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ABSTRACT

THE PENTATEUCHAL TARGUMS:
A REDACTION HISTORY AND GENESIS 1: 26-27
IN THE EXEGETICAL CONTEXT OF FORMATIVE JUDAISM

This thesis combines Targum studies with Judaic studies. First, secondary sources were examined and independent research was done to ascertain the historical process that took place in the compilation of extant Pentateuchal Targums (Fragment Targum [Recension P, MS Paris 110], Neofiti 1, Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan). Second, a framework for evaluating Jewish exegetical practices within the age of formative Judaism was established with the scrutiny of midrashic texts on Genesis 1: 26-27. Third, individual targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 were compared with the Hebrew Masoretic text and each other and then juxtaposed with midrashic literature dating from the age of formative Judaism. Last, the outcome of the second and third step was correlated with findings regarding the historical process that took place in the compilation of the Targums, as established in step one. The findings of the summative stage were also juxtaposed with the linguistic characterizations of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) of Michael Sokoloff and his colleagues.

The thesis can report the following findings:

(1) Within the age of formative Judaism pharisaic sages and priest sages assimilated into a new group of Jewish leadership known as ‘rabbis’. Under the direction of these scholars, Pentateuchal Targums were collectively and purposefully redacted for use in liturgical, educational
or *halakhic* contexts. This finding counters the alternative view that priestly groups remained distinct from rabbinic circles until the fourth century C.E. and that priests alone were responsible for the compilation of Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan*.

(2) The analysis of midrashic literature revealed different modes of exegesis used by Tannaim and Amoraim, thus providing information on the time and context wherein midrashic passages were compiled. When midrashic passages were then juxtaposed with individual renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27, it became possible to obtain more specific information on the dating and purpose for which extant Pentateuchal Targums were compiled.

(3) The comparison of targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 with the Hebrew Masoretic Text and each other challenges the assumption that *all* extant Targums were compiled for the Synagogue. In Fragment Targum and *Neofiti 1*, *haggadic* rendering goes together with the popular Aramaic dialect used in Synagogue services, while the use of Standard Literary Aramaic employed in the context of *halakhic* decision-making characterizes the literal rendering of Targum *Onqelos*. The use of different dialects in Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* (PJ) in conjunction with an expansive rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, which concurs with rhetorical arguments of Palestinian Amoraim in the Palestinian Talmud and Genesis Rabbah, may be an indication that PJ was used for educational purposes.
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ABBREVIATIONS

General observations

- Full stops are retained for initials in personal names: G.E. Lier (without a space between the G. and the E.). Spaces are retained after any abbreviation which is followed by a full stop: p. 43.
- p. and pp. as abbreviations for ‘page(s)’ are avoided except where there is real danger of confusion.
- Full stops are omitted in contractions (i.e. where the last letter of the word is retained), e.g. Dr, St, eds, vols, including contractions of titles of biblical books. Otherwise a final full stop is included.
- Abbreviations end with a full stop only if the abbreviation ends with a letter other than the last letter of the name.

General abbreviations follow the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (6th edition). The following are used: c. (circa), ed./eds (edition/editions), fn. (footnote), frg./frgs (fragment/fragments), n.d. (no date of publication), n.p. (no place of publication), n.s. (new series), o.s. (old series), vol./vols (volume/volumes) , cf. (compare), e.g. (for example), ff. (following further), i.e. (that is), cent. (century).

The terms i.e. and e.g. are not followed by a comma.

Abbreviations of journal titles and well-known encyclopaedias, etc. use the commonly used abbreviations, but are not abbreviated in the bibliography.
Abbreviations in ancient sources
Names of biblical books are abbreviated when both chapter and verse are given, otherwise not: Gen. 1: 26, Genesis 1, Genesis 1-6.

Biblical abbreviations

Josephus
Antiq. = Antiquities of the Jews
War = The Wars of the Jews
Life = The Life of Flavius Josephus
Apion = Against Apion

Specific abbreviations
Abbreviations which consist of sets of initials (JSS), no full stops are used. Targum abbreviations follow the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL).

B.C.E. = Before the Common Era
BDB = Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament
BibAr = Biblical Aramaic
CG = Cairo Geniza Targum fragments

---

1 Following the traditional abbreviation
C.E. = Common Era
CPA = Christian Palestinian Aramaic
FragTarg = Fragment Targum, recension P, MS Paris 110
GA = Galilean Aramaic
HT = Hebrew Text
ImpArMesop = Mesopotamian Imperial Aramaic
JBA = Jewish Babylonian Aramaic
JLA = Jewish Literary Aramaic (Palestinian)
JPA = Jewish Palestine Aramaic
JTA = Jewish Targumic Aramaic
LD = literally dependent or literary dependence
LJLA = Late Jewish Literary Aramaic
LXX = Septuagint
ms. = Manuscript
mss. = Manuscripts
MH = Mishnaic Hebrew
MT = Masoretic Text
N = Targum *Neofiti 1*
OAPal = Palestinian Old Aramaic
OASyr = Standard Syrian (Old Aramaic)
Old Pal. Targ. = Old Palestinian Targum
OT = Old Testament
PA = Palestinian Aramaic
PalTarg = Palestinian Targum
PalTargs = Palestinian Targs

---

2 Following the traditional abbreviation
3 My own abbreviation used instead of the CAL abbreviation FrTgP
PJ = Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan*
PJu = PJ-unique = source of material unique to *Pseudo-Jonathan*
Proto-O = Proto-Onqelos
Proto-PT = Proto-Palestinian Targum source
R. = Rabbi/Rabban/Rav
SLA = Standard Literary Aramaic
Syr. = Syriac
TO = Targum *Onqelos*
viz. = namely

**Rabbinic Texts**
Ber. = Berakhot
BT = Babylonian Talmud
Ed. = Eduyot
DeutR = Midrash Rabbah Deuteronomy
ExodR = Midrash Rabbah Exodus
GenR = Midrash Rabbah Genesis
LevR = Midrash Rabbah Leviticus
M. = Mishnah
NumR = Midrash Rabbah Numbers
Meg. = Megillah
Mek. = Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael
Naz. = Nazir
PesR = Pesiqta Rabbati
PT = Palestinian Talmud
T. = Tosefta
Ta. = Taanit

---

4 Own abbreviation
Grammatical abbreviations

1cpl = first person common plural
1csg. = first person common singular
2cpl = second person common plural
2fpl = second person feminine plural
2fsg. = second person feminine singular
2mpl = second person masculine plural
2msg. = second person masculine singular
2pl = second person plural
3cpl = third person common plural
3fpl = third person feminine plural
3fsg. = third person feminine singular
3mpl = third person masculine plural
3msg. = third person masculine singular
3pl = third person plural
abs. = absolute
adj. = adjective
adv. = adverb
art. = article
conj. = conjunction
cons. = construct
cpl = common plural
dir. = directive
f. = feminine
fpl = feminine plural
fsg. = feminine singular
impf. = imperfect
impv. = imperative
inf. = infinitive
inf. abs. = infinitive absolute
inf. cons. = infinitive construct
juss. = jussive
lit. = literally
m. = masculine
mpl = masculine plural
msg. = masculine singular
n = noun
num. = numeral, number
pass. = passive
pf. = perfect
pl = plural
prep. = preposition
prêt. = preterite
pron = pronoun
ptc. = participle
sg. = singular
sf. = suffix
vb = verb
LABELS USED IN THE THESIS

The following labels⁵ are used with words appropriate in a particular situation.

**additional material** or **expansions** in Targums can be a word or two, a phrase, sentence or even paragraph placed into an otherwise exactingly literal translation. It can take the text in a direction quite unrelated to the Hebrew Text.⁶

**deviation** is the moving away from a standard text. This happens when a second text adds or changes individual words; uses terms that are not equivalent to an interpretation or translation of the standard text. Deviations can be classified into units which may consist of parts of a word, words, phrases or sub-phrases, sentences and paragraphs.⁷

**Destruction** refers to the destruction of the Second temple.

**dialect** describes expressions that are mainly used in particular geographical regions during a specific period of time.

---

⁵ Where labels are not referenced, they follow the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (⁶th edition).
**Targumic dialects** are classified in accordance with the electronic Targum Lexicon to the Aramaic versions of the Hebrew Scriptures. This lexicon is compiled from the files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) (2004).\(^8\)

**Figurative** language is language that is used in a non-literal or metaphorical way.

**Formal** expressions are usually only used in serious or official language and would not be customary in normal everyday conversation.

**Hapax legomenon** refers to a word that only appears once in the Hebrew Scriptures in a specific form.\(^9\)

**Informal** expressions are used between friends or in a relaxed or unofficial situation. They are not appropriate for formal situations.

**Insertion** is a unit of material—a phrase, sentence or paragraph—that is placed into the translation, sometimes set between two parts of a verse, at other times overriding and eliminating part of the translation. It characteristically looks as if it was stuck into the translation.\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) Preparation of this electronic database was made possible by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, USA. The Editor-in-Chief of this lexicon is Stephen A. Kaufman. These electronic texts were initially prepared under the direction of Michael Sokoloff during the preparation of his *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Bar Ilan, 1990).

\(^9\) Own definition

Linguistic relationships are distinguished on three levels: (i) Language – same Aramaic dialect, same word choices or choice of same translations equivalents where the literal meaning of the Hebrew guides Targums to use the same words to translate the dialect\(^\text{11}\) (ii) the sharing of a common exegetical tradition, which means there is mutual dependence on common exegetical traditions, because a verse or phrase is interpreted on the basis of the same interpretation or otherwise, common translation techniques are used. \(^\text{12}\) (iii) Literacy dependency is identified where: a. one text consistently recasts a second text from beginning to end in accordance with its own standards; b. the writer of one text regularly consults a second text and incorporates results of the consultation into the new text; c. two different texts depend and derive from a third, often an unknown or hypothetical text, whose character can only be determined indirectly.\(^\text{13}\) In historical relationships the following distinctions are made: (i) relating consequences of historical happenings to subsequent developments in history; (ii) connecting and comparing people in relation to written or spoken accounts of past events, customs and cultures of different periods; (iii) placing people and events in a setting or context in relation to the development of a particular place, custom, culture or subject and/or written or spoken account of past events, customs, cultures or subjects.

literary language is used mainly in literature and imaginative writing.

liturgy / liturgical / liturgically refers to a fixed form of public worship used in synagogues.

\(^\text{13}\) Adapted from Flesher (1999: 43).
old use describes expressions that are no longer in current use.

passim indicates definitions found in several or all dialects of Aramaic.

rare words exist but are not commonly used. Sometimes there is a more frequent form of the word that is usually used instead.

Redaction history refers to the reconstruction of various redactions undergone by Targums (FragTarg, N, TO and PJ) in the age of formative Judaism. Within this thesis, the reference to redaction history includes the study of the way in which works of literature (or parts of them) have been received, understood and accepted or rejected by actual audiences in the course of history.\(^{14}\)

relationship refers to a connection between two or more things.

rendering refers to a piece of writing that is translated into a different language; it is the particular way in which a word or a group of words has been translated. Expansive rendering or ‘expansive translation’ consists of words that are added to the translation. They comprise less than half of the number of translated words and are carefully fitted between the translated words.\(^{15}\) Free structured rendering\(^{16}\) is a free translation that incorporates ideas and words which are not directly linked to the Hebrew Text, but remain tied to the structure of the Hebrew Text.

\(^{15}\) Flesher (1999: 50).
\(^{16}\) See Flesher (1999: 53) for this definition.
**rendition**\(^{17}\) refers to the performance of something; is the particular way in which something is performed.

**saying** describes a well-known fixed or traditional phrase, such as a proverb, that is used to make a comment, or give advice.

**source** is a point of origin for primary or secondary information. This can be from a person in an oral context, or from a written text. The Hebrew Text is a primary source of information. Extant Targums may derive from earlier translations referred to as ‘proto’ sources, like the Proto-PT source and the PJ-unique source. These Proto-Targums are hypothetical translations, which are believed to have existed in the early history of Judaism because there is overwhelming evidence of material that is shared among different Targums.\(^ {18}\)

**spoken** is language expressed in speech, rather than being written.

**translation** is the process of changing something that is written or spoken into another language.

**written** refers to expressions that are used mainly in written language.

\(^{17}\) See Chapter 2, 2.5.3.  
The thesis makes use of a number of electronic texts made available by the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, USA. Preparation of this electronic database was made possible by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

The CAL electronic texts were initially prepared under the direction of Dr Michael Sokoloff during the preparation of his *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Bar Ilan, 1990). Details concerning the CAL electronic texts, which are used in this thesis, are set forth below.

**Targum Neofiti to the Pentateuch**

Targum Neofiti was completely collated against the microfilm of the manuscript, and re-read again for marginalia by M. Abegg and S. Kaufman.

**Targum Onqelos to the Pentateuch**

The main text is that which was prepared by M. Cohen for his new multi-volume publication *Mikraot Gedolot HaKeter* (Bar Ilan University Press, 1992-).
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch

The CAL text is based on that prepared by E. Clarke et al. for the publication of their *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Ktav, 1984) based on an independent reading of the London ms.

Fragment Targum, recension P, MS Paris 110

Fragment Targums comprise a Palestinian Aramaic version of deliberately selected portions of the Pentateuch from the files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL). The texts of the Fragment Targums come from Michael Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, Analecta Biblica 76, (Biblical Institute Press, Rome 1980). There are four recensions of Fragment Targums, of which only Fragment Targum recension P (MS Paris 110) contains the full text of Genesis 1: 26-27 and Fragment Targum, recension VNL (MSS Vatican Ebr. 440, Nuernberg and Leipzig B.H. Fol. 1.) has Genesis 1: 27\(^\text{19}\). The remaining two fragments do not have the text.

\[^{19}\text{Fragment Targum, recension VNL agrees with Fragment Targum, recension P and Neofiti I in the rendering of Gen. 1: 27 and therefore does not influence the research. J. Bowker notes in regard of the Geniza Fragments that they ‘not only represent the Palestinian Targum in different recension, but they also differ among themselves: where the same verse has survived in two fragments, the two fragments may well represent the verse differently. This again bears witness to the extreme fluid state of the Palestinian Targum’ (1969: 21).}\]
Hebrew and Aramaic texts are usually rendered in the original script. Where the transliteration is applied the system indicated in the table below is followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ז</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ח</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ט</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Hebrew Characters</td>
<td>Combining Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ע</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פ</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פ</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צ</td>
<td>tz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ש</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ת</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The research focus of this thesis is on certain bodies of Jewish interpretive texts, which derive from the historical context of the age of formative Judaism. The texts under investigation are religious texts. This means that they were meaningful to certain groups of people in specific religious contexts at a particular time. The period in review follows in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple. The destruction of the Second Temple was the most decisive event and leading factor for the development of Jewishness without the Temple. It led to the re-organization of Jewish political and spiritual leadership and the standardization of its faith expression. In the aftermath of the Destruction, the compilation and redaction of two main bodies of interpretive texts of the Hebrew Scriptures can be set apart from each other. These are the extant Targums (Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Scriptures).  


2 The process of standardization came as a result of increasing sectarianism within the Jewish faith. Hamburger ascribes this phenomenon to the influence of the Herodians and the pressure of the Roman rule. He refers to the patriarch R. Gamliel I who was the first that stood up against the Hellenism in the Targums, ‘Man brachte ihm ein Targum vom Buche Hiob. Er las es und befaßt dessen Beseitigung’ (cf. Sabbath S. 115a). He adds, ‘Man beschränkte die bisher zugelassene freie Übersetzungsweise durch Aufstellung bestimmter Gesetze für sie [die Targumim] und trat streng gegen jede Abweichung von denselben auf.’ Hamburger quotes a number of such restrictive rules from the Mishnah, Tosephta and Jeruschalmi under the following headings: ‘a. Vorgelesen und übersetzt werden… b. Vorgelesen und nicht übersetzt werden… c. Weder vorgelesen noch übersetzt werden…’ The age of these rules is attested from the fact that teachers of the second century CE already interpreted them. From this Hamburger deduces that they already existed in the first century CE (1892: 1170-72). For more information on this topic see ‘Targum’ (Hamburger 1892: 1167-75).

Bible) and expository works of the Hebrew Bible, of which a prominent sub-category are the Midrashim.

Broadly speaking, the main focus of this research study is the redaction history of the Pentateuchal Targum traditions in relation to Midrash traditions of the age of formative Judaism. Within this broad context, the focus is narrowed down to the investigation of synoptic parallels from Pentateuchal Targums. These will be read in reference to midrashic texts that focus on similar passages of Scripture. The research approach is set forth in more detail and defended in the following.

In the past fifty odd years, research into the study of Aramaic Targums has increased. From this research, a number of linguistic aids have emerged, such as:

---

4 For Hamburger the term Targum means more than simply translation; it also refers to the practice of interpreting the text (1892: 1167), ‘Der Name “Targum” ist aramäisch und bedeutet nicht so sehr “Uebersetzung” schlechthin, als vielmehr “Uebersetzung und Erklärung” zugleich, die freie, nicht an das Wort gebundene Uebertragung, welche die Verdeutlichung, das Verständnis des Textes geben will und so mehr der Dolmetschung entspricht.’ Hamburger places the start of targumic activity into the Babylonian Exile, referring to ‘Megilla 3a; Nedarim 37b; Sanhedrin 21b. Die Thora wurde in Esras Zeit in aramäischer Sprache gegeben; Tosephta Sanhedrin Cap. 4 Jeruschalmi Megilla 1. 9. Esra hat die Thora in anderer Sprache gegeben’ (1982: 1168). G.H. Schodde differentiates between the technical term Targum, derived from ragam ‘to throw’ (stones) and its etymological connection to the Latin terms jacere and trajicere, where its figurative meaning respectively, ‘to transfer’ or ‘translate’. He also refers to Pinches, Fr. Delitzsch and Schrader, who accept the Assyrian verbal root ragamu ‘to speak, crying aloud or exulting’ as the true etymology of Targum. In the Old Testament the term is only used once in Ezra 4: 7, but in the Talmud and Targums it is found often in the sense of translating and interpreting (1889: 262). See also G.J. Kuiper (1972: 7).

5 Midrashim fall into two categories, expositional and homiletical. For more detail on the structure of the Midrashim, see H.L. Strack (1974: 204-205).

6 Cf. definition of redaction history under ‘LABELS USED IN THE THESIS’ (p. xv). See also 2.5.3.3.

7 Midrash traditions are not confined to the Midrashim, but have also been integrated into other corpuses of rabbinic texts like, for example, the Palestinian Talmud.

The need for and shortfall in studies relating to the redaction history of Targums was pointed out, some time ago, by John Bowker (1969: 26-27) and again, more recently, by Willem Smelik (1999: 249). Bowker emphasizes the need for more *synoptic studies* of known versions of the Palestinian Targum-tradition, the results of which, in his view ‘have been most suggestive’ (1969: 27). The point in argument for Bowker lies in the fact that Targums frequently bring the most usual and accepted rabbinic interpretations of a text (from the Hebrew Scriptures) in a summarized form (1969: 26). Bowker’s

---

8 A remark on the structure of the *Grammar*: A clear system of transliteration is not in place. The *Grammar* is not user-friendly, because of the extensive use of transliterations.

9 This dictionary is not very comprehensive, but nevertheless is particularly helpful when it comes to the translation of typical rabbinic and idiomatic expressions.

10 The book provides a complete and authoritative account of the history and development of Aramaic. For a short discussion on the Galilean dialect, see K. Beyer (1986: 39, 47-50). The author provides comprehensive footnotes for the sources he consulted. This is particularly useful for research on dialectical issues.

appeal for synoptic studies of Targum traditions must be understood in light of the fact that Midrashim, by contrast to the Targums, show in greater detail how traditional rabbinic interpretation was transmitted. Presumably, therefore, midrashic passages demonstrate the process of redaction of oral Jewish exegetical traditions more comprehensively than targumic rendering. Smelik draws attention to the aspect of rabbinic interpretation, when he states that the reception history of targumic literature has to be revised in relation to the impact that rabbis had on early Bible translations (1999: 249). The point in correspondence, between midrashic exposition and targumic rendering, which he appears to allude to, is that rabbis are responsible for the development and compilation of Midrashim as well as extant Targum traditions.  

Coming back to Bowker’s appeal (1969: 26-27). In past synoptic studies of Pentateuchal Targum traditions, synoptic parallels (e.g. one or two verses) have largely been restricted to viewing divisions of targumic rendering in comparison with the corresponding Hebrew counterpart in Scripture. The aim of these studies was to determine the form of rabbinic insertions, the influence of rabbinic interpretation in syntactic expansions, the type of interpretive translation and paraphrase of the Hebrew Scriptures in each instance. The

---


13 F. Deist defines synoptic parallels as follows: ‘Passages occurring, or stories or events presented, in more than one of the three SYNOPTIC GOSPELS’ (1984: 166). The same principle of parallel passages is applied here in reference to the extant Pentateuchal Targum traditions.

14 In a syntactic expansion, the word(s) in the Hebrew text is rendered into the Aramaic equivalent together with an additional element(s), which is contained in the Targum, but that is not reflected in the Hebrew Text. This may occur, either after the word(s) that have been translated literally, or between two words in the form of an insertional element(s)” (Grossfeld 2000: xxxiii).
limitation of such an approach is demonstrated, by example, from Bernard Grossfeld’s comparative study of Targum Neofiti 1 (2000) with other ancient translations of the Hebrew Scriptures. The work shows that the parallel study of ancient Bible translations does not, on its own, yield significant and sufficient information to revise the redaction history of Targums. The point in argument is that the scope of comparative textual studies without orientation to historical context is too restricted for establishing a redaction history of Targums. In other words, a history of text traditions should, at the very least, also include a historical framework from which texts evolved.

Relating the above argument to a revision of the redaction history of Pentateuchal Targums, my suggestion is that, where possible, the comparative investigation of extant Targum traditions and midrashic passages should be conducted from within the context of their historical composition (in the case of Jewish exegetical texts of the Hebrew Scriptures [Targum and Midrash], these should be correlated with and placed into the context of the development of rabbinic Judaism in the aftermath of the Destruction). In this regard, Smelik’s recommendation for writing a reception history for Targums is of particular significance. His major concern is that early Bible translations

---

15 He compared the text of Neofiti with the Peshitta, the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Vulgate, the Samaritan Targum, Targum Onqelos and the Palestinian Targumim (Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragment Targum and Cairo Geniza Palestinian Targum Fragments) (2000: xxxvi).

16 Grossfeld never intended to write a reception history of Targums with his study (2000), but I am referring to his work in this instance, to demonstrate that the mere comparison of Targum and Midrash does not provide enough evidence to work towards a reception history of Pentateuchal Targums.

17 In 1992 the Consultative Committee on Bible and Near Eastern Studies organized the international conference on the ‘Aramaic Bible: The Targums in their Historical Context.’ The papers that were read at this conference have been published in the book The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context edited by D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara (1994). The papers reflect the various interests and differences of Aramaic Targum Studies. The book, however, does not provide a comprehensive redaction history of Targums.
should not only be read in reference to their Hebrew counterpart but also in reference to and comparison with other rabbinic texts, in particular the Midrashim (1999: 249; see above). Presumably, in line with this approach, more light will be shed on how rabbis, in the context of formative Judaism, engaged in reading Scripture and what their role in and contribution towards the evolvement of extant Targum traditions was.\(^{18}\)

The said research approach is supported by the fact that several scholars found there was correspondence between Targum and Midrash traditions.\(^{19}\) There are, however, still uncertainties as to how these two bodies of exegetical traditions relate to each other within the context of formative Judaism. In Grossfeld’s suggestion, the similarities between Targum and other rabbinic texts should be attributed to common oral traditions and not, as suggested earlier by researchers Kasher and Albeck\(^{20}\), to borrowings of Midrashim from the Targumim (2000: xxviii-xxix). The rationale behind Grossfeld’s argument is that there is just not enough evidence to support the theory of an initial separate development between Targum and Midrash traditions where targumic redaction preceded the composition of Midrashim.\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{18}\) The early translation of Scripture into Chaldee and Greek during the Second Temple period must be set apart from the development and redaction of standardized Targums in the age of formative Judaism (cf. Steinberger 1967: 7). This thesis deals primarily with the latter aspect although some overlapping certainly must be taken into account for reason that Targum traditions, like Midrash have a long history of oral transmission that precedes their redactional periods.

\(^{19}\) See Strack and Stemberger (1982: 226) and Grossfeld (2000): xxviii-xxix; see also Chapter 3 for more detail. From Hamburger’s discussion of the topic ‘Targum’ (1892: 1167-75), the interaction between rabbis in the learning environment and their critical allusion to existing traditions and rules of interpretation becomes apparent.

\(^{20}\) Regrettably he does not reference these two scholars in detail.

\(^{21}\) Undoubtedly extant Targum traditions were influenced by circulating oral traditions (cf. Schodde 1889: 262-63), but from this it can not be precluded that their actual composition and redaction preceded the Midrash compilations.
Dating errors relating to Targum and Midrash traditions can, largely, be attributed to the fact that, as yet, too little has been researched and written about the actual redactional process of Targums and Midrashim in the age of formative Judaism. This shortfall is highlighted by Grossfeld. He notes that Midrashim have not been positively dated in all instances and points out that they may contain early traditions, although they are late in exposition (2000: xxviii). What Grossfeld further recognizes, rightly, is that particular instances of dating discrepancies between Targum and Midrash have led researchers to conclude in generalisation that extant Targums are the main source texts for other Jewish exegetical texts\(^\text{22}\) (cf. Grossfeld 2000: xxviii). The said dating fallacy is the result of inductive reasoning approaches.

I refer to Grossfeld’s contention (2000: xxviii), because I believe he has a feasible argument. Although not much systematic evidence is available in this regard, there is no doubt that late Midrashim contain early traditions, which are common to both rabbinic texts as well as Targums.\(^\text{23}\) In relation to Grossfeld’s proposal that Targums and other Jewish exegetical texts have common exegetical traditions my conjecture is therefore, that there existed a common collective source from which both Targum and Midrash compilations tapped. The presence of a common collective source of oral Jewish exegetical traditions can best be argued from the perspective of an oral learning community. This perspective has been receiving increased attention in several scholarly studies. The researchers J. Neusner (1983: 132-37; 1986:

\(^{22}\) I.e. the Mishnah, Tosefta, Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds.

69-70&89), S. Safrai (in Safrai 1987: 35-119) and M.S. Jaffee (2001)\textsuperscript{24} all argue in favour of a common oral learning setting for the transmission, compilation and redaction of Jewish exegetical traditions, where rabbis engaged in scholarly learning activities.\textsuperscript{25} However, in the context of Targum studies, the aspect of oral learning has not been widely explored.\textsuperscript{26} In terms of exploring this aspect, more clarity is needed of the evolvement of rabbinic Judaism within the religious context of the age of formative Judaism. After it has been established how, in the aftermath of the Destruction, the standardization of the Jewish faith (i.e. the evolvement of rabbinic Judaism) impacted upon the oral learning environment, the compilation and redaction of Jewish exegetical traditions, such as the Targums and Midrashim, can be investigated from within that context.

The imperative for verifying the process of evolving rabbinic Judaism for the purpose of future Targum studies is highlighted with the publication of two fairly recent articles by the researchers Beverly Mortensen (1999)\textsuperscript{27} and Paul V.M. Flesher (2001). From their textual studies on Targum \textit{Pseudo-Jonathan}, both Mortensen and Flesher come to the conclusion that priests still played a decisive role in the land of Israel without the Temple. Mortensen’s thesis is that a priest-centered society was responsible for the compilation of Targum \textit{Pseudo-Jonathan}. Her hypothesis is that expansions in \textit{Pseudo-Jonathan} display an overriding attention to priests and their support. Flesher concurs with Mortensen that \textit{Pseudo-Jonathan} is a ‘thoroughly priestly targum’

\textsuperscript{24} See, in particular, M.S. Jaffee (2001: 126-52).

\textsuperscript{25} Indirect information can also be derived from Hamburger’s discussion of the topic ‘Exegese’ (1892: 181-212). See Chapter 4, 4.2 for a more detailed discussion of the method of Midrash exegesis.

\textsuperscript{26} However, Hamburger’s discussion of the topic ‘Targum’ (1892: 1167-75) is informative.

\textsuperscript{27} See also Mortensen (2007).
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(2001: 31) on the argument that the unique additions in *Pseudo-Jonathan* (PJ) are written in a new dialect, called Late Jewish Literary Aramaic. In his analysis, these additions ‘reveal a dominant interest in matters of concern to priests’ (2001: 31). Flesher’s final conclusion is that priests controlled the Synagogues in the aftermath of the Destruction. In consequence, he rejects the standard scholarly view that rabbis were involved with Synagogues. In differing, Flesher argues that rabbis ran the courts and the *batei midrash* (2001: 19 & 26-27). The implication of Flesher’s theory is that rabbis and priests continued to form distinct groups in post-Temple Judaism – as they did during the Second Temple Period – at least up until the mid-third century.

The problem with Mortensen’s and Flesher’s theories is that they have both been constructed on the basis of inductive reasoning, which has led them to conclude theses from the particular to the general perspective. Rimon Kasher’s criticism of Mortensen’s theory highlights this error. In a recent book review on Mortensen’s study, Kasher notes that the theory assigning the Jewish Aramaic Targumim to priestly circles was first advanced by Arie van der Kooij in his doctoral dissertation some 30 years ago. Mortensens’ work adopts a different method to demonstrate the link of Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan I* (PJ) to priestly circles. Kasher remarks that the research approach is plausible from the topical link to the status and role of priests and the Temple and its rituals, but he criticizes the fact that Mortensen expands the scope of ‘priestly topics’ to every targumic expansion (2007: 411-13). From her research approach Mortensen concludes that PJ is a priestly Targum on basis of her analysis of particular passages in *Pseudo-Jonathan* that display an overriding attention to priests and their support (2007). Flesher’s thesis, that rabbis and priests continued to form distinct groups in post-Temple Judaism, is similarly based on the investigation of unique additions in *Pseudo-Jonathan*
(PJ). He found that they are written in a new dialect, called Late Jewish Literary Aramaic. Since these additions reveal a dominant interest in matters of concern to priests, he comes to the conclusion that PJ must be a priestly Targum. From this he deduces that rabbis and priests must have been active in distinction from each other in the aftermath of the destruction.

The theory of Mortensen and Flesher that rabbis and priests worked in distinct groups in the fourth century C.E., can be shown to hinge on a dating discrepancy regarding the time of integration of priests with rabbis.\(^{28}\) My preliminary argument in contention is: if priests and rabbis remained in their distinct groups at least up until the mid-third century and PJ’s final redaction was completed, at the earliest, in the mid-fourth century (Flesher 2001: 31)\(^{29}\), then it is unlikely that priests, alone, were part of the redactional process of PJ, since they no longer formed a distinct group from rabbis at the time of the redaction of PJ.\(^{30}\) Although Mortensen and Flesher’s theories are contrary to valid reasoning, their conclusions have, for the present, nonetheless undermined the standard scholarly view that priests and rabbis became an integrated group in the aftermath of the Destruction. This means that it has become imperative to revise the question of the social context, wherein priests and rabbis conducted themselves after the destruction of the Second Temple. The said question is of particular significance in relation to the hypothesis that extant Targums came to be compiled and redacted in an environment of oral learning in rabbinic academies in formative Judaism. To establish the social context of rabbinic Judaism in the aftermath of the Destruction, the argument

---

\(^{28}\) According to P. Du Toit, M. Heese and M. Orr (1995: 207), ‘It takes only one premise to make an inductive argument invalid, that is, unacceptable.’

\(^{29}\) In consequence, Flesher concludes that PJ was composed at a slightly later stage in Palestinian Judaism than the other Palestinian Targums (2001: 34).

\(^{30}\) Cf. 2.4.2 to 2.4.5 for a discussion on priests and rabbis after the destruction of the second Temple.
should preferably be directed to deriving evidence from the general to the particular. In other words, the overall research approach should be deductive, working from a body of statements (hypotheses) to a conclusive statement (thesis). In the overall structure of my thesis, I therefore work, by progression, from the more comprehensive (the historical context) to the more specific (synoptic texts) (cf. Du Toit et al 1995: 208-209). For the specific focus (synoptic parallels), I have decided to limit myself to the image-of-God passage in Scripture, which is Genesis 1: 26-27. In the following, I will motivate why I chose to use Genesis 1: 26-27 in my comparison of targumic rendering and midrashic exegesis.

The bottom argument of my thesis is that priests and rabbis did not remain in distinct groups after the destruction of the Second Temple, but became part of an active learning community within the evolvement of rabbinic academies in Palestine after the Destruction. Rabbis sought to standardize Jewish exegetical traditions in the face of the threat to monotheism. The process of standardization was a communal effort and can not be ascribed to individuals working on their own authority. This historical context impacts the way we evaluate Jewish exegetical practices within the age of formative Judaism. It means that Midrashim should not be evaluated in one piece, but rather in relation to the structure and style of their individual midrashic units to determine whether they are of an earlier or later nature.

To distinguish between early and later rabbinic traditions is a matter of discerning between different modes of midrashic exegesis and aligning them with the interpretive approach that is characteristic of a specific period in rabbinic Judaism (cf. Strack and Stemberger 1982: 239-87; Segal 1958: 19; cf. also Chapter 4 for more detail). This is where the value of synoptic studies in Targum research, as recommended by Bowker (1969: 27), fits in. In such a
venture, the relation between the choice of the synoptic pericope and the purpose it serves within the greater scope of the research study is of crucial importance. Ideally, the synoptic pericope should be relevant in all exegetical traditions deriving from the same historical period (i.e. the age of formative Judaism). In other words, for the purpose of synoptic studies, a passage that embodies a constant in the religious expression of Judaism should be selected.

In my preliminary inquiry of contextualising Pentateuchal Targums with the assistance of synoptic studies, I came to the conclusion that the image of God pericope in Genesis 1: 26-27 is generally relevant in terms of geography and time for the scope of the research problem (i.e. contextualising Palestinian Targum traditions historically). The reason for this is that the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 is reflected throughout the Pentateuchal Targums and also in midrashic sources that derive from the period of formative Judaism. What is more, I found that the idea of monotheism is linked to the interpretation of צלם image and דמות likeness (Gen. 1: 26) in ancient Israel through the Second Commandment in Exodus 20: 3-4 and the recitation of the Shema in Deuteronomy 6: 4-9 (cf. Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion of this phenomenon). The corresponding link to monotheism between ancient Israel and later rabbinic Judaism through the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26 indicates that the canonization of Judaism’s interpretive traditions in the age of formative Judaism followed in line with the faith expression of Israel and Judah preceding the destruction of the Second Temple. The implication is that the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 represents a constant in the religious traditions of Israel and Rabbinic Judaism. 

31 Genesis 1: 26-27 is therefore a suitable synoptic pericope for revisiting the redaction history of Targums in

---

31 This topical focus is in line with R. Kasher’s question (2007: 412), which he raised in contention with Mortensen’s approach in her study of PJ (2006), ‘Are there topics common to all these genres’, where genres applies to other ancient Jewish works.
The Hebrew Text (HT) of Genesis 1: 26-27 reads as follows:

יְאֵרָה הַאֲדָמָה בְּצָלָם אֱלֹהִים יִכְּרֶא בְּרָא אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצָלָם אֱלֹהִים
שָׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וְיִרְדּוּ בִדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַמֶּשֶׁר

And God said, ‘Let us create humankind in our image after our likeness and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ So God created the man in his image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.

