chick in pure refined gold.

³⁹² The use of the perfect tense (**איטלטלו**) prevents these kingdoms from being associated with the kings present in Canaan, which could have been included in the light of Exodus 15 and the references there to the future conquest of the land.

³⁹³ See *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בא 13; *Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai* p.32; *Sifre Devarim* 120; *Ex. Rab.* 81:12; *Tanbuma* 2, לך לך 11, ויחי 5. תרומה, ביזת מצרים relates to the spoil that the Israelites received from the Egyptians as described in Ex 12:35–36, whereas **ביזת הים** relates to the spoil that the Israelites gained when the Egyptians were drowned and all the money and treasures they bought with them came into the hands of the Israelites.

tion of the 'kingdoms,' 'sages,' and 'wicked kings' has to be connected to the Egyptians and Pharaoh, despite the difficulty with the plural forms.³⁹⁴ Here again there is an element of individuality that needs to be explained.

4.2c Tg.Ps. 68:15

MT Ps 68:15

בפרש שדי מלכים בה תשלג בצלמון:

When *Shaddai* scattered kings in it, it [seemed like] snow in Tzalmon.

Tg.Ps.

כד פרסת ארחא על ימי בצלו שדי אמאיך מלכוון ואמטולתא סנין
גיהנם היך תלגא פצא יתה מטולא דמותא:³⁹⁵

When you stretched out the path in the sea, by prayer *Shaddai* humbled kingdoms, for the sake of refining Gehenna like snow he saved her from the shadow of death.³⁹⁶

The Targum and the 'Targum *aher*' suggest in v.15 that Gehenna is cooled down (cleared/refined) on account of the prayers of either the generation of the Exodus (as in the Targum) or the prayers of the priests blessing the people, presumably in the Temple (as in the 'Tar-

³⁹⁴ These forms may reflect a tradition that has more than just Pharaoh chase after the Israelites, perhaps derived from Ex 14:4–5 where in v.4 Pharaoh is mentioned and in v.5 the king of Egypt (clearly Pharaoh in the MT) thus making it possible for the development of such a tradition. I have yet to find another example of this though and so it remains just a possibility at present. Note however that Targumim to Ex 12:31 insert the idea of the 'palaces of the kingdom of Pharaoh'; and the MT Ex 7:11 includes 'wise men' in the story.

³⁹⁵ ת"א מטול היכנא כד פרסין כהניא ידיהון ומברכין עמא – VA, P¹¹⁰ + דמותא – ישראל שדי מסכים עמהון ומלכיא מתכבשין תחותיהון ומטול זכוותהון חוביהון מתחורון היך תלגא וגהנם מצטנן לרשיעיא דבבניהון כד קבילו מרדותא ותבו מעובדיהון בישיא

³⁹⁶ Targum *Aher*: Therefore when the priests stretch forth their hands and bless the people of Israel God agrees with them and kings are conquered under them, and on account of their merit their sins are made white like snow and Gehenna is cooled down for the wicked who in their sons received punishment, and turned from their evil deeds.

gum aher').³⁹⁷ Such interpretations are clearly linked with those in rabbinic literature, although the reasons given by the sages for the cooling down of Gehenna are different.³⁹⁸ Clearly for the Targum the verb פָּרַס stimulates the interpretation proffered, which the 'Targum aher' has simply linked with the prayer of the priests with outstretched hands, whereas the Targum has cleverly interpreted the verb in two ways,³⁹⁹ firstly the stretching forth of a way in the sea (thus keeping close to its Exodus context), and at the same time in connection to prayer (as in the 'targum aher' although in a different context)⁴⁰⁰ that resulted in the humbling of kingdoms and the cooling down of Gehenna. Thus there is a connection in the idea behind the tradition but a difference in the detail.

4.2d Tg.Ps. 80:1

MT Ps 80:1

לִמְנַצַּח אֶל שְׁשָׁנִים עֲדוֹת לְאַסָּף מִזְמוֹר:

For the leader, to *shoshanim eduth* (lilies, testimony) for Asaph, a Psalm.

³⁹⁷ The 'Targum aher' here, as with the previous verse, departs from the specific 'historical' context of the Exodus and relates the verse to more general themes.

³⁹⁸ BT *Berachot* 15b, where the reading of the *Shema* combined with the close attention to its letters causes Gehenna to be cooled down; whereas *Tanbuma* (Buber) בְּרֵאשִׁית, p.9b attributes this cooling effect to the studying of Torah. Also see C. Milikovsky, גִּיהֶנוֹם וּפּוֹשְׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל פִּי סֵדֶר עוֹלָם *Tarbiz* 55.3 (1986), pp.311–343.

³⁹⁹ Probably connected to the two ways one could read the verb in the Hebrew (separate, make distinct, or spread out) depending on whether the final consonant is read as a שׁ or a שׂ, c.f., BT *Berachot* 15b. Although this double interpretation is not immediately clear from the Aramaic text as a ܫ is used, it is important to remember that the Targumim are all preserved for us alongside the Hebrew and not separate or distinct from it, and thus this interpretation would be clear when read alongside the Hebrew.

⁴⁰⁰ Note how 2 manuscripts have 'hand' instead of 'way in the sea' thus removing the double interpretation noted above. Such a change may have come about under the influence of the 'Targum aher' or through a misunderstanding of the thought process outlined above in n.399, or it may represent a different interpretive addition.

Tg.Ps.

לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין דמתעסקין בסהדות אוריתא על ידוי
דאסף תושבחה:

For praise concerning those who sit in *the Sanhedrin who occupy themselves with the testimony of the law*, by Asaph, praise.

יְתָבִי סִנְהֶדְרִין replaces the Hebrew שְׁשָׁנִים,⁴⁰¹ and determines the additions דַּמְתַּעֲסָקִין and אֹרִיתָא. *Tanbuma* (Buber) 3 דְּבָרִים makes a connection between ‘lilies’ and the Sanhedrin, linking Ps 60:1 with Song of Songs 7:3 to show that ‘lilies’ refers to the Sanhedrin and ‘testimony’ to the Torah.⁴⁰² *Midrash Tebillim* 60:1 also makes the same connection, as does Rashi on his commentary on the same verse.⁴⁰³ The Targum’s translation clearly belongs to this same strand of interpretation. Interestingly, outside Tg.Ps. none of the other Psalm titles containing ‘lilies’ are interpreted midrashically as the Sanhedrin. Why it should choose not to use such a tradition in the one place that the Midrashim use it is a difficult question to answer, but may indicate a certain element of creative freedom within the established interpretive tradition.

4.2e Tg.Ps. 81:6

MT Ps 81:6

עדות ביהוסף שמו בצאתו על ארץ מצרים שפת לא ידעתי אשמע:

He placed it a testimony in Joseph on his going out over the land of Egypt; a language I didn’t know I heard.

⁴⁰¹ C.f., Tg.Ps. 45:1; 69:1 where the same ‘translation’ is found, however, note Ps 60:1 where the Targum ‘translates’ with עֵתִיק (ancient).

⁴⁰² Note how other passages relate Song of Songs 7:3 to the Sanhedrin, although it is not שְׁשָׁנִים that supplies the interpretation but שֹׁרֶךְ. See *Tanbuma* (Buber) 4 במדבר and parallels.

⁴⁰³ *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A 2, associates the ‘lilies’ of Song of songs 7:3 with the 70 elders, but without reference to Ps 60:1.

סהדותא על יוסף שוויה דלא קריב לאיתת רבוניה ביה ביומא נפק מבית אסירי ושלט על ארעא דמצרים שיפתא דלא חכימית אליפית ושמעית:

He placed it, a testimony on Joseph *who did not touch his master's wife*,
on the very day he went out from jail and *ruled in* all the land of
 Egypt;⁴⁰⁴ a language (lit. lip) I didn't know, *I taught* and I heard.

Verse 6⁴⁰⁵ includes the most significant changes and additions to the Psalm, and evinces both a relationship to and departure from rabbinic interpretations of this verse. Tg.Ps. replaces the preposition ב in עדות סהדותא (על) (He placed it as a testimony in Joseph), with על יוסף (על יוסף). The unusual spelling of Joseph, with the added ה (part of the Tetragrammaton), combined with the possibility of reading שמו (he placed it) as ‘his name’ if vocalised differently, made the change of name the testimony in rabbinic literature.⁴⁰⁶ This is only possible if the preposition is ב, and thus the Targum certainly seems to disallow that interpretation by removing it.⁴⁰⁷ The Targum does explain, however, why a testimony is placed upon Joseph—he didn’t touch his master’s wife, a clear reference to his refusal to ‘lie with’ Potiphar’s wife (Gen 39:12–13).⁴⁰⁸ The testimony then, according to the Targum, must be seen as the timing of Joseph’s release, i.e., that he was released from jail on Rosh Hashanah. The Targum seems to be making this conclusion with the use of the phrase ביה ביומא that serves to emphasize the specific day that is about to be revealed—the day Joseph left jail and became viceroy in Egypt. Thus the Targum states that God placed a testimony on Joseph because of his faithfulness to God in the face of the seduction of Potiphar’s wife, and that this testimony was placed on him on the day he left jail and was promoted to his eminent position of authority.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁴ The change from the third person to the first person in the verbs requires a more substantial break than a comma, hence the semi-colon.

⁴⁰⁵ Also see ch.3.1d for a discussion on different aspects of this verse.

⁴⁰⁶ See BT *Sotah* 10b, 36b, and *Num. Rab* 14:5. The reason given for this honour is clear, Joseph ‘sanctified God in secret,’ an explicit reference to Genesis 39 and the attempted seduction of Joseph by Potiphar’s wife.

⁴⁰⁷ Only N and P¹¹⁰ retain the unusual spelling of Joseph.

⁴⁰⁸ As in rabbinic literature, see n.406.

⁴⁰⁹ C.f., Aphrahat's Demonstration 1: ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܝܬܐ (Demonstration on Faith)

The passage below from BT *Rosh Hashanah* 11a–b backs up this conclusion:

בר"ה יצא יוסף מבית האסורין מנלן דכתיב תקעו בחדש שופר
(תה' פא ד)

Joseph left prison on Rosh Hashanah, whence is it written? Blow the Shofar on the new moon (Ps 81:4)⁴¹⁰

זכר שמואל : אף האלו הנה : השמואל בלשון שמואל

And Joseph, because his faith was proved/tried at the waters of controversy and he escaped from the test, the Lord placed a testimony in him as David said: He placed a testimony in Joseph.

Aphrahat explicitly quotes Ps 81:6, and makes a specific allusion to v.8 by using the term **בכח הנני**. (The Peshitta uses the root **בנו**, whereas Aphrahat uses **נש**. This does not affect the conclusion that he is alluding to Ps 81:8 as the quote from this passage immediately after is designed to provide scriptural support for the point being made as well as tie the whole passage together. Interestingly in *Tibat Marqe, And Moses Spoke in the ears of all Israel*, 204, the root **נסי** is used in relation to Joseph, although there is no specific mention of which test is being referred to.) The use of the third person singular in v.8 in the Peshitta will have influenced Aphrahat in his interpreting vv.6–8 as referring to Joseph, but as we have already seen (ch.3.3d), the Targum and the Peshitta have much in common, and linked with this passage from Aphrahat it seems judicious to conclude that there is a shared tradition behind these passages. A similar idea is also found in the Samaritan Midrash collection *Tibat Marqe, The Book of Wonders*, 26, where we find the following reference to Joseph at the end of a list of figures whom God had saved (manuscript variation in brackets):

פלטת ליוסף ויהבתה לה חסד וארכנו (וארכנת) כל אמי עלמה (אמיה) קדמיו:

I saved Joseph and gave him favour and all the nations of the world bowed before him.

Here again the same idea appears, God saves Joseph and raises him to a high position, although this example is more general in nature. C.f., the later Samaritan Midrash, *On the twenty-two letters*, 274, where we find the following passage on the effects of knowing that there is but one God:

יוסף חכמה ולידה ערק פלטה מכל עובד ביש:

Joseph knew and he fled to Him, He saved him from every evil work.

Here there seems to be a clear reference to his refusal to lie with Potiphar's wife.

⁴¹⁰ The ramification of this date is carried on in this passage so that the slavery of Israel also ceased on *Rosh Hashanah*, and therefore Israel will be redeemed in the future on Rosh Hashanah (c.f., *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* 14). Clearly the Targum does not allude to any such ideas in its translation.

The last phrase in this verse: **ספתא דלא חכימית אליפית שמעית** contains the addition to the Hebrew of 'I taught' alongside 'I heard.' This is a somewhat problematic addition to the text in that it betrays a relationship to rabbinic aggadah that surrounds the story of Joseph's release from jail, yet at the same time is used in such a way as to conflict with it. BT *Sotah* 36b relates how Gabriel taught Joseph the seventy languages of the nations, which Joseph in turn spoke to Pharaoh thus demonstrating his qualification to be a ruler in Egypt. Joseph then spoke in Hebrew and Pharaoh desired to learn this language. Joseph tried to teach him but Pharaoh was unable to learn it, much to his embarrassment.⁴¹¹

The Targum's addition of 'I taught' certainly appears to be related to this aggadah; however, the way it is used is somewhat confusing. In the aggadah Joseph is taught the seventy languages of the world that he formerly did not know, yet he taught Pharaoh Hebrew, a language that Joseph already knew. The Targum verse reads in a way that Joseph taught and heard a language he didn't know, which is clearly different to the aggadah. Interestingly, this passage in BT *Sotah* also includes the addition of the letter in Joseph's name on account of him learning the seventy languages. Tg.Ps. is clearly different in detail from these traditions, yet clearly related in its form. Such a situation allows the possibility that some element of creativity has been exercised, although the question remains as to which language Joseph taught in the Targum.⁴¹²

4.2f Tg.Ps. 93:3–4

MT Ps 93:3–4

נשאו נהרות ה' נשאו נהרות קולם ישאו נהרות דכים:
מקולות מים רבים אדירים משברי ים אדיר במרום ה':

⁴¹¹ Other passages that relate similar stories concerning the seventy languages are: *Tanhuma* (Buber) **חקת** 6, *Num. Rab.* 19. Also the Samaritan Midrash, *On the Twenty-two letters* 302, refers to God teaching Joseph and increasing his wisdom. There isn't, however, any reference to the seventy languages.

⁴¹² The only other solutions are if you take the verb **אליפית** as a *Peal* and not *Pael* thus making it mean 'I learned,' thus removing any link whatsoever with the aggadah surrounding this verse (c.f., Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*). However, all the manuscripts checked point it as a *Pael*. One could suggest that someone who hadn't fully understood the Targum, but wanted some form of correspondence with the aggadah that was well known added this phrase to the Targum later. The latter solution, however, would need manuscript evidence to verify it.

The rivers are lifted up O Lord, the rivers have lifted up their voices, the rivers have lifted up their waves.

The Lord on high is more majestic than the sound of many waters, than the waves of the great sea.

Tg.Ps.

זקפון נהרוותא ה' יקבלון נהרוותא קלהון בשירת[א] יקבלון
נהרוותא אגר שבחהון:
מן קלן דמיין סגיעין ממשבחיא תברי ימא רבא משבח בשמי
מרומ[א] ה':

The rivers lift up Oh Lord, the rivers lift up⁴¹³ their voices *in song*, the rivers will *receive a reward of their praise*.

More than the voice of many waters, more than the majestic breakers of the great sea,⁴¹⁴ the Lord *is to be praised* in the highest heaven.

In vv.3–4 Tg.Ps. specifically associates the ‘lifting up’ of the rivers’ voices with a song of praise. Such an association is commonplace in rabbinic literature, which associates this praise with creation. The Targum sits firmly within that tradition.⁴¹⁵ Its interpretation of the Hapax Legomenon דכים (אגר שבחהון), however, appears unique, not only amongst the early Bible translations,⁴¹⁶ but also in rabbinic interpretations.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹³ Reading from apparatus: יקבלון נהרוותא קלהון should be considered as a scribal error probably caused by the presence of the root קבל in the third clause. The other manuscripts repeat the root זקף, which makes much better sense (c.f., the LXX, Peshitta, and Jerome, who repeat the same verb). קבל can mean ‘cry out,’ which may fit the context, but it remains more likely in light of the other manuscripts that this is a scribal error.

⁴¹⁴ ממשבחיא תברי ימא רבא is difficult to translate, as the adjective precedes the noun it modifies. However, the awkward syntax appears to come from a desire to keep the word order of the Hebrew. E. Cook in his translation adds an extra word (‘waters’), but, this does not solve the grammatical difficulty.

⁴¹⁵ C.f., *Gen. Rab.* 5, 28; *Ex. Rab.* 17:1; *Lam. Rab.* 1:52.

⁴¹⁶ C.f., the Peshitta that uses כַּבֵּל, and thus utilised a similar root in Syriac to solve the problem. This phrase is missing in most LXX manuscripts, and Symmachus translates with ἐπιτρύψεις (‘wearing away’).

⁴¹⁷ C.f., *Gen. Rab.* 5 where various sages give interpretations of the word based around the use of the same or similar roots, however none come close to the Targum’s solution.

It would seem, however, that the solution is related to the idea communicated in the Midrash in *Gen. Rab.* 5 that the waters were the only part of creation that praised God, especially in contrast to humans, and thus this implicit ‘praise’ of the waters may have led to the Targumic solution—‘they will receive the reward of their praise.’⁴¹⁸

4.2g Summary

The examples given above, along with those in other chapters in this study, all point to a degree of individuality in Tg.Ps., a conclusion that raises questions for our understanding of the relationship between Tg.Ps. and rabbinic literature. Importantly, this individuality has been shown to operate within the bounds of tradition and thus suggests a degree of creative freedom being exercised from within a tradition of interpretation. It seems, therefore, that the Targum may have developed in a way that cannot be explained by a slavish dependence upon rabbinic Midrash, as such dependence cannot explain differences without resorting to the supposition of the existence of unverifiable ‘non-extant’ Midrashim. By saying this I do not mean that there were no interpretations of scripture from antiquity that have not been preserved, that is patently obvious. However, the issue is that of Midrashic hegemony, and the assumption that the Targum is somewhat of a second rate form of literature that simply restates what the rabbis have already said in the more superior form of Midrash (both halachic and aggadic).

Such creativity seems to be essential when comparing the different disciplines that are known as Targum and Midrash (genres that are undeniably similar),⁴¹⁹ yet an essential difference between the two must be

⁴¹⁸ Clearly the whole context of the Psalm, thus far, in the Targum is ‘creation.’ Such a context is of interest when examining the superscription of this Psalm in the LXX: Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ προσαββάτου, ὅτε κατοικεῖται ἡ γῆ αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυίδ (‘For the day before the Sabbath when the earth was inhabited, the praise of the song of David’), and the reason for its inclusion in the daily Temple liturgy given in BT *Rosh Hashanah* 31a: על שם שגמר מלאכתו ומלך עליהן (‘Because He [God] completed His labour and ruled over them’). Both these statements, separated by a considerable length of time, appear to belong to the same tradition, within which the passages from rabbinic literature cited above and the Targum are a part. (C.f., *Avoth de Rabbi Natan* A.1 where different reasons are given from those found in BT *Rosh Hashanah* 31a for its inclusion in the liturgy on this day.)

⁴¹⁹ I use the term ‘genre’ cautiously, as the boundaries between disciplines, and the definition of disciplines in late antiquity were not as defined or compact as we would sometimes like to portray them.

that of context. Midrash thrives on the particular, often isolated from the broader context of the verse or passage it is drawn from and can indulge in multiple interpretations if it wants to;⁴²⁰ whereas Targum has no such freedom, and so it is forced to produce a coherent contextual reading of a passage, no matter how interpretive or paraphrastic it may be on any given occasion.⁴²¹ The Targumim are thus confined to one interpretation, except on those occasions where they produce a double translation or alternative translations under the rubric of 'Targum aher.'

Thus the art of Targum by definition demands creativity, yet that creativity appears quite clearly to have been exercised from within the wider tradition of rabbinic scriptural interpretation, i.e., Targum and Midrash are partners in the world of biblical interpretation, working towards the same end.

4.4 CONCLUSIONS

Numerous examples discussed above reveal a translator(s) thoroughly at home in the world of Midrash,⁴²² yet not as a servant in that home, but a creative partner, both willing and able to adopt existing traditions that fit with the 'message' being communicated, and adapt them in both form and content. Such adaptation occurs on a number of occasions because the context of the whole Psalm demands it, or the interpretation being given to the Psalm demands it. The text therefore is the determining factor in the creativity of the targumist, not the tradition being adopted.⁴²³

Not only this, but we have seen evidence of a scholar who expects a level of sophistication and knowledge in his readers for whom he has presented an interpretation of the book of Psalms that both corre-

⁴²⁰ This is not to say that Midrash always ignores the context of a passage, but rather it is free to do so if it so chooses, which it clearly does on many occasions.

⁴²¹ Therefore, although both genres are inextricably connected to the Hebrew text, the Targumic connection is both particular and contextual, whereas midrash need only be particular if it so chooses.

⁴²² Included in the examples are those already discussed in earlier chapters. The reader should also note that specific examples that are yet to be discussed also reveal the same characteristics.

⁴²³ 'Text' here can refer either to the Hebrew or the newly created, yet dependent on the Hebrew, Aramaic text. Both are uppermost in the targumist's mind.

sponds to the original Hebrew and also the reader's daily religious life.⁴²⁴

On a more specific level we have noted many shared traditions with midrashim also preserved in various parts of rabbinic literature, yet the bulk of these shared traditions reveal a much closer association with Amoraic rather than Tannaitic traditions. Such a situation casts serious questions for those who would seek to give Tg.Ps. an early date. On certain occasions definite influence from late Amoraic and possibly medieval times has been demonstrated, that although only directly pertinent to those passages themselves, must be taken into account when discussing issues of dating and redaction history. It appears clear that Tg.Ps. as we have it today is a collection of traditions that spans centuries. That is not to say that Tg.Ps. did not exist in some complete form earlier, but that its redaction history was 'fruitful' and thus great care is needed in referring to Tg.Ps. as 'early' or 'late' or any other term that implies it reached its finished form before the medieval period. The fact that there was never an official Tg.Ps. obviously allowed greater freedom for 'additions' or changes to be made and perhaps accounts for the differences found between the different manuscript families.

We have also seen examples of the translator making specific translation decisions that take a stance in disputes over specific verses, when he could have translated in a way that allowed the reader to reach his/her own conclusion. Such a situation reveals much about the confidence of the targumist, who appears willing and able to communicate to his readers a specific, desired interpretation on particular passages that has the purpose of leading them on a gentle path to tradition. Such conclusions also confirm the assertion above that Tg.Ps. was produced from within the scholarly world and not from some enthusiastic laymen.

⁴²⁴ I use the word scholar deliberately, as I cannot conceive the notion that Tg.Ps. could be in any way a creation of anyone other than an individual(s) who was firmly a part of the rabbinic scholarly world.

5. UNIQUE TRADITIONS IN Tg.Ps.

The previous chapter presented Tg.Ps. as a creative partner in the world of Jewish biblical interpretation. Both creativity and confidence were evinced in the original use and development of traditions that were also found in rabbinic literature. This chapter will continue with such a focus and discuss those occasions where Tg.Ps. contains interpretations that have no parallel elsewhere in rabbinic literature. The question will be asked as to the significance of such examples: do they represent evidence of targumic creativity or are they simply evidence of non-extant rabbinic midrashim? M. Bernstein has already taken a stance on such a question,⁴²⁵ and clearly comes down on the latter option, which he describes as the ‘safer, surer way’ of explaining the presence of such unique readings. He acknowledges there is a ‘riskier alternative,’ which he suggests with ‘a good deal of diffidence,’ i.e., the creativity of the targumist. The justification he gives for so strongly favouring one possibility over the other is ‘...the undoubted fact that we may possess only a fraction of what became rabbinic literature, and that these rabbinically “unattested” Torah interpretations or associations belong to the rabbinic traditions which are no longer extant.’

This chapter will therefore seek to analyse those unique interpretations found in Tg.Ps. and tentatively suggest the most plausible explanations for them: Targumic creativity or reproductions of non-extant midrashim?⁴²⁶

5.1 Tg.Ps. 24:7–9

MT Ps 24:7–10

שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד:
מי זה מלך הכבוד ה' עזוז וגבור ה' גבור מלחמה:
שאו שערים ראשיכם ושאו פתחי עולם ויבא מלך הכבוד:

⁴²⁵ “Torah and its Study in the Targum of Psalms,” pp.66–67.

⁴²⁶ Tg.Ps. 45 also is an example of a unique interpretation, and is discussed in detail in ch.7.2a.

מי הוא זה מלך הכבוד ה' צבאות הוא מלך הכבוד סלה:

Lift up your heads, you gates, and be lifted up you everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in.

Who is this King of glory? The Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord, mighty in battle.

Lift up your heads, you gates, and be lifted up you everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in.

Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts, He is the King of glory.

Tg.Ps.

זקופו תרעי בית מקדשא רישיכון ואיזדקפו מעלני עלמא ויעול מליך
איקר:

מאן דיכי מליך יקרא ה' עשין וגיבר ה' מרי גבורת[א] ועביד קרבא:
זקופו תרעי גינת[א] דעדן רישיכון ואיזדקפו מעלני עלמא ויעול
מלכ[א] יקירא:

מאן הוא דיכי מלך יקירא ה' צבאות הוא מליך דיקיר[א] לעלמין:

Lift up your heads! Doors of the Temple, and be lifted up you everlasting gates, and the King of honour will enter.

Who is this King of honour? The Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord master of mighty deeds and waging war.

Lift up your heads! Doors *of the Garden of Eden*, and be lifted up you everlasting gates, and the King of honour will enter.

Who is this King of honour? The Lord of hosts He is the King of honour (forever).

Various rabbinic midrashim interpreted these verses in the context of Solomon bringing the Ark of the Covenant into the Temple. On his arrival the doors were closed and would not open. Ps 24:7–9 are then interpreted as a conversation between Solomon and the gates, who refused to open until Solomon quoted 2 Chron 6:42 (**ה' אלהים אל תשב**) **פני משיחך זכרה לחסדי דויד עבדך**; 'O Lord God do not turn away the face of your anointed, remember the good deeds of your servant David'), thus appealing to the faithfulness of David.⁴²⁷ This tradition

⁴²⁷ Interestingly modern day scholars view this Psalm as being originally part of the procession of the Ark of the Covenant into the Temple. Conversely many Church Fathers viewed the Psalm as prophetically referring to the ascension of Christ to heaven (e.g., Justin Martyr *Ibid.*; Irenaeus *Adv. Her.* 4:33.17; Origen *In Psalmos* 24:7–9), and others interpreted it as Christ at the doors of Hell when he descended and let loose the captives after his death (e.g., The

although only appearing in Amoraic sources (see BT *Sanhedrin* 107b; *Shabbat* 30a and parallels), is clearly older as Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* 36 and 127 witnesses this line of interpretation almost 200 years before we find it in rabbinic literature.

Tg.Ps., despite taking a different route in the way it has interpreted these verses, knows of this tradition of interpretation as is clear from its translation of Ps 132:10:

MT Ps 132:10

בעבור דוד עבדך אל תשב פני משיחך:

For the sake of David Your servant, do not turn away the face of your anointed.

מטול זכותיה דדוד עבדך במיעל ארונא במצע תרעיא לא תתיב אפי
שלמה משיחך:

On account of the merit of David your servant on the bringing in of the ark through the doors, don't reject Solomon your anointed.⁴²⁸

Tg.Ps., therefore, incorporates this well-known tradition in an unusual place as opposed to the well-attested proof text of that tradition, i.e., Ps 24:7–9. It then adds elements to those verses (the Temple and the Garden of Eden) not found in any other extant interpretation. How

Gospel of Nicodemus). For a discussion on this last interpretive tradition see A. Cabaniss, "The Harrowing of Hell, Psalm 24, and Pliny the Younger: A Note" *VC* 7 (1953), pp.65–78, who attractively suggests that the reason for the association between Psalm 24 and this tradition developed because of its place in the liturgy of the temple—Sunday, and thus when the first disciples were reciting the Psalm on the Sunday of Jesus' resurrection the association was 'well nigh unavoidable' (p.69). His hypothesis, however, is based upon too many assumptions, (i.) The disciples were in the Temple on that particular Sunday, (ii.) They were there when the Psalm was recited, (iii.) This liturgical event was naturally connected by them with Jesus' resurrection, and (iv.) The logical conclusion was that Christ descended to hell. All these assumptions cannot be proven and combine to cast doubt on his theory.

⁴²⁸ Interestingly, the only other occasion that this verse is interpreted in this way is by Rashi, who comments: שלמה בבואו להכניס שם את הארון ('Solomon, when he came to bring in the ark there'). The correspondence with Tg.Ps. is striking especially in light of its uniqueness; however, the clear textual stimulus for this interpretation disallows positing any specific relationship between Tg.Ps. and Rashi in this instance.

can such a situation be explained? Before answering this question we need to analyse these verses more closely.

Tg.Ps. has already added the Temple to the text in v.3, where the Hebrew *מי יעלה בהר ה'* ('who will go up to the mount of the Lord?') is translated as *מאן יסק בטור בית מקדשא דה'* ('who will go up to the Temple Mount of the Lord?'). Contextually, therefore, the addition of the Temple in v.7 is not surprising; whereas the addition 'Garden of Eden' comes as much more of a shock, and suggests an eschatological prospect for this Psalm, as it is a common epithet for paradise.⁴²⁹ Such an addition may well come from the presence of *עולם* (everlasting) in these verses, which was taken as a key in answering the all important question of which doors the psalmist is referring to?⁴³⁰

If such a scenario is true then we must conclude that the Temple in v.3 and v.7 is probably the eschatological temple, which already ap-

⁴²⁹ E.g., BT *Pesahim* 54a and BT *Nedarim* 39b. It is also important to note that the term 'the gates of Paradise' (lit. the gates of the Garden of Eden) also appears in rabbinic literature, see BT *Shabbat* 119b and parallels.

⁴³⁰ H. Preuss, "Die Psalmüberschriften in Targum and Midrasch," *ZAW* 71 (1959), pp.44–54 has suggested that the rabbinic interpretation of the Psalm titles in BT *Pesahim* 117a is the reason for the eschatological aspect to Ps 24:9. However, he seems to have added to the Talmudic text in his explanation. The text reads: *לדוד מזמור מלמד ששרתה עליו שכינה ואח"כ אמר שירה* ('For David a Psalm; teaches that the Shekinah rests upon him and afterwards he spoke a song'). Preuss explains (p.45) "so ruhte zuerst die Schechinah auf ihm und er sprach dann den Psalm in prophetischem, heiligem Geiste." The passage in *Pes.* 117a, however, says nothing about prophecy or the Holy Spirit. The passage simply interprets the presence of the word *מזמור* before David's name as indicating that the Shekinah rested on David after he spoke the Psalm, whereas when it appears after his name it rested on him before he sang the Psalm. The passage has nothing to do with inspiration, prophecy, or the Holy Spirit. The fact that some Psalms with that title have an eschatological aspect does not support his argument as many Psalms without that title also have an eschatological aspect in the Targum e.g., Ps 45. In fact the example given for the former case i.e., the Shekinah only rested on him after he sang, which according to Preuss indicates a lack of inspiration, is Elisha the prophet in 2 Kings 3:15, who requests some music and when it has finished the hand of the Lord comes upon him and he begins prophesying! Also see *Midrash Tehillim* 24.1 where the difference lies in whether David requested the Holy Spirit to come upon him or the Holy Spirit came without a request, although c.f., *Midrash Tehillim* 24:3, which parallels BT *Pesahim* 117a and refers to the Holy Spirit and not the Shekinah.

pears in Tg.Ps. on numerous occasions (e.g., Tg.Ps. 45).⁴³¹ Tg.Ps. therefore seems to have transformed Psalm 24 into an eschatological treatise on who will ascend to the Temple in the end of days. Such a reading of the Psalm is unique, and in stark contrast to the ‘historical’ prospect given in rabbinic midrashim surrounding these verses.

There are those, however, who have claimed an eschatological prospect for the LXX that translates with ἄρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν (‘lift up the gates O princes of yours’).⁴³² This passage is described as having a ‘demonological flavour’ by Skarsaune, who connects it with the interpretation found in Tg.Ps. and in a midrash in לקח טוב.⁴³³ He then compares these traditions with *The Apocalypse of Peter*

⁴³¹ It is also possible that an association with Isaiah 2:3 stimulated the eschatological aspect of Tg.Ps. There are only three places in the MT where the root עלה and the term הר ה' appear together: Psalm 24:3, Is 2:3, and Micah 4:2 (a parallel text to Isaiah), and all three texts translate the phrase in the same fashion. Isaiah 2:2–3 has an eschatological time frame according to the Targum that uses בסוף יומיא to translate באחרית הימים (a biblical phrase that refers to the future, but not necessarily the eschatological future suggested in the Targum, see S. Talmon, “The Signification of אחרית הימים and אחרית in the Hebrew Bible,” in S. Paul *et al* [eds.] *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.795–810) and thus the association with this passage could quite easily produce an associative interpretation for our Psalm.

⁴³² E. Kahler, *Studien zum Te Deum und zur Geschichte des 24 Psalms in der Alten Kirche* Göttingen, 1958, pp.46–50. Also see O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy* Leiden, Brill, 1987, pp.267–268, who accepts Kahler’s proposal. I can find no obvious reason for ἄρχοντες lending an eschatological aspect to this verse. It is clearly translating the Hebrew ראש, as it does on numerous occasions in the LXX (*contra* J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie (eds.) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, p.65, where they suggest that שערים in Ps 24:7 is the stimulus for this translation). Such an eschatological reading of this term appears to be as a result of reading the text through the lens of the New Testament, where ἄρχων is used demonologically (see Mt.9:34, Jn.12:31 and Eph.2:2). The only occasion in the LXX that it appears to have any ‘heavenly’ meaning is when it translates the Hebrew שר in Ps 82:7 and Dan 10:13, neither of which are comparative texts to Ps 24:7.

⁴³³ This Midrash was authored by Tobias ben Eliezer at the end of the eleventh century. The passage that Skarsaune refers to is a midrash on Num 24:7 referring to the Messiah. This passage describes the work of the Messiah ben Joseph who was killed in the battle with Gog and Magog, and the subsequent direct intervention of God announced and described in ten *B’not Kol*. In the third *Bat Kol* the Davidic Messiah is revealed, and the last one quotes Ps

15–17, a second century Christian apocryphal apocalypse,⁴³⁴ and Justin Martyr's interpretation of this Psalm referring to Christ's ascent to heaven.⁴³⁵ He then concludes that 'the *Apocalypse of Peter* thus seems to stand midway between the Jewish tradition and Justin's material...' (p.268). Such claims of antiquity for this tradition in Tg.Ps. and לקח טוב seem overly optimistic, especially considering the unclear nature of the connection between them, and the lack of any 'early' witnesses to the Jewish tradition.

Tg.Ps.' placing of the eschatological temple in this Psalm does not provide a parallel for the Christian ascension traditions for the following reasons: (i.) It has no messianic connotation whatsoever, but rather refers to the general question of who may ascend to this Temple,⁴³⁶ (ii.) The earliest Jewish interpretations of this Psalm were 'historical,' and not 'eschatological,' and thus there is no evidence to suggest that this tradition in Tg.Ps. is an early tradition.

Such a reading of the Psalm is unique to Tg.Ps. when compared to other extant Jewish interpretations surrounding this Psalm, yet the novelty lies only in the application of a common rabbinic concept (the eschatological Temple) to Ps 24, a text that is traditionally associated with Solomon in rabbinic midrash.

5.2 Tg.Ps. 48

MT Ps 48.

1. שיר מזמור לבני קרה:
2. גדול ה' ומהלל מאד בעיר אלהינו הר קדשו:
3. יפה נוף משוש כל הארץ הר ציון ירכתי צפון קרית מלך רב:

24:7, and is followed by the resurrection of the dead and the ingathering of the exiles.

⁴³⁴ See D. D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes will be Opened* Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1988 for the text of this apocalypse and a full discussion and commentary.

⁴³⁵ *Dialogue* 36 and 85. Note that Justin actually inserts the word 'heaven' into his quotation of Ps 24:7 in *Dialogue* 36:5 and 1 *Apology* 51:7 thus making it read 'lift up the gates of heaven you princes.' Interestingly, Skarsaune posits the same reason for the connection between this Psalm and the 'ascension' interpretation as Cabaniss does for the 'descent' interpretation, i.e., the position of Ps 24 in the liturgy!

⁴³⁶ The possible association with Is 2:1–5 (see n.431) is of interest here as there are no conditions given there for ascending to this eschatological Temple, and so Tg.Ps. provides those conditions.

4. אלהים בארמנותיה נודע למשגב:
5. כי הנה המלכים נועדו עברו יחדו:
6. המה ראו כן תמהו נבהלו נחפזו:
7. רעדה אחזתם שם חיל כיולדה:
8. ברוח קדים תשבר אניות תרשיש:
9. כאשר שמענו כן ראינו בעיר ה' צבאות בעיר אלהינו אלהים
יכוננה עד עולם סלה:
10. דמינו אלהים חסדך בקרב חיכלך:
11. כשמך אלהים כן תהלתך על קצוי ארץ צדק מלאה ימינך:
12. ישמח הר ציון תגלנה בנות יהודה למען משפטך:
13. סבו ציון והקיפוח ספרו מגדליה:
14. שיתו לבכם לחילה פסגו ארמנותיה למען תספרו לדור אחרון:
15. כי זה אלהים אלהינו עולם ועד הוא ינהגנו על מות:

Tg.Ps.

1. שירת[א] ותושבחתא על ידיהון דבני קרח:
2. רב ה' ומשבח לחדא בירושל[ם] קרתא דאלהנא ובטור בית
מקדשיה:
3. שפיר היך חתנ[א] חדות כל יתבי ארעא טורא דציון שידא
דציפונא קריתא דמלכא רבא:
4. ה' בבירניתה[א] איתידע לתקוף:
5. ארום הא מלכיא איתחברו עברו כחדא:
6. אינון חמון היכנא תמהו על ניסיא ופרישתא איתבהילו אף ערקו:
7. זיעא אחדתנון תמן רתית[א] היך איתתא ילדא:
8. בקידום תקיף כאישא דמן ק[דם] ה' תתבר אילפיא דטרסוס:
9. יימרון כלהון כחדא כמא דשמענא היכנא חמינא בקרתא דה'
צבא[ות] בקרתא דאלהנא אלהים
ישכללינה על עלמי עלמי[ן]:
10. אשוניה ה' טובך במציעות היכלך:
11. היך שמך ה' היכדין תושבחתך על סייפי ארעא צדקתא מליא
ימינך:
12. יחדי טורא דציון בוען בתושבחן כנישתא דבית יהודה מטול
דינייד:
13. אקיפו ציון וחזרו עלה מנו מגדלהא:
14. שוו לבכון לאוכלוסהא דמן לעיל בירנייתהא מטול דתשתעיו
לדר אחרן:
15. ארום דנן ה' אלהנא דשכינתיה בגוה ומדוריה בשמיא לעלמי
עלמין הוא ידברנינא ביומי
טליותנא:

1. Song and praise of the sons of Korah.
2. Great is the Lord and praised very much, in *Jerusalem* the city of our God and in the mount of His *temple*.
3. Beautiful as a *bridegroom*, joy of all those dwelling in the earth, mount Zion, the side of the north, the city of the great king.

4. The Lord is in her palaces, He is known for strength.
5. Because here the kings grouped together, they passed through as one.
6. They saw and were amazed *at the signs and wonders*, they were terrified and fled.⁴³⁷
7. Trembling gripped them there, fearful trembling like a woman giving birth.
8. In a strong east wind as fire from before the Lord you will break the ships of Tarsis.
9. *All of them will say as one*: as we have heard even so we have seen in the city of the Lord of hosts in the city of our God, the Lord will establish her forever (forever).
10. We have considered (lit. compared or made level) your goodness Lord in the midst of your sanctuary.
11. As is your name Lord, even so your praise upon the ends of the earth. Righteousness fills your right hand.
12. Mount Zion will rejoice, the *assemblies of the house of Judah* will burst forth *with praises* because of your judgment.
13. Surround Zion and go around it, count its towers.
14. Pay attention (lit. set your hearts) to her crowds above her palaces so that you may relate it to the next generation.
15. That this is the Lord, He is our God, *His Shekinah is in her midst*, and *His dwelling is in heaven* forever. He has been leading us in⁴³⁸ the days of our youth.

The addition of **בירושלים** and **בית מקדשיה** in v.2 gives an added geographical specification to the Psalm, if one was needed! The translator clearly wanted no one to be in doubt about the identity of this city, long associated with the appellations found in this Psalm. The description of Jerusalem as **יפה נוף** ('beautiful in elevation')⁴³⁹ in v.3 however caused some difficulty,⁴⁴⁰ and 'Tg.Ps.'

⁴³⁷ It is also possible to translate this last part as '...they made haste and fled.'

⁴³⁸ The manuscripts listed in the apparatus read, 'like the days of our youth,' which appears to be the better reading.

⁴³⁹ The translation of **נוף** as 'elevation' comes from the Arabic use of this root. See *BDB* p.632b.

⁴⁴⁰ The difficulty was experienced by all the early translators of the book of Psalms as the following list demonstrates: LXX and Theodotion: **εὐρίζω**—well rooted; Aquila: **καλῶ βλάστήματι**—'with beautiful offshoot/bud'; Symmachus: **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀφορισμένω**—'set apart from the beginning' (this is perhaps the most interesting of the translations and seems to be related to the

שפיר היך חתנא ('beautiful as a bridegroom'), has interesting implications. The question remains as to how Tg.Ps. reached such a translation.

One possible pathway is found in rabbinic literature, which interprets the phrase יפה נוף in a similar fashion, but through an association with the Greek term νύμφη (bride), and thus Jerusalem is described as a כלה (bride).⁴⁴¹ It would seem possible that the Targum is drawing upon this interpretation but has consciously adapted it to fit with the gender of the phrase in the Hebrew. However, there is another possibility, unrelated to the above-mentioned rabbinic interpretations. Isaiah 62:5b contains references to a bridegroom and rejoicing in the context of Jerusalem and Zion. I have quoted the verse in full below.

כי יבעל בחור בתולה יבעלך בניך

ומשוש חתן על כלה ישיש עליך אלהיך:⁴⁴²

As a young man espouses a maiden your sons (your builder?) will espouse you

rabbinic ideology concerning Jerusalem and the Temple, which were created before the beginning); Peshitta: מְצַמֵּא—praiseworthy and *Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos: Specioso germini*—beautiful offshoot/bud. Only Jerome and Aquila agree, and probably because Jerome used Aquila in his translation, although it is not as far from the LXX as first impressions indicate. (In Ben Sira 50:12 (Greek) the priests surrounding Simeon the High priest are described as ὡς βλάστημα κέδροι ἐν τῷ λιβάνῳ, the Hebrew original however has in v.16 כשתלי ארזים בלבנון; one would perhaps expect some form of ῥιζώ in the Greek in translating the Hebrew שתלי.) It would seem possible that Aquila drew on the LXX as well as the Hebrew in coming up with his translation, although it is hard to prove. The association with 'trees' was also made in *Pesikta Rabbati* 173b–174a (this passage is particularly interesting in that it lists numerous interpretations of this phrase, none of which parallel the one found in Tg.Ps.), and by Rashi who states: נוף של אילן (waving of a tree) explaining the use of such a word to describe Zion: כי הוא הר הזיתים (because it is the Mount of Olives).

⁴⁴¹ An appellation found in both the Hebrew Bible and in the New Testament (e.g., Is 62:5; Rev 21:2), also see BT *Rosh Hashanah* 26a; *Ex.Rab* 36; *Num.Rab.* 8:1.

⁴⁴² The Targum reads:

ארי כמא דמתיתב עולים עם בתולה (בתולתא) כן יתיתבון בגוין בנכי וכמא דחדי חתנא עם כלתא יחדי עלך אלהיך:

For as a youth dwells with a maiden so your sons will dwell in your midst, and as the bridegroom rejoices with the bride so your God rejoices over you.