I will now argue, why previous synoptic studies of Targums have failed to deliver convincing evidence for the redaction history of extant Targum traditions. Three important comparative studies of exegeses of Scriptural passages, which are common to extant Pentateuchal Targums and Midrashim, have been completed in the past. Bowker in his book The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (1969) explains how Jewish biblical exegesis arose and gives a brief description of the main works it produced. He investigates the Targum method and the results it produced, in the main, against Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. He parallels certain Chapters of Genesis with a translation of selections from other Targums on the same passage to show how the Targums arrived at their interpretation of a particular verse. In his notes he mainly refers to quotations from classical rabbinic literature that gives the arguments leading up to the Targum interpretation in greater detail. This approach does, however, not contextualize Targum and Midrash

32 In the past, Ephraim E. Urbach (1979: 214-54), Günter Stemberger (1989: 91-109) and Jacob Neusner (2002: 29-43) have conducted specific studies of Jewish interpretive traditions on Genesis 1: 26-27.
interpretations within the historical framework of formative Judaism. A similar approach is taken by Kuiper in his work *The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and its relationship to Targum Onkelos* (1972). He analyses narrative passages from Scripture in correspondence with the translations of *Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Onqelos*. He looks, in particular, at the midrashic additions in these two Targums and how they agree or disagree with other Palestinian Targums. His contribution lies in the light that is shed on the Palestinian Jewish Biblical interpretation of the first centuries of the Common Era and on the Palestinian Aramaic dialect of those times. Kuiper does not aim to contextualize Targums, historically, in correspondence with midrashic passages. Of the two preceding studies, Grossfeld’s work *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis including full rabbinic parallels* (2000) provides the most comprehensive reference to a specific Targum and rabbinic parallels. Although Grossfeld attempts to shed some light on translation variants and differences between the Hebrew Scriptures, Neofiti’s rendering of them and corresponding exegetical passages from rabbinic parallels, he does not follow a specified synchronic or diachronic approach.

Because of the lack of synchronic and diachronic approaches, the research studies of Bowker, Kuiper and Grossfeld do not provide sufficient and conclusive evidence for a redaction history of Palestinian Targum traditions. I hope to address this shortfall in my thesis by integrating the study of historical context with textual evidence. As pointed out previously, the linear progression will be from the historical context to the textual context. Within

---

33 The failure to contextualize texts within a broader historical framework is, essentially, the criticism that Kasher points out with regard to Mortensen’s study (2006). He makes a methodological remark, saying that ‘Every general theory about the Aramaic Targumim needs to be examined and tested in a broader scholarly perspective’. Accordingly, this broader perspective includes the dialect, parallels to talmudic literature and, in reference to PJ, the expectations of a renewal of the Temple ritual (2007: 411-13).
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the historical framework of research, I will readdress the oral learning context, wherein priests and rabbis conducted themselves after the destruction of the Second Temple to determine from the start of my investigation how rabbinic Judaism evolved and progressed in the aftermath of the Destruction.

In Chapter 2, I will show how the standardization of the Synagogue liturgy, the oral learning environments, the rabbi / priest relationships and the question of Targum development interlink within the historical period referred to as the age of formative Judaism. From the establishment of the historical framework in Chapter 2, I move towards establishing the theological framework that underlies rabbinic theology. This is set forth in Chapter 3, wherein I show the interpretation of לִכְהַ יִֽלָּם image and דָּמָת likeness in Genesis 1: 26-27 is linked to the root of monotheism and thence to the rabbinic idea of the deity. In Chapter 4, I link the historical framework of rabbinic learning with their theological idea of the deity and show synchronically and diachronically how different groups of rabbis sought to interpret Genesis 1: 26-27. In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, I compare the targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 of the different versions of Pentateuchal Targum Traditions (Fragment Targum, Neofiti 1, Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan) with each other and corresponding passages from rabbinic Midrash exegeses, in an attempt to establish how Pentateuchal Targums were compiled and redacted within the context of formative Judaism. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions. I adopt the following hypotheses to argue from the general to the particular (i.e. deductively):

(i) **Premisses**\(^{34}\): Priestly sages and pharisaic sages became an integrated group of rabbis in the aftermath of the Destruction. Rabbis were

\(^{34}\) I make use of the plural term here, because in deductive reasoning a number of arguments lead to the particular conclusion of the hypothesis in reference.
active either in the context of the Synagogue or in the context of the academy in the age of formative Judaism. The actual compilation of Jewish exegetical traditions took place in the academies.

**Conclusion:** The integrated group of priestly sages and pharisaic sages called *rabbis* compiled Jewish exegetical traditions in the rabbinic academies in Palestine in the age of formative Judaism.

(ii) **Premisses:** A historical root of monotheism is the interpretation of צָלֵם *image* and דָּמָּה *likeness* in Genesis 1: 26-27. The idea of God was perceived to be either corporeal or supranatural. Jewish sages did not support the idea of an iconographic representation of God on earth in their exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27.

**Conclusion:** Jewish sages contended the idea of polytheism by developing the concept of a supramythological deity in their exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27.

(iii) **Premisses:** Jewish sages, in the aftermath of the Second Temple comprised of Tannaim (90-225 C.E.) and Amoraim (220-400 C.E.). Tannaim and Amoraim consecutively learnt and taught in the context of the rabbinic academies in Palestine. The exegetical traditions of Jewish sages are held in Midrashim and Targumim. Tannaim and Amoraim defended the concept of monotheism with regard to Genesis 1: 26-27, by interpreting the biblical passage midrashically. Jewish sages (Tannaim and Amoraim) used either structured precepts or dialectical arguments in their midrashic exegesis of Genesis 1: 26-27. Tannaim did not use advanced techniques of dialectical argumentation to interpret Genesis 1: 26-27.


36 For an overview of rabbinic academies in Palestine see Stemberger (1979: 115-120).
Conclusion: Midrashic exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27 in Midrashim can be analysed in correspondence with the distinctive midrashic approaches that Tannaim and Amoraim used to interpret the said biblical passage.

(iv) Premisses: Extant Palestinian Targum traditions of the Pentateuch are standardized versions, which were composed in the context of the rabbinic academies in Palestine after the Destruction. Rabbis composed them in different Aramaic dialects. The dialect and character of extant Palestinian Pentateuchal Targum traditions indicate their suitability, either for use in the Synagogue context or formal education (i.e. rabbinic academy [beth midrash] and Sanhedrin [beth din]). The renderings of extant Targum traditions of Genesis 1: 26-27 are in some instances similar and in other instances dissimilar to each other. Similarities and dissimilarities in question of exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27 can, likewise, be pointed out between exegetical passages from Midrashim and targumic renderings of the said Scripture.

Conclusion: Similarities and dissimilarities between targumic rendering and midrashic passages of Genesis 1: 26-27 shed light on rabbinic activities within the oral learning context in the age of formative Judaism and assist with establishing the process of compilation and redaction of extant Pentateuchal Targum traditions.
1.1 Aramaic Dialects

An important aspect that comes into the picture of targumic translations are the different Aramaic dialects\(^\text{37}\) that are present in extant Targum traditions. Among Jews, Aramaic first gained prominence during the four-hundred years when Israel and Judah were controlled by the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian Empires. During their Babylonian exile, Jews became fluent in what is called Official Aramaic\(^\text{38}\). From that time onwards Jews continued to use Aramaic in the context of their daily lives and culture.\(^\text{39}\) By the time the Second Temple was destroyed and their national independence had been taken from them, Aramaic had almost completely become the language spoken by Jews in Palestine. Witnesses to the prominent use of Aramaic in this period of Jewish history are their writings and, in particular, the Targums.

Extensive studies on the history of Aramaic in Judaism have been conducted by scholars in the twentieth century. According to the current state of scholarly knowledge and debate the Aramaic language went through five historical phases, which can be divided into Old Aramaic, Official Aramaic, Middle Aramaic, Late Aramaic and Modern Aramaic. The said schematic division was first proposed by J.A. Fitzmyer (1979: 57-84) and later adopted with a few modifications by the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL). For the classification of Aramaic words in different targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27, I have relied heavily on the CAL outline of periodization and geographical differentiation of Aramaic dialects. In my analysis, the use of different Aramaic dialects in the Targums can, presumably, be linked to the following factors:

---

\(^{37}\) See dialects and targumic dialects on pp. xii and xiii.

\(^{38}\) Evidence for the use of this dialect in Jewish writings is confined to parts of Ezra (4:8-6:18 and Daniel 2:4b-7:28) and Jeremiah 10:11.

\(^{39}\) For a short historical overview of the use of Aramaic in the Second Temple period and specifically of its use in literary works, see Lee I. Levine (2002: 274-76).
(i) Immigration and geographical location: established spoken dialects tend to influence a newly introduced dialect. Dialects absorb aspects of a dominant language and loose their purity against the dominant dialect.

(ii) Historical and cultural forces

(iii) Context: a) in a religious context such as the Synagogue, sacred written and spoken terminology tends to develop; b) an official context will reflect a learned and authoritative structure; c) in the popular context language tends to derive from the oral context, making use of expansions and insertions\(^{40}\) in a style that is more conducive to listening.

(iv) Written communication tends to retain the purity of a dialect to a greater degree than a spoken dialect, e.g. liturgical texts and prayer books. Written texts therefore often exhibit traces of an ancient flavour as they borrow from previous dialects. Dialects in written texts are, at times, used in an artificial manner, fusing aspects of earlier dialects. This can also be indicative of scholarly activity.

The above factors play a decisive role in the question of identifying and establishing historical and linguistic relationships in targumic renderings. In relation to the foregoing explanation, this thesis will focus on the integration of two main aspects, (i) how ancient Jewish exegetical traditions and Pentateuchal renderings of the age of formative Judaism correspond or differ on the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 and (ii) how the destruction of the Second Temple influenced the evolvement of the different Targum traditions and, in turn, diverse targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27.

\(^{40}\) See definitions on pp. xii and xiii respectively.
1.2 Discussion of Selected Primary and Secondary Sources

A number of primary and secondary sources were of primary importance for this thesis. Some of them will be briefly discussed, below, with respect to their function and specific contribution towards the thesis. Others, which fulfilled their purpose in the context of primary sources for texts, are simply listed in the bibliography.

For a cursory overview of historical studies on the concept of the *imago Dei*, Gunnlaugur A. Jónsson’s published thesis (1988) on *The Image of God: Genesis 1: 26-28 in a Century of Old Testament Research* was consulted. It is a monographic study and also the only one, which to date has been devoted to an evaluation of the role of the *imago Dei* problem in Old Testament research. Jónsson placed the different *imago Dei* interpretations in an ideological historical relationship and asked which factors were decisive in these interpretations. This focus makes Jónsson’s work an excellent source for gaining insight into a historic overview on past *imago Dei* interpretations.

The retrieval of the primary texts of targumic recensions on Genesis 1: 26-27 was done electronically through an electronic database supplied by *Logos Bible Software*. This database includes the *Targum Lexicon* edited by Stephen A. Kaufman (2004). The Lexicon makes it possible to discern between different Aramaic dialects used in extant targumic renditions. It also conveniently includes J.L. Levy’s inputs from his work *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums* (1867). Michael Sokoloff’s *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (1990), was of particular assistance with the translation of Fragment Targums and *Neofiti 1*. Although neither Marcus

1.3 **Terminology and Methodology**

The term ‘rendering’\(^{41}\) refers to the translation of a piece of writing into a different language. More specifically, it refers to the particular way in which something has been translated. In this thesis, the term denotes a piece of writing that has been translated into an Aramaic dialect. In the context of this research, it also refers to the particular way in which the Hebrew Text (HT) is translated into a particular Aramaic dialect(s).

A *Targum* is an Aramaic Bible translation. Targums did not only translate the Hebrew Text of Scripture into Aramaic but, at times, they also added words to the translation or incorporated ideas and words that were not directly linked to the Hebrew Text. In the past, Targums have generally been closely associated with the Synagogue service. The expansive description ‘Pentateuchal Targums’ refers to those targumic traditions that render the first five books of Scripture, namely Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy into Aramaic. In the context of this thesis, the name ‘redaction history’ refers to the study of the way in which targumic traditions or parts of them have

\(^{41}\) See definition on p. xv.
been received, understood and accepted or rejected by actual audiences in the aftermath of the destruction of the Second Temple.\textsuperscript{42}

This thesis grows directly out of a number of previous, important, preliminary studies done on the historical, linguistic and contextual background of the Targums. In other words, important methodological advances by other researchers form the basis for my own approach in this study. For one, there is consensus that a hypothetical source existed for Palestinian Targums because of the presence of similar words that have been added to extant Targum traditions. This hypothetical source is referred to as the Proto-Palestinian Targum source (Proto-PT) (cf. Flesher 1999) or Proto-Onqelos (Proto-O) (cf. Flesher 2001). In this thesis, the source for Palestinian Targums will be referred to as Proto-O, since it represents the latest stance in research on this topic. Further, Flesher (1999) has demonstrated an advanced approach towards determining linguistic relationships between extant Targums, on which I am basing my own analysis of targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27. In my thesis, I demonstrate how a differentiation and comparison between different dialects, exegetical approaches and historical contexts can contribute towards establishing a feasible reception history of extant Palestinian Targum traditions.

In the framework of my research, ‘relationship’ refers to a connection between two or more things. More specifically, ‘historical relationships’ are established by (i) relating consequences of historical happenings to subsequent developments in history; (ii) connecting and comparing people in relation to written or spoken accounts of past events, customs, cultures and dialects used in different historical periods; (iii) placing people and events in a

\textsuperscript{42} This definition has been adapted from Ferdinand Deist’s definition of Reception Criticism (1984: 141). See also p. xv for the label \textbf{redaction history}.
setting or context in relation to the development of a particular custom, culture or subject and/or written or spoken account of past events, customs, cultures or subjects.

In correspondence with Flesher’s demonstration of linguistic relationships between extant Targums, three levels are differentiated in this thesis: (i) Language – same Aramaic dialect, same word choices or choice of same translations equivalents where the literal meaning of the Hebrew guides Targums to use the same words to translate the Hebrew. (ii) The sharing of a common exegetical tradition, which means there is mutual dependence on common exegetical traditions, because a verse or phrase is interpreted on the basis of the same interpretation or otherwise, common translation techniques are used. (iii) Literacy dependency is identified where: a. one text consistently recasts a second text from beginning to end in accordance with its own standards; b. the writer of one text regularly consults a second text and incorporates results of the consultation into the new text; c. two different texts depend and derive from a third, often unknown or hypothetical text, whose character can only be determined indirectly (1999: 41-43).

In my investigation of sages’ interpretation of the phrase בצלמנו כדמותנו in Genesis 1: 26 I seek to differentiate between the Jewish conceptualization of the deity and that of other nations, thus highlighting Israel’s constant struggle with polytheism. This struggle did not end with Judaism’s formative age, but rather continued to influence much of Judaism’s theological expression in its interpretive sources. Taking the latter aspect into account, I compare and differentiate between tannaitic and amoraic traditions on the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27.

Additional aspects that I investigate in the targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 are: (1) dialect, popular or literary Aramaic; (2) rendering, periphrastic
or literal; (3) insertions, theological, *halakhic* or juridical (4) contradictions/reinforcements of rabbinic parallels (5) comparison between the etymology of words and their effective interpretation by sages and, (6) apologetic considerations. Where a specific rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 does not supply convincing evidence towards the establishment of a plausible reconstructive history for the context and purpose of the extant Targum tradition in question, I continue to do further textual probing, to establish, whether the preliminary findings that I gleaned from my investigation into a specific targumic rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 correlates with the overall character of a rendition. Ultimately my aim, therefore, is to inquire concerning (i) a clearer perspective of the position of rabbis in early Bible translation; (ii) how targumic renditions relate to theological, *halakhic* and juridical matters in the age of formative Judaism; and lastly, (iii) a plausible timeline for the development of extant Targum traditions in the context of the *beth knesset*, the *beth midrash* and the *beth din*.

### 1.4 Motivation for Chapters 2-8

The aim of **Chapter 2** is to place extant Targum traditions into a broader context of functionality in relation to the realignment of Jewish political and religious groups. The main focus of the Chapter is, therefore, is to inquire into the contexts and functions that contributed to the development of the Pentateuchal Targums. Presumably, the transition from Temple to Synagogue worship implicated the realignment of Jewish political and religious groups which, in turn, would have had a direct influence on the various contexts in which Targums functioned.
Chapter 3 provides a basic historical outline for the development of Judaism’s principal creed in relation to the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27. The reason for the inclusion of this outline in the thesis is that there is evidence for anti-heretical and apologetic tendencies in the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in ancient rabbinic writings. I show how the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in Scripture is directly related to the idea of God’s Unity and Uniqueness, which is the concept of monotheism.

Thereafter, in Chapter 4, I investigate and compare the understanding and interpretation of tannaitic and amoraic sages of Genesis 1: 26-27 in relation to the development of Judaism’s principal creed. The choice of midrashic passages is not exhaustive, but in correspondence to the purpose of demonstrating the difference between early (tannaitic) and later (amoraic) rabbinic exegetical approaches in formative Judaism. In correlation, I set off sages’ main deliberations against those of their proponents and antagonists. The aim is to establish a historical context for tannaitic and amoraic defenses and reactions (e.g. opposing arguments by deriving proof-texts from Scripture), which are deemed to underlie the different targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27. One distinctive aspect between tannaitic and amoraic traditions is what Richard Gottheil and Wilhelm Bacher (n.d.) have noted. They found that tannaitic literature is characterized by its use of neo-Hebrew, while Amoraim adhered, only partially, to the Hebrew form to express their propositions and explanations. As a rule, Amoraim used Aramaic for debates and lectures, deliberations and discussions in the academies. Haggadic Midrashim from the time of Amoraim, which derive from the context of the Synagogue as well as explanations of Scripture, are for the greater part in Aramaic. In line with Gottheil and Bacher’s distinction between tannaitic

---

43 G. Stemberger differentiates between interpretive approaches used by Tannaim and Amoraim (1977: 68-69).
and amoraic interpretations of Genesis 1: 26-27, I hope to show even more distinctive elements between these interpretive traditions to assist with the reconstruction of a feasible reception history for Pentateuchal Targum traditions. The point in argument is that rabbinic theology from the age of formative Judaism shows how Jews confronted their faith issues during the transitional age from Second Temple to post-Temple Judaism.

In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, I investigate the correspondence between history, dialect and exegesis underlying the renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 in Fragment Targum (recension P, MS Paris 110)\(^{44}\) (FragTarg), Targum Neofiti 1 (N), Targum Onqelos (TO) and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (PJ). The Cairo Geniza manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch have no renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27. Since periphrastic renderings often make use of midrashic traditions to illustrate a point, my aim is to demonstrate how such targumic renderings relate to other Jewish interpretive traditions in formative Judaism. Presumably, the manner in which a targumic tradition interprets and relates to other Jewish interpretive traditions on Genesis 1: 26-27, will shed more light on its function and Sitz-im-Leben in formative Judaism. In Chapter 8, I summarize and conclusively analyze the findings of my research.

\(^{44}\) In his study on Genesis 28-50, Flesher (1999: 40) notes that Frag. Targ. (P) has material that follows PJ and TO, a feature, which he views as indicative of its late contamination by the PJ-unique source. He also observes that Frag. Targ. (P) has been recast in a dialect of Aramaic, which was shown by S. Kaufman and Y. Maori (‘The Targumim to Exodus 20: Reconstructing the Palestinian Targum’ Textus 16, 1991: 13-78) to be known primarily from the medieval mahzorim. On this basis, Flesher discards Frag. Targ. (P) as a worthless independent witness for the relationship between sources. Nonetheless, since Frag. Targ. (P) contains an Aramaic translation of Gen. 1: 26-27 it must perforce be investigated in this thesis.
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**A HISTORICAL CONTEXT FOR PENTATEUCHAL TARGUMS**

This Chapter deals with more than one aspect. In the first place it seeks to contextualize the interpretive activity of Tannaim and Amoraim, which is investigated in greater detail in Chapter 4, within an environment, wherein midrashic and targumic exegeses are no longer viewed in distinction from each other, but are placed into the context of scholarly learning in Synagogues and schools / academies in the aftermath of the Destruction. Second, it readdresses the question of the roles of priests and rabbis in the age of formative Judaism. The review of this question has become necessary in the light of the new theory of separate development between the priesthood and rabbis after the destruction of the Second Temple, which was put forward by Paul Flesher (2001) and Beverly Mortensen (1999). Flesher and Mortensen argue their theory from the context of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (PJ), a rendition which they attribute to the activity of priests in the aftermath of the Destruction.¹ In their research, they come to the conclusion that priests still played a decisive role in the land of Israel without the Temple in the Synagogues. In fact, Flesher goes so far as to reject the standard scholarly picture of rabbis being involved in the Synagogues. Mortensen, likewise (1999: 62), suggests a scenario where priests split from one of the rabbinic schools. Her specific notion is that priests undertook ‘to resurrect the profession of the priesthood in a fresh way’ in the hope that the Temple will soon be rebuilt.

The problem with Flesher’s and Mortensen’s stance is that it comes from a very limited perspective. What they have not done is look at the impact of the destruction of the Second Temple on the development of rabbinic Judaism, the

---

¹ PJ is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7 of this thesis.
process of standardization that began with the ending of sectarianism, a comparison of the functions of, and leadership in, Palestinian Synagogues before and after the Destruction, the development of batei midrash (the first of which was established in the town of Yabneh), the emergence of a new leadership, where pharisaic sages played an increasingly important role, the moral decline and secularization of the priesthood, the person and role of Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai in the adjustment of Judaism to the reality without the Temple and the practice of Semikhah (ordination) whereby the title of ‘rabbi’ was designated. In short, they did not take notice of the integrated historical picture in the age of formative Judaism, how Judaism developed in the aftermath of the Destruction. The question of dissimilar targumic recensions has also not been dealt with in a comprehensive manner. This means that a number of issues, like the link of targumic rendering to midrashic activity in the rabbinic academies, the use of Targums in the learning environment and the possible distinction between scholarly and liturgical Targums\(^2\) have not been taken into consideration.

The noted aspects are entwined with each other in such a way that they each have a bearing, directly or indirectly, on the overall redaction history of the Targums. But it is the rabbi / priest aspect, which is most determinative in the matter of Targum compilation. What roles these groups played in the evolvement of Judaism, what their standing was in the context of Synagogue and school, how they interacted with each other in these respective environments: all of these facets will ultimately determine how modern scholarship will conduct targumic research in future, from which perspectives Targums will be read, studied and analysed in time to come. If we should accept

---

\(^2\) As pointed out by J. Maier (1972: 129; cf. also 2.5.3.3).
the theory of a rift between priests and rabbis in the aftermath of the Destruction, targumic research will, in consequence, be directed towards conducting further studies within the perimeters of such distinctions. If, however, we conclude that rabbis and priests did not function in distinction from each other in the aftermath of the Destruction, then scholars will be viewing targumic and midrashic literature from the standard scholarly perspective, which holds that priests were absorbed into the ranks of rabbis in the age of formative Judaism. In other words, it is by no means insignificant whether we accept the theory of distinct developments between the rabbi and priest groups in the age of formative Judaism, or not. The premise will determine from which perspective scholars will, in future, evaluate Jewish exegetical traditions that were compiled after the Destruction.

For this reason, this chapter will readdress the aspect of how the destruction of the Second Temple impacted Judaism’s spiritual leadership, because this matter has direct implications for the development and unfolding of Judaism’s religious bodies in the post-Temple period. The point in argument is that the entire nature of Judaism’s religious expression, in the aftermath of the Destruction, is also tied to the development, compilation and standardization of its exegetical traditions. Since the focus of this thesis is, in particular, on extant traditions of Pentateuch Targums, I will provide, first, a short overview of the different categories and the theories of oral and written Pentateuch Targums, before I turn to discussing the impact of the destruction of the Second Temple on Judaism, the evolvement and formation of its religious leadership, and other interconnected issues.
2.1 ‘Targum’ as Defined By Scholars

The name Targum refers to the Aramaic translation of the Bible. Although there is no direct evidence for the translation of books of the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic before the Christian era, scholars like Martin McNamara, (1992: vii), Wilhelm Bacher 3 (1906), Eberhard Nestle 4 (n.d.), John Stenning 5 (1911), and Günter Stemberger 6 (1977: 81) commonly agree that a type of oral Aramaic translation of certain books of the Hebrew Bible is evident from the time of the Second Temple period. Against such generalization, Philip S. Alexander 7 (in Mulder & Sysling, 1988: 238, 247) tends to be more specific in defining targumic rendering. He places the practice of translating books of the Bible into Aramaic late into the Second Temple period. He concedes though that all rabbinic Targums contain early Aggadot. He also attributes Targum to the ‘category of Oral Law (Tora she-be ‘al pe)’ (in Mulder & Sysling, 1988: 238).

3 Bacher bases his view on the use of the verb תרגם in Ezra iv. 7 where it appears ‘in reference to a document written in Aramaic’. He links the targumic activity in particular to the Tannaim.

4 Nestle believes that the Targum at first was ‘a free oral exposition’, which gradually acquired fixed form and later was reduced to writing. Although he does not explicitly say so, it nevertheless appears that he places the ‘free oral exposition’ into the time after the exile when, according to him, Aramaic became the vernacular of the Jews in Palestine.

5 Although he rejects the tradition that ascribes the introduction of Targums to Ezra as ‘unhistorical’, he holds that the talmudic tradition ‘is doubtless correct in connecting the origin of Targums with the custom of reading sections from the Law at the weekly services in the Synagogues’ which was already well established in the 1st century A.D. He also has little doubt that Targums existed for a long time in oral form. Hence, he infers a pre-Christian oral evolvement of targumic renditions, which had established itself in the liturgy of the Synagogue by the 1st century A.D.

6 Stemberger is, like McNamara, of the opinion that written Targums could already have existed in pre-rabbinic times on the basis of textual evidence found in a Targum of Job and fragments of a Targum of Leviticus.

7 He doubts that the Qumran Targums of Job and Leviticus are Targums in the rabbinic sense but nevertheless agrees that they constitute evidence for the practice of translating books of the Bible into Aramaic.
2.2 Categories of Pentateuch Targums

Extant Targums can roughly be divided into periphrastic versions and literal renditions. With respect to the dating and context of Pentateuch Targums, scholars generally propose\(^8\) that an early oral developmental period preceded the appearance of the so-called *learned* or written versions of Targums. Scholars\(^9\) have divided these *learned* versions into four categories, with distinctive dialects:

(i) A hypothetical Targum referred to as *Proto-Onqelos*\(^{10}\) (Proto-O) or Old Palestinian Targum, compiled in Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA).\(^{11}\) This is assumed to be the only written version, which falls into the Second Temple period.

(ii) Targum *Onqelos* (TO); it adheres close to the Hebrew Text (HT) and is written in JLA.\(^{12}\)

(iii) The Fragmentary Targums (FragTarg) (about 860 verses\(^{13}\)) and Targum *Neofiti 1* (N); both are written in a sub-dialect of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA), namely Jewish Targumic Aramaic

---


\(^9\) See 2.1; Flesher (2001); Levy (1986: 20) and McNamara (1972: 187).

\(^{10}\) Flesher (2001: 3) defines this Targum as ‘the original form of *Targum Onqelos’.*

\(^{11}\) JLA is classified by scholars as a form of Middle Aramaic (start of the second century B.C.E. to the third century C.E.) It is found in the Qumran Aramaic documents and is in the Bar Kokhba letters, which is one of the latest exemplars where this dialect is found. Flesher discusses the concept of a literary dialect in some detail (2001: 12-13). See also the discussion of Aramaic dialects on pp. 18-20 and 2.5.3.3.

\(^{12}\) Cf. 2.5.3.3

\(^{13}\) Cf. Stemberger (1977: 82).
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(JTA)\textsuperscript{14}, which is a liturgical dialect\textsuperscript{15}. JPA was at one stage the Aramaic spoken dialect of Jewish Galilee.\textsuperscript{16}

(iv) Targum \textit{Pseudo-Jonathan} (PJ), containing distinctive material written in the dialect of Late Jewish Literary Aramaic (LJLA), expansions in JTA (Flesher 2001: 9) and JPA (Flesher 2001: 31).

2.3 Theories Concerning Oral and Written Targums

Ismar Elbogen (1993: 152-53) presents a compelling case that earliest evidence for targumic rendition points to a \textit{non-literal, free translation} in the language of the people within the context of the Synagogue. He argues that translations were improvised, however, without expanding on the Hebrew Scriptures. Such an inference can indeed be drawn from \textit{T. Meg.} 4: 41, which explicitly states, ‘R. Judah says, “He who translates a verse literally is a falsifier, and he who adds to it is a blasphemer.”’ What is, nonetheless, not clear is whether this rule was later changed in view of extant written Targum traditions; in other words, whether later Targums allowed for the addition of greater expansions (e.g. PJ). Possibly, the ruling refers to an earlier context when Jewish oral traditions were not yet in danger of being obliterated (as after the Destruction). It fits the context of the Second Temple Synagogue, where the person reading the Torah and translating it into Aramaic appear to have been one and the same. In the instance where Jesus was driven out of the Synagogue (Luke 4: 23-29), it appears that this happened because he did not render the prophetic passage in Isaiah in accordance with the accepted view. The result was that the people in the

\textsuperscript{14} See Flesher (2001: 12-13) and M. Sokoloff (2002: 3).

\textsuperscript{15} See JTA, a liturgical dialect, adapted for use in Synagogues in 2.3, pp. 327-38.

\textsuperscript{16} Compare my discussion of the different dialects in 2.3 and Chapter 5 [5.2].
Synagogue were infuriated (v. 28) and treated him like a heretic. The incident suggests that at this point in Jewish history there must already have been some sort of agreement amongst Jews in Palestine concerning what was an acceptable oral translation of Scripture.\(^\text{17}\) The fact that the reading of the Torah portion as well as its interpretation was left to a person, who had a somewhat authoritative standing, suggests that the practice of translating Scripture and interpreting it, changed in the Mishnaic period.\(^\text{18}\) This transpires from M. Meg. 4: 6\(^\text{19}\), where it is stated that even a minor was free to translate the HT into Aramaic. The statement indicates that a standardized version was used, which simply had to be memorized.\(^\text{20}\)

Nonetheless, from the one incidence in the New Testament – which indicates that Targum was used in Palestinian Synagogues during the Second Temple period – it can not be inferred in general that a written Targum tradition did not exist in the Second Temple period. There is no direct indication that written Targums were used in the Synagogue before the Destruction,\(^\text{21}\) but from this it can not be assumed that priests did not have one for the purpose of study in the Temple setup. Flesher (2001: 5) adduces arguments in favour of such a

\(^{17}\) Cf. 4.3.1, Mek. Pischa 14. In this Midrash, reference is made to King Ptolemy II, who lived from 283-246 B.C.E. The Midrash refers to a translation of the Torah, which was compiled for him.

\(^{18}\) An example of this change is pointed out by Hamburger, who states that the Patriarch R. Gamliel I stood up against the Hellenism in the Targums (cf. Sabbath S. 115a). He elaborates, ‘Man beschränkte die bisher zugelassene freie Uebersetzungsweise durch Aufstellung bestimmter Gesetze für sie und trat streng gegen jede Abweichung von denselben auf.’ (1892: 1171).

\(^{19}\) Cf. also Tosefta Megillah 4: 6 and 11; Babylonian Talmud Megillah 23a; 4: 6; Yerushalmi Megillah 4: 3, 75a.

\(^{20}\) David Golomb (1985: 7) argues that the prohibition against the reading of Targum in the Synagogue ‘surely implies that there is a written text.’ In his view the prohibition against written Targumim concerns an activity in the Synagogue service, ‘not against writing down the Aramaic translation.’

\(^{21}\) However, Hamburger presents comprehensive evidence of targumic activity, which he ascribes to ‘die Männer des jüdischen Hellenismus in Palästina’ (1892: 1170; cf. also pp. 1168-69).
hypothesis in his historical reconstruction of the existence of a first century Judean pre-cursor of written Palestinian Targums, called Proto-Onqelos (Proto-O). His assumption that Proto-O was compiled in Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) agrees well with the picture of a priestly school in the Second Temple period and provides a feasible link in the transition from Temple to post-Temple Judaism (2001: 12). His argument that (2001: 3) ‘the prestige of the priests inerred in their earliest Targum, Proto-Onqelos’, adding (2001: 6) that it ‘remained in Palestine and played a key role in the development of the Palestinian Targums and Pseudo-Jonathan’ was shown to be plausible from Mortensen’s study of PJ (2006).

Although there is no concrete evidence that such a Targum actually existed, the fact that the Aramaic dialect in Targum Onqelos (TO) is of a literary nature, presupposes an environment, in which scribes were active and in which focused learning took place. Priests and Levites formed the majority group within the context of the Second Temple Sanhedrin (cf. Hamburger 1892: 1149). Many of them would have been part of the groups of scribes and elders, who accumulated ancient traditions. Moreover, the administration of justice was largely in their hands. Presumably then, they would have made use of either a standard oral tradition or a written law code for the purpose of jurisdiction. This assumption can be related to Deuteronomy 17: 8-13, which indicates that priests and Levites were learned in the law, educating and civilizing the people. Both priests and Levites\(^{22}\) received instruction for their various occupations, which would have included the study of the Law or instruction of others. It is evident from S. Zeitlin’s study on Temple and worship during the Second Temple

\(^{22}\) With regard to Levites, S. Zeitlin indicates that a change took place during the Second Commonwealth in regard of their occupation. Accordingly, they occupied themselves mainly with manual labour of opening the gates, playing the musical instruments and singing. At the age of twenty they started with study and practice and at the age of twenty-five they could begin with their actual service (Zeitlin 1961: 217&221).
period (1961: 217&221) that there were schools in the Temple, where Scripture was taught. Moreover, the fact that the biblical canon was still very fluid in Second Temple times, made bible interpretation relevant, not only among the priesthood, but also among non-priestly groups. Indeed, the different sectarian groupings (Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes) among Jews in the Second Temple period, demonstrate the prevalence of divergent exegetical views. The level of learning that took place is further attested by the scribal activities in the exegetical commentaries of Qumran scrolls, especially, the Temple Scroll. This scroll demonstrates how priests were trained and how the Temple functioned in the Second Temple period. The overall picture thus supports the theory that an early priestly Targum tradition could have existed during the Second Temple period; if not in writing, then almost for certain in memory.

After the Destruction, we have concrete evidence that two main Targum traditions developed in Palestine, namely Targum Onqelos (TO), which is a dry, mostly literal translation, and Targum Neofiti I(N), which is, by comparison, more fluid and popular by nature. The fact that both N and TO show links to a common older Targum tradition, is further supportive of Flesher’s theory of the existence of an earlier rendition. It is feasible that an older version would have served as point of reference in the compilation of a standardized Targum for the context of the Synagogue liturgy in the post-Destruction period; particularly, in view of Elbogen’s finding (1993: 152-53) that a fixed translation was introduced for the purpose of restricting the extreme freedom that translators

---

23 Zeitlin (1961: 222, fn. 81 & 82) refers to Yer. Shek. 4 saying, ‘Likewise the instructors of the priests in the laws of slaughtering and sacrifices, and the readers who examined the Sefer Torah kept in the Azarah, to make sure that it be free from errors, were paid from the Temple treasury.’

24 For a detailed discussion on the works in the Qumran Library see S.J.D Cohen (1989: 150-54).

permitted themselves. He maintains that people did not want, and were not able to accustom themselves to the dry style of the authorized translation, which he believes was Targum Onqelos. He concludes, ‘thus the ancient free method survived’. However, there is a problem with Elbogen’s hypothesis in the point that he holds, ‘the ancient free method survived’. The argument against this is that extant recensions of Pentateuch Targums do not reflect characteristics of a free translation approach, which in D. Golomb’s definition amounts to an ‘“off-the-cut” rendering into colloquial Aramaic for the benefit of the illiterate’ (1985: 8). Although N and FragTarg are written in a more popular Aramaic dialect than TO, namely JTA, scholars have pointed out that the JTA dialect of N and FragTarg is liturgical by nature. This means that JTA does not correspond to the vernacular JPA. From this it may be assumed that N was compiled in a regulated setup and does not reflect a free translation approach. What is more, N represents a complete Targum. The entire picture supports the theory that N was designed with the intent of compiling a standard version for the Synagogue. The context for this activity would preferably have been the rabbinic academy where it was possible for the new leaders of post-Temple Judaism to compile a new Targum for the Synagogue in reference to possible earlier written version and other circling oral traditions. This assumption rests, in particular, on Golomb’s investigation of N. He found that ‘there is structure to this work, cohesion, literary technique, and above all, translation technique’

26 According to Rashi (in Elbogen 1993: 153), the purpose of the translation was to bring the contents of Scripture closer to the ignorant, the women and the children (Babylonian Talmud Megillah 21b).
27 Flesher (2001: 22-23) points out that the Palestinian Targum tradition reflects a written version of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA) dialect, which at one stage was the spoken Aramaic of Jewish Galilee. The latter notion is confirmed by Sokoloff (2002: 3), who defines Jewish Palestinian Aramaic as ‘…the Aramaic dialect spoken and written by Jews, mainly in Palestine during the Byzantine Period (3rd cent. C.E. – Arab Conquest) and for some time afterwards, corresponding to the Aramaic and Gaonic (post-Amoraic) Periods.’
28 See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion.
29 In Golomb’s assessment, ‘The Targum is the authorized community standard of what the words of the Torah mean’ (italics added) (1985: 8).
(1985: 8). In relation to translation technique, Golomb has found that it is most observable from the use of anthropomorphic avoidance formulae (1985: 14).

On the grounds that both TO and N show traces of correspondence with a common older Targum tradition, the most accommodating theory and one which fits both Targum traditions is, that they evolved from a process of standardization in the aftermath of the Destruction. In that case, both TO and N represent reworked versions of the Old Palestinian Targum tradition; with the distinction that TO retained much of the literary character of its predecessor, Proto-O, while N was adapted for use in the Synagogue in dialect and verse division.

My proposition is thus that distinct Targums were compiled for liturgy and study in the aftermath of the Destruction. This theory is not far-fetched, for it follows in line with the tradition of the Second Temple period, if we concur with Flesher that priestly schools during the Second Temple period already made use of a Targum tradition (Proto-O), whose character was different from targumic rendering that took place in Synagogues during the same period. It is not the first time that researchers have noted that Targum traditions are dissimilar. Some time ago already, Peter Schäfer (in Maier & Schreiner 1973: 398-99) proposed that a distinction should be made, as early as the pre-Christian era, between Targums that were composed for oral performance in the

32 Cf. Chapter 5 for more detail in this regard.
33 Flesher (2001: 28) proposes that the original Palestinian Targum was created for the purpose of being a ‘teaching targum’, whose distinctive feature it was to help listeners to understand the meaning of Scripture. This feature is particularly prominent in N, whose verse division correlates closely with mishnaic regulations on Synagogue rituals (cf. Levy 1986: 20 and Mc Namara 1972: 187).
Synagogue (a liturgical Targum) and written Targums that were used for the purpose of study:

Das Targum wurde im Synagogengottesdienst zweifellos von Anfang an frei und ohne Benutzung eines schriftlichen Textes vorgetragen… Nun besitzen wir zwar schriftliche Targumim schon aus vorchristlicher Zeit... doch kann man diese schriftlich fixierten Targumim sicher nicht ohne weiteres mit den in der Synagoge mündlich vorgetragenen Targumim gleichsetzen. Vielleicht muß man überhaupt von einem verschiedenen Sitz im Leben (Synagoge und Studium?)... ausgehen (italics added).

Schäfer here contrasts the oral Targum (Synagogue) from the written one (study) during the pre-Christian era. Schäfer’s proposal accords with Flesher’s analysis (2001: 28) that a scholarly rendition (Proto-O) existed during the Second Temple period, which was distinct from the one used in the Synagogue. Flesher’s suggestion is that the Palestinian Targum tradition in the post-Destruction period was based on the prestigious ‘Proto-Onqelos’ (also referred to as Old Palestinian Targum),\(^{34}\) which was written in JLA.\(^{35}\) Flesher (2001: 21) argues convincingly and extensively that the function of Proto-O was distinctly scholarly, while the new Palestinian Targum\(^{36}\) reflects a popular character with a specifically liturgical function.\(^{37}\)

In my assessment, the practice of standardizing popular /oral and scholarly /written Targum traditions came as a direct result of the Destruction. As much as

---

\(^{34}\) Flesher (2001: 34) identifies three stages of targumic development: Proto-Onqelos, the Palestinian Targums, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. His argument (2001: 4) leaves little doubt that these Targums were written at three different stages in history. In his view, their interpretations reflect the goals of the priestly caste.

\(^{35}\) Classified by scholars as a form of Middle Aramaic (cf. Flesher 2001: 12). Also see Flesher’s discussion of the literary standard of JLA (2001: 13-16).

\(^{36}\) Flesher (2001: 8) also refers to it under the name ‘original Palestinian Targum’ which he believes was translated from the Hebrew text into Jewish Targum Aramaic ‘with constant close consultation of Proto-Onqelos and the careful incorporation of the expansions of the Proto-PT source.’

\(^{37}\) For a discussion on this aspect, see Flesher (2001: 27-31).
it became necessary for spiritual leaders of Jews to unite in response to the theological crisis that confronted their nation with the destruction of the Second Temple, so it became imperative that some uniformity would be achieved in terms of liturgy and learning. Hence, it is reasonable to suggest that rabbinic scholars compiled TO and N in correspondence with the Old Palestinian Targum tradition, which presumably was, at the time, the only standardized tradition that drew from the scholarly activity of priests in the Second Temple. Forthwith, it served to become a common source of reference for reworking targumic traditions for the diverse contexts of the *beth knesset*, *beth midrash* and *beth din*. In line with this theory, the survival of a number of extant fragmentary Targums can be attributed to the ongoing process of standardization in the early age of formative Judaism. Fragmented traditions are likely to have circulated until a complete popular Targum for the Synagogue was successfully compiled.

By contrast to the complex process of redaction of a standardized version for the Synagogue, it may be assumed that the compilation of a standardized Targum, (like TO) for the purpose of study, was less complicated, for reason that its precursor, Proto-O had already been used in the context of learning. If a Proto-O version did exist, its adaptation for use in post-Temple academies would not have required the same amount of redactional activity that went into the collection, sorting and organizing of oral traditions for a standard Synagogue version. On this theory, it is probable that the adapted Proto-O version, or an early TO version, was completed some time before the official popular Targum for the Synagogue saw its final redaction. Still in line with this theory, the probability is high that the adapted Proto-O (TO), retained the literary style and dialect of its precursor (Proto-O) for the length of time that it remained in Palestine. However, at the stage when it (TO) reached Babylonia, rabbis were concerned that its Halakhah should always correspond to the
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contemporary state of rabbinic thought and also, that it should agree with the official HT; for this reason, Stemberger points out, it was submitted to a constant process of revision (1977: 81-82).

We now turn to the question of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (PJ). Against Flesher’s view (2001: 35) that priests alone were responsible for the writing of a later Targum, PJ\(^\text{38}\), the question can be raised as to why we have three main extant Targum traditions (TO, N and PJ) that can be dated back to the age of formative Judaism? If there was already one standardized Targum tradition (N) for the Synagogue, why would priests have resorted to composing another Targum (PJ), in addition to TO (which, theoretically, constituted a reworking of the ancient priestly rendition, Proto-O)? My point in deliberation is here that extant Targums were possibly composed and redacted in same or similar settings,\(^\text{39}\) namely the rabbinic academies\(^\text{40}\) in Palestine in formative Judaism.

Flesher’s argument that priests continued to guard a type of autocracy in the context of Palestinian Synagogues for a number of centuries after the destruction of the Second Temple, leads him to assert that priests and rabbis of post-Destruction Judaism must be viewed in distinction from one another. Consequently, he seeks to demonstrate by comparison that priests controlled the

\(^{38}\) Flesher (2001: 35) reaches the following conclusion, ‘What was the historical impetus that caused Pseudo-Jonathan to be written? I think that the historical events surrounding Julian’s plan to rebuild the Jerusalem temple in 362 provide this impetus. For this is a targum written for priests by priests.’

\(^{39}\) Even if the increasing tension between some rabbinic circles and the patriarch is taken into account, there existed a basic unity between Jews of the Roman Empire. This is evident from the unified system of law compiled in the Mishnah, as well as the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.

\(^{40}\) There were rabbinic academies in Lydda, Caesarea, Sepphoris and Tiberias where disciples were trained by leading amoraic scholars to serve as teachers and judges in Jewish communities (cf. Sanhedrin 32b in fn. 83).
Synagogues in post-Destruction Judaism whereas rabbis ran the study houses (2001: 24-27). Flesher (2001: 26) arrives at the following conclusions:

(i) Rabbis saw their main institution as the *beth midrash*.
(ii) Rabbis do not claim to control the Synagogues.
(iii) Prior to the mid-third century rabbis had no significant place in the Synagogue.
(iv) Priests and Synagogue officials\(^{41}\) are mentioned as leaders of Jewish communities in the Theodosian Code, the writings of Epiphanius and Jerome, but never rabbis.

In doubt against Flesher’s distinction, is the question whether emerging rabbinic Judaism would have tolerated distinct religious groups to rule over the *beth din*, *beth knesset* and *beth midrash*. The insecurity of the Jewish populace in the aftermath of the Destruction called for drastic measures of stabilization to be implemented. This was achieved through standardization. In my analysis of the age of formative Judaism, the separate institutions of *beth din*, *beth knesset* and *beth midrash* are simply a reflection of the most prominent divisions of Torah observance, known as *Mishnah* and *Midrash* (cf. 2.4.6). In other words, the separation appears to have been for practical purposes and not integral to a rift that might have occurred between priests and rabbis.

Regarding Flesher’s distinction between priests and rabbis; this must thus be probed for feasibility in relation to the process of stabilizing an insecure Jewish populace after the Destruction and the need for an overall system of standardization of Jewish religiosity. It, in turn, rests on an interpretation of how

\(^{41}\) See section 2.4.5 for a discussion of their respective functions.
the destruction of the Second Temple impacted on the Jewish nation, its spiritual leadership, learning and worship.

2.4 The Impact of the Destruction of the Second Temple on Judaism

The premise of my argument that rabbis and priests eventually came to be an integral group of scholars in the age of formative Judaism, rests on the supposition that destruction of the Second Temple constituted one of the most incisive events in the history of the Jewish people. In aftermath, it was followed by a period of reconstruction, which gave way to an age of creativity and renewal out of which ultimately emerged a new culture of pharisaic Judaism, wherein the talmudic conception molded a Jewish expression of faith based on Torah, by revising the past in line with the Oral Law. In the following, I will endeavour to propose how the origination of written (also referred to as learned) Pentateuch Targums links to two important developments in the aftermath of the Great Revolt of 66-73 C.E., that is, the transition from Temple to Synagogue worship and the realignment of Jewish political and religious groups that took place.

2.4.1 The standardization of the Synagogue liturgy

Lawrence Schiffman already pointed out that the destruction of the Second Temple and the wars following it, afforded the Jewish leadership with a unique opportunity to develop and standardize the liturgical system in the context of the Synagogue (1991: 237). Several other scholars have likewise attested to the standardization of the Synagogue liturgy in the post-Destruction period in

---

Palestinian Judaism. However, there is no direct evidence that liturgical elements of the Temple worship were transferred to the Synagogue per se; only intrinsic evidence in the Mishnah and the two Talmuds that some conceptions of Judaism’s prayer characteristics derive from the Temple, its priesthood and offerings. The process of standardization therefore needs to be investigated in greater detail; more specifically, the Synagogue liturgy, as it took shape after the Destruction.

2.4.1.1 The exigency for standardization

With the destruction of the Second Temple, sectarianism in Judaism ended abruptly. Whereas uniformity was shunned during the Second Temple period, it was actively pursued after the Destruction, because the Temple, the primary link between diverse expressions of Judaism, no longer existed. Besides being the binding factor between different Jewish sects, the temple had also played a prominent part in national unity; it constituted the place of meeting between pilgrims from the Land of Israel and pilgrims from the Diaspora. Even more importantly, the supreme judicial and legislative body of Jewish national life, the Sanhedrin, could only exercise its authority in the vicinity of the Temple (see *Avodah Zarah* 8b and *Sanhedrin* 14b). When therefore the guiding inspiration of the Temple presence had disappeared from the Jewish nation, its spiritual leaders had to actively seek other ways in which to unify a distraught and confused nation. The first step was to introduce new centres for learning

---

43 Synagogues most certainly did exist already in the first or second century, as suggested by Martin Goodman (1998: 82) and Ismar Elbogen (1993: 337-82). According to BT *Ketuvot* 105a Jerusalem had 394 Synagogues, while PT *Megillah* 3: 1, 73d says that there were 480. A variant in PT *Ketuvot* 13: 1, 35c states 460. F. F. Bruce (1969: 143) attributes Psalm 74: 8, ‘they have burnt all the meeting places of God (mo’ade  ‘El) in the land’ to the earliest literary reference of Synagogues. However, the standardization of the liturgy must be placed after 70 C.E. (cf. Sandmel 1969: 71-72, 80).


45 Certain cases could only be dealt with when the Sanhedrin sat in the Chamber of the Hewn Stone, its official venue. The ruling is based on Deuteronomy 17: 8 (Marsden 1980[1]: 15).
where Jewish leaders could meet, to discuss and implement measures that would unite Jews in the absence of the Temple. The second step was to introduce regulations or takkanot\textsuperscript{46} that would fill the vacuum following the Destruction. Ultimately, Jewish leaders aimed to standardize Judaism’s expressions of faith and to create a central binding authority. Jewish leaders understood that the survival of the Jewish nation was directly connected to the level of unity among its people; they realized that such unity could be achieved through standardizing (cf. Marsden 1980[1]: 31).

2.4.1.2 Synagogue functions before and after the Destruction

Passing by a detailed analysis of Synagogue practices, I will instead focus on specific aspects of the Synagogue service that presumably began during the Second Temple period and were carried over and standardized after the Destruction. Prayer is an aspect that is particularly under discussion as indication for the standardization of the Synagogue liturgy. There is an unresolved difference in Zeitlin’s and Elbogen’s summation of prayer practices in the Second Temple period. While Zeitlin (in Stemberger 1979: 94 ‘Synagogen als Gebetsstätten’) denies that Synagogues as places for prayer\textsuperscript{47} existed before 70 C.E., there are strong indications from other scholars that the

\textsuperscript{46} For more detail on these regulations see Norman Marsden (1980[1]: 23-29).
\textsuperscript{47} Cf. also Zeitlin’s study (1961: 235), wherein he remarks ‘There were no communal or organized prayers throughout the period of the Second Temple. Any person who was in distress asked God to grant his request.’ In the Diaspora prayer-houses for Jews can be dated to the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 B.C.E.). Nonetheless, one must bear in mind that the primary function of Palestinian Synagogues, unlike prayer-houses in the Diaspora, was educational. Synagogue buildings in Palestine were an inseparable part of the structure of the city (Elbogen 1998: 339; cf. also Seder Eliyahu Rabbah, Chapter 10). Mostly, they were in the hands of local communities or even wealthy individuals. Furthermore, they served a variety of needs for Jewish communities (cf. Gottlieb 1980[4]: 40 and Cohen 1989: 111-23). Lee I. Levine (1987: 14-15) found that Synagogues generally functioned in many capacities and served a wide range of activities within the Jewish community. However, Levine concedes (1987: 14-15) that the first and foremost purpose of the Second Temple Synagogue was to be a place for religious worship.
value of personal\textsuperscript{48} and daily devotions – putting aside certain times each day for prayer\textsuperscript{49} – had already become part of the religious practice of pious Jews before the destruction of the Second Temple (cf. Matthew 6: 5; see also M. Ber. 2: 4). Elbogen, for one, seeks to demonstrate that prayer, at the beginning of the Common Era, had already become a formal part of the Synagogue service (1998: 195-99). He maintains (1998: 196) that the liturgy had become ‘common property; every individual Jew knew it and repeated it daily.’ Shmuel Safrai (1987: 38) concurs with Elbogen that a Synagogue liturgy in which prayer functioned as an important element already appears to have existed before the Destruction. He ascribes the genre of prayer to the literary scope of Oral Torah that was developed by sages throughout the Second Temple period. Further arguments could probably be adduced either in favour or against the two standpoints. At all events, even if prayer had, or had not become an integral part of Synagogue services in Palestine during the Second Temple period, fixed forms of prayer like the ‘Eighteen’ (שמונים עשרה)\textsuperscript{301}, the reading of Shema (שמע)\textsuperscript{359} and Benedictions (ברכות) are not mentioned earlier than in the Mishnah\textsuperscript{50}. Safrai’s (1987: 38) calculation that uniformity, in Second Temple Judaism, was strongly disliked by sages, particularly in the area of prayer, is realistic in the light of the pluralism that characterized the period. Even if a certain amount of formalization had already occurred, creativeness was undeniably a distinctive feature of that time.\textsuperscript{51}

After the Destruction, the pluralistic tolerance of Jewish leaders changed distinctively and worship became regulated. Synagogues in Palestine were

\textsuperscript{48} Stemberger notes that Synagogues during the Second Temple period became centres for the cultivation of individual pioussness (1979: 95).

\textsuperscript{49} For a discussion on prayer in the tannaitic Period consult Elbogen (1993: 195-205).

\textsuperscript{50} See M. Friedlander (1937: 430) for a discussion on Synagogue rituals.

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. S.D. Hoenig’s remarks on (1963: 122) on the standardization of the mode of the common practice of reading the Torah. He argues that it could not have been set till after the Destruction, when the Synagogue pattern became firmly entrenched in Jewish life.

45
increasingly perceived as sanctified places, wherein certain Temple rites like the blowing of the shofar, the shaking of the lulav and the recital of the priestly blessing became part of the standard liturgy. Initially, the functions of formal teaching and adjudication\textsuperscript{52} were separated from the beth knesset (cf. 2.4.2), but for Jewish communal life\textsuperscript{53} and community worship they provided an alternative for the missing Temple. As such, Synagogues served as a meeting-place to discuss community needs. The primary school house (beth sefer) for children, and in some instances even for adults, was also part of the Synagogue building. Primary school teachers were engaged for this purpose (cf. Seder Eliyahu Rabbah, chapter 10). Adin Steinsaltz (1989: 17) elaborates that children could be taught in the teacher’s home, ‘but more often in the Synagogue, where special rooms were set aside for this purpose.’ Moreover, the weekly Torah reading took place in the Synagogue on the Sabbath. On Sabbath afternoons, the whole congregation would assemble to listen to a public discourse or sidra by a scholar, the theme of which was taken from the subject matter of the set Torah portion (cf. Steinsaltz 1989: 18-19). This practice is mainly inferred from Sifre on Deuteronomy §161 (quoted in Bowker 1969: 14) where it is stated that the Targum as an object of study accompanied Miqra (Scripture), Mishnah and Talmud (cf. also PT Meg. III, I, 73d and Chag. 1: 76c). Steinsaltz notes that public discourses involved the expertise of a translator or interpreter (1989: 19). The reading of the Hebrew text was, however, only accompanied by an Aramaic targumic rendering in Palestine and the east, whereas in the Greek-speaking provinces of the west the Septuagint, the Greek translation was used until the Byzantine era (Bruce 1969: 144). Overall, the centrality of Scripture grew, differing modes of exegesis were developed and attempts were made to set norms and limits (cf. Sandmel 1969: 31). By the fourth century, the shift

\textsuperscript{52} Here, formal teaching and adjudication refers to the scholarly learning that took place in rabbinic circles.

\textsuperscript{53} Referred to as רוכי צבור צ ‘affairs of the community’ (Friedlander 1937: 423).
from Temple to Synagogue worship was almost complete\(^{54}\) (cf. Gruen 2002: 116-18).

2.4.2 The ‘house of study’ after the Destruction

During the first centuries after the Destruction, ‘houses of study’ or *batei midrash*\(^{55}\) (also Torah academies, *yeshivot* or houses of scholars) appear to have existed apart from Synagogues.\(^{56}\) They were places wherein Jews conducted more formal studies of learning and where the meetings of the post-Temple Sanhedrin took place. What is more, Steinsaltz shows that boys could at the age of about fifteen, after the study of the Mishnah attend rabbinic lectures at a rabbinic academy to continue with Gemara (cf. Steinsaltz 1989: 17-20). He adds that members of the Sanhedrin\(^{57}\), who concurrently were Torah scholars, would function as judges of their communities in that context (1989: 21).

The first academy to be established after the destruction of the Second Temple was in the town of Yabneh, which Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai had requested from the Romans in 70 C.E. It was here that Rabban Yochanan re-established the Sanhedrin for supreme religious authority. From Avot I: 2-4, it appears that this Sanhedrin was regarded as the continuation of the Great *beth din* in the hall of hewn stone, which earlier on was known as the *knesset ha-g\(\ddot{e}\)dolah*. Yochanan’s leadership at Yabneh was recognised by the Romans.\(^{58}\)

When Rabban Gamliel II succeeded him, he was permitted to establish a

\(^{54}\) Jeffrey A. Spitzer (n.d.) notes that by the fourth century, Synagogue inscriptions at Hammat Tiberias refer to the Synagogue as ‘a holy place.’

\(^{55}\) Sometimes the *beth midrash* is also referred to as בֵּית מִדְרוּשׁ or ‘the house of scholars’ (Steinsaltz 1989: 19).

\(^{56}\) Cf. J. Hamburger (1892: 676).

\(^{57}\) The Small Sanhedrin consisted of 23 judges and the Great Sanhedrin of 71 judges (cf. Steinsaltz 1989: 21; see also Blackman 1963[4]: 233).

\(^{58}\) Schiffman (2003: 277) points out that Rome was willing to accept the rabbis as the leaders of Palestinian Jewry partly because they had opposed the revolt and partly because they were popular with the people at large.
system of self-government for the Jews of Palestine and with it the patriarchate or *nesi’ut* was instituted (Schiffman 2003: 277-78).

It is known that the Jewish centre of learning was, initially, transferred to Usha after the Bar Kokhba revolt. From 160 to 200 C.E., it moved to Beth Shearim under the leadership of Yehuda ha-Nasi and thence to Sepphoris from about 200 to 225 C.E., finally to settle in Tiberias under Gamliel III (Schiffman 2003: 296-97). Gamliel VI was the last to serve as president from 400 to 425 C.E., when what remained of the ancient Sanhedrin became illegal under the Christian emperor Theodotius I (Schiffman 2003: 335). All the towns where the Sanhedrin had been located were in Galilee.

The question that now transpires is who the teachers/leaders of the Synagogues and academies were? What had happened to the priesthood of the Temple after its destruction? More specifically, when did the term ‘rabbi’ appear and in what capacity did rabbis serve? The interrelatedness of these questions will now be demonstrated from an analysis of the different aspects that dominated this period.

**2.4.3 The emergence of an innovative new leadership**

As pointed out beforehand, the absence of the Temple necessitated the overall reconstruction of channels that had formerly regulated the form and content of religious ceremonial activity in Palestinian Judaism. The vacuum left by the abolition of the Temple service and the national leadership had to be filled. This meant that new channels for regulated religious activity had to be developed for Jews in Palestine, to express their faith. The reconstructive development is evident, for one, from sage literature (e.g. *M. Ed.* 5: 6; BT *Bava Metzia* 59a-b), but more specifically, from the emergence of what Jacob Neusner calls a

---

59 The migrations of the Sanhedrin are noted in a Midrash in GenR 97: 13.
60 Marsden (1980[1]: 43) provides a clear sketch of this reconstructive activity.
creative and innovative new leadership (1991: 157-63). The philosophy of post-Temple Jewish leaders was that Jews could still live and even flourish, notwithstanding that the Temple no longer stood (Marsden 1980[1]: 41).

2.4.3.1 The increasing influence of pharisaic sages

There is little doubt that the emergence of rabbinic Judaism happened gradually, as determined pharisaic sages endeavoured to return the role of the disbanded Sanhedrin of the Second Temple period somewhat to that of the former Great Assembly. Günter Stemberger (1979: 84) found that Pharisees already had considerable influence in the Synagogues and schools of the Second Temple period due to their knowledge of Torah. In further support of this notion, Josephus may be quoted. He (Antiq. 13, 10[5] in Whiston 1987: 354) testifies to the authority of the Pharisees among the masses, the so-called ‘am ha-‘arets or common people, stating:

These (i.e. the Pharisaic sages) have so great a power over the multitude, that when they say anything against the king or against the high priest, they are presently believed (brackets added).

Josephus (Antiq. 18, 1[3]) in Whiston 1987: 477) argues that the respect of masses for the Pharisees can be attributed mainly to the fact that they were:


62 Talmudic tradition (Rosh Hashanah 31a-b) notes that the Sanhedrin wandered ‘from Jerusalem to Yabneh, and from Yabneh to Usha…from Usha to Shefar’am and from Shefar’am to Sephoris, and from Sephoris to Tiberias’.
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...able greatly to persuade the body of the people ...insomuch that the cities gave
great attestations to them on the account of their entire virtuous conduct, both in the
actions of their lives and their discourses also (italics added).

Against the popularity, wherewith he credits the Pharisees, Josephus (*Antiq.* 18, 1[4] in Whiston 1987: 477) places the Sadducees\(^64\) in a negative light:

> ...they addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the multitude
would not otherwise bear them

Since Sadducees were mostly from priestly lineage, it may be assumed from
Josephus’ testimony that the authority of pharisaic sages during the Second
Temple period increased concomitant with the moral decline of priests (see also
*M. Yoma* 1: 5; *T. Yom Ha-Kippurim* 1: 8; PT *Yoma* 1: 39a, *Yoma* 19b, *Yoma*
71b). A direct result of the secularization of the priestly leadership was that the
high priest, as *nasi* or president of the Sanhedrin was given charge of the state
affairs, while the *av-beth-din* (lit.: ‘father of the court of justice’) was made
spiritual head of the Sanhedrin.\(^65\) This can be deduced from an outline Josephus
gives (*Antiq.* 4, 8[14] in Whiston 1987: 117) of the ruling institution in
Jerusalem during his time, wherein he lists the high priest, prophet and
Sanhedrin as authoritative powers ‘to give a just sentence’ if judges are unable
to. The researchers, Joseph Jacobs and Kaufmann Kohler (n.d\(^66\): ‘Nasi’) clarify
Josephus’ reference to the prophet, stating that he is, in this context, none other
than the *av-beth-din*, who is ‘endowed with the spirit of God ...so that his

---

\(^64\) In *Yoma* 19b, the impression is created that the Sadducees were afraid of the Pharisees.

\(^65\) Zeitlin remarks that the high priest lost his authority as the interpreter and teacher of the
law after the theocracy was abolished, and instead the influence of the *Soferim* and the
*Darshanim* increased greatly. These were members of the *Beth Din*. The purpose of laws that
*Soferim* introduced was to adjust religion to life (1961: 240). See also Zeitlin on ‘The Titles
High Priest and the Nasi of the Sanhedrin’ (1957: 1-5).

\(^66\) No date is indicated for the article in the internet source.
words have divine authority’. More than likely, this ‘prophet’ was a pharisaic sage. There is no suggestion that points to another state of affairs other than that the Pharisees were regarded as the spiritual heads of the Jewish people during the Second Temple period, while the high priests, who had become worldlier in character, were regarded as unfit to decide in religious matters.

Despite the popularity, which Pharisees enjoyed in the Second Temple period, Stemberger (1979: 91-92) and Cohen (1989: 115) agree that the pharisaic rabbi initially lost his influence in the context of the Synagogue during the early post-Temple period, insomuch that rabbis were not immediately capable of ensuring the acceptance of their regulations in Synagogues outside of their direct control in the post-Temple period. At times they even had to tolerate things that did not suite them, but which they could not change. It can be assumed that pharisaic sages became unpopular among the \textit{am ha’aretz} as a result of their political standing during the time of the revolt. They had accepted the Roman supremacy. This persuasion made them loathsome to the masses, at least for some time in the aftermath of the Destruction. However, two significant factors contributed to their final triumph\textsuperscript{67}. For one, they were in an advantageous position from the start, because the Romans placed them in charge of the internal affairs of the Jews in Palestine after the Destruction due to their neutral stand during the Jewish uprising (cf. Schiffman 1998: 475). Another gain that they had over other leadership groups was their spiritual status in the Sanhedrin during the Second Temple period. They retained the authority of this standing and even increased it after the destruction of the Temple\textsuperscript{68}, albeit not in the sphere of the Synagogue but rather in the \textit{beth midrash}. This becomes evident from the structure of the new spiritual centre of Yabneh. Here the influence that

\textsuperscript{67} S.J.D. Cohen (1993: 22) approximates the triumph of rabbis not earlier than the seventh century.

\textsuperscript{68} For more detail see Gottlieb (1980[3]: 12-14) on the rise of the sages in the context of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Sanhedrin.
pharisaic sages had held in the former Sanhedrin on account of their virtuous conduct was brought to prominence (cf. Safrai 1987: 16). Support for the appointment as members of the Sanhedrin, on the basis of specific merits, is found in Sanhedrin 17a:

None are to be appointed members of the Sanhedrin but men of stature, wisdom, good appearance, mature age, with knowledge of sorcery, and who are conversant with all the seventy languages of mankind.

The immediate picture of the post-Temple era suggests that the authority of pharisaic sages was more or less confined to the Sanhedrin. However, it is notable, that priests also made up a significant number of the Sanhedrin during the Mishnaic-talmudic period, though this must not be attributed to their status as kohanim but rather to their reputation as sages (Gottlieb 1980[3]: 33&83). Other than on the basis of their priestly status, which derived from family lineage, priest sages formed a ‘spiritual elite’ on the basis of their Torah knowledge. In the light of these developments, it may be assumed that both pharisaic sages as well as priest sages formed part of first academy at Yabneh.

On the other hand, some high priestly families continued to oppose the loss of their power following the Destruction and claimed special privileges on account of family pedigree and ritual purity (Gottlieb1980[3]: 32-33). Bekhoroth 30b attests to this fact as follows:

From the day that the Temple was destroyed, the priests guarded their dignity by not entrusting matters of Levitical cleanliness to everybody.

---

Notwithstanding, priests increasingly lost their authority where it was merely based on privileges of pedigree.

In the light of the foresaid, the question as to why the priest Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkaï could successfully adjust Judaism to the reality of life without the Temple is not astounding (cf. Marsden 1980[1]: 18&28; Hamburger 1892: 949-50). The answer lies in the connection between his knowledge of the Temple set-up and authority as a priest, and his capacity as a leading Torah scholar during the Second Temple period. This dual function equipped him to cope with the challenges of establishing a post-Destruction Sanhedrin in Yabneh. Although his priestly prestige initially paved the way for him to assume authority as spiritual leader of the Jews after the Destruction (cf. Gottlieb 1980[3]: 69-70), it can be attributed to his political standing that he earned the trust of Romans to permit him the establishment of Yabneh as new religious centre for his people. It can further be attributed to his knowledge of priestly matters that he introduced certain takkanoth to the public with the aim of preserving the identity of the Jewish people within a pluralistic worldview. Despite of his priestly prestige, both Stemberger (1979: 16) and Neusner (1970)

70 S. Safrai (1987: 15) describes Rabban Yochanan’s activities as ‘…a harbinger of the major halakhic and theological re-evaluation that would characterize the rabbinic world after the destruction.’

71 Hamburger notes, „Die Kenntnisse R. Jochanan b. S. erstreckten sich auf alle Zweige des damaligen jüdischen Wissens: die Bibel, die Mischna, (Halacha), die Haggada, die Gemara (Erklärung der Halacha) (s. Agada), die Herleitung aus demschriflichen Gesetz und den sopherischen Bestimmungen mit den dabei zur Anwendung kommenden Schlußfolgerungen, die Astronomie, die Kalenderberechnung, die Fuchs und Wäschertfabeln (s. Fabeln), die Engel und Geisterlehre, die Merkaba (s. Geheimlehre) u.a.m. Mit diesem reichen Wissen verband er eine Lebensweise, die ihn bald zu einem beliebten Volks- und Gesetzeslehrer machte” (1882: 464; cf also pp. 465-89).

72 Stemberger (1979: 57) remarks in this respect, ‘Wenn er, wie manche aus TPara IV,7 (R. 196) und anderen Texten schließen, als führender Schriftgelehrter zugleich auch Mitglied einer priesterlichen Familie gewesen ist, erleichterte dies seine Mittlerfunktion.’

73 They were ‘ordinances enacted by virtue of rabbinic authority which do not have a biblical basis’ (Schäfer 2003: 135).
concur that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai could, at the same time, emerge as leader from the wider circle of Torah scholars due to his thorough knowledge of Scripture. It was the driving force behind his vision to establish Yabneh as centre for the study of Scripture to shape the intrinsic content of the entire Jewish life.\textsuperscript{74}

Rabban Yochanan’s \textit{takkanoth} were shaped in such a way that they would serve as guidelines for transferring the ceremonies of the altar and the Temple to the Synagogue (cf. Marsden 1980[1]: 27; Hamburger 1892: 949-50). For example, M. \textit{Rosh Hashanah} 4: 3\textsuperscript{75} makes it clear that the \textit{takkanah} of the \textit{lulav} was introduced to keep the memory of a Temple practice (\textit{zekher la-Mikdash}) alive:

Originally, the \textit{lulav} was taken in hand on all seven days only in the Temple; in the country at large, however, on one day alone. After the Temple had been destroyed, Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai ordained that it should be waved for seven days throughout the country as a memorial to the Temple…

Being a priest himself, he had thorough knowledge in matters of genealogy and divine worship. Consequently, he was able to overrule a number of regulations that had depended on the authority of the priesthood before the Destruction; \textit{Rosh Hashanah} 31b provides a typical example:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{74} Neusner (in Stemberger 1979: 84) sees in the five disciples of Yochanan ben Zakkai (Avot II, 10) the representatives of the different directions that joined together in Yabneh to rebuild the Jewish life: Eliezer, the Pharisee, Yose the priest, Simeon ben Nataniel as representative of the \textit{am ha-arets}, Eleasar ben Arakh, the mystic and Yehoshua ben Chananja as type of the rabbi whilst Yochanan ben Zakkai himself represents the tradition of the Scribes. Stemberger draws this information (1979: 252) from the following sources of J. Neusner: \textit{Talmudic Judaism in Sasanian Babylonia}, Leiden 1976: 46-135; and ‘Pharisaic-Rabbinic’ Judaism: A clarification, History of Religions 12 (1973: 250-70).
\item \textsuperscript{75} Based on Leviticus 23: 40; quoted in Marsden (1980[1]: 27).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Priests may not ascend the *dukhan* in their sandals. This was one of nine regulations issued by Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai.