Note the differences and c.f., the LXX and Qumran Isaiah scroll.

And as a bridegroom rejoices over the bride your God will rejoice over you.⁴⁴³

The relationship between the two texts is found in the root שוש, although to posit an influence from Is 62:5 on our Targum is not without its problems. Firstly, if there is a relationship, then we must understand the Targum to be comparing Mount Zion to God in beauty: “beautiful as a Bridegroom” i.e., God is the bridegroom to whom Zion is being compared.⁴⁴⁴ The comparison between God and Zion is problematic in that I am unaware of another occasion where this comparison occurs.⁴⁴⁵ Secondly, although the object of rejoicing is the same in the two verses the subject is different. In Isaiah God is rejoicing, whereas in Ps 48:3 it is the inhabitants of the earth who rejoice. This is less of a difficulty; as in rabbinic hermeneutic the mere presence of the same root in two verses can produce an association between them without any need for a similar context or structure. It seems quite possible therefore to read this verse in Tg.Ps. as ‘beautiful like a Bridegroom,’ and it thus becomes an extravagant description of Jerusalem’s beauty, without specific parallel in rabbinic literature, but not in conflict with it either.⁴⁴⁶

In v.6 we have the addition נִסִּיא ופְּרִישָׁתָא (signs and wonders) that simply adds detail to the general description found in the Hebrew, which leaves to the imagination of its readers what the kings saw that made them so afraid. This same phrase also occurs four times in Tg.Ps.Jn., each time referring either explicitly to God’s delivering Israel from Egypt,⁴⁴⁷ or implicitly, alongside other deliverances.⁴⁴⁸ Also in

⁴⁴³ The poetic structure of the verse strongly points to the reading in brackets being the preferred one (c.f., Ps 147:2), although I am not aware of any early translation that supports that reading.

⁴⁴⁴ Having the bridegroom as indefinite, as it is pointed in the manuscripts, is not a problem as it is indefinite in the verse in Isaiah.

⁴⁴⁵ Note, however, that rabbinic literature is full of praise for the beauty of Jerusalem that has taken nine of the ten portions of beauty given to the world (BT *Kiddushin* 49b, *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* B.48).

⁴⁴⁶ Such a reading fits contextually as well, in that the next verses in the Psalm describe God’s presence in Jerusalem, as does v.15, and thus Jerusalem could be expected to take on something of the beauty of God. Also c.f. *Midrash Tehillim* 48:2, where יפה נוף is interpreted as: מהו יפה נוף אמרו בני קרח שהיו הכל מייפין היפה שלא היה כמוהו (“What is this ‘beautiful in elevation’? The sons of Korah said, ‘Everything was beautiful, the beauty that was without comparison’”).

⁴⁴⁷ Ex 13:8; 15:11.

Tg.Ps. 'miracles' are an addition that regularly harp back to the Exodus or another historic redemption, or look forward to the future eschatological redemption.⁴⁴⁹ In other words this phrase specifically provokes recollections of God's past actions on behalf of Israel, His people. In light of this it would seem safe to conclude that the translator used this phrase deliberately to awaken and remind people that the deliverance described in this Psalm is of the same nature and character to the redemption God wrought for His people in Egypt and immediately after.

Tg.Ps, however, does not appear to be setting this Psalm in a specific historical event or period as others have. Ben Sira, for example, seems to link this Psalm with the events in 2 Kings 19 and the repelling of Sennacherib,⁴⁵⁰ as does the 4th Century Christian Diodore.⁴⁵¹

V.9 has an important addition that will help us in reaching conclusions about how this Psalm was being interpreted. In order to introduce the declaration that begins in v.9 the Targum adds the detail: **יִמְרוּן כֹּלֵהוֹן** ('they will say as one'). N is more specific and states that it is the 'sons of Israel' who are speaking. The other manuscripts, however, do not specify and initially seem to refer to the kings who came, saw and fled terrified; yet, the continual use of the first person plural suffix (our God, etc) rules out that possibility, and thus we are left to assume the identity of those speaking, which appears to clearly be the

⁴⁴⁸ Num 23:23; Deut 1:1.

⁴⁴⁹ C.f., Tg.Ps. 18:1,32; 22:28; 68:16; 77:7,13; 78:42; 90:16.

⁴⁵⁰ Ben Sira 48:18–19 reads:

בימיו עלה סנחריב את רב שקה:
ויט ידו על ציון וידגף אל בגאווה:
[אז נ]מוגו בגאון לבם ויחילו כיולדה:

In those days Sennacherib arose and sent Rav Shakeh.

And extended his arm against Zion, and blasphemed God in his pride

So their hearts melted, and they travailed as a woman giving birth.

(Note that **בגאון** in line 3 is not translated. It appears to be a scribal error due to its presence in line 2, see M. Segal, **ספר בן סירא השלם**, Jerusalem, Mosad Bialik, 1997, p.335 n.26.)

I would claim that this last phrase (**ויחילו כיולדה**) is a deliberate reference to Psalm 48:7. All other biblical passages that might serve as possible parallels do not fit the context of this passage, as they refer to judgment on Israel or Lebanon or Babylon. Only Psalm 48 gives us the context of the deliverance of Jerusalem, exactly as the context in which Ben Sira places this choice of words.

⁴⁵¹ Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentarii in Psalmos I–L*, pp.286–287, where he specifically mentions Sennacherib in his commentary on v.5.

inhabitants of Jerusalem or, as in N, the sons of Israel.⁴⁵² The use of the imperfect here appears to imply that this declaration is yet to take place, and follows nicely on from the use of the imperfect in v.8.

Lastly, in v.15 **כיומי טליתונא**⁴⁵³ (like the days of our youth) is used to translate **על-מות**.⁴⁵⁴ This phrase is not only unique amongst the early Bible translations; it is also unique amongst the interpretations given for this phrase in rabbinic literature.⁴⁵⁵ There is, however, a very clear parallel in Rashi's commentary on this phrase where he comments: **כאדם המנהיג את בנו קטן לאט** (like a man who leads his small son slowly).⁴⁵⁶ The similarity is stimulated by the Hebrew text itself, in that both Tg.Ps. and Rashi have read the phrase **על מות** as **עלמות** from the root **עלם** meaning 'youth/boy,' a reading attested in numerous manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, and thus there is a possibility that Tg.Ps. was using a different text from the one we have today. In light of the interpretation given thus far in Tg.Ps. it seems likely that this phrase referred to the days after the Exodus and before the exile.⁴⁵⁷

⁴⁵² E. White, *Critical Edition* part 2, p.350, views it as referring to the kings.

⁴⁵³ Reading from the apparatus.

⁴⁵⁴ C.f., **עלמות** as one word in Ps 9:1; 46:1, and the different translations given in the Targum to these passages. Also note that some manuscripts of the LXX leave out this last part of the verse altogether whereas others translate it as 'forever' (**τοὺς αἰῶνες**), Symmachus has: **εἰς τὸ διηγεκέας** (continuously), and Aquila, according to the Yerushalmi (PT *Megilab* 2:3, 73b) has **אתא נסייא** (from **ἀθάνατος**/immortal, but note the Yerushalmi's translation: **עולם שאין בו מות**), which is similar in thought to the Peshitta that has: **ܠܐ ܡܬܐ ܕܡܘܬ** (beyond death). The variety in renderings shows the difficulty in understanding the meaning of the word. Note also the uniqueness of the translation in Tg.Ps.

⁴⁵⁵ There are 3 possibilities given in Rabbinic literature for interpreting this last phrase, firstly that connected to Aquila's translation (see n.454), secondly 'with strength' and finally 'with speed/swiftness' (all found in PT *Megilab* 2:3, 73b).

⁴⁵⁶ Also c.f. Ibn Ezra, who comments: **כמנהג הנערות** (as a leader of youth).

⁴⁵⁷ Interestingly the only occasion in rabbinic literature that the phrase **יומי טליתונא** occurs is in *Lev. Rab.* 18:1, where it is a translation of **בימי בחורתיך** found in Qoheleth 12:1. This same verse is interpreted in *Lam. Rab.* פתיחות 23, as the time when God chose and established the priesthood, Levites, the kingdom of David, Jerusalem, the Temple and the people of Israel. The Midrash continues with Eccl 12:1 and the phrase **ימי הרעה** which are taken as referring to the exile. Although there is no specific or direct connection between Tg.Ps. 48 and this midrash, the similarity in idea is interesting, and supports my reading of this verse.

In light of the above discussion it is possible to summarise the interpretation given to this Psalm in Tg.Ps. as follows:

Vv. 1–7 refer to the glory and position of Jerusalem and the past redemption of Israel by God, a redemption of the same type as that from Egypt, and other historic redemptions.

V.8 is a statement of faith concerning the future judgment on the ‘ships of Tarshish.’ This statement is bolstered by the previous recollections of past events, and in particular the paradigmatic redemption from Egypt that is the blueprint for the deliverance of God’s people both in the past and the future.

Vv. 9–14 illustrate in graphic detail the expected response from the children of Israel to this expected future redemption.

V.15 could be paraphrased therefore like this: ‘This is our God, the one we have just described as our redeemer and the judge of the wicked and saviour of Jerusalem, His Shekinah dwells with us now and He dwells in heaven and He will lead us once more as He did in the days of our youth, when He chose us and established us as His treasured possession.’

With this reading of the Targum, it is of interest to return briefly to the connection made above between v.3 and Is 62:5. This latter passage clearly has a future prospect in mind, and with a similar focus being given to this Psalm, the link is perhaps made a little stronger.

The question we must now approach is the relationship between the interpretation of this Psalm, as outlined above, in the Targum and that found within rabbinic literature. We have already explored the possible link between v.3 and interpretations found in rabbinic literature, but have found that there isn’t any dynamic relationship between them. However, the passage below from *Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai* pp.61–62 is of interest:

ויוֹלֵךְ ה' אֶת הַיָּם בְּרוּחַ קָדִים עֶזְרָה כָּל הַלֵּילָה (שְׁמוֹת יד כֹּא) בַּעֲזָה
שְׁבִירוּחוֹת וְאִי זֶז זֶז זֶז רֹחַ הַקָּדִים וְכֵן אֶת מוֹצֵא בְּאַנְשֵׁי מִבּוֹל וּבְאַנְשֵׁי
סָדוֹם שֶׁלֹּא נִפְרַע מֵהֶן אֲלֵא בְּרוּחַ קָדִים שֶׁנִּי מְנַשְׁמֵת אֱלֹהִים יֵאבְדוּ
(אִיּוֹב ד ט) זֶה דּוֹר הַמִּבּוֹל וּמִרוּחַ אֲפֹי יִכְלֹ (שֵׁם) אֱלֹו אֲנִשֵּׁי סָדֶם וְכֵן
אֶת מוֹצֵא בְּאַנְשֵׁי מִגְדֵּל שֶׁלֹּא נִפְרַע מֵהֶן אֲלֵא בְּרוּחַ קָדִים שֶׁנִּי יִפְּץ
ה' אֶתְּם (בְּרוּחַ) וְגוֹמ' (בֵּר' יֵא ח) אֵין הַפְּצָה אֲלֵא בְּרוּחַ הַקָּדִים שֶׁנִּי
בְּרוּחַ קָדִים אֲפִיצִים וְגוֹמ' (יִרְמְיָהוּ יח יז)⁴⁵⁸ וְכֵן אֶתְּה מוֹצֵא בְּמִצֵּי
שֶׁלֹּא נִפְרַע מֵהֶן אֲלֵא בְּרוּחַ קָדִים שֶׁנִּי וְה' נִהְגַּ רֹחַ קָדִים וְגוֹ

⁴⁵⁸ Note MT has בְּרוּחַ קָדִים אֲפִיצִים, but many manuscripts witness the reading found here in the *Mekilta*, although, note the same quote later in the midrash that agrees with the MT.

(שמות י יג). וכן את מוצא בעשרה שבטים שלא נפרע מהן אלא ברוח קדים שנא' כי הוא בין אחים יפריא יבא קדים וגומ' (הושע יג טו). וכן את מוצא בשבט בנימן ויהודה שלא נפרע מהן אלא ברוח קדים שנא' ברוח קדים אפיצם לפני וגומ' (ירמ' יח יז). וכן את מוצא בצור שלא נפרע ממנה אלא ברוח קדים שנ' צור את אמרת וגומ' (יחזקאל כז ג) ברוח הקדים שברך וגו' (שם כו). וכן את מוצא במלכות עליזה זו שאין נפרעין ממנה אלא ברוח קדים שנ' ברוח קדים תשבר וגו' (תהלים מח ח). וכן את מוצא כשהמקום עתיד ליפרע מן הרשעים בגיהנם אין נפרע מהן אלא ברוח קדים שנ' כי ערך מאתמול תפתה וגומ' (ישעיה ל לג) מה הוא אומ' הגה ברוחו הקשה וגומ' (שם כז ח) אף כאן אתה אומר ברוח קדים עזה בעזה שברוחות ואי זו זו רוח קדים:

And the Lord caused the sea to go back all night with a strong east wind (Ex 14:21), in the strength that is in the winds, and which is this? This is the east wind. Also you find that He did not punish the people of the flood and the people of Sodom except in an east wind, as it says: they are destroyed by the breath of God (Job 4:9) this is the generation of the flood; they are brought to an end by the wind of his nostril (*Ibid*), these are the people of Sodom. Also you find that the people of the tower [of Babel] that He did not punish them except with an east wind, as it says: And from there the Lord spread them (Gen 11:9), and there is no scattering except in an east wind, as it says: In an east wind I scattered them (Jer. 18:17) Also you find with Egypt that He didn't punish them except in an east wind, as it says: And the Lord drove an east wind (Ex 10:13) Also you find with the ten tribes that He did not punish them except with an east wind, as it says: As he flourishes amongst the brothers the Lord will bring an east wind (Hosea 13:15). Also you find with the tribes of Benjamin and Judah that He did not punish them except with an east wind, as it says: in an east wind I scattered them (Jer.18:17). Also you find with Tyre, that He did not punish her except in an east wind, as it says: Tyre you have said [I am the perfection of beauty] (Ezek 27:3) the east wind broke you in the midst of the sea (Ezek 27:26). Also you find with the exultant kingdom there is no punishing her except in an East wind, as it says: in an East wind you will break...(Ps 48:8). Also you find that God will punish in the future the wicked in Gehenna, He will not punish them except in an East wind, as it says: The Tophet is arranged from long ago (Isaiah 30:33) what does He say He removed in His hard wind (Is 27:8) and also here with a strong east wind, in the strength that is in the winds, and which is this? This is the east wind.

The progression of this passage is clear. Starting from the paradigmatic redemption from Egypt, the reader is taken on a tour of scrip-

tural passages, linked by the presence (explicit or implied) of the east wind, through a history of God punishing the wicked, both Israel and the nations, up until the final judgment on the wicked in Gehenna. The question we must investigate is if this midrash has influenced in any way Tg.Ps. 48. We have already noted the link that the Targum consciously made with the redemption from Egypt, as well as the future hope for the destruction of the ships of Tarshish. This in itself does not prove any form of relationship. There is, however, an interesting link with Ezekiel 27, a passage that occurs in this midrash. *Midrash Tebillim* actually quotes Ezek 27:3 in its exegesis on Ps 48:3a, asserting that Tyre claims perfect beauty for herself, as opposed to Zion who receives the compliment from others.⁴⁵⁹ In the *Mekilta* above, this same verse is quoted, seemingly as a justification for the judgment meted out and described in v.26 of the same chapter, and it is this judgment that is immediately prior to that on the exultant kingdom and its proof text of Psalm 48:8. It is possible therefore in light of all these points of connection that Tg.Ps. 48 belongs in the same tradition of interpretation to the Midrash quoted above, which communicates the contiguous line of judgment and punishment, that will end with the redemption of Israel before the judgment of the wicked in Gehenna. Through the stimulus of other midrashic connections, therefore, Tg.Ps. 48 has become a means of encouragement to its readers to both remember God's historic redemption of His people and look forward to his future redemption.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁹ *Midrash Tebillim* 48:2.

⁴⁶⁰ *Midrash Tebillim* 48:4 places v.13–14 of this Psalm in the future, with an exposition of Eccl 1:9 (מה שהיה הוא שיהי) which compared the deliverance from Egypt to the expected future redemption, and then proceeds to discuss the number of towers, wells, gardens, fountains, etc that there will be in the future Jerusalem (כמה ... עתידות/עתידין להיות דירושלים), using ספרו מגדליו as the springboard for such speculation. (This particular midrash appears to be unique to *Midrash Tebillim*.) Tg.Ps. although differing with respect to the detail, agrees with the eschatological prospect of this midrash, c.f. the comment by Ibn Ezra to v.13: א"ר משה זה היה בימי דוד ורבים אמרו כי זה לימות המשיח. His reference to 'many' is of interest in that only *Midrash Tebillim* and Tg.Ps. appear to have preserved such a reading in rabbinic literature. Also see *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* 22:3 where Ps 48:12 is used in a midrash with an eschatological prospect.

5.3 Tg.Ps. 80:4,8, 20

MT Ps 80:4⁴⁶¹

אלהים השיבנו והאר פניך ונושעה:

Restore us O God, cause Your face to shine and we shall be saved.

Tg.Ps.

אלהא אותיב יתנא מגלותנא ואנהר זיו סבר אפייד עלנא ונתפרק:

God return us *from our exile* and light *the splendour* of your countenance upon us and we shall be saved.

Before examining the reference to the return of the exiles in vv.4,8, and 20 we must first examine the use of 'exile' in the Targum as a whole. The word גלות appears on seventeen occasions in Tg.Ps. other than in this Psalm; on four occasions it translates the Hebrew root שבי or שוב,⁴⁶² and once it translates the root נדח.⁴⁶³ On nine occasions it can be said to interpret a poetic metaphor,⁴⁶⁴ and on three occasions it is an addition to the MT.⁴⁶⁵

The stimulus for the addition in Tg.Ps. 80:4,8, and 20 clearly comes from the root שוב. These verses are not quoted in rabbinic literature. Yet, Rashi, in his commentary on v.1 makes an interesting comment:

מזמור של עדות שרמז להם שלש גליות והתפלל עליהם שהרי
נאמר במזמור זה שלש פעמים השיבנו והאר פניך ונושעה:

Psalm of witness that hints to the three exiles and prayed concerning them, as it says in this Psalm three times: return us, and cause your face to shine, and we will be saved.

Rashi clearly associates these verses with the exile, like the Targum, and it seems as though the root שוב is also the stimulus for his interpretation;⁴⁶⁶ but Rashi in contrast to the Targum associates each of these verses with a different exile. This fact, combined with his interpretation of שושנין as referring to Israel, disallows making any direct relationship between the Targum and his interpretation.

⁴⁶¹ Vv.8,20 repeat the main phrase and thus are not quoted.

⁴⁶² 14:7, 53:7, 126:1,4

⁴⁶³ 147:2

⁴⁶⁴ 18:28, 29, 23:4, 69:1,3(x2),15, 88:7, 107:10

⁴⁶⁵ 50:8, 84:11, 102:24.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibn Ezra, in his commentary to v.8 associates two of the verses with the two exiles of Judah.

between the Targum and his interpretation. However, the fact that the only association of these verses in Psalm 80 occurs in the Targum and two medieval commentators indicates the probable lateness of the tradition, especially as the interpretation is textually stimulated in the same way. It is also important to note how the Targum turns the whole Psalm into a prayer for the ending of the exile, and as such contemporises the Psalm whereas Rashi historicizes it. The concern for the Targum is personal and immediate.⁴⁶⁷

When one combines this 'uniqueness' of Tg.Ps. with the reference to the Messiah in v.16 (also unique to Tg.Ps),⁴⁶⁸ then we find that again Tg.Ps. presents an interpretation that evinces creativity in the application of ideas and values common to rabbinic tradition in a context that is unique.

5.4 Tg.Ps. 94:9–10

MT Ps 94:9–10

הנטע און הלא ישמע אם יצר עין הלא יביט:
היסר גוים הלא יוכיח המלמד אדם דעת:

Shall He who planted the ear not hear? Will He not see who created the eye?

Shall He who disciplines nations not reprove? He who teaches man knowledge.

Tg.Ps.

האיפשר שאיתנציבא אודנא ולא שמיע אולפנא אין איפשר דיברא
עינא ולא איסתכל באוריתא:
האיפשר דיהב אוריתא לעמיה וכד יחובון ולא יתווכחון הלא ה'
אליף לאדם קדמאי מנדעא:

Is it possible that the ear was planted, but does not hear *instruction*?

Is it possible He who created the eye does not look *into the Law*?

Is it possible *that He gave the law to His people, that when they sin* they will not be admonished? And did not the Lord teach *the first* man knowledge?

⁴⁶⁷ C.f., Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In Psalmos*, 80 where this Psalm is placed by Theodoret in the context of the Babylonian exile, and a prayer from the exiles for a return to the Land of Israel. Such an association made by the Christian author seems to confirm that the text and context of the Psalm is the stimulus for the interpretation.

⁴⁶⁸ C.f., ch.3.1c.

The Targum introduces many additions and changes to this Psalm that are simple amplifications of a poetic text;⁴⁶⁹ however, the changes made in vv.9–10 significantly effect the understanding of the Psalm as a whole and thus are more significant in a study of the exegetical character of the Targum.

In the MT vv.9–10 serve as rhetorical questions concerning God and his ability to hear, see, correct, and teach. The context is universal (i.e., the ‘nations’ and ‘man’ in general), and a response to the brazen claims of the wicked in v.7 that God neither sees nor understands—an expression of dismissive defiance. Vv.9–10 respond by stating the obvious. The God who created the eyes and ears does see and hear (the actions and words of the wicked). The God, who disciplines nations and teaches humans, does reprove (the wicked for their actions), and understand (the devices of the wicked).

The Targum, however, juxtaposes the two clauses of v.9, with the rhetorical question concerning whether the ears cannot hear instruction (the answer clearly is yes in light of the rest of the Psalm), and whether God, who created the eyes, could not look into His law, i.e., take note of it (the answer clearly being no). This change in the second clause leads nicely into the dramatic changes made in v.10, where the general, universal outlook is changed into a specific, national focus and the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai.⁴⁷⁰ The Targum asks rhetorically, is it possible that God gave the Law to His people, and yet would not punish them when they sin (the answer clearly being no). The Targum then removes the rhetorical aspect from the second clause of v.10 and uses it to answer the question (with a question) just stated by a reference to Adam and God teaching him knowledge.⁴⁷¹

⁴⁶⁹ See ch.1.5.

⁴⁷⁰ Interestingly, although not cited in rabbinic literature, Rashi and Ibn Ezra interpret this verse as referring to the flood generation, the tower of Babel and the men of Sodom. Also C.f., Theodoret of Cyrrihus, *Commentary on Psalms 73–150*, (Transl. R. C. Hill), Washington 2001, who comments on this verse in Psalm 94:

The nations, he is saying, that neither received the law nor enjoyed the teaching of the inspired authors...

This passage is striking in its contrast to the Targum, and serves to highlight the dramatic change made by the Targum in its application of the verse to the giving of the law at Sinai.

⁴⁷¹ The Targum seems to be referring to the occasion when God gave Adam a command, which he broke and thus God punished him (hence, ‘teaching him knowledge’); and so it is with Israel.

This juxtaposition of Sinai/Israel and Eden/Adam is not a novel development by the Targumist, but an adoption of an already existing interpretive tradition.⁴⁷² Note, however, the uniqueness of placing such an interpretation in these verses of this Psalm; this is the only occasion where such an association is made in rabbinic literature. In light of this uniqueness we must ask the question why such an interpretation was placed here.

The insertion of Adam into the Psalm at this point is straightforward. V.9 contains the root יצר, which is used in Gen 2:7 alongside אדם, which itself appears in Ps 94:10. The presence of these two words in itself is sufficient justification to link the two passages in the rabbinic world. Such a linking of passages by common words also explains the unusual *Ithpael* form of יצב in v.9a as we find ויתיצבו in Ex 19:17, and thus the Targum was specifically making the link with Sinai by using this form. The association of v.10a with God giving the law to 'his people' is a more dramatic departure from the MT which speaks of 'disciplining nations;' however, Israel, in Ex 19:6, is referred to as גוי קדוש, which again provides a possible route for linking these two passages. The Targum therefore viewed vv.9a and 10a as referring to Sinai, and vv.9b and 10b as referring to Eden.⁴⁷³ Once the connections were made the additions and changes to the MT followed in order to make the associations clear.

These verses in Tg.Ps. seem to interpret 'the wicked' in this Psalm as members of God's people, and not the nations (as in the MT). The whole Psalm is therefore turned into an exhortation to Israel to either repent because God will not overlook their wickedness forever, or take heart at the future prospect for the wicked who seem at present to be having it easy despite their infidelity to the law. These changes are designed therefore to give a coherent reading of the Psalm in which the central theme of God's covenant faithfulness to His people and their concurrent obligation to Torah faithfulness is brought into focus alongside the future prospect of judgment on those who ignore God's law. Such a reading has been achieved by the changes made in vv.9–10 and

⁴⁷² See my M.A. Thesis *The Jewish interpretation of Psalm 82* for a discussion on texts juxtaposing Sinai and Eden. Also note that Christians (starting with the New Testament) juxtapose Eden with Calvary. See most recently, G. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection* Westminster John Knox Press, 2001 for a discussion on the many aspects of Adam and Eve in the Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions.

⁴⁷³ The addition in v.10b seems to be a reference to the sin of the golden calf as well as a general application to God's dealing with his people.

suggests that the translator had the whole Psalm in view when he employed the common midrashic method of גזירה שוה to link these verses to Sinai and Eden. This utilisation of midrashic method to create an interpretation of this Psalm that is unique in rabbinic literature highlights both the relationship of the Targum to the rabbinic world, and yet its creative freedom within it. To resort to the existence of non-extant midrashim to justify such an example seems to be wholly unnecessary and unwarranted. There seems little doubt that the targumist comes from within the rabbinic world, and exercised his own creative freedom from within that world to produce his translation.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has examined examples where Tg.Ps. evinces interpretations that have no parallel elsewhere in rabbinic literature. The question that has needed to be asked is whether these passages are the product of the targumist, or the adoption of now non-extant midrashim? Throughout the chapter the former option has been preferred, as Tg.Ps. has consistently been shown to be at home in the world of Midrash and yet adept in the art of Targum. The uniqueness evinced in this and other chapters is not one of 'theology' but in the application of rabbinic ideas in unique places. Such a situation suggests that Tg.Ps. came from within the academy and not from outside, and as such portrays a creative mind behind its inception. The creativity therefore is in the application of tradition, and not in adding to or replacing it. Such a conclusion fits well with those reached at the end of the previous chapter that suggested that the Targum sought to lead its readers on a gentle path to tradition.

6. Tg.Ps. AND *MIDRASH TEHILLIM*

The previous chapters have sought to illustrate the confident and creative work of Tg.Ps, somewhat in contrast to the typical view of Targumim as simply collations of midrashic material found in other midrashic corpora. As such the search for a specific relationship between Tg.Ps. and a particular midrashic work takes on a different focus. The search is no longer a search for the compiler's source but rather for common character traits that suggest they came about in close connection with each other.⁴⁷⁴ As such the comparison between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* needs to proceed with caution.

Any comparison between texts runs the risk of finding parallels where no parallel genuinely exists. This is partly due to the tendency to divorce each element under comparison from its own context, and thus relationships are posited upon superficial similarities, which do not hold up to serious scrutiny. Any comparison of Tg.Ps. with *Midrash Tehillim* is particularly vulnerable to such a situation, as both texts remain obscure in relation to their respective date and provenance, and both appear to have a complex redaction history. Buber, in his edition of *Midrash Tehillim*, has claimed that the 'original' Midrash finished at Ps 118, with a later interpreter (דרשן) adding Pss 119–121 and 138–150, with Pss 122–137 being copied word for word from the *Yalkut*.⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷⁴ That is not to say that stages in the development of a tradition cannot be uncovered in different midrashic corpora.

⁴⁷⁵ See Buber's introduction pp.4–5. Also see W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* vols.1 and 2, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1959, pp.xxv–xxxii, for a discussion in English on the manuscript tradition and text of *Midrash Tehillim*. E. E. Menn, "Praying King and Sanctuary Part 1: David and the Temple's origins in Rabbinic Psalms Commentary (*Midrash Tehillim*)" *JJS* 52.1 (2001), pp.1–26, and "Praying King and Sanctuary Part 2: David's Deferment and the Temple's Dedication in Rabbinic Psalms Commentary (*Midrash Tehillim*)" *JJS* 53.2 (2002), pp.298–323 also comments briefly on these textual issues, but only restates the conclusions of Buber. Also c.f., *Encyclopedia Judaica* vol.11, "Midrash

It is also easily forgotten that both texts are exegetically dependent upon the same source text—the Hebrew Bible, and both approach that text with similar exegetical rules of interpretation.⁴⁷⁶ Such a situation makes it very possible that identical interpretations could arise in both texts quite independently of each other, and that such interpretations could and do also arise in other rabbinic collections, which makes the task of assessing lines of influence or relationship virtually impossible.

P. Churgin, in his study on Tg.Ps., listed comparative midrashic material including *Midrash Tehillim*.⁴⁷⁷ He began this section stating that the majority of midrashic material in Tg.Ps. was preserved in other midrashic collections and most of them in *Midrash Tehillim*. He asserts that it is unclear which text drew upon which,⁴⁷⁸ although he claims that in the majority of cases they both drew upon a third source. His list, however, lacks sufficient analysis to demonstrate where a genuine parallel exists and why it exists, and thus each example he brings needs to be checked thoroughly before being accepted.

This chapter will seek to analyse those points of contact between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* and assess whether there is any specific relationship between the two texts, and if there is, whether it is possible to determine the nature of the relationship. No examples are given in this chapter where traditions of interpretation appear in Tg.Ps., *Midrash Tehillim*, and other rabbinic Midrashim, as numerous such examples have been discussed in earlier chapters, and shed little or no light on a specific relationship that may or may not be present between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* in particular. Such a situation suggests at the outset that there will be little evidence that connects these two particular texts beyond the particular book of the Bible upon which they are based and from which they take their name. However, such conclusions cannot be made before the evidence is fully set forth. This chapter will focus therefore upon those interpretations that are unique to Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*, and conclude with a more detailed comparison of one Psalm in both texts: Ps 82. Only after such a detailed analysis will we be at the point where we can reach a conclusion.

Tehillim,” pp.1519–1520 for an overview of the (few) scholarly opinions concerning this Midrash.

⁴⁷⁶ See ch.2.3a.i, for a good example of this.

⁴⁷⁷ תרגום כתובים pp.31–44.

⁴⁷⁸ He does list numerous examples in a footnote that he claims are examples of *Midrash Tehillim* relying upon Tg.Ps. (pp.31–32 n.3).

6.1 PARALLEL INTERPRETATIONS UNIQUE TO TG.Ps. AND MIDRASH TEHILLIM

This section will analyse those interpretations in Tg.Ps. that have a parallel in *Midrash Tehillim*, but in no other extant (classical) rabbinic text. Each text will be discussed on their own merit and only afterwards will the question be asked as to the significance of the parallel, and whether it suggests a specific relationship between the two texts or not.

6.1a Tg.Ps. 2:7 and *Midrash Tehillim* 2:9.⁴⁷⁹

MT Ps 2:7

אספרא אל חק ה' אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך:

I will declare the decree of the Lord; He said to me 'you are my son today I have begotten you.'

Tg.Ps.

אישתעי אלקא קיימא ה' אמר חביב כבר לאבא לי אנת זכאה
כאילו יומא דין בריתך:

I will declare the Lord is *God* of the covenant (or: the God who exists), He said you *are beloved to me as a son to a father, righteous as if I created you* this day.⁴⁸⁰

Ask me, and I will give *the possessions of* the nations as your inheritance, and *the rulers of* the ends of the earth as your possession.

Midrash Tehillim 2:9⁴⁸¹

אספרא אל חק ה' אמר אלי בני אתה (תה' ב ז) מסופרין הן בחוקה של תורה ובחוקה של נביאים ובחוקה של כתובים, כתוב בחוקה של תורה בני בכורי ישראל (שמות ד כב) וכתוב בחוקה של נביאים הנה ישכיל עבדי (ישעיהו נב יג) וכתוב בתרי הן עבדי אתמך בו [בחירי רצתה נפשי] (שם מב א) וכתוב בחוקה של כתובים נאם ה' לאדוני שב לימיני (תהלים קי א) וכתוב ה' אמר אלי בני אתה [וכתוב אחר אומר וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא (דניאל ז יג) ה' אמר אלי בני אתה]. אמר ר' יודן כל הנחמות הללו בחוקה של מלך מלכי המלכים הן לעשותן למלך המשיח וכל כך למה לפי שהוא עוסק בתורה: דבר אחר בני אתה. אין אומר בן לי, אלא בני

⁴⁷⁹ This passage is also discussed in ch.7.2b.

⁴⁸⁰ I have read קיימא as covenant as opposed to 'everlasting' following Bernstein "Translation Technique," p.337 n.29. See Ch.2.3d for further discussion on this verse.

⁴⁸¹ The whole section will be quoted for the sake of context.

אתה, כעבד שרבו עושה לו קורת רוח, ואומר מחבב את לי כבני:⁴⁸² [אני היום ילדתיך] ר' הונא אומר שלשה חלקים נחלקו היסורין, אחת נטלו אבות העולם וכל הדורות, ואחת דורו של שמד, ואחת דורו של מלך המשיח, וכד תייתי שעתא אמר להם הקב"ה עלי לבראותו בריאה חדשה, וכן הוא אומר אני היום ילדתיך, הא שעתא ברייה ליה וכן הוא אומר ואותו ילדה אחרי אבשלום (מ"א א ו) וכי אמו של אבשלום ילדה לאדוניהו והלא זה בן מעכה וזה בן חגית אלא מה זה רכב ופרשים למרוד באביו אף זה עשה כן מה זה בעל מחלוקת אף זה כן מה זה וחמשים איש רצים לפניו (שם שם ה) אף זה כן:

I will declare the decree of the Lord, He said to me 'you are my son [today I have begotten you].' (Psalm 2:7) They⁴⁸³ are spoken about in the decree of Torah, the decree of the Prophets and the decree of the Writings. It is written in the decree of Torah, Israel is my first-born son (Ex 4:21), it is written in the decree of the Prophets, My servant will prosper (Isaiah 52:13), and written after him, This is my servant whom I uphold [My chosen one the desire of my soul] (Isaiah 42:1) and it is written in the decree of the Writings, The Lord said to my lord sit on my right hand (Psalm 110:1) and it is written The Lord said to me you are my son [and it is also written, And one like a son of man was coming with the clouds of heaven (Daniel 7:13). The Lord said to ME you are my son] R. Yudan said,⁴⁸⁴ 'All these consolations by decree of the king of the king of kings will be done to the King Messiah,' and why? Because He studies Torah. Another interpretation: You are my son. It doesn't say 'I have a son,' but 'you are my son,' as a servant whose master demonstrated his pleasure (lit. made for him cooling of the spirit), saying, 'You are beloved to me like my son': [today I have begotten you]. R. Huna said, 'Three portions of sufferings are appointed, one was taken by the fathers of the world (i.e., the patriarchs) and all

⁴⁸² 5 manuscripts read: מחבב אנא לך כברי.

⁴⁸³ W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, translates with 'the children of Israel.' Such an identification seems likely considering the first proof-text: Ex 4:21.

⁴⁸⁴ Braude, *op. cit.* quotes Ps 2:7–8 and starts this interpretation of R. Yudan on a new paragraph, the implication being that the 'consolations' refer to the promises in Ps 2:7–8 and not the previous quotes from Exodus, Isaiah, Psalms, and Daniel as well. It appears to me that R. Yudan's comments make best sense when seen in connection to the previous quotes and not isolated from them, i.e., the 'decrees' recorded refer to Israel, and can refer to the Messiah on account of his study of Torah.

generations, one by the generation of the (Hadrianic) destruction, and one in the generation of the King Messiah, and when this time comes God will say to them 'I need to create him [the Messiah], a new creation' and thus it says: Today I have begotten you, behold the time He created him.' And it also says:⁴⁸⁵ and he was born after Absalom (1 Kings 1:6) Did Absalom's mother bear Adonijah? Wasn't [Absalom] son of Ma'acah and [Adonijah] son of Hagit? What is [the purpose] of chariots and horsemen? To rebel against his father, Also [Absalom] did this, as are the expressions 'creator of strife' and five hundred men running before him (*Ibid.*) [Absalom] also was like this.⁴⁸⁶

This midrash begins by picking up the Hebrew חק and quotes passages from the Torah, Prophets, and Writings that contain 'decrees' that are related in intention to this decree in Psalm 2. The passages quoted, all of which are of significance in Christian interpretations of Jesus' Messiahship, are set out to demonstrate that the Hebrew בן in Ps 2:7 should be interpreted as meaning servant (עבד) and not taken literally as 'son,' as well as claiming that Israel is the focus of these passages. All the passages selected, except Dan 7:13 that does not appear in all the manuscripts, contain words spoken by God, and thus qualify as a decree similar to that in Ps 2:7. R. Yudan then relates all these passages to the Messiah, who receives them on the basis that he studied Torah.⁴⁸⁷ The passage then continues with the identification of 'son' as 'servant' and illustrates this conclusion with a *mashal* that takes 'son' as a simile for 'servant.' The midrash then interprets 'begotten' as 'created' and looks forward to the coming of the Messiah as a 'new creation.' The third section appears to change direction completely and deals with 1 Kings 1:6 (linked to Ps 2:7 through the root ילד) and the difficulty of Adonijah being listed alongside Absalom. The midrash provides the answer that as Absalom rebelled against his father David so did Adonijah.⁴⁸⁸ However, the point of this section is to illustrate the fact that the root ילד should not always be taken literally, i.e., it provides justification for the reading given to Ps 2:7.

⁴⁸⁵ Braude, *op. cit.* translates with 'So, too, the verse ... cannot be taken literally. *Bear* cannot mean 'gave birth to,' for how could Absalom's mother be said to have given birth to Adonijah.'

⁴⁸⁶ The phrase בעל מחלקת is referred to Adonijah in *Derech Eretz* 3.5.

⁴⁸⁷ C.f., n.484.

⁴⁸⁸ C.f., BT *Baba Batra* 109b.

The fact that all the texts in the first part of this midrash are central texts in Christian messianic exegesis, strongly suggests that there is at least one eye on the 'other.' All these texts are combined to highlight that 'son' is to be understood as a simile for 'servant,' and that if these verses that initially referred to Israel are referred to the Messiah, as in R. Yudan's interpretation, he was God's servant not son. In addition to this God would create the Messiah, and specifically this would be a 'new creation.' Such a 'polemical' context makes sense of this passage more than a possible 'internal' Jewish discussion on the nature of the Messiah.

Having highlighted the main points of this midrash we can proceed to a comparison with Tg.Ps. There are two parallel interpretations with the Targum, firstly the use of the simile: 'you are beloved to me as a son,' and secondly, the idea of the Messiah being created in connection to the Hebrew 'begotten.'⁴⁸⁹ Both these interpretations are unique to Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*,⁴⁹⁰ although Rashi also uses the same simile in his commentary on Ps 2:7:

ילדתיך: להיות קרוי בני, וחביב עלי כבן בשבילם...

To be called my son, and beloved to me as a son for them...⁴⁹¹

Is there any relationship between Tg.Ps. 2:7 and *Midrash Tehillim* 2:9. The use of this simile in *Gen. Rab.* 42:3 (see n.491) rules out making any definitive statements linking Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* in this instance, as it is clear that such a simile was used in at least one other context, making it possible that both reached the conclusion independently in their respective attempts to avoid potential theological difficulties in a literal reading of the text. Secondly, the translation in Tg.Ps. changes the

⁴⁸⁹ P. Churgin, *Ibid.* does not list this verse in his collection, rather Tg.Ps. 2:12 and the translation of נשקו בר with קבילו אולפנ[א], compared with *Midrash Tehillim* 2:17 and BT *Sanhedrin* 91a that interpret בר as referring to Torah. However the LXX translation, ὁράσθαι παιδείας is much closer and thus it appears that Tg.Ps. has retained an old translation tradition.

⁴⁹⁰ BT *Sukkah* 52b also refers Ps:2:7–8 to the Messiah, but there is no reference to his 'creation' or to the simile found in the above texts.

⁴⁹¹ Rashi goes on to quote 1 Chron 14:2 and 22:10 where a similar interpretation is implied. It is possible that Rashi has taken this from *Midrash Tehillim* as he quotes from it numerous times, although usually he states that he is quoting. However, Rashi attached this interpretation to the root ילד and not as in *Midrash Tehillim* to בני אהה. We also find the simile, 'beloved as a son' in *Gen. Rab.* 42:3 applied to הילדים in Is 8:18, but this time referring to Isaiah's students and not his children.

construction of the sentence in such a way (כבר לאבא לי) that it resembles the construction that *Midrash Tehillim* deliberately points out as not being used (אין אומר בן לי) thus causing it to employ a simile. It seems safe, therefore, to conclude that with regards the non-literal reading there is no reason to link these two texts in any specific way even though they share the same interpretive tradition.

With regards the use of 'created' in place of begotten, Tg.Ps. clearly has a different interpretive agenda in using it, i.e., the Messiah is righteous as the day he was created. The emphasis is on the righteousness of the Messiah and not on his creation, whereas in *Midrash Tehillim* the emphasis is on his creation, and in particular his 'new creation.' Therefore, as with the non-literal translation above, there seems no reason to make any specific link between the two texts on this issue, despite the shared use of the root ברא to translate the *hiphil* of ילד.

6.1b Tg.Ps. 110:1 and *Midrash Tehillim* 110:5

MT Psalm 110:1

...נאום ה' לאדני שב לימני עד אשית איביך הדם לרגליך:

...The Lord said to my lord, sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.

Tg.Ps.

...אמר ה' במימריה למיתן לי רבניתא חלף דיתיבית לאולפן אורית
מיניה אוריד עד דאשוי בעיל דבבייך כביש ריגלך: ל"א אמר ה'
במימריה לשוא[ה?] יתי ריבון על ישראל ברם אמר לי תיב אוריד
לשואל דמן שבט בנימן עד דימות ארום לית מלכותא מקרבא
אבהרת[א] ובתר כן אשוי בעלי דבבך כביש ריגלך:

...Praise by David, The Lord, by His Memra, said to give to me dominion because (lit. in exchange that)⁴⁹² I sat to learn the Torah of His right hand;⁴⁹³ wait until I place your enemies as a stool for your feet: Lashon Aher The Lord said by His Memra to place me as

⁴⁹² The expression חלף ד is difficult to translate here as the context gives the impression of the consequence of action (especially with the use of the perfect tense in the verb following), whereas the literal rendering only suggests a swapping of roles, without the idea of consequential reward. The difficulty is also accentuated in that this is the only occasion I can find where חלף is used in conjunction with the preposition ד. I have translated therefore in a way that seems best to communicate the point being made by the translator.

⁴⁹³ V 'my right hand.'

ruler over Israel, but He said to me sit, wait until Saul, from the tribe of Benjamin, dies because a kingdom should not encroach on another, and afterwards I will place your enemies as a stool for your feet.⁴⁹⁴

Rabbinic interpretations surrounding this Psalm associate it with Abraham.⁴⁹⁵ The Targum, however, clearly takes a different approach. The 'Lashon aher' explicitly links the Psalm with King David, an association that is only made in *Midrash Tehillim*, once as a passing reference in the context of David killing Goliath and the blessing of Judah in Gen 49:8,⁴⁹⁶ and again in its commentary on Ps 110, (*Midrash Tehillim* 110:5), quoted below:

דבר אחר נאום ה' לאדוני שב לימיני (תה' קי א) אמר ר' שלום הלוי
כך אמר דוד אמר הקב"ה לשיתני אדון ומלך על ישראל בזמן
ששלח את שמואל הנביא למשחני שנאמר מלא קרנך שמן (ש"א
טז א) וכיון שראה שאין מלכות נוגעת בחבירתה אפילו כמלא נימא
אמר לי שב לימיני המתן לשאול בן קיש איש ימיני כי עדיין לו שעה
ואחרי מות שאול תמלוך אשית אויביך הדום לרגליך ואין שב אלא
המתן שנאמר שבו נא בזה (במדבר כב יט) ומתרגמין אורכין:

Another interpretation, 'The Lord said to my lord, 'Sit at my right hand' (Psalm 110:1) R. Shallum the Levite said, 'David said, "When God said to place me as lord and king over Israel when He sent Samuel the prophet to anoint me, saying, Fill your horn with oil (1 Sam 16:1) and because he saw that no kingdom should touch its companion even a hair's breadth (i.e., not overlap at all), he said to me, "Sit at my right hand, wait for Saul son of Kish the Benjamite, because he still has time and after the death of Saul you will rule, I will make your enemies your footstool". There is no sitting except 'wait' as it says, wait now this [night] (Num 22:19) And it is translated as wait.'⁴⁹⁷

Clearly the interpretation here is the same as in the 'Lashon aher' of Tg.Ps., and such an interpretation does not appear in this form in

⁴⁹⁴ The order of the Targum and 'Targum aher' is reversed in N.