In the Temple, priests did not wear sandals while they performed their duties. S. Zeitlin (1964: 292) explains that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai’s reason for introducing the *takkanah*, that priests should not wear sandals when ascending the *dukhan* for the blessing, was because he wanted the Synagogue to take the place of the Temple. It is very unlikely that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai could have ruled in matters such as the above, had he not been a priest himself. Further, whereas previously the Supreme Court under the leadership of the *av-beth-did* had ruled in the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, R. Yochanan ben Zakkai now ordained that witnesses no longer had to answer to the *av-beth-din*, but rather were to go to the place of Assembly in Yabneh (Marsden 1980[1]: 26). This is surprising, if we consider that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai himself actually was the *av-beth-din* in the last days of Jerusalem (Hamburger 1892: 465; cf. also Finkelstein 1938: 29). The drastic move indicates that R. Yochanan was wisely aware of the important changes that had to take place if Judaism was to survive without the Temple. So he also changed the regulations concerning the sounding of the *shofar* on the Sabbath (*Rosh Hashanah* 4:1-2), the sanctification of the New Moon (*Rosh Hashanah* 4: 4), the waving of the *lulav* (*Rosh Hashanah* 4: 3) and the duties of a proselyte (*Rosh Hashanah* 31b). The fact that most of his measures were confined to reorganizing principles that had previously been part of the Temple sphere is an indication of the authoritative standing he had over

---

76 The *dukhan* is a raised platform from which the priests recited Psalms and gave the priestly blessing (Num. 6: 24-26); see Marsden (1980[1]: 58) for more information on this topic.

77 Zeitlin (1961: 240) concedes that the heads of the *beth din* (the Sanhedrin) were ‘still priests’ during the Second Temple period; he adds, significantly, that their authority was not vested in them because of their priesthood but because they were learned in the law.’

78 For a detailed discussion on the *takkanot* of R. Yochanan ben Zakkai see Zeitlin (1964: 288-310).
the priesthood and the sages.\textsuperscript{79} When the locality of the Temple fell away, it was reasonable for him to place new emphasis on the significance of the great feasts to encourage the pious populace in their expression of faith (cf. Maier 1972: 131-33).

It is not known for certain, whether R. Yochanan died, or whether he was forcefully removed from leadership due to opposition; though Isaac Gottlieb’s explanation (1980[3]: 32-33) is supportive of the latter. He argues that both, the members of the priestly establishment, as well as a number of prominent sages were absent from R. Yochanan’s academy, because they had reason to oppose his leadership. Some disliked him because of his surrender to the Romans on the eve of the destruction, while priests in particular, did not want to take leave of their elite status, despising to be equated with pharisaic sages\textsuperscript{80}. Gottlieb (1980[3]: 32) notes that it took some time for the priesthood to become accustomed to the actuality that it had lost its power (see again \textit{Bekhoroth} 30b). Priests that were not at the same time sages, continued to hold on to their elite status for some time, in the hope that the Temple service and with it, their privileged and autonomous position would be restored.

From the foregoing analysis of events, which tied up with developments in Judaism immediately after the Destruction, it can be assumed that the prospect for priests to restore their autonomy began to fade, when the pharisaic sage, Rabban Gamaliel II, and not a priest, succeeded Rabban Yochanan as leader of

\textsuperscript{79} Already when he was \textit{av-beth-din} during the Second Temple period, two functions are known that were introduced by him (Hamburger 1892: 465, fn. 10, Tosephta Para Absch. 2).

\textsuperscript{80} Second Temple Judaism accommodated a number of sects such as the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and even early Christians (Schiffman 1998: 231-99). K. Kohler (n.d.: ‘Pharisees’) notes that ‘the whole history of Judaism was reconstructed from the Pharisaic point of view’ with the destruction of the Temple; the Sadducees disappeared altogether and a new aspect was given to the Sanhedrin of the past.
the Sanhedrin in Yabneh.\textsuperscript{81} Rabban Gamaliel II was the son of Simeon ben Gamaliel I, the leader of the Pharisees before 70 C.E. In so far that he was also a relative of the esteemed Hillel, there is no doubt that he had enough prestige to frustrate, even further than R. Yochanan, the pluralistic tolerance\textsuperscript{82} that had existed in Judaism during the Second Temple (Stemberger 1979: 17). His decision to develop other local academies for the study of Torah apart from Yabneh reflects this endeavor.\textsuperscript{83} In this way he advanced the aim of pharisaic sages to revive and decentralize the study of Torah.

The Destruction with its resulting political upheavals and troubled times also motivated R. Gamaliel II – just as it had motivated R. Yochanan – to bring some stability to the inner confusion of his people. He intended to accomplish this by instituting fixed regulations\textsuperscript{84} in the area of public worship (Elbogen 1993: 201). It appears, though, that these rulings were initially confined to the house of study (beth midrash), where their establishment was opposed by R. Gamaliel’s colleagues due to their disproportionate strictness (cf. BT Ber. 27b-28a). However, the process of standardizing the Jewish faith in accordance with pharisaic principles continued steadily as the power-base of the priestly democracy and the survivors of the Herodian dynasty were absorbed, increasingly, into the ranks of pharisaic sages (see Bava Metzia 59b; cf. also Mardsen 1980[1]: 30-32). Concomitantly, a fixed order of worship was established in the Synagogue (cf. Marsden 1980[1]: 47; Maier & Schreiner


\textsuperscript{82} The pluralistic tolerance is visible from the diverse Jewish sects that were part of the Judaism’s of the Second Temple period, i.e. Essenes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Zealots and even the early Jewish Christians.

\textsuperscript{83} According to Sanhedrin 32b, sages had academies in Lydda, Beror Chayil, Peki’in, Yabneh, Bene Berak, Sikhnin in Galilee and Sepphoris.

\textsuperscript{84} E.g. the birkat ha-minim, the benediction that was inserted into the liturgy by Rabban Gamaliel (Safrai 1987: 17; see also Maier & Schreiner 1973: 404-13; Maier 1972: 153-58).
1973: 391-99). This is particularly evident from the period of the Amoraim onwards (cf. Elbogen 1993: 205-12).

2.4.4 The term ‘rabbi’ as title
There are indications that the priests and sages, before the destruction of the Second Temple, developed in relative distinction from one another. E.S. Gruen (2002: 121) points out that those officials, who ran Synagogues in the late Second Temple period, ‘…were quite separate from but no challenge to the priesthood that ministered to the cult in Jerusalem’. However, in respect of the post-Temple period, the standard scholarly view is that the former two variously affiliated groups of late Pharisees and scribes (soferim), no longer remained distinct after 70 C.E., but fused into a new group. The standard view holds that the new group of scholarly teachers came to be referred to with the title of rabbi.

Arguments in support of the standard view refer to the fact that early rabbinic texts do not mention priests in a separate teaching category to rabbis. They hold that scribes of the Second Temple period – probably priests or Levites – were absorbed into the leadership of rabbinic Judaism after 70 C.E. (cf. Schäfer 2003: 133-34; Grabbe 2000: 151). Schäfer, for one, argues (2003: 133) that the term ‘rabbi’ as title, only emerged after 70 C.E., adding that the use of ‘rabbi’ as title, indicates the emergence of a new order in post-Temple Judaism ‘…which had not previously existed in this form.’ Accordingly, the term was used in the NT only in reference to the role of a teacher. Shmuel Safrai (1987: 17) comes to a similar conclusion, noting that the bestowing of a title ‘rabbi’ on the ordained Sage is for the first time encountered at Yavneh. The most compelling evidence for the designation by the title of ‘rabbi’ is, however, offered by J. Newman

---

85 F.F. Bruce observes that the general sequence of the Synagogue service to some extent even influenced the order of early Christian Worship (1969: 144-45.)
(1950), who makes it clear that the ordained sage was bestowed with the title ‘rabbi’, and could additionally be granted judicial powers. Newman approaches the topic through the subject of Semikhah in his comprehensive study on the origin, history and function of ordination in rabbinic literature. Accordingly, BT Sanhedrin 13b links the title of ‘rabbi’ directly to the practice of Semikhah stating, ‘He (the ordinand) is designated by the title of ‘Rabbi’, and granted authority to adjudicate in cases of Kenas’ (quoted in Newman 1950: 10). Maimonides amends this definition slightly, ‘You are Rabbi, you are ordained, and you have the right to adjudicate Kenas’ (quoted in Newman 1950: 116-17). PT Bikkurim 3: 3 adds that the ordained even received a testimonial letter, certifying that he had graduated to the status of ‘rabbi’ (Newman 1950: 125). Further, in his book Sefer Hashetaroth, R. Judah b. R. Barzili of Barcelona likewise mentions the issuing of a ‘certificate of ordination’ in conjunction with the titling of ‘rabbi’:

The certificate of ordination, whereby they ordain one of the students to be called ‘Rabbi’ or ‘Hakham’. Matters of fine are not adjudicated outside the Land and ordination was not with laying on of hands on the head of the ordinand, they only write a ‘Certificate of Ordination’ without laying on their hands (italics added).

What is more, the talmudic statement אין סמיכה בחוץ לארץ there is no semikhah outside the Land (of Israel) (BT Sanhedrin 13b), supports evidence that the practice of ordination and together with it, the giving of the title of ‘rabbi’ must be linked to the age of formative Judaism.

---

86 Quoted in Newman (1950: 127).
87 For Maimonides’ reference to this practice in his Yad Hahazakah see Newman (1950: 127).
2.4.4.1 Different rabbinic titles

The fact that Palestinian Amoraim were called rabbis, as distinct from the Babylonian teachers of that period, who were referred to by the title of ‘rab’ or of ‘mar’, is a further indication that the use of the term ‘rabbi’ in association with Semikhah (ordination), was initially restricted to Palestine in the aftermath of the Destruction. The distinction between the titles of ‘rabbi’ and ‘rab’ was for the sake of differentiation: Palestinian Amoraim applied a simple method of teaching and expounding the Mishnah, while their Babylonian counterparts engaged in more advanced dialectical discussions (Mielziner n.d.: ‘Amora’). The title ‘rabban’, on the other hand, was an honorary title meaning ‘our master’. It was given to the earliest teachers of the rabbinic tradition, specifically, the first three leaders of the rabbinic movement after 70 C.E., Yochanan ben Zakkai, Gamaliel and his son Simeon ben Gamaliel (Stemberger 1979: 83).

2.4.5 Who provided the leadership in Palestinian Synagogues?

Flesher argues (2001: 25) that priests were active and authoritative in the Synagogues from the second century onwards. This hypothesis does, however, not concur smoothly with all the literary evidence of the post-Destruction era.

To be sure, as explained in 2.4.3.1, priests continued to hold on to their elite status for some time, but the influence of pharisaic sages increased steadily. It was argued that the initial rise of priestly influence can largely be attributed to the authority that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai exercised over the priesthood. However, his rejection of priestly privileges and the disposal of powers, which priests had formerly exercised, made him increasingly unpopular within the ranks of the priesthood.88 Nonetheless, this rejection did not perturb him from

---

further restructuring Judaism in the aftermath of the Destruction, because what mattered most to R. Yochanan ben Zakkai was not his own popularity, but rather what benefited the people. This outlook is clearly apparent from the manner in which he conducted the reforms after the destruction of the Temple. Without exception, his rigorous introduction of *takkanot* aimed to harmonize religion and life in the aftermath of the Destruction (cf. Zeitlin 1964: 288). Due to this stance, Yochanan appears to have, progressively, isolated himself from the priesthood and also from his contemporaries. Proportionately with the decline of his popularity, his power also waned, to the point when Rabban Gamaliel, who was a strong *nasi*, emerged as the new spiritual leader of the Jewish people. The fact that Rabban Yochanan never achieved the status of *nasi* (Patriarch) and Head of the post-Temple Sanhedrin (Marsden 1980[1]: 29) can possibly also be related to his priestly descent; he was thus not a descendant

---

89 This was pointed out by A.J. Saldarini (1977: 265).

90 L. Finkelstein (1938: 24-25) in his study on *Pirkeh Abot* points out that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai already was involved in a conflict with R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I, the holder of Hillel’s office, and the leader of Pharisaism before the destruction of the Second Temple. His discussion sheds light on the backdrop of events leading to Rabban Yochanan’s popularity as teacher among the populace. He was interested in furthering the study and not just the practice of the law, oral and written. Hence he became the link between the ‘pairs’ and the later tannaitic scholar. Finkelstein’s describes the backdrop as follows, ‘The conflict became embittered, apparently, in the last days of the Commonwealth, when R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I, the great-grandson of Hillel, was Nasi, and R. Johanan ben Zakkai was Ab Bet Din, or Associate. It was universally recognized that while R. Simeon ben Gamaliel had inherited Hillel's office, R. Johanan ben Zakkai was the heir to his spirit. It was also obvious that R. Johanan ben Zakai, the foremost teacher of his generation, and the master of all the distinguished scholars of the following generation, was actually preserving the Oral Tradition in a sense that R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I could not even pretend to do, for he had no disciples at all. Yet R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I and his adherents felt that his work was the more important, even from the point of view of the preservation of Pharisaism, for they held that "Not the study of the Law but its practice, is fundamental"; and surely R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I, as the holder of high office, and the leader of Pharisaism, was contributing as much to the general observance of the Law, as R. Johanan ben Zakkai was to its study. We have no direct evidence of the controversy as it probably was carried on in the early days, during the lifetime of R. Simeon ben Gamaliel I and R. Johanan ben Zakai. But it was renewed with even greater vigor a generation later, when R. Gamaliel II became the leader of the Pharisaic Order, and president of the Academy at Yabneh…’

91 Finkelstein (1938: 14, fn. 3) suggests that ‘it seems altogether probable that there was an interim between the death of R. Johanan ben Zakkai about the year 80 C.E. and the
from the line of David\textsuperscript{92}. With the rise of the \textit{nasi}, the influence of priests declined even further until their ultimate absorption into the ranks of pharisaic sages. Concurrent with the fusion of pharisaic sages and priest sages, the ‘rabbis’ of rabbinic Judaism emerged (cf. Stemberger 1979: 84-92).

Although the change appears to have taken place smoothly, the situation was more complex. Not exactly all priests and Levites were absorbed into the ranks of rabbis. Some of them continued to put into effect their service and gifting they had previously exercised in the Temple and Synagogues. Whether these functions contributed towards or became part of the leadership roles in post-Destruction Synagogues, will be focused on next.

\textbf{2.4.5.1 Different leaders in post-Temple Synagogues in Palestine}

Seder \textit{Eliyahu Rabbah} 10 (quoted in Gottlieb 1980\cite{4}: 40) speaks of the hiring of both a sage and a primary school teacher for the small city. Gottlieb (1980\cite{4}: 40) observes that in general, no special building was set aside as a school; instead, the local Synagogue was used for this purpose. Hence, it can be assumed that sages acted as teachers in the Synagogues (cf. 2.4.2.1). The differentiation noted by Martin Goodman (1998: 207) between the inferior position of the Synagogue official or \textit{rosh knesset} and that of the sage, indicates that the running of Synagogues was in the hands of several people. In this regard, Jeffrey A. Spitzer (n.d.: ‘The Synagogue and the Study House’) deduces from a first century inscription, found in Jerusalem, that Synagogues were built and maintained by wealthy benefactors, like ‘Theodotus, son of Venetos, kohen appointment of R. Gamaliel II as Nasi or resident of the Academy. It was probably necessary to obtain permission from the Roman government for R. Gamaliel to serve as President...’

\textsuperscript{92} See also Neusner’s remarks (1966: 412-13) on the question, whether Gamaliel disposed of R. Yochanan ben Zakkai, ‘I think it likely that he was deposed, and since R. Gamaliel was his successor, restoring the rule of the Hillel house, I suppose he was involved in the deposition’.
and *archsynagogus.*’ He further maintains that different groups took leadership roles in the Synagogue through the centuries. Accordingly, *kohanim* (priests) would have served some functions in the Synagogue, while other functions were performed by the professional *meturgeman* (translators of the Torah reading into Aramaic); *payetanim* (poets) attended to the *piyyut* (liturgical poetry).

Johann Maier (1972: 134) links the roles of priests and Levites in the early post-Destruction Synagogue service to the *chazzanim* who, he says, were mostly from levitical-priestly descent. These took over the function of reciting the prayers before the congregation from the *Shaliach Shibbûr*. He elaborates (1972: 154-55), ‘Dazu hat beigetragen, daß der Pijjut-Vortrag auch musikalisch-gesangliche Fertigkeit vorraussetzte. Ein guter Teil des frühen Pijjut erwuchs so aus der freien Variation der Stammgebete’. Evidence from Scripture confirms Maier’s observation. 2 Chronicles 5: 12 refers to the Levitical singers Asaph, Heman, Yeduthun, their sons and brothers, who were clothed in fine linen, with cymbals, and with harps and lyres, and stood on the east of the altar. With them were a hundred and twenty priests blowing with trumpets (cf. also 2 Chronicles 30: 21). Verse 13 appears to be referring to the Levitical singers, who lead the ‘prayer songs’ (referred to as ‘Stammgebet’ in Maier 1972: 154); prayer songs, which later developed into *piyyutim*, ...they lifted up (their) voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised Adonai, saying, ‘For He is good; for his mercy (endures) forever’. Similarly, in 2 Chronicles 30: 2 Levites are said to be offering peace offerings and

93 Cf. also Maier 1972: 154.
94 Significantly Maier (1972: 154[d]) observes, ‘Die Improvisationsfähigkeit, die der nicht wörtlich festgelegte Vortrag der Stammgebete vom *sheli‘ach shibbur* erforderte, war nicht jedermanns Sache.’
95 Alfred Edersheim (1994: 50) notes that only Levites could act as choristers in the Temple, while other distinguished Israelites were allowed to take part in the instrumental music. For a discussion on the musical performance by Levites in the Temple service during the Second Temple period, see Zeitlin (1961: 220-21).
making confession to the LORD God of their fathers
זבחי שׁלים ומתודים מזבחים
ליהוה אלהי אבותיהם
… The root of ידִוַתְמִ is from which the proper noun יְדוּתָן is derived, referring to a Levite skilled in music, whom David appointed one of the choristers (1 Chron. 23: 6). 1 Chronicles 25: 1 and 3, likewise make mention of the sons of Yeduthun, who prophesied with the harp and verse 6 speaks of Aspah, Yeduthun, and Heman with their brethren, who were instructed in the songs of the LORD. In the wake of such religious tradition, it is not surprising that priests and Levites would have continued and even developed the rituals of singing prayers in the context of the Synagogue liturgy, which is still part of the modern Synagogue liturgy. These prayer songs developed into what is later known as piyyutim.

Coming back to the terms of rosh knesset, sage and rabbi; the rosh knesset appears to have been the person that was responsible for the general running of the Synagogue, while the term ‘sage’ refers to a Torah scholar with the title of rabbi. Neusner (1983: 137) defines the rabbi as one who ‘…speaks with authority about the Mishnah and the Scripture’ (italics added). This definition fits the commitment of pharisaic sages to safeguard the unity of oral and written Torah. Neusner (1983: 136) elucidates, saying ‘…it was not the case that one component of the torah, of God’s word to Israel, stood within the sacred circle, another beyond’ (italics added). The sage, in Neusner’s definition, is the result of ‘the union of the scribe and the priest’ (1991: 161). However, this definition must be viewed from the context of Second Temple Judaism. According to Gottlieb (1980[3]: 33), the phenomenon of priest-sage was well-known already in Temple times. The priest-sage was not qualified by birth in the priestly caste but rather by his learning in the Torah. This means that priests must have

---

96 Compare Maier (1972: 155). He explains, ‘Um ein völliges „Zersingen“ der Stammgebete zu vermeiden, wurde in amoräischer Zeit ihr Wortlaut mehr und mehr fixiert und die poetische Ausschmückung auf feste Einschübe und Zusätze eingeschränkt.’
associated themselves with different religious groups during the Second Temple period. A point in case is Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai, who was both a priestly scribe as well as a Torah scholar. He appears to have been sided with the Pharisees in certain matters\(^97\). Josephus (\textit{Antiq.} 20, 9[1] in Whiston 1987: 537) also distinguishes between different religious groupings among priests. Accordingly, the high priest, Ananus, was ‘also of the sect of the Sadducees.’ Interestingly, more priests appear to have associated themselves with the Sadducees than with the Pharisees. In this regard, Johann Maier (1972: 40) reasons, ‘Für den Sadduzäismus dürfte weit mehr als für die Pharisäer die kultische Gottesgegenwart im Tempel eine Rolle gespielt haben.’ Maier’s argument can be substantiated from the fact that Sadducees insisted on the literal observance of the law and took pride in their aristocratic blood line (\textit{Sanhedrin} 4: 2; Josephus \textit{Apion} 1, 7; \textit{Antiq.} 18, 1[4]). Their main objective was to live for the Temple. It is thus feasible to argue that they disappeared from history with the destruction of the Temple (Kohler n.d.: ‘Sadducees’)\(^98\).

In view of the above considerations, it is reasonable to define the term ‘sage’\(^99\), in the context of Second Temple Judaism, as inclusive of priests\(^100\), Levites, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes\(^101\) and Chaverim\(^102\). In other words, a

\(^{97}\) Zeitlin (1964: 298) maintains that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai ‘did not participate in the controvercies between Sadducees and Pharisees’. He shows that the debates with the Sadducees that are ascribed to him have no historical basis, although he concedes that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai could well have participated in one debate with the Sadducees, which was in regard to the defilement of the Holy Scriptures. In a retort to the Sadducees he said (M. \textit{Yadin} 4.6), ‘Have we naught against the Pharisees save this’ (1964: 308).

\(^{98}\) The Sadducees are replaced by the late Boethusians (Kohler n.d.: ‘Sadducees’).

\(^{99}\) Zeitlin (1961: 240) lists among the learned men who enacted the law, the \textit{Sofer, Grammatikos}, Scribe and the \textit{Darshan}, interpreter. He defines these as ‘the guides of the people’.

\(^{100}\) Ezra was a priest and scribe and is traditionally reckoned among the 120 sages that constituted the Great Assembly (Goldwurm 1982: 34-35).

\(^{101}\) Josephus refers to three main Jewish sects (\textit{Antiq.} 18, 1[2] in Whiston 1987: 477), ‘The Jews had for a great while three sects of philosophy peculiar to themselves; the sect of the
multiplicity of sages, among whom were priests, Levites, Sadducees, Pharisees and the Herodian dynasty, constituted the Jewish elite before 70 C.E. However, after 70 C.E. this elite ceased to exist and instead, tannaitic Judaism evolved, clothed eventually in the robe of the Pharisees. Neusner’s definition therefore (1991: 162) that the rabbi constitutes the new leader of the ‘Judaism of dual Torah,’ who either emerged from a priestly lineage or from the ranks of the Pharisees, expresses the essence of developments that took place among Judaism’s spiritual leadership in the aftermath of the Destruction.

It follows that the amalgamation of priest-sages with pharisaic sages into the new group of ‘rabbis’, created a new authoritative basis for leading and guiding a confused nation, whose frameworks and national leadership—the Sanhedrin and the High Priesthood—had collapsed with the destruction of the Second Temple. However, there is no doubt that the proportion of priests among the members of the Sanhedrin remained high during the Mishnaic-talmudic period (Gottlieb 1980[3]: 32). This could indicate that many priests had not been part of the moral decline during the Second Temple period but, instead, had joined the ranks of the sages. It could also account for many of the tensions that had existed between the nesi’im, that is, between the high priest and the av-beth-din

---

102 According to Hersh Goldwurm, the title chaver was awarded to a learned person who was known to observe the Halakhah scrupulously (1982: 92-98).

103 In Lester L. Grabbe’s view (2000: 152), the elite ‘…may have included priests who had broken with the temple (including some of the people of the Qumran scrolls?) scribes who were not priests or Levites, and others for whom the tradition was an avocation (the Pharisees?).’

104 Stemberger argues that the tenth, which was originally devoted to priests and Levites for their services in the Temple, was either given to rabbis or those priests that also were active in rabbinic teaching, after 70 C.E. (1979: 157).

105 Goldwurm (1982: 92-98) notes that the sages were called Pharisees [Perushim] ‘those who separate themselves’.

106 *Dual Torah* refers to Oral and Written Torah.
or *chakham* of the Second Temple Sanhedrin (cf. Gottlieb 1980[3]: 19). As mentioned previously, the high priest, who constituted the political *nasi* during the Second Temple period, had become a pawn of the ruling Roman Power and often belonged to the ranks of the Sadducees (cf. Goldwurm 1982: 92-143). He was responsible for matters of state and public policy, while the chief sage or *av-beth-din* was responsible for questions of religion, Halakhah and civil law (Gottlieb 1980[3]: 19).

When, therefore, Seder *Eliyahu Rabbah* 10 speaks of the hiring of both a sage and a primary school teacher for the small city, the ‘sage’ in this context could have been either from priestly descent or a pharisaic sage. However, it is questionable whether all priests and Levites were schooled to the same degree as rabbinic sages were. Some priests and Levites, undoubtedly, continued to function in their former capacities of Levitical singers and prayer leaders, developing respectively, into *payyetanim* and *chazzanim* in the post-Destruction Synagogues in Palestine. When, therefore, rabbinic literature refers to ‘sages’ in the context of Synagogues after 70 C.E., one should bear in mind that the reference is to Torah scholars with the title of ‘rabbi’. No doubt, many of these rabbis would have been *priest-sages*, but certainly not all.

2.4.6 Two forms of study

The differentiation, which Lawrence H. Schiffman (1991: 184-87) makes between two forms of study in the tannaitic period, namely *Mishnah* and *Midrash*, is particularly noteworthy in the context of the evolvement of tannaitic Judaism in the post-Temple age. While one can hardly argue convincingly that

---

107 For a discussion on the development of the titles of the High Priest and Nasi in the Sanhedrin see Zeitlin (1957: 1-5).


109 Compare Stemberger (1979: 84-88) *Wie wird man Rabbi?*
the roles of priest, scribe and pharisaic sage had not integrated into one leadership group referred to as rabbis, it is nevertheless true that the exposition of Scripture developed into two distinct but complementary techniques: *Mishnah* involved the study of abstract, apodictic principles of law, whereas *Midrash* concerned the technique of scriptural exposition, that is, explanations were derived from biblical verses or words and the application of laws was discussed.

Schiffman\(^{111}\) (1991: 184-87) links the development of these two techniques of exposition to the Second Temple period, but more specifically to the fact, that there were two nesi’im (presidents) in the Sanhedrin of the Second Temple, who each had a separate designated sphere of empowerment, that is, (i) state and public policy and (ii) religion, Halakhah and civil law. Schiffman proposes (1991: 177-79) that the midrashic approach was developed in pharisaic circles and involved the study of the Bible. He argues that mishnaic reasoning constitutes a logical progression from the midrashic method. His reasoning makes sense in the context of the rabbinic literature. It nevertheless, needs to be investigated further for the purpose of substantiation.

### 2.4.6.1 Two religious groupings: strict and lenient

Schiffman’s hypothesis is that the two separate forms of study, *Mishnah* and *Midrash* retained their distinct foci innately, notwithstanding that the separate judicial and executive roles of the high priest and chakham were integrated – concomitant with the fusion of pharisaic sages and priests– in the new leadership group, known as ‘rabbis’ as a result of the Great Revolt of 66-73 C.E. Schiffman argues that the two separate forms of study, *Mishnah* and

---

110 Unconditional legal prescriptions not based on reasons or Scripture.
111 In line with a proposition made by Gedalya Allon (1975: 20).
Midrash are reminiscent of the inseparable link between the two Torahs, the oral and the written (1991: 199).

In support of Schiffman’s theory, the following argument can be submitted. Pharisees had been involved with the addition of new restrictions to the biblical law. Therefore, one would expect to detect their influence among the ranks of such tannaitic sages that composed abstract, apodictic principles of law as evidenced in the Mishnah. By comparison to later Tannaim, Pharisees were notorious for piling statute upon statute in their endeavours to ‘make a fence around the law’ (cf. Avot I: i). Nonetheless, there is no doubt that priests and Levites had been in charge of the law since biblical times. It is thus reasonable to assume that a certain disparity would have surfaced between the two groups of pharisaic sages and priestly sages that were part of the ranks of the rabbis in the early post-Destruction Sanhedrin. This is reflected in a number of ways:

(i) The rabbinic names to which specific laws are attributed bear testimony to the religious group from which the laws derive. This is particularly evident in the first generation of Tannaim. For example, Chanina ben Antogonos, was a Tanna of priestly descent and a contemporary of Akiva and Ishmael (Bekhoroth 7: 5). Many of the laws and halakhic midrashim linked to his name reflect priestly concerns (Kiddushin 4: 5; Bekhoroth 6: 3, 10, 11; 7: 2, 5; Temuroth 6: 5)\(^{112}\).

(ii) The ancestral lineage of a rabbi can be indicative of the group he was associated with. Since he could not appeal to ancestral merit for status, R. Akiva, a pharisaic sage, is known to have reflected sadly, ‘Happy the man whose ancestors give him merit; happy the man who has a peg on which to hang his name’ (PT Berakhoth 4: 7d). By contrast,

\(^{112}\) Cf. J. Jacobs and S. Mendelsohn (n.d.: ‘Hanina (Hananiah) B. Antigonus’).
his opponent R. Yishmael is linked to a priestly descent (Strack and Stemberger 1982: 78).

(iii) **Antagonistic couples** from the earliest Tannaim to the latest Amoraim reflect the conflict of opinion that dominated talmudic discussions (Ginzberg and Greenstone n.d.: ‘Conflict of Opinion’).

(iv) **Opposing rabbinic rulings** were noted either according to the House of Hillel or according to the House of Shamai, where Hillel represents the lenient and Shamai the strict ruling.

(v) In tannaitic midrashim, the schools of R. Akiva and R. Yishmael, can be respectively discerned through exegetical methods and subject vocabulary (Stemberger 1977: 84). The exegetical rules of the school of R. Akiva were always opposed by the school of R. Yishmael (Stemberger 1979: 138).

From the above, it is apparent that priests as well as pharisaic sages were part of the academies in post-Temple Judaism. Overall however, the pharisaic group dominated the scene. The prominence of R. Akiva in the Bar Kokhba revolt illustrates the strong influence that pharisaic sages had on the Jewish nation after the Destruction. Similarly, as pointed out by Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemberger (1982: 82), the school of Akiva decisively influenced the written redaction of Targum Onqelos, which can be dated back to the second century C.E. This Targum was not used much in Synagogues because of its literary Aramaic until it reached Babylonia, where it was consistently revised in order for its Halakhah to correspond with the contemporary rabbinic thought and the official HT of the Bible. With respect to Halakhah, sages mostly ruled in favour of the House of Hillel. Hillel was one of the most famous scholars of
the Pharisees (Stemberger 1972: 39). Noteworthy in this context is that the seven basic exegetical rules\textsuperscript{113} were named after Hillel.

Notwithstanding the two major religious groupings among the rabbis, it would be erroneous to differentiate, \textit{per se}, between priests and Pharisees in the post-Temple period. Pharisaic sages as well as priests were carriers of a particular religious framework and in this capacity both groups contributed to the establishment of the new movement from which the so-called \textit{rabbis} evolved as spiritual leaders; initially, only leaders of the \textit{beth midrash} and the \textit{beth din}, but ultimately also of the \textit{beth knesset}.

It is in the light of the transition from Second Temple to post-Temple Judaism that the evolvement of extant Targums, respectively those written in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA) (at one stage the spoken Aramaic of Jewish Galilee) and Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) (the language of the learned), will now be investigated. The transitional process was shown to be marked by a separation between the teaching and adjudication in the \textit{beth midrash}, and community life and worship in the \textit{beth knesset}. Furthermore, as argued previously, an innovative new leadership emerged whereby the roles of pharisaic sage and priests gradually integrated into a new group of spiritual leaders, the so-called rabbis. These new developments had a marked influence on the compilation of written targumic traditions; although, to date, they have hardly been taken into account in targumic research.

\textsuperscript{113} See Stemberger (1972: 134-36).
2.5 **Pentateuch Targums: Different Dialects Dissimilar Designs**

The question of contextualizing extant Pentateuch Targums is complex. Scholars have not yet been able to fully account for the existence of diverse Pentateuch Targums that belong into more or less the same period of time in Palestine, but are written in different dialects and are either literal or periphrastic in character. Their standardization is directly linked to the development of Judaism’s institutions of the post-Temple period and its related communities. For this reason, it was important to first establish the rudiments from which rabbinic Judaism developed after the Destruction before proceeding to investigate the rationale for different targumic renditions.

2.5.1 **The use of Aramaic Bible translations**

The practice of translating Scripture into Aramaic can be attributed to two consecutive historical developments. First, the colloquial speech of the common Jew in Palestine during the Second Temple period was overwhelmingly Aramaic. Hebrew had largely become the language of the intellectuals. Since Aramaic was the language that Jews mostly spoke during their time of captivity in Babylon, it is natural that this dialect was chosen to submit the sacred text in translation for Jews living in Palestine after their return from exile. Similarly, Greek was the language, wherein the Hebrew text was rendered for Greek-speaking Jews in the Diaspora. But, more importantly, the main reason for Targum in due course came to be for the purpose of differentiating between the written Hebrew Text and its interpretation (Safrai 1987: 39&43). This differentiation became increasingly imperative with the establishment of a fixed canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.
2.5.2 The prohibition on writing

Written Targums of the Second Temple do not exist on account of the prohibition on writing\(^{114}\) that was linked to an old directive—primarily existing in pharisaic circles—not to fixate texts on a word-for-word basis.\(^{115}\) Initially, oral Targum gave sages the opportunity to express their opinion about the reading of the Torah. An example of this practice is evident from the New Testament in Luke 4, 16-28:

> And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and he entered in, as was his custom on the Shabbat, to the Synagogue, and stood up and read. And the scroll of the prophet Isaiah\(^ {116}\) was handed to him. And he unrolled the scroll, and found the place where it was written …And he rolled back the scroll, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down; and the eyes of all in the Synagogue were fixed in a gaze upon him …And all in the Synagogue were filled with anger as they heard these things; and they rose up and cast him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, in order to cast him over the precipice.\(^ {117}\)

This passage shows how Scripture and interpretation were correlated with each other in the Synagogue service during the early first century. Before Jesus read from the scroll of Isaiah, which was handed to him by the *rosh knesset*, he stood up. It was customary to read Torah, while standing. Thereafter he sat down to teach. This action testifies to the fact that he was teaching in Aramaic, because the translation had to be taught in a sitting position to differentiate between

\(^{114}\) For a discussion on ‘Prohibition on Writing’ see Safrai (1987: 45-49).

\(^{115}\) Cf. Jerusalem Talmud *Megillah* IV, I, 74d; *Megillah* 32a and *Gittin* 60b; *Qiddushin* 49a. See also Stemberger’s discussion ‘Der Targum’ (1977: 80-81). For a discussion on Targum as part of the Oral Torah, see Safrai (1987: 38). Assuming that pharisaic sages already taught in Synagogues in the Second Temple period, Safrai’s statement (1987: 38) that ‘…Targumim represent another part of the literary creation of the Sages’, must be understood in the context of a time when sages still insisted that Targum be recited orally. See also Safrai’s comments on the origination of Oral Torah in the Second Temple period (1987: 63). The Palestinian Talmud, *Megillah* 4, 74d considers Targum as part of Oral Torah.

\(^{116}\) Isaiah 61: 1-2.

\(^{117}\) Adapted from the Messianic New Covenant Bible.
Scripture and someone’s interpretation of the text. Obviously, at this stage in Jewish history, targumic rendition had not yet been standardized, since the New Testament (NT) states \textit{…and the eyes of all in the Synagogue were fixed in a gaze upon him}. The text implies a certain expectancy of the audience to listen to the interpretation of the reading. The fact that Jesus’ interpretation stirred up the anger of his listeners, is an indication that his interpretation did not accord with the traditionally accepted view. Although sages were apparently still permitted a certain amount of freedom concerning the way they interpreted the Torah reading,\footnote{Safrai (1987: 38) observes that ‘Targumim reflect the halakhic and aggadic exegesis of the Sages.’} the passage from Luke suggests that an entirely divergent view was not tolerated. Someone who dared to express a totally contradictory opinion was considered a heretic and could pay with his life. An indication that in such cases the majority decision determined the outcome is stated in the Palestinian Talmud \textit{Sanhedrin} 4, 22a:

Moses said to Him: ‘Lord of the Universe, tell me, just how is the halakhah? He said to him: ‘Turn aside after the majority’ (Exodus 23: 2); if the majority exonerate, the accused is exonerated, but if they convict, he is convicted.

In the gospel of Luke, this convention is borne out with the observation \textit{…they rose up and cast him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, in order to cast him over the precipice}. A well-known \textit{baraita} in \textit{T. Hagigah} 2: 1-2 bears witness to the fact that people, who opposed the tradition, were not viewed positively. It speaks of ‘Four who entered paradise’: One of them ‘uprooted the saplings’ or abandoned \textit{the world of Jewish tradition}, while two others ‘were stricken’ as a result of their mystical speculations; only R. Akiva ‘entered in peace and emerged in peace.’ R. Akiva was a pharisaic sage, who obviously followed the traditional opinion.
Luke’s account accords with the observation made by Safrai (1987: 212) that Oral Torah was hardly formalized during the Second Temple period. In its oral stage, Oral Torah constituted the essence of an idea, a thought or a Halakhah that was transmitted from generation to generation (Safrai 1987: 212). Synagogues, clearly, were the context wherein Pharisees, before the Destruction, could practice to formulate and validate diverse opinions. After the Destruction, the practice of increasing and expanding the Torah appears to have moved to the house of study (beth midrash) as accorded in a tradition from the generation of Yavneh in T. Sota 7: 9 -10:\(^{119}\):

It was that R. Yochanan ben Beroka and R. Elazar Chisma came from Yavneh to Lod to pay honour to R. Yoshua at Pekiin. R. Yoshua asked them: what innovation was taught in the house of study? They answered: we are your disciples and it is of your water that we drink. He said: the house of study cannot exist without innovation.

Synagogues, during the Second Temple period, also appear to have been the floor, where a sage’s teaching would be confirmed or rejected by majority vote. This is confirmed in Luke’s account. He gives no indication that one of the worshippers opposed the general accord to cast Jesus over the precipice. Instead, the congregation appears to have acted in general agreement or by majority vote to cast Jesus out of the Synagogue, because Luke 4: 29 states that they rose up.

The primary reason for the prohibition on writing, during the Second Temple period, must be sought in the fact that sages believed in a living instruction, a creative process of teaching that was based on the written Torah (cf. Safrai

---

\(^{119}\) Similarly, PT Sota 3: 18d; PT Hagigah 1: 75d; BT Sota 3a.
1987: 45-69). Nonetheless, divergent interpretations were scrutinized for approval. However, the idea of Oral Torah was not accepted in Sadducee circles and also not in various branches of the Essenes. Hence, Safrai’s definition (1987: 35) that written sources of Oral Torah are pre-eminently the literature that contains the teachings of the pharisaic sages and their successors, the Tannaim and Amoraim, is to the point. Even more pertinently said; the collection, standardization and redaction of Oral Torah can be seen as a direct result of the destruction of the Second Temple and the wars following it (cf. Safrai 1987: 36). The reason for these activities is, in Schiffman’s analysis, that the motivation to collect and preserve traditions often increases in the aftermath of wars and catastrophes (1991: 179).

2.5.3 Fixed authorized Aramaic renditions

Extant targumic renditions, specifically, FragTarg, N, TO, as well as PJ, reflect the process of standardization that frequently follows an age in which innovation and creativity have celebrated their peak. These Targums are either written in a language that was understood by the common people in Palestine or they were composed in Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) or a mix of both. Flesher’s differentiation (2001: 23&33) between Targums that were written in a liturgical dialect (JPA) and Targums written in a literary dialect (JLA), is in line with the distinction that David Golomb (1985: 8) makes between a translator and/or meturgeman, and the ‘lectionary activity’ of scholars whereby the technique of translation was involved. From his distinction, it may be assumed that Targums were created with two purposes in mind; either for the beth knesset or for the beth midrash. The first would have been used in the
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120 See definition for ‘rendition’ on p. xvi.

121 Safrai also differentiates between the two reflections in the contents of Targums, that is, the halakhic and haggadic exegesis of the sages (1987: 38).
Synagogue context, while the second played a role in scholarly debates. Safrai (1987: 60-61) even attempts to delineate the various creations of Oral Torah further, namely by ascribing them to the diverse settings in which sages taught and studied Torah, which were ‘…1) the sage teaching to a small group of students; 2) derashot (homilies) of the sage in the Synagogue or House of Study; 3) the teaching of Torah at assemblies and communal meals; at the marketplace or at any other suitable location.’ While such distinctions make sense from what is known about the age of formative Judaism, more specific information on the different teaching locations and settings must be gathered by focusing in greater detail on the specific translation techniques and dialects exhibited in extant Targums. While it is an accepted fact, that FragTarg and N were used in the context of the Synagogue we can not yet explain what the exact purpose was of the hypothetical Targum, Proto-O and the later O, both of which are believed to have been compiled in Jewish Literary Aramaic, the language of the learned. We also do not know, where, when and for what purpose was Pseudo-Jonathan used. I will seek to shed some light onto these uncertainties by comparing the activity of targumic rendering in the beth knesset with the activity of academic learning in the beth midrash.

2.5.3.1 Targumic rendering in the Synagogue

The oral translation of the Torah reading in the pre-Mishnaic period, which was done by the interpreting sage or any one whom the ‘elders’ or ‘rulers’ of the Synagogue deemed qualified to address to the people, must have been in colloquial Aramaic. Not much literary proof exists for this practice, because of the prohibition on writing in the context of the Synagogue. However, at least three stages of development in the targumic rendition of the Hebrew Scriptures can be discerned in the context of the Synagogue:

Note in this respect Safrai’s observation (1987: 38) that the very existence of Targums reflects the desire of the sages to teach the people Torah.
(i) The interpreting sage of the Second Temple period

(ii) The translator in the Mishnaic period

(iii) The low-level Synagogue functionary called meturgeman of the post-Mishnaic period

The Second Temple period was the age, wherein the innovative approach towards interpreting the biblical text was at its peak. Taking into account the literary evidence from Luke, it appears that, initially, in the Second Temple period, one and the same person attended to the reading of the Torah portion and its elucidation. The implication is that the person had to be someone, who could read Hebrew and was also competent in the skill of translating Scripture into Aramaic. In this regard, Alfred Edersheim notes that the ‘rulers’ of the Synagogues, the teachers of the people, the leaders of their devotions, and all other officials were not necessarily ‘priests’¹²³ but simply chosen for their learning and fitness. Anyone whom the ‘elders’ or ‘rulers’ deemed qualified for this task might, at their request, addresses a word of exhortation to the people on the Sabbath (1994: 63-64).

During the Mishnaic period, on the other hand, the activity of targumic rendering became standardized. This may be assumed from the reference that even a child could translate the Torah reading if the individual had memorized the standard literary translation. A person that fulfilled the function of

¹²³ Edersheim’s observance that the priesthood was representative of the people according to Exodus 19: 5 and 6, places the whole question of the role of the priesthood into a different light. He adds that Jewish history shows how little power or influence the priesthood wielded, comparatively speaking. Even the high-priest was answerable to the Sanhedrin. He could be whipped by the Great Sanhedrin for an offence and thereafter again be restored to his office. According to Mishnah Yoma 1, 1 a scholar was deemed of far higher value, though he were a bastard, than an unlearned high-priest (1994: 63-64).
translating the sacred text into Aramaic did not need to have a high status. In the post-Mishnaic period, such a person was called *meturgeman* (cf. *Moed Qatan* 21a in Golomb 1985: 7).

2.5.3.2 *The meturgeman*

According to Golomb (1985: 7), the evolvement of a ‘fixed, traditional, authorized Aramaic version in conjunction with the reading of the Hebrew text’ by a *translator* (who simply memorized the text) and the development of the role of the simple translator called *meturgeman*, both happened in the aftermath of the Destruction. Golomb also suggests (1985: 6) that the two positions of translator and *meturgeman* must be distinguished from the ‘lectionary activity connected with an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text’ (italics added), an activity that is discussed in talmudic texts such as *Megillah* 21b, 23b, 24a and 24b. He connects this ‘lectionary activity’ with the *translation technique* used by rabbinic scholars. It can be assumed that the ‘lectionary activity’ took place in a formal learning setting, because Golomb points out that the Aramaic was not the colloquial dialect (1985: 8). Elbogen (1993: 153) adds that the use of literary Aramaic was limited to rabbinic scholars because it could not be understood by the masses, who attended the Synagogue services.

The views of Golomb and Elbogen agree well with the picture we have from rabbinic literature, from where it is apparent that the role of the *meturgeman* was not confined to the Synagogue: the *meturgeman* is mentioned in two contexts; for one, in the position of the low-level Synagogue functionary and further, also in the context of the academy. Although it is not clear, whether Golomb is aware of the fact that the *meturgeman* is also mentioned in the context of the early academy in Yavneh (cf. BT *Berakhoth* 27b-28a) - he only speaks of the function of the *meturgeman* in the context of the Synagogue in the post-Mishnaic period (1985: 7) - he does nonetheless, mention that R. Akiva’s
early training involved studying Bible and Targum. Such training could hardly have taken place in the context of the Synagogue service. It is plausible that the place for integrated training in Bible and Targum was the bet midrash. Indeed, this can be inferred from Bacher’s observation (1906) that the Targum is mentioned in Sifre Deuteronomy 161 as an intermediary branch of study between Mikra (Scripture) and Mishnah. This brings us back to Golomb’s (1985: 6) argument that literary Aramaic was used in the context of the ‘lectionary activity’ when it was connected to an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Text. His argument is feasible, when we consider that Mishnah too was compiled in a dialect that would distinguish it from Scripture, namely Mishnaic Hebrew (cf. my discussion of this aspect in Chapter 4). In light of the fact that written copies of learned texts were not yet freely available in the age of formative Judaism, it is reasonable that sages would have resorted to the use of different dialects in the context of learning to distinguish between several texts and their own oral comments. In my view, the prohibition against writing, which was directed against reading from a targumic rendition in the Synagogue service, must be viewed from the context of the Second Temple period. The Mishnah had not yet been compiled, nor had learning developed to the extent that it took place in an orderly setting of the bet midrash. So there was no need for writing down Targum; it was fairly uncomplicated to keep Scripture and Targum apart with the use of different dialects. Further, the entire nature of Second Temple Judaism was still conducive to fluidity and a certain freedom of expression prevailed.

However, this all changed with the destruction of the Second Temple and the Bar Kokhba revolt. The decision to begin writing down oral tradition can be directly linked to the loss of the lives of prominent sages during the wars, one of them being R. Akiva. The death of prominent sages meant that precious oral traditions could be lost forever. The only way to combat such losses was to
collect and write down oral traditions of Torah. Golomb’s distinction between an ‘oral translation’ of the pre-Mishnaic period (1985: 5) and the written Targums of the Mishnaic and post-Mishnaic periods, underlines the point, I am trying to make. The pre-Destruction time and the post-Destruction era were characterized by different needs and accordingly, different rules applied. The entire nature of the post-Destruction period in Palestine required that oral traditions should be put to writing, if Judaism was to survive.

At all events, Golomb is right in marking out that the written Targum (1985: 8) ‘is not a vernacular translation’ but rather ‘a highly technical piece of rabbinic literature.’ The purpose for rendering the sacred text into literary Aramaic was clearly not, to produce a vernacular translation, because Hebrew was both known and used in post-Temple Judaism. Rather, the fixed, authorized rendition was used to extract meaning from the sacred text in the context of the academy and to set that exegesis off from the Hebrew text of Scripture. This is clear from Moses Mielziner’s (n.d.) definition of the Amora (Aramaic for ‘the speaker’), who translated the Hebrew lecture into Aramaic in the rabbinic academy. Mielziner describes him as one

…who stood at the side of the lecturer or presiding teacher in the academy and in meetings for public instruction, and announced loudly, and explained to the large assembly in an oratorical manner, what the teacher had just expressed briefly and in a low voice. While the lecturer generally pronounced his sentences in the academic language, which was chiefly Hebrew, the Amora gave his explanations in Aramaic, the popular idiom (see Rashi on Yoma, 20b).

Mielziner’s definition must be viewed in line with what M.S. Jaffee has to say about the teaching method employed by Amoraim. He notes (2001: 152) that the crucial and distinctive contribution of the Amoraim was ‘to link the idea of
Torah in the Mouth firmly to the pedagogical reality of discipleship training’. In his analysis, Torah learning was inextricably linked to dialogue with the learned sage, who was the principal pedagogical mediator. Safrai similarly connects the redaction of Oral Torah to the teaching event. Accordingly, the editing of texts took place during instructions and discussions between learned sages and their students, or learned sages and the public (Safrai 1987: 71). When Mielziner’s, Jaffee’s and Safrai’s observations are set off against Stemberger’s remarks on the role of the meturgeman, it becomes clear that one must differentiate between the lesser role of the Amora and the learned sage, in the time of Amoraim. Stemberger explains (1979: 105) that the teacher or lecturer would not speak directly to the listeners, but would give his interpretation to the meturgeman or Amora in a soft voice, while sitting. The meturgeman, in turn, would translate the teaching of the lecturer in a loud voice to the audience. The entire procedure constituted a gesture of respect for the teacher or lecturer. In the light of Stemberger’s explanation, I would surmise that the lecturer he refers to is the sage that Jaffee (2001: 152) has in mind. The Amora, on the other hand must have been a rabbi of lesser qualification than the teacher or learned sage, but one who was learned enough to translate the scholarly Hebrew, used by the learned sage, into Aramaic. The mere fact that the Mishnah was written almost entirely in Hebrew, is proof that Hebrew remained in use as the sacred language (lashon ha-kodesh) in rabbinic academies and continued to be employed for literary, liturgical, and legal purposes. It was the language of the learned, though Aramaic was spoken on the streets.

A case in point of this practice is noted in Genesis Rabbah 84: 6 מורה דר' יוחנן the speaker of Rabban Yochanan translated (into Aramaic) before him (quoted and translated in Sokoloff 2002: 62). The speaker in this context is most probably the Amora or אמור (‘Amor) …who tells the audience what the
A lecturer said in a low voice (see Sokoloff 2002: 62). From talmudic literature it appears that some interpreters were linked to specific academies. For example, R. Chutzpit is named as the interpreter at the academy of Rabban Gamaliel II (BT Berachoth 27b-28a). On that specific occasion, ‘Chutzpit’ is said to be the *turgeman* (‘interpreter’), whom students ordered to stop relaying the speech of the Head of the Yeshivah, Rabban Gamaliel:

Rabban Gamaliel remained sitting and lecturing, while Rabbi Yoshua remained standing[^124], until everyone began to shout at Chutzpit, the *turgeman* [who was repeating aloud Rabban Gamaliel’s words]: ‘Stop!’ And he stopped.

According to Norman Marsden, it was customary for students to command the interpreter to stand up if they wanted the head of the Yeshiva[^125] to stop speaking. Further, prominent rabbis, like Rabban Gamaliel, appear to have had their own interpreters (1980[1]: 60).

### 2.5.3.3 Liturgical and scholarly Targums

A number of researchers have made it quite clear that extant Targums are not vernacular translations, but rather the result of the work of scholars[^126]. Johann Maier ascribes their scholarly nature to the fact that they were ‘Gegenstand des Interesses in Bêt Midrash der Gelehrten’ (1972: 129). To be sure, in spite of the distinction, which has been noted between liturgical Targums and scholarly Targums, scholars concur that extant Targums are the result of scholarly activity. What differentiates them is first of all their dialect, but further and no

[^124]: Schiffman explains (1998: 476) that Rabbi Yoshua remained standing out of respect for the patriarch, Rabban Gamaliel. He was not given permission by Rabban Gamaliel to sit in order to humiliate him in public, because he had dared to differ from him regarding the status of a first-born animal belonging to Rabbi Zaddok.

[^125]: The head of each academy was a *Rosh Yeshiva* (Talmud, Berakoth 64) (cf. Cohn-Sherbok 1997: 72).

less important, the way they are rendered. The dialect is definitive of their *Sitz-im-Leben* in so far as it indicates for which audience a Targum was compiled. For example, the dialect used for TO is the same dialect that appears in the Bar Kokhba letters. It is known as Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) or Standard Literary Aramaic and is believed to be based on the hypothetical Proto-O. According to Flesher’s theory Proto-O was compiled in JLA, which is a form of Middle Aramaic (2001: 12). The popular Palestinian Targums, on the other hand, are written in Jewish Targumic Aramaic (JTA), which is the dialect that was used in Palestinian Synagogues. It is in turn, related to other forms of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA), but it has distinct differences. These have already been pointed out by Flesher (1999: 66-67).

If we take into account that the process of editing texts ensued over several generations, then we can also explain why the *focus* and *contextual use* for extant Targums (either *beth knesset* or *beth midrash* in Palestine or Babylon) differed. My assumption is that each version was compiled in a particular dialect, where the features and emphasis of its translation depended on whether scholars sought to teach the populace in the Synagogue, or students in the house of study. Arguments that can be adduced in favour of my theory are I. Elbogen’s (1993: 152), E.Y. Kutscher’s (in Flesher 2001: 5) and G. Stemberger’s (1977: 82) hypotheses. Kutscher’s premise is that TO has elements of both Eastern and Western dialects, because it was composed in two stages. In his analysis, TO first appeared in Judea as Proto-O and later, in Babylonia where it was recast into the version known as TO (in Flesher 2001: 5). Elbogen’s theory, on the other hand, is that TO was composed at the time of the first establishment of the amoraic academies in Babylonia (ca. 250), but it could only be used in an academic context because it was composed in a literary dialect. Hence, it was of no use to the populace, because they did not understand
it any better than the Hebrew Text (1993: 153). Stemberger’s argues that Babylonian scholars consistently revised TO’s Halakhah in line with the contemporary rabbinic thought so that its rendition would fit the official Hebrew Text (1977: 82). What can be gleaned from the three hypotheses is that TO underwent dialectical as well as halakhic changes from the time when it appeared in Palestine to the time that it became the official Targum in Babylonia. It may be assumed from this general analysis of TO that its features and translation changed in conjunction with the purpose for which it was used at earlier and later stages in the post-Destruction period. Furthermore, it is clear that its literary character and halakhic nature contributed to the fact that it was not widely used in Palestinian Synagogues. These conjectures, in turn, rest on an interpretation of the function that the hypothetically scholarly Targum, Proto-O, played in the Second Temple period and how it impacted the compilation of TO. Further, they are linked to the theory, that a standardized Targum (N) was compiled for the Synagogue in the aftermath of the Destruction. Third, they require us to ask the question, whether Targums were used in rabbinic academies for the purpose of study. These three aspects receive attention in the following.

2.5.4 The function of Proto-O
Flesher argues persuasively that Jerusalem provided the home for the educational support structure of Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) prior to 70 C.E. (2001: 13). From inscriptions and Qumran Aramaic documents, as well as the Bar Kokhba letters, it is evident that this literary dialect was widely used. Flesher maintains that priests sustained the dialect, when they compiled Proto-O (2001: 14-21). The question in that connection is, for what purpose would priests use a Targum and why would they compose it in JLA? The most logical

\[127\] Therefore, the need for a compilation of a popular nature, Neofiti 1.
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Conclusion would be that such a Targum was used in the context of their instruction. Although we have no direct evidence that points to the use of Targum in the context of Temple instruction, researchers have made mention of some aspects, which indicate that a Targum in JLA might have existed for the purpose of study during the Second Temple period. The most likely context for such learning would have been the Temple. In this respect, I have previously (in 2.5.3.1) already referred to Edersheim, who notes that priests, in general, had to undergo a course of instruction, and were examined before being allowed to officiate. They were, furthermore, subject to the ordinary tribunals, which consisted of men learned in the law, without regard to their descent from one or another tribe (1994: 64). Edersheim is not the only one, who refers to the instruction of priests in connection with judicial matters. W. Smith similarly notes that priests were also involved in judicial and teaching functions (1893: 920). Coming from this perspective, it can be assumed that priests, who laboured under tribunals, would have had to receive training in the use of the language that was used for official documentation during the Second Temple period. As pointed out above, we know from inscriptions and Qumran Aramaic documents, as well as the Bar Kokhba letters, that JLA was the dialect, which was used in official documents. There is thus a strong possibility that JLA was taught in the Temple context, where a priestly Targum in this dialect could have been used for the instruction of priests in matters of jurisdiction. In this light, Flesher’s theory is reasonable that learned priests would have carried with them Proto-O after the Destruction (2001: 21). While the spoken Aramaic dialect of Jewish Galilee, namely JPA, retained its position as dominant dialect after 135 C.E., knowledge of JLA was preserved, initially, through the memorization of Proto-O by learned priests, and later in the revised and written edition of TO (cf. Flesher 2001: 23-24).
2.5.5 A proposed theory of standardized liturgical Targums

As argued earlier on, after the Destruction, the populace needed reassurance. During the Second Temple period, the priestly order was divided between contending sects (Smith 1893: 924). Of the learned priests some, like R. Yochanan ben Zakkai\(^{128}\), were part of the scribal profession in Jerusalem. Priests, who functioned as high priests, can mainly be identified with the Sadducees.\(^{129}\) Others were associated with the pharisaic sect, one of whom appears to have been R. Yochanan ben Zakkai. Because he took on a neutral stand in the uprising, he received preferential treatment from the Romans. On the whole, the neutral political stand of pharisaic sages contributed chiefly to their diminished popularity among the ‘am ha-‘aretz in the aftermath of the Destruction. Although, they appear to have enjoyed only limited success already in pre-70 C.E. according to Seán Freyne’s detailed study on Galilean Pharisaism (1980: 305-43). This state of affairs played into the hands of some of the more powerful, learned priests, who had formerly been members of the sect of the Sadducees: For a short period of time, they could increase their influence among the populace in the Synagogues post-70 C.E. Many priests, on the other hand, had lost their genealogies with the destruction of Jerusalem and were thus deprived of their occupation. This fateful situation made it possible for the learned, powerful members of the priesthood to have full play against the greater number of poor and ignorant ones, who were scattered throughout Palestine. As a result, an antagonistic relationship developed between the different groupings among the priesthood. This means that the learned priests, who had gained influence in the Synagogues, used their weight to try and introduce the fixed, traditional and authoritative version of the so-called Proto-O into the Synagogue service (cf. Flesher 2001: 27). But, because of its literary

---

\(^{128}\) Seán Freyne (1980: 323) attributes Yochanan’s active propagation of the ‘new’ religion to his background as a Jerusalem scribe.

\(^{129}\) For a discussion on Pharisees and Sadducees see Kohler (n.d. ‘Pharisees’ and ‘Sadducees’); cf. also Smith (1893: 924).
nature, it was not well accepted by the populace. In the long run, priests could not maintain their authoritative standing among the populace due to the overall corruption of the priesthood and the disunity in their ranks. The combined circumstances of priestly disunity and rising power of the *nasi* eventually led to the fall of the priesthood and the increase of the rabbinic authority (cf. Smith 1893: 924-25).

The emerging leadership of rabbis, into which many powerful priests were being absorbed, recognized the need for a standardized targumic rendition in a dialect that was known to the wider population of Jewish Galilee. It is possible that, initially, several fragmented versions emerged from the academies where rabbis had discussed and advanced Oral Torah. Of these, presumably all were based on the prestigious Proto-O, although the Fragment Targums show that the dialect, which was used for their compilation, namely JTA, was similar to the popular spoken dialect of Galilee, that is JPA (cf. Flesher 2001: 28). This means, that rabbis were aware of the need for a popular targumic rendition in the Synagogue and were reworking Proto-O into what would eventually become an acceptable standardized popular Targum.\(^\text{130}\)

In due course, during the amoraic period, a standardized version of the Palestinian Targum, known as Targum *Neofiti I* (N) was successfully compiled in the context of the academy.\(^\text{131}\) From the many parallels that exist between N and the homiletic Midrashim in Genesis Rabbah, it becomes apparent that N’s

\(^{130}\) Flesher believes that these fragmented versions (referred to as Proto-PT) had an educational character, whose primary focus was on the aspect of doing Torah and practicing the commandments (2001: 29).

\(^{131}\) Etan Levine holds that only the official Targums, *Onelos* and *Jonathan* are products of a redaction of a previous version, the other Targums by and large reflect Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition (1988: 39-40). But this is an oversimplification. In the light of the historical circumstances that surround the evolvement of liturgical Targums, as shown in this chapter, it is more than likely that all extant Targums were the products of redactional processes.
style afforded itself favourably to the context of the Synagogue service. The parallel texts, which Grossfeld (2000) lists, clearly demonstrate the close connection that exists between rabbinic stock phrases and targumic renderings in N (cf. also Golomb 1985: 225-27). Rabbinic stock phrases are also present in homiletic Midrashim, which frequently contain in explicit expanded form the Midrash to which the Targum only alludes (cf. Levine 1988: 10). Genesis Rabbah specifically, presents a collection of homiletic Midrashim, whose traditions are believed to have been associated with the delivery of early Synagogue sermons or proems. The presence of idiomatic or ‘stereotypical’ literary forms in liturgical Targums is indicative of the twofold purpose they fulfilled in the Synagogue service, that is, to create defining criteria for the homiletic exercise and also to attract the audience’s attention to specific rabbinic interpretations of the weekly pericope.

2.5.6 The case for academic Targums
There is evidence that not all Targums were compiled for the Synagogue service. The point in argument for this is that not all Targums show parallels to homiletic Midrashim. My assumption is that there were Targums, which were compiled for use in a context other than the Synagogue. Passing by an exact

---


133 Cf. Joseph Heinemann (1971: 100-122). See also D. Moshe (1972: 399-401) and Golomb (1985: 226). In another more recent study by Golomb (1998: 3-25), he discusses and identifies a very plausible methodological approach to “unpack” Targumic texts’ (p. 25). This approach could be tested against homiletic Midrashim.

134 Franz Bäuml (in Jaffee 2001: 5-6) discusses this term in the context of orally transmitted traditions. He notes that stereotypical formulations are devices with a mechanical and referential function, “…they are essential mechanisms for the composition and simultaneous performance of the text, as well as for its reception and retention. They are also culturally essential references to the tradition they formulate and transmit.”

analysis of my hypothesis at this point of my thesis (see Chapter 7 for a more detailed discussion), I will here only sketch my premiss.

Schiffman’s reference (1991: 184-87) to two forms of study, *Mishnah* and *Midrash* provides reason to believe that the aspect of learning in rabbinic academies involved a more complex process than has been previously assumed. Flesher and Mortensen made a point in this, when they allocated the compilation of PJ to priestly activity. However, the picture does not agree with other aspects of the age of formative Judaism, specifically that of evolving rabbis. Flesher is certainly correct in his argument that much of PJ focuses on priestly matters (2001: 33). But this emphasis does not necessarily imply that priests were the sole authors of the expansions and new material that became part of Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan*. As argued in sections 2.4.3 and 2.5.4 of this Chapter, they indeed were part of the post-Destruction academies, but as ‘rabbis’, who no longer stood apart as a separate entity from the rest of the Torah scholars.

The rigid differentiation that rabbis in the post-Destruction period sought to maintain between Scripture and exegesis constituted the motivational impetus for targumic rendering. Just as the Mishnah was composed in a language that was distinctly different from the language of Scripture, so Targums were used to differentiate between Scripture and its interpretation in the context of exegetical studies and jurisdiction. The purpose of different dialects for different texts was, in my assessment, for two reasons: (i) to make a distinction between exegetical activity / the derived law and the authority of Scripture (ii) to maintain the officiating power of the *beth din*, which represented the authority of the former Second Temple Sanhedrin for Jews in Palestine after the Destruction. The underlying incentive for rabbis was that all exegetical
exercises had to avoid imitation of the document, which was to be interpreted and explained.\footnote{Cf. Neusner (1988: 41).}

### 2.6 Summative: The Relation between Targums and Rabbinic Academies

In this Chapter, I showed that the standard scholarly perception, namely that rabbis constituted an integrated group of priests and sages, fits the picture of formative Judaism better than the hypothesis that priests and rabbis continued to exist as distinct groups as during the Second Temple period.

I showed this by explaining, how the merger came as a direct result of the confusion and instability experienced by the Jewish people, when they lost their Temple. A leading figure in this process was argued to have been R. Yochanan ben Zakkai. I base my argument on the fact that he held a twofold authoritative position, both as priestly av-beth-din and student of the renowned Hillel during the Second Temple period. This background empowered him with the foresight and courage to establish a new learning centre in Yabneh after the Destruction. From the manner in which he conducted the reforms in Yabneh, it appears that he acted unconventionally, that is, he did not seek to establish a new authoritative basis for the priesthood outside of the Temple context. Rather, in the face of loosing his approval among the priests, he placed previous Temple rites into a new context of Judaism without a Temple. In my assessment, it is this courageous stance on the part of R. Yochanan, which ultimately led to the cessation of priestly elitist activities and to the evolvement and formation of a new group of religious leaders, the ordained rabbis, which were made up, primarily, of priestly sages and pharisaic sages. In my investigation, I showed
that pharisaic sages influenced the expression of Jewish faith in the aftermath of the Destruction, most notably. This development was shown to the result of the rising power of the *nesi’im* under Rabban Gamaliel II, whose father had been the leader of the Pharisees before 70 C.E. and who also was a relative of the esteemed Hillel. R. Gamaliel’s prestige eventually surpassed the influence of the aged R. Yochanan. Under Gamaliel’s strong leadership the pluralistic tolerance, which Judaism had experienced during the Second Temple period was completely stifled, and normative Judaism began to take shape.

The integrated group of priestly scholars and pharisaic sages became consecutively known as Tannaim and Amoraim. These consecutive groups thoroughly impacted and characterized rabbinic learning in the age of formative Judaism. Many of the priests that became part of rabbinic academies in the aftermath of the Destruction had already previously been associated with pharisaic learning during the Second Temple period, although not all of them. There is no doubt that these priest sages heavily influenced rabbinic learning in the age of formative Judaism. What we, however, do not know, is whether they contributed source material solely from memory or whether they brought with them written compilations from the former Temple schools. Notwithstanding, their contribution in the compilation and redaction of Pentateuch Targums, has been effectively demonstrated through a number of past research projects that were conducted on extant Targums.

In this multifaceted framework of research, I also discussed the relationship between the evolvement of oral and written Targums. I argued that extant Targums can be related to targumic activity, which took place in the Second Temple period. By contrast however, extant Targum traditions reflect the input of scholars. The context in which these scholars were active was argued to have been the rabbinic academies, which evolved in the aftermath of the Destruction.
At this stage of my thesis, it appears that extant Targum traditions evolved over different periods in the age of formative Judaism. Nonetheless, in my analysis, the diverse foci of these Targums do not suggest that two distinct bodies of scholars (viz. priests or rabbis) worked on them, as suggested by Flesher (2001) and Mortensen (1999). The basis for my objection to such hypotheses is that the former distinct bodies of priests and sages integrated into a new Jewish leadership group, wherein individuals came to hold the honorific title of rabbi through the practice of Semichah (ordination). From this premise, I draw the conclusion that targumic activity did not take place in isolation from other learning activities in rabbinic academies, but rather in correspondence with the compilation of Midrashim and other exegetical compendiums.

Concerning the hypothesis of the reworking of Proto-O (Proto-Onqelos) into TO (Targum Onqelos) and N (Neofiti 1), my proposition is that this activity took place during the act of teaching and in discussions of rabbis with students in the house of study (beth midrash). As a result, the specific character and dialect of a targumic rendition was determined by the purpose which is served, either popular or learned. In my analysis, fragmented Targums are forerunners of the standardized edition N, which rabbis compiled for the beth knesset, while TO continued to be used for purposes of Halakhah in the beth din, similar to the use of the hypothetical Targum, Proto-O, in the Second Temple period. Researchers agree that the Sitz-im-Leben of N was the Synagogue. However, concerning the composition and development of TO, there are still some debatable concerns. I will address the composition of FragTarg and N in Chapter 5, and the case of TO in Chapter 6. The compilation of PJ is a more complex matter. I have reason to believe that it had a specific function in the beth midrash, but I will argue this point in Chapter 7.

For Targum research, the implication of my research in Chapters 2 to 4 is that Targums should not be studied in isolation of such Midrashim that derive from
the period of formative Judaism. Future research approaches should thus, ideally, compare and investigate targumic passages with midrashic sayings in terms of exegetical approaches (tannaitic or amoraic / halakhic or haggadic etc.), conceptual and linguistic aspects. I will implement this comparative research approach in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.
The interpretation of צלם image and דמות likeness in Genesis 1: 26-27\(^1\) by Jewish sages of the post-Destruction period is undoubtedly narrowly linked to the idea of God’s Unity and Uniqueness, which is the concept of monotheism. This concept is expressed in Judaism’s principal creed. The main source of Judaism’s creed of the existence of God as an invisible power, who created the universe, is the Hebrew Scriptures. We find an early and explicit injunction to the belief in one God in Deuteronomy 6: 4-9, which states, *Hear O Israel: the LORD our God, the LORD is One* (NIV). The verse was recited in relation to the evening and morning offering times in the temple.\(^2\) The Second Commandment in Exodus 20: 3-4 establishes this belief by forbidding all kinds of idolatry (Friedlander 1937: 250):

\[
לא יהיה־לך אלהים אחרים על־פני׃
לא תעשה־לך פסל וכל־תמונה אשׁר בשׁמים ממעל ואשׁר בעבר ואשׁר במים מתחת לארץ׃
\]

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the form of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.\(^3\)

The two Hebrew terms פסל graven image and תמונה form that are used in this prohibition, parallel each other just as the terms צלם image and דמות likeness in Genesis 1: 26; see the table below:

---
\(^1\) See 1.1 for the complete text.  
\(^3\) Friedlander’s translation (1937: 249).
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| graven image | The Hebrew root is פסל and denotes ‘to hew into shape’. The masculine noun פסל is used in reference to a man-made idol or image hewn out of wood, stone or metal (BDB 1966: 820). |
| form | The feminine noun תְמוּנָה is derived from the masculine noun פסל, which denotes a kind or species of something; the masculine noun is usually used in connection with animals. In Scripture, תְמוּנָה appears parallel to פסֶל (BDB 1966: 568). |
| image | The masculine noun צֶלֶם, when used together with בessentiae expresses the figurative sense of something in terms of its essential or vital being (cf. BDB 1966: 854). |
| likeness | The root of the feminine noun דְמוּת is דמה, the Piel use of which is frequent in comparisons or similitudes (parables, symbols, etc.). It is also used in the Piel to express imagine, form an idea, devise. In Scripture, its derived noun דְמוּת is chiefly used to relate to the live appearance or pattern of something, e.g. in Ezekiel. It also parallels the masculine noun צֶלֶם (cf. BDB 1966: 198). |

From the above table it can be seen that there is a notable connection between the two parallel uses of פסֶל graven image and תְמוּנָה form in Exodus 20: 3 and צֶלֶם image and דְמוּת likeness in Genesis 1: 26. In both instances a

---

4 For other options cf. Koehler and Baumgartner (1958: 519).
masculine noun form is paralleled by a feminine noun form, which chiefly appears to relate to the live expression⁵ of its masculine counterpart. The differences between the two parallel units, in Exodus 20: 3 and Genesis 1: 26 respectively, are of a qualitative nature. On the other hand, תְּמוּנָה (in connection with the noun מין from which it derives) refers to a kind or species of something, usually an animal. In its parallel position to סֶלפֶּ, it fulfills the function of exemplifying what the man-made idol or image stands for in real life. Similarly, דְּמוּת fulfils the function of paralleling the live appearance or pattern of the essential being for which צֶלֶם stands.