⁴⁹⁵ For a recent discussion on the association of Abraham with this Psalm see G. Bodendorfer, "Abraham zur Rechten Gottes," *Evangelische Theologie* 59.4 (1999), pp.252–266.

⁴⁹⁶ See *Midrash Tehillim* 18:32.

⁴⁹⁷ Note that this passage of *Midrash Tehillim* is only found in two of the eight manuscripts used by Buber (א, Parma 1232, and י, Halberstamm MS), and is not included in the traditional printed versions of the Midrash.

any other passage in classical rabbinic literature.⁴⁹⁸ In fact the connection between this Psalm and David only occurs in these two passages and in R. David Kimhi,⁴⁹⁹ and thus appears to be a late development in the interpretive life of this Psalm.⁵⁰⁰ Is there reason to specifically link these two passages? Linguistically, the Aramaic רבון is a straightforward translation of אדון, and Tg.Ps. on at least two occasions uses the root קרב to translate the root נגע.⁵⁰¹ Thus the phrase in Tg.Ps., לית מלכותא שאין מקרבא אבהרת[א] מלכות נוגעת בחבירתה.⁵⁰² The differences between the texts are not significant, although do disallow a specific copying of one text from another. In fact Tg.Ps. seems to be one step further away from the Hebrew than *Midrash Tehillim*, which may indicate it is a later stage in the tradition. These two passages are clearly related in intent and function. However, both have a questionable status within their respective texts,⁵⁰³ one only appearing in two manuscripts of *Midrash Tehillim* and the other as a *Lashon aber* in Tg.Ps. (n.504).⁵⁰⁴ The ambiguity of their place and status therefore presents the need for caution.

6.1c Tg.Ps. 68:12 and *Midrash Tehillim* 68:6

MT Ps 68:12

אדני יתן אמר המבשרות צבא רב:

The Lord gave the word; the heralds were a great company.

⁴⁹⁸ The phrases שאין מלכות נוגעת בחבירתה and אפילו כמלא נימא occur in various rabbinic passages, and appear together in connection to the Kingdom of David in BT *Ta'anit* 5b, and BT *Berachot* 48b. However, these latter passages are not connected to Ps 110, and have no other connections with the interpretation found in Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*.

⁴⁹⁹ See his commentary *ad.loc.* and ch.7.2c for a fuller discussion on the relevance of his commentary.

⁵⁰⁰ See ch.7.2c for a further discussion on this point and its significance in uncovering the interpretation of Ps 110 in Tg.Ps.

⁵⁰¹ See Ps 104:32; 144:15.

⁵⁰² Ignoring the textual error of [א] אבהרת and reading אחברתה from the apparatus.

⁵⁰³ E. Cook, "The Psalms Targum," pp.191–193 describes Tg.Ps. as being 'indebted' to *Midrash Tehillim* for this interpretation. Such a claim lacks the caution needed in comparing these two texts.

⁵⁰⁴ Note also that the justification for the interpretation 'wait' for 'sit' comes from Onkelos and not Tg.Ps., although this may be due to the authoritative status of Onkelos over the unofficial Tg.Ps.

Tg.Ps. 68:12

ה' יהיב פיתגמי אוריתא לעמיה ברם משם משה ואהרן⁵⁰⁵ ומבסרן
מימר אלהא לחילא רבא דישרן[אל]:

The Lord gave the words of the law to His people, even from Moses and Aaron, and they were announcing the word of the law to the great army⁵⁰⁶ of Israel.

The additions in v.12 of Moses and Aaron fit the overall Sinaitic context given to this Psalm by the Targum. The Targum as a result has translated the feminine participle **מבשרות** with the masculine **מבסרן**.⁵⁰⁷ The addition of Aaron is particularly interesting as nowhere in the biblical text is it implied that he was involved in the declaration of the Torah to the people.⁵⁰⁸ Such an addition may simply reflect the need for two individuals in relation to the plural **מבשרות**, or reflect a more specific aim of raising Aaron's stature.⁵⁰⁹ The only other passage that connects Moses and Aaron to this verse however is *Midrash Tehillim* 68:6:

ה' יתן אומר המבשרות תבא רב (תה' סח יב) הקב"ה יתברך שמו וגבורתו כשהיה אומר בדיבור הקול נחלק לשבעה קולות ומשבעה לשבעים לשונות של שבעים אומות שיהו הכל שומעין לכך נאמר המבשרות צבא רב: דבר אחר ה' יתן אומר הדיבור היה יוצא מפי הגבורה ומשה ואהרן מבשרים לצבא רב לכנסת ישראל:

The Lord gave the word, the heralds were a great company (Ps 68:12) God, may His name and might be praised! When He was speaking the *dibbur* (The divine word) the 'voice' was divided into seven 'voices' and from seven to the seventy languages of the seventy nations, so that everyone heard, therefore it is written, the heralds were a great company: Another interpretation, The Lord gives the word, the speech left the mouth of God (lit. Mighty one) and

⁵⁰⁵ Reading from apparatus.

⁵⁰⁶ 'Crowd' in 2 manuscripts.

⁵⁰⁷ C.f. TJ Isaiah 40:9 where the phrases **מבשרת ירושלם** and **מבשרת ציון** are translated with **דמבסרין ל...** Note however that Ibn Ezra related the heralds in Ps 68:12 to women singing, c.f., the JPS translation: "The women who bring the good news are a great host."

⁵⁰⁸ Note also that this is the only occasion in Tg.Ps. where 'Aaron' is an addition to the text.

⁵⁰⁹ C.f. "Aaron," in *Encyclopedia Judaica* vol.2, pp.7–8 for a discussion on Aaron in rabinnic aggadah. However, considering n.508 it appears that Tg.Ps. as a whole makes no concerted attempt to raise Aaron's stature.

Moses and Aaron announced it to the great host, to the assembly of Israel.⁵¹⁰

Having given the common interpretation of this verse connected to the giving of the law in the seventy languages of the nations, *Midrash Tehillim* gives an alternate interpretation based on the plural form **מבשרות**, which was taken as referring to Moses and Aaron. The similarity with Tg.Ps. is clear, however, the end of the verse is interpreted differently, with Tg.Ps. retaining its normal translation of the word **צבא** whereas *Midrash Tehillim* interprets it as referring to the assembly of Israel. These differences, however, do not detract from this being shared interpretive tradition. As there is little textual stimulus for inserting Moses and Aaron here it appears that Tg.Ps. has adopted it and inserted it into its translation of this verse.⁵¹¹

6.1d Tg.Ps. 81:7 and *Midrash Tehillim* 81:7

MT Ps 81:7

הסירותי מסבל שכמו כפיו מדוד תעברנה:

I removed his shoulder from the burden, his hands freed from the basket.

Tg.Ps.

אעדיתי⁵¹² משיעבודא כתפיה ידוי מן למירמי טינא קידרא
איסתלקן:

I removed⁵¹³ his shoulders from enslavement, and his hands were taken up *from throwing clay for pots*.

⁵¹⁰ C.f., BT *Shabbat* 88b, *Ex. Rab.* 28 (end), for other passages connecting this verse and the giving of the divine word in the seventy languages of the world. Interestingly Psalm 68 (and Ps 29) is connected to Shevu'ot, the festival that is related to the giving of the law at Sinai, and the interpretations above provide an interesting comparison to the account in Acts 2 where men from 'every nation under heaven' (v.5) heard the gospel in their own language (v.6) at Shevu'ot, and vv.33–35 provide a possible allusion to Ps 68:19.

⁵¹¹ Churgin also links Tg.Ps. 68:20 with *Midrash Tehillim* 68:12 as uniquely sharing the same interpretation. I have not discussed it in this section as the addition in Tg.Ps. of **פיקודיא** although comparative to *Midrash Tehillim's* **מצות** **והוקים**, cannot be used to demonstrate any specific relationship between the two texts.

⁵¹² אעדיתי – V,VA,N אעריתי.

⁵¹³ Reading from apparatus.

We have already discussed this passage in Tg.Ps. with reference to TN Gen 40:18 and Tg.Ps.Jn. Gen 37:17 (see ch.3.1e). We noted that *Midrash Tehillim* 81:7 was the only place in classical rabbinic literature, other than Tg.Ps. that related this verse to Joseph. The passage reads as follows:

עדות ביהוסף שמו (תה' פא ז) אל תקרי שמו אלא שמו יה שמו של
הקב"ה מעיד על יוסף שלא נגע באשת פוטיפר בצאתו על ארץ
מצרים (תה' פא ו) שנו רבותינו בראש השנה יצא יוסף מבית
האסורין שנאמר הסירותי מסבל שכמו (שם שם) מהו כפיו מדוד
תעברנה (שם שם) מהיות משרת לשר הטבחים כמה דאת אמר
והכה [בכזר או] בדוד (ש"א ב יד) ורבנן אמרי מדוד משעבוד
מצרים ללמדך שלא נשתעבדו בניו של יוסף במצרים כמה דאת
אמר בבכור שורו הדר לו (דברים לג יז) מה בכור שור אין עושים בו
עבודה שנאמר לא תעבוד בבכור שורך (שם טו יט) אף זרעו של
יוסף לא נשתעבדו במצרים ואין דוד אלא שעבוד מצרים שנאמר
בשבטנו סיר הבשר (שמות יו ג) ומתרגמין על דודא דבשרא...

He placed it as a testimony on Joseph (Ps 81:7) Don't read 'He placed it' but rather 'His name,' Yah, the name of God was a witness on Joseph, that he didn't touch Potiphar's wife, On his going out over the land of Egypt (Ps 81:6), Our sages relate that Joseph was released from jail on Rosh Hashanah, as it says, I removed his shoulder for the burden (*Ibid.* v.7) what does his hands from the basket (*Ibid.*) mean? From being a servant to the chief of cooks, as it says, and he stuck into the pan or kettle (1 Sam 2:14). The rabbis say that 'from the basket' means from the slavery of Egypt, to teach that the offspring of Joseph were not enslaved in Egypt, as it says, The first born bullock, majesty is His (Deut 33:17), as the firstling bullock does not do work as it says, You shall not work with the firstling of your bullock (Deut 15:19), thus the offspring of Joseph were not enslaved in Egypt, and the pot only means slavery of Egypt as it says, in our sitting by the flesh pots (Ex 16:3) which is translated by *duda*...⁵¹⁴

In this Midrash earlier traditions are woven together (שנו רבותינו and ורבנן אמרי), and includes the detail that Ps 81:7a relates to Joseph's release from jail, and v.7b to his imprisonment that also entailed being a servant to the chief cook. The midrash then details the sages' interpretation that relates this verse to the offspring of Joseph who were not enslaved, presumably because of Joseph's merit in his resisting the seduc-

⁵¹⁴ C.f. BT *Rosh Hashanah* 11a for the tradition that places Joseph's release from jail on Rosh Hashanah.

tion of Potiphar's wife. The relationship with Tg.Ps. comes through connecting Ps 81:7 with Joseph, yet such a connection can be made by reading the Psalm literally, i.e., 'Joseph' refers to Joseph and not Israel. Thus there is no reason to posit any direct relationship between the two texts on this issue.

6.2 TEST CASE: TG. PS.82 AND *MIDRASH TEHILLIM* 82—A DETAILED COMPARISON

This section will make a detailed comparison of Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* on one particular Psalm. Psalm 82 was chosen because it is of manageable length for this study and contains interpretive changes and additions to the Targum that betray a relationship with rabbinic midrashim surrounding this Psalm.⁵¹⁵ The texts are reproduced below:

Midrash Tehillim

Tg.Ps.

1. מִזְמוֹר לְאַסָּף אֱלֹהִים נָצַב
בְּעֵדֹת אֵל בִּקְרַב אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפּוּט.
 זֶהוּ שֶׁאֵמַר הַכְּתוּב לֹא תִכְרֹוּ פָנִים
בְּמִשְׁפָּט (דב' א יז) וְכֵן יִהְיֶה שֹׁפֵט
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵל הַשּׁוֹפְטִים רְאוּ מָה אַתֶּם
עוֹשִׂים כִּי לֹא לָאָדָם תִּשְׁפֹּטוּ כִּי לֵה'
וְעִמָּכֶם בְּדִבְרֵי מִשְׁפָּט (דה"ב יט ו)
וְכָתִיב כִּי הַמִּשְׁפָּט לְאֱלֹהִים הוּא
(דב' א יז) שֶׁלֹּא יֹאמְרוּ הַדִּיּוּנִין אֲנִי
יוֹשְׁבִים לְעִצְמוֹנוּ בְּדִין אֵלָּא אֵמַר
הַקֹּב"ה לְדִיּוּנִין הוּוּ יוֹדְעִין כִּי עִמָּכֶם
אֲנִי יוֹשֵׁב שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר אֲנִי ה' אוֹהֵב
מִשְׁפָּט (ישעיה סא ח) וְאִם הִטִּיתֶם
אֶת הַדִּין אוֹתִי אַתֶּם מֵטִים שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר
וְקִרְבַּתִּי אֵלֵיכֶם לְמִשְׁפָּט (מלאכי ג
ה) הוּי בִּקְרַב אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁפּוּט
בְּאַמְצַע הַדִּיּוּנִין יִשְׁפּוּט וּמֵאַן אֱלֹהִים
דִּיּוּנָא שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר עַד הָאֱלֹהִים יָבֹא
דְּבֵר שְׁנֵיהֶם (שמות כב ח)

1. תושבחה על ידא דאסף
 אלהא שכינתיה שריא בכינשת
 צדיקא דתקיפין באוריתא במצע
 דיינין דקשוט ידין:

2. עַד מָתִי תִשְׁפֹּטוּ עוֹל. אַתֶּם
נוֹשְׂאִים פָּנִים לְרִשְׁעִים שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וּפְנֵי
רִשְׁעִים תִּשְׂאוּ סֵלָה (רצוני)
[רצונכם] לַעֲשׂוֹת דִּין שִׁפְטוּ דַל

2. עד אימתי רשיעיא תדונון
 שקר ואפי רשיעיא תסבון לעלמין:
 3. דונו מסכינא ויתמא עניא

⁵¹⁵ We have discussed some aspects of Tg.Ps. 82 in previous chapters (4.1e, 4.1f), the conclusions of which will be referred to in this section.

Midrash Tehillim

ויתום עני ורש הצדיקו תרחמו אין
 כתיב כאן אלא הצדיקו הצדיקו
 עליו את הדין לא בשביל שהוא
 יתום או עני לומר ליתן לו משל
 עשיר לה' הארץ ומלואה (תה' כד
 א) ואם תקחו מן העשיר בדין
 ותתנו לעני לי אתם גוזלים ושלי
 אתם נותנים לו שכל העולם שלי
 הוא ואני אמרתי להעשירו ואתם
 נוטלים את שלו:

3. לא ידעו ולא יבינו. לפי
 שאינן יודעין לכזין את הדין לפיכך
 העולם מתמוטט שנאמר בחשכה
 יתהלכו ימוטו כל מוסדי ארץ אני
 אמרתי אלהים אתם ובני עליון
 כולכם מצוה אחת צויתי לאדם
 הראשון ולא עמד בה וגרשתיו מגן
 עדן וקנסתי עליו מיתה שנאמר
 אכן כאדם תמותון וכאחד השרים
 תפולו אלו שרים של מעלה
 שנאמר יפקוד ה' על צבא (מרום)
 [המרום] במרום (ישעיה כד כא)
 קומה (ה') [אלהים] שפטה הארץ
 העבר את אלו ותהא בעצמך מלך
 ושופט שנאמר וה' לעולם ישב כונן
 למשפט כסאן (תה' ט ח)

Tg.Ps.

ומסכינא אצדיקו:

4. שיזבו מסכין וחשוכא מן
 ידיהון דרשיעיא פצו יתהון:

5. לא חכימו לאוטבא ולא
 אתביינו באוריתא בחשוכא
 מהלכין מטול הכנא מיתמוטטן
 ריגליהון דבסיסי ארעא:

6. אנא אמרית הי כמלאכיא
 אתון חשיבין והיך אנגלי מרומ[א]
 כולכון:

7. ברם בקושטא היך בני
 נשא תמותון והיך חד מן רברבניא
 תיפלון:

8. קום ה' דון ית כל יתבי
 ארעא ארום את תחסין בכל
 עממיא:

1. A Psalm of Asaph: God stands in the divine assembly, in the midst of gods he judges. This concerns what is written, Do not shew favouritism in judgment (Deut 1:17), and also Jehoshaphat, and he said to the judges consider what you are doing because it is not before man that you judge but the Lord, and he is with you in the matter of judgment (2 Chron 19:6), and it is written, behold judgment is God's (Deut 1:17),

1. Praise by the hand of Asaph: God, His *Shekinah* dwells in the congregation of the righteous who are mighty in the law, in the midst of judges of truth He will judge.

Midrash Tehillim

thus judges should not say, 'we sit for ourselves in judgment' but, God says to the judges, 'Know that I am sitting with you,' as it says I the Lord love judgment (Isaiah 61:8); thus if you lay aside judgment you lay me aside, as it says, I will draw near to you for judgment (Malachi 3:5), thus in the midst of gods He judges, means in the midst of judges he judges, where are judges called 'gods?', as it says, two of them shall bring the matter before the judges (lit. 'god') (Ex 22:8)

2. How long will you judge unjustly. You are favouring the wicked as it says, and favour the wicked. If you desire to do justice, judge the poor and orphan, justify the poor and the oppressed, 'have mercy' is not written here, but 'justify,' justify him in court, do not say, 'Because he is an orphan or a poor man 'give him what belongs to the rich man,' because The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof (Ps 24:1) if you take from the rich man in court and give to the poor it is me you are robbing, and giving what is mine to him for all the world is mine, and I commanded to make him rich, and thus you are taking what is mine:

3. They don't know and don't understand. Because they do not know how to establish judgment the world is tottering, as it says, they walk in darkness, all the foundations of the earth totter.

I said, 'You are gods, and sons of the most high all of you.' I

Tg.Ps.

2. How long o wicked will you judge falsely and favour (lit. lift up the face of) the wicked? (forever).

3. Judge the poor and the orphan, vindicate/treat generously the oppressed and the poor.

4. Deliver the poor and the unfortunate, save them from the hands of the wicked.

5. They do not know *to do good* and they do not understand *the law*, they walk in darkness so that the pillars of the foundations of the world are tottering.

6. I said you are considered *like* angels, all of you are *like* angels on high.

*Midrash Tehillim***Tg.Ps.**

gave one commandment to Adam, and he did not stand in it, and I expelled him from the Garden of Eden, and decreed death upon him, as it says, thus as man (Adam) you shall die and as one of the princes you shall fall, these are the princes from above as it says, the Lord will punish the heavenly host (Isaiah 24:21).

Arise o Lord, judge the earth. Remove these [unjust judges] and You Yourself rule and judge, as it says, The Lord sits forever, He has established His throne for judgment (Ps 9:8).

7. But in truth as humans you will die, and like one of the great men you will fall:

8. Rise o Lord, judge all the inhabitants of the earth, for you will take a heritage amongst all peoples:

6.2a Tg.Ps. 82:1 and *Midrash Tehillim* 82:1

We have already concluded that Tg.Ps. 82:1a was in keeping with other traditions that interpreted **עדת אל** as Torah scholars, and that Tg.Ps. 82:1b preserves an intermediate stage in the development of an interpretive tradition surrounding Ps 82:1 (see ch.4.1e), whose early stages represented God dwelling with judges, and whose latter stages saw God's Shekinah departing from Israel on account of unjust judgment. *Midrash Tehillim* 82:1, however, only preserves the judicial context in its interpretation, and thus only deals with the interpretation of 82:1b.

Midrash Tehillim opens its explanation with Deut 1:17 and 2 Chron 19:6, passages that warn against unjust judgment. Both of them contain the root **שפט** as does Ps 82:1. The midrash then cites Deut 1:17b, interpreting it as signifying that God sits with judges as they are judging, and thus favouritism should not be shown, especially as God loves justice (Is.61:8). Malachi 3:5 is then cited as a proof text to show that perverting justice repels God.⁵¹⁶ Ps 82:1b is then cited with the specific interpretation that God judges in the midst of judges (**באמצע הדיינים**)

⁵¹⁶ The root **נטי** in the midrash is used in connection to God as the foil to the root **קרב** found in Malachi 3:5, hence the meaning 'repel.' Note that Mal.3:5 also links in with Ps 82:1 both in the presence of the root **שפט** and the noun **יתום**.

(ישפוט) with Ex 22:8 as a proof text showing that אלהים can have the meaning, ‘judges.’

This judicial context given to Ps 82:1b by *Midrash Tehillim* (באמצע) (במצע דיינין דקשוט ידיו) parallels that in Tg.Ps. (הדיינין ישפוט). However it is clear that the similarities simply arise from the Hebrew text rather than any direct relationship between the two texts. The main difference, the qualifying דקשוט of Tg.Ps., derives from the interpretation given to the Psalm by the Targum, and clearly sets it in a different stream of this interpretive tradition from that found in *Midrash Tehillim*. Tg.Ps. qualifies the type of judge God dwells with, whereas *Midrash Tehillim* is closer to those aspects of the interpretive tradition that depict God sitting with all judges, a fact that should serve as a warning against injustice.⁵¹⁷ Thus it seems clear that no specific link or relationship can be drawn between the two texts for this verse.

6.2b Tg.Ps. 82:2–4 and *Midrash Tehillim* 82:2

Tg.Ps., after the changes made in v.1, adds the ‘wicked’ in v.2 in order to clarify the addressee. Other than that no changes are made. However it is important to note that the retention of the root צדק in v.3 is unusual, as Tg.Ps. usually translates this root (when used verbally) with זכי.

Midrash Tehillim continues the judicial context in its interpretation, with v.2 being an indictment of the judges who have favoured the wicked in their judgment, as opposed to what they should have done as described in v.3.⁵¹⁸ The midrash then continues to explain that הצדיקו should be understood in a judicial sense, specifically ruling out the meaning ‘have mercy’ (תרחמו אין כתיב) that seems to be a reference to the accepted meaning of the nominal use of the root, ‘charity.’⁵¹⁹ The Midrash then qualifies this statement by highlighting the need to give a just judgment and not to favour the poor and the oppressed,⁵²⁰ and

⁵¹⁷ C.f., Tosephta (Lieberman) *Sanhedrin* 1:8; BT *Sanhedrin* 6b; PT *Sanhedrin* 1:1, 18b. Note also *Mekiltah de Rabbi Ishmael* יתרו 11 pp.242–243. Here *elohim* is interpreted as judges, due to the reasons given above, as well as the number three which comes from m. *Sanhedrin* 1:1 describing the number of judges needed for particular cases. (See also BT *Berachot* 6a.)

⁵¹⁸ The implication therefore is that the judges have favoured the wicked over and against the poor and oppressed in their judgment.

⁵¹⁹ The earliest use of the root צדק to mean charity appears to come in Daniel 4:24, and certainly has the meaning of ‘charity’ towards the end of the Second Temple Period, as is clear by Jesus’ statement in Matt 6:1–2.

⁵²⁰ Although not stated the commands in Ex 23:3, ודל לא תהדר בריבו, and Deut 1:17 לא תכירו פנים במשפט, are behind this midrash.

especially not to take from the rich, who had been made rich by God's sovereign decree, and give to the poor.⁵²¹

This passage could be purely an independent midrash based upon this verse; however, it is possible to read it as part of a dispute over the meaning of the root צדק in Ps 82:3. BT *Hullin* 134a and PT *Peab* 4:8, 18c interpret this verse in the context of giving charity to the poor,⁵²² and in particular the gleanings, etc of one's crops. Both passages specifically rule out the possibility of interpreting it in a legal sense, and quote Ex 23:3 as the proof text to demonstrate this point. It is probable therefore that this passage in *Midrash Tehillim* is part of a dispute over the meaning of this phrase, and thus *Midrash Tehillim* makes every effort to maintain the judicial context without especially contravening the command in Ex 23:3, as well as specifically ruling out the possibility of interpreting it in the context of almsgiving.⁵²³

The question remains as to the possible relationship between Tg.Ps., and its unusual retention of the root צדק and *Midrash Tehillim's* interpretation of the same root. The difficulty in answering this question is in the extent to which one can draw conclusions concerning the use by Tg.Ps. of the same root as the Hebrew. It certainly seems that Tg.Ps. could have used the root זכי as it does on three other occasions, to expressly indicate a judicial context continuing into the second half of this verse. However, it didn't, thus leaving open the possibility of interpreting it in the same way as found in BT *Hullin* 134a and PT *Peab* 4:8, 18c. Yet one could also argue that *Midrash Tehillim* expressly interprets the root צדק in a judicial context and disallows the meaning of charity, thus Tg.Ps. may have been specifically siding with *Midrash Tehillim* by retaining this root. This appears to me, however, to be the less likely option, as the use of the root זכי would have been a far clearer way of siding with *Midrash Tehillim's* interpretation.

⁵²¹ The significance of this final part concerning the rich only becomes clear when compared to other interpretations of this verse that give an alternative interpretation, see below.

⁵²² Thus in the Yerushalmi the biblical imperative הצדיקו is interpreted with the addition במתנותיו implying that the root צדק here in Ps 82:3 has the meaning of treat with צדקה or generously.

⁵²³ The fact that the root רחם is not used in either BT *Hullin* 134a or PT *Peab* 4:8, 18c disallows any specific linguistic link between them and this passage in *Midrash Tehillim*, yet the similarity in context is striking and suggests that there was a debate over the meaning of this verse in Ps 82 and in particular what it meant to 'justify' (הצדיקו) the poor in relation to other commands in the Torah that disallowed favouring them in judgment.

It appears possible therefore that Tg.Ps. has retained the root צדק deliberately, with the meaning ‘treat generously’ and in doing so takes a different interpretive line from *Midrash Tehillim*.

6.2c Tg.Ps. 82:5–8 and *Midrash Tehillim* 82:3

For v.5 there is a clear difference between the two texts, with Tg.Ps. interpreting the shaking of the earth’s foundation as resulting from a lack of knowledge of Torah and how to do good,⁵²⁴ whereas *Midrash Tehillim* attributes it to a failure to establish justice. Such differences, combined with the discussion above on v.4 point to the likely probability that Tg.Ps. stands on one side of a dispute with *Midrash Tehillim* firmly on the other side.

The differences continue in vv.6–7. Tg.Ps., as has been highlighted in ch.4.1f, preserves an ontological interpretation of these verses, whereas *Midrash Tehillim* specifies Adam and his failure to keep the command given him,⁵²⁵ and relates v.7b to the angelic beings.⁵²⁶ Again no specific correlation is found between the two texts.

6.2d Ps 82 in Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*

Having highlighted the details of the interpretation of Ps 82 in the respective texts, an overview of the interpretation given to the whole Psalm first in *Midrash Tehillim* and then in Tg.Ps. would be helpful.

Midrash Tehillim clearly focuses on the judicial context of the Psalm achieved through interpreting the Hebrew אלהים as ‘judges,’ although in doing so it either ignores v.1a and the problematic phrase עדת אל or assumes this is judicial as well. Clearly Ps 82 is viewed as an admonition of judges, with whom God sits in judgment, and exhorts them to stop favouring the wicked and to give justice to the poor and oppressed. This failure of the judicial system has caused the very foundation of the earth to shake. However, such an exhortation is qualified by the need to prevent the opposite happening: the poor being favoured and rich

⁵²⁴ Such additions increases the probability that the root צדק in v.4 should be read as ‘treat generously,’ as the ‘doing good’ is not so readily transferable into a judicial context.

⁵²⁵ C.f., Jerome *in xta Hebraeos* who translates the Hebrew אדם with the proper name *Adam*.

⁵²⁶ C.f. Justin Martyr *Dialogue* 124 for a similar interpretation, and the discussion in my, *The Jewish Interpretation of Psalm 82* (M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, unpublished, 2000) for a fuller treatment of these texts. Also see Jerome’s comment on this verse in his *Commentarioli* where he likens Adam to a demon (*diabolus*) quoting Gen 3:22 as a proof-text.

treated unjustly. Both Adam and angelic beings are held up as examples of those who received commands but disobeyed and thus lost their high position. Thus vv.6–7 serve as a warning to the unjust judges to change or face the consequences. The Psalm ends with a cry to God for him to remove the unjust judges and rule himself.

For Tg.Ps. there are two groups of people with whom God dwells, Torah Scholars and judges of truth. The wicked, however, are those who pervert justice and have no understanding of doing good or knowledge of Torah, as is evinced in their dealing out of injustice and failure to give to the poor. Vv.6–7 recall the ontological nature of humans and the potential of becoming like the divine beings, yet death and failure follow disobedience. The Psalm ends with a plea for God to arise as judge and inherit the nations as his own.

Clearly both texts are doing different things with the Psalm, despite overlapping on a number of interpretations of specific verses. Thus for this Psalm there is no reason to posit any closer relationship between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* than one would between Tg.Ps. and any other part of the rabbinic midrashic corpora.

6.3 CONCLUSIONS

The careful examination of comparative texts from Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* has highlighted areas of difference as well as evidence of shared interpretive traditions. Those examples of interpretations that are only found in Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*, which one would expect to demonstrate signs of relationship between the two texts if one was there, provided no evidence of a specific relationship. The one occasion (Ps 110:1) where there was a very similar interpretation and even similar wording, could not be used to posit a specific relationship between the two texts due to the unclear position of each interpretation in the manuscript tradition and redaction history of each text.

In light of such findings for the fifteen Psalms studied there appears to be no evidence that these two texts are related in any specific way, beyond being based upon the same biblical book from which they both derive their name.

7. Tg.Ps., THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND EARLY CHRISTIAN EXEGESIS OF THE PSALMS

This chapter will specifically focus upon the relationship, if any, between the exegesis in Tg.Ps. and that found in the New Testament and the early Church.⁵²⁷ Two areas of relationship will be explored, (i.) Early contemporary exegesis, i.e., can Tg.Ps. be used in New Testament research? Or, does Tg.Ps. contain traditions dating from the first century? And (ii.) Reactionary exegesis i.e., does Tg.Ps. respond in any way to Christian interpretations of the Psalms?⁵²⁸ Such questions are important in any attempt to understand the history and ‘theology’ of Tg.Ps.⁵²⁹

These questions, however, abound with methodological pitfalls, as texts from different traditions, times and geographical location are being compared. Such difficulties are compounded in that they are based

⁵²⁷ Throughout each chapter thus far Christian texts have been referred to when a parallel interpretation is found to that in Tg.Ps; therefore, no specific section on ‘shared traditions’ with Christian texts will be included in this chapter, as those points of contact that do exist have been highlighted in the course of the study.

⁵²⁸ The issue of the extent to which Jews and Christians were in contact with one another, or knew what each other taught and said, is still debated. This study will take the position outlined by M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (translated from the Hebrew by B. Stein), Albany, State University of New York, 1996, where he sought to ‘re-establish the relevance of Christian exegesis regarding content as well as form, to the understanding of rabbinic Midrash’ (pp.120–121). For an earlier example of such a position see, E. E. Urbach, “The Homiletical Interpretations of the Sages and the Expositions of Origen on Canticles, and the Jewish-Christian Disputation,” in J. Heinman and D. Noy (eds.) *Scripta Hierosolymitana 22: Studies in Aggadah and Folk Literature* Jerusalem, Magnes, 1971, pp.247–275.

⁵²⁹ As well as having an importance for those engaged in New Testament research.

upon the same source text, the Hebrew Bible.⁵³⁰ In this respect no comparison between Tg.Ps. and any Christian text can be undertaken without first analyzing the Targum in relation to the Hebrew text, and secondly seeking to understand it from within its own Jewish context. Only then can one tentatively begin to make any comparison with Christian texts (New Testament and patristic writings),⁵³¹ which themselves need to be taken in context,⁵³² both in relation to the source text (Hebrew or Greek Bible) and other Christian literature.⁵³³

7.1 Tg.Ps. AND CONTEMPORARY EXEGESIS

The use of Targumim for New Testament research can no longer be based upon the concept of a pre-Christian Palestinian Targum, championed by P. Kahle⁵³⁴ and others;⁵³⁵ yet the possibility of old traditions being preserved within the later Targum text remains. With such a possibility in mind, we need to discuss Tg.Ps. 68 and 118 that have been presented as retaining traditions of interpretation and translation from the first century, and therefore can contribute to an understanding of the New Testament.⁵³⁶

⁵³⁰ Be it in Hebrew or its Greek translation.

⁵³¹ I use the term 'Christian text' in relation to the New Testament for clarity in the discussion, despite its origin within a definite Jewish context.

⁵³² I.e., one has to take genre, date, provenance, and intention into account before suggesting links with Tg.Ps., which itself arose in a particular time, place, and for a particular purpose.

⁵³³ See ch.1 n.98.

⁵³⁴ See "Das palaestinischen Pentateuchtargum und das Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramaisch," *ZNW* 49 (1958), pp.103–130.

⁵³⁵ E.g., A. Diez Macho "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums," in *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* Leiden, Brill, 1960, pp.222–245.

⁵³⁶ The use of Tg.Ps. in New Testament research is reasonably widespread, as the discussions below will highlight. In this light it is interesting to note E. Cook's comments introducing his translation of Tg.Ps.: "The translation was originally intended for New Testament scholars who wished to examine the text for its relevance for New Testament background." Cook expands upon this statement in his article "The Psalms Targum" (2002), and his most recent article, "Covenantal Nomism in the Psalms Targum," although acknowledging its lateness appears in a collection of essays on the concept of covenant in the Second Temple Period (S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo (eds.) *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period* Leiden: Brill, 2003, pp.203–220). However, note that B. Chilton, a constant advocate for the relevance of the Targumim in

7.1a Tg.Ps. 68 and Ephesians

Tg.Ps. 68:19 has been claimed by many to represent the text used by Paul in his quotation of the Psalm in Ephesians 4:8.⁵³⁷ We must be careful however not to read the Targum through the lens of Ephesians, and thus we will first examine the translation in the Targum.

MT Ps 68:19

עלית למרום שבית שבי לקחת מתנות באדם ואף סוררים לשכן יה
אלהים:

You have ascended on high and led captivity captive, you have received gifts from man, even the rebellious that the Lord God may dwell [with them].

Tg.Ps.

סליקתא לרקיעא משה נביא שביתא שביטא אליפתא פתגמי
אוריתא יהבתא יתהון מתנן לבני נשא ברם סרבניא מתגירין ותייבין
בתתובא שרת עליהון שכנית יקרא דה' אלהים:

You went up to the sky, *Moses the prophet*, you took captivity captive, *you learnt the words of the law*, you gave them as a gift to the sons of men, even the rebellious *who converted returning in repentance, the glorious Shekinah* of the Lord God dwelt upon them.

Clearly the Targum has both added to the MT and changed its meaning. **משה נביא** is an addition, as is **פתגמי אוריתא**, and **למתגירין** **ותייבין בתתובא**. However, we have two verbs **אלף** and **יהב**, and it has been assumed by many because of the error of reading the Targum

New Testament research, made no reference to Tg.Ps. whatsoever in his most recent study on the topic, "Four Types of Comparison Between the Targumim and the New Testament," *JAB* 2.2 (2000), pp.163–188.

⁵³⁷ M. Wilcox, "The Translation of the Targum of Psalms: A Report," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997), pp.153–157, also see his earlier paper, "The Aramaic Targum to Psalms," *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* Division A, pp.143–159, Jerusalem, 1981; R le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature Targumique* vol.1, Rome, Chicago, Pontifical Biblical Institute, p.55; R. Rubinkiewicz, "Ps.68:16 (=Eph 4:8) Another Textual Tradition or Targum?," *NT* 17(1975), pp.219–224. (His use of Test. Dan 5:10–11, however, should be viewed with some caution as the text cannot be shown to support the conclusions he seeks to draw from them.) M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966, pp.78–81. Also see Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 5:8) and Justin Martyr (*Dialogue* 87) as comparative texts.

through Ephesians, that **יהב** translates/replaces the Hebrew **לקח**. It must be pointed out though that there is no precedent for such a translation in Tg.Ps. Bernstein has proposed that **אלף** translates **לקח**, which is semantically acceptable (c.f. Prov 4:2) and has a precedent in Tg.Ps. 49:16. Bernstein concludes: "I believe that we have here a typical targumic technique which splits the verb **לקחת** from its object in the Hebrew sentence **מתנות** and supplies a new object, **פטגמי אוריתא**, for the verb, and a new verb, **יהבתא**, for the object".⁵³⁸ Such a conclusion fits the Targumic context better.

Having read the Targum's translation in this way, we can now compare it to the text in Ephesians and the Peshitta.

Ephesians 4:8

διὸ λέγει· ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν,⁵³⁹
ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις...

Therefore it says: when he ascended on high he took captivity captive and gave gifts unto men...

Peshitta Ps 68:19

...ܠܡܠܟܐ ܠܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ

You ascended on high and took captivity captive and gave gifts unto men...

The similarity between these texts and Tg.Ps. centres on the use of 'give' instead of 'take,' and the preposition 'unto' instead of 'among.' Such a comparison has caused some to suggest that the Targum has preserved a form of the text that was used in the letter to the Ephesians.⁵⁴⁰ M. Weitzman,⁵⁴¹ however, has pointed out that Peshitta MS 9a1, which often preserves older readings than the other Peshitta manuscripts,⁵⁴² retains the verb 'take,' but changes the preposition from a **ב** to a **ל** thus implying 'taking to give' rather than 'to keep':

⁵³⁸ M. Bernstein, "Torah and its Study," p.57.

⁵³⁹ καὶ is found in numerous manuscripts.

⁵⁴⁰ See n.537.

⁵⁴¹ *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, pp.286–287.

⁵⁴² M. Weitzman, "The Originality of unique readings in Peshitta MS 9a1" in *The Peshitta, its Early Text and History* (P. Dirksen, M. J. Mulder eds.), Leiden, Brill, 1988, pp.225–258, has shown that this manuscript has a number of readings that are closer to the MT than earlier manuscripts and that it preserves an earlier stage in the textual history of the Peshitta. Such conclusions are significant in the context of this discussion.

וְלָקַח אֶת הַמִּתְּנָה לְבָנִי אֲדָמָה (...and you took gifts for men). Thus we see a text preserving the process of change, which underlies the text in Ephesians.⁵⁴³ Ephesians therefore appears to have ‘quoted’ the accepted meaning of the verse rather than its form.⁵⁴⁴

The Targum reflects this interpretation, but seeks to translate as well as interpret.⁵⁴⁵ This being the case the Targum cannot serve as an example of an early tradition that is reflected in Ephesians, since it is doing something quite different.⁵⁴⁶ The Targum does contain the same interpretive tradition surrounding the verb לָקַח, but it incorporates this alongside an acceptable translation of that verb. The Targum therefore translates the one Hebrew verb according to an inherited interpretive tradition, as well as providing an acceptable semantic equivalent.⁵⁴⁷

⁵⁴³ It is quite likely that the Peshitta text was changed to bring it in line with Ephesians.

⁵⁴⁴ T. Moritz, *A Profound Mystery* E. J. Brill, 1996, concludes that ‘attempts to explain Ephesians 4 on the basis of the Targum of Psalms are misguided’ and with regards the Ephesians quote he concludes ‘[The author] quoted a text form other than Ps 68 itself, which the author expected his audience to know...’ (p.63). The basis for his sidelining Tg.Ps. as the source appears to be that it is ‘rather late’ (p.84), however, positing another text that was widely known remains problematic. E. M. Cook, “The Psalms Targum,” pp.189–191 discusses this passage and concludes ‘in its present form Targum Psalms does not give us a very old text.’

⁵⁴⁵ The same interpretation is found in numerous rabbinic sources, e.g., *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* 2; *Ex. Rab.* 28 (beginning), 33:2; *Ruth Rab.* 2:3. The translation aspects discussed above make the detailed discussion necessary, as these parallel traditions do not in themselves confirm or disallow a relationship with the verse in Ephesians.

⁵⁴⁶ The reason for understanding the text in such a way may be the seeming inappropriateness of God receiving gifts from man, especially the rebellious, in the context of the Sinai revelation and the giving of Torah.

⁵⁴⁷ The difficulties that such a conclusion causes, with respect to Paul’s introduction of the passage as being a quote from Scripture (διὸ λέγει), are not pertinent to our study. See the bibliography in n.537 for a discussion on this issue and details of other relevant secondary literature.

7.1b Tg.Ps 118 and the Rejected Messiah⁵⁴⁸

The New Testament interpreted Ps 118:22ff, in conjunction with other 'stone' texts, as referring to the religious leaders' rejection of Jesus.⁵⁴⁹ For the early Christian community, the stone that was rejected was Jesus,⁵⁵⁰ rejected by the religious leaders of the day,⁵⁵¹ but whom God appointed to be King, and the 'head of the corner' of His spiritual building in which his followers were described as 'living stones.'⁵⁵² Vv.25–26 were chanted by the crowds as Jesus came to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover,⁵⁵³ and this welcome was interpreted as having definite messianic import,⁵⁵⁴ and the same verses were found on Jesus'

⁵⁴⁸ This section is focussed wholly on assessing the use of Tg.Ps. 118 in New Testament research, yet the discussion also reveals a strong relationship with rabbinic traditions, as well as evidence of creativity on the part of the Targum, and thus supports the conclusions voiced in chs.4 and 5.

⁵⁴⁹ Heb 13:6 (118:6); Luke 20:17, Acts 4:11, 1 Pet. 2:7 (118:22); Matt 21:42, Mark 12:10–11 (118:22–23); Matt 21:9, Mark 11:9–10; John 12:13 (118:25–26); Matt 23:39, Luke 13:35, 19:38 (118:26). All these references are quotes. I have not listed possible allusions to the Psalm, of which there are some (*The Greek New Testament* [4th edition], B. Aland, K. Aland, *et al*, lists four references as allusions, whereas J. Ross Wagner, "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread," *Early Christian Interpretations of the Scriptures of Israel* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, lists fifteen in the books of Luke and Acts alone!).

⁵⁵⁰ Luke 20:17, Acts 4:11, 1 Peter 2:1–7, Matt 21:42, Mark 12:10–11.

⁵⁵¹ See references in n.550 (especially Acts 4:11 where the word 'you' is added to Ps 118:22 by Peter to associate the builders with the religious leaders). Also see Origen, *Selecta in Psalmos* (PG 12, p.1584) where he specifically names the builders as 'the scribes and Pharisees' (Οἰκοδομοῦντας δὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίοις λέγει, τοὺς γραμματεῖς, τοὺς φαρισαίους, ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμαζον αὐτὸν ...). For secondary literature on the 'parable of the tenants,' which identifies Jesus as the stone and points to the religious leaders as the builders, see, K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1983, G. J. Brooke, "4Q500 and the use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," *DSD* 2.3 (1995), pp.268–294 and J. Ross Wagner, *Ibid*.

⁵⁵² 1 Peter 2:5.

⁵⁵³ Matt 21:9–11, Mark 11:9–10, Luke 19:38.