Whether, or not, rabbis detected the noted parallels between Exodus 20: 3 and Genesis 1: 26 remains to be seen (see chapter 3). What is, however, of significance at this point is the fact that they linked the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 to the exposition of Exodus 20: 3-4. At all events, the Jewish scholar, Umberto Cassuto (1978: 56) argues that the meaning of צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת changed with the course of time:

The original significance of this expression in the Canaanite tongue was, judging by Babylonian usage, corporeal, in accordance with the anthropomorphic East. Nevertheless, when we use it in modern Hebrew, and say, for instance, ‘all that has been created in the divine image’, we certainly do not associate any material idea with it, but give it a purely spiritual connotation, to wit, that man, although he resembles the creatures in his physical structure, approaches God in his thought and his conscience. It is clear, therefore, that the meaning of the phrase⁶ changed

---

⁵ See the table, where מין denotes a kind or species of something; the masculine noun is usually used in connection with animals and דְּמוּת which, in Scripture, is chiefly used to relate to the live appearance or pattern of something.

⁶ Cassuto is referring to בצלמנו כדמותנו in Genesis 1: 26 here.
in the course of time; it was corporeal to begin with but subsequently became spiritual.

With regard to the context of formative Judaism, Cassuto’s argument certainly holds true; rabbinic literature testifies to the fact that sages of the Second Temple and post-Destruction periods had a supramythological and supranatural notion of the deity (Urbach 1979: 37; cf. also Neusner 2002: 167ff.). Furthermore, judging from the use and meaning of הפסל graven image and תמונה form in Exodus 20: 3, it could be assumed that Exodus 20: 3 came about in reaction to the anthropomorphic or corporeal significance that was attached to the terms צלם image and דמות likeness in the Canaanite tongue. The point is that the idea of God, in non-Jewish cultures, continued to be associated with corporeal images in the context of polytheism. Pluralistic religious practices evidently led to a conflict with what was considered to be correct Yahwistic practice in Ancient Israel.

It may be assumed from Mark S. Smith’s investigation that such conflicts did not only arise as late as the second half of the monarchy, but appear to precede written data (2002: 18). The point in argument is that from its inception, Israel’s religion never, per se, supported the idea of an iconographic representation of God on earth. Its prevailing contention with iconography is apparent from its earliest narrative traditions. The root of monotheism, together with Israel’s hatred of images, is expressed in Israel’s cultural development in a number of ways.

First, the Hebrew Scriptures repeatedly set forth the strict proscription against graven imagery; beginning with the second commandment in Exodus
20: 3-5, is the suggestion that iconography was so contentious in ancient Israel that it was addressed in the harshest terms\(^7\). As further evidence for an early contention with graven imagery in ancient Israel is Thomas Cranmer’s deliberation (in Gutmann 1989: III, 7)\(^8\) that the first documented ‘iconoclastic controversy’ stems from the book of Deuteronomy. In his judgment ‘no other sacred ancient Near Eastern text is so concerned with images, high places, pillars, and their evil connotations as in Deuteronomy.’\(^9\) He adds that Deuteronomy remains a major source of the biblical period for the study of iconoclasm (i.e., hatred of images). The entire nature of the development of Israel’s written evidence for iconoclasm indicates that the idea was already present in its oral traditions. At all events, there is no suggestion in the history of Israel that its embrace of polytheism was ever tolerated.

The most striking argument for Israel’s hatred of images is the early use of anthropomorphic terminology in the description of YHWH\(^10\). Already in the cult of YHWH, God’s form or image was understood to be spiritual or abstract. Anthropomorphisms had metaphoric connotation as opposed to the rigid form that was believed to enshrine the character or essence of deities as evidenced in extra-biblical cultures. Although YHWH’s presence and inherent characteristics were later associated symbolically with a number of different cult objects (for example, the Ark, the Tent and eventually

\(^7\) Further prohibitions and destruction of iconographic representations are expressed in Exodus 20: 4; 34: 13-17; Leviticus 26: 1; Isaiah 44: 9-20 and Hosea 8: 6.

\(^8\) ‘Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution.’

\(^9\) Cf. Deuteronomy 12: 3.

\(^10\) See Rainer Albertz’ detailed discussion (1994[1]: 49-66[2.23]) on Yahweh, the God of liberation, which supports the view that the ‘Yahweh cult had a certain innate aniconic
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Solomon’s Temple), the deity was never *per se* represented with human features in terms of a statue. Also, only certain aspects of its *implicit* being were portrayed symbolically. Moreover, the Ark was the only recognized and officially consecrated symbol of holiness in Israel during Josia’s reign. It housed the לוחות הברית (*luchot ha-b’rit*), the two tablets of the Covenant that became symbols of divine revelation according to Deuteronomistic legislation (Cranmer in Gutmann 1989: III, 12-13). The picture agrees well with Israel’s religious law, which spelt out, that idols had to be destroyed.\textsuperscript{11} Further, whenever YHWH’s ‘presence’ took on the proportions of an iconographic representation in the capacity of a concrete substitute for the unseen deity, Israel was accused of idolatry. Specific examples of this practice are as follows:

(i) The golden calf is a particular instance where an iconographical representation of YHWH is strongly condemned in the biblical context (Exod. 32: 4-12 and 20). The subsequent burning and pulverization of the idol, is an act whereby its transitory nature and frailty were exhibited, as opposed to the invisible YHWH whose omnipotence was portrayed equally through the forces of nature and his faithful servants.

\textsuperscript{11} References in Scripture to idols that were to be destroyed: Exodus 23: 24; 34: 13; Numbers 33: 52; Deuteronomy 7: 5; 7: 25-26: 12: 1-4; Judges 2: 2; Jeremia 50: 2; destroyed by Jacob in Genesis 35: 2-4; Moses in Exodus 32: 19; 32: 20; Gideon in Judges 6: 28-32; David in 2Sa 5: 21, 1Chronicles 14: 12; Jehu in 2Kings 10: 26-28; Jehoiada in 2Kings 11: 18; Hezekiah in 2Ki 18: 3-6; Josiah in 2Kings 23: 4-20; Asa in 2Chronicles 14: 3-5, 2Chronicles 15: 8-16; Jehoshaphat in 2Chronicles 17: 6, 2Chronicles 19: 3; Jews in 2Chronicles 30: 14; Manasseh in 2Chronicles 33: 15.
(ii) The brazen serpent, on the other hand, was initially intended as a symbol whereby Israel might be reminded of its God. However, Israel ultimately treated it as a divine object and worshipped its icon. As a result, Hezekiah reduced it to scrap metal (2 Kgs 18: 4).

(iii) Gideon’s ephod, which was intended to remind the Israelites of YHWH’s presence in their midst, is similarly mentioned in the context of idolatry (Judg. 8: 27). Even more striking is the fact that archaeological finds of pottery and ceramics of Israel’s monarchical period show a marked lack of artistic skills in the fashioning of images (Gutmann 1989: II, 165). This phenomenon could explain why Solomon is said to have imported the skills of a non-Israelite, Hiram of Tyre, to fashion different sorts of work with copper for the Temple (1 Kings 7: 13ff.). If Israel’s law had not so stringently prohibited the fashioning of icons and visual imagery, its artistic skills would most certainly, at that point of its history, have developed to a similar degree as that of its Canaanite neighbours.\(^\text{12}\)

The point in argument is that the development of Israel’s literary skills is a direct consequence of the prohibition against iconography. The medium of writing literally took the place of iconography. It became Israel’s vehicle for

\(^{12}\) Gutmann (1989: II, 161-74) confirms this marked lack of artistic skills. Furthermore, an interesting quotation by Bernard Berenson (“Jüdische Kunst”, in Rübenach 1981:169), an art-critic, adds to the probability that Israel’s artistic skills were limited as a result of the prohibition against iconographic representation, ‘…die Juden wie ihre ismaelitischen Vettern, die Araber, und vielleicht wie alle echten Semiten (wenn es solche gibt) geringes Talent für die Malerei und fast gar keins für die Bildhauerei gezeigt haben … Den Juden eignete Leuchtkraft und Entzückung des Wortes’.
the propagation of its religious convictions. Over against the advance in Israel’s literary skills, its pictorial or visual art remained stunted. In J. Gutmann’s analysis, it exhibits ‘crudeness’ (1989: II, 165). The elimination of images together with the disposing of the idea in Israel that God can be represented in the form of an icon, led to the growth of its literary art, so much so that Israel can now lay claim to the title of people of the book (cf. Demsky in Mulder and Sysling 1988: 19).

On the other hand, a point in argument against Israel’s active opposition of setting up iconographic objects of veneration is the relatively late reference in Scripture to the prohibition of images - in the book of Exodus. But the argument is not feasible for reason that Israel, in the early stages of its history, was still faced with the active elimination of idols as opposed to the later prohibition against idol worship (e.g. Judg. 6: 25-28). The prohibition took the whole idea of iconoclasm a step further than the initial mere elimination of idols, by resisting the evil at its root.

In sum, ancient Israel’s contention with iconography must be viewed in line with its struggle against assimilation. Throughout its history, Israel’s singular status among the heathen nations surrounding it became manifest from its ongoing struggle against the pluralistic religious practices of its neighbours. A similar situation can be detected from Judaism’s formative

---

15 Although Mark S. Smith (2002: 25) challenges the notion of Israel’s religious distinctiveness on the grounds of a common terminology for cultic sacrifices and personnel, he nevertheless admits that ‘some Israelite features are unattested in Canaanite sources.’
age, where sages consistently opposed Gnostic, Christian and Hellenist teachings, which corroborate with notions of polytheistic elements.¹⁶

As will be shown in Chapter 4, the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 became for sages a constant source of contention with Gnostics and Christians inasmuch, for Israelite prophets, it was the struggle against polytheist beliefs and practices. Israel’s continuing struggle against polytheism persisted throughout the Second Temple period and is evident also in the philosophical expression surrounding the idea of a supramythological and supranatural deity, which sages developed as they increasingly had to contend with heretic views in confrontation with the evolvement and establishment of Christianity from the third and fourth century onwards (see Chapter 4).

¹⁶ For examples see Kister (2006); Neusner (1985b: 45) and Urbach (1979: 19-36).
A MIDRASHIC FRAMEWORK FOR TARGUMIC RENDERS OF GENESIS 1: 26-27

The purpose of this Chapter is to show how tannaitic and amoraic sages1 of the post-Temple period interpreted Genesis 1: 26-27 in exegetical sources other than the Pentateuchal Targums. The inclusion of this aspect in this thesis is significant for reason that presumably, many sages, who were involved in bringing about targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27, also contributed to other exegeses on these verses, which are found in midrashic compilations dating from the age of formative Judaism. In other words, the targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 did not arise in a vacuum. They must be viewed as the product and outcome of extensive discussions and redactional activity that took place in post-Temple academies in Palestine.2

In my assessment, rabbis did not work in isolation from each other, but were part of a larger group of learned scholars that interacted with each other in Palestine during the age of formative Judaism.3 For targumic

1 By sages are meant the religious scholars of Judaism during the Second Temple period and the first six centuries C.E.
2 Hamburger (1892: 676) makes a distinction between the Synagogue and what he refers to as ‘Lehrhaus’. Accordingly, the latter was referred to either as ‘Haus der Versammlung’ (Avot I: 4), ‘Haus der Gesetzesforschung’ (many instances) or ‘das Haus der Rabbiner’ (Megilla 28a). In the Temple, where the Sanhedrin sat the was also the place of learning and prayer. See also M.S. Jaffee’s plausible argument on the topic of Torah in the Mouth in Galilean Discipleship Communities (2001: 126-52).
3 See Neusner’s discussion on The Consensus of Sages and Resolving Disputes (1983: 132-37). He further notes (1986: 69-70): ‘The sources constitute a collective, and therefore official, literature. All of the documents took shape and attained a place in the canon of the rabbinical movement as a whole. None was written by an individual in such a way as to testify to personal choice or decision… The collections by
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compilation, the implication of this view is that rendering did not take place in isolation of other exegetical sources but rather in comparison and differentiation with them. From my own comparison between Targums and midrashic compilations, I have come to the same conclusion as H.L. Strack and G. Stemberger, who note (1982: 226):

Mit Le Déaut 411 ist anzunehmen, daß viele Elemente vom Targum in den Midrash kamen und umgekehrt, also keine selbstständige Geschichte der beiden literarischen Gattungen anzunehmen ist… Die Verwandschaft der beiden Gattungen ergibt sich auch aus dem gemeinsamen Sitz im Leben, der für beide in Schule sowie Synagogenliturgie zu sehen ist.

Neusner comes to a similar conclusion. In his assessment, the redactional approach of rabbis in the age of formative Judaism must be seen in the context of their organizing isolated remarks on individual verses of Scripture into units of discourse according to the large-scale purpose, which they had in mind for a particular document that was being compiled and redacted (1986: 89). In other words, it can be safely assumed that sayings and statements were not just randomly collected and put together. Rather, official documents of the canon of the rabbinical movement were arranged, compiled and redacted with different purposes in mind. The character and style of a document thus provides evidence for the purpose that its redactors had in mind at the time of its compilation.4

The rabbinic method of systematic differentiation can, in particular, be observed from a comparison between Targums and Midrashim. The definition were composed under the auspices of rabbinical authority—a school or a circle… The compositions reach us because the larger rabbinical estate chose to copy and hand them on.’ The same notion is held by Jaffee (2001), namely that the rabbis lived and taught in a setting that was largely ‘oral’.
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function of Targums was essentially, to provide an authorized interpretive rendering of the Hebrew Scriptures. Targums were not random collections of stories, homilies and translations, nor did they follow the close reading of the Mishnah (cf. Golomb 1985: 8). Rather, they closely follow the text and verse division of the Hebrew Scriptures. Their purpose was to differentiate an exegetical / periphrastic reading of Scripture from the Hebrew Text itself. This is significant in view of the fact that paper was not yet freely available and therefore not everyone in the academy or school had a copy of the Hebrew Text that was under discussion. Had the periphrastic recitation of Scripture not been set off against the Hebrew Text in terms of rendering it in Aramaic, the danger would have been great for the line of division between text and exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures to become indistinct, at least at the level of the hearer. The effort by rabbis to give prominence to the Hebrew Text against an interpretation of it is also evident from the Hebrew dialect that is made use of in exegetical comments in the Midrashim, a dialect, which is dissimilar to biblical Hebrew in a number of ways. Midrashim are compiled in Mishnaic Hebrew (the Hebrew language as used from the second to the tenth century C.E.; also called Rabbinic Hebrew because it

---

5 A distinction between Biblical Hebrew (BH) and Mishnaic or Rabbinic Hebrew was only made when Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) began to be used only in the learned circles in the schools. MH was used exclusively for, statements of the formulated Halakhah, even in popular addresses; homiletical expressions of the Scriptures (e.g. in the Talmuds and the earlier Aggadic Midrashim); parables and prayer (cf. Segal 1958: 3-5). For a discussion of the differences between BH and MH and the similarities between MH and Aramaic see M. H. Segal (1958: 5-15).

6 ‘Mishnaic Hebrew is a later form of the language, represented by the collection of rabbinical literature, the most prominent of which is the Mishnah, a collection of Hebrew treatises on Jewish law, written in the 1st century AD’ (© 2008 University of Cambridge Language Centre. Available from http://www.langcen.cam.ac.uk/resources/hebrew/hebrew.php. Accessed 14/01/08). In Neusner’s words the Mishnah ‘ignored the style of biblical Hebrew, speaking in a quite different kind of Hebrew altogether’ (1983: 8). It was used in the period from about 400-300 B.C.E. to about 400 C.E. (Segal 1958: B).
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was spoken by rabbis in their learning environment). The use of different dialects in the context of the rabbinic academy, made it possible for teachers and students of the Torah to distinguish between an exegetical/ periphrastic reading of Scripture (in Aramaic), a miderashic interpretation of it (in Mishnaic Hebrew)\(^7\) and the actual Hebrew Text of Scripture (in Biblical Hebrew) in an oral setting, where the availability of written documentation was still limited.

In comparing Targum and Midrashim, it is not unusual for a Midrash on a verse in Scripture to include several interpretations and even opposing views of sages. By contrast, the targumic rendering of a bible verse only presents one view. In other words, targumic renderings tend to reflect a particular exegetical stance. In instances where such renderings are part of a standardized recension, the Targum undoubtedly reflects the majority ruling that sages have decided upon.

When Targum is therefore not studied in isolation but rather in correspondence with other contemporary Jewish exegetical sources it should, presumably, be possible to assess and define, more accurately, the historic period from which a recension emerged and the particular purpose for which it was compiled – since we have more than one extant Pentateuchal Targum that was compiled during the age of formative

\(^7\) M.H. Segal points out, that Mishnaic Hebrew sayings were originally spoken in MH. In the mishnaic tradition it was held that a tradition which was handed down by word of mouth must be repeated in the exact words of the master from which it had been learnt: חַיּוּב אָדָם לְוָמָר בִּלְשׁוֹן רַבּוֹ. Throughout the mishnaic and talmudic periods this rule was strictly observed (cf. Ber. 47a and Bek. 5a). It was also the basis of the authority of the Oral law (1958: 19). Segal adds, ‘So careful were the Rabbis in the observance of this rule that they often reproduced even the mannerisms and the personal peculiarities of the Masters from whom they have received a peculiar tradition, or Halakah. This rule makes it certain that, at least in most cases, the sayings of the Rabbis have been handed down in the language in which they had originally been expressed’ (1958: 19).
Judaism. The type and amount of redactional information that can be gleaned from a particular Targum depends, largely, on the manner of rendering that typifies it. In other words, a literal rendering of Scripture is likely to provide less redactional clues than a periphrastic rendering.

Not only do the Targums and Midrashim differ in the way they are compiled, but rabbis also made a distinction between halakhic, haggadic and homiletic midrashic activity, although this is seldom explicitly stated via the title of a Midrash compilation. Nonetheless, modern scholarship has come to the conclusion that extant midrashic collections were compiled and redacted by rabbis of the age of formative Judaism in accordance with different modes of midrashic exegesis, and largely, it appears, in correspondence with the time from which the sayings derived (cf. Strack and Stemberger 1982: 239-87; Segal 1958: 19). In most instances there is, of course, the problem of an early core text and later additions (this is an inherent problem in the Targums as well). This means that, apart from the rabbinic names that occur in sayings –these can be misleading– one must also take cognizance of structural, stylistic and linguistic distinctions that can indicate whether a saying dates from earlier or later times. G. Stemberger, for example, points out that amoraic exegesis is not only based on, but also expands on tannaitic exegesis. He explains that Tannaim (teachers of the first two centuries C.E.) began to formulate traditional rabbinic sayings into structured precepts, which

---

8 Cf. R. Kasher’s use of midrashic literature to assist with the interpretation of targumic passages (1999: 53-77).
9 In P. Weimar’s view (in Maier 1973: 137) the Midrashim were originally only transmitted orally. He adds, ‘…und haben ihren Sitz im Leben entweder in der Predigtpraxis des Synagogengottesdienstes oder in the Erörterungen des Lehrhauses …die späteren umfangreichen und vielgestaltigen rabbinischen Midrashim sind typrische Sammelwerke.’
were subsequently developed by Amoraim (rabbis of the period 200-500 C.E.) in their dialectical discussions (1977: 68-69).

Overall, it appears that rabbinic scholars compiled Midrashim in correspondence of what they perceived were earlier and later exegetical comments. In the process, they not only differentiated between *Halakhah* and *expository Haggadah*, but also substantially and systematically (structure and style) between these comments. Broadly speaking, Tannaim tended to stick to the simple method of citing bible verses verbatim in order to explain Scripture, while Amoraim responded to tannaitic sayings by amplifying on them in parable, narrative setting, illustration or story through skilful use of rhetoric.

---

10 Cf. M. Steinschneider’s very insightful discussion of this aspect (1967: 28-46). On the development of Midrash and Haggadah-Midrash, he divides between General Haggadah and Special Haggadah. In the latter, he explains, the biblical exposition takes precedence and it also employs all the various elements of general Haggadah. He cautions that the original elements of the Haggadah, both oral and written, must be distinguished from the later collections and extracts (30), adding that all these developmental tendencies have points of connection with Halakhah, and come in as conflicting elements in the simple explanation of words, the Targumim (1967: 31).

11 M. Steinschneider (1967) defines this Midrash saying that it ‘is in some sense the old Jewish Exegesis and Homiletics, and aims at an explanation of the text, without excluding the tendencies and methods of the general Haggadah, or even those of Halakhah. On the contrary, it sometimes applies and makes use of them in constructing a whole, of which the text forms the centre. The works are collected from fragments, and in their complete form constitute a kind of commentary on particular books of Holy Scripture, and are named after them (51)... At the time of the redaction of the Mishna there were certain *Books of Haggadah* which were studied, although not without some fear of the misuse of free thought if it were allowed to become paramount; but these are known to us principally by fragments and quotations from existing works (52).’ Cf. also on the different types of Midrash, P. Weimar (in Maier 1973: 137-55). He differentiates between *exegetical Midrash* ‘ist eine fortlaufende, Vers für Vers vorhergehende Auslegung des Schrifttextes’ and *homiletical Midrash*, which interprets a single text and has the form of a synagogal sermon or *proem*. Over against these two types of Midrash, he adds, ‘kennt der *erzählende Midrash* diese Trennung zwischen Text und Kommentar nicht. Hier sind vielmehr beide Größen ineinander verschlungen.’

With the foresaid in mind, in my venture to differentiate between different layers of exegetical deposits in rabbinic exegeses, I intend to distinguish between two aspects, in particular. First, the dominant\(^{13}\) mode of Midrash used in a given passage – *halakhic* or *haggadic* (Neusner 1998: xvi; 1983: Preface).\(^{14}\) Second, whether a saying bears characteristics of tannaitic or amorica origin; this entails how is it structured and what its style is. In this endeavour, I am indebted to Jacob Neusner, who has contributed vastly towards unravelling the mindset of sages by differentiating between the historical approaches of Western researchers towards biblical texts and a socio-philosophic reading of Scripture by ancient Jewish exegetes. He demonstrates how sages thought philosophically about Scripture; they constructed a theology that coheres with Scripture, wherein persuasive argumentation and rhetoric play a decisive role. In his explanation of the theological system of rabbinic Judaism, he also discusses how sages understood the principles of correspondence and complementarity between God and man (2002: 166-80). Regrettably, he does not, per se, distinguish between texts that evolved from tannaitic and amorica periods respectively. According to his mishnaic model, sage literature is all part of a singular system sustaining a rabbinic theology that appears to be untouched by history and changing linguistic aspects. While the point he endeavours to make in this book comes across clearly – of the *enduring* theological system sustained in

\(^{13}\) It is pointed out by Steinschneider that the single as well as the collective Halakhah-Midrash also contained important portions of Haggadah, e.g. the old collections Sifri, Sifra, and Mekilta (1967: 31).

Oral Torah – the reality of life in post-Destruction Judaism was marked by a series of significant historical events which influenced and marked the way in which sages articulated their interpretation of Scripture.\textsuperscript{15} In other words, a number of factors influenced the way whereby sages articulated their views. For one, their theological convictions appear to stand in direct relation to historical circumstances and dialectical issues. This means that a Jewish theological formula or an interpretation of a biblical passage could in one period of history successfully serve one side of a polemic but in a later period and in another context become the springboard for an adversary’s attack or an insidious internal theological problem (cf. Kister 2006). Further, concomitant with the separation of Synagogue and Church\textsuperscript{16} sages, increasingly, were forced to deal with non-Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures, but which were in conflict with a Jewish theological understanding.\textsuperscript{17}

How Judaism took shape in the reaction to Christianity, in the fourth century under Constantine, as defined in Judaism’s documents of the late fourth and fifth centuries, is described and argued by Neusner (1986). He discovers a single interesting convergence: ‘each doctrine in Judaism responds to a point of contention with Christianity’ (1986: 11). With the development of a reactive theology in Judaism sages, not only, reviewed

\textsuperscript{15} Neusner is undoubtedly aware of these influences; see his comments on Anti-Gnostic Polemic (1985b: 45, Chapter 5).
\textsuperscript{17} However, rabbinic responses must be viewed as sporadic rather than regular. In response to Catherin Hezser’s cautioning that there is no rabbinic evidence that rabbis were well acquainted with particular philosophers and their doctrines (2000: 180), Azzan Yadin adds that rabbinic responses must be seen as ‘particular to the figures in question… the key issue is that philosophical content is mandated – or at least strongly suggested – by the rabbinic texts themselves’ (2006: 173-74).
the way in which many of Judaism’s theological convictions had been articulated before the triumph of Christianity\textsuperscript{18} from the fourth century onwards, but they also took cognizance of dialectical changes that were the result of rapidly changing cultural and learning environments in Palestine after the Destruction.

My intention in the following is, therefore, to compare rabbinic exegeses from tannaitic and amoraic sources in relation to their substance and structure, in order to ascertain how views that were in conflict with sages’ interpretation of Scripture caused them to refer to God in a certain way, at a specific time in history. Over against this comparison, I assume that the re-casting of exegetical sayings in targumic renderings will provide clues for redactional activities that reflect ‘the contrast between the sages’ system as revealed in writings closed in the later second and third century… and the system that emerged in the writings of the later fourth and fifth centuries’ (Neusner 1986: x). Essentially, I presume that the structure, style and substance of sage sayings in Targums could reflect midrashic elements from the period (tannaitic or amoraic) in which they were compiled and redacted in the age of formative Judaism. Once this assumption has been verified, corresponding historical data can be linked and compared with this information and so, I hope to arrive at a more comprehensive history of the redaction of Targums.

Such a research can perforce potentially cover an enormous scope of literature. However, on the basis of what I pointed out in Chapter two of my thesis –that the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 became for sages a

\textsuperscript{18} In his book, \textit{Judaism in the Matrix of Christianity}, Neusner argues that Judaism in the post-Destruction period developed in reaction against Christianity, ‘… things took the particular changes they did because of a critical challenge: the triumph of Christianity’ (1986: ix).
constant source of contention with heretic views inasmuch as iconoclasm had also been for Israel’s prophets the struggle against polytheism– I believe that the exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27, a passage that narrowly links to Judaism’s belief in one God, affords a fitting textual delimitation for my proposed investigation.

My process of investigation is as follows. I briefly deal with the development, prevalence and evolvement of the concept of God’s Unity and Uniqueness into Judaism’s principle creed (4.1). Thereafter, I define the method of Midrash in correspondence to the parallelism between צלמה and דמות in Genesis 1: 26 as previously discussed in Chapter 3 (4.2). Finally, I focus on a systematic analysis of passages taken from a number of tannaitic and amoraic Midrashim that deal exegetically with Genesis 1: 26-27 (4.3). My aim is threefold, namely, to establish in a given passage:

(i) The mode of Midrash exegesis
(ii) The midrashic structure and style
(iii) The theological stance: passive or confrontational

After these three aspects have been demonstrated in selected midrashic exegeses on Genesis 1: 26-27, the resulting data will be assessed against the midrashic source from which it derives and later compared with the respective targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 (in FragTarg, N, TO and PJ) in terms of substance, structure, style and historical timing.
4.1 The Concept of God’s Unity and Uniqueness

Jewish Texts reflecting on the nature of God, which derive from the period of formative Judaism\textsuperscript{19}, commonly aim to safeguard the belief in one God. This belief is defined as ‘monotheism’. It eventually developed into the formulation of Judaism’s principal creed, the belief in the One and Only God and the Unity of God\textsuperscript{20} (see Chapter 3).

Scholars concede that the idea of God’s Unity and Uniqueness already existed in the time of tannaitic and amoraic sages and even earlier (cf Chapter 2). Whoever negated it was called כופר בעיסר ['one who denies the primary principle of faith'] (Urbach 1979: 26). The fact that the term כופר בעיסר was widely used in an exaggerated sense during the middle of the second century is an indication that the idea of God’s Unity and Uniqueness was most probably already current in previous generations.\textsuperscript{21} Johann Maier connects the start of the use of Deuteronomy 6: 4-9 Hear O Israel: the LORD our God, the LORD [is] One, as principle of faith, to the temple liturgy, where it was recited in the evening and morning in relation to the offering times (1972: 136).

Ephraim E. Urbach ascribes the development of the concept of God’s Unity to a refining process that went through various stages before it

\textsuperscript{19} Formative Judaism is defined in terms of the first six centuries C.E. of Judaism’s formative years.
\textsuperscript{20} See Friedlander’s citation of the thirteen articles as put forth by Maimonides (1937: 20-22). Yehezkel Kaufmann (in Jacobs 1964: 81-82) defines Israelite monotheism as an original, primary institution which moulded all of Israel’s creativity. The comparative analysis of respectively tannaitic and amoraic theological formula and interpretations of biblical passages should bear out evidence whether Kaufman’s definition accurately captures the essence of Israelite monotheism.
\textsuperscript{21} See Urbach for an illustration on the prevalence of the term in the second century (1979: 26-36).
evolved into Judaism’s principle creed (1979: 19-36). Although he discusses various aspects of this development in some detail, a more systematic approach is nevertheless required to establish an effective basis for comparison between tannaitic and amoraic exegeses of biblical passages on the topic of God.

In sage literature the concept of God’s Uniqueness and Unity is dealt with both indirectly and directly by rabbinic scholars of the age of formative Judaism. Rabbinic teachers of the first two centuries C.E. are commonly referred to as Tannaim. As pointed out previously, G. Stemberger notes that they began to formulate traditional rabbinic sayings into structured precepts. Subsequently Amoraim, rabbis of the period 200 C.E. to 500 C.E., developed these precepts in their dialectical discussions (1977: 68-69).

4.2 Midrash Defined in Correspondence with Gen. 1: 26-27

The method of exegesis that sages developed is commonly referred to as Midrash. Importantly, in Midrash, the metaphysical is expressed in terms of the physical. See in this regard, my discussion of the parallelism between צלם and דמות in Chapter 3, where the function of דמות was shown to fulfil the live appearance or pattern of the essential being for which צלם stands. The implication is that צלם denotes the inner structure/symbolic abstract of a text or metaphor, which is consistently illustrated in

---
22 This process also attested and discussed by J. Maier (1972: 162-70; cf. also L. Ginzberg 2002: 2). For a discussion on the formula Melekh Ha-ʿolam, part of the Beracha (benediction), the most common Jewish prayer, see E.J. Wiesenberg (1964: 1-56; 1966: 47-72).
correspondence with דמות through a concrete situation/pattern/simile or parable.

‘Physical’, or concrete, involved concepts that sages were familiar with. By implication, sages’ conceptualization was thus situational, meaning that it was driven by what can be described as a ‘reactive’ impetus. Presumably, most circumlocutions used in midrashic exegeses by sages are reactive expressions to non-biblical mindsets that prevailed in specific historical settings. ‘Situational conceptualisation’ thus pertains to the way in which sages expressed their thoughts, namely, how structure and content of a given text are related to each other.\(^2\) This thought process entails that the symbolic abstract of an encoded text, although abstract (e.g. metaphor), nonetheless constituted a concrete system of thought. In other words, the primary metaphor that sages derived from the relationship between structure and content of a given base text could yield itself to generate other similar categories of expression (see, for example, the generative metaphor ‘face to/by face’ based on Gen. 1: 26 as discussed in 4.3.3).\(^3\) Sages thus intellectually derived meaning from an encoded base text\(^4\) by generating metaphoric realities that could illustrate  

\(^2\) Just as ‘inner structure’ and דמות ‘live appearance/pattern’ (Gen. 1: 26) were shown to relate to each other, in Chapter 3. Neusner aptly refers to these thought processes as ‘mythopoeic’ (1965: 23).

\(^3\) In this way rabbinic sages derived a number of voices from a stable starting-point, a specific biblical text. David K. Blumenthal is critical of the one-sided translator-commentator method wherein the plurality of the readings of the tradition is lost. He points out, significantly, that the multivocality and plurisignificance of a text was thus preserved in traditional rabbinic commentaries. For the sake of highlighting this multivocality, he applies the ancient rabbinic technique of a ‘grouped textual field’ (466) whereby a specific biblical text becomes more lucid in the context of different rabbinic interpretations (1998: 465-74).

\(^4\) An instance of such an encoded base text is בצלמנו כדמות (Gen. 1: 26).
its encoded message. In their search for meaning, they appealed to the inherent character of things.

4.3 A Systematic Analysis of Gen. 1: 26-27 in Midrashim

Exegetical works wherein sages used the method of Midrash to search for the meaning of Scripture are called Midrashim. These can be divided into two primary categories, namely tannaitic and amoraic Midrashim. With respect to the tannaitic Midrashim, I restrict myself in this Chapter, for the most part, to passages from the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (Mek.) and Sifre on Deuteronomy because they, presumably, contain primary comments of Tannaim on Genesis 1: 26-27. For J.Z. Lauterbach, Mek. is ‘one of the older tannaitic works’ and ‘one of the oldest Midrashim’ (quoted in Strack and Stemberger 1982: 239). Strack and Stemberger differentiate between an early core text and later additions in this work. They place the final redaction of the text into the second half of the third century (1982: 239-40). Strack and Stemberger further point out that Sifre Deuteronomy is not a uniform work. In their assessment it contains halakhic and haggadic parts of earlier and later origins. Its final redaction is estimated to have happened in the late third century (1982: 254-55).

26 Neusner has an excellent definition for generative approach. For him the generative problematic of the various Midrash compilations ‘is that abstract problem that over and over again, in a variety of concrete settings, tells me what I want to know about this, that, and the other thing: which, for there to be a generative problematic, must be always the same thing’ (1992: 2-3).

27 There are also other works of this period which contain teachings of the Oral Torah, like the Mishnah and Tosefta. But their teachings are arranged under topics and their method is codification and not exegeses of Scripture, although incidental exegeses are not rigidly excluded (see Maccoby 1988: 23).