⁵⁵⁴ This may have been a traditional part of the Passover celebration/welcome of pilgrims to Jerusalem, especially as Ps 118 was part of the Hallel recited during the pilgrim festivals (see m. *Pesahim* 5:7, 10:5–7, m. *Sukkah* 3:9–11, etc). However, the writers of the New Testament obviously saw great significance in the chant, and interpreted it messianically.

lips, signifying the future national ‘turning’ of the Jews to belief in Him as the Messiah of Israel.⁵⁵⁵

New Testament scholars such as Gartner,⁵⁵⁶ Wilcox,⁵⁵⁷ Evans,⁵⁵⁸ and Young⁵⁵⁹ have commonly used the Targum’s translation of these verses in order to shed light on the use of these verses in the NT. Such claims of antiquity for the Targum’s interpretation are bold. We must, however, understand the Targum in its own Jewish context before we attempt to reach such conclusions.

Clearly the Targum has placed this whole Psalm in the context of King David. There are those who have seen it as messianic in context,⁵⁶⁰ although I have yet to find any reason for making such an association.⁵⁶¹ The additions to vv.22–29 locate these verses unmistakably in the context of 1 Samuel 16, and David’s anointing as king by Samuel. Apart from these final verses, the Targum stays very close to the literal sense of the MT, with only v.13 having an addition of interpretive import.

⁵⁵⁵ Matt 23:39, Luke 13:35.

⁵⁵⁶ Av. B. Gartner wrote “טליא als Messiasbezeichnung” (*Svenske Exegetiske Årsbok* xviii–xix (1953–1954), pp.98–108, specifically connected to the appearance of טליא in v.22 and v.27 of the Targum. On p.100 he writes:

Diese Targumstelle kann nun in der Diskussion über טליא und seinen Zusammenhang mit der urchristlichen Christologie nicht übergangen werden, Ps 118:22–29 ist hier auf den Davidssohne Messias gedeutet.

He later associates the use of טליא, as lamb in v.27, and the presence of the root שבק in v.22 as possibly connected to Jesus death and cry from the cross in Matt 27:47.

⁵⁵⁷ M. Wilcox, “Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew 16:17–18” *NTS* 22 (1976), pp.73–88, especially pp.85–86.

⁵⁵⁸ C. A. Evans, “Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple” *James the Just and Christian Origins* B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), Leiden, Brill, 1999, pp.243–244, who uses the Targum to support his argument concerning ‘Dominical’ tradition in the gospels.

⁵⁵⁹ B. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* New York, Paulist Press, 1989, pp.293–294.

⁵⁶⁰ See L. Diez Merino, *Targum de Salmos*, p.360.

⁵⁶¹ Perhaps due to David being the ‘model’ for the Messiah, an idea that began in the prophetic books of the Bible, see Y. Zakovitch, *דוד מרועה למשיח* Jerusalem, Yad ben Zvi, 1995, although Zakovitch does not see Ps 118 as messianic. Also c.f., n.579 below.

The addition in v.13 of 'my sin' is unique to the Targum, and arises out of a textual difficulty in the MT.⁵⁶² There are no rabbinic interpretations for this verse that make such a connection, although *Midrash Tehillim* 118:3 connects David's singing of v.1 to the forgiveness of his sin. Such a contextual similarity may have served for this addition, although the fact that there are no other real points of contact between the Targum and *Midrash Tehillim* makes this connection more tenuous.⁵⁶³ However, in light of the clear association with David in the latter verses of the Psalm, this addition may be a reference to the affair with Bathsheba and Uriah the Hittite. Such an insertion would clearly mark David out as the 'speaker' in this Psalm, which is an important point to bear in mind when examining the latter verses, as will be seen below.

The speech-narrative additions to vv.23–29 present us with a problem in assessing the relationship between the Targum and rabbinic literature, which itself contains the same speech-narrative interpretation, but with different characters.⁵⁶⁴ The table below highlights the differences between the Targum and the manuscript tradition of BT *Pesahim* 119a,⁵⁶⁵ combined with *Midrash Samuel Zuta* and *Yalkut Machiri* on the Psalms. The individuals listed are those who speak, and the verses listed on the left are those being spoken.

	<i>Targum</i>	<i>BT.Pes.119a</i>	<i>MS.Munich</i>	<i>MS.Columbia</i> <i>141T-398X</i>	<i>MS.Tegon</i>	<i>Sam.Zuta</i>	<i>Yal.Machiri</i>
v.21	(David) ⁵⁶⁶	David	David	David	David	David	-
v.22a	(David)	Jesse	Jesse	Jesse	Jesse	Jesse	Jesse's wife
v.23a	Builders	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers
v.23b	Jesse's sons	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers	Brothers
v.24a	Builders	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	-

⁵⁶² i.e., between the plural forms in the preceding verses and the singular form in this verse.

⁵⁶³ See ch.6 for a detailed discussion that concludes that there is no reason to specifically associate Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim*.

⁵⁶⁴ Also see *Midrash Tehillim* 118:22 where there is a similar speech-narrative, but between the people of Jerusalem and the people of Judah.

⁵⁶⁵ *Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank*, The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, Jewish Theological Seminary, 1998.

⁵⁶⁶ I have included David in brackets here and in v.22 as the Targum has implicitly made David the speaker by his insertion in v.13 of 'my sin,' and thus it is assumed that he has continued speaking until the narrative indicates otherwise.

	<i>Targum</i>	<i>BT.Pes.119a</i>	<i>MS.Munich</i>	<i>MS.Columbia</i> <i>141T-398X</i>	<i>MS.Tegon</i>	<i>Sam.Zuta</i>	<i>Yal.Machiri</i>
v.24b	Jesse's sons	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	-
v.25a	Builders	Brothers	David	Brothers	-	Brothers	-
v.25b	Jesse + Wife	David	Brothers	David	David	Jesse	-
v.26a	Builders	Jesse	Jesse	Israel ⁵⁶⁷	Jesse	-	-
v.26b	David	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	-	-
v.27a	Tribe of Judah	Everyone	Everyone	Everyone	Everyone	-	-
v.27b	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	Samuel	-	-
v.28a	David	David	David	(David)	-	-	-
v.28b	David	Everyone	-	(David /everyone)	Everyone	-	-
v.29	Samuel	-	Everyone	-	-	-	-

Clearly the Targum belongs to this tradition of interpretation, but at the same time transmits a version that is different in nearly all its component parts. Not only does the Targum attribute different verses to different characters, it also introduces characters not in the other traditions.⁵⁶⁸ How can such differences be explained? Is it simply an-

⁵⁶⁷ Also in *Yalkut Shimoni* on Psalms, which is the same in all other respects.

⁵⁶⁸ Jesse's wife is only found in the Targum and in *Yalkut Machiri*, the builders only appear in the Targum, as is true for the tribe of Judah. Also note the apparently reduced role for Samuel and Jesse in the Targum's version of this speech-narrative. With regards the identity of the builders, Levy, *Chaldäische Wörterbuch*, p.60b suggests that they are those accompanying Samuel to crown the king, i.e., according to 1 Sam 16:4 the elders of the city. However, such identification is problematic, as we have no reason (from the Bible or midrash) for why the elders of the city 'rejected' David, as v.22 implies. Identifying them as the brothers would perhaps make more sense (especially in light of the midrash preserved in *Yalkut Machiri* where the brothers on seeing David born 'red' wanted to kill him, assuming him illegitimate, but instead made him as a servant who looked after the sheep), but they are included as a separate 'part' of this speech-narrative. One other possibility is that they represent the 'everyone' of the talmudic tradition. C. A. Evans, "Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple" in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.) *James the Just and Christian Origins* Leiden, Brill, 1999 somewhat casually, considering his previous statement that their identity was ambiguous, states that the builders are 'religious authorities,' citing parallels in rabbinic literature and Qumran as evidence (p.244). Also see

other stream of the same tradition adopted by the Targum, or has the Targum adapted an existing tradition for its own ends? Such questions must be answered before approaching the relationship between the Targum and the NT.

Hoffman's midrash collection, 1:17 מדרש תנאים על ספר דברים, based on Deut 1:17 is important in this context. This midrash begins:

והדבר אשר יקשה מכם תקריבו אלי ושמעתי (דב' א יז) שלשה נביאים גדולים לא עמדו בישראל כמוהם וכיון נתגאו נתמכו ואלו הן משה ושמואל וישעיהו:

And the matter that is too difficult for you, bring to me and I will hear it (Deut 1:17) Three great prophets, the like of whom have not stood in Israel, because they were proud they were humbled; and they are Moses, Samuel and Isaiah.

The passage connected to Samuel is as follows:

...שמואל כשאמר לו שאול הגידה נא [לי] איזה בית הרואה (שמואל א' ט' י"ח) היה צריך לומר מה אתם מבקשין אני אומר לכם איכן הוא אלא נתגאה ואמר אנכי הרואה אמר לו הקב"ה אתה הרואה אף אני אראך שאין אתה רואה אימתי הראהו בשעה שאמר לו מלא קרנך שמן ולך ואשלחך אל יישי בית הלחמי (שמואל א' ט"ז א') כיון שבא אל יישי העביר לפניו אליאב וראה אותו בחור התחיל משבחו ואומר אך נגד ה' משיתו אמר לו הקב"ה לא כך אמרת אנכי הראה אל תביט אל מראהו ואל גבה קומתו כי מאסתיהו העביר לפני כולן והוא אומר לו לא בחר ה' באלה לבסוף ויאמר שמואל אל יישי התמו הנערים ויאמר עוד שאר הקטן וכי קטן היה והלא אלי הוא הקטן שני' אצם הששי דוד השביעי (דה"י א' ב' ט"ו) ולמה נקרא קטן שהיה מאוס בעיני אביו מפני שכשהיה קטן היה מתנבא ואומר עתיד אני להחריב את מקומות פלשתים ולהרוג מהן אדם גדול ושמו גלית ועתיד אני לבנות בית המקדש מה עשה בו אביו הניחו לרעות את הצאן אמר לו שמואל שלחה וקחננו: וישלח ויביאהו והוא אדמוני עם יפה עינים וטוב רואי התחיל שמואל מזלזל בו מיד קצף עליו הקב"ה ואמר לו קום משחתו כי זה הוא קום בגערה אמר לו קום מלפני משיחי עומד ואתה יושב וכשמלך מהוא אומר אבן מאסו הבונים היתה לראש פנה (תהלי' קי"ח כ"ב): הבונים זה שמואל וישי היתה לראש פנה היה ראש למלכים:

...Samuel, as Saul said to him: Tell me where is the house of the Seer (1 Sam 9:18) What he should have said was 'What you are

K. Snodgrass, p.96 who cites Targum Ps. 118:22 as a proof-text that builders = religious leaders.

seeking? I will tell you where it is' but he was proud and said 'I am the Seer,' God said to him 'You are the Seer! But I will show you that you do not see.' When did he show him? At the time that He said to him: Fill your horn with oil and go, I will send you to Jesse, the Bethlehemite (1 Sam 16:1) When he had come to Jesse, he [Jesse] made Eliav pass before him [Samuel] and he assumed he was chosen [lit. he saw him chosen] and began to praise him and said 'Before the Lord is His anointed,' but God said to him "Didn't you say 'I am the seer,' don't look upon his appearance or his stature, for I have rejected him". He [Jesse] made all of them pass before him [Samuel] and he said to him 'The Lord has not chosen these,' finally Samuel said to Jesse 'are these all your sons?' and he said, 'The smallest is still left.' Was he the smallest, for surely Elihu was the smallest? As it says: Otzem the sixth, David the seventh (1 Chron 2:15), and why was he called small? Because he was rejected in the eyes of his father because when he was small he prophesied and said 'I will destroy the places of the Philistines and kill from their midst a giant called Goliath, and I will build the Temple.' What did his father do to him? He left him to shepherd the sheep. Samuel said to him 'Send and bring him' and he sent and they brought him, and he was ruddy, with beauty of eyes, and of good appearance. Samuel began to despise him. Immediately God was angry with him and said 'Get up, anoint him for he is the one.' He said, 'Get up' in rebuke, 'Get up before him, my anointed stands and you are sitting,' and when he is king what does he [David] say: The stone the builders rejected has become the head of the corner (Ps 118:22), the builders—this is Samuel and Jesse, has become the head of the corner—has become the head of kings.⁵⁶⁹

This midrash, as it stands here, only occurs in the late medieval collection *Midrash HaGadol Sefer Devarim* 1:17,⁵⁷⁰ and nowhere else in rabbinic literature (as far as I can ascertain), although parts of it are found in various sources.⁵⁷¹ However, the question we must ask regards

⁵⁶⁹ This criticism of Samuel, also finds expression in modern interpreters of the story, see R. Alter, *The David Story* London, New York, W. W. Norton, 1999, p.96, where commenting on ch.16:6 states, "Nothing could illustrate more vividly Samuel's persistent unreliability as seer..." Alter, however, goes beyond the Sages and suggests this failure began with the appointment of Saul.

⁵⁷⁰ S. Fisch, Jerusalem, 1972.

⁵⁷¹ The main body of the midrash (although much abbreviated) appears in *Sifre Devarim* 17, *Tanhuma* (Buber) **מקץ** 6, *Aggadat Bereshit* 70:1, and *Midrash*

its relationship with Tg.Ps. 118:22–29. The specific identification of ‘the builders’ as Samuel and Jesse is of interest in this regard. The Targum, in comparison to the talmudic versions of the tradition, appears to give a reduced role to Samuel and Jesse; however, if the identity of the builders in the Targum were the same as that in the above passage, i.e., Samuel and Jesse, then the tradition in the Targum makes more sense, for it is they who are amazed at the promotion of this child whom they had both already rejected, and it is they who have a central role together in the narrative. There may also be a linguistic link. The midrash clearly interprets the root **מָאָס**,⁵⁷² which is a clear reference to Ps 118:22, with the phrase **אָבִי הַנִּיחוּ**. This is especially interesting in the light of the Targum using **שִׁבַּק** for **מָאָס**, which is a unique translation in Tg.Ps. The significance lies in the fact that the Hebrew root **נָוַח** is translated on three of four occasions in Tg.Ps. with the root **שִׁבַּק**. The link between these two texts may be very close. It also should be noticed that the speaker in the Targum in v.22 is David, as is explicitly said in the passage above. It certainly seems possible that the Targum is related to this interpretation of the events of 1 Sam 16.⁵⁷³

This tradition however, is not necessarily ‘late,’ it appears in some form in Pseudo-Philo *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 59:1–4. In v.2 the midrash connected to 1 Sam 9 and 16 appears in a very similar fashion to that in *Sifre Devarim* 17. V.3 proceeds with the anointing of David, which is followed by David singing a Psalm in v.4:

...For my brothers were jealous (*zelaverunt*) of me, and my father and my mother abandoned (*neglexerunt*) me. When the prophet came they did not call to me. When the ‘anointed one of the Lord’ was

Samuel 14:3. We also find it in Pseudo-Philo *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 59:1–4 (discussed later). However, in all these texts explicit association with Psalm 118, and the details concerning the rejection of David and the reasons for them are missing. In *Gen. Rab.* 63 and *Midrash Samuel* 19:6 we find Samuel assuming David will ‘spill blood’ because of his ruddy appearance and his likeness to Esau. In *Midrash Tehillim* 31:7 (although only in 4 manuscripts) we find the implied criticism of Samuel sitting in the presence of David.

⁵⁷² The root **מָאָס** is central to this midrash. Those whom God rejected (**מָאָס**) Samuel and Jesse ‘accepted,’ whereas the individual rejected (**מָאָס**) by Samuel and Jesse is accepted by God.

⁵⁷³ Determining precedence between Tg.Ps. and this midrash is difficult, although if the linguistic connection suggested above is true then it would be more likely that Tg.Ps. built upon the midrash and not vice versa.

mentioned they forgot me. But God extended to me his right hand
and his mercy...⁵⁷⁴

Jacobson has pointed out the connection with some of the midrashim listed above, as well as noting the links with Gen 37:11 (Joseph's jealous brothers), and Psalm 27:10 ('my mother and father have abandoned me'). Clearly this is an early occurrence of this tradition. It would seem, however, that the Targum, although in the same tradition of interpretation as that of Pseudo-Philo, is not specifically related to it.

Psalm 151, as found in 11QPs151 (xxxviii. 3–12),⁵⁷⁵ also provides an interesting comparison to all these texts, as vv.1, 5–7 demonstrate:

1. Smaller was I than my brothers	1. קטן הייתי מן אחי
And the youngest of the sons of my father,	וצעיר מבני אבי
So he made me shepherd of his flock	וישימני רועה לצונו
And ruler over his kids.	ומושל בגדיותיו
5. He sent his prophet to anoint me	5. שלח נביאו למושחני
Samuel to make me great;	את שמואל לגדלני
My brothers went out to meet him,	יצאו אחי לקראתו
Handsome of figure and appearance.	יפי התור ויפי המראה
6. Though they were tall of stature	6. הגבהים בקומתם
And handsome by their hair,	היפים בשערם
The Lord God chose	לוא בחר ה'
Them not.	אלהים בס
7. But he sent and took me from behind the	7. וישלח ויקחני מאחר הצואן
flock	וימשחני בשמן הקודש
And anointed me with holy oil,	וישימני נגיד לעמו
And he made me leader of his people	ומושל בבני בריתו
And ruler over the sons of his covenant.	

Here again, as in Tg.Ps., we have David recalling his anointing by Samuel (against all the odds) in the form of a Psalm, although, as with all the other earlier versions of this tradition, Psalm 118 is not employed.⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷⁴ Text taken from H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* vol 1–2, Leiden, Brill, 1997.

⁵⁷⁵ Text and translation from J. A. Sanders, *DJD* iv, Oxford, 1965, pp.53–57, also see *Idem*. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1967, pp.93–103. For a recent discussion on the literary history of this psalm see, M. Segal, "The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version," in *Textus* 21 (2002), pp.139–158.

⁵⁷⁶ There may be a connection with Ps 118 (v.17) in v.4 (not quoted above) in the phrase **ומי יספר את מעשי אדון**, although Sanders sides very defi-

D. Flusser and S. Safrai⁵⁷⁷ re-published two texts from the Cairo Genizah which they claim (convincingly)⁵⁷⁸ to come from the Second Temple period. In text 1:18 we find the following:

פינה ממואסה אשר מאסו הבונים העלית לראש מעל כל האומים:

The rejected corner [stone] that the builders rejected, you have raised to the head over all the nations.

Flusser and Safrai note the similarities with some of the passages discussed above, but identify the 'builders' as David's brothers (without explanation). They then clearly outline the salient points of the texts and in particular the 'messianic' character given to David in the psalms they are discussing. The question that concerns us is the relationship between these psalms and Tg.Ps. 118. Most importantly Tg.Ps. has none of the messianic and universal elements found in these psalms, despite the rejected stone of Ps 118:22 being identified in both texts as David. Tg.Ps. clearly does not go beyond the 'historical' king found in 1 Samuel 16 and following. Such a fundamental difference rules out any relationship in scope or intention between Tg.Ps. and these psalms from the Cairo Genizah. The parallel use of Ps 118, however, is interesting, as these Genizah texts are the earliest occasion Ps 118 is used referring to David, although the 'Messianic, universal' David of the future, not the local, earthly David of the historic books of the Bible."

What do all these comparative traditions show concerning Tg.Ps. 118? Clearly this tradition has a long history. However, it seems probable that the linking of Psalm 118 with the story in 1 Sam 16:1–13 was a later development of that tradition, rather than an integral part of it from the start.⁵⁷⁹ Combine this with the close relationship between the

nately with 'the spirit of' Is 40:12–13 and Sirach 16:26. What exactly this means I am not sure, but there are no linguistic reasons for preferencing the latter texts over Ps 118, yet there remain no connection with Ps 118:22ff that are central to our discussion.

⁵⁷⁷ D. Flusser and S. Safrai, "שיר דוד" החיצוניים, תעודה ב עיונים במקרא, ספר זכרון ליהושע מאיר גרניץ, Tel Aviv 1982, pp.83–109

⁵⁷⁸ Although not every one agrees, see A. Rofé, מבוא לשירה המזמורית, Carmel: Jerusalem, 2004, p.14 n.15. However, see more recently, G. W. Lorein and E. Van Staaldue-Sulman, 'A Song of David for Each Day. The Provenance of the Song of David,' *Rev. de Qumran* 85 (2005), pp.33–59.

⁵⁷⁹ It seems as if the association of Ps 118:22 with the 'Messianic David' occurred in an earlier period, with the latter 'historical' connection appearing

Targum and the passage in *Midrash HaGadol to Deuteronomy* 1:17, and one has to conclude that the Targum represents a later development of the tradition, perhaps rabbinic, or maybe even later.⁵⁸⁰ Such conclusions thus make the earlier application of Tg.Ps. on these verses to the New Testament seem overly optimistic, and stresses that Tg.Ps. must be understood in its own Jewish, Targumic, and exegetical context before any attempt is made to use it in the study of the NT.⁵⁸¹

7.1c Tg.Ps. 80, the 'Son of Man' and the Messiah

We have already discussed in some detail Tg.Ps. 80:16, and the way in which a connection with Gen 49:11 brought about the messianic focus.⁵⁸² It is necessary in this section to briefly consider the possibility of its use as background for the New Testament, and in particular the 'Son of Man' traditions contained therein, as Tg.Ps. has been utilised to this end in some New Testament scholarship.⁵⁸³

The basis for Tg.Ps. 80:16 being used in relation to the Son of Man traditions appears to be the assumption that the phrase 'King Messiah' in v.16 is somehow a parallel designation to the phrase 'son of man' in v.18, and thus 'son of man' must have messianic associations. It is possible to read Tg.Ps. that way.⁵⁸⁴ Clearly the examples given in

later. Whether this latter 'historic' connection is a response to the 'messianic' connection is hard to determine.

⁵⁸⁰ *Contra* E. Cook, "The Psalms Targum," pp.193–194 who briefly analyses Tg.Ps. 118 and suggests that both BT *Pesahim* 119a and Tg.Ps. 'must depend on a prior tradition of interpretation,' and suggests that this was linked to the use of Ps 118 in the liturgy.

⁵⁸¹ Such conclusions clearly rule out any use of Tg.Ps. 118:27 by New Testament scholars, and in particular the play on words with youth/lamb that is found in the Aramaic טליא compared with its use in v.22.

⁵⁸² See ch.3.1c.

⁵⁸³ See W. Horbury, "The Messianic Association of the 'Son of Man,'" *JTS* 36.1 (1985), pp.34–55; B. McNeil, "The Son of Man and the Messiah: A Footnote," *NTS* 26 (1980), pp.419–421; M. Black, "Die Apotheose Israels: eine neue Interpretation des Danielischen 'Menschensohns,'" in R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (eds.), *Jesus und der Menschensohn für Anton Vögtle* Herder, 1975, pp.92–99.

⁵⁸⁴ Certainly Rashi interpreted the individuals in vv.16 and 18 as referring to the same person—Esau. Ibn Ezra, however, has a different reading of the text that is of interest in our discussion. He interprets על איש ימין in v.18 as interpreting נטעה ימין in v.16, he then explains the *masbal* as referring either to Israel or Messiah ben Ephraim.

n.584 are interpreting this Psalm differently from Tg.Ps., but the comparison sheds light on the possibility of the Tg.Ps. understanding the parallel phrases in vv.16 and 18 together, and thus the Son of Man may have messianic connotations.

With this possibility highlighted, the question remains as to its significance for New Testament research. Here the issue of dating is important. Horbury (p.38) clearly assigns an earlier date for Tg.Ps., although not specifically, whereas McNeil (p.420) defends the use of Tg.Ps. with the claim that a late redaction does not prove the lateness of individual traditions. Our study of the messianic interpretation of this Psalm (ch.3.1c) indicates that the earliest witnesses of the connection between Gen 49:11 and Ps 80:16 is found in the Church Father Theodoret and *Gen. Rab.* Such a situation makes the jump back to the first century difficult to make, although this does not detract from the interesting association there may be between 'son of man' and the Messiah in Tg.Ps.

7.1d Summary

In the three examples discussed the relevance of Tg.Ps. for New Testament research has been ruled out, but only after placing each interpretation in Tg.Ps. in its own Jewish context first. Such findings highlight the importance of methodological exactness when using this Targum as a source for traditions that might date back to the first century. It is important to note however, that to rule out the use of Tg.Ps. as a whole (as opposed to these three examples) for New Testament research purely on the basis of being 'late,' without proper analysis of the text being referred to is also inadequate.

7.2 Tg.Ps. AND REACTIONARY EXEGESIS

E. White,⁵⁸⁵ commenting on Tg.Ps. 2:12 makes the remark that "since Christians saw in the Psalm allusions to the divinity of Jesus, Jewish teachers *had to respond*" (emphasis mine).⁵⁸⁶ Clearly, to posit a purely

⁵⁸⁵ *Critical edition*, p.117.

⁵⁸⁶ White's assertion seems strange as this verse was not interpreted christologically by those early Christian authors who used the LXX. This is no doubt because the LXX translated 'Kiss the Son' in Ps 2:12 as 'receive instruction.' Jerome in his *iuxta Hebraeos* translates the same phrase with *adore pure*, and in doing so appears to follow Aquila's καταφιλήσατε ἐκλεκτός, yet in his *Commentarioli* he translates it literally (*adore filium*) and gives it a messianic interpretation. I am unaware of how this influenced later Christian interpreters of this verse.

reactionary position to Jewish biblical interpretation ignores the vitality and confidence of the Jewish tradition. Yes, Jews did respond to Christian arguments, but no, this was not a necessity. However, the opposite tendency in scholarship is also equally problematic, i.e., the view that Jews lived without concern or thought for their Christian counterparts and the claims they made. Thus this section will focus on occasions that may evince a reaction to Christian exegesis of the Psalms.

7.2a Tg.Ps. 45 and the Messiah

MT Ps 45:7–8

כסאך אלהים עולם ועד שבט מישר שבט מלכותך:
אהבת צדק ותשנא רשע על כן משחד אלהים אלהיך שמן ששון
מחבריך:

Your throne O God is forever, a sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of your kingdom.

You have loved righteousness and hated evil; therefore God your God has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.

Tg.Ps.

כורסייך אלהא בשמיא לעלמי עלמין מלכות תריץ חטר מלכותך:
אנת מלכא משיחא מטול דרחימת[א] צדקתא וסניתא רישעא מטול
היכנא רבייך ה' אלהך משחא דחדוא יתיר מן חברך:

Your throne O God is *in heaven* forever, the rule of righteousness is the sceptre of your kingdom.

And you, King Messiah, because you have loved righteousness and hated wickedness therefore the Lord your God has anointed you with the oil of gladness over your fellow.

The MT, in its current form, has an individual in v.7 called God (אלהים), being anointed by God (אלהים אלהיך) in v.8 on account of His love of righteousness and hatred of evil.⁵⁸⁷ For the author to the Hebrews and the early Church Fathers this passage was proof of the divinity of the Messiah Jesus.⁵⁸⁸ Modern interpreters, however, approach this text from the assumption that it couldn't possibly accord

⁵⁸⁷ C.f., Ps 89:21 for another example of God performing the anointing.

⁵⁸⁸ Hebrews 1:8–9 (see discussion below), also c.f., Justin Martyr *Dialogue with Trypho* 38,56,63,86; Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* 3.6.1; Tertullian *Adv. Prax.* 13; Origen *Contra Celsum* 1:56. Note also that these verses also became the subject of Christological controversy within the church, see F. M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* Peabody, Mass., Hendrickson, 2002, p.43.

divinity to an individual other than God and thus suggest ‘solutions to the perceived problem,’ which include adding an extra ‘throne’ into v.7 (c.f., Ibn Ezra), or making the כסא into a verbal form, thus creating a unique use of this root in biblical Hebrew!⁵⁸⁹ Another solution has been to explain that אלהים was a term for ancient sacral kings. Rashi also attempted to solve the problem, although without emending the text. He suggested that אלהים in v.7 should be understood in the same way as in Ex 7:1 where God said to Moses נתתיך לפרעה.

Tg.Ps. also found these verses problematic and thus made changes that avoided attributing divine status to the individual in v.7.⁵⁹⁰ However, we must see how the whole Psalm was translated before we deal with these specific verses in detail.⁵⁹¹

The key to understanding the Targum of this Psalm is in differentiating between those verses that speak of the Messiah and those that speak of God. This is not an easy task; Samson Levey in his work on Messianism in the Targum tradition describes the interplay between God, the Messiah (and Israel) as ‘skilful if difficult to follow at times.’⁵⁹² I have read the term ‘king’ in vv.2, 12, 16 as referring to God and not the Messiah, who is specifically designated as ‘King Messiah’ and not just ‘king.’ This reading is difficult and somewhat awkward but it is the only way of making sense of vv.13–14 where the Targum has rich gentiles seeking the king early in his Temple, as well offering him sacrifices. We can summarise therefore how the Targum has read the Psalm as follows:

⁵⁸⁹ C.f. G. Wallis “A Note on Ps 45:7a,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls* (eds. F. Garcia Martinez, et al), E. J. Brill, 1992, pp.100–103. Here Wallis describes the suggestion that אלהים used to be ה, which in turn was a corruption of יהיה! He also describes the suggestion that there was an extra כסא immediately after כסאך. He then goes on to propose his own solution of reading כסאך as a verbal form with אלהים as the subject thus making it read ‘God enthroned you...’ M. Dahood, *Psalms 1 1–50* Doubleday, New York, 1966 suggests the same ‘solution,’ although this is not noted by Wallis in his article above.

⁵⁹⁰ The problematic nature of these verses is also highlighted by the numerous manuscript variations surrounding them, all designed to rule out the possibility of the readers reaching the wrong conclusion.

⁵⁹¹ J. Schaper, *Eschatology of the Greek Psalter*, pp.78–83, suggests that the vocative use of ὁ Θεός in v.7 indicates that ‘it did not represent an insurmountable theological problem to the translators...’ Even if this is the case, it clearly became a problem for later translators.

⁵⁹² S. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation* Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, 1974, pp.111–112.

vv. 1–2 Introduction, with ‘king’ in v.2 referring to God.

vv. 3–6 Description of the Messiah and his actions as a warrior against God’s enemies

v.7 Refers to God.

vv. 8–11 Description of the Messiah and an exhortation for Israel to listen to his teaching.

v.12 God’s response to Israel’s obedience to the Messiah.

vv. 13–16 The response of the nations to the work of the Messiah—they come to worship God in the Temple, along with the re-gathering of the exiles to worship God in Jerusalem.

v.17 The appointing of the people of Israel as rulers throughout the earth.

v.18 Praise of God, by Israel and converted gentiles, in response to what He has done.

It is clear that the Targum significantly differs from the structure of the Hebrew, especially in the association of vv.1–2 and 7 with God, and is in effect retelling the Psalm. The translator, through additions and alterations, has managed to create a text that communicates the essential nature of the Messiah, his deeds, and the results that will come from his obedience.

Before proceeding further, we should note the occasions in which the Targum of Psalms uses the term ‘King Messiah’ or ‘Messiah.’ ‘King Messiah’ is used on three occasions stimulated by the Hebrew term ‘king’ (Psalms 21, 61, and 72), on one occasion by the Hebrew ‘ben’/‘son’ (Psalm 80),⁵⁹³ and once here in Psalm 45 where the catalyst for its addition to the Psalm is unclear. White suggests that ‘king’ in v.2 stimulated the addition,⁵⁹⁴ whereas Levey suggested the reason was the root מִשָּׁח in v.8 alongside a ‘vague contextual intimation.’⁵⁹⁵ White’s suggestion cannot be accepted if one reads the Targum in the way outlined above, and Levey’s suggestion remains problematic in its awkwardness, although it seems as if the author of the book of Hebrews uses vv.7–8 in such a way as to suggest that v.8 was the stimulus for the messianic association. Hebrews 1:8–9 quotes Ps 45:7–8, with the introduction πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν (and concerning the son...). The whole passage is designed to show that Jesus, as the Son of God, is better (κρείττων) than the angels (v.4). Thus for the author to the Hebrews Ps 45:7 refers to Jesus and thus by implication Jesus must be understood as ὁ θεός in v.7. It would appear that for the author of the Hebrews v.8 is

⁵⁹³ See Ch.3.1c for a discussion on this passage.

⁵⁹⁴ White, *Critical Edition*, p.125.

⁵⁹⁵ S. Levey, *Ibid.*, pp.111–112.

the clinching verse for making this connection, as in that verse God is described as anointing the individual described in v.7.

On ten other occasions the Targum uses the term משיח corresponding to the same root in the Hebrew. Thus it is important to note at this stage the difficulty in explaining the presence of 'king Messiah' in Tg.Ps. 45.

The Messianic focus of this Psalm in the Targum is all the more striking when viewed against the absence of any such interpretation in rabbinic literature.⁵⁹⁶ However, the idea that the Messiah would come and defeat God's enemies and set up a kingdom that would extend throughout the earth, ruled by God's people, is not foreign to Jewish ideas of the Messiah,⁵⁹⁷ nor is the idea that he would teach Torah and turn Israel back to God and return the exiles to Jerusalem, which would once again have a Temple that would be the centre of the worship of God for Jew and gentile. The uniqueness of the Targum to this Psalm lies not in the 'theology' of the Messiah but in connecting these ideas with Ps 45.⁵⁹⁸

However, a non-Jewish source reflects exactly the interpretation found in the Targum. Origen in *Contra Celsum* book 1, ch.56 relates how a Jew with whom he was debating interpreted Ps 45:7–8, which for Origen demonstrated that the Messiah, Jesus was God:⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁶ However, Ibn Ezra notes that this Psalm is about David or the Messiah, his son. Amos Hacham, however, in his commentary on the Psalms (ספר תהלים Jerusalem, Mossad haRav Kook), comments that the messianic interpretation is found in the Targum and 'many places' in rabbinic literature. I have yet to find these messianic interpretations in rabbinic literature.

⁵⁹⁷ See for example Tg.Ps.Jn Gen 49:10–12 and Fragment Targum P Num 24:7. It is interesting to note, however, as R. Kimmelman has pointed out in "The Daily Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption," *JQR* 79 (1988), pp.165–197, all these aspects are reflected in the daily Amidah prayer but it is God and not the Messiah (the prayer uses the term 'shoot of David') who does all these things and only then does the Messiah appear. Kimmelman notes that these views are similar to those attributed to R. Johanan in *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* 21 [ed. Mandelbaum, p.320] and other places. For an overview of the idea of the 'King Messiah' in rabbinic literature, see P. S. Alexander, "The King Messiah in Rabbinic Judaism" in J. Day (ed.) *King Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, pp.456–473.

⁵⁹⁸ C.f. the conclusions to ch.5.

⁵⁹⁹ Hebrews 1:8–9 may be the source for Origen's christological interpretation of Ps 45, although the text of Ps 45 itself may have generated the interpretation, as it clearly did with the passage from Hebrews.

Καὶ μέμνημαί γε πάνν θλίψας τὸν Εἰουδαῖον νομιζόμενον σοφὸν ἐκ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης· ὃς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπορῶν εἶπεῖν τὰ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἰουδαισμῷ ἀκόλουθα εἶπε πρὸς μὲν τὸν τῶν δλων θεὸν εἰρῆσθαι τὸ « Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου » πρὸς δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν τὸ « Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός σου » καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

And I am reminded how I greatly pressured the Jew, who was held as wise, concerning this saying [Psalm 45:7–8], and he being in difficulty answered consistent with his Judaism, saying that, Your throne o God is forever and the sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of your kingdom, proclaimed the God of everything; and, You have loved righteousness and hated iniquity so God your God has anointed you, etc, proclaimed the Messiah.⁶⁰⁰

This passage is very significant in that it is the only text I have found that in any way parallels the interpretation of these verses in the Targum. The question remains, however, as to the authenticity of Origen's attribution of this interpretation to his Jewish disputant. De Lange⁶⁰¹ begins and ends his chapter on 'debates and discussions' with the claim that there are "traces" and "fragmentary reminiscences" of actual discussions and debates between Origen and Jews recorded in Origen's work.⁶⁰² We know that Origen debated with the Jews and we know that Ps 45 was a popular text in dispute literature,⁶⁰³ therefore, the correspondence between the interpretation attributed to the Jew found in *Contra Celsum*, and that in the Targum, increases the possibility of historical authenticity. However, a closer analysis of the text is needed before arriving at such a conclusion.

Origen clearly portrays the Jew as having difficulty in responding to his interrogation over Ps 45:7–8 and the attribution of divinity to a being other than God. This difficulty, Origen claims, caused the Jew to answer "consistent with his Judaism" (τὰ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἰουδαισμῷ

⁶⁰⁰ Greek text is from *Contra Celse* (ed. M. Borret) Sources Chrétiennes 132, Paris 1967.

⁶⁰¹ *Origen and the Jews* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.

⁶⁰² C.f. G. Bardy, "Les Traditions juives dans l'oeuvre d'Origène," *RB* 34 (1925), pp.217–252. He expresses doubts (pp.225–226) as to the reliability of this information because of its vagueness and the popularity of the text being discussed in polemical literature.

⁶⁰³ C.f., Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 38, 56, 63, 87; \f 'Ancient Texts Index' Tertullian, *Answers to Jews*, ch.9.

ἀκόλουθα). This phrase is extremely important, and this is the only occasion that Origen uses it, as far as I can ascertain. Is Origen claiming that the Jew fell back on the traditional Jewish interpretation of this verse? Or that he fell back on traditional Jewish theology concerning the nature of the Messiah and interpreted these verses in Psalm 45 in that light? This latter question implies that the Jews were not interpreting the Psalm messianically and thus Origen's disputant was stumped as how to answer the question.⁶⁰⁴ Whichever way one answers this question the repercussions are significant for this study. If the former is correct then we have an early witness to the interpretation of these verses found in the Targum that would help in dating this tradition; however, if the latter is correct we have evidence that Jews were not interpreting this Psalm messianically but only through the pressure of polemic resorted to an interpretation in keeping with a Jewish understanding of the Messiah. If Origen's record reflects an actual historical reality, then we may suggest that the interpretation found in the Targum arose directly out of Jewish-Christian disputes over these verses. We should note in this context that in *Dialogue with Trypho* Justin adduces this Psalm on numerous occasions as evidence for the divinity of Christ and that Christ should be worshipped, but on no occasion does he place any exegetical response to such an interpretation in the mouth of Trypho.⁶⁰⁵

Thus I would tentatively conclude that the expression used by Origen in this passage, the silence of both rabbinic literature and Christian *adversus Iudaeos* literature with regard to Jewish interpretations of this Psalm in a messianic context, combined with the difficulties discussed earlier concerning the stimulus for the insertion of the idea of the Messiah in this Psalm along with the awkward structure of the Targum, which came about in order to avoid the possibility of reaching the 'wrong' conclusions when reading vv.7–8; all point to the likelihood that Origen's Jewish disputant fell back on traditional Jewish theology on the Messiah to interpret Ps 45:7–8 in a messianic context.

This text, therefore, possibly gives us an insight into the process that occurred and whose end product is only reflected in Tg.Ps. 45, i.e., Jews, in response to Christian disputation and polemic surrounding Ps

⁶⁰⁴ This holds true if this situation was a complete fabrication or historical reality, as Origen knew Jewish traditions of interpretations both through personal contact and other sources. The centrality of Psalm 45 to Christian arguments with Jews therefore makes it very unlikely that Origen would be unaware of Jewish interpretations of this Psalm.

⁶⁰⁵ In ch.63–64, however, we find Trypho acknowledging that the Messiah is God, but only for the gentiles!

45 concerning the divinity of the Messiah and thus of Jesus, developed a response which interpreted Psalm 45 messianically but in a way that was acceptable to Jewish theology. The possibility that Tg.Ps. 45:7–8 should be viewed as part of an internal Jewish debate over the nature of the Messiah, devoid of any ‘response’ to the ‘other’ remains a possibility, although in light of the evidence brought forward it remains much more of a conjecture than the ‘reactionary’ interpretation suggested above. This text from *Contra Celsum* therefore, if the above scenario is correct, acts as a sort of photograph that has captured an historical process, a rare glimpse of a stage in the development of an interpretation of a biblical passage, for which we only have the end product.⁶⁰⁶ It seems therefore that this interpretation of Psalm 45 in Tg.Ps. initially arose at a time when, and amongst a community where, Jewish-Christian polemic was a reality in the Roman province of *Syria Palaestina*.⁶⁰⁷

Why this response is not evinced in rabbinic exegesis remains a difficulty, although this may have something to do with the ‘target audience’ of each *genre* or the simple fact that the Targum has to deal with the text in context and in so doing needed to deal with the messianic intimations both in the Hebrew text itself and those given to the whole Psalm in Christian literature and exegesis. The atomistic nature of Midrash allowed any such exegetical influence to be ignored. The other solution to this may lie in our discussion of the eschatology reflected in the daily *Amidah* (see n.597), which attributed much of the work connected to the Messiah in this Psalm, to God and therefore messianic

⁶⁰⁶ I therefore disagree with G. Bardy (see n.602) and see this passage as quite possibly reflecting an actual historical situation.

⁶⁰⁷ I have yet to find any pre-Christian Jewish texts that interpret Psalm 45 in a messianic context. We do have 4Q171 that interprets Psalm 45, and the reconstruction appears to suggest that the Teacher of Righteousness is the figure that appears as the focus of the Psalm (see 4Q171 col. IV 23–27). Examination of the fragments, however, clearly shows that the placement of the fragment that contains the name of the Teacher of Righteousness is very uncertain and as such cannot be used in any concrete way. This fact seems to have escaped the editors of subsequent reproductions and or translations of the text who include it without any reference to the actual problem or the cautionary note given in the official publication in DJD 5, “F.9 is however uncertainly placed”. This cautionary note, I would suggest, is a little understated considering the fragmentary nature of the whole document and the way it seems to have been consistently ignored.

interpretations of this Psalm were avoided because they may encourage actions and events that surrounded the failed Bar Kochba rebellion.

7.2b Tg.Ps. 2 and the Begotten Messiah

The text of Psalm 2 also presented the Targum with specific problems, as potentially did various Christian interpretations of that Psalm. We must, however, examine the translation of vv.7–8 before we look closer at the interpretation and its relationship to other traditions.

MT Ps 2:7–8

אספרה אל חק ה' אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך:
שאל ממני ואתנה גוים נחלתך ואחזתך אפסי ארץ:

I will declare the decree, the Lord said to me, 'You are my son to-day I have begotten you.'

Ask of me and I will give the nations as your inheritance and the ends of the earth as your possession.

Tg.Ps.

אישתעי אלקא קיימא ה' אמר חביב כבר לאבא לי את זכיא כאילו
יומא דין בריתך:
בעי מיני ואתן ניכסי עממיא אחסנתך ואחזתך שלטוני סייפי ארעא:

I will declare the Lord is *God* of the covenant (or: the God who exists), He said you *are beloved to me as a son to a father, righteous as if I created you* this day.⁶⁰⁸

Ask me, and I will give *the possessions of* the nations as your inheritance, and *the rulers of* the ends of the earth as your possession.

אמר חביב כבר לאבא לי את זכיא כאילו יומא דין בריתך translates and adds to the Hebrew אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך. Clearly the unambiguous wording of the MT has caused the Targum to translate using simile in order to prevent the reader/hearer from drawing conclusions at odds with the theological worldview of the translator. The question remains as to the 'pressure' that caused such a translation—was it purely textual as Bernstein has claimed,⁶⁰⁹ or did the use of this verse in the Christian world influence this translation? Secondly, the use of the root ברא to translate ילד needs some comment, as it is the

⁶⁰⁸ I have read קיימא as covenant as opposed to 'everlasting' following Bernstein, "Translation Technique," p.337 n.29. See Ch.2.3d for further discussion on this verse and for a discussion on אלהים replacing the preposition אל.

⁶⁰⁹ "Translation Technique," pp.337–338.

only occasion that Tg.Ps. translates it in such a way.⁶¹⁰ Bernstein suggests the desire to avoid theological error combined with the desire to emphasize God's role as creator as the rationale behind this translation, citing Onkelos to Deut 32:18 as another example.⁶¹¹ However, Aquila had no problem in translating the phrase literally: τέκνον μου ἐλὺς σὺ, ἐγὼν σήμερον ἔτεκόν σέ,⁶¹² and apparently neither did 1Q28a:

[ה]וא [זה מו]שב אנשי השם [קראי] מועד לעצת היחד אם יוליד
[אל] א[ת] המשיח אתם יבוא [הכהן] ראש כול עדת ישראל
וכול⁶¹³

[This shall be the ass]embly of the men of renown [called to] the meeting of the assembly of the community when God begets the Messiah, the [priest] shall come with them [at] the head of the whole community of Israel and all...

This text seems to, and I would stress 'seems to,' allude to Ps 2:7, and in a way that understood the Psalm literally, i.e., God begot the Messiah, who is identified as the king of v.7.⁶¹⁴ Thus this text (possibly),

⁶¹⁰ One manuscript, VA, seems to use the root ברא to translate ילד in Ps 87:4–5, although it seems clear, when comparing it to the other manuscripts and the context, that it is down to scribal error (either the original scribe or Diez Merino) as all other manuscripts checked use the root רבא.

⁶¹¹ C.f., Ibn Ezra to Deut 32:18 who makes the same connection.

⁶¹² See also the LXX, which also rendered the Hebrew literally, although the LXX uses a different word for son (υἱός). Whether Aquila used τέκνον to avoid Christological interpretations is difficult to determine.

⁶¹³ The text is taken from *DJD* 1 (eds. Bartholomew and Milik), for a slightly different reconstruction see *Dead Sea Scrolls vol.1 Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. Charlesworth), 1994. The reading at the end of line 11 (יוליד) appears quite clearly (to my eyes) on the computer-generated images, although it remains a disputed reading.

⁶¹⁴ This text, and in particular these lines, have generated much discussion in scholarly literature in the past fifty years. For a recent assessment and review of the past literature see P. Maiburger, "Das Verstandnis von Psalm 2 in der Septuaginta, im Targum, in Qumran, im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament," in *Beiträge zur Psalmenforschung. Psalm 2 und 22* Würzburg, 1988, pp.85–152. In light of all the proposed emendations, additions, etc, given in the literature there remains the danger, outlined above for 4Q174, of building theories upon texts that cannot, in their present damaged and fragmentary condition, confirm or refute them.

along with the LXX and Aquila all had no problem with repeating the literalness of Ps 2:7,⁶¹⁵ whereas the Targum clearly removed it.⁶¹⁶

In v.8 the Targum adds to the MT in this verse, making the ‘possessions’ of the nations, and the ‘rulers’ of the ends of the earth, the inheritance and possession given in response to the desired request. These additions seem superfluous as land and people are common objects of ‘possession’ and ‘inheritance’ in biblical theology. Ps 82:7 is a comparative example which the Targum leaves unaltered. Reasons for such additions, therefore, must be looked into further.

The question we must explore is whether Christian interpretations have influenced the Targum’s translation of vv.7–8. The specific avoidance of God calling the king his ‘son,’ the use of ‘created’ over and against ‘begotten,’ plus the additions of ‘possessions’ and ‘judges’ to v.8 all point to the possibility that the Targum is specifically removing those elements of the Psalm that early Christians were using as proof texts for Jesus’ Messiahship, divinity, and universal mission.⁶¹⁷

However, we must see the Targum in its Jewish context first. *Midrash Tehillim* 2:9 provides an interesting parallel to the Targum in v.7:⁶¹⁸ Here we have two parallel interpretations with the Targum, firstly the use of simile: ‘you are beloved to me as a son,’ which is derived from the unusual mode of expression (בני אתה)⁶¹⁹ that is interpreted as

⁶¹⁵ Although note comment in n.612 concerning Aquila’s translation.

⁶¹⁶ The fact that the LXX and Aquila both preserved the literalness of this Psalm means that 1Q28 may also have read Psalm 2 literally.

⁶¹⁷ For Jesus’ divinity see Heb. 1:4–5; Justin Martyr *Dial.* 88, 103; Tertulian, *Adv. Marc.* 4:22; *Adv. Prax.* 7, 11; Cyprian *Treatise* 12:8; Novatian *Trinity* 27; Ephrem *Hymnen de Nativitate* 25:8; *Hymnen Contra Haereses* 34:8. For Jesus’ universal mission see Justin Martyr *Dialogue* 122; Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* 4:21; Tertulian *Adv. Marc.* 5:17; Origen *Contra Celsum* 4:8, 5:32; Eusebius *Ps. Comm.* Titles given to Psalms, PG 23, p.68. No claims are specifically made in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature concerning particular Jewish interpretations connected to this Psalm, although Tertullian in his *Adversus Iudaeos* ch.12, explicates how vv.7–8 cannot possibly refer to David (this same argument is followed by Origen in his commentary on John 6:23). This, however, seems to be rhetorical rather than a specific reference to contemporary Jewish interpretation, although Rashi refers the ‘plain meaning’ of the text to David.

⁶¹⁸ See ch.6.1a for a discussion on the relationship between *Midrash Tehillim* and Tg.Ps. on this verse.

⁶¹⁹ This is the only occasion that this phrase appears in the Hebrew Bible, and it is this uniqueness, combined with the fact that God is speaking, that

symbolising a metaphoric relationship and not a familial one; and secondly, the idea of the Messiah being created in connection to the Hebrew 'begotten.' Our discussion in ch.6.1a has shown that these texts are not necessarily related, and in fact are making different points, yet both clearly see the need to prevent 'wrong conclusions' being reached from the Hebrew text.

With regard to v.8 the Targum has added 'possession' and 'judges' to the MT thus specifying those aspects that the King Messiah will inherit. Such an interpretation appears unique to the Targum. *Midrash Tehillim* 2:10, however, comments after quoting this verse:

אם גוים כבר הן נחלתך, ואם אפסי ארץ כבר הן אחוזתך:

If [you ask for] the nations, they are already your inheritance, and if [you request] the ends of the earth, they already are your possession.

Such an interpretation seems strange as it stands, although it becomes clearer in the printed versions of the Midrash (cited in Buber's footnotes) where Ps 72:8a is brought as a proof-text to the first half and 72:8b in relation to the second half of the midrash.⁶²⁰ It is possible therefore that the Targum, aware of this interpretation, added the specific aspects of 'inheritance' and 'possession,' so as to link in with the messianic interpretation given in Ps 72, where in vv.9–10 the Messiah's enemies and the kings of the earth come and bow down, bringing gifts.⁶²¹

We have seen therefore the relationship between the Targum and *Midrash Tehillim* for v.7, and it is interesting that both texts assert a messianic interpretation, but within the confines of contemporary Jewish thought. The possibility that some reaction to Christian messianic interpretation to this Psalm, especially with regard to their literal reading of the poetic text, may have influenced the expanded, metaphoric interpretations given both in the Midrash and the Targum. However, it is impossible to prove in light of the information available, although the likelihood is increased when one considers the earlier examples of Jewish translation/interpretation of this text that deal with it literally. With re-

provides the hook upon which to build this interpretation in *Midrash Tehillim* and thus avoid any potential theological ambiguity.

⁶²⁰ Note that the Targum interprets Ps 72 in reference to the Messiah, and v.8 that he will rule (וישלוט) throughout the earth. Note also that v.8 is specifically linked with the Messiah in *Num. Rab.* 13:14, and *Pesikta Rabbati* 13.

⁶²¹ If this was the case the link would be purely contextual and not linguistic, as the specific words נכס and שלטון do not appear in Tg. Ps. 72:8–10.

gards v.8 the same applies, the Targum may be responding to Christian interpretations, although other reasons have been put forward that may explain the additions. It seems imprudent therefore to specifically claim that the Targum is responding to Christian interpretations, although it should not be ruled out.

7.2c Tg.Ps. 110, the Messiah, and David

When reading Tg.Ps. 110:1 there is a danger of reading the explicit detail given in the 'Lashon aher,' concerning David and his appointment as king over Israel, back into the text of v.1.⁶²² In this way we assume something that is far from clear when we take the text at face value. V.1 reads as follows:

על יד דוד תושבחתא אמר ה' במימריה למיתן לי רבניתא חלף
דיתיבית לאולפן אורית ימיניה
אוריד עד דאשוי בעלי דבביך כביש ריגלך:

Praise by David. The Lord, by His *Memra*, said to give to me dominion because I sat to learn the Torah of His right hand, 'Wait until I place your enemies as a stool for your feet.'

From this verse we can be certain that the author of Tg.Ps. viewed David as the author of this Psalm, but this does not automatically make the content of the Psalm relate to him. We can be certain that the individual who is speaking has received dominion from the Lord because of his Torah study, and that he is to wait for the Lord to place his enemies under his feet. Who this individual is, what the nature of his dominion will be and who the enemies are, the Targum does not specify. The 'Lashon aher,' however, gives one solution—David is the individual and the kingship of Israel is the dominion:

ל"א אמר ה' במימריה לשוא[ה?] יתי ריבון על ישראל ברם אמר לי
תיב אוריד לשאול דמן שבט בנימן עד דימות ארום לית מלכותא
מקרבא אבהרת[א?] ובתר כן אשוי בעלי דבבך כביש ריגלך:

Lashon Aher 'The Lord said by His *Memra* to place me as ruler over Israel, but He said to me, 'Sit! Wait until Saul, from the tribe of Benjamin, dies because a kingdom should not encroach on another⁶²³, and afterwards I will place your enemies as a stool for your feet.'

⁶²² N reverses order of Targum and 'Targum aher.'

⁶²³ Reading from the apparatus, V and N read 'no kingdom should encroach breaking (?).'

This does not mean however that the answer is the same in our verse, in fact, the 'Lashon aher' functions in a similar way to the **דבר אחר** in the Midrashim, and signifies a different interpretation to the one preceding it. Thus David may not be the individual referred to in the first verse of this Psalm.

Secondly, vv.6–7 in the Targum creates problems for us in ascertaining who is being talked about and how this fits in with the rest of the Psalm.

MT Ps 110:6–7

ידין בגוים מלא גויות מחץ ראש על ארץ רבה:
מנחל בדרך ישתה על כן ירים ראש:

He will judge the nations, piling up bodies smiting the head[s] of a great land.

He will drink from the wadi on the way, therefore he shall raise the head.

Tg.Ps.

איתמנא [את מיתמנא/את מנא]⁶²⁴ לדיין על עמיא מלי ארעא גושמי
(גושמי) רשיעין קטילין מחא רישי מלכיא על ארעא סגיעין לחדא:
מפום נבייא באורחא אולפן יקבל מטול היכנא יזקוף ריש[א]:

He was [you were] *appointed* judge over the nations, the earth was filled with *the bodies of the wicked who were killed*, He smote the heads of *kings* over the earth, very many.

From the mouth of prophets on the way *he received instruction*, because of this he will raise the head.

In the Hebrew it is the Lord who is judge and who seems to then drink from a stream (v.7); whereas the Targum in adding to v.6 and interpreting v.7 metaphorically, has made it impossible for the Lord to be the focus,⁶²⁵ although the syntactical structure of the whole Psalm points to this conclusion. My proposed emendation **את מתמנא/את** (**מנא**)⁶²⁶ makes it possible to read these verses as referring to the individual to whom the Lord is talking and as such makes this

⁶²⁴ Proposed emendation.

⁶²⁵ I find it hard to imagine a Jewish text that has God receiving instruction from the mouths of the prophets He himself inspired.

⁶²⁶ **את מתמנא** would link nicely with **דאת מיתמני** in v.4, whereas **את מנא** provides the same meaning. However, note that the MT is in the third person.

vidual to whom the Lord is talking and as such makes this individual somewhat messianic in his role.⁶²⁷

Rabbinic interpretations surrounding this Psalm associate it with Abraham, either through a connection with Gen 14 and the blessing of Melchizedek or through a connection with Gen 18 and Abraham sitting at the door of his tent when God visits him.⁶²⁸ The Targum, however, clearly takes a different approach. The 'Lashon aher' as we have already mentioned explicitly links the Psalm with King David, an association that is only made in *Midrash Tehillim*, once as a passing reference in the context of David killing Goliath and the blessing of Judah in Gen 49:8,⁶²⁹ and again in its commentary on Ps 110 (*Mid. Tehillim* 110:5), where it reflects the interpretation of the 'Targum aher' exactly.⁶³⁰ Interestingly, R. David Kimhi in his Psalms commentary corresponds with the interpretation in the Targum on a number of occasions.⁶³¹ He lists previous authorities who interpreted it in the light of King David,⁶³² based on reading לָדוֹד of the title as בַּעֲבוּר לָדוֹד. In v.4 he interprets the Hebrew כֹּהֵן as מֶלֶךְ וְנָגִיד (king and prince), which corresponds in thought to the Targum's 'appointed as leader,'⁶³³ and the Hebrew עַל דְּבַר מַלְכִי צָדֵק is interpreted with עַל דְּבַר שְׂאֵתָהּ מֶלֶךְ צָדֵק, which is exactly the same as the Targum. His interpretation is then followed by a critique of the Christian interpretation of the Psalm.⁶³⁴

⁶²⁷ This emendation does not solve the problem as the text continues in the third person, but it remains a possibility that should not be ruled out, otherwise one could read vv.6–7 as referring to the individual in v.5, although this causes a significant break in the flow of the Psalm.

⁶²⁸ For a recent discussion on the association of Abraham with this Psalm see G. Bodendorfer, "Abraham zur Rechten Gottes," *Evangelische Theologie* 59.4 (1999), pp.252–267.

⁶²⁹ See *Midrash Tehillim* 18:32.

⁶³⁰ Note that this particular passage only occurs in two of the eight manuscripts used in Buber's edition.

⁶³¹ Although R. David Kimhi is considerably later (12th–13th Century) than the intended scope of the research, the similarities are striking enough to be included and contribute to the uncovering of the history of interpretation of this Psalm.

⁶³² He refers to an anonymous poet, Ibn Ezra and his father.

⁶³³ Although for RaDaK the focus is not the world to come as it is in the Targum.

⁶³⁴ This critique does not impinge on our study, although it is interesting to note that he criticizes the Christians for translating/interpreting the Hebrew עַמְךָ (your people) as 'with you,' an interpretation that also occurs in *Gen. Rab.*

At present therefore the connection between this Psalm and David only occurs as a 'Lashon Aher' in the Targum, two manuscripts of *Midrash Tehillim*, and some medieval commentaries, who themselves claim it to be the 'plain meaning' of the text.⁶³⁵ All this points to it being a minority tradition and/or a late tradition.

However, in light of this discussion it is important to note at this point that the Targum makes significant changes to the text in vv.1,3, and 4, plus a metaphorical reading of v.7. Vv.1,3, and 4 are well known proof texts used extensively in the NT and early Christian literature in a Christological fashion. The fact that the Targum removes those aspects that are used by the New Testament and early church fathers should highlight the possibility that the translation has been made with one eye on the 'other.' This possibility is increased when the New Testament is seen to make specific use of the authorship of David and how the Psalm cannot be read to refer to him.⁶³⁶ If this is the case then we need to ask if this was the original message of the Targum, or a later development in response to Christian claims?

In the light of the discussion above it is important to return to the possibility hinted at above concerning the Targum of v.1 where no specific figure is mentioned. The fact that we have a figure who receives greatness in return for Torah study, and then as a result of ruling righteously over his enemies as well as Israel, earns greatness in the world to come, and who also possibly is appointed judge over the nations and exercises a severe judgment upon them, points to the possibility that there is a messianic figure behind this interpretation (c.f., the Messiah in Tg.Ps. 45). This Psalm is associated with messianic speculation within rabbinic literature, although only on four occasions. *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A.34 uses v.4 to suggest that the Messiah is more beloved than Aaron, both of whom are identified as the two 'sons of oil' in Zech 4:14:

כיוצא בו אלה שני בני היצהר העומדים על אדון כל הארץ (זכריה ד' י"ד) זה אהרן ומשיח ואיני יודע איזה מהן חביב כשהוא אומר נשבע ה' ולא ינחם אתה כהן לעולם [על דברתי מלכי צדק] (תהלים ק"ה') הוי יודע שמלך המשיח חביב יותר מכהן צדק:

39 where R. Nehemiah reads it the same way (also see *Tanbuma* (Buber) לך לך 4), Aquila, and the LXX.

⁶³⁵ It would appear, however, considering the lack of interpreters who connected this Psalm with David that such a connection was not as 'plain' as they thought.

⁶³⁶ See Matt 22:44, Acts 2:31–37.

Similarly, these are the two sons of oil that stand by the Lord of all the earth (Zechariah 4:14) this is Aaron and the Messiah, and I don't know which of them is more beloved, as it says, the Lord has sworn and will not repent you are priest forever after the manner of Melchizedek (Ps 110:4). Thus it is known that King Messiah is more beloved than the righteous priest.⁶³⁷

The connection between Ps 110 and Zechariah 4 is clear—**אדון** appears in both texts (Zech 4:14 and Ps 110:1), as does an individual on His side. Ps 110:4 is used to illustrate the preference of the Messiah over the priest Aaron, and thus the proper name 'Melchizedek' is used as a noun and modifier—righteous king, and is seen as referring to the Messiah. The priest in this verse refers to Aaron, although his eternal priesthood is given to him *on account* of the righteous king (thus the Hebrew **על דברתי** is interpreted as 'according to the words of...'),⁶³⁸ thus the Messiah is more beloved as Aaron's position is derived from his decree and not vice-versa.

Clearly this interpretation is different from that in v.4 of the Targum, although both remove Melchizedek from the context and replace the name with 'righteous king'.⁶³⁹ The messianic context given to the Psalm, however, is important to note. Such a context also appears in *Midrash Tehillim* 2:9.

אספרה אל חק ה' אמר אלי בני אתה. (תהלים ב ז) מסופרין הן בחוקה של תורה, ובחוקה של נביאים, ובחוקה של כתובים, כתוב בחוקה של תורה בני בכורי ישראל (שמות ד כב), וכתוב בחוקה של נביאים הנה ישכיל עבדי (ישעיה נב יג), וכתוב בתריה הן עבדי אתמך בו [בחירי רצתה נפשי] (שם מב א), וכתוב בחוקה של כתובים נאם ה' לאדוני שב לימיני (תהלים קי א), וכתוב ה' אמר אלי בני אתה, [וכתוב אחר אומר וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הווא. (דניאל ז יג) ה' אמר אלי בני אתה] אמר ר' יודן כל הנחמות הללו בחוקו של מלך מלכי המלכים הן לעשותן למלך המשיח, וכל כך למה, לפי שהוא עוסק בתורה:

⁶³⁷ For a discussion on the manuscript and textual issues of this passage see M. Kister, *עיונים באבות דר' נתן נוסח, עריכה ופרשנות*, p.41.

⁶³⁸ See also *Lev. Rab.* 25:6 for a similar interpretation of this phrase where it is interpreted: **על דברו של מלכי צדק**.

⁶³⁹ The earliest text I am aware of that interprets the name Melchizedek, as 'righteous king' is Hebrews 7:2 although the etymological interpretation does not replace the name here, only develops its significance.

I will declare the decree of the Lord, He said to me 'you are my son [today I have begotten you.]' (Psalm 2:7) They are spoken about in the decree of Torah, the decree of the Prophets and the decree of the Writings. It is written in the decree of Torah, Israel is my first-born son (Ex 4:21), it is written in the decree of the Prophets, My servant will prosper (Isaiah 52:13), and written after him, This is my servant whom I uphold [My chosen one the desire of my soul] (Isaiah 42:1) and it is written in the decree of the Writings, The Lord said to my lord sit on my right hand (Psalm 110:1) and it is written The Lord said to me you are my son [and it is also written, And one like the son of man coming with the clouds of heaven (Daniel 7:13). The Lord said to me you are my son] R. Yudan said, 'All these consolations by decree of the King of the king of kings will be done to the King Messiah,' and why? Because He studies Torah.⁶⁴⁰

Two things are important from this text for our study of the Targum. Firstly, the messianic interpretation for Ps 110 and secondly, the connection made by R. Yudan between the Messiah and his reward for studying Torah is the exact same reason given in the Targum of v.1 for the individual's elevation to greatness.⁶⁴¹

We also need to comment in this context on the translation **חוטרא** **עושנד** in v.2, which translates **מטה עוז**. This construction occurs three other times in the MT and is translated with **שלטונין תוקפין** on two occasions (Ezek 19:12,14), and by **מלך מבאיש** on one occasion (Jer. 48:17). The Hebrew **מטה** occurs once more in the Psalms and is translated with **סעיד** (105:16). The uniqueness of this translation within Tg.Ps. is of note, especially as **חוטרא** appears five other times in the Targum: Ps 2:9; 45:7(x2); 78:13,15. Except Ps 78:13,15, where the reference is to the rod of Moses, all the other occurrences are in Psalms with Messianic features. In this context *Gen. Rab.* 85:18 is of significance in its use of Ps 110:2:

ויאמר מה הערבון וגו' ותאמר חותמך ופתילך ומטך וגו' (בראשית
לח יח) אמר ר' חוניה נצנצה בה רוח הקודש חותמך זו המלכות היך

⁶⁴⁰ It seems clear that this text, with the very specific biblical references, all of which have significance in Jewish-Christian polemic, has a very specific focus on competing Christian claims. See ch.6.1a for a discussion on this text.

⁶⁴¹ In *Midrash Tehillim* 18:29 R. Yudan is also attributed another interpretation of Ps 110:1 in connection to the Messiah, where the Messiah sits on God's right hand and Abraham on God's left.

דאָת אָמַר כִּי אִם יִהְיֶה כּוֹנֵיָה בֶן יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ יִהְיֶה חוֹתָם וְגו' (יִרְמְיָה כב כד), וּפְתִילֶךְ זֶה סִנְהֶדְרִין הֵיךְ דָּאָת אָמַר וְנִתְּנָה עַל צִיצִית הַכֹּנֵף פְּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת וְגו' (בַּמִּדְבָּר טו לח), וּמִטָּךְ זֶה מֶלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ הֵיךְ דָּאָת אָמַר מִטָּה עֹזֶךְ יִשְׁלַח י"י מִצִּיּוֹן: (תְּהִלִּים קי ב)

And he said, 'What pledge [shall I give you?]' She said, 'Your signet ring and your cord and your staff' (Gen 38:18) R. Hunia said, 'The Holy Spirit shone upon her: 'Your signet' this is the kingdom as it says: though if Coniah son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, were the signet ring...(Jer. 22:24), 'and cord' this is the Sanhedrin as it says: and put upon the fringes of your garment a violet cord (Num 15:38) and 'your staff,' this is the King Messiah as it says: He will send the rod of your strength from Zion (Ps 110:2).⁶⁴²

This midrash attributed to R. Hunia is significant to our study because of the way it uses Ps 110:2 as its proof text that **מִטָּה** in Gen 38 can be interpreted as the Messiah. The assumption behind this midrash is that Ps 110:2 and in particular the phrase **מִטָּה עֹזֶךְ**, is known to refer to the Messiah. If this were not the case the midrash would not make any sense.⁶⁴³ It is both important and interesting that nowhere else (i.e., other than *Gen. Rab.*) is this verse (Ps 110:2) interpreted in a messianic context in classical rabbinic literature, except possibly our Targum.

A much earlier text, from the New Testament, also hints at the possibility of Ps 110 having a messianic interpretation. The passage is from Matt 22:41–46 where Jesus asks the Pharisees who they say the Messiah is; whose son is he? They reply, the son of David. Jesus replies to this:

...Πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ δὲν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων, Εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἃν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου (Ps 110.1) εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν⁶⁴⁴

⁶⁴² Also see *Num. Rab.* 18:23.

⁶⁴³ Ps 110:2 functions in the same way that Num 15:38 functions in this midrash, where the author assumes that his readers will know that this verse has a connection to the Sanhedrin.

⁶⁴⁴ Note the Greek here is slightly different from that in the LXX, which has ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. Hengel has suggested quite plausibly that the text in Matthew and Mark comes from the influence of Ps 8:7 which he claims was used from a very early stage in conjunction with Ps 110. See "Sit at my Right Hand," *Studies in Early Christology* T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1995, pp.119–226, esp. p.171. The combining of two Psalms in one 'quote/reference' is

...How therefore can David call him Lord saying: The Lord said to my Lord sit at my right hand, until I place your enemies under your feet (Ps110:1) If therefore David calls him lord, how can he be his son?⁶⁴⁵

Without going into all the details of the use of this Psalm in the New Testament, it is instructive for our study to note the assumption behind the question and answer of Jesus that Ps 110:1 refers to the Messiah, and that no opposition to such a claim is recorded by the Synoptics.⁶⁴⁶

All these texts have been brought forward to aid us in our investigation into the possible messianic interpretation of Ps 110 in the Targum. There seems, therefore in light of this discussion, to be a reasonable possibility that the Targum retains in some of its features some remnants of a messianic interpretation.

Having highlighted the possible messianic association in the Targum we must now return to the question concerning the link made specifically in the 'Lashon aher' between this Psalm and David. It seems that two interpretations of this Psalm are preserved for us in the manuscripts of the Targum,⁶⁴⁷ one messianic and one historical (with a future aspect to it). Can we discern an 'older'/'younger' division between these two interpretations? I.e., was one added later? To answer this question definitely is very difficult, especially in light of the difficulties in dating

common, c.f. Ephrem's *Hymn on the Nativity* 25:8 where he combines Pss 2 and 110.

⁶⁴⁵ C.f., Mk. 12:36 and Luke 20:42–43.

⁶⁴⁶ There is, however, little evidence of specific messianic association with this Psalm in Second Temple literature, and in fact Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (chs. 32–33, 83) claims that the Jews interpreted this Psalm in reference to King Hezekiah. (This is commonly referred to, and it is claimed that no such interpretation is extant in rabbinic literature, see for example Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament—Excursus zu Einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testament*, iv.i pp.452–465. However, in *Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael* בְּשִׁלַּח דְּשִׁירָא 6 (and parallels) v.2 of this Psalm is related to various historical deliverances of Israel, one of which is the deliverance from Sennacherib under the reign of Hezekiah. The proof text given in the *Mekilta* is Is 36:24, whereas in the parallel passage in *Tanbuma* בְּשִׁלַּח 16 the text is 2 Kings 19. Although not specifically referring to Hezekiah there is a definite link between this Psalm and a very specific deliverance during his reign. Thus I would advise caution before claiming there was no reference to such an interpretation in rabbinic literature.)

⁶⁴⁷ A fact that has been lost due to the reading of v.1 of the Targum through the lens of the 'Targum aher' by scholars.

the document as a whole and tracing its redaction history. However, our research thus far on this Psalm has noted that the Davidic interpretation reflects later exegetical traditions, which have no earlier counterparts.⁶⁴⁸ This interpretation is also found as a 'Lashon aher' (except in one manuscript), and as such points to the possibility of it being added rather than original. The Messianic tradition, however, although itself only having some parallels in later midrashic works, may have an earlier witness in the New Testament where the Psalm is assumed to be messianic in the conversation recorded in the Synoptics between Jesus and the Jewish religious leaders. Such an assumption is also found in *Gen. Rab.* 85:18. This argument only works if one posits there being an original Targum from which all variations have differed, a view I sense is more realistic over and against a multiplicity of Targums all being redacted to be closer to the Hebrew text and thus coming to resemble one another.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to suggest that the Targum both retains traces of an earlier messianic reading of the Psalm, and includes a later, perhaps specifically anti-Christian, interpretation connected to King David.⁶⁴⁹ It must be stressed, however, that any attempt to discover the 'original' Targum text and all of its messianic interpretations would be a futile exercise in light of the impossibility of tracing in any meaningful way its redaction history.⁶⁵⁰

7.3 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter set out to investigate two areas of relationship between Tg.Ps. and early Christian interpretations of the Psalms: i. Early Contemporary exegesis, i.e., can Tg.Ps. be used in New Testament research? And ii. Reactionary exegesis i.e., does Tg.Ps. respond in any way to the Christian interpretations of the Psalms? We may conclude that although there is some evidence of antiquity in certain exegetical traditions in Tg.Ps., the possibility of its use as a source for New Testament research has been undermined, and thus the burden of proof of antiquity, which must go beyond superficial parallels, rests upon those scholars who would seek to utilise it in such a way. However, to simply dismiss it as

⁶⁴⁸ The fact that Acts 2:31–36 uses David apologetically only serves to indicate the exegetical methods of the author/speaker, rather than a debate with current exegetical traditions.

⁶⁴⁹ This includes the unusual translation at the end of v.3.

⁶⁵⁰ Thus although there appear to be remnants of a messianic interpretation in Tg.Ps. 110 that might possibly have roots that go back to the first century, the uncertainties that remain disallow its use in New Testament research.

'late' is also unsatisfactory as is shown by the discussions surrounding Tg.Ps. 110.

Specific examples have been discussed suggesting that on occasions the Targum can be shown to be interpreting the Psalms to counteract Christian interpretations of the same Psalms, and thus elements of reactionary exegesis can be uncovered.

8. CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter will seek to draw together all the threads of this study, and place Tg.Ps. in its exegetical context, specifically in relation to other Jewish and Christian traditions. Having done this it will be necessary to return to a number of issues raised in the introduction concerning its style, date, and manuscript tradition. Naturally, the point made in the introduction concerning the limitations of studying a selection of Psalms remains true, yet the representative nature of the selection allows tentative conclusions being made on the whole document from a study focussed on a portion of it.

The title of the thesis described the exegesis in Tg.Ps. as *The Old, the New and the Rewritten*, and it is in these terms that the findings of this research will be summarised.

8.1 THE OLD—TG.PS. AND EXISTING INTERPRETIVE TRADITIONS ON THE PSALMS

Tg.Ps. did not arise in a vacuum. It was clearly part of the ancient world of biblical interpretation, and a product of what is a long history of biblical interpretation, that began in the Bible itself.⁶⁵¹ As a part of the very vibrant world of Jewish biblical interpretation that valued tradition, it is only natural that inherited (and probably contemporary) traditions connected to the Psalms, can be found within the Aramaic rendering of this book. Thus we find numerous examples of traditions that are recorded in other rabbinic collections embedded in the text. Such ‘additions’ are always contextual and add to the smooth rendering of the ancient He-

⁶⁵¹ It has been suggested that the methods and assumptions found in post-biblical, biblical interpretation are all found in the Bible itself, where we find later books interpreting passages from earlier material. See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985, and Y. Zakowitch, *מבוא לפרשנות פנים-מקראית*, Israel: Reches 1992, especially pp.131–135. Note, however, the uncertainty of positing a direct historical relationship between the earlier ‘inner biblical’ exegesis and later post biblical exegesis, see M. Fishbane, *Ibid.*, pp.523ff.

brew Psalms into a relevant and meaningful Aramaic interpretation that speaks to its readers where and when they are living.⁶⁵² In this respect the adoption of 'the old' is not the work of a compiler of tradition, but the art of a scholar adept both in the world of midrash and the art of Targum. I would disagree, therefore, with the view that the more midrashic interpretations can be removed from the text thus leaving a more literal translation behind. Tg.Ps. clearly embeds more midrashic translations in such a way as to make it very difficult to remove them without making the text incomprehensible.

The conclusion that Tg.Ps. is a product of a scholar (or scholars) adept both in the world of midrash and the art of Targum is supported by those examples given throughout the study that demonstrate the translator's use of midrashic method to arrive at his 'translation.' Thus, we found interpretations derived from reading one verse in light of another, either from a different Psalm or a different book in the Bible;⁶⁵³ as well as interpretations arrived at by reading different roots from the same word, or even different layers of meaning found within the one Hebrew root.⁶⁵⁴ Tg.Ps. therefore, can be seen to be very much part of the rabbinic world, and not separate from it, i.e., the translator was not an outsider looking in on a world closed off to him.⁶⁵⁵

There were occasions where specific translations were incorporated into the text to lead the readers to a specific interpretation of a passage for which disputes about the meaning are found in rabbinic literature.⁶⁵⁶ Although such a situation is linked to the nature of Targum, the instances described demonstrate that Tg.Ps. specifically sided with one side of a dispute when the opportunity was there to 'sit on the fence.' Such interpretive decisions indicate a confidence on the part of the translator, as well as his close connection and interaction in the world of rabbinic biblical interpretation.

⁶⁵² A good example of this is Tg.Ps. 80; turning of the Psalm into a prayer for the return from exile, especially in contrast to Rashi's historicising of the Psalm (see 5.1c). Note again that the readers would have read this Aramaic rendering in connection to the Hebrew text, and not instead of it.

⁶⁵³ E.g., Tg.Ps. 24:4 and Ex 20:7.

⁶⁵⁴ E.g., ch. 2.3a.i.

⁶⁵⁵ Such a conclusion seems unavoidable considering those passages within rabbinic literature that include Targumim in the process of education. See the conclusions at the end of this chapter for a further discussion on this issue.

⁶⁵⁶ See ch.4.1a–b.

In relation to rabbinic literature a specific comparison between Tg.Ps. and *Midrash Tehillim* revealed no evidence of any particular relationship between the two texts. Numerous shared interpretive traditions were highlighted, yet even on those occasions where those traditions were only found in these two documents, there was no reason to posit a direct relationship, i.e., one neither depends upon or reacts to the other.

The study also highlighted areas of overlap with some Christian traditions, although the majority of these can be explained through a combination of similar exegetical method and the dependence upon the same source text. There were occasions, however, where traditions found in Tg.Ps. had parallels in Christian texts that seem to preserve ancient Jewish interpretation, most probably unwittingly.⁶⁵⁷

Examples have also been given that highlight the presence of traditions of translation that appear both in Tg.Ps. and a variety of the early translations. The translations of Aquila and Symmachus appeared as the most likely dated texts in which to find traditions that also appear in Tg.Ps.⁶⁵⁸ Interestingly we found only one occasion of actual dependence by Tg.Ps. upon an earlier translation: Aquila on Ps 92:13,⁶⁵⁹ most other comparative examples are simply shared interpretive traditions or similarities produced by similar exegetical methodology.⁶⁶⁰

Finally, we have also highlighted targumic traditions that appear in other Targumim and are found in Tg.Ps. On occasions where the same traditions also appeared in rabbinic midrashim, the form of the tradition in Tg.Ps. often resembled the Targum tradition more closely. These traditions come from the Targumim to the Torah and the Prophets, but in the Psalms studied no interpretive traditions from the Targumim to the Hagiographa were specifically related to those in Tg.Ps., despite similarities in language and style to the Targum of Job. Such a situation clearly places Tg.Ps. in the Targum tradition, despite its unofficial status.

The question was also raised as to the extent that the author of Tg.Ps. expected his readers to know other Targum traditions, an issue that requires further detailed study.

⁶⁵⁷ E.g., chs. 3.1c and 4.2e.

⁶⁵⁸ Any comparison between Tg.Ps. and the early Greek versions will benefit greatly from the publication of the Göttingen edition of the LXX for the book of Psalms.

⁶⁵⁹ See ch.2.1a.

⁶⁶⁰ See ch.2.3.

8.2 THE NEW—Tg.Ps. AND UNIQUE INTERPRETATIONS ON THE PSALMS

Various examples have been discussed that demonstrate unique interpretations of the Psalms in Tg.Ps. The uniqueness is clearly not in the ideas being communicated, but with regard to the verse(s) to which common themes are attached, e.g., Tg.Ps. 48 presents a history of redemption and encouragement to look forward to the future redemption based upon the paradigmatic redemption from Egypt, ideas common in Jewish thought, yet without parallel in connection with this particular Psalm. Such a situation indicates a level of creativity within rabbinic tradition, rather than a separation from it.

The stimulus for this creativity is varied. One clear example of Jewish-Christian polemic has evidently stimulated a messianic interpretation in Tg.Ps. 45,⁶⁶¹ though as with other examples the Messiah in Tg.Ps. is consistent with Jewish ideas found in other texts.⁶⁶² Other unique interpretations appear to have been stimulated by the association of particular verses in another midrash,⁶⁶³ or simply through the creative association of ideas and verses, a hermeneutic common to all Jewish biblical interpretation.⁶⁶⁴

Thus the uniqueness represents a creative continuity with rabbinic ideas, and not necessarily the work of an independent and disconnected individual or group outside of the rabbinic world.

8.3 THE REWRITTEN—Tg.Ps. AND THE CREATIVE ADAPTATION OF TRADITION

The last exegetical characteristic to be highlighted also indicates both the closeness and creativity of the targumist in relation to rabbinic interpretations that are connected to the Psalms. Numerous examples have been discussed that highlight the creative adaptation of existing traditions.⁶⁶⁵ Tg.Ps. clearly knew traditions of interpretation, and incorporated them into the text, yet in doing so it adapted them to the spe-

⁶⁶¹ Tg.Ps. may have adopted the interpretation, which itself was stimulated by Jewish-Christian polemic. If this is the case, the fact that Tg.Ps. includes this interpretation contrary to traditional Jewish exegesis that avoids any messianic association, suggests that the polemic that inspired the interpretation may still have been a reality at the time Tg.Ps. came into being.

⁶⁶² Tg.Ps. 2 and 110 also may have arisen in response to Christian interpretations, although it cannot be stated with complete confidence, see ch.7.2b–c.

⁶⁶³ E.g., ch.5.2.

⁶⁶⁴ See ch.5.4.

⁶⁶⁵ See ch.4.2.

cific context of the text being worked with, and the context of the text he was producing. Such a situation is necessary in the world of Targum, as context is an essential ingredient of any translation, whether literal or paraphrastic, whereas for Midrash context need not be taken into account at all if not required.

Tg.Ps. evinces numerous rabbinic interpretations that it has adapted to the specific context it is dealing with. Such a situation, placed alongside the two exegetical characteristics described above, strongly supports the conclusion that such adaptation of tradition is not simply evidence of non-extant midrashim as is commonly thought, but rather the work of a creative scholar thoroughly at home in the world of rabbinic biblical interpretation.

8.4 THE DATE, STYLE AND MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF Tg.Ps.

In the introduction to this study the problems of the date, style, and manuscript tradition of Tg.Ps. were highlighted, as questions that remain problematic and to a certain extent unanswered. It is necessary to return to them in the light of the research undertaken.

8.4a The Date of Tg.Ps.

In the introduction it was suggested that the only safe way to proceed in the dating of Tg.Ps. was to provide a *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* based upon the dating of individual traditions alongside the document as a whole as we have it today. In light of this, and on the basis of the fifteen Psalms studied, it seems that the earliest datable tradition found comes from dependence upon Aquila, and thus can be dated to the early 2nd century, with the document as we have it being clearly medieval. To make any firmer conclusions would lack any sound basis, and thus be foolhardy. However, by far the majority of exegetical traditions found in Tg.Ps. are close to Amoraic traditions, which would suggest that any date before the 5th century for the 'original' Tg.Ps. is very unlikely.

8.4b The Manuscript Tradition of Tg.Ps.

Having raised the prospect of an 'original' Tg.Ps. in the previous section, it is important to return the issue of the complex manuscript tradition, and in particular the possibility raised by some scholars of 'Targums' to Psalms.⁶⁶⁶ Those who have raised this question of 'Targums'

⁶⁶⁶ See ch.1.2.

have tended to concentrate on the differences between the manuscripts. Such a position, however, does not provide an adequate explanation for the overwhelming similarity between the manuscripts. The fact that Tg.Ps. never attained official status greatly contributes to the willingness of later scribes and authorities to alter or add to the text, although not in any great measure. Thus from the detailed study of these Psalms, there seems a much stronger case for there being an original Targum that has been added to during its long redaction history.

8.4c The Style of Tg.Ps.

The problem voiced in the introduction concerning the style of Tg.Ps. was the split between styles found within the Targum, i.e., one finds both literal translations and midrashic translations/additions within the same text, and even within the same Psalm.

Clearly from the fifteen Psalms studied, this is the case. Yet, despite this style being somewhat unique amongst the Targumim, it is important to note the uniqueness of the material being interpreted, the Psalms—a text that began its life as words spoken to God, and which became God's word to man.⁶⁶⁷ In this respect numerous Psalms (e.g., Pss 120–150) have very few 'hooks' upon which to build the more midrashic interpretations, and thus the variety in style is, at least in part, due to the Hebrew text itself.⁶⁶⁸ In this regard it should also be noted that there is a great variety in the language found in the Psalms. Ps 68 for example, contains extremely difficult Hebrew and is probably the most midrashic of translations in the Targum; whereas other Psalms with much simpler Hebrew have a more straightforward translation. Such suggestions, although not fully answering the problem, do go some way in making the question less problematic.

8.5 Future Research on Tg.Ps.

As is clear from the introduction, Tg.Ps. has suffered a lack of scholarly attention and thus all aspects of Targum studies remain open to research. However, this study has highlighted numerous areas of research that would be fruitful; in fact what was done in each chapter for fifteen

⁶⁶⁷ See, J. Kugel, "Topics in the History of the Spirituality of the Psalms," in A. Green (ed.) *Jewish Spirituality vol.1* New York, Crossroad, 1986, pp.113–149.

⁶⁶⁸ C.f., E. Cook, "The Psalms Targum," who describes Tg.Ps. as a 'conglomerate' work with regards its style, and 'like the text it translates' (p.185).

Psalms in this study needs to be done comprehensively for the whole Targum. The size of Tg.Ps., however, makes each task very demanding.

Specifically, a comprehensive comparison between Tg.Ps. and all the early Bible versions is necessary, especially between Tg.Ps. and Aquila, and Tg.Ps. and Symmachus.⁶⁶⁹ Once such a task has been completed a comparison with Jerome's *iuxta Hebraeos* would be important and valuable.⁶⁷⁰ Likewise, a comprehensive comparison with rabbinic literature (including the other Aramaic Targumim) is a desideratum, as is a thorough comparison with early Church interpretations, including the New Testament. However, preceding all these desiderata, there is a need for a complete and accessible critical edition so that a comprehensive picture of Tg.Ps. can be built upon a firm foundation.

8.6 CONCLUSION

למען ילמד ליראה את ה' אלהיו (דברים יז יט) מלמד שהמורא
מביא לידי מקרא, מקרא מביא לידי תרגום, תרגום מביא לידי
משנה, משנה מביאה לידי תלמוד, תלמוד מביא לידי מעשה,
מעשה מביא לידי יראה: (ספרי דברים 161)

So that he may learn to fear the Lord his God (Deut 17:19) this teaches that seeing [it]⁶⁷² leads to scripture, scripture leads to Targum, Targum leads to *mishnah*, *mishnah* leads to *talmud*, *talmud* leads to action, action leads to fear.

This text, along with others,⁶⁷³ indicate that the Targumim served an important function within the rabbinic world of study that led the student from scripture to tradition, which in turn led the student to correct action and the fear of God. Such a view of the Targumim could not have been promulgated without them having some status within the

⁶⁶⁹ The size of the task makes it likely that Aquila and Symmachus will need to be done separately.

⁶⁷⁰ The comparison with Jerome should occur after a comparison with Aquila and Symmachus, as similarities with Tg.Ps. may occur via Jerome's knowledge of Aquila or Symmachus.

⁶⁷¹ המראה in some manuscripts.

⁶⁷² Reading המראה and not המורא, following S. Fraade, "The Torah of the King (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law," in J. Davila (ed.) *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.25–60, particularly p.55 n.84 where he brings the relevant manuscript details to support the reading המראה against המורא.

⁶⁷³ E.g., *Avoth de Rabbi Nathan* B 12, 28.

accepted mode of study, as well as a definite connection to the rabbinic world that was recommending it.

Tg.Ps. was part of the ancient Targum tradition and, as has been suggested in this study, clearly belonged to the rabbinic world, both in its exegesis and its methods of exegesis.⁶⁷⁴ However, its position was not one of subservience, but as a partner in the world of ancient Jewish biblical interpretation, that sought to take an ancient document and make it meaningful to readers living in a different age. In this respect Tg.Ps., as is suggested by the results of the fifteen Psalms studied, sought creatively to lead its readers on a gentle path to (rabbinic) tradition, a tradition that sought to delineate the mode of living (מעשה) and belief (יראה)⁶⁷⁵ for the Jews in an age without land or Temple.⁶⁷⁶

⁶⁷⁴ Such conclusions are in keeping with S. Fraade's recent paper given at a colloquium of the Summer School of Jewish Studies, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2003, "How Broad was the Rabbinic Umbrella? The Case of Targum and Rabbinic Literature." My thanks to S. Fraade for kindly giving me a copy of this paper and permission to cite it here before it is published in a revised form.