29 In regard of evidence for Mek. De-Rabbi Ishmael as a tannaitic Midrash, see C. McCarthy’s analysis of the main sources attesting the tradition of scribal emendations (1981: 25-30).
One would therefore have to decide on the basis of analysis of individual midrashic passages, whether they derive from the time of Tannaim or Amoraim.

In the case of so-called amoraic Midrashim, I focus on sayings that are either parallel to or, in some cases, expand on tannaitic exegeses, which are connected to the base text of Genesis 1: 26-27. These works are Genesis Rabbah (GenR), Exodus Rabbah (ExodR), Numbers Rabbah (NumR) and Pesiqta Rabbati (PesR). Again, as mentioned previously, the systematic analysis of individual midrashic passages will determine, whether they derive from the time of Tannaim or Amoraim.

4.3.1 Gen. 1: 26-27 in Mek. *Pischa* 14 and GenR 8: 11

The two passages, Mek. *Pischa* 14 and GenR 8: 11 are chosen and discussed together, because they allude to correspondence with the Greek king in Egypt.

In Mek. *Pischa* 14, the following reference to Genesis 1: 26-27 introduces a striking change to the Hebrew Text:

ואשים זה אחד מן הדבר שכתבו למלכתו כיוצא בו כתיבנו אלהים ברא בראשית
.זכר ונקוביו בראו. אדם בצלם ובדמות

30 These exegetical Midrashim mainly derive from the Palestinian context. GenR is an exegetical Midrash to Genesis with parallels to the amoraic homiletic Midrash Tanchuma – Jelamdenu (cf. Strack and Stemberger 1982: 257-63). Neusner defines GenR as a composite document, which accompanies the Talmud. He further notes that some of the material in the compilation can be shown to have been put together before that material was used for the purposes of the compilers (2003: 69). ExodR and NumR are both also homiletic Midrashim. The homilies of ExodR follow the Sedarim of the Palestinian reading cycle, but the final redaction of this homiletic Midrash remains disputed. Although its final redaction is placed late c. 9th century, NumR contains exegeses, from early (tannaitic) and later (amoraic) periods (cf. Strack and Stemberger 1982: 284-87).
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This (referring to a preceding verse) is one of the instances when they wrote for Ptolemy the king. Likewise in it (the rewritten Torah) they wrote for him: ‘God created in the beginning. Let me make man in an image and in a likeness\(^{31}\). A male and his openings He created him\(^{32}\) / a male with his corresponding female parts’.\(^{33}\)

In this comment, sages refer to changes that were introduced into the translation of the Hebrew Text for King Ptolemy; such as were made to Genesis 1: 26 and 27. Presumably, the King in reference was Ptolemy II, who lived from 283-246 BCE. A legend, preserved in both the Letter of Aristeas and talmudic sources, attributes the translation of the Septuagint (LXX) to 72 elders brought from Jerusalem to Alexandria by Ptolemy II. Josephus (\textit{Antiq.} Preface 3 in Whiston 1987: 27) refers to King Ptolemy II, by writing:

\[^{31}\] The indefinite form of translation is preferred here (the text is unvocalized), because the corresponding exegetical analysis (A male and his openings He created him / a male with his corresponding female parts), which sages infer, is non-specific.

\[^{32}\] The exposition ‘a male and his openings He created him’ is partly caught up in the GenR 8: 11 wherein the expansion reads, \textit{He created in him four creations from above and four from below: eating and drinking like the beast (oral orifice), fructifying and multiplying like the beast (sexual orifice) and excreting dung like the beast (anal orifice) and dying like the beast (nasal orifice)}.

\[^{33}\] The translation is in accordance with Jastrow (1996: 930). The theme that man is composed of various parts, not only male and female, has been extensively dealt with by Urbach. He notes that already to Tannaim man appeared as composed of various parts. Their views were transmitted to Amoraim. Urbach does not deem it impossible that Jews, in Babylon, in Rav’s days were also acquainted with the Iranian myths about the Pristine man… and about the first human pair… who were joined to each other and were of the same stature’ (1979: 218-30). In this translation for King Ptolemy, it is not clear, which is the preferred exposition of the two alternatives given for \textit{זכר ונקוביו בראו}. It is also not of importance for the purpose of this Chapter. What I want to show is how the tannaitic and the amoraic approaches differ from each other. This becomes clear when Mek. \textit{Pischa} 14 and GenR 8:11 are compared with each other. Both passages refer to the copy of the Torah, which was made for King Ptolemy. However, the tannaitic Midrash in Mek. \textit{Pischa} 14 merely is one of a number of listed changes, while the amoraic Midrash expands on the change using a lengthy dialectic approach.
I found, therefore, that the second of the Ptolemies was a king who was extraordinarily diligent in what concerned learning and the collection of books; that he was also peculiarly ambitious to procure a translation of our law, and of the constitution of our government therein contained, into the Greek tongue (italics added).

L.H. Schiffman suggests that among those, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek could have been Palestinian scholars; the project may even have been encouraged by the king. His argument is that at some points, the Septuagint (LXX) reflects knowledge of Palestinian exegetical traditions, which were enshrined in rabbinic literature. He adds that in many areas of the LXX, the translators used Hellenistic Greek terms, which made it easier for Greek readers to understand the text, although the meaning was thereby subtly changed. Schiffman further notes that translations of the various biblical books circulated, independently, as well as in many differing manuscripts (1991: 92-94).

The rabbinic comment in Mek. *Pischa* 14 undergirds Schiffman’s theory that sages were involved in the translation of the book of Genesis into the Greek for King Ptolemy. The rabbinic reference in Mek. *Pischa* 14 to the translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 does, however, not reflect the rendering of the two verses in the LXX. One can therefore assume that the references in Mek. *Pischa* 14 stem from a different and independent manuscript or tradition.

Be that as it may, the reading of Genesis 1: 26 in Mek. *Pischa* 14 הָעָשַׁה אֲדֹם בְּצָלָם וּבְדִימוֹתָיו eliminates any suggestion of ambiguity that could imply a plurality of God. This is apparent from (i) the change of the plural verb form נָעַשָׂה let us make to a singular verb form נָעַשְׂ הָעָשַׁה let me make and (ii) the removal of the pronominal plural suffix ‘our’ from each noun form in
the illustrative parallelism in our image, after our likeness (Gen. 1: 26).

The reading in Mek. *Pischa* 14 shows further that the translators of Genesis 1: 26 substituted the comparative preposition ב with both a *waw* conjunctive and the preposition ב, presumably, to avoid the function of an otherwise analogous relationship, which is expressed between כצלם and כדמות in בצלמנו כucciónנו (Gen. 1: 26). With the inclusion of *waw* in the translation, the analogous relationship between כצלם and כדמות is converted into a hendiadys: בצלם ובדמות in an image and in a likeness.

Furthermore, the Midrash gives Genesis 1: 27 as זכר ונקוביו בראו, in differentiation to the Hebrew Text, which has זכר ונקבה ברא אתם. The interpretation of the midrashic alternative זכר ונקוביו בראו is ambiguous. It could either be understood in agreement with M. Jastrow, a male with his corresponding female parts (1996: 930), or in terms of a male with his openings He created him, as suggested by H. Freedman in his English translation of a Midrash on Genesis 1: 26-27 in GenR 8: 11 (1983: 61).

34 Cf. Y. Gitay’s discussion of the use of figurative language of metaphor and simile (1981: 75-76). In his case the simile contrasts the metaphor; here the simile has the function of illustrating the metaphor.

35 In the HT (Gen. 1:26) the use of the preposition ב is connected to the idea of a close connection with something, even in the metaphorical sense of following some kind of pattern (cf. Kautzsch and Cowley 1910: 379). See also my discussion of this relationship in Chapter 3.

36 This is a stylistic device in which one idea is presented in two expressions (Deist 1984: 73). According to Nuttall’s *Standard Dictionary of the English Language* such a device is also used in rhetoric (1893: 34).

37 Freedman motivates the translation, saying, ‘This change is to explain the plural ‘them’ (v. supra, I), or (since he was created in God’s image), to avoid the implication that God is male and female. Cf. also fn. 32 and 33 for the two alternative translations.
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The Midrash on Genesis 1: 26-27 in GenR 8: 11 also includes the reference to ‘one of the things which they altered for Ptolemy the king’.

H. Freedman (1983: 61, cf. fn. 33) associates this reference to הַמֶּלֶךְ the king with King Ptolemy II Philadelphus, ‘at whose command the Septuagint is said to have been produced’. The interpretive variant of Genesis 1: 26-27 in GenR 8: 11(Midrash Rabbah 2001 [א:א]) to Mek. Pischa 14 reads as follows:

This is one of the things which they changed for King Ptolemy, a male and his openings He created them / a male with his corresponding female parts. R. Joshua bar Nehemiah said in the name of R. Chanina bar Isaac and Rabbanan in the name of R. Eleazar: ‘He

---

38 Midrash Rabbah 2001 [א]: צ–טב.  
39 See also Josephus Antiq. (Preface 3 in Whiston 1987: 27).  
40 Electronic copy in Kantrowitz (1991-2004). The same Midrash is repeated almost word for word in GenR 14: 3.  
41 The text here is in MH. From the context of the Midrash it appears the Hebrew root שׁנה is used here in its meaning of ‘change’ (BDB 1966: 1039 I.), which corresponds with the root of the verb שׁני in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and means ‘to be different, change, remove, distinguish (Sokoloff 2002: 560).  
42 Cf. fn. 32 and 33 for the two alternative translations.  
43 A fourth generation Palestinian Amora, ca. 320-350 CE (Schiffman 1991: 222).  
44 A fourth generation Palestinian Amora, ca. 320-350 CE; a haggadist (Strack and Stemberger 1982: 98).  
45 Unnamed rabbis who are referred to under the name of R. Eleazar for the purpose of creating an authoritative view.
created in him four creations from above and four from below: eating and
drinking like the beast, fructifying and multiplying like the beast and
excreting dung like the beast and dying like the beast. From above:
standing like the ministering angels, speaking like the ministering angels,
he has insight like the ministering angels and he sees like the ministering
angels. However, an animal can not see (from the side) – incredible! But
this one (can see) sideways.’ R. Tifdai\(^ 47 \) in the name of R. Acha\(^ 48 \): ‘The
celestial beings were created in an image and in a likeness and they do not
procreate and increase, but the terrestrial creatures procreate and increase;
however, they are not created in [an] image and in [a] likeness. Said the
Holy One, blessed be He: “Behold, I am creating him in [an] image and in
[a] likeness after the celestial beings, procreating and multiplying after the
terrestrial beings’’. R. Tifdai in the name of R. Acha says: ‘Said the Holy
One, blessed be He: “If I create him from the celestial beings, he will live
and not die; from the terrestrial beings, he will die and not live. Therefore,
I am creating him from the celestial and from the terrestrial beings: if he
sins, he will die and if he does not sin, he will live.”’\(^ 49 \)

The reading of Genesis 1: 26-27 in this Midrash largely matches the text
of Genesis 1: 26-27 cited in Mek. Pischa 14; however, with emendations
and additions. While Mek. Pischa 14 reads זכר ונקוביו בראו with the
singular pronominal suffix, GenR 8: 11 retains the plural pronominal
suffix ‘them’ of the HT, rendering: זכר ונקוביו אְָּּרוּ...He created them. In
line with Mek. Pischa 14, GenR 8: 11 substitutes אְָּּרוּ for אְָּּרֶּבְּה. It
appears that the aim of the substitution in GenR 8: 11 is to create a
midrashic focus. The focus is supported with the introduction of the angel

\(^{46}\) Probably R. Eleazar ben Pedat, usually referred to without the name of his father,

\(^{47}\) He is mentioned only here and in GenR 14: 3.

\(^{48}\) Probably the fourth generation Palestinian Amora R. Acha from Lydda (Strack and

\(^{49}\) Own translation
theme\textsuperscript{50}. Angels belong to the category of celestial beings, which sets them off, hierarchically, from terrestrial beings. The hierarchical structure, which is thus, introduced into the Midrash forms the basis for a comparative analysis of human versus celestial beings and human versus terrestrial beings.

In GenR 8: 11, the substitute reading for בפָּנָיו כְּמוֹנְנוּ in our image after our likeness, namely בְּעֵלְמֵנוּ וּבְדִמְנוּ in an image and in a likeness\textsuperscript{51}, which is listed in Mek. Pischa 14, is followed. On the whole, the midrashic focus in GenR 8: 11 is on comparison and contrast: human versus celestial beings / human versus terrestrial beings. A major distinction separates celestial beings from terrestrial beings, namely, the image and likeness aspect. It is only found in celestial beings. By contrast, terrestrial beings are not created in correspondence with the image and likeness aspect. The Midrash concludes that man compares with celestial beings in the image and likeness aspect, which means he has eternal life on condition that he does not sin. The aspect of eternity, which man potentially shares with celestial beings is in contrast to that, which he potentially shares with terrestrial beings, namely, death. The overall approach of the Midrash in GenR 8:11 is rhetorical\textsuperscript{52}.

In comparing the reading of Mek. Pischa 14 with GenR 8: 11, it strikes one that the midrashic approach in Mek. Pischa 14 is by far simpler and less expansive than that used in GenR 8: 11. Although Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael follows a similar systematic verse-by verse exegesis as Genesis

\textsuperscript{50} The angel theme as well as the practice of diversifying between different aspects of the human body and making use of rhetoric argumentation is particularly evident in PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 (see Chapter 7).
\textsuperscript{51} The indefinite form of translation is preferred here; cf. also fn. 31.
\textsuperscript{52} For a review of these rhetorical methods cf. Y. Gitay (1994: 4-5).
Rabbah, it is a *halakhic* commentary to Exodus 12, 1-23, 19; 31, 12-17 and 35, 1-3\(^{53}\), while Genesis Rabbah follows the *Sedarim*, which provided for reading through the Torah in the Palestinian synagogues in a three-year period\(^ {54}\). In effect, Genesis Rabbah rereads the entire *narrative* of Genesis. In other words, it reads, midrashically, predominantly haggadic passages of Scripture (cf. Neusner 2003: 69). In its exegesis on Exodus 12: 40, Mek. *Pischa* 14 states that this is ‘one of the passages which they changed when writing the Torah for King Ptolemy’ (translated in Lauterbach 1976[1]: 111). It is at this point that Mek. *Pischa* 14 introduces the changed readings of verses 26 and 27 (Gen. 1) – among a number of other listed bible verses – with the words ‘likewise they wrote for him’:

- *God created in the beginning* (Gen. 1: 1);
- *I will make a man according to an image and a likeness*\(^ {55}\) (Gen. 1: 26);
- *A male with corresponding female parts created He him* (Gen. 1: 27 // 5: 2)\(^ {56}\)
- *And God finished on the sixth day... and rested on the seventh day* (Gen. 2: 2)
- *Now I will go down and there confound their language* (Gen. 11: 7) etc.

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael\(^ {57}\) is, as has been pointed out already, counted among the oldest compilations of ancient comments and traditional

\(^{54}\) Cf. Strack and Stemberger (1982: 258).
\(^{55}\) Cf. fn. 31.
\(^{56}\) Cf. fn. 32 and 33 for the alternative reading.
interpretations of the Torah. In line with that, the method of listing verses – as demonstrated above – is typical of the approach of tannaitic sages (cf. Stemberger 1977: 68-69). Overall, the midrashic approach in Mek. Pischa 14 is not confrontational, except, if one takes into account that the translation changes introduced for King Ptolemy derived from a context, where sages sought to defend the principles of the Jewish faith.

By contrast, GenR 8: 11 is preceded by a midrashic passage (GenR 8: 9) that directly confronts heretic views on Genesis 1: 26. The Midrash begins with a question addressed to R. Simlai, ‘How many deities created the world? ’ R. Simlai’s advice to his disciples is, ‘Whenever you find a point [apparently] supporting the heretics, you find the refutation at its side’ (Freedman 1983[1]: 60).58 This confrontational stance corresponds with the aspect I pointed out previously, in Chapter 3, that the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 became for sages a constant source of contention in their struggle against polytheism in the aftermath of the Destruction. I argued that the main reason for this is that the verse narrowly links to the development of Judaism’s principle creed. The fact that both nouns in בצלמנו כדמותנו in our image, after our likeness, carry the plural pronominal suffix ‘our’, led to interpretations of this passage by non-Jews that were unacceptable to rabbis59. Even the concept of ‘Trinity

---


59 Cf. M. Freimann (1911: 555-85; 1912: 49-64, 164-80); A.B. Hulen (1932: 58-70). Vexatious disputations between Jews and non-Jews can also be seen as having contributed to the introduction of the belief in the Unity of God into the Amidah (cf. Friedlander 1937: 225). Justin, the Martyr – born about A.D. 100 in a small town in Samaria (but apparently a Gentile) – wrote apologies to the emperor Antoninus Pius and his adopted son, Marcus Aurelius, and a dialogue with Trypho the Jew. As a philosopher, he took part in public debates. In his dialogue with Trypho, Justin tried to show that Jesus was the Messiah. He was an Apologist. ‘In seeking to win a favorable
in Unity’ – however much Christians sought to make it compatible with the idea of one God in the metaphysical sense – remained for sages a direct denial of the only God (cf. Epstein 1959: 134). It is therefore not surprising, that sages, in their exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27, increasingly, in the aftermath of the Destruction, countered heresies by way of translation changes, logical reasoning, rhetoric and cross-reference to other scriptural contexts as found in Mek. *Pischa* 14 and GenR 8:11. Albeit, not much can be said with certainty concerning the actual spread and extent of the deviating beliefs they had to contend with.  

60 Christians, according to J. Maier were the most prominent group of heretics – in particular Jewish Christians – although rabbis, by and large, tended to ignore as far as possible bearings that were disagreeable to them (1972: 206).

The comparative analysis of midrashic exegeses on Genesis 1: 26-27 between Mek. *Pischa* 14 and GenR 8:11 illustrates in terms of a historical time frame, the increasing reactive stance taken on by rabbis after the Destruction, against heresies. It corresponds with Neusner’s observation that each doctrine in Judaism responds to a point of contention with Christianity (1986: 11). It also demonstrates Stemberger’s statement that tannaitic precepts became part of dialectical discussions in amoraic times (1977: 68-69).

60 J. Maier (1972: 206) remarks in this regard, ‘Gemessen am Umfang des rabbinischen Schriftums ist das Echo auf das Christentum allerdings schwach. Dennoch hat es eine wechselhafte Beeinflussung gegeben…’

61 The word ‘dialectics’ can be understood in two ways: 1. *(philosophy)* refers to a method of discovering the truth of ideas by discussion and logical argument and by
Three redactional strata must accounted for in the midrashic reading of Genesis 1: 26-27 (i) the introduction of the changes to the Hebrew Text for King Ptolemy by sages, who lived before the Common Era (283-246 B.C.E); (ii) the incorporation of these changes, by way of listing, into Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael by tannaitic sages (100-200 C.E.) and (iii) the rereading of the tannaitic precept by amoraic sages in GenR 8: 11 (200-500 C.E.).

The comparative analysis between Mek. *Pischa* 14 and GenR 8:11 further illustrates how Amoraim sustained the practice of tannaitic sages to replace existing terms in Judaism’s exegetical traditions with terminology that they believed would sustain Judaism’s belief that Israel’s God is incomparably unique (e.g. the replacement of מעשה with אעשה in Gen. 1: 26). However, instead of staying with the simple citation of verses of Scripture, Amoraim, unlike Tannaim, used a more illustrative approach to bring their point across.

4.3.2 Gen. 1: 26-27 and the identification of polytheistic exegeses
This section deals with the appellation of the Divine Being and angels consulted as part of the heavenly court, as features in GenR 19: 3, NumR 16: 21, PesR 48: 2 and GenR 8.

There is no doubt that Israel’s struggle with polytheism continued beyond biblical times into the rabbinic period. A number of midrashic passages show that sages also actively opposed the belief that there are two powers considering ideas that are opposed to each other 2. (formal) the way in which two aspects of a situation affect each other (Hornby 2001: 320).
Adherents of the dualistic doctrine propagated the belief of two powers in heaven on the basis that Genesis 1: 26 uses the plural verb form נעשה in conjunction with the plural noun אלהים. However, in Judaism, the two names of God, יהוה and אלהים, never implied plurality in the sense of two separate deities. Presumably therefore, sages’ defence of their belief in one God motivated them to substitute the name אלהים (in Gen. 1: 26) in both FragTarg and N with either יי or the circumlocution המרה דייי.

There is evidence in midrashic passages that both Tannaim and Amoraim differentiated between the functions of יהוה and אלהים in Scripture. Tannaim proposed that the name יהוה refers to God’s attribute of mercy, while אלהים refers to God’s attribute of justice in Scripture, e.g. Sifre to Deut. Pisqa 26; Mek. Ba-Chodesh 4 and Mek. Beshallach 5. Tannaitic differentiations between the names, יהוה and אלהים, were in some instances developed further in amoraic discussions, e.g. GenR 33: 3 on Mek. Shirata 1: 1. Both passages link to Exodus 34: 6.

There is also midrashic evidence (e.g. NumR 19: 3) that amoraic sages were very much aware of creeds which, in their view, contained polytheistic elements. However, as shown in the example of GenR 8: 11 where reference is made to King Ptolemy, they no longer stuck with the simple method of citing several Bible verses, like Tannaim, to prove their theological stance. Instead, they began to make use of dialectical reasoning processes, which were linked to Scripture, an example of which is found in NumR 19: 3. NumR is part of the homiletic Midrash.

---

62 The translation and accompanying arrangement of the text are my own.
Midrash Rabbah, whose collections of proems (sermons) are believed to have played a role in the early Synagogue service:

The question: ‘The first man: what was His wisdom?’ introduces the proposition:

A. Proposition
You find when the Holy One, blessed be He, sought to create man; He took counsel with the ministering angels.

B. Proof-text from Scripture
He said to them: ‘Let us create man in our image.’

C. Ruling by illustrated inference from Scripture
They said before Him: ‘What is man that thou are mindful of him?’ (Ps. 8: 5).
He answered them: ‘Man whom I want to create: his wisdom must be more than yours.’
What did He do? He assembled all the cattle, beasts and fowl and caused them to pass before them.
He asked them: ‘What are their names?’
They did not know.
When He created man, they (the animals) passed before Him. He (God) said to him (Adam): ‘What are their names?’

He answered as follows: ‘it is fitting to call this an ox and that a lion and that a horse and that a donkey and that a camel and that an eagle,’ as it is stated (Gen. 2: 20): ‘And the man gave names.’

He said to him: ‘and you, what is your name?’

He answered Him: ‘Adam.’

‘Why?’

‘Because I was created from the ground’

The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him: ‘I, what is My name?’

He said to Him: ‘LORD [יהוה]’

‘Why?’

‘Because you are LORD over all created beings’

Hence it is written (Isa. 42: 8): ‘I am the LORD [יהוה]; that is My name.’

That is My name by which the first man (אדם) called Me. It is the name I have agreed upon between Me and Myself. It is the name I have agreed upon between Me and My creatures.

The above Midrash illustrates the rhetorical approach of Amoraim. The aim of the Midrash is to demonstrate what the connotation of the plural verb form נעשה let us make is within the context of Genesis 1: 26. The Midrash infers the use of the Tetragrammaton in its exposition of the plural noun form אלהים in the clause נעשה אדם (בראשית א כו)אמר להם בצלמנו And He said, Let us create man in our image. The reason for this inference is that heretics deduced that the plural verb form נעשה, in its relation to the plural noun form אלהים, was indicative of more than one

Differentiated thought processes, are used in this Midrash, namely of hierarchy, ‘What is man that thou are mindful of him’: Between God, the creator and His ministering angels; comparison, ‘more than’: Man has a higher intellect than the ministering angels, since he has the ability to discern between different animal species; categorization, ‘It is fitting to call’: Man is able to name animals according to their species and association, ‘Because I was created from the ground’: Man’s name is ‘Adam’, since he was created from ‘Adamah’.
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deity (cf. GenR 8: 9). In repudiation of this interpretation, Amoraim introduced the proposition that God took counsel with the ministering angels in the matter of man’s creation. In this proposition, the Nifʿal verb in the singular נמלך he took counsel infers a single deity; similarly the use of the circumlocution The Holy One, blessed be He, which is used in substitution of the plural אלהים. In correspondence with the change from a plural to a singular subject, the Qal Cohortative נעשה implies that the deity speaks in exhortation of the company of angels, the point being that they are hierarchically lesser beings and not to other deities.

There is no doubt that the formula The Holy One, blessed is He, which is used in the above Midrash, refers to the Tetragrammaton, which stands for God in the singular. M. Friedlander notes that the Tetragrammaton was not pronounced since the destruction of the Temple; in Bible reading, the word Adonai substituted it wherever it occurred. The custom of substituting the names of God with such words as the Name, and the Omnipresent, as well as employing single letters like or instead of the full names, was in reverence of the Divine name (1937: 287-88). Although Friedlander attributes the substitution of the Divine names to the custom of showing reverence towards God, this was most probably not the only reason; since the Midrash ultimately

65 In this particular defence (GenR 8: 9), sages set forth that the verb בָּרָא to create never appears in the plural in conjunction with-animation אֱלֹהִים in Scripture. But apparently disciples of sages were not satisfied with this answer. In their view it did not adequately address the dilemma of the plural pronominal suffixes in in our image, after our likeness (Gen. 1: 26) in Scripture. R. Simlai’s response to them is that is indicative of the manner in which the human will come into being after the creation of the first man and woman. He suggests that the plural suffixes in in our image, after our likeness refer to the circumstance in which a human is conceived from the union of a man and a woman in conjunction with the Divine Spirit (cf. Freedman 1983: 60, fn. 3).
creates an associative link between the plural verb form נעשה and the specific name of the deity, which is יהוה. The question, אני מה שמי, I, what is my name that the deity asks of Adam, enhances the idea of a single partner in dialogue. The purpose appears to be twofold:

(i) To determine in principle that God is One by inferring that Adam is addressing God in the singular with the use of the pronoun אתה (2nd person masculine singular): Because you (sg.) are Lord over all created beings.

(ii) To link the inference with a proof-text from Scripture: I am יהוה; that is my name (Isa. 42: 8).

The point in argument for Amoraim thus appears to be that the Tetragrammaton יהוה does not come with a plural connotation. The assumption is based on the observation that the Midrash infers, three times, that the name יהוה connotes the deity in the singular: 1) that is my name by which the first man called me; 2) it is the name I have agreed upon between me and myself; 3) it is the name I have agreed upon between me and my creatures. In every instance, the use of the pronoun is in the first person singular.

In the Targums, it is striking that FragTarg, N and TO (see Chapters 5 and 6) also substitute the plural noun form אלהים with either יי or with the circumlocution ממרה די, while PJ does not (see Chapter 7). The matter will be taken up again in the discussion of the targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27.
In yet another Midrash from Numbers Rabbah (NumR 16: 24\textsuperscript{66}), Genesis 1: 27 is substituted as proof-text to verify the proposition that there is only one God. Surprisingly, in the same context, sages also quote from Genesis 3: 22 where the plural once more marks the speech of the deity. However, as the Midrash goes on, it becomes apparent that sages in this instance, too, connect the presence of ministering angels to the use of the plural pronoun ‘us’ in Genesis 3: 22\textsuperscript{67}:

A. Said to them the Holy One, blessed is He: ‘I said, that [if] you do not sin then you will live and endure just like me; even as I live and endure for ever and for eternity of eternity. I said: “Gods (referring to men) you are and sons of the Most High, all of you” (Ps. 82: 6), like the ministering angels who do not die.

B. But you sought, subsequent to this greatness, to die! Indeed, like man you will die, just as the first man, whom I charged with one commandment that he should do it and he would live and endure forever; as it is said: “Behold man is become like one of us” (Gen. 3: 22).’

C. And so, God created Adam (האדם) in His image (Gen. 1: 27); so that he should live and endure like Himself. ‘Yet he corrupted his deeds and

\textsuperscript{66} Midrash Rabbah 2001 [ז]: רבי.
\textsuperscript{67} The translation and accompanying arrangement of the text are my own.
nullified My decree and he ate from the tree. Therefore, I said to him:
“For dust you are” (Gen. 3: 19).’

In my assessment – there may be alternative structures – the Midrash amounts to a syllogistic argument. Statement [A] talks about life; [B] talks about death; [C] talks about life and death. In the conclusive statement [C] Amoraim submit that man has lost the distinction of eternal life, because he sinned. If the first man would have kept the one commandment God charged him with, he would have endured and lived eternally, like God. The implication for man to be created in God’s image is, accordingly, that he should have had eternal life just as God and the ministering angels.

One may conclude from the midrashic interpretations of NumR 19: 3 and NumR 16: 24 that Amoraim developed the doctrine of ministering angels in response to the use of the plural pronoun ‘us’ in Genesis 1: 26 and Genesis 3: 22. With the implication that God was speaking inclusive of the ministering angels in these Scriptures, Amoraim were able to sustain their interpretation that there was only one deity present at the creation of man.

In Pesiqta Rabbati 48: 268 (PesR), the doctrine of ministering angels appears, once again, in correspondence with the plural pronoun ‘us’ and reference to the deity. The Midrash opens with the proposition that God created Adam ‘with the intention of having him live and endure for ever like the ministering angels’:

The words *That which hath been is now* allude to the fact that when the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, He created him with the intention of having him live and endure for ever like the ministering angels, for *The Lord God said: “Behold, the man is become as one of us”* (Gen. 3: 22). As the ministering angels are not meant to die, neither was Adam meant to know the taste of death.\(^{69}\)

The inference that ministering angels were present at the creation of man is once again drawn from Genesis 3: 22 *Behold; the man is become as one of us*. But in the Midrash of the above passage, Amoraim add that ‘man is like God’, not only in the aspect of eternal life – an aspect whereby the ministering angels resemble the deity – but also in the aspect of His kingship: Man has been given the task to rule over all creatures. The final analogy of Amoraim in PesR 48: 2 is that *Adam will be king in the worlds below* just as God is *King in the worlds above*. The implication is: just as the ministering angels are hierarchically lower than the deity, in the celestial sphere, so man is hierarchically lower than the deity, in the terrestrial sphere.

The inclusive aspect of *Let us make* (Gen. 1: 26) was, undoubtedly, the most widely debated point in the ‘image of God’ question, among Amoraim. In GenR 8, amoraic sages devote almost an entire *parashah* [י:ג – ט] to the question, ממה נמלך, with whom did He take counsel (‘He’ taken as referring to God), which is proposed in response to *Let us make* (Gen. 1: 26). The following propositions are offered:

\(^{69}\) Translation of the Hebrew by William G. Braude (1968[2]: 813.
\(^{70}\) Midrash Rabbah 2001 [א]: 3-56.

Chapter 4

(i) [ג] בָּקֵלָאֱלֹהִים נַמָּלַךְ נִמְלַךְ with the work of heaven and earth He took counsel.

(ii) בְּלִבּוֹ נִמְלַךְ with his heart He took counsel.

(iii) שֶׁבָּא לִבְרֹאת אֶת אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן נִמְלַךְ בְּמַלְאֲכֵי הַשָּׁרֵת when He came to create the first man He took counsel with the ministering angels.

(iv) בְּנַפְשׁוֹתָן שֶׁל צַדִּיקִים נִמְלַךְ with the souls of the righteous he took counsel.

In subsections ח and ט (8-9) of GenR 8, Amoraim explain why the answer to this question is so vital. They are very aware of the fact that the statement in Scripture, *And God said: Let us make man*, etc. furnished a powerful excuse to heretics to derive polytheistic doctrines. Hence, in subsection [ח] the question is asked of the deity, 

רִבּוֹן הָעוֹלָם מָה אַתָּה נוֹתֵן פֶּה לַמִּינִים אֶתְמָהָ Sovereign of the Universe! Why, do you give an excuse of mouth to the minim – incredible!? Following in subsection [ט], amoraic sages scrutinize the heretic argument and construct a plausible defense from Scripture:

The heretics asked R. Simlai: ‘How many deities created [אֱלֹהוּת בָּרְאוּ the world?’ ‘I and you must inquire of the first day,’ replied he, as it is written, *for ask now of the first days* (Deut. 4: 32). Not, ‘Since the day Gods created [כְּרַא man’ is written here, but *God created [בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים* in the beginning Elohim [plural] created? He answered them: ‘כְּרַא אֲלֹהִים אֲלֹהִים is not written, but בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים’.

71 Heretics are referred to as *minim* in rabbinic traditions. R. Kalmin draws attention to and discusses several early Palestinian sources, which urge avoidance of minim and Christians. In early and later literature the term *minim* refers to different groups, but Kalmin concludes that its precise significance is at present still elusive (1994: 155-70).
R. Simlai said: Wherever you find a point [which apparently] supports the heretics, you will find the refutation at its side. They asked him again: ‘What then is this that is written, נעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ?’ He answered them: ‘Read what follows it: it is not said וַיִּבְרְאוּ אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמֵיהֶם [and Gods created the man in their images] but וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ (Gen. 1: 27). When they went out, his disciples said to him: ‘You have dismissed them with a mere makeshift, but how will you answer us?’ He said to them: ‘In the past Adam was created from the earth, Eve was created from the man; but henceforth and further נַעֲשֶׂה כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ [refers to]: not man without woman and not woman without man and neither of them without שְׁכִינָה [the Divine Spirit].

From the above discussion of Genesis 1: 26 it follows that the obsession of Amoraim with the interpretation of the Cohortative verb form נעשה stemmed from what they believed was a very real and serious threat to monotheism; the point of argument being, as noted previously, that the plural noun form אֱלֹהִים, together with the plural verb form נעשה Let us make (Gen. 1: 26), became for heretics an indication that more than one deity was involved with the creation of the world.

To sum up, the introduction of the doctrine of the ministering angels appears in correspondence to the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in amoraic midrashic compilations, only. Every midrashic passage under analysis was shown to reflect an expansive approach, which indicates that Amoraim no longer restricted themselves, like Tannaim, to the use of structured precepts in their exegeses. From this it can be deduced with relative certainty that the development of rhetoric and the doctrine of ministering angels can be linked to the time of redaction of Judaism’s documents of the late fourth and fifth centuries. This means that Neusner
is correct in his hypothesis that there is a contrast between the sages’ system as revealed in writings concluded in the later second and third century and the system of exegesis that emerged in the writings of the later fourth and fifth centuries (1986: x). Furthermore, each Midrash exegesis of Genesis 1: 26-27 ascribed to Amoraim demonstrates a marked reactive stance, which proves that Neusner is correct in his discovery that each doctrine in Judaism responds to a point of contention with Christianity (1986: 11).\footnote{Cf. also my reference to Neusner (1986:11) on p. 113.}

4.3.3 Gen. 1: 26-27 and the aspect of דמות

In contrast to Greek philosophers who, at times, ventured to argue the existence or non-existence of gods by way of reason,\footnote{Xenophanes, for example, asserted that ‘no one has seen, nor shall there ever be one who knows about the gods and the things that I say about the universe. Even if a man should happen to say what is exactly right, still, he himself does not know; but opinion is over all (underlining added) (quoted in Burn 1974: 132).} sages believed that God’s presence was not arguable. Instead, for them it was irrefutably evident from the revelation of the Decalogue on Sinai.\footnote{G.F. Moore (in Jacobs 1964: 54) explains that there was no reason for question and argument about the existence of God in Judaism’s accord with the principle of revelation. If it were possible to argue the existence or non-existence of God, the scriptural principles of omnipotence, omnipresence and incomparability would no longer apply.} With the reception of the Ten Commandments, sages argued that Israel, as it were, received the likeness of God’s image or דמות (cf. Gen. 1: 26) into its midst, the Decalogue being regarded as the concrete demonstration of the deity’s presence in Israel. It is, therefore, not astounding that sages linked the Ten Commandments to the concept of the divine image and likeness (Gen. 1: 26).
In Israel’s tradition, the Ten Commandments were arranged five on the one tablet and five on the other. Accordingly, the first commandment: *I am the LORD* [יהוה] *thy God* (Exod. 20: 2) stood opposite the sixth commandment: *Thou shalt not commit murder* (Exod. 20: 13). From this parallel arrangement, sages drew the conclusion that a person who sheds blood, simultaneously ‘diminishes the divine likeness’—since every human being is made in the divine image’. This is illustrated in the following tannaitic Midrash (Mek. *Bachodesh* 8, Exod. 20. 12-14):

*שוחה שופך דמים מעלין עליו כאלו ממעט בדמות שנאמר שופך דם האדם וגוכי בצלם אלהים עשה את האדם*

He who sheds blood it is reckoned against him as if [he was] diminishing [in] the likeness since it is written: ‘Whoso sheds the blood of man, etc.’ (Gen. 9: 6) because in the image of God He made the man.