⁶⁷⁵ I am not suggesting here that יראה means 'belief' but rather the concept of 'fear' in relation to God falls into the category of what one believes or not concerning God, which in itself is an essential part of Jewish tradition.

⁶⁷⁶ In this respect the work of M. Bernstein on themes found in Tg.Ps., to be published soon as a monograph, will be of great benefit in our understanding of which particular aspects of the 'tradition' Tg.Ps. is imparting to its readers.

Appendix

APPENDIX: TEXTS, APPARATUS AND TRANSLATION OF PSALMS STUDIED

PSALM 1⁶⁷⁷

1. טוב[והי] לגבר די לא הליך במילכת רשיעין ובאורחת חייבין לא קם ובסיעת ממיקני לא אסתחר:
2. אילהן בנימוסא דה' ⁶⁷⁸ רעותיה ובאוריתיה מרגין יימם ולילי:
3. ויהי כאילן חיי דנציב על טרופי מוי די אנביה מבשל בעידנה ואטרפוי לא נתרין וכל לולבוי די מלבלב שגרגר ומצלח:
4. מטול (sic) היכנא רשיעי אילהן כמוזא די תשקפיניה עלעולא:
5. מטול היכנא לא יזכון רשיעי בדינא וחייבין בסיעת צדיקא:
6. מטול דגלי קד[ם] ה' אורח צדיקא ואורחתהו[ן] דרשיעא תהובד:

APPARATUS⁶⁷⁹

v.1 לגבר – V,VA,P¹¹⁰ דגבר; אסתחר – VA יסתחר v.3 | חיי – VA, P¹¹⁰ *lit.*; מטול – v.4 | מגרר – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ שגרר; טוופין – VA, טוופי – V, P¹¹⁰ טרופי – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ עלעולא; לא – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ זעפא – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ יזכון – V,P¹¹⁰ קיימין – VA, קיימין – V,P¹¹⁰ וחטאי – V,VA,P¹¹⁰ וחייבין; ביום דינא רבא – V,VA, P¹¹⁰ בדינא; יקומון

⁶⁷⁷ All the texts are taken from MS 1106, University library, Wrocław (Breslau), Poland (dated 1237–1238).

⁶⁷⁸ ה' will be used throughout to denote the tetragrammaton, as well as forms such as יי or יי and other such variations.

⁶⁷⁹ The apparatus for each Psalm includes the following manuscripts: N – Cod. Solger 6.2 (Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, 1291); V – Cod. Urbinati-Vaticano 1 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome, 1294); P¹¹⁰ – MS heb. 110 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1455); VA – MS Villa-Amil n.5 (as published by L. Diez Merino, 1982). Note that Pss 1–5 do not appear in N. The apparatus is kept to a minimum as this is not intended as a critical edition, but only a tool to convey the necessary information to the reader.

TRANSLATION⁶⁸⁰

1. Blessed is the man that has not walked in the counsel of the wicked nor stood in the way of sinners nor sat at table with the company of scoffers.
2. But his delight is in the law of the Lord and in his law he meditates day and night.
3. He will be like a tree of life that is planted on channels of water; whose fruit ripens in season and whose leaves don't fall and every blossom that sprouts produces berries and succeeds.
4. Not so⁶⁸¹ the wicked, who are like chaff that the strong wind will blow about.
5. Thus the wicked will not be acquitted in the judgment, or sinners in the company of the righteous.
6. For the way of the righteous is known/revealed before the Lord and the way of the wicked will perish.

PSALM 2

1. למה מיתרגשין עממיא ואומיא מרנין סריקותא:
2. קימין מלכי ארעא ושלטוניא יתחברון כחדא למרדא קדם ה' ולמנצי עם משיח[ה]:
3. נתרע ית אסרותהון וניטלוק מנגא שושילוותהון:
4. דיתיב בשמיא יגחך ה' ידחך להון:
5. הידין ימליל להון בתוקפיה וברוגזיה יבהלינן:
6. ואנא רביית מלכי ומניתיה על ציון טור מקדשי:
7. אישתעי אלקא קיימא ה' אמר חביב כבר לאבא לי אנת זכאה כאילו יומא דין בריתך:
8. בעי מיני ואתן ניכסי עממיא אחסנתך ואחזתך שלטוני סיפי ארעא:
9. תתברינון בחוטרא דפרזלא היך מאן דפחר תתרעינון:
10. וכדון מלכיא אשכילו ... מרדותא נגידי ארעא:
11. פלחו קד[ם] ה' בדחלא וצלו בריתא:
12. קבילו אולפנ[א] דילמא ירגוז ותהובדון אורחא מטול דיחור כזעיר רוגזיה טובי לכל
13. דסברין במימריה:

⁶⁸⁰ All translations are my own with additions to the MT written in italics.

⁶⁸¹ Reading from apparatus.

APPARATUS

v.3 P¹¹⁰ start with אמרין | v.4 ה' – P¹¹⁰,V + ד מימרא | v.7 אמר – P¹¹⁰,V + לי. |
 v.9 תתברינון – P¹¹⁰,V + היך | v.10 ... - P¹¹⁰,V קבילו | v.12 רוגזיה – P¹¹⁰
 תוקפיה.

TRANSLATION

1. Why do the nations clamour, and the peoples murmur vanity?
2. The kings of the earth are standing and the rulers will join together as one *to rebel* before the Lord *and to quarrel* with his Messiah/anointed one.
3. Let us smash their bands, and cast off their chains from us.
4. He who sits in heaven laughs, the Lord derides them.
5. Then He will speak to them in His strength, and in His anger He will frighten them.
6. But I have anointed My king and *appointed him* on Zion My holy mountain.
7. I will declare the Lord is *God* of the covenant (or: the God who exists), He said you are *beloved to me as a son to a father, righteous as if I created you* this day.⁶⁸²
8. Ask me, and I will give *the possessions of* the nations as your inheritance, and *the rulers of* the ends of the earth as your possession.
9. You will break them with the rod of iron, You will smash them as a clay pot.
10. Now understand oh kings, receive⁶⁸³ chastisement princes of the earth.
11. Serve the Lord with fear, and pray with trembling.
12. Receive instruction lest He becomes angry and you lose the way, for His anger will burn for a short time, happy are all who trust in his *Memra*.

PSALM 24

1. לדוד תושבחה דה' היא ארע[א] וברייתהא תבל ודיתבין
בה:
2. ארע[א] וברייתהא תבל ודיתבין בה:
3. מטול דהוא על יממיא שוי שיתאשיה ועל נהרות אתקנה:
4. מאן יסק בטור בית מקדשא דה' ומאן יקום באתר קודשיה:
5. דכי ידיא ובריר רעיונא דלא אומי על שקרא לחייבא
נפשי[ה] ולא קיים לניכלא:

⁶⁸² See ch.2.3d p.50 n.177 for a discussion on this translation.

⁶⁸³ Reading from the apparatus.

6. יקביל ברכתא מן ק[דם] ה' וצדקתא מאלקי פורקניה:
 7. דנן דרא דתבעין ליה יעקב דבעין סבר אפוי לעלמין:
 8. זקופו תרעי בית מקדשא רישיכון ואיזדקפו מעלני עלמא
 ויעול מליך איקר:
 9. מאן דיכי מליך יקרא ה' עשין וגיבר ה' מרי גבורת[א] ועביד
 קרבא:
 10. זקופו תרעי גינת[א] דעדן רישיכון ואיזדקפו מעלני עלמא
 ויעול מלכ[א] יקרא:
 11. מאן הוא דיכי מלך יקרא ה' צבאות הוא מליך דיקיר[א]
 לעלמין:

APPARATUS

v.1 אבריתא – VA + ומלייתה v.2 מטול – VA,P¹¹⁰ ארום; על יממא – VA,P¹¹⁰
 יזכי למיסק – VA,P¹¹⁰ יסק v.3 | נהרוותא – V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ נהרותא; שבע ימא +
 על מגן – VA,P¹¹⁰ על שקרא; אומא – VA אומי v.4 | בטור – VA,N לטור |
 VA,P¹¹⁰ – דבעין; N lit.; יעקב; דיין – VA דנן v.6 | בנכילו – VA,P¹¹⁰ – לניכלא
 | דאיקר – VA איקר v.7 | אפי שכינתיה VA,P¹¹⁰, יעקב + N – אפוי; דתבעין
 | עביד – V,VA וועביד; P¹¹⁰ lit.; עשין...קרבא; הוא – V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ + מאן v.8
 v.9 P¹¹⁰ lit. | v.10 מאן...יקרא – P¹¹⁰ lit.; [א] דיקיר – V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ ד lit.

TRANSLATION

1. A song of David. The earth is the Lord's and its creatures, the world and those dwelling in it.
2. Because he placed its foundations upon the seas and established it on the rivers.
3. Who may ascend to the mount of the Lord's Temple, and who may stand in the holy place.
4. He who has pure hands and clean thoughts and has not sworn falsely, thus *condemning* himself, and does not take an oath deceitfully.
5. He will receive the blessing from before the Lord and righteousness from God, his salvation.
6. This is the generation that is searching for Him, Jacob, that is seeking the countenance of *His* face forever.
7. Lift up your heads! Doors *of the Temple*, and be lifted up you everlasting gates, and the King of honour will enter.
8. Who is this King of honour? The Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord master of mighty deeds and waging war.
9. Lift up your heads! Doors *of the Garden of Eden*, and be lifted up you everlasting gates, and the King of honour will enter.
10. Who is this King of honour? The Lord of hosts He is the King of honour (forever).

PSALM 45

1. לשבּחא על יתבי סנהדרים(sic) דמשה דאיתמר ברוח
קודשא על ידיהון דבני קרח שיכלא טבא תושבחתא
ואודאותא:
2. בעא ליבי ממלל טב אימר ... עובדי למלכא ... לישני מוהי
היך קולמוס ספרא רגיל:
3. שופרך מלכא משיחא עדיף מבני נשא איתיהב רוח
נבוא[ה] בסיפּוּותך מטול כן ברכנך ה' לעלמא:
4. זריז סיפּך על ירכא גברא למקטל מלכין עם שלטנין הדך
ושיבהורך:
5. ושיבהורך סגי בגין כן תצלח למרכב על כורסי מלכותא על
עיסק הימנותא וקשוט ועינוותנותא וצדקתא וילפינך ה'
למעבד דחילין ביד ימינך:
6. גירךך שליפן למיקטל אוכלוסין עממין תחותך יפלון ובני
קשתייך ישתלחון בלב סנאי מלכא:
7. כורסייך אלהא בשמיא לעלמי עלמין מלכות תריץ חטר
מלכותך:
8. אנת מלכא משיחא מטול דרחימת[א] צדקתא וסניתא
רישעא מטול היכנא רבייך ה' אלהך משחא דחדוא יתיר מן
חברך:
9. מירא ואקסיל אליאון וקציעתא מתגמרין כל לבושייך מן
היכליא דמכבשין בשין דפיל מארעא מני יחדונך:
10. פילכי מלכוותא אתיין למקבל אפך וליקרוּתך בזמן דמתעתד
ספר אוריתא בספר [sic] ימינך ומיכתבא באובריוון דמן
אופיר:
11. שמעי כנישתא דישר[אל] אורית פומי וחמי פרישן עובדי
ותצלי אודניך לפתגמי אורית[א] ותתנשי עובדין בישיא
דרשיעי עמך ובית טעותא דפּלחַת בבית אבוייך:
12. ובכן ירגג מלכא שופריך ארום הוא ריבונייך ותסגדין ליה:
13. ויתבי כרכא דצור בתקרובתא תהא אתיא ואפיין ישחרון
לבית מוקדשך עתירי עממי[א]:
14. כל שפר ארג ניכסי פילכי אוצרי מלכי[א] דמיטמרין מלגיו
יקרבו[ן] לכהני דמרמצין בדהב[א] סנינא לבושיהון:
15. בלבושי ציורין יקרבוּן קורבניהון קדם מלכא דעלמא ושאר
חבריא מיתבדרין ביני עממיא:
16. ייתיין בחדוה ותושבּחא ויעלון בהיכל[א] מלכא עלמא:
17. בתר אבהתך צדיקיא יהון בנך תמניון לרברביא בכל
ארעא:
18. בעידנא ההו[א] תימרון אידכר שמך בכל דר ודר מטול
היכנא עממיא דמתגירין יהודון לותך לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא:

APPARATUS

v.1 ברוח קודש – N,P¹¹⁰,VA בנבואה | v.2 ... N אני, P¹¹⁰,V,VA אָנא; ...
 N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA ממלל; מוהי – N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA מוחי | v.3 ה' – P¹¹⁰ אלהים, VA אלהא
 | v.4 ירכא – N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA ירכך, P¹¹⁰,VA + היך; הדך – VA זיוך | v.5 כורסי –
 N כורסיך | v.6 וּבְנֵי – P¹¹⁰,VA וגיררי; סנאי – P¹¹⁰,VA בעלי דבבי | v.7 כורסיך
 יקרך אלהא בשמיא, V כורסי יקרך ה' קיים בשמיא – N אלהא בשמיא
 | v.9 אלהים – P¹¹⁰ ה' – N *lit.*; אנת מלכא משיחא | v.8 חוטרא – N מלכות
 מיכתבא – N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA בסטר – N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA בספר | v.10 דכיא + N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA מירא
 | v.13 פומיה – N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA פומי | v.11 בפרשגן זיותך היך + P¹¹⁰,VA תהא
 – P¹¹⁰,VA + שבח; כל | v.14 תהון אתיין למקבל, VA ייתון – N אתיא
 – V שאר | v.15 + קורבנין קדם מלכא ודורונין VA, P¹¹⁰ – יקרבון[ן]; פלגין P¹¹⁰
 יתיין + N – עממא; חבריך, V חברייהא, P¹¹⁰,VA חברייה – N חברי; כל +
 יתתיין בחדוא, V יתיין בחדוה לוותיך לירושלם, P¹¹⁰ בחדוא לוותיך לירושלם
 | v.17 יתאיין בחדוא לוותיך לירושלם, VA ותושבחתא ויעלון לוותך לירושלם
 | v.18 לארכונין P¹¹⁰,VA לרברביא, יהויין – N אבהתך, באתר – N בתר
 שמך – N לוותך; ההיא P¹¹⁰,V,VA – ההון[א].

TRANSLATION

1. For praise concerning the members of the Sanhedrin of Moses that was said in the Holy Spirit by the sons of Korah, good understanding, praise and thanksgiving.
2. My heart desired good speech, I will say: my work is for the King, the speech of my tongue hurries⁶⁸⁴ like a reed of a quick scribe.
3. Your beauty King Messiah is superior to men, the spirit of prophecy has been given on your lips so that the Lord has blessed you forever.
4. Gird your sword on your⁶⁸⁵ side o mighty one to kill kings with rulers, [with] your glory and majesty.
5. And your majesty is great so that you will succeed to mount the thrones of the kingdom on account of faith and truth and humility and righteousness and the Lord will teach you to do fearful deeds with your right hand.
6. Your arrows are drawn to kill crowds, nations will fall under your feet and the sons of your bows will be sent into the heart of the king's enemies.
7. Your throne O God is in heaven forever the rule of righteousness is the sceptre of your kingdom.

⁶⁸⁴ Reading taken from apparatus.

⁶⁸⁵ Reading taken from apparatus.

8. And you King Messiah because you have loved righteousness and hated wickedness therefore the Lord your God has anointed you with the oil of gladness over your fellow.
9. [With] Myrrh and Aloe wood and Cassia all your garments are perfumed, from the sanctuary layered with ivory (lit. elephants teeth) from the land of Minni, they will make you glad.
10. The regions of the kingdoms come to visit you and honour you at the time he fixes the book of the law on the side of⁶⁸⁶ your right hand, written in refined gold from Ophir.
11. Listen congregation of Israel [to] the law of his⁶⁸⁷ mouth and see the wonders of his deeds and incline your ear to the words of the law and forget the evil deeds of the wicked of your people and the house of idols which you worshipped, (in) your fathers house.
12. And the king will desire your beauty because he is your Lord and you will worship Him.
13. The inhabitants of the fortified villages of Tyre will come with an offering, and your presence (lit. face), the rich of the gentiles will seek (lit. rise) early in your Temple.
14. All the best and choice possessions of the regions (, and) treasures of the kings that are hid inside, they will offer (sacrifices to the king and gifts) to the priests whose clothing is entwined with pure gold.
15. In their embroidered garments they will offer offerings before the king of the world and the remaining brethren that are scattered among the nations ...⁶⁸⁸
16. They will come with joy and praise and will enter the sanctuary *of the King of the world*
17. After your fathers your sons will be *righteous*, you will appoint them as rulers in all the earth.
18. *In that time you will say*, I will remember your name in every generation, because of this the gentiles *who converted* will confess *to you* forever and ever.

⁶⁸⁶ Reading from apparatus.

⁶⁸⁷ Reading from apparatus.

⁶⁸⁸ Will come with joy to You to Jerusalem (see apparatus, although note the differences in MSS readings).

PSALM 48

1. שירת[א] ותושבחתא על ידיהון דבני קרח:
2. רב ה' ומשבח לחדא בירושל[ם] קרתא דאלהנא ובטור בית מקדשיה:
3. שפיר היך חתנ[א] חדות כל יתבי ארעא טורא דציון שידא דציפונא קריתא דמלכא רבא:
4. ה' בבירניתה[א] איתידע לתקוף:
5. ארום הא מלכיא איתחברו עברו כחדא:
6. אינון חמון היכנא תמהו על נסיא ופרישתא איתבהילו אף ערקו:
7. זיעא אחדתנון תמן רתית[א] היך איתתא ילדא:
8. בקידום תקיף כאישא דמן ק[דס] ה' תתבר אילפיא דטרסוס:
9. יימרון כלהון כחדא כמא דשמענא היכנא חמינא בקרתא דה' צבא[ות] בקרתא דאלהנא אלהים ישכלינה על עלמי עלמי[ן]:
10. אשוניה ה' טובך במציעות היכלך:
11. היך שמך ה' היכדין תושבחתך על סייפי ארעא צדקתא מליא ימינד:
12. יחדי טורא דציון בוען בתושבחן כנישתא דבית יהודה מטול דיניד:
13. אקיפו ציון וחזרו עלה מנו מגדלהא:
14. שוו לבכון לאוכלוסהא דמן לעיל בירנייתהא מטול דתשתעיו לדר אחרן:
15. ארום דנן ה' אלהנא דשכינתיה בגוה ומדוריה בשמיא לעלמי עלמין הוא ידברינה ביומי טליותנא:

APPARATUS

ה' v.4 | דמן + P¹¹⁰ – דציון v.3 | טור VA, P¹¹⁰ – ובטור; דאלהא V – דאלהנא v.2
 v.8 | הנון V, VA, P¹¹⁰ – אינון v.6 | אישתמודע VA, P¹¹⁰ – איתידע; אלהא VA –
 – דטרסוס; היך אישא VA, P¹¹⁰ – כאשא; ברוח קידום VA, P¹¹⁰ – בקידום
 כמא N lit.; – כחדא; בני ישראל + N – יימרון כלהון v.9 | דמן תרסיס VA, P¹¹⁰ –
 V, N – אלהים; בקרתא דאלהנא; היך מה N, היכמא VA, היך כמה V –
 הי VA, P¹¹⁰, היך כשמך V – היך שמך v.11 | עד עלמי V, VA, N – על עלמי; ה'
 רמן V, N, P¹¹⁰ – דמן לעיל v.14 | יבועון + N – ציון v.13 | עד VA – על; כשמך
 שכינתיה V, VA, N – דשכינתיה; אלהא VA, P¹¹⁰ – ה' v.15 | דמלעילא VA, לעיל
 כיומי V, VA, P¹¹⁰ – ביומי.

TRANSLATION

1. Song and praise of the sons of Korah.

2. Great is the Lord and praised very much, in *Jerusalem* the city of our God and in the mount of His *temple*.
3. Beautiful as a *bridegroom*, joy of all those dwelling in the earth, mount Zion, the side of the north, the city of the great king.
4. The Lord is in her palaces, He is known for strength.
5. Because here the kings grouped together, they passed through as one.
6. They saw and were amazed *at the signs and wonders*, they were terrified and fled.⁶⁸⁹
7. Trembling gripped them there, fearful trembling like a woman giving birth.
8. In a strong east wind as fire from before the Lord you will break the ships of Tarsis.
9. *All of them will say as one*: as we have heard even so we have seen in the city of the Lord of hosts in the city of our God, the Lord will establish her forever (forever).
10. We have considered (lit. compared or made level) your goodness Lord in the midst of your sanctuary.
11. As is your name Lord, even so your praise upon the ends of the earth. Righteousness fills your right hand.
12. Mount Zion will rejoice, the *assemblies of the house of Judah* will burst forth *with praises* because of your judgment.
13. Surround Zion and go around it, count its towers.
14. Pay attention (lit. set your hearts) to her crowds above her palaces so that you may relate it to the next generation.
15. That this is the Lord, He is our God, *His Shekinah is in her midst*, and *His dwelling is in heaven* forever. He has been leading us in⁶⁹⁰ the days of our youth.

PSALM 68

1. לשבחא לדוד תושבחה ושירתא:
2. יקום אלהא יבדרון בעלי דבבוי ויעירקון סנאוי מן קדמוי:
3. היכמה דשקיף תננא ישקפון היכמה דיתימסי שעוא מן קדם אישא יהובדון רשיעיא מן קדם אלהא:
4. וצדיקיא יחדון וידוצון קדם ה' ויחדון בחדוה:
5. שבחו קדם אלהא שבחו שום יקריה קלסון ליתיב על קורסי יקרא בערבות ביה שמיה ובועו קדמוי:

⁶⁸⁹ It is also possible to translate this last part as '...they made haste and fled.'

⁶⁹⁰ The MSS listed in the apparatus read 'like the days of our youth,' which appears to be the better reading.

6. אבוהון דיתמי ודייניהון דארמלן אלהא במדור בית שכינת קודשיה:
7. אלהא דמזווג זוגין יחידאין לברזוגא כחדא דאפיק בית ישראל דהוו אסירין במצרים על עובדי אבהתהון כשירין בפומבי ברם פרעה ומשיריתיה דסריבו לשלחותהון שרון צחיין:
8. אלהא כד נפקתא בעמודא דאישתא ובעמוד[א] דענגא קומוי עמך כד טליתא דישימון לעלמין במדברא:
9. כד יהבתא אוריתא לעמך ארעא ארגישת לחוד שמיא אטיפו טלא מן קדם ה' דין סיני סליק תנניה כתננא דאתונא מן קדם דאיתגלי עלוי אלהא דישראל:
10. כד שמעו בית ישראל[אל] ית קל גוברתך פרחו נפשיהון מן יד אחיתתא עיליהון טלין דתחיותא ומיטרין דרעי ארימתא אלהא על אחסנתך וכנישתא דאישתלהית אנת אתקנתה:
11. חיתך אתיבתא בה אתקינתא משירית מלאכיא לאוטבא לעניי אלהא:
12. ה' יהיב פיתגמי אוריתא לעמיה ברם משם משה ... ומבסרן מימר אלהא לחילא רבא דישר[אל]:
13. מלכוותא עם חיליהון איטלטלו מן פלטיריהון דחכימו איטלטלו מן מרעיהון וכנישתא דישר[אל] מפלגא עדאה מן שמיא:
14. אין אתון מלכיא רשיעיא שכיבין בין קילקלתא כנישתא דישראל דדמיא ליונתא מיטללא בעניי יקרא מפלגא ביזת מצראי סימא זקיק וטיסברייתא מליין אובריזין סנין:
15. כד פרסת ארחא על ימי בצלו שדי אמאיך מלכוון ואמטולתא סנין גיהנם היך תלגא פצא יתה מטולא דמותא:
16. . טור מוריה אתר דפלחו אבהת עלמא קדם ה' איתבחר לבניין בית מקדשא וטור סיני למהיבית אוריתא וטור מתנן וטור תבור וכרמל איתפסילו איתעבד להון גיבנא היך טור מתנן:
17. אמר אלהא למה אתון טפזין טוריא לית רעותי למתן אוריתא על טוריא גיוותניא מבסרני[א] הא טור סיני דמכיד רגג מימריה דה' לאשראה עילוי שכינתיה לחוד בשמי שמיא ה' ישרי לעלמיא:
18. ארתכין דאלהא תרין ריבוונן דנור ... תרין אלפין דאנגלי[א] מדברין להון שכינת[א] דה' שרת עליהון על טורא דסיני בקודשא:
19. סליקתא לרקיעא משה נביא שביתא שביתא אליפתא פתגמי אוריתא יהבתא יתהון מתנן לבני נשא ברם סרבניא דמתגירין ותייבין בתתובא שרת עליהון שכינת יקרא דה' אלהים:
20. בריך ה' דכל יומא ויומא טעין לנא מוסיף פיקודיא עלוי פיקודיא תקיפא דהוי פורקנא וסעידנא לעלמין:

21. אלהא לנא תקוף ופורקן ומק[דס] אלהא ה' מתגריין
ברשיעיא מותא ומפקנות נשמתא בסרניקתא:
22. ברס אלהא יתבר ריש בעלי דבבוי ינתר סער גבר דמהלך
בחובוי:
23. צדיקיא דמיתו ואית אכלו מן חיות ברא אמר ה' ממתנן
אתיב אתיב צדיקיא דאישתנקו במצולתיה דימא:
24. מן בגלל דיחמון בפורענות רשיעיא יטמשון רגליהו[ן] באדם
קטילין לישן חיות ברא מן תרביהון ידהנון מן בעלי דבבא
מנהון יסבינון:
25. חמון בית ישר[אל] הליכת שכינת ה' על ימא ... אמרין
הליכת אלהנא מליך כל עלמא בקודשא:
26. אקדימו ואמרו שירתא בתר משה ואהרון דמנגנין במצע ...
צדיקתא דעס מרים מתפפן:
27. בני כינשיא בריכו אלהא רוממו ה' עובריא במעי אמהון מן
זרעא דישר[אל]:
28. תמן בנימן זעיר בשיבטיא מן שירויא נחת לימא מטול
היכנא קביל מלכותא מן שירויא ובתריהון נחתו רברבי
יהודה רגמו יתהון שבטי[א] אבנין וקבלו רבנותא בתריהון
דבני זבולון הוּו תגריהון דבני נפטלי הוּו גיבריהון:
29. פקיד אלהא עושנד איתעשן אלהא שרי בבית מוקדשא דנן
דעבדתא לנא:
30. מן היכלך תקבל קורבניא על ירושלם שכינתך שריא
מפניקטיהון לך ייתון מלכיא קורבניא:
31. נזף במשירית חייבין תרע יתהון היך קניא כנישת גיברין
דמתרחשין בעיגליא טעות עממיא רעותיה בעמא
דמתעסקין ברעותא באוריתא דזיקק מן סימא בדר עמיא
דלאגחא קרבא צביין:
32. ייתון בבודחא אווכמנא ממצרי[ם] לאיתגיר בנוי דכוש
ירהטון למפרס ידיהון בצלו קד[ם] אלהא:
33. מלכות ארעא שבחו קד[ם] ה' שבחו קד[ם] ה' לעלמין:
34. ליתיב על כורסיה בשמי שמיא מן לקדמין הוא במימריה
יהיב בקל[יה] קל רוח נבואתא לנבייא:
35. הוב יקר בעושנא לאלהא דעל ישר[אל] גיותנותיה ועושניה
בשמיא:
36. דחיל אלהא מן בית מוקדשך תקיפא דישר[אל] הוא יהיב
עושנא ותוקפ[א] לעמיה ויימרון בריך אלהא:

APPARATUS

- v.3 | ויתבדרון VA, יתבדרון N, P¹¹⁰ – יבדרון v.2 | על יד דוד VA, P¹¹⁰ – לדוד v.1
+ VA, P¹¹⁰ – כחדא v.7 | אלהא VA, P¹¹⁰ – ה' v.4 | קוטרא VA, P¹¹⁰ – תננא
v.8 | פרקינזון + VA, P¹¹⁰ – כשירין; מטול VA, P¹¹⁰ – על; למיבני ביתא מנהון
דאישתא N – דעננא + בלילא P¹¹⁰, הי בלילא VA + דעננא N – דאישתא
– ארגישת v.9 | במדברא + VA, N, P¹¹⁰ – טליתא; ביומא + VA, P¹¹⁰

TRANSLATION

1. For Praise for David, praise *and* song.
2. God will arise, his enemies will be scattered⁶⁹¹ and those who hate him will flee from before him.
3. As smoke is driven they will be driven, as wax melts before fire the wicked will be destroyed from before God.

⁶⁹¹ I have translated as if the verb is an *Ithpael* and not a *Pael*, as in 2 mss.

4. And the righteous will rejoice and celebrate before the Lord, they will rejoice with joy.
5. Praise before God, praise His *glorious* name, *sing praises* to him who sits *on the throne of heavenly glory*, Yah is his name rejoice before Him.
6. A Father to orphans and Judge to widows is God in *His Shekinah's* holy dwelling.
7. God who joins the solitary to wives in marriage as one⁶⁹², who, on account of the worthy deeds of their fathers, brought out the house of Israel who were bound in Egypt, in public procession, whereas Pharaoh and his soldiers, who refused to send them, dwelt in drought.
8. God, when you went out in the pillar of fire⁶⁹³ and the pillar of cloud⁶⁹⁴ before⁶⁹⁵ your people, you walked in the desert⁶⁹⁶ of Yeshimon forever.
9. *When you gave the law to your people* the land trembled, also the heavens poured out (lit. overflowed) *dew*⁶⁹⁷ from before the Lord, this Sinai, *its smoke went up as smoke from a fire-place*, from before the God of Israel *who was revealed upon it*.
10. When the house of Israel heard the voice of your might their souls flew away, immediately you caused the dew of resurrection to descend upon them, You raised up O God choice rain upon your heritage and the congregation that was weary you established.
11. You returned your life to it,⁶⁹⁸ you arranged *a camp of angels* to do good to the poor of God.
12. The Lord gave the words of the law to His people, even from Moses and Aaron,⁶⁹⁹ and they were announcing the word of the law to the great army⁷⁰⁰ of Israel.
13. Kingdoms with their armies were exiled from their palaces, sages were exiled from their pastures⁷⁰¹ and the assembly of Israel divided the spoil from heaven.

⁶⁹² + to build a house from them, in 2 manuscripts.

⁶⁹³ + at night, in 2 mss.

⁶⁹⁴ + at day, in 2 mss.

⁶⁹⁵ Most mss. read 'before him,' but this does not make sense as God is referred to in the second person in this verse and not the third person as in this reading, nor does it reflect the MT, which has no pronominal suffix.

⁶⁹⁶ According to most mss. and not the Bresalu mss.

⁶⁹⁷ + of his pleasure, in 2 mss.

⁶⁹⁸ Most mss. have: you returned your resurrection to it.

⁶⁹⁹ Reading from apparatus.

⁷⁰⁰ Crowd in 2 mss.

⁷⁰¹ Knowledge in 3 mss.

14. If you wicked kings lie between the dung hills the assembly of Israel that is likened to a dove will fly in the clouds of glory dividing the spoil of Egypt, refined silver and treasure stores full of refined gold.⁷⁰²
15. When you stretched out the path in the sea, by prayer Shaddai humbled kingdoms, for the sake of refining Gehenna like snow he saved her from the shadow of death.⁷⁰³
16. Mount Moriah, the place where the Fathers of the world worshipped before the Lord, chosen for the building of the Temple, and mount Sinai for the giving of the law, and mount Tabor and Carmel were rejected, a summit was made for them like mount Matnan (Bashan).
17. God said, why are the mountains leaping it is not my desire to give the law on the proud overbearing/contemptuous mountains, behold mount Sinai which is humble the Memra of the Lord desired to cause His Shekinah to rest upon it, but the Lord will dwell in the heaven of heavens forever.
18. The chariots of God are two myriads *of burning fire*, two thousand *angels leading them*, the *Shekinah* of the Lord *rested* on mount Sinai in holiness.
19. You went up to the sky, *Moses the prophet*, you took captivity captive, *you learnt the words of the law*, you gave them as a gift to the sons of men, even the rebellious *who converted returning in repentance*, the *glorious Shekinah* of the Lord God dwelt *upon them*.
20. Blessed be the Lord who daily carries us, *adding commandment upon commandments*, the Strong One our salvation *and our help forever*.
21. God is to us strength and salvation, from before the Lord God death and *death by suffocation are let loose against the wicked*.
22. Surely God will break the head of his enemies, the hair of the man who walks in his sin *will fall out*.

⁷⁰² In 2 Mss.: Targum Aher: If you wicked kings sleep in your theatres that are compared to dung hills, behold the sons of the assembly of Israel who are likened to the face of doves covered with the words of the law that are likened to silver, and the scholars who are likened to the plumage of a chick in pure refined gold:

⁷⁰³ In 2 Mss.: Targum Aher: Therefore when the priests stretch forth their hands and bless the people of Israel God agrees with them and kings are conquered under them, and on account of their merit their sins are made white like snow and Gehenna is cooled down for the wicked who in their sons received punishment, and turned from their evil deeds:

23. The righteous who died and were eaten by wild beasts, God said from Matnan, I will surely return the righteous that were strangled⁷⁰⁴ in the depths of the sea.
24. Therefore they will see the punishment of the wicked they will dip their legs in the blood of those killed, the tongue of wild beasts will grow fat from their corpulence, they will be sated⁷⁰⁵ from the enemies.
25. *The house of Israel* saw the going of *the Shekinah* of the Lord *on the sea*, O God, *they say*, the goings of our God, King of the world in holiness:
26. They rose early and recited songs after Moses and Aaron who were making music in the midst of the righteous women playing tambourines with Miriam.
27. The sons of the assembly/amidst the assembly they blessed God, *exalt* the Lord, *babies in your mother's wombs from the seed* of Israel.
28. There, Benjamin least of the tribes, from the beginning (first?) went down to the sea, because of this he received the kingdom from the beginning, and after them the princes of Judah went down, the tribes stoned them with stones and they received greatness after them, the sons of Zebulun became their merchants, the sons of Naphtali became their mighty men.⁷⁰⁶
29. God has commanded your strength/God your strength has commanded, show yourself strong o God, *dwelt in this temple* that you made for us.
30. From your sanctuary *you will receive offerings*, your *Shekinah dwells* over Jerusalem, kings will bring offerings to you *from their camps*.
31. Rebuke *the camps of sinners*, *break like* reeds the assembly of mighty ones *who trust* in calves, *the idols of* the gentiles; *Your desire is on the people who willingly study the law* which is refined as silver; scatter the nations who desire to wage war.
32. The Ochmani⁷⁰⁷ will come *joyfully from Egypt to convert*, the sons of Cush *will run* to stretch out their hands *in prayer* before God.
33. Kingdoms of the earth⁷⁰⁸ praise the Lord, Praise the Lord forever:

⁷⁰⁴ + And fish swallowed them. In 2 mss.

⁷⁰⁵ According to 3 mss., but not Breslau.

⁷⁰⁶ The verse according to the Sephardi mss. tradition is translated as follows: There Benjamin the least of the tribes from the beginning, and after them the princes of Judah went down, the tribes stoned them [princes of Judah] with stones, and from after Saul, King David from the tribe of Judah, and the princes of Judah were dressed in purple to serve him, the princes of Zebulun were their merchants and the sons of Naphtali provided food for them from their inheritance:

⁷⁰⁷ The sons of Ham, the Ochmani... in 3 mss.

34. To Him who sits *on the throne* in the heaven of heavens, who from beforetime *with his Memra* gave his voice, the voice of the *spirit of prophecy to his prophets*.
35. Give *glory in* strength to God whose glory is over Israel and His strength in heaven.
36. Fear God from your temple, the strength of Israel, He will give strength and power to His people *and they will say*, blessed be God.

PSALM 80

1. לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין דמתעסקין בסהדות אוריתא על ידוי דאסף תושבחה:
2. פרנסא דישראל אצת דמדבר היך ענא ארונא דיוסף שכינה שריא ביני כרוביא הופיע:
3. לפני אפרי[ם] ובנימן ומנשה עורר ית כח גבורתך ועלך מן דינא למיפרוק לנא:
4. אלהא אותיב יתנא מגלותנא ואנהר זיו סבר אפייד עלנא ונתפרק:
5. ה' אלהים צבאות עד אימתי לא קבילתא צלותהון דעמד:
6. אוכלתא להון לחים טמיש בדמעא ואשקין חמר דדמען תולתיה:
7. שויתנא למדיינא לשיבבנא ובעלי דבבנא יתלעבון להון:
8. אלהים צבאות אתיב יתנא מגלותנא אנהר זיו סבר אפך עלנא ונתפרק:
9. בית ישראל דמתילין לגופנ[א] ממצרים אטילתא תריכתא עמיא מארע[א] דישראל ונציבתנן:
10. פנייתא מן קדמהא כנענאי ושרשת[א] שורשיהא ומלאת ארעא:
11. חפון טוריא דירושלם טור בית מקדשא ובתר מדרשיה רבנן אמרין אילנין מתילן לארזין תקיפין:
12. שבישתא שבשין שדרתא תלמידה[א] עד ימא רבא ולנהר פרת יינקייהא:
13. למה תקיפתא גדרהא ומכסחין יתה כל עברי אורחא:
14. ינובריה חזיר מן חורשא ותרנגיל ברא יתפרנס מינה:
15. אלהים צבאות טוב כדון איסתכל מן שמיא וחמי ואידכר ברחמין גופנא הדא:
16. ועוברא די נציבת ימינך ועל מלכא משיחא דחיילתא לך:
17. מתוקדא בנורא ומיפרכ[א] ממזופיתא דמן קדמך יאבדון:

20. תיהוי אידך על גבר דקיימתא ליה ביד ימינך על בר נש
דחיילתא לך:

21. ולא נזור מבתר דחלתך תקיימינא ובשמך ניקרי:

22. ה' אלהים צבאות אתיב יתנ[א] מגלותנא אנהר זיו סבר
אפייד עלנא ונתפרק:

APPARATUS

v.1 שכינה; פרנסיה VA – פרנסא v.2 | שירתא VA, P¹¹⁰ – תושבחה v.1
crossed out and לבני N – לפני v.3 | אופע V – הופיע; דשכינתיה N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V
VA – סבר v.4 | עלנא N + גבורתך; קדם V, לבני VA added in margin, קדם
– ואשקינן v.6 | צלותא N – צלותהון v.5 | אפך N, VA – אפייד⁷⁰⁹; דבר
– אפך VA + ו; אנהר v.8 | דדמעה N, VA – דדמען; ואשקיתן N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V
– שורשייא; קדמהון N – קדמהא v.10 | ד VA – מארע[א] v.9 | אפייד P¹¹⁰, V
– ובתי N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V – ובתר; טול N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V – טור v.11 | שורשיהון N
– אילנין; lit. N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V – אמרין; הא VA + מדרשיא N, P¹¹⁰ – מדרשיה
| תלמידיה VA – תלמידה[א] v.12 | ד VA, P¹¹⁰ – מתילן, אילמין N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V
VA – ינוברינה v.14 | כל VA, P¹¹⁰ – עברי; גודהא N, P¹¹⁰, V – גדרהא v.13
אפך N, VA – אפייד v.20 | ו N – ולא v.19 | דמן N, VA, P¹¹⁰, V – מן; יתברינה

TRANSLATION

1. For praise concerning those who sit in *the Sanhedrin who occupy themselves with the testimony of the law*, by Asaph, praise.
2. The leader of Israel listen! Who leads like a flock, Joseph's *coffin*; the *Shekinah*, who dwells between the Cherubim, appear!
3. Before Ephraim, and Benjamin and Manasseh awaken the strength of your might, for it is *justly beholden upon you* to save us.⁷¹⁰
4. God return us *from our exile* and light *the splendour* of your countenance upon us and we shall be saved.
5. O Lord God of hosts how long will you *not accept* the pray of your people.
6. You have fed them bread *immersed in tears*, and caused them to drink *wine of tears* in large measure (lit. thrice).
7. You have placed as for strife to our neighbours and our enemies will mock (lit. for themselves).

⁷⁰⁹ This appears to be a clear scribal error (either Diez Merino or the original scribe) as the other two occurrences of this repeated refrain (vv. 8,20) have the correct סבר.

⁷¹⁰ Cook translates: and it is right for you to redeem us. This seems to lack the force of the Aramaic, hence the use of 'for' instead of 'and,' combined with the concept of justice.

8. God return us *from our exile* and light *the splendour* of your countenance upon us and we shall be saved.
9. *You caused the House of Israel*, who are compared to the vine, to travel from Egypt; You expelled the nations *from the land of Israel* and planted them.
10. You removed *the Canaanites* before it, and planted roots and you filled the land.
11. The mountains of Jerusalem cover the Temple Mount, and the houses⁷¹¹ of study are strong⁷¹² compared to strong cedars.
12. You sent forth branches, *sending its students as far as* the great sea and its children to the Euphrates river.
13. Why have you seized her fences and all those passing the way cut her down.
14. The swine *from* the forest will dig her up and the wild cock will be sustained from her.
15. God of hosts return now, look from heaven and see and remember *with mery* this vine.
16. And the branch that your right hand planted, and *the King Messiah* whom you made strong for yourself.
17. It burns with fire and is being crushed, they will be destroyed from the rebuke that comes from before you.
18. May your hand be over the man *to whom you swore by your right hand*, over the son of man whom you made strong for yourself.
19. We will not turn away from *the fear of You*, raise us up and we shall call on your name.
20. Lord God of hosts return us *from our exile* and light the *splendour of* your countenance upon us and we shall be saved.

PSALM 81

1. לשבח[א] על כינרא דאתיא מן גת על ידא דאסף:
2. שבחו קדם אלהים עושננא יבבו קדם אלהא דיעקב:
3. ארימו קלא בתושבחתא וסדרו תופיא כנרא דקליה בסים עם נבלין:
4. תקעו בירחא דתשרי שופרא בירחא דמתכסי יומי חגיגא דילנא:
5. ארום קיים גזיר לישראל הוא הילכת דינא לאלהא דיעקב:

⁷¹¹ Reading taken from apparatus.

⁷¹² Reading according to apparatus. The manuscript reads: the houses of study, say the rabbis, are trees likened to strong cedars. The reading from the apparatus seems preferable.

6. סהדותא על יוסף שוויה דלא קריב לאיתת רבוניה ביה
ביומא נפק מבית אסירי ושלט על ארעא דמצרים שיפתא
דלא חכימית אליפית ושמעית:
7. אעריתי משיעבודא כתפיה ידוי מן למירמי טינא בקידרא
איסתלקן:
8. בעידן עקת דמצרים קרית ופציתי יתך עניית יתך באתר
טמיר בית שכינתיה דאכליית קדמוי גלגלין דנור בחניתך
על מי מצותא לעלמין:
9. שמעו עמי ואסהיד בכון ישראל אין תקביל למימרי:
10. לא יהוי ביניכון פלחן טעוותא נוכראה ולא תסגדון לטעוות
חילונאי:
11. אנא הוא ה' אלהכון דאסיקית יתכון מארעא דמצרים אפתי
פומך בפתגמי אוריתא ואמלי יתיה מכל טבאתא:
12. ולא קבילו עמי לקלי וישראל לא צבי למימרי:
13. ותריכיתיה בהירהורי לבהון אזלו במילכת רשיעהון:
14. הלואי דעמי שמע לי ישראל באורחתי יהלכון:
15. כזעיר בעלי דבביהון אמאיך ועל בעלי דבביה אתיב מחת
גבורתי:
16. סנאי ה' יכדבון ליה ויהי תוקפהון לעלם:
17. ואוכלינן מטב לחם חיסין ומטינרא דובשא אשבעינד:

APPARATUS

v.3 סדרו – VA פקדו | v.4 דתשרי – VA ד *lit.*, N ד added by second hand; יומי
– VA,N יומא | v.5 לישראל – N ל *lit.* | v.6 יוסף – N,P¹¹⁰ | יהוסף – N,P¹¹⁰ | v.7
– VA,N יומא | v.7 ו *lit.*, P¹¹⁰ | ושמעית; לאלפא – N, P¹¹⁰; לאלפית, N; ושלט ב
– VA,N עניית | v.8 לקידרא – VA,N,P¹¹⁰; בקידרא; אעדית – V,VA,N; אעריתי
– VA,N,P¹¹⁰; דאכלין – V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰; דאכליית; שכנתי – VA,N,P¹¹⁰; שכינתיה; צמית
– VA | v.15 ישמע – VA | שמע – v.14 | אלהך – N | אלהכון – v.11 | אם – N | אין; בדך – VA
– VA,N | חיסין – N | מעיקיהון – VA; דבבהון – V,N,P¹¹⁰; דבביה; ועלו – VA | ועל

TRANSLATION

1. For praise on the stringed instrument that is coming from *Gath*⁷¹³ by Asaph.
2. Praise before God our strength; shout out before the God of Jacob.
3. Raise a voice in praise, arrange the timbrels, the stringed instrument whose sound is pleasant with the lyres.

⁷¹³ I have transliterated the term גת as it could be both a personal name or connected to the season of wine pressing.

4. Sound the Shofar in the month *of Tishrei*, when the moon that is *concealed*, the days of our feasts.
5. For it is a statute decreed for Israel,⁷¹⁴ a law of justice to the God of Jacob.
6. He placed it, a testimony on Joseph *who did not touch his master's wife, on the very day* he went out from jail and *ruled* over all the land of Egypt;⁷¹⁵ a language (lit. lip) I didn't know, *I taught* and I heard.
7. I removed⁷¹⁶ his shoulders from enslavement, and his hands were taken up *from throwing clay for pots*.
8. In the time of the distress *of Egypt* you called and I saved you, I answered you in the secret place of *his Shekinah where fiery wheels cry out before him*, I examined you on the waters of quarrelling (forever).
9. Hear my people and I will testify against you, Israel if you will receive my *Memra*.
10. There shall *not be among you a worshiper of foreign idols*, and you shall not bow down to strange idols.
11. I am the Lord your God that bought you up from the land of Egypt, open (lit. make wide) your mouth *with words of the law* and I will fill it *from everything good*.
12. But my people did not accept my voice and Israel did not *desire my Memra*.
13. I drove him out in the thoughts of their heart, they went in the counsel of *their wickedness*.
14. If only my people had listened to me, Israel would walk in my paths.
15. In a short while I would humble their enemies and against their enemies I would return the blow of my might.
16. Those who hate the Lord will *deny* Him [the Lord]; but He will be their [Israel's] strength forever (OR: those who hate the Lord will deny him [Israel], but He [the Lord] will be their [Israel's] strength forever).
17. I will cause you to eat from good things, fine bread, and I will satisfy you [with] honey from the rock.

⁷¹⁴ The passive construction is taken from VA that seems to be the better reading, thus making קיים the subject of the clause where previously there was none (taking the הוא as the subject of the clause is most unsatisfactory syntactically).

⁷¹⁵ The change from the third person to the first person in the verbs requires a more substantial break than a comma, hence the semi-colon.

⁷¹⁶ Reading from apparatus.

PSALM 82

1. תושבחה על ידא דאסף אלהא שכינתיה שריא בכינשת
צדיקיא דתקיפין באוריתא במצע דיינין דקשוט ידון:
2. עד אימתי רשיעיא תדונון שקר ואפי רשיעיא תסבון
לעלמין:
3. דונו מסכינא ויתמא עניא ומסכינא אצדיקו:
4. שיזבו מסכין וחשוכא מן ידיהון דרשיעיא פצו יתהון:
5. לא חכימו לאוטבא ולא אתביינו באוריתא בחשוכא מהלכין
מטול הכנא מיתמוטטן ריגליהון דבסיסי ארעא:
6. אנא אמרית הי כמלאכיא אתון חשיבין והיך אנגלי מרומ[א]
כולכון:
7. ברם בקושטא היך בני נשא תמותון והיך חד מן רברבניא
תיפלון:
8. קום ה' דון ית כל יתבי ארעא ארום את תחסין בכל עממיא:

APPARATUS

– ריגליהון דבסיסי v.5 | בקשוט ידיהון VA – דקשוט; אלהים P¹¹⁰ – אלהא v.1
– חסין VA – תחסין VA lit.; ית כל v.8 | כל בסיסי VA

TRANSLATION

1. Praise by the hand of Asaph: God, *His Shekinah* dwells in the congregation of *the righteous who are mighty in the law*; in the midst of judges *of truth* He will judge.
2. How long o wicked will you judge falsely and favour (lit. lift up the face of) the wicked? (forever).
3. Judge the poor and the orphan, vindicate/treat generously⁷¹⁷ the oppressed and the poor.
4. Deliver the poor and the unfortunate, save them from the hands of the wicked.
5. They do not know *to do good* and they do not understand *the law*, they walk in darkness so that the pillars of the foundations of the world are tottering.
6. I said you are *considered like* angels, all of you are *like* angels on high:
7. But *in truth* as humans you will die, and like one of the great men you will fall.
8. Rise o Lord, judge all the inhabitants of the earth, for you will take a heritage amongst all peoples.

⁷¹⁷ See ch.6.2b for a discussion on this translation.

PSALM 92

1. שבחא ושירה דאמר אדם קדמאי על יומא דשבת[א]:
2. טב לאודאה קדם ה' ולשבחא לשמך עילא[ה]:
3. לתנאה בצפרא טובך וקושטך בלילותא:
4. עלי פום כינרא דעשרתי נמנין עלי פום ניבלא עלי ריננת כינריא:
5. ארום אחדינני ה' בעובדך בעובדי אידך אבוע:
6. כמה רברבין הינון עובדך ה' לחדא עמיקין הינון מחשבתך:
7. בר נש שטיא לא ידע וכיסלא לא יתבוין כל דא:
8. כד איתלבלבן רשיעיא היך עיסבא ומנצין כל עבדי שקר ועתידי די ישתצנין אלהא עד עלמא:
9. ואת מרומם לעלמא דאתי ה':
10. ארום הא בעלי דבבך ה' [ארום הא בעלי דבבך]⁷¹⁸ יהובדון לעלמא דאתי ומתפרשין מן סיעתהון דצדיקיא כל עבדי שקר:
11. וזקפתא היך רימנא תוקפי רבייתא יתי במישחא רטיבא בזית[א] עבוף:
12. ואיסתכלית עיני בהובדנא דמעיקי ובקיימין עלי לאבאש[א] שמען אודניי קל תברהון:
13. צדיקא היך דיקלא ילבלב פירין היך ארזא בליבנן יסגא ויעביד שורשין:
14. בנוי יהון שתילין בבית מקדשא דה' בדרת אלהנא ילבלבון:
15. תוב כאבהתהון יעבדון בנין בשיבו דהינין ורטיבין יהון:
16. מטול דיחון דיירי ארע[א] ארום תריץ ה' תקיפי ולית עוולתא ביה:

APPARATUS

הינון v.6 | בלילון V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – בלילותא v.3 | *lit.* ל V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – לשמך v.2 – כיסלא; טפשא VA – שטיא v.7 | *lit.* VA,N – הינון, רברבין < V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – על VA – כל; ונצצין V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – ומנצין v.8 | ית VA,N – כל; שטיא VA – ואת רמא ועילאה בעלמא הדין ה' ואת רמא ועילאה VA,N, *lit.* דאתי V – תרגום אחר: ואת ידך עיליתא לאיתפרעא מן חייביא VA + ,לעלמא דאתי לעלמא דאתי לים דינא רבא ה' ואת ידך עיליתא למיתן אגר טב לצדיקיא מצלחין בעלמא V,VA + – דבבך v.10 | *lit.* as N + 'ה' at end v.10 | דבבך v.10 | ה בדרת v.14 | דזית V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – בזית; רבותא N + – במישחא v.11 | הדין בית N + .

⁷¹⁸ The text in square brackets was added in the margin.

TRANSLATION

1. The Praise and song *that Adam said about Shabbat*:
2. It is good to give thanks before the Lord, and to praise your name O Most High.
3. To recount in the morning your goodness and your truth at night time(s).
4. On the ten stringed instrument and on the Lyre and on the music of the stringed instrument.
5. Because you have made me rejoice, O Lord, in your deeds,⁷¹⁹ in the work of your hands I will exult.
6. How great is your work O Lord, your thoughts are very deep:
7. A foolish man does not know, and an ignoramus does not understand this.
8. When the wicked sprouts forth as the grass and those who work falsehood blossom, *in the future God* will destroy them forever.
9. But you O Lord are exalted and most high in this world and you are exalted and most high in the world to come.⁷²⁰
10. For behold your enemies O Lord,⁷²¹ for behold your enemies will be ruined/destroyed *in the world to come* and all workers of falsehood are separated *from the company of the righteous*.
11. You raised up my strength as the wild ox, you anointed me with the succulent oil *of the densely covered olive [tree]*.
12. My eyes have looked upon the destruction of my oppressors, in rising against me *to do harm* my ears heard *the sound of their misfortune/breaking*.
13. The righteous will produce *fruit* like a date Palm, like a cedar in Lebanon he will increase *and produce roots*.
14. *His sons* will be transplanted in the Temple of the Lord, in the courtyard of the house of our God they will sprout forth.
15. [Once] again, *like their fathers*, they will *produce sons* in old age, they will be succulent and fresh.
16. *Therefore the inhabitants of the land/earth will relate that* the Lord my strength is upright and there is no iniquity in Him.

⁷¹⁹ VA: ...in the working of your miracles...

⁷²⁰ The **תרגום אחר** reads: You Lord, your power (lit. hand) O Most High will punish the sinners in the world to come on the great day of judgment, and you Lord, Your power O Most High will give a good reward to the righteous in the world to come.

⁷²¹ VA adds: ...are successful in this world...

PSALM 93

1. ה' מליך גיוותנותא אלביש אלביש ה' עושנא ואיזדרז לחוד תקין תבל דלא תיזדעזע:
2. מתקן כורסייך מלקדמין מן עלמא את הוא אלהא:
3. זקפון נהרוותא ה' יקבלון נהרוותא קלהון בשירת[א] יקבלון נהרוותא אגר שבחהון:
4. מן קלן דמיין סגיעין ממשבחיא תברי ימא רבא משבח בשמי מרומ[א] ה':
5. סהדוותא קשיטין לחדא לבית מקדשך יאין וקדישין ה' לאורכות יומין:

APPARATUS

זקפון נהרוותא קלהון בשירת V – זקפון נהרוותא ה' v.3 | v.2 – VA *lit.* – הוא
 – שבחהון; זקפו V,VA – יקבלון; *lit.* P¹¹⁰, 'זקפו נהרוותא ה' VA, 'שבחא קדם ה'
 v.5 | V + 1 – ממשבחיא; *lit.* ד P¹¹⁰ – דמיין; קליין P¹¹⁰ – קלן v.4 | שבחיהון VA
lit. ו P¹¹⁰ – וקדישין; סהידוותך V,VA,P¹¹⁰ – סהדוותא

TRANSLATION

1. The Lord reigns He puts on glory, the Lord puts on strength, He is also girded about; [the] world is established it will not be moved.
2. Your throne is established from beforetime, from eternity you are God.
3. The rivers lift up Oh Lord, the rivers lift up⁷²² their voices *in song*, the rivers will *receive a reward of their* praise.
4. More than the voice of many waters, more than the majestic breakers of the great sea, the Lord *is to be praised* in the highest heaven.
5. Your⁷²³ testimonies are very true, beautiful and holy for your temple, Oh Lord, for the length of days.

PSALM 94

1. אלהא מרי פורענות ה' אלהא מרי פורענותא הופע:
2. איתנטל דיין ארעא ואתיב גומלא בישא על גיותנא:
3. עד אימתי רשיעיא יתבון בשלוותא:
4. יבועון וימללון גידופין אמרין מלין דקלנא כל עבדי שקר:
5. עמד ה' ישופון ואחסנתך ימסכנון:
6. ארמלת[א] וגירא יקטלון ויתמי ירצחון:
7. ואמרו לא חמי יה ולא יתביין אלהא דיעקב:

⁷²² Reading from apparatus.

⁷²³ Reading taken from the apparatus.

8. איתבוננו דשטיא בעמא וכסילי אימתי תסכלון:
9. האיפשר שאיתנציבא אודנא ולא שמיע אולפנא אין איפשר דיברא עיינא ולא איסתכל באוריתא:
10. האיפשר דיהב אוריתא לעמיה וכד יחובון ולא יתווכחון הלא ה' אליף לאדם קדמאי מנדעא:
11. קדם ה' ידיע מחשבת בני נש[א] ארום הינון למא:
12. טב לגברא די תכסניניה יה ומן אוריתך תאלפינא:
13. לשדכא ליה מן יומא בישא עד דיתכרי לרשיעא שחתא:
14. ארום לא ינטוש ה' עמיה ואחסנתיה לא ישבוק:
15. ארום עד צדקותא יתוב דינא ובתרוי יתפרקן כל תריצי ליבא:
16. מאן יקום לי לאגחא קרבא עם מבאשין מאן יתעתד לי למנצי עם עבדי שקר:
17. אילולי ה' סעיד לי כזעיר שריית בשתיקותא נפשי:
18. אין אמרית איתמוטט[א/ה?] רגלי טובך ה' יסעוד יתי:
19. בסוגעי מחשבתך בגווי נחומתך יפרנקון נפשי:
20. איפשר דיתחבר עמך כורסי שיקרא ביריית ליעותא התעתד עלי קיים:
21. יכנשון בישן על נפשא דצדיקא ואדמא זכאי יחייבון דין קטול:
22. ויהי ה' לסעיד ואלהי לתקוף רוחצני:
23. ויתב עליהון שקרהון ובבישתהון יגמרינון יגמרינון ה' אלהנא:

APPARATUS

עד אימתי v.3 | VA 1 *lit.* – ואתיב v.2 | פורענותא VA, P¹¹⁰, V – פורענית v.1
 יה v.7 | עד אימתי רשיעא מצלחין ה' < VA, P¹¹⁰, V – רשיעא יתבון בשלוותא
 v.13 | ה' VA – יה v.12 | ידיען V – ידיע v.11 | יליף VA – אליף v.10 | ה' VA –
 v.16 | שווחא VA, P¹¹⁰ – שחתא; דיכרי VA – דיתכרי; יומי VA, P¹¹⁰, V – יומא
 VA, P¹¹⁰, V – שרייר; בזעיר VA – כזעיר v.17 | מאן יקום לי VA, P¹¹⁰, V – מאן לי
 v.21 | יתעתד V – התעתד v.20 | מחשבתא VA, V – מחשבתך v.19 | שריית
 + VA – לסעיד; מימרא ד VA – ה' v.22 | מ... VA – דין; יתכנשון VA – יכנשון
 יגמרינון ימגר VA, P¹¹⁰ – יגמרינון יגמרינון; ואתיב VA, P¹¹⁰ – ויתב v.23 | לי
 : יתהון

TRANSLATION

1. God, the lord of retribution,⁷²⁴ is the Lord, God, the lord of retribution, appears.

⁷²⁴ This reading is taken from the apparatus (see notes for discussion).

2. Be lifted up Oh judge of the earth, return the evil deeds upon the proud.
3. How long will the wicked *succeed*?⁷²⁵ How long will the wicked dwell in peace?
4. They shout and speak blasphemies, all the workers of falsehood speak words of disgrace.
5. Your people, O Lord, will be destroyed, and your inheritance will be brought to nothing.
6. They kill widows and strangers, and they murder orphans.
7. And they have said 'Yah does not see and the God of Jacob does not understand.'
8. Those fools amongst the people be wise, and ignoramuses, when will you learn.
9. Is it possible that the ear was planted, but does not hear *instruction*? Is it possible He who created the eye does not look *into the Law*?
10. Is it possible *that He gave the law to His people, that when they sin* they will not be admonished? And did not the Lord teach *the first* man knowledge?
11. The thought of man is known before the Lord, that they are nothing.
12. Blessed is the man whom You rebuke O Yah, and from Your law You teach.
13. To give him quiet from the evil day, until the pit is dug for the wicked.
14. For the Lord will not forsake His people, and will not abandon His inheritance.
15. Because justice will return to righteousness, and after it all the upright in heart *will be redeemed*.
16. Who will rise⁷²⁶ for me *to wage war* with evildoers? Who will stand firm for me *to quarrel* with workers of falsehood?
17. If the Lord had not been my help my soul would have almost dwelt in silence.
18. When I said 'my legs are shaking' Your goodness O Lord sustained me.
19. In the multitude of your thoughts within me, Your consolations will delight my soul.
20. Is it possible that the throne of falsehood can be joined with You, a creature of vanity/labour *setting himself* against the covenant?

⁷²⁵ This first clause is missing in the Breslau MS. The reading is taken from the apparatus.

⁷²⁶ Reading taken from the apparatus.

21. Evildoers are gathering against the soul of the righteous, and they will condemn innocent blood *to the death sentence*.
 22. The Lord will be my help,⁷²⁷ my God the strength of my security.
 23. And He will return their lie upon them, and He will consume them in their evil deeds, the Lord our God will consume them.

PSALM 110

1. על יד דוד תושבחתא אמר ה' במימריה למיתן לי רבניתא חלף דיתיבית לאולפן אורית ימיניה אוריך עד דאשוי בעיל דבביך כביש ריגלך: ל"א אמר ה' במימריה לשוא[ה?] יתי ריבון על ישראל ברם אמר לי תיב אוריך לשאול דמן שבט בנימן עד דימות ארום לית מלכותא מקרבא אבהרת[א] ובתר כן אשוי בעלי דבבך כביש ריגלך:
2. חוטרא דעושנך ישדר ה' מציון ותהי רדי במצע בעלי דבבך:
3. עמך ישראל דמתנדבין לאוריתא ביום אגחות קרבא תסתייע עימהון בשיבהורי קודשא רחמין דאלהא איסתרבהון לך היך נחתת טלא יתבון לרוחצן תולדתך:
4. קיים ה' ולא יתוב דאת מיתמני לרבא לעלמ[א] דאתי בגין זכותא דהוית מליך זכאי:
5. שכינתא דהי על ימינך מחא ביום רוגזיה מלכיא:
6. איתמנא [את מיתמנא/את מנא]⁷²⁸ לדיין על עמיא מלי ארעא גושמי רשיעין קטילין מחא רישי מלכיא על ארעא סגיעין לחדא:
7. מפום נבייא באורחא אולפן יקבל מטול היכנא יזקוף ריש[א]

APPARATUS

v.1 (N places reverses order of Targum and "Targum aher"); תושבחתא – V חולף P¹¹⁰ – חלף; רבנותא V, P¹¹⁰, VA – רבניתא; למתן V – למיתן; תושבחתא – אוריך; דימיניה VA, ימיני V, N – ימיניה; אוריית P¹¹⁰, VA – אורית בעלי P¹¹⁰, VA – בעלי דבביך V – בעיל דבביך; זמן VA + עד; P¹¹⁰, VA + 1; לשואה, (תרגום אחר VA) – ל"א v.1 | לרגלך V, P¹¹⁰, VA – ריגלך; דבבך P¹¹⁰, VA lit.; – תיב; ה' לי VA + אמר; ארכון V, P¹¹⁰, VA – רבון V – ריבון; למנאי די יסתלק P¹¹⁰, דאסתלק מן עלמא V – דימות; דמשבט VA, שיבט P¹¹⁰ – שבט אבהרת[א?]; P¹¹⁰, VA lit.; – ארום... אבהרתא; דיסתלק מן עלמא VA, מן עלמא כדן תחסין V, P¹¹⁰ – כן; ומן בתר V, P¹¹⁰ – ובתר; אחברתה V מתברתא N – P¹¹⁰, VA, לרגלך V, VA – ריגלך; V, P, VA + 1; אשוי; תחסין מלכותא VA + מלכותא

⁷²⁷ Reading taken from the apparatus.

⁷²⁸ Suggested possible emendation discussed in ch.7.2c.

דבית N, בית + VA, P¹¹⁰, ישראל v.3 | מימרא דה' VA – ה' v.2 | לריגלך
 – V תסתייע; קרבך V – קרבא; אגחותך VA – P¹¹⁰, אגחות; ד lit. – V דמתנדבין
 – V, VA עימהון; עמהון V, VA – V, N, P¹¹⁰, VA יסתרהבון; נחתות VA | נחתית V, P¹¹⁰ – נחתת
 – V, P¹¹⁰, VA + במימריה; דאנת V – דאנת VA, מיתמני – V, VA מתמני; בגין
 – P, VA בגלל | v.6 – N, P¹¹⁰ איתמנא, VA איתמנא; לדיין – P¹¹⁰, VA
 – VA גושמין ד VA, גושמין P¹¹⁰ – גושמי; מלא VA – מלי; עממיא VA – עמיא; לדיינא
 | v.7 – VA יקבל; נביאה VA, נביא V – נביא; מפם P¹¹⁰ – מפוס v.7.

TRANSLATION

1. Praise by David, The Lord, by His Memra, said to give to me dominion because (lit. in exchange that)⁷²⁹ I sat to learn the Torah of His right hand;⁷³⁰ wait until I place your enemies as a stool for you feet: Lashon Aher The Lord said by His Memra to place me as ruler over Israel, but He said to me sit, wait until Saul, from the tribe of Benjamin, dies because a kingdom should not encroach on another⁷³¹, and afterwards I will place your enemies as a stool for your feet.⁷³²
2. The Lord sent forth the rod of your strength from Zion and you will rule in the midst of your enemies.
3. Your people Israel who give themselves willingly to Torah, on the day of fighting a battle you will join with them in the splendour of holiness, the mercy of God will hasten to you as dew falls, their descendants will sit securely.
4. The Lord has sworn and will not repent (lit. turn), that you have been appointed to greatness in the world to come on account of the fact that you were a righteous king.
5. The Shekinah of the Lord is on your right hand, He smites kings on the day of His anger.
6. He was [you were] appointed judge over the nations, the bodies of the wicked who were killed filled the earth, He smote the heads of kings over the earth, very many.
7. From the mouth of prophets on the way he received instruction, because of this he will raise the head.

⁷²⁹ See ch.6.1b n.492 for a discussion on this translation.

⁷³⁰ MS V 'my right hand.'

⁷³¹ Reading from the apparatus, MS V. MS N read 'no kingdom should encroach breaking (?).'

⁷³² The order of the Targum and 'Targum aher' is reversed in V.

PSALM 118

1. שבחו קדם ה' ארום טב ארום לעלם טוביה:
2. יימרון כדון ישראל ארום לעלם טוביה:
3. יימרון כדון בית אהרן ארום לעלם טוביה:
4. יימרון כדון דחליא דה' ארום לעלם טוביה:
5. מן עקתא קריתי יה קבל צלותי בפותיא יה:
6. מימרא דה' בסעדי לא אידחל מה יעבד לי בר נש:
7. מימרא דה' למיסעדא יתי ואנא איחמי פורעניתא בסנאי:
8. טב למתרחצא במימר[א] דה' מן למירחץ בבר נש:
9. טב למתרחצא במימר[א] דה' מן למרחץ ברברביא:
10. כל עממיא חזרו יתי בשום מימרא דה' רחיצית ארו[ם]
אתושנון:
11. אקפוני לחוד אחזרו יתי בשום מימרא דה' רחיצית ארו[ם]
אתושינון:
12. אקפוני היך זיבוריתא דלקון היך אשתא בכובין בשום
מימרא דה' רחיצית ארו[ם] אתושינון:
13. מידחת דחיית יתי חובי למינפל ומימר[א] דה' סייעני:
14. תוקפי ותושבתי דחיל על כל עלמיא ה' אמר במימר[יה]
והוה לי לפריק:
15. קל תושבחתא ופורקנא במשכניהון דצדיקי ימינא דה'
עבדת חילא:
16. [ימינא דה' מרממא ימינא דה' עבדת חילא]⁷³³
17. לא אמות ארום אחי אישתעי עובדי אלהא:
18. מכסנא אכסנינני יה ולמיתא לא מסר יתי:
19. פתחו לי מעלני קרתא דצדיק[א] איעול בהון אשבח יה:
20. דין מעלני דבית מקדשא דה' דצדיקא ייעלון ביה:
21. אהודה קדמך ארום קבילתא צלותי והוות לי לפריק:
22. טליא שביקו ארדיכליא ביני בניה דישי זכא לאיתמנ[אה]
למליך ושולטן:
23. מן קדם ה' הות דא אמרו ארדיכלי[א] היא פרישא קדמנא
אמרו בנוי דישי:
24. דין יומא עבד ה' ארדיכליא נדון ונחדי ביה אמרו בנוי ישי:
25. בבעו מינך ה' פרוק כדון אמ[רו] ארדיכ[ליא] בבעו מינך ה'
אצלח כדון אמרו ישי ואינתתיה:
26. בריך דאתי בשום מימר[א] דה' אמ[רו] ארדיכליא בריכנא
יתכון מבית מקדשא דה' אמר דוד:
27. אלהא ה' ואנהר לנא אמרו שבט[יא] דבית יהוד[ה] כפיתו
טליא לניכסת חגא בשלשלוון עד די תקרבון ותדון אדמיה
בקרנת מדבחה אמר שמואל נביא:

⁷³³ V.16 is missing in MS Breslau. The text is taken from MS Vatican.

28. אלהי את ואודה קדמך אלהי אשבחינך אמר דוד:
 29. מתיב שמואל שבחו בכינשתא דישראל אודו קדם ה' ארום
 טב ארום לעלם טוביה:

APPARATUS

v.5 יה – VA אלהא (x2) | v.6 'דה – V + לי | v.10 חזרו – VA אקפון יתי; V – יתי; אקפוני v.12 | אתושיניון V, אתושיניון VA – אתושיניון; רחיצית; יתיה – V חזרו; חזרו V, VA, P¹¹⁰ – אתושיניון VA – אתושיניון; דכוכין VA – בכוכין; דבוריתא VA – זיבוריתא v.12 | אתושיניון עלמא N – עלמא v.14 | N lit. חובי v.13 | אתושיניון V, אתושיניון VA – מעלני VA – מעלני קרתא דצדיק[א] v.19 | אלהא VA – יה v.18 | עממא VA v.20 | מעלני VA, V, P¹¹⁰ – מעלני v.20 | אלהא VA – יה; צדקתא v.25 | אמרו V, N > v.24 | ארדיכליא v.23⁷³⁴ | זכאה VA – זכא v.22 | ד lit. יתדון N – ותדון; ו N lit. v.27 | וננהר v.26 | בריכנא N – בריכנא v.26 | פרוק v.29 | ואמר N > – שבחו v.29.

TRANSLATION

1. Praise the Lord for he is good, for his blessing is forever.
2. Let Israel now say His blessing is forever.
3. Let the house of Aaron now say, His blessing is forever.
4. Let those who fear the Lord now say, His blessing is forever.
5. In (lit. from) distress I called, Yah; Yah accepted my prayer in a spacious place.
6. The *Memra* of the Lord is my *help* I shall not fear; what can man do to me!
7. The *Memra* of the Lord is to help me, and I will see the punishment on those who hate me.

⁷³⁴ Vv.23–29 in MS VA are given in full here because of the difference in structure:

23. מן קדם ה' הות דא אמרו ארדכליא היא פרישא קדמנא:
 24. אמרו בנוי דישי דין יומא עבד ה' אמרו ארדכליא נדון ונחדי ביה:
 25. אמרו בנוי דישי בבועו מינך ה' פרוק כדון אמרו ארדכליא בבועו מינך ה' אצלח כדון:
 26. אמרו ישי ואתתיה בריך דאתי בשום מימרא דה' אמרו ארדכליא בריכין יתכון מבית מוקדשא דה':
 27. אמר דוד אלהא ה' אנהר לנא אמרו שבטיא דבית יהודה כפיתו טליא לנכסת חגא בשושלון עד די תרקביניה ותדון אדמא בקרנת מדבחא:
 28. אמר שמואל נביאה אלהי את וטודי קומך אלהי ואשבחינך:
 29. אמר דוד ומתיב שמואל שבחו כנישתא דישראל אודו קדם ה' ארום טב לעלם טוביה:

8. It is better to trust in the *Memra* of the Lord than to trust in man:
9. It is better to trust in the *Memra* of the Lord than to trust in princes.
10. All the nations surrounded me, in the name of the *Memra* of the Lord *I have trusted*, therefore I will tear them apart.⁷³⁵
11. They encompassed me very much, they surrounded me, in the name of the *Memra* of the Lord *I have trusted*, therefore I will tear them apart.
12. They have encompassed me like bees, burning as a fire in thorns, in the name of the *Memra* of the Lord *I have trusted*, therefore I will tear them apart.
13. *My sin*, you pushed me greatly (lit. pushing my sin you pushed me) so that I might fall, but the *Memra* of the Lord supported me.
14. My strength and my praise is *the awesome one of all the earth*, *the Lord spoke by His Memra*, and He was for me a redeemer.
15. The voice of praise and salvation in the tents of the righteous, the right hand of the Lord has done great deeds.
16. The right hand of the Lord is exalted, the right hand of the Lord has done great deeds.
17. I will not die but leave, I will recount the deeds of God.
18. The Lord has severely disciplined me (lit. disciplining the Lord has disciplined me), but has not given me over to death.
19. Open for me the doors of the city of the righteous, I will enter them, I will praise Yah.
20. This is the entrance⁷³⁶ of the Temple of the Lord into which the righteous will enter.
21. I will give thanks before you because you have received my prayer, and you have become for me a redeemer.
22. *The child from amongst the sons of Jesse* who the builders forsook, is worthy to be appointed king and ruler.
23. 'It is from the Lord' *the builders said*, 'it is a wonder before us' *said the sons of Jesse*.
24. 'This is the day that the Lord has made' *said*⁷³⁷ *the builders*, 'we will rejoice and be glad' *said the sons of Jesse*.
25. 'If it please You O Lord, save now!' *said the builders*, 'if it please you O Lord, prosper now!' *said Jesse and his wife*.

⁷³⁵ 'I will weaken them' in MS VA and V.

⁷³⁶ Singular taken from reading in apparatus.

⁷³⁷ Reading from the apparatus.

26. 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the *Memra* of the Lord' *said the builders*, 'we bless you from the temple of the Lord' *said David*.
27. 'God is the Lord and will enlighten us' *said the tribe of the house of Judah*, 'bind the *lamb* for a festal offering with cords, *so you may offer [it] and pour out its blood on the horns of the altar*' *said the prophet Samuel*.
28. 'You are my God and I will give thanks to you, my God and I will praise you' *said David*.
29. *Samuel replied* 'Give praise in the assembly of Israel, give thanks before the Lord for [He] is good His blessing endures forever.'

PSALM 137

1. על נהרוותא דבבל תמן יתבנא לחוד בכינא כד הוינא דכרין ית ציון:
2. על ערבין במיצעה תלינן כינרנא:
3. ארום תמן שיילו יתנא בבלאי די שבו יתנא למימר מילי דשיריא ובזוזנא על עיסק חירוה
4. אמרין שבחו לנא מן שירתא דהויתון אמרין בציון:
5. מן יד קטעו ליואי אליוניהון בככיהון ואמרין הכדין נשבח ית תושבחתא דה' על ארעא
6. חילוניתא:
7. מתיב קל רוחא דקודשא ואמרה דאין אנשינא לך ירושל[ם] אנשייה ימיני:
8. תדבק לישני למוריגי אין לא אידכר יתיכי אין לא אסיק דוכרן ירושלם על שירוי חדות בית שמש
9. שמש
10. אמר מיכאל רבה דירושלם אידכר ה' לעמא דאדום ית יומא דחריבו ירושלם דאמרין צדו צדו
11. עד שיתאסא בה:
12. אמר מיכאל רבה דציון לאומא בבליית[א] בזוזיתא טב ליה די שלם לך ית גמלך ביש די גמלת
13. לנא:
14. טב ליה דאחיד ומרטיש ית טלייך על כיפא

APPARATUS

ברת קלא משמיא VA – רוחא דקודשא v.5 | חדוה V,VA,N,P¹¹⁰ – חירוה v.3
 VA – אידכר יתיכי v.6 | + N,V,VA – ימיני; מנשינא לך VA – אנשינא לן
 – בית; אסיק ית ירושלם לדוכרן טב VA – אסיק דוכרן ירושלם; דכירנא לך
 – ית יומא; רביהון דישראל VA – רבה דירושלם v.7 | ת"א בית N^m, כיתי N,VA
 – מיכאל v.8 | שיתא סאבה N^m – שיתאסא בה; פנון VA – צדו צדו N *lit.*;
 טב ליה די שלם לך ית גמלך; בת אימא VA – לאומא; גבריא N,P¹¹⁰,V,VA

טבוהי דמאן דפרע לײך ית תשלומת גומליך די גמלת VA – ביש די גמלת לנא
לנא.

TRANSLATION

1. By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat, we also cried whilst we were remembering Zion.
2. On the willows in its midst, we hung our harps.
3. Because there, *the Babylonians* who had taken us captive, asked us to say words of songs, and our plunderers for fun (lit. on account of joy)⁷³⁸ said, ‘Give praise for us from the songs you used to say in Zion’.
4. Immediately the Levites bit off (lit. mutilated) their thumbs with their teeth saying, ‘How can we sing the praise of the Lord on strange land?’
5. *The voice of the Holy Spirit replies*, ‘If I forget you Jerusalem may I forget my right hand.
6. May my tongue stick to my palate if I do not remember you, if I don’t raise up the memory of Jerusalem over the first joy of *the place of my ministers*’.
7. *Michael prince of Jerusalem said*, “Remember O Lord the people of Edom on the day that they destroyed Jerusalem saying, ‘Destroy! Destroy, unto her foundations.’”
8. *Gabriel*⁷³⁹ *the prince of Zion said to the Babylonian nation, the plunderer*, ‘Blessed is he that repays you for the evil deeds you did to us.
9. Blessed is he who takes hold and smashes your children against a stone.’

⁷³⁸ Reading from apparatus.

⁷³⁹ Reading from apparatus. It seems that the repetition of Michael is a scribal error caused by the similarity with v.7, although see ch. 3.2c for a discussion of these verses and comments on the manuscript differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Bible

Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia, K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (eds), Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.

Biblia Sacra, Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1967.

Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1931–1993.

The Greek New Testament, B. Aland and K. Aland, et al (eds.), Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. I–II, Oxford, 1867–74, rep. Hildesheim, 1964.

2. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Second Temple Literature

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols., J. Charlesworth, New York, Doubleday, 1985.

The Apocryphal Old Testament, H. Sparks, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1984.

The Book of Enoch, R. Charles, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912.

Philo, F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, London, Cambridge, Mass., Heinemann, Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Josephus, H. St. J. Thackeray (et al), London, Cambridge, Mass., Heinemann, Harvard University Press, 1926–1985.

Discoveries in the Judean Desert, vols. i–xxxix, E. Tov (editor in chief), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955–2002.

The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations, J. Charlesworth and F. M. Cross (eds.), J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1994 ff.

Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, K. Beyer, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984.

הספרים החיצונים, מהדורת א. כהנא, ירושלים
מגילת המקדש, י. ידין, ירושלים תשל"ז

3. Rabbinic Sources

תוספתא, מהדורת צוקרמאנדל, ירושלים תש"ל
תוספתא, מהדורת ליברמן, ניו יורק תשל"ג
ששה סדרי המשנה, מהדורת ת. אלבק, ישראל תשמ"ט
המשנה על פי כתב יד קאופמן, ירושלים 1968
ששה סדרי המשנה, כתב יד פארמא, ירושלים 1970
ספרי על ספר דברים, מהדורת פינקלשטיין - האראוויטץ, ניו יורק, תשכ"ט
מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מהדורת האראוויטץ - רבין, ירושלים תש"ל
מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מהדורת לויטערבאך, פילאדלפיה תש"ט
מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי, מהדורת אפשטיין, ירושלים תשט"ו
תלמוד בבלי מסכת סוטה, דקדוקי סופרים השלם, י. לוי (עורך)
דקדוקי סופרים, ז. ראבינאוויטץ, תש"ך
תלמוד בבלי נדפס
תלמוד בבלי מסכת עבודה זרה, כתב יד בית מדרש לרבנים בניו יורק, ש.
אברמסון, 1957
תלמוד ירושלמי, קראטאשין.
מדרש ויקרא רבה, מהדורת מרגליות, ירושלים תשל"ב
מדרש רות רבה, מהדורת ב. לרנר, תשל"א
מדרש קוהלת רבה, פרשות א-ד, מהדורת מ. הירשמן, ירושלים תשמ"ב
מדרש בראשית רבה, מהדורת ת. אלבק, ירושלים תשכ"ה
מדרש שיר השירים רבה, ש. דונסקי, תש"מ
פסיקתא דרב כהנא, מהדורת מנדלבוס, ניו יורק תשכ"ב
פסיקתא רבתי, מהדורת איש שלום, תל אביב תשכ"ג
מדרש שמות רבה, א.א. הלוי, תל אביב תשכ"ג
מדרש תנחומא, מהדורת בובר, ווילנא, 1885
מדרש תנחומא, מהדורת ח. זונדל, ירושלים תשכ"ב
מדרש דברים רבה, מהדורת ליברמן, ירושלים ת"ש
במדבר רבה, א.א. הלוי, ירושלים תשכ"ג
מדרש תהלים, מהדורת בובר, ירושלים תשכ"ו
אבות דרבי נתן, מהדורת שטכטער, ניו יורק תשכ"ז
לקוט המכרי על ספר תהלים, מהדורת בובר, ירושלים תשכ"ד
ספר תשב"ץ (פ"ג שא) fol 1738 Amsterdam

4. Aramaic Targum Texts

M. Cohen (ed.), מקראות גדולות הכתר, Jerusalem: Bar Ilan University Press,
2003.

- E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* Hoboken, N.J., Ktav Pub. House, 1984.
- R. Kasher, תוספתות תרגום לנביאים, Jerusalem, Israel Academy of Sciences, 1996.
- C. Müller-Kessler and M. Sokoloff (eds.), *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic New Testament Versions from the Early Period. Gospels* Groningen, Styx Publications, 1998.
- M. Klein, *The Fragment—Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources* Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1980.
- , *Geniza Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* HUC Press Cincinnati, 1986.
- P. de Lagarde, *Hagiographa Chaldaica* Leipzig, 1873
- A. Diez Macho, *Targum Neophyti I* vol.2, Madrid, CSIC, 1968–1979.
- L. Diez Merino, *Targum de Salmos: Edition Principe del Ms. Villa-Amil n.5 de Alfonso de Zamora* Madrid, CSIC, 1982.
- , *Targum de Job: Edition Principe del Ms. Villa-Amil n.5 de Alfonso de Zamora* Madrid, CSIC, 1984.
- A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos* Leiden, Brill, 1959.
- , *The Bible in Aramaic: The Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan* Leiden, Brill, 1959.
- , *The Bible in Aramaic: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan* Leiden, Brill, 1962.
- D. Stec, *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition* Leiden, Brill, 1994.
- A. Tal, תרגום השומרוני לתורה University of Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv, 1980.

5. Church Fathers

- Aphrahat, *The Homilies of Aphrahat* W. Wright, London, Edinburgh, 1869.
- Clément D'Alexandrie, *Le Pedagogue* H. Marrou and M. Harl, Sources Chrétiennes no' 70, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1960–1970.
- , *Protreptique* C. Mondésert, Sources Chrétiennes, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1949.
- Diodore of Tarsus *Diodori Tarsensis Commentarii in Psalmos I–L* J. M. Oliver, Turnhout, Brepols, 1980.
- Ephrem, *de Confessoribus. Nachträge zu Ephraem Syrus*, E. Beck, Louvain, SCO, 1975.
- , *Hymnen de Fide*, E. Beck, Louvain, L. Durbecq, 1955.
- , *Sancti Ephraem Syri Opera Omnia*, P. Benedictus and S. Assemanus (eds.), Rome, 1732–1746.

- _____, *Hymnen de Nativitate*, E. Beck, Louvain, L. Durdecq, 1959.
- _____, *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen Contra Haereses*, E. Beck Louvain, L. Durbecq, 1957.
- _____, *Nachträge zu Ephraem Syrus—Herausgegeben*, E. Beck, Louvain, L. Durbecq, 1975.
- Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, L. Kirsopp et al., London, Cambridge, Mass., Heinmann, Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 1949.
- _____, *Psalms Commentary*, J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 23, Paris, 1857.
- Jerome, *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, G. Germain Morin (ed.), Maredsoli, 1895.
- Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, M. Marcovich, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- _____, *Apologiae Pro Christianis*, M. Marcovich, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Irenaeus, *Contre Les Hérésies*, Books 1–5, A. Rousseau, L. Doutreileau, B. Hermmedinger, C. Mercier, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1965–82.
- Narsai, *Homiliae et Carmina*, A. Migana, Mausili, 1945.
- Origen, *In Psalmos*, J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 13, Paris.
- _____, *Traité des principes*, H. Crouzel and M. Simonetti, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1978–1984.
- _____, *Contra Celse*, M. Borret, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1967–1976.
- _____, *Selecta in Psalmos*, J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 12.
- Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, E. Evans, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972
- Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In Psalmos*, J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 80, Paris.
- Theophilus, *Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolycum*, R. M. Grant, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970.

6. Translations.

i. Bible

- Holy Bible*, American Standard Version 1901, Star Bible, Fort Worth Texas, 1992.
- The Holy Bible*, Authorised King James Version, Trinitarian Bible Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (n.d.).
- The Holy Bible*, Revised Version, Oxford, Oxford University press, (n.d.).
- Tanakh, A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, Jerusalem, 1985.
- A New English Translation of the Septuagint. The Psalms*, A. Pietersma, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2000.

ii. Rabbinic Texts

- I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud* Soncino Press, London, 1948–1952.
 J. Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1955.
 R. Hammer, *Sifre A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* Yale, 1986.
 D. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms* The Aramaic Bible, vol.16, Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 2004.

iii. Christian Texts

- G. W. Barkley, *Origen, Homilies on Leviticus* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
 E. Beck, *Nachträge zu Ephraem Syrus—herausgegeben [und übersetzt]*, Louvain, L. Durbecq, 1975.
 H. Chadwick, *Origen, Contra Celsum* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1965.
 R. Deferrari, *Eusebius Pamphili, Ecclesiastical History* Catholic University Press of America, 1953–55.
 J. K. Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993.
 J. Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1991.
 R. E. Heine, *Origen, Homilies on Genesis and Exodus* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1982.
 ———, *Origen, Commentary on the Gospel of John* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
 R. C. Hill, *Theodoret of Cyrus, Commentary on Psalms 1–72 and 73–150* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 2000–2001.
 A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante Nicene Church Fathers* Rev. Ed. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1985–1987.
 P. Schaff and H. Wace (eds.), *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers* Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988–1991.
 J. Smith, *Origen, Homilies on Jeremiah and 1 Kings 28* Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

- M. Aberbach, “The Relations Between Master and Disciple in the Talmudic Age,” in H. J. Zimmerli and I. Finstein (eds.) *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* London, Soncino Press, 1967, pp.1–24.

- M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis together with an English Translation of the Text* New York, Denver, KTAV, University of Denver, 1982.
- T. Albeck, מבוא לתלמודים, תל אביב תשכ"ט.
- C. Albeck, *Untersuchungen über die Redaktion der Mishna* Berlin, C. A. Schweschke & Sohn, 1923.
- P. S. Alexander, "How did the Rabbis Learn Hebrew?," in W. Horbury (ed.) *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben Yehuda* Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1999, pp.71–89.
- _____, "The King Messiah in Rabbinic Judaism," in J. Day (ed.) *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 456–473.
- _____, "Tradition and Originality in the Targum of the Song of Songs," in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in their Historical Context* Sheffield, JSOT Press in association with the Royal Irish Academy, 1994, pp.318–339.
- _____, "The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum," in J. A. Emerton (ed.) *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983*, Supplement to Vetus Testamentum Series 36, Leiden, Brill, 1985, pp.14–28.
- _____, "Targum, Targumim," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol.6 (1992), pp.328–330.
- R. Alter, *The David Story* London, New York, W. W. Norton, 1999.
- E. Amélineau, *Contes et Romans de L'Egypte Chrétienne* ii. Paris, E. Leroux, 1888.
- G. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection* Louisville, Ky., Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- G. Archambault, *Dialogue avec Tryphon* Paris, Picard, 1909.
- W. Bacher, "Das Targum zur den Psalmen," *MGWJ* 21 (1872), pp.408–416, 463–473.
- _____, *Jewish Encyclopedia* vol 8, 1908, p.62.
- F. Baethgan, "Der Textkritische Werth der alten Übersetzungen zu den Psalmen," *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882), pp.593–667.
- G. Bardy, "Les Traditions juives dans l'oeuvre d'Origene," *RB* 34 (1925), pp.217–252.
- J. Baumgarten, "4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord's Vineyard," *JJS* 40 (1989), pp.1–6.
- M. Bernstein, "The 'Righteous' and the 'Wicked' in the Aramaic Version of the Psalms," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.5–26.

- _____, "Translation Technique in the Targum to the Psalms: Two Test Cases. Psalms 2 and 137," in E. H. Lovering (ed.) *SBL Seminar Papers 1994* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1994, pp.326–345.
- _____, "Torah and Its Study in the Targum of Psalms," in J. Gurock and Y. Elman (eds.) *Hazon Nabum: Studies in Honour of Dr. Norman Lamm on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* Hoboken, Yeshiva University Press, 1997, pp.39–67.
- _____, "The Righteous and the Wicked in the Aramaic Version of Psalms," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.5–26.
- _____, "The 'Given' Levites: Targumic Methods and Method in the Study of the Targumim," in P. Flesher (ed.) *Targum Studies ii: Targum and Peshitta* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998, pp.93–111.
- _____, "The Aramaic Targumim: The Many Faces of the Jewish Biblical Experience," in G. J. Brooke (ed.) *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp.133–165.
- _____, "A Jewish Reading of Psalms: Some Observations on Method of the Aramaic Targum," in P. W. Flint and P. D. Miller (eds.) *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* Leiden: Brill, 2005, pp.476–504.
- E. Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998.
- M. Black, "Die Apotheose Israels eine neue Interpretation des Danielischen 'Menschsohns,'" in R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (eds.) *Jesus und der Menschensohn für Anton Vögtle* Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1975, pp.92–99.
- _____, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels* 3rd Edition with an appendix on the Son of Man by G. Vermes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967.
- G. Bodendorfer, "Abraham zur Rechten Gottes," *Evangelische Theologie* 59.4 (1999), pp.252–266.
- J. Bosniak, *The Commentary of David Kimhi on the Fifth Book of the Psalms cvii–cl* New York, Bet ha-Midrash ha-Rabbanim de-America, 1954.
- W. G. Braude, "Midrash as Deep Peshat," in S. Brunswick (ed.) *Studies in Judaica, Karaitica and Islamica, Presented to Leon Nemoy on his Eightieth Birthday* Ramat Gan, Israel, Bar Ilan University Press, 1982, pp.31–38.
- S. P. Brock, "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.) *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992, pp.301–338.
- _____, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20.1 (1979), pp.69–87.
- _____, "Translating the Old Testament," in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (eds.) *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, Essays in Honour*

- of Barnabas Lindars* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, 87–98.
- G. J. Brooke, “4Q500 and the use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard,” *DSD* 2.3 (1995), pp.268–294
- D. D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will be Opened, A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter* Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1988.
- A. Cabaniss, “The Harrowing of Hell, Psalm 24 and Pliny the Younger: A Note,” *Vigilia Christianae* 7 (1953), pp.65–78.
- M. Cahill, “Not a Cornerstone! Translating Ps 118:22 in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures,” *RB* 106.3 (1999), pp.345–357.
- B. Chilton, “Four Types of Comparison Between the Targumim and the New Testament,” *JAB* 2.2 (2000), pp.163–188.
- P. Churgin, *תרגום כתובים* New York, 1945.
- M Cohen (ed.), *מקראות גדולות הכתר: תהלים א* Jerusalem, Bar Ilan University, 2003.
- E. M. Cook, “The Psalms Targum: Introduction to a New Translation with Sample Texts,” in P. V. M. Flesher (ed.) *Targum and Scripture. Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in memory of Ernest G. Clarke* Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp.185–201.
- , “Covenantal Nomism in the Psalms Targum” in S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo (eds.) *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.203–220.
- M. Dahood, *Psalms 1–50* New York, Doubleday, 1966.
- , *Psalms 51–100* New York, Doubleday, 1968.
- , *Psalms 101–150* New York, Doubleday, 1970.
- R le Déaut, *Introduction a la literature Targumique* vol.1, Rome: Chicago, Institut biblique pontifical, 1966.
- N. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.
- A. Drom, *הפירוש השלם על תהלים ר' דוד קמחי (רד"ק)* Jerusalem, Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1967.
- J. Dunn, *Romans* Word Biblical Commentary, vol.38a–b, Dallas, Texas, Word Books, 1988.
- , *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* Grand Michigan, W. B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- T. Edwards, *The Jewish Interpretation of Psalm 82: A Study in the Origins and Development of Midrash* Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000 (unpublished).
- E. E. Ellis, *Paul's use of the Old Testament* Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1957.

- J. A. Emerton, "The Syntactical Problem of Psalm 45:7," *JSS* 13 (1968), pp.58–63.
- J. Epstein, **מבוא לנוסח המשנה כרך ב** Tel Aviv, Magnes Press, 1948.
- C. A. Evans, "Jesus and James: Martyrs of the Temple" in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), *James the Just and Christian Origins* Leiden, Brill, 1999, p.243–244.
- S. Fine, "'Their Faces Shine with the Brightness of the Firmament' Study Houses and Synagogues in the Targumim to the Pentateuch," in F. W. Knobloch (ed.) *Biblical Translation in Context* Bethesda, University Press of Maryland, 2002, pp.63–92.
- M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985.
- D. Flusser, S. Safrai, **"שיר דוד" החיצוניים**, **תעודה ב עיונים במקרא ספר**, **זכרון ליהושע מאיר גרינץ** Tel Aviv, 1982.
- J. T. Forsetell, *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament. An Annotated Bibliography with a New Testament Index* Chicago, California, Scholars Press, 1979.
- S. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third–Sixth Centuries," in L. I. Levine (ed.) *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, pp.253–286.
- , "How Broad was the Rabbinic Umbrella? The Case of Targum and Rabbinic Literature," (Unpublished) presented at *The Colloquium of the Summer School of Jewish Studies* The Institute for Advanced Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2003.
- , "Scripture, Targum and Talmud as Instruction: A Complex Textual Story from the *Sifra*," in J. Magness and S. Gitin (eds.) *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1998, 109–122.
- , "The Torah of the King (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law," in J. Davila (ed.) *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.25–60.
- S. Freehof, "Sound the Shofar—'Ba Kesse' Psalm 81:4," *JQR* 64 (1973–4), pp.225–228.
- M. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine* vol.1, Tel-Aviv, New York, Tel-Aviv University, Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1980.
- , **"פוליגאמיה: תעודות ותשובות מן הגניזה"** *Tarbiz* 43 (1974), pp.166–198.

- Av. B. Gartner, "טליא als Messiasbezeichnung," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* xviii–xix, 1953–1954, 98–108.
- S. E. Gillingham, *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994.
- D. Golomb, "Methodological Considerations in Pentateuchal Targumic Research," *JSP* 18 (1988), pp.3–25.
- R. P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets from Nahum to Malachi* Leiden, Brill, 1994.
- , "The Citations of the Targums in Recent English Translations (RSV, JB, NEB)," *JJS* 26 (1975), pp.50–60.
- , "Targum as Midrash: Contemporizing in the Targum to the Prophets," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Bible Studies and the Ancient Near East*, Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988, pp.61–73.
- M. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Language of Targum Onqelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic," *JNES* 37 (1978), pp.169–179.
- B. Grossfeld, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* vol.4, (1972), pp.848–849.
- M. Gruber, *Rashi's Commentary on Psalm 1–89 (Books i–iii)* Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1998.
- Z. Ben-Hayyim, *תיבת מרקה A Collection of Samaritan Midrashim* Jerusalem, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1988.
- C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple, A Non-Biblical Source Book* London, New York, Routledge, 1996.
- I. Heinman, *דרכי האגדה, מאגנס, ירושלים תשכ"ח*.
- J. Heinmann, *אגדות ותולדותיהן* Jerusalem, Keter, 1974.
- M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* translated from the Hebrew by B. Stein, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1996.
- B. Z. Hoffman, *מדרש תנאים על ספר דברים* Berlin: 1900/1909.
- W. Horbury, "The Messianic Association of the 'Son of Man,'" *JTS* 36.1 (1985), pp.34–55.
- Y Hyman, *ספר תולדות תנאים ואמורים, ירושלים תשכ"ד*.
- H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* vol.1&2, Leiden, Brill, 1996.
- S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- A. Jeruchen, *Ohel Rachel* New York: Sinai, 1942.
- P. Kahle, "Das palaestinischen Pentateuchtargum und das Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramaeisch," *ZNW* 49(1958), pp.103–130.
- E. Kahler, *Studien zum Te Deum und zur Geschichte des 24. Psalms in der Alten Kirche* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

- R. Kasher, "Angelology and the Supernal World in the Aramaic Targums to the Prophets," *JSJ* 27.2 (1996), pp.168–191.
- , **תוספתות תרגום לנביאים**, Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies, 1996.
- , "The Aramaic Targums and their *Sitz im Leben*," in M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem 1985). Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988, pp.75–85.
- , "Eschatological Ideas in the Tosephtot Targums," *JAB* 2.1 (2000), pp.25–59.
- P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheto Scroll," in K. Aland and F. L. Cross (eds.) *Studia Patristica 1* Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1957, pp.343–353.
- S. Kaufman, "Methodology in Targum Studies," *JSNT* 23 (1988), pp.117–124.
- , **התרגום המיוחס ליונתן והארמית היהודית הספרותית**, **המאוחרת**, in M. Ben Asher, M. Garsiel, D. Dimant and Y. Maori (eds.) **עיוני מקרא ופרשנות כרך ג: ספר זכרון למשה גושן גוטשטיין** Ramat Gan, Israel, Bar Ilan University Press, 1993, pp.363–382.
- , "Dating the languages of the Palestinian Targums and their use in the Study of First Century Texts," in D. Beattie and M. McNamara (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* Sheffield, JSOT press in association with the Royal Irish Academy, 1994, pp.118–141.
- S. Kaufman, Y. Maori, "Aspects and Implications of the Targum to Ex 20," *Textus* 16 (1991), pp.13–78.
- R. Kimmelman, "The Daily Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption," *JQR* 79 (1988), pp.165–197.
- A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* vol.1, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1891–1901.
- R. Kirschner, "Two responses to Epochal Change: Augustine and the Rabbis on Psalm 137 (136)," in *VC* 44.3 (1990), 242–262.
- M. Kister, 1998 **עיונים באבות דרבי נתן. נוסח עריכה ופרשנות, ירושלים**, Jerusalem, Hebrew University and Yad ben Zvi.
- M. Klein, "The Translations of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim," in J. A. Emerton (ed.) *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* Leiden, Brill, 1981, 162–177.
- , "Associative and Complimentary Translation in the Targumim," *Eretz Israel* 16 (1982), pp.134–140.

- Y. Komlosh, **קווים אופייניים בתרגום תהלים**, in J. Grintz, J. Liver (eds.) **ספר סגל קובץ מחקרים במקרא** Jerusalem, Israel Society for Biblical Research, 1964, pp.265–270.
- _____, **המקרא באור התרגום** Tel Aviv, University Bar Ilan, 1973.
- _____, **אנציקלופדיה מקראית "תרגום"** vol 8, p.756.
- A. Van der Kooij, "The Origin and Purpose of Bible Translations in Ancient Judaism, Some Comments," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1.2 (1999), pp.204–214.
- J. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry, Parallelism and its History* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1981.
- _____, "Is there but one Song," *Biblica* 63 (1982), pp.329–350.
- _____, *Traditions of the Bible, A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era* Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1998.
- _____, *In Potiphar's House, The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass., 1994.
- _____, "Topics in the History of the Spirituality of the Psalms," in A. Green (ed.) *Jewish Spirituality: From the Bible through the Middle Ages* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986, pp.113–149.
- G. Kuiper, *The Pseudo Jonathan Targum and its Relationship to Targum Onkelos* Roma, Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1972.
- E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon': A Preliminary Study," in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds.) *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4, Jerusalem, Magnes, 1957, pp.1–35.
- H. Lenowitz, "The Mock *simba* of Psalm 137," in E. Follis (ed.) *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987, pp.149–159.
- S. H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* HUC Press, Cincinnati, 1974.
- E. Levine, *The Aramaic Versions of the Bible. Contents and Contexts* Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- L. I. Levine, *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, pp.241–251.
- B. B. Levy, *Targum Neophyti 1: A Textual Study* Lanham, University Press of America, 1986.
- S. Liberman, **סדר זרעים כפשוטה** New York, 1955.
- A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* Word Biblical Commentary, vol.42, Dallas, Texas, Word Books, 1990.
- S. Loewenstamm, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition* Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1992.
- _____, *From Babylon to Canaan; Studies in the Bible and its Oriental Background* Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1992.

- _____, "אנציקלופדיה מקראית "עדת אל".
- _____, מסורת יציאת מצרים בהשתלשלותה, מאגנס, ירושלים תשכ"ח.
- G. W. Lorein and E. Van Staaldvine-Sulman, "A Song of David for Each Day. The Provenance of the Song of David," *Rev. De. Qumran* 85 (2005), pp.33–59.
- J. Mann (I. Sonne), *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* Cincinnati, Ohio, HUC press, 1940–1966.
- A. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums," in *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* Leiden, Brill, 1960, 222–245.
- P. Maiberg, "Das Verstandnis von Psalm 2 in der Septuaginta, im Targum, in Qumran, im fruhen Judentum und im Neuen Testament," in J. Schreiner (ed.) *Beiträge zur Psalmenforschung. Psalm 2 und 22* Wurzburg, Echter Verlag, 1988, pp.85–152.
- Y. Maori, תרגום הפשיטתא לתורה והפרשנות היהודית הקדומה, Jerusalem, Magnes, 1995.
- N. F. Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context* Leiden, Brill, 2000.
- R. Margaliot, מלאכי עליון, Jerusalem, 1945.
- M. McNamara, "Some Targum Themes," in D. Carson, P. O'Brien, M. Seifred (eds.) *Justification and Variegated Nomism, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2001, pp.303–356.
- _____, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966, pp.78–81.
- _____, "Melchizedek: Gen 14,17–20 in the Targums, and in Rabbinic and Early Christian Literature," *Biblica* 81 (2000), pp.1–31.
- B. McNeil, "The Son of Man and the Messiah: A Footnote," *NTS* 26 (1980), pp.419–421.
- E. E. Menn, "Praying King and Sanctuary Part 1: David and the Temple's origins in Rabbinic Psalms Commentary (*Midrash Tehillim*)," *JJS* 52.1 (2001), pp.1–26.
- _____, "Praying King and Sanctuary Part 2: David's Deferment and the Temple's Dedication in Rabbinic Psalms Commentary (*Midrash Tehillim*)" *JJS* 53.2 (2002), pp.298–323.
- L. Diez Merino, "Haggadic Elements in the Targum of Psalms" in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A The Period of the Bible*, Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1982, pp.131–137.
- C. Milikovsky, גיהנום ופושעי ישראל על פי סדר עולם, *Tarbiz* 55.3 (1986), pp.311–343.
- J. C. de Moor (ed), *A bilingual concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*, Leiden, Brill, 1995–2003.

- T. Moritz, *A Profound Mystery* Leiden, Brill, 1996.
- C. Peters, "Peshitta Psalter und Psalmentargum," *Le Museon* 52 (1939), pp.275–296.
- H. Preuss, "Die Psalmenüberschriften in Targum und Midrasch," *ZAW* 71 (1959), pp.44–54.
- L. Rabinowitz, "Does Midrash Tillim reflect the triennial Cycle of Psalms," *JQR* 26 (1936), pp.349–368.
- J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila*, completed and revised by N. Turner, Leiden, Brill, 1966.
- D. Rokeh, 1998 **יוסטינוס מארטיר והיהודים, מרכז דינור, ירושלים**.
- A. Rofé, **מבוא לשירה המזמורית ולספרות החכמה שבמקרא** Carmel, Jerusalem, 2004.
- R. Rubinkiewicz, "Ps.68:16 (=Eph 4:8) Another Textual Tradition or Targum?," *NT* 17(1975), pp.219–224.
- J. R. Busto Saiz, *La Traducción de Símaco en el Libro de los Salmos* Madrid, CSIC, 1978.
- A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* Manchester, University of Manchester, 1991.
- _____, *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- _____, "Symmachus and the Dating of Targumic Traditions," *JAB* 2 (2000), pp.233–245.
- A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums* Tübingen J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- J. A. Sanders, *DJD* iv, Oxford, 1965.
- _____, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* New York, Cornell University Press, 1967.
- S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962), pp.1–13.
- N. Sarna, "The Psalm Superscriptions and the Guilds," in S. Stein and R. Loewe (eds.) *Studies in Jewish Religion and Intellectual History Presented to Alexander Altmann on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* London, University of Alabama Press, 1979, 281–300.
- _____. "The Psalm for the Sabbath Day," *JBL* 81.2 (1962), pp.155–168.
- D. Satran, 15–145 **עמ' (1980) תרביץ נבא. ביקורת ספרים**.
- P. Schafer, "Targum," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* vol 6, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- P. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- J. Schunary, "Avoidance of Anthropomorphisms in the Targum of Psalms," *Textus* 5 (1966), pp.133–144.
- M. Segal, **ספר בן סירא השלם** Jerusalem, Mosad Balik, 1997.

- M. Segal, "The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version," *Textus* 21 (2002), pp.139–158.
- M. Seligsohn, "Michael," *Jewish Encyclopedia* vol.viii, pp.535–538.
- D. Shepherd, "Before Bomberg. The Case of the Targum of Job in the Rabbinic Bible and the Solger Codex (MS Nürnberg)," *Biblica* 79.3 (1990), pp.360–380.
- A. Shinan, "The Aggadah of the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Rabbinic Aggadah: Some Methodological Considerations," in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in Their Historical Context* Sheffield, JSOT Press in association with the Royal Irish Academy, 1994, pp.203–217.
- _____, **אגדתם של מתורגמנים**, Jerusalem, 1979, pp.30–38.
- _____, **תרגום ואגדה בו**, Jerusalem, Magnes, 1992.
- _____, "The Angelology of the Palestinian Targums on the Pentateuch," *Sefarad* 43.2 (1983), pp.181–198.
- _____, "The Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean Jewry," in L. I. Levine *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, pp.241–251.
- J. Shunary, **'מלאכים' בתרגומי המקרא הארמיים והפשיטתא**, in C. Rabin (ed.) **ספר מאיר ולנשטיין מחקרים במקרא ובלשון**, Jerusalem, Society for Biblical research, Kiryat Sefer, 1979, pp.269–276.
- M. Silva, "The Greek Psalter in Paul's Letters: A Textual Study," in R. J. V. Hiebert, C. E. Cox, P. J. Gentry (eds.) *In the Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, 277–288.
- O. Skarsaune, *The Proof From Prophecy* Brill, Leiden, 1987.
- E. Slomovic, "Towards an Understanding of the Formation of Historical Titles in the Book of Psalms," *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp.350–386.
- W. and M. Smelik, "Twin Targums: Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22," in A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg (eds.) *Biblical Hebrews, Biblical Texts* Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 2001, pp.244–281.
- W. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* Brill, Leiden, 1995.
- _____, *Extant Manuscripts of the Targum of Psalms* (unpublished paper).
- _____, "Language, Locus and Translation Between the Talmudim," *JAB* 3.1–2 (2001), pp.199–224.
- _____, "Concordance and Consistency: Translations Studies and Targum Jonathan," *JJS* 49.2 (1998), pp.286–305.
- _____, "Translation and Commentary in One: The Interplay of Pluses and Substitutions in the Targum of the Prophets," *JSJ* 29 (1998), pp.245–260.

- A. Smith Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelium da-Mepharreshe the text of the Palimpsest with the variants of the Curetunian text* London, 1910.
- K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- M. Sokoloff, J. Yahalom, *שירת בני מערבא* Jerusalem, Israel Academy of Sciences, 1999.
- H. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* München, 1922.
- H. Strack, G. Stemmer, *Introduction to Talmud and Midrash* Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1991.
- H. Sysling, *Tehbiyyat Ha Metim* J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1996.
- A. Tal, "Is there a *raison d'être* for an Aramaic Targum in a Hebrew-speaking society?," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 160.3–4 (2001), pp.357–378.
- S. Talmon, "The Signification of *אחרית הימים* and *אחרית* in the Hebrew Bible," in S. Paul *et al* (eds.) *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.795–810.
- M. E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100* Word Biblical Commentary, vol.20, Dallas, Texas, Word Books, 1990.
- L. Techen, *Das Targum zu den Psalmen* Wismar, 1896.
- H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. A Study in Origins* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1921.
- J. Tigay, "Divine Creation and the King in Ps 2:6" *Eretz Israel* 27 (2003), pp.246–251.
- E. Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* Jerusalem, Magnes, 1979.
- _____, "The Homiletical Interpretations of the Sages and the Expositions of Origen on Canticles, and the Jewish-Christian Disputation," in J. Heinman and D. Noy (eds.) *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 22 Jerusalem, Magnes, 1971, pp.247–275.
- _____, *חז"ל פרקי אמונות ודעות, מאגמס, תשל"א*.
- H. J. Venetz, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta und Hexapla Forschung* Hildesheim, Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg, 1974.
- J. Ross Wagner, "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread," in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.) *Early Christian Interpretations of the Scriptures of Israel* Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, 154–178.
- M. Weitzman, "The Origin of the Peshitta Psalter," in J. A. Emerton and S. C. Reif (eds.) *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible* Essays in Honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp.277–298.
- _____, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- _____, "The Originality of unique readings in Peshitta MS 9a1," in P. Dirksen, M. J. Mulder (eds.) *The Peshitta, its Early Text and History* Leiden, Brill, 1988, pp.225–258.
- E. White, *A Critical Edition of the Targum of Psalms: A Computer Generated Text of Books I and II* Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1988, Unpublished.
- M. Wilcox, "The Translation of the *Targum of Psalms*: A Report," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 24 (1997), pp.153–157.
- _____, "The Aramaic Targum to Psalms," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A The period of the Bible* Jerusalem 1981, pp.143–150.
- _____, "Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew 16:17–18," *NTS* 22 (1976), pp.73–88.
- _____, *The Semitisms of Acts* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965.
- A. D. York, "The Targum in the Synagogue and the School," *JSJ* 10 (1979), pp.74–86.
- _____, "The Dating of Targumic Literature," *JSJ* 5.1 (1974), pp.49–62.
- B. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* New York, Paulist Press, 1989.
- F. M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* Peabody, Mass., Hendrickson, 2002.
- G. Wallis, "A Note on Ps 45:7a," in F. Garcia Martinez, et al (eds.) *The Scriptures and the Scrolls* Leiden, Brill, 1992, 100–103.
- Y. Zakovitch, "Implied Synonyms and Antonyms: Textual Criticism vs. Literary Criticism," in S. Paul et al (eds.) *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in honour of Emanuel Tov* Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp.833–849.
- _____, **מבוא לפרשנות פנים-מקראית** Israel, Reches, 1992.
- _____, **דוד מרועה למשיח** Jerusalem, Yad ben Zvi, 1995.
- _____, "And You Shall Tell Your Son..." *The Concept of the Exodus in the Bible* Jerusalem, Magnes, 1991.

C. ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

- Global Jewish Database (Responsa Project)* Version 9, Givat Ram, Bar Ilan University, 2001.
- Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank*, The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, Jewish Theological Seminary, 1998.
- http://www.tulane.edu/%7 Kentcs/pss/tg_ps_index.htm
- <http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/>

D. DICTIONARIES, CONCORDANCES, GRAMMARS AND INDICIES

- F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* USA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* Frankfurt, J. Kauffmann, 1897.
- E. Hatch, H. Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions* Oxford, 1848–1908.
- M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Talmud* Jerusalem, Horeb, (n.d).
- P. Jouon, T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* Subsidia Biblica 14/1, Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.
- G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961.
- J. Levy, *Chaldäische Wörterbuch über die Targumim* Leipzig, 1867.
- H. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek English Lexicon* Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1937.
- J. Lust, E Eynikel, and K Hauspie, (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992–1996.
- S. Mandelkern, **קונקורדנציה לתנ"ך** Jerusalem, Shocken, 1945.
- T. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint* Michigan, Grand Rapids, 1998.
- W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (Fifth edition revised by H. K. Moulton), Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1978.
- T. Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* translated by J. Crichton, Indiana, Eisenbrauns. Winona Lake, 2001.
- A. Even-Shoshon, **קונקורדנציה חדשה לתורה נביאים וכתובים** Jerusalem, Kiryat Sefer, 1996.
- J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* Oxford Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903.
- M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* Ramat Gan, Israel, Bar Ilan University Press, 1990.
- W. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962.
- A. Tal, *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* Leiden, Brill, 2000.
- J. Allenbach [et al], *Biblia Patristica, Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Littérature Patristique* vols. 1–5, Paris: Éditions de Centre national de la Recherche scientifique, 1975–.

GENERAL INDEX

- Aaron, 31, 60, 158, 199, 200
 Abednego, 81
 Abraham, 30, 116, 156, 198
 Absalom, 153
 Adam, 106, 107, 115, 146, 147, 167, 168
 Adonijah, 153
 Alexander, P. S., 4
 Aquila, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 48, 49, 50, 53, 67, 102, 193, 194, 219, 221, 223
 Ark of the Covenant, 130
 Bacher, W., 3, 16, 39, 53
 Bathsheba, 176
 Ben Pazzi, Amora Shimon, 43, 44
 Ben Sira, 29, 139
 Bernstein, M.
 Manuscript Tradition, 14
 Past Research into Tg.Ps., 18
 Ps.48:5, 35
 Rabbinic Literature, 87
 Targum Tradition, 6
 Tg.Ps. 110:3, 79
 Tg.Ps. 137:3, 51
 Tg.Ps. 137:7–9, 81, 83
 Tg.Ps. 2, 192
 Tg.Ps. 68, 172
 Unique Traditions, 129
 Bomberg, D., 14
 Breslau manuscript, 81, 91
 Cain, 107
 Cairo Genizah, 182
 Churgin, P., 17, 40, 55, 150
 Cook, E. M., 18
 David, 181, 196, 203
 Tg.Ps. 110:1, 156, 157
 Tg.Ps. 110, 196, 197, 198, 199, 204
 Tg.Ps. 118, 175
 Tg.Ps. 118, 180
 Tg.Ps. 118, 182
 Tg.Ps. 132:10, 131
 Tg.Ps. 2:7, 153
 Tg.Ps. 24:7–9, 130
 Tg.Ps. 68:28, 78, 79
 Tg.Ps.118, 176
 Day of Judgment, 91, 94
 De Lange, N., 189
 Diodore, 139
 Eden, 147, 148
 Evans, C.A., 175
 Eve, 115
 exile, 144
 Exodus, the, 22, 67, 68, 69, 114, 117, 119, 120, 139, 140
 Flusser, D., 182
 Gabriel (angel), 81, 83, 124
 Garden of Eden, 131
 Gartner, Av. B., 175
 Gehenna, 119, 120, 143
 Gog and Magog, 36
 Goliath, 156, 198
 Holy Spirit, 110
 Horbury, W., 184
 Ibn Ezra, 186
 Jacobson, H., 181
 Jannai, school of, 90
 Jehiel, Rabbi Nathan ben, 13

- Jerome, 25, 27, 37, 48, 49, 50, 52, 67, 223
 Jerusalem, 136, 137, 141
 Jesse, 180
 Jesus, 153, 174, 185, 187, 188, 194, 202, 203, 204
 Joseph, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 122, 124, 160
 Judah, 74, 78, 156, 198
 Justin Martyr, 131, 134
 Kahle, P., 170
 Kasher, R., 4, 82
 Kaufman, S., 9, 60
 Kaufmann manuscript, 92, 94
 Klein, M., 57
 Kugel, J., 10
 Law, 146
 Levey, S., 62, 186, 187
 Levites, 109
 Maori, Y., 60
 Masoretes, 50
 McNeil, B., 184
 Melchizedek, 198, 200
 Merino, Diez, 7, 15, 17
 Messiah, 22, 62, 64, 65, 145, 153, 154, 155, 174, 175, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 200, 201, 202, 203, 220
 Michael (angel), 81, 83
 Moses, 22, 59, 158, 186
 Nachmanides, 13
 Nürnberg manuscript, 14
 Origen, 32, 33, 188, 189, 190
 Peters, C., 17
 Pharaoh, 117, 118, 124
 Potiphar's wife, 122, 161
 Preuss, H., 17
 Pseudo-Philo, 181
 R. David Kimhi, 157, 198
 R. Hunia, 202
 R. Nehemiah, 94
 R. Samuel, 91
 R. Yossi, 114
 R. Yudan, 153, 154, 201
 Raba, 91
 Rashi, 36, 140, 144, 154, 186
 Rosh Hashanah, 122
 Safrai, S., 182
 Samuel, 178, 180, 181
 Saul, 77, 79
 Schunary, J., 17
 Sennacherib, 139
 Sephardi manuscripts, 9, 14, 79
 Shabbat, 107
 Shadrach, 81
 Shekinah, 100, 102, 104, 141, 164
 Shinan, A., 82, 111
 signs and wonders, 138
 Sinai, 106, 118, 146, 147, 148
 Sisera, 80
 Smelik, M., 18
 Smelik, W., 5, 14, 18
 Sodom, 93
 Solomon, 130, 134
 Son of Man, 183
 Stec, D., 14, 18
 Symmachus, 25, 26, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45, 48, 50, 52, 53, 67, 219, 223
 Taylor, D.G.K., 47
 Techen, L., 16
 Temple, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134
 Theodoretus Cyrensis Episcopus, 64, 184
 Throne of Glory, 71
 Uriah the Hittite, 176
 Uzziel, Jonathan ben, 1
 Venetz, H.J., 33
 Weitzman, M., 55, 172
 White, E., 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 184, 187
 Wilcox, M., 14, 15, 18, 175
 Young, B., 175
 Zamora, Alfonso de, 17
 Zion, 137

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

1:1, 71
 2, 115
 2:24, 115
 6:3, 92, 93
 13:13, 94
 14, 198
 18, 198
 37:17, 68, 69, 160
 38, 202
 38:18, 202
 40:18, 68, 160
 49:8, 156, 198
 49:11, 62, 64, 65, 183
 49:22, 63
 49:26, 75

Exodus

1:12, 68
 7:1, 186
 10:13, 142
 14:21, 142
 15:2, 72
 16:3, 161
 17:8–9, 47
 19:17, 147
 20:4, 101
 20:7, 56, 58, 59
 22:8, 162, 165
 23:3, 166
 30:34, 13
 32:4, 41

Leviticus

1:11, 60
 8:33, 31

9:2, 31

23:23–25, 99

Numbers

13:23, 32, 63
 15:38, 202
 21:8, 27
 22:19, 27

Deuteronomy

1:17, 162, 164, 178
 15:19, 161
 17:19, 223
 32:12, 70, 71
 32:18, 193
 32:22, 27
 33:12, 76
 33:17, 160

Joshua

13:21, 41

Judges

4, 80
 5:2, 79, 80

1 Samuel

2:14, 160
 9, 180
 9:18, 179
 15:17, 77
 16, 175, 180, 182
 16:1, 156, 179

1 Kings

1:6, 153

2 Kings

19, 139

Isaiah

12:2, 72

- 21:5, 83
 21:6, 80
 24:21, 162
 27:6, 33
 30:33, 142
 42:1, 152, 201
 52:13, 152, 201
 61:8, 162, 165
 62:5, 137
 Jeremiah
 3:2, 26
 18:17, 142
 22:24, 202
 48:17, 201
 Ezekiel
 17:3, 63
 19:12, 201
 19:14, 201
 27, 143
 27:3, 142
 27:26, 142
 32:30, 41
 41:16, 27
 Hosea
 13:15, 142
 14:6, 63
 Zechariah
 4:14, 199
 Malachi
 3:5, 162, 165
 3:16, 101
 Psalms
 1:3, 90
 1:5, 92
 2:2, 35, 36
 2:7, 153, 154, 193
 2:7–8, 192
 2:9, 201
 12:6, 103
 24:4, 56, 57
 24:7–9, 130, 131
 45, 188, 189, 201
 45:7–8, 185, 187, 189, 190, 191
 48, 36
 48:3, 138, 143
 48:5, 35
 60:1, 121
 68, 222
 68:7, 114, 115
 68:10, 97
 68:28–29, 75
 72:8, 195
 78:13, 201
 78:15, 201
 80, 63
 80:4, 144
 80:8, 144
 80:16, 184
 80:20, 144
 81, 69
 81:4, 99, 123
 81:7, 161
 82, 150
 82:1, 101
 82:1–2, 104
 82:3, 166
 82:6, 69, 105
 82:7, 105, 194
 92:1, 107
 92:13, 219
 92:14, 31
 94:10, 147
 110, 156, 198, 201, 203
 110:1, 203
 110:2, 202
 110:4, 200
 110:6–7, 197
 118, 149
 118:22, 180, 182
 132:10, 131
 137, 111
 139:20, 57
 Song of Songs
 5:6, 97
 7:3, 121
 Daniel, 3, 81, 84
 7:13, 152, 201
 10:3, 41

1 Chronicles
6:35, 31

New Testament

Matthew
22:41–46, 202
Acts, 42
4:27, 42
Ephesians, 171
4:8, 171, 172
Hebrews, 185, 187
1:8–9, 187

Qumran, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha

4QPs^b
xxxvi, 38
Genesis Apocryphon
col. 19, 31
col. 19:14–16, 29
The Apocalypse of Peter
15–17, 134
Ben Sira
48:18–19, 139
50:12, 137
Psalms of Solomon
14:2–3, 89
Pseudo-Philo LAB
10:3, 78
59:1–4, 180

Rabbinic Literature

m. *Avot*
3:17, 90
m. *Avot* (Kauffman and Albeck)
3:5, 102
m. *Maaserot*
5:1, 89
m. *Sanhedrin*
10:3, 91, 92
m. *Shabbat*
16:1, 8
m. *Tamid*
7, 20

m. *Yoma*
1:1, 114
Tosephta *Berachot*
4:18, 75
Tosephta [Lieberman] *Sanhedrin*
1:8, 102, 165
13:6, 92
Tosephta [Lieberman] *Sotah*
14:3–4, 103
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael (Horowitz and Rabin) יתרו
11, 101
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael בא
13, 118
14, 123
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael בא
16, 116
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael בשלח
5, 74
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael בשלח דשירא
6, 80
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael דפסחא
14, 99
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael יתרו בחדש
9, 117
Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai
32, 118
Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai בא
38, 116
Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai
בשלח יד pp.61–62, 141
Mekilta de Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai יתרו
20, 101
Mekiltah de Rabbi Ishmael יתרו
11, 165
Sifre Devarim, 104
17, 180
120, 118
306, 27, 105
BT *Avodah Zarah*
3b, 36
18b, 43
19a, 88

- 19a–b, 89
 BT *Baba Batra*
 82a, 30
 82b, 31
 109b, 153
 BT *Baba Metz'ia*
 59b, 2
 BT *Baba Qama*
 84a, 87
 BT *Berachot*
 6a, 102, 165
 7b, 36
 15b, 120
 48b, 157
 BT *Bet'za*
 16a, 99
 BT *Eruvin*
 53a, 90
 BT Hagigah
 12b, 96
 BT *Hullin*
 134a, 166, 167
 BT *Kiddushin*, 2
 49b, 138
 BT *Megillah*, 7
 3a, 1, 12
 21b, 12
 BT *Nedarim*
 39b, 71, 132
 BT *Pesahim*
 54a, 132
 117a, 132
 118a, 81
 119a, 176
 BT *Rosh Hashanah*
 11a, 161
 11a–b, 68, 123
 26a, 137
 31a, 126
 34a, 98
 BT *Sanhedrin*
 6b, 165
 11b, 99
 22a, 115
 96b, 98
 107b, 131
 107b–109b, 92
 BT *Shabbat*
 30a, 131
 88b, 96, 97, 117, 159
 105b, 70
 115a, 2, 8, 12
 116b, 8
 118b, 114
 119b, 132
 BT *Sotah*, 124
 2a, 115
 10b, 122
 36b, 75, 122, 124
 36b–37a, 75
 47b, 103
 BT *Sukkah*
 52b, 154
 BT *Ta'anit*
 5b, 157
 25a–b, 30
 PT *Berachot*
 1:1, 2c, 89
 PT *Kiddushin*
 3:12, 64c, 115
 PT *Megilah*
 1:9, 71c, 1
 2:3, 73b, 25, 140
 PT *Peah*
 4:8, 18c, 166, 167
 PT *Sanhedrin*
 1:1, 18b, 165
 10:1, 27c, 92
Avot de Rabbi Nathan, 94, 199
 A.1, 126, 107
 A.2, 121
 A.8, 90
 A.36, 92
 A.34, 88
 B.48, 138
 B.44, 117
Derech Eretz
 3:5, 15

Gen. Rab., 84, 184, 202

- 1:4, 71
- 5, 125, 126
- 22, 107
- 26, 30
- 28, 125
- 42:3, 154
- 44:13, 81
- 44:16, 81
- 48:7, 102
- 61:1–2, 30
- 63, 83, 84
- 65, 115
- 68:4, 114
- 85:18, 202, 204
- 93:1, 25
- 99:8, 64

Ex. Rab.

- 17:1, 125
- 18:5, 81
- 28, 159
- 33:4, 117
- 36, 137
- 36:1, 61
- 81:12, 118

Lev. Rab., 107

- 4:1, 92
- 11:9, 25
- 27:11, 36
- 29:6, 99
- 33:1, 6, 25

Num. Rab.

- 3:6, 116, 117
- 8:1, 61, 137
- 11:3, 117
- 14:5, 122
- 19, 124

Deut. Rab.

- 7:9, 117

Lam. Rab.

- 1:52, 125

Qobelet Rab.

- 1:2, 106
- 9:11, 117

Song of Songs Rab.

- 3:2, 83
- Tanhuma* (Buber) במדבר 17, 30
- Tanhuma* (Buber) במדבר 4, 121
- Tanhuma* (Buber) בראשית 10.25, 107
- Tanhuma* (Buber) דברים 3, 121
- Tanhuma* (Buber) וירא 4, 102
- Tanhuma* (Buber) חקת 6, 124
- Tanhuma* (Buber) לך לך 9, 30
- Tanhuma* (Buber) נשא 19, 71
- Tanhuma* (Buber) שמיני 4, 30
- Tanhuma* בא 9, 99
- Tanhuma* במדבר 16, 115, 116
- Tanhuma* בשלח 16, 80
- Tanhuma* ויחי 10, 64
- Tanhuma* ויחי 11, 118
- Tanhuma* כי תשא 5, 115
- Tanhuma* לך לך 2, 118
- Tanhuma* משפטים 4, 103
- Tanhuma* משפטים 6, 100, 102
- Tanhuma* נשא 11, 71
- Tanhuma* פקודי 1, 12
- Tanhuma* תרומה 5, 118

Pesikta de Rav Kahana

- 22:3, 143
- 23:6, 99
- 25:11, 107

Pesikta Rabbati, 107, 108

- 15:3, 117
- 136a, 109
- 144a, 109, 110
- 173b–174a, 137

Midrash Tehillim

- 1:6, 107
- 1:7, 44
- 1:11, 90
- 1:19, 89, 90
- 2:8, 41
- 2:9, 151, 154, 196, 202
- 2:10, 197
- 18:32, 156
- 24:1, 132

- 24:3, 132
 48:2, 61, 138, 143
 48:4, 143
 60:1, 121
 68:4, 115, 116
 68:6, 158
 68:14, 75
 76:2, 75
 81:7, 160
 82, 161
 82:1, 164, 165
 82:2, 165, 166
 82:3, 167
 92:11, 32
 93:3, 72
 110:5, 26, 155, 156
 118:3, 176
 137:3, 84
 137:5, 109
Midrash Masblei
 8:9, 71
Midrash Samuel Zuta, 176
Midrash HaGadol to Deuteronomy
 1:17, 179, 183
Pesikta Rabbati (ed. Ulner)
 20:20, 97
 Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer
 19, 107
Yalkut Machiri, 176
- The Targumim**
 Targum Jonathan Judges
 5:2, 80
 Targum Jonathan 1 Sam
 15:17, 73, 77, 79
 Targum Jonathan 2 Kings
 16:14, 60
 Targum Jonathan Is
 12:2, 73
 27:6, 33
 40:9, 158
 65:22, 89
 Targum Jonathan Jer
 3:2, 26
- Targum Jonathan Ezek
 17:3, 63
 Targum Jonathan Hos
 14:6, 63
 Targum Neofiti Gen
 1:1, 71
 Targum Neofiti Ex
 1:12, 68
 14:13–14, 78
 40:18, 68, 160
 40, 69
 Targum Neofiti Deut
 32:12, 70
 Targum Onkelos Gen
 22:5, 26
 40:11, 65
 41:45, 66, 67
 49:11, 63, 64, 65
 Targum Onkelos Ex
 15:2, 73
 20:7, 56
 40:22, 24, 61
 Targum Onkelos Lev
 1:11, 60, 61
 Targum Onkelos Deut
 32:18, 193
 Targum Onkelos Num
 3:29, 61
 21:8, 27
 35, 61
 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Gen
 37, 69
 37:17, 68, 69, 160
 41:45, 66, 67
 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Ex
 15:2, 73
 17:8–9, 47
 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Deut
 32:22, 27
 Tg.Ps.
 1:1, 42
 1:3, 88
 1:5, 91
 2, 192

2:6, 39
 2:7, 151
 2:7a, 49
 2:12, 184
 24:4, 58
 24:7–9, 129
 45, 185
 48, 134
 48:3, 60
 68, 171
 68:6–7, 113
 68:10, 96
 68:12, 158
 68:13–14, 117
 68:15, 119
 68:28, 73
 80, 183
 80:1, 120
 80:4, 144
 80:8, 144
 80:16, 62
 80:20, 144
 81:1, 46
 81:4, 98
 81:6, 66, 121
 81:7, 68, 160
 81:10, 70
 82, 161, 167
 82:1, 48, 164
 82:1–2, 100
 82:2–4, 165
 82:5–8, 167
 82:6–7, 104
 92:1, 106
 92:13–15, 28
 93:2, 71
 93:3–4, 125
 94:9–10, 145
 110, 196
 110:1, 155
 110:3, 79
 118, 174
 118:8, 38
 118:14, 72

137:3, 50
 137:3–5, 108
 137:7–9, 80

Patristic Literature

Aphrahat Demonstrations
9, 95

Aphrahat, Demonstration ‘On the
Messiah that He was the Son of
God, 105

Aphrahat’s Demonstration
1, 122

Clement of Alexandria
Ped 3.76.3, 44

Ephrem, *Hymnen de Fide*
29:1, 106

Irenaeus *Adv. Her*
4.33.17, 130

Jerome *Commentarioli*
1:3, 89

Jerome *Homilies on Psalms*
81, 100
92, 107

Jerome’s *letters*
55:3, 89

Justin Martyr *Dialogue*
87, 171
124, 167

Narsai *Homilies on Creation*
4, 105

Origen *In Psalms*
24:7–9, 130
92, 107

Tertullian
Adv. Marc 5:8, 173
De Spec 1, 44
Strom 2: 68, 44

Theodoret of Cyrrhus *In Psalms*
94, 146

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *In Psalms*
80, 145

Samaritan Midrash

Tibat Marqe

The Book of Wonders 6a, 123

Tirbat Marque

217a, 78