Here sages argue that to him, who sheds blood, it is reckoned as diminishing in the likeness /diminishing the likeness. The method of reasoning is simple:

---

75 Cf. fn. 82.
76 Cf. fn. 77 and 78 for the translation used. Another option would be to translate ‘diminishes with regard to the divine likeness.’
77 The translation option depends on whether ממעט is regarded a transitive verb as in *diminishing the likeness*, where דמות is the direct object (where the preposition ב is part of the verbal expression and ‘the likeness’ is regarded as the object) or an intransitive (Pi ‘el) verb as in *diminishing in the likeness*, where the verb ממעט has no direct object and ב is the preposition, which governs the indirect object מ.MULTI. In my assessment the latter translation is the advisable option, since there is no evidence in Brown, Driver and Briggs (1966) or Koehler and Baumgartner (1958) that ממעט is used together with the preposition ב as, for example, is the case with שמע ‘to hear, listen’ and שמע ב ‘to obey’.
A. Proposition:
He who sheds blood, it is reckoned against him as if [he was] diminishing [in] the likeness

B. Proof-text from Scripture:
Since it is written: ‘Whoso sheds the blood of man, etc.’ (Gen. 9: 6)

C. Conclusion:
Because in the image of God He made the man

The proposition is that a human diminishes [in] the likeness of God when he sheds the blood of his fellowman. The fact that sages drew their conclusion by allusion to the parallel arrangement of the first (Exod. 20: 2) and sixth commandments (Exod. 20: 13) illustrates that the function of דמות was held to demonstrate correct moral behaviour on the part of the human. Thus, man is unlike God when he commits murder (Thou shalt not commit murder Exod. 20: 13), because God is the giver and preserver of life (I am the LORD [יהוה] thy God Exod. 20: 2). Commensurate with the blood that flows from the murdered fellowman, man diminishes [his own] likeness of the image of God in which he has been created. A proof-text from Scripture, whoso sheds the blood of man (Gen. 9: 6), is cited to establish the premise that man is accountable for his actions. Sages’ conclusive statement כי בצלם את האדוםשט את האדם because in the image of God He made the man implies the link of דמות to צלם image. The function of the preposition ב in conjunction with צלם (i.e. בצלם in the image), is ב essentiae, which, as I noted in Chapter 3, expresses

78 In T. Yebamot 8.7 discussed by Alon Goshen-Gottstein 1994: 191-92) the diminishing of life is linked to murder and abstaining from procreation. In Goshen-Gottstein’s view humanity constitutes the divine demut, which is the divine body. He offers two understandings; one is that all of humanity constitutes the great divine body of manifestation and therefore, harming humanity is harming the body of God. Two, abstaining from procreation diminishes humanity’s potential size, which diminishes the dimensions of the body of God. In this sense דמות refers to the cosmic form of Adam, where all humans are part of the deity’s body (see also Yebamot 63b; t. Ned. 9.4).
the figurative sense of something in terms of its essential or vital being. Here, the בּ esseentiae implicates that כְּלַם refers to the innate character of the deity. This means that man is not like the deity in terms of his physical\textsuperscript{79} appearance, but rather in terms of his moral character.\textsuperscript{80} Sages thus propose that man should preserve life because God is the preserver of life. In other words, if man preserves life; that is how he himself, essentially, reflects the likeness of God.

Passing by the exegetical analysis of the passage in Mek. \textit{Bachodesh} 8, and moving on to the aspect of structure and style of midrashic reasoning, it is clear that here sages followed the simple approach of proposition, proof-text from Scripture and conclusion, in their verse-by-verse exegesis of Exodus 20: 12-14. The exegetical approach used in this passage from Mek. \textit{Bachodesh} 8 reflects the mode of interpretation followed by Tannaim in midrashic exegesis. The fact, that the theological stance is passive, by comparison with the reactive stance that can be observed in midrashic passages, which stem from the time of Amoraim, supports the view that the above Midrash is of tannaitic origin.

By contrast to this simple approach, Amoraim expand extensively on the above tannaitic exposition \textit{I am the LORD} [יהוה] \textit{thy God} (Exod. 20: 2). The amoraic Midrash on this passage is found in PesR 21: 6.\textsuperscript{81} It deals

\textsuperscript{80} Cf. also Alon Goshen-Gottstein (1994: 171-95) for a detailed discussion and D.H. Aaron’s response to his views. Aaron pleads that more attention should be expended in trying to define the relationship between midrashic writings and rabbinic beliefs because ‘a potpourri of texts from the entire corpus will ultimately produce whatever theological construct the interpreter wishes to find’ (1997: 299-314).
\textsuperscript{81} The translation of this passage is slightly adapted from W.G. Braude (1968[1]: 420-25). The point I want to make with this specific Midrash, can be argued from the English translation.
with the image of God in an indirect way by linking the aspect of the
divine likeness (i.e. דמות from Gen. 1: 26) to the expression
פנינים פנים in Deuteronomy 5: 4, The LORD [יהוה] spoke with you face to face in the
Mount. Here (PesR 21: 6) ‘faces’ is interpreted in terms of diverse
manifestations of the likeness of God. The Midrash expands
systematically, in nine comments, on the different faces (diverse
manifestations of the likeness) of God. Accordingly, the phrase
פנינים פנים is read, mirdrashically, either as face after face / facet after facet / faces
and faces or face to face. The aim of the Midrash is to exemplify or
demonstrate inherent character traits of the deity by way of illustrative
reasoning. I am quoting, in the following, all nine comments – though
lengthy – to demonstrate the length of mirdrasic reasoning that amoraic
sages could go to, in order to argue a point. In my understanding of the
Midrash (there may be other alternatives), sages argue that the deity’s
manifest presence on earth is illustrated pre-eminently through Torah
which, by mirdrashic argument, is said to be in the likeness of the
deity (cf. PesR 21: 19 in Friedman 1963b: קוח). Although the link
between Torah and דמות is not explicitly stated in the Midrash, the

---

82 In PesR 21: 19 (Friedman 1963b: קוח), the aspect of דמות (Gen. 1: 26) is paired off
with the ninth commandment:

לֹא תַעֲנֵה כִּי נָתַן אַלְמָה לְעַל שָׁם אוֹמֶר אוֹמֶר (שָׁם וְרָאשִׁית שָׁם אַלְמָה) וְאֵלֶּה תַּעֲנֵה בְּעַיִן לְךָ לְאֵל בִּרְיָה [וּבֵית יְהוָה] דֹּמֶת (כֹּלְמִית) לְאֵל בִּרְיָה לְכָל מִי [לְכָלִים] לְאֵל בִּרְיָה לְכָל מִי לְאֵל בִּרְיָה

‘Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour,’ etc. is paired with ‘And
God said: Let us make man in Our image’ (Gen. 1: 26). The Holy One, blessed be He,
said: Behold, for thee I created thy neighbour in My likeness. And thou, by acts as call
for punishment, would swallow and make an end of thy neighbour. Do not bear false
witness against thy neighbour (Translation by Braude 1968[18]: 445-46).
The Midrash places the ninth commandment opposite the formula which accounts
for the creation of man in Genesis 1: 26: Thereby the Torah is equally the source for the
creation of man inasmuch as it also sets forth his behavioural pattern, that is, the
human is created commensurate with the moral laws set forth in Torah. If he adheres
to Torah, he in turn shows to his fellowman the essence of the deity. Since Torah
testifies to the true nature of the deity, man should testify to the true nature of his
fellowman. This amounts to not testifying against ones neighbour a testimony that is
false.
inference is to the first commandment (Tannaim already linked the first commandment to the concept of דמות; cf. Mek. Bachodesh 8: Exod. 20: 12-14). In other words, in sages’ view, the innate nature of the deity became accessible to humanity in the likeness of Torah, which in their view demonstrates how the mind of the deity worked:

[A] <Another comment: Face after face.> R. Levi said: God faced them in many guises. To one He appeared standing, and to one seated;\(^{83}\) to one as a young man, and to one as an old man. How so? At the time the Holy One, blessed be He, appeared on the Red Sea to wage war for His children and to requite the Egyptians, He faced them as a young man, since war is waged but by a young man, as it is said The Lord is a man of war, יהוה is His name (Exod. 15: 3). And when the Holy One blessed be He, appeared on Mount Sinai to give the Torah to Israel, He faced them as old man, for the Torah is at its best when it comes from the mouth of an old man. What is the proof? The verse: With aged men is wisdom, and understanding in length of days (Job 12: 12); and therefore Daniel said: I beheld thrones were placed, and one that was Ancient of days did sit (Dan. 7: 9). In regard to God’s guises, R. Chiyya bar Abba said: If a whoreson should say to you, “They are two different Gods,” quote God as saying in reply: I am the One of the sea and I am the One at Sinai.

[B] <Another comment: > R. Levi taught: At Sinai the Holy One, blessed be He, appeared to them with many faces, with a threatening face, with a severe face, with an angry face, with a joyous face, with a laughing face, and with a friendly face. How so? When He showed them punishment of the wicked, He showed it to them with a threatening face, with a severe face, with an angry face. And when He showed them the reward of the righteous in time-to-come, He showed it to them with a joyous face, with a laughing face, with a friendly face. In regard to God’s many faces R. Chiyya bar Abba taught: Should a whoreson say to you,

\(^{83}\) See Gen. 28: 13 and Isa. 6: 1.
“They are two different Gods”, reply to him, Scripture does not say “The Gods have spoken…face after face” but הוהי has spoken with you face after face.

[C] In another comment, the verse הוהי spoke with you face after face is read The splendour of the Divine Face came into [thy] face.> R. Zakkai of Shaab taught in the name of R. Samuel bar Nachman: At the time Israel stood at Mount Sinai and said: We will do [what we have been commanded], and eagerly hearken [to what we shall be told] (Exod. 24: 7) – at that time splendor from the splendor of the Presence above was bestowed upon them. And the proof? The verse Thy renown went forth among the nations for thy beauty; for it was perfect, through My splendor which I had put upon thee, saith the אלהיםיהוה (Ezek. 16: 14).

[D] In another comment, the words face after face, etc. are understood as “facet after facet.” R. Tanchum bar Chanilai said: Had the Torah been given in the form of clear-cut decision, no teacher would have a leg to stand on the expression of his opinion; as it is, when he pronounces an object unclean, there are others like him who pronounce it clean. For, as Rabbi Yannai said, the Torah which the Holy One, blessed be He, gave to Moses was given to him with forty-nine other arguments by which a thing may be proved unclean. This number corresponds to the numerical value of wdglw in the words Because his banner (wdglw) – Torah – [is variegated], love [for it] is within me (Song2: 4). Because of such variegation in Torah, Moses asked: How shall I go about deciding questions? God replied: When those who pronounce a thing unclean are in the majority, pronounce it unclean; when those who pronounce it clean are in the majority, pronounce it clean.

[E] R. Abbahu said in the name of R. Jochanan: R. ‘Akiba had a faithful disciple who knew how to expound Scripture with forty-nine reasons

\[84\] w=6, d=4, g=3, l=30, w=6.
\[85\] His banner over me is love.
drawn from another text, apparently not relevant to the first, to prove a thing clean. This disciple, it is said, was a chip from Mount Sinai.

[F] <In another comment,> R. Chanina bar Papa, interpreting the words *face after face* literally, takes them to mean “faces and faces.” <For the word *panim*, “face,” having only a plural form, implies at least two faces, and the repetition of the word implies at least two more faces. You thus have four faces:> and earnest face at the revelation of Scripture, a serene face at the revelation of Mishnah, a friendly face at the revelation of Talmud, and a joyous face at the revelation of Aggadah.

[G] <In another comment the words previously read *Face after face* are read *face to face*, etc.> R. Menacheman taught in the name of R. Jacob ben Tardai: *As in water face answers to face, so the heart of man to man* (Prov. 27: 19). Whereas among men it may be that the master wishes to teach but the disciple does not wish to learn, or the disciple wishes to learn but the master does not wish to teach, here at Sinai the Master wished to teach and the disciple wished to learn.

[H] <Another comment: *Face to face.*> R. Joshua ben Levi took the phrase to mean that one face was opposite the other face and hence suggests one of two things: either the One on High descended to face the one below, or the one below lifted himself up to face the One on high. However, said R. Joshua ben Levi, since it is written *And *יהוה* came down upon Mount Sinai* (Exod. 19: 20), we know that the One on High had Himself come down below. Now you find that when the Holy One, blessed be He, gives anything to a righteous man, He never takes it away, so that it even goes down into the grave with him. Therefore R. Simeon ben Yochai said: If an opening were to be made in the grave of Moses, the entire world could not endure the light. And if true of the opening, lo, how much more true of the grave! And if true of the grave, lo, how much more true of Moses!
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[I] Another comment: *Face to face, etc.* R. Berechai taught: Moses said to Israel: My children, when you were in the land of Egypt, I used to say to you *The God of your fathers has sent me unto you.* And you asked me, *What is his name?* And for the time being I replied: His name is *I am that I am* (Exod. 3: 13-14). But now, here is which is to be bought, and here is the source; here are the wares and here the merchant –face to face. Now you hear Him directly: *I am יהוה thy God.*

From the Midrash, sages set forth a number of interpretations in relation to the image of God: [A] for a start, God’s different faces were revealed indirectly and generally through His redemptive acts (note the use of the name יהוה in this context) and when Israel accepted the Torah at Sinai (use of the name יהוה). [B] Thereafter, YHWH revealed Himself to Israel on a more personal level through acts of punishment and reward. [C] In consequence of the deity’s personal revelation to Israel, the nation became the visible expression of YHWH’s beauty and splendour on earth (here, the phrase ‘the splendour of the Divine Face’ substitutes the Tetragrammaton יהוה). [D] More specifically, within Israel there evolved a particular group of people, who received authority to make legal decisions because of their extraordinary love for Torah (יהוה in this and the following comments [E-G] becomes Torah). [E] The result of faithful teachers of Torah was that they gained faithful disciples who in turn exhibited extraordinary knowledge of Torah/YHWH. [F] The growing knowledge of Torah/YHWH was accumulated in the diverse compilations of Scripture, Mishnah, Talmud and Aggadah, whereby the four main characteristics of the deity’s innate being/image are demonstrated. [G] Knowledge of Torah/YHWH is never enforced; but whoever desires to learn it will develop a close relationship with the deity. Learning Torah equals personal, or face to face instruction by the deity. [H] Moses was such a man. He desired to know the deity; so the deity came down to
Mount Sinai to instruct him via oral and written Torah. The impact of Moses’ face to face encounter with YHWH was so remarkable that knowledge of the deity, which had been propagated by Moses, continued to spread even after his death via the Torah (oral and written): [I] Just as the deity revealed its essence to Moses at Sinai (*I am who I am* [Exod. 3: 13]), so Torah knowledge of the essence of the deity to everyone; it is the concrete *likeness* of the deity on earth. Amoraim conclude, *now you hear Him directly*, where ‘directly’ alludes to the general availability of Torah.

Each of the subsections in the Midrash shows that the expression ** País País** (Deut. 5: 4) was not understood in the literal sense but rather as metaphor for the presence of YHWH.86 In other words, Torah constituted the means through which Israel could experience and interact with a deity that was invisible. Amoraim, in this Midrash, sought to show by analogy, how the invisible deity communicates and presents itself.87 Reading the Torah aloud thus became the ultimate event whereby sages believed to encounter the speaking deity.

---

86 J. Manston (2000: 150) argues that ancient rabbis are the real ‘traditionalists’, who ‘have been established now for some 2000 years’. They never interpreted the Genesis narratives literally. He maintains that the ‘the concept of taking much of Genesis 1 to 3... literally was alien to their interpretive framework’ (146). In fact, Jewish interpreters contributed a literal reading of Scripture to an ignorance of biblical thought patterns. Neusner (1965: 23) ascribes this ignorance to the fact that modern man ‘no longer sees abstraction in the supple fabric of immediate situations.’ Sages’ interpretation of Deut. 5: 4, ‘The LORD [יהוה] spoke with you face after face in the Mount’ shows that even in the figure of speech of *likeness*, mythopoeic thought patterns never leave the concrete. It must be kept in mind that concretization of thought processes cannot be equated with literalness, neither do metaphors represent a historical situation per se. The concept of **בצלמנו כדמתנו** thus holds potentially more information than its historicity suggests.

87 The amoraic approach is similarly illustrated in a dictum from GenR I: 1 wherein God consults the Torah in His creation of the world (Freedman 1983: 1).
The midrashic argument that דמות refers to Torah is stated, more explicitly, in another Midrash (PesR 25: 3)\(^8\) on Exodus 20: 2. The dialectical approach suggests that the Midrash is of amoraic origin\(^9\):

So the Holy One, blessed is He said to them [the angels]: ‘What you are implying when you say, “Give thy praise above the heavens” is that it [the Torah] cannot be beside you.

Why?

It is written in it [the Torah]: “I am the יהוה your GOD” (Exod. 20: 2-3).

Do you deny My Kingship?

Your [place] is not beside me; accordingly, you may not – even\(^90\) for the like\(^91\) of a day – behold the likeness [رسم] of My Glory.

And it is written in it [the Torah]: “man when he dies in a tent” (Num. 19: 14).

Now then, do you die?

It is written in it: “this you may eat” (Lev. 11: 9); and “that you may not eat” (Lev. 11: 4); now then, do you eat and do you drink?

Yet you request that I should give My Torah to you?’

What did the Omnipotent One\(^92\), blessed is He, do?

---

\(^8\) Friedman 1963b: קככ.


\(^90\) The expression כל...אין is here translated in the sense of ‘not at all’ (cf. Jastrow 1996: 638).

\(^91\) כ used quantitatively here (BDB 1966: 453).

\(^92\) Urbach (1979: 66-67) points out that the term appears as early as in an ancient formula used by the Great Sanhedrin of Israel, when it judged the priests and
The text continues with a detailed exploration of the Midrashic interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27. It discusses the nature of the deity and its representation in the form of angels, emphasizing the distinction between angels and the deity, particularly in terms of incorruptibility. The text references a dictum of R. Johanan b. Zakkai and Mek. Ba-chodesh 11: 88, where the abbreviation ה״קב (Lauterbach 1976[2]: 290) stands for ברוך הואהמקום ‘the Omnipresent, blessed be He’. Similarly, a Baraita of R. Ishmael at the beginning of the Sifra reads: ‘This teaches us that ה״הקב, bent’ (Urbach 1979: 712, fn. 4).

93 Own translation

94 To dispose of the heresy, that a celestial being represented an expression of the deity (Mek. Bachodesh 6: Exod. 20.3-6), tannaitic sages implicated the second commandment:

אבל יעשה לו דמות מלאכים וכרובים ואופנים וכוכבים ומזלות תם לא דמות כרובים ולא דמות אופנים ולא יעשה לו דמות כל שלמה.

But if he makes for himself a likeness of angels or Cherubim or Ophannim, the Torah states: ‘which is in heaven’ (Exod. 20: 4). As for ‘which is in heaven’, it could be a likeness of the sun and moon, stars and planets. The Torah specifies: ‘[which is in heaven] above’ (למעלה, [meaning] not a likeness of angels, not a likeness of Cherubim and not a likeness of Ophannim; you shall not make for yourself a likeness of any of these [above].

95 Neusner (1998: 277) has captured the essence of this rabbinic reasoning process in the following: ‘Reason operating within the limits of Scripture produces truth. This is because humanity is “in our image, after our likeness,” and the aspect of humanity that is like God is not the external and material but the interior: the heart, the soul, the mind.’
would be as much as denying the deity its kingship. By distinction, the fact that the human eats, drinks and dies, makes him unlike the deity in terms of incorruptibility. There is, thus, no danger for the human to be mistaken for the deity.\(^{96}\) On the basis of man’s corruptibility therefore, Torah – the essence of the deity – may be imparted to man.

The Midrash differentiates categorically between God, angels and man:

(i) Angels from the deity: *Your [place] is not beside me; accordingly, you may not – even for the like of a day – behold the likeness* [דָּהָרוּ] of My Glory.

(ii) Man from the deity: *man when he dies in a tent* (Num. 19: 14).

(iii) Angels from man: *Now then, do you die? It is written in it: “this you may eat”* (Lev. 11: 9); and “that you may not eat” (Lev. 11: 4); now then, *do you eat and do you drink?*

---

\(^{96}\) Cf. in this regard also Silviu Bunta’s discussion of GenR 8: 10 (2006: 69-71), a parable which opposes the worship of Adam as the representation of God. In Bunta’s analysis the text emphasizes both the resemblance and the distinction between the image of God and God. Bunta interprets that Adam and God are said to have the same form, yet do not share the same nature in this Midrash: *When the Holy One, blessed be He, created Adam, the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim ‘Holy’ before him... What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He casued sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was but a mortal man.* However, Bunta’s analysis does not take into account GenR 8: 11 (following GenR 8:10), which counters the perception that Adam resembles God in a physical form. GenR 8: 11 distinguishes Adam from the deity in terms of his moral behaviour. The point in argument is that ‘form’ in terms of a resembling body must not be equated with physical body in GenR 8: 10 (cf. also A. Goshen-Gottstein’s conclusion [1994: 195], ‘the meaning of body is not necessarily the physical body with which we are acquainted... not necessarily corporeal’). Rather, when the angels mistook Adam for a divine being, it was his *action* [of sleep], which differentiated him from the deity. The distinction and resemblance between God and Adam, which is stressed in GenR 8: 11 – and likewise in PesR 25: 3 – is based on mode of behaviour rather than substance. GenR 8 must be read as a unified whole to come to a clear understanding of the idea ancient sages intended to convey.
The approach of this Midrash is persuasive\textsuperscript{97}, presumably in opposition to the non-Jewish idea that angels are deities. The context of a heavenly courtroom served as platform for the speech-act\textsuperscript{98} whereby the hierarchy between God, the ministering angels and man was established in correspondence with the demonstrative aspect of דמות (Gen. 1: 26), which is Torah. Sages demonstrate the function of דמות by from Scripture verses, which add proof to their proposition that angels are not deities. The style of the Midrash, as well as its persuasive stance, is a strong indicator that it originated in a Palestinian academy in the time of Amoraim.

4.4 Midrashic Exegeses of Gen 1: 26-27: A Comparative Summary

In my analysis and comparison of midrashic passages that deal with Genesis 1: 26-27, I have found that the exegetical mode, which characterizes a Midrash, will provide information on whether it was compiled in the time of Tannaim or Amoraim. In other words, if the style and structure of a Midrash is simple and the tone is directive, it may be assumed that the saying stems from the period of Tannaim. By contrast, if the style and structure of a Midrash is expansive and its tone is persuasive, reactive or apologetic, it may be held with relative certainty that a comment derives from an amoraic context. In their theological articulation, amoraic sages generally addressed confrontational issues; therefore, it can be said that their approach was pragmatic. This means that the discourse in each instance is particular and came into existence

\textsuperscript{97} The speech-act is described by Y. Gitay (1981: 42) as being ‘orientated toward persuading the reader / listener to change his mind.’ For a detailed discussion of the rhetorical situation see Gitay 1981: 42-45.

\textsuperscript{98} See Y. Gitay 1981: 42.
because of a specific condition or situation wherewith sages were confronted. By implication therefore, it can be said that they did not follow a system or a plan in an organized way, but rather, responded spontaneously to arguments raised by heretics (minim).

Whereas tannaitic statements tend to remain strictly within the confines of Scripture, amoraic articulation reflects a greater freedom of expression with the inclusion of illustrative and persuasive methods of argumentation in what can be described as a ‘speech-act’ style. Amoraim followed earlier tannaitic midrashic exegeses closely, albeit with emendations and additions. They did not deviate from the innate views propagated by Tannaim but tended to entrench the structured precepts of their predecessors by using techniques of rhetoric. To refute the Gnostic interpretation that נעשׂה referred to angels as deities, Amoraim addressed an inclusive aspect, making use of differentiated thought processes to demonstrate from other Scriptures, the existence of a hierarchy between the deity, angelic beings, the human and the remainder of creation.

Both Tannaim as well as Amoraim demonstrated the aspect of דמות in relation to the Ten Commandments to show that God’s likeness must be understood in terms of the physical presence of Torah in Israel and its function in that context. Tannaim inferred a functional aspect to דמות, which implies that man is like the deity if he behaves in accordance with the pattern that is set forth by the deity through Torah. Amoraim developed the functional aspect of דמות in line with the analogous pattern given in Genesis 1: 26, where צלם was understood by them.

99 This is a linguistic concept, which stresses the speech situation in communication. For a discussion of this concept, see Gitay (1981: 41-45).
to denote the inner structure of the deity, which is demonstrated through Torah.

The use of יְהֹוָה and אלהים, denoting names of the deity, also played a major part in the defence of Judaism’s main premise that God is One, in both tannaitic as well as amoraic sayings. Sages did this by differentiating between the two names and respectively linking them to God’s rule of mercy and judgement. On the other hand, they argued that the concomitant use of יְהֹוָה אלהים in Scripture pointed to the complementary workings of God’s rule of mercy and justice. They used methods of substitution and rhetoric to show that the plural designation אלהים for God could equally stand for the Tetragrammaton and the formula הקדוש ברוך הוא.

The practical implication of the foresaid is that tannaitic sages first and foremost, or simply, appealed to Scripture to argue their case. Amoraim, on the other hand, went a step further. They appealed to logical processes of classification and differentiation, operating within the limits of Scripture, to demonstrate and thereby entrench what Tannaim had proposed in earlier times. Amoraim developed the doctrine of ministering angels in rhetorical arguments, to contend with heretics on the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27. The fact that Amoraim were particularly active in the third and fourth centuries when Christianity took shape under Constantine, explains why Judaism’s documents of the late fourth and fifth centuries developed for the most part in response to points of contention with Christianity (cf. Neusner 1986). The defensive techniques that sages used can be summed up as follows:
Chapter 4

- They changed the formula בצלמנו כדמותנו to בצלם בדמות נעשה, and the plural verb form, Let us make to a singular, namely, אעשה, in Genesis 1: 26-27, to support the doctrine of monotheism.

- They substituted plural pronominal suffixes with the singular to support the doctrine of monotheism.

- They cited proof-texts from seemingly non-related contexts of Scripture to prove their propositions.

- They differentiated between the functions of the names יהוה and אלהים in Scripture and substituted אלהים in Genesis 1: 26-27 with the Tetragrammaton or a formula to address the inclusive aspect of נעשה.

- They introduced and developed the doctrine of ministering angels to demonstrate the inclusive aspect of נעשה.

For the investigation and analysis of targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 and also, for the redaction history of Targums, each of these defensive techniques can prove to be informative, if we assume that Midrash and Targum did not develop separate from each other but rather, as Stemberger puts it, that they developed ‘aus dem gemeinsamen Sitz im Leben, der für beide in Schule sowie Synagogenliturgie zu sehen ist’ (1982: 226). In that case, one should presumably be able to determine whether interpretive tendencies in a Targum correspond with the tannaitic period or whether they reflect the development of later midrashic activity by Amoraim (see Chapters five, six and seven for this venture). Taking into account, further, that extant Targum traditions are for the most part standardized versions, we can assume that the process of standardization took place, for the most part, during the amoraic period. My conjecture in this respect is that extant Targum traditions – where they represent
official versions – will reflect the approach of Amoraim. However, at this point of my thesis, this is a conjecture, which remains to be investigated against the rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 in the various Pentateuch Targum traditions in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.
This Chapter deals with two targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27, that is, from Fragment Targum, *recension P, MS Paris 110* (FragTarg) and Neofiti 1 (N). The Aramaic translations are compared with the Hebrew Text of the Hebrew Scriptures and with midrashic passages dating from the age of formative Judaism. The aim is to establish how these targumic renderings correspond to other midrashic exegeses of Genesis 1: 26-27 in that age and what the implication of these research results is for dating and contextualizing the two said extant targumic renditions within the framework of emerging rabbinic Judaism. Preceding this investigation, the two Targums are placed into the context of current scholarly research in terms of how scholars, in the past and more recent, perceived their function and their *Sitz- im-Leben*.

### 5.1 Current Scholarly Views on FragTarg (Recension P, MS Paris 110) and Neofiti 1

Scholars are in consensus that the targumic recensions, FragTarg and N, are Palestinian Targums. Generally speaking, Targums exemplify how rabbis read Scripture at particular points of time and in specific contexts. Palestinian Targums show us how Scripture was interpreted in the Land of Israel during the first centuries of the Common Era. To date, Palestinian Targums have been placed into the categories of either periphrastic or literal.

---

1 See my discussion of this aspect in Chapter 2 (2.1 and 2.2).
It was pointed out in Chapter 2 [2.2] that both Schäfer and Flesher suggest that not all Targums may have had a similar *Sitz-im-Leben*. Schäfer (in Maier & Schreiner 1973: 398-99) proposes that the prime purpose of some written Targums could have been the academy, while Flesher (2001: 28) speaks of a ‘teaching targum’; but, neither Schäfer nor Flesher has taken the matter much further than that. Nonetheless, there is general consensus among scholars that FragTarg and N are liturgical renditions (cf. 2.1 and 2.2). The term ‘liturgical’ here means that they were used in the local Synagogue service with the congregation present.

5.2 The Theological Emphasis of Liturgical Targums

Liturgical Targums or Targums that were used during Synagogue services were not, first and foremost, compiled for the purpose of formal teaching and adjudication, but rather to involve the community in the study of Torah. This is demonstrated through the interpolation of rabbinic stock phrases into the rendering of N. The practice of interpolating rabbinic stock phrases into targumic renderings shows how rabbis sought to correlate targumic rendering with the Synagogue sermon or proem.² By implication, the emphasis in liturgical Targums is on theological topics (e.g. the concept of God) and not so much on *halakhah*. The Aramaic dialects (JTA)³ of FragTarg and N also disclose something about the purpose, which they served. Their dialect falls

² An example of such a rabbinic stock phrase is the repeated interpolation of the paraphrase מַעְשֵׂהׁ בְּרֵאשִׁית in Genesis 1 (N). B. Barry Levy notes that this interpolation seems to have been joined to the Aramaic equivalent of the Mishnaic Hebrew מַעְשֵׂהׁ בְּרֵאשִׁית (1986: 87; cf. also Golomb 1985: 226). Levy points to many cases where rabbinic ideas are used in both midrashic embellishments and the base translation of N, e.g. Exodus 12: 9; Leviticus 19: 20; Numbers 12: 12; 35: 31; Deuteronomy 4: 32; 17: 8 and 25: 2 (1986: 31).

³ Jewish Targumic Aramaic, which is a sub-dialect of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA). JPA was at one stage the Aramaic spoken dialect of Jewish Galilee (cf. Flesher 2001: 22-23; Sokoloff 2002: 3).
into the category of ‘popular’ rather than ‘literary’ Aramaic⁴. The use of a popular dialect implies that they were compiled for a popular audience.

It can thus be expected that a passage, like Genesis 1: 26-27 – whose primary focus is the image-of-God – will be rendered from a theological perspective rather than a halakhic one, in a liturgical Targum, because in rabbinic theology the text of Genesis 1: 26-27 is narrowly linked to the idea of God’s Unity and Uniqueness, and also to the evolvement of Judaism’s principle creed (cf. Chapter 3). To investigate this postulation, I will compare, in the following, the respective renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27, in FragTarg and N, with the Hebrew Text of Scripture and also with midrashic passages that I have dealt with in Chapter 4. In the process, the following aspects will be taken under scrutiny:

What do FragTarg and N reveal concerning rabbinic theological views within the context of Judaism’s formative age⁵? Further, how are FragTarg and N similar / dissimilar? And lastly, what do these research results spell out for contextualizing these two Targums, historically?

For the purpose of comparing the two said targumic renderings with the HT of Genesis 1: 26-27, I will align the HT of each verse with the targumic rendering under survey. The targumic rendering will be scrutinized, in particular, with a view to departure from literalness and how the departure from literalness fits into the context of rabbinic Judaism.

---

⁴ The concept of a literary dialect is discussed quite comprehensively by Flesher (2001: 12-13).
⁵ Stretching from time of the destruction of the Second Temple to circa 500 C.E.
5.3 FragTarg (Recension P, MS Paris 110)

A fragmentary Targum (recension P, MS Paris 110) on Genesis 1 was found in the Cairo Geniza. Not much is known about the function of the Geniza fragments, except that they bear witness to an early fluid state of the Palestinian Targum. They not only represent a distinctive targumic tradition but fragments also differ slightly among themselves (cf. Bowker 1969: 21). Hamburger ascribes a considerable age to these fragments. Among other reasons, he notes that the older part of the Midrash Rabbah frequently quotes fragments of the Targum Jerushalmi, ‘…es sind aramäische Uebersetzungsstücke zum Pentateuch, die in ihrer Zusammenstellung Reste alter Targumträümmer enthalten …Das Alter ist dadurch verbürgt, daß die in dem älteren Theil des Midrasch rabba zitirten aramäische Übersetzungen zu vielen Bibelstellen die unseres Targums sind …’ (1892: 1177). The point of note is here that fragments of ancient Targum citations are present in the older parts of Midrash Rabbah. This fact illustrates that Targum and Midrash traditions were not always kept apart. It also alludes to the interdependency of the two exegetical text traditions. In the following, some aspects of this interdependence will be highlighted and discussed from the synoptic passage that I selected for this purpose, namely Genesis 1: 26-27.

---

6 For a more detailed discussion on these fragments see J. Bowker (1969: 20-21).
7 Hamburger reasons that the translation of Genesis 1: 1 is reminiscent of the Alexandrian Logos teaching; this was later avoided because of the increasing sectarianism. Further, the names of angels do not yet appear in their later composition (see Mysticism) and also none of the names of later cities and countries that are noted for the younger age of Pseudo-Jonathan. Hamburger ascribes the fragmentary nature of this Targum to their primary oral function (1892: 1177).
8 Hamburger notes the following citations, ‘So in Midrasch rabba 1 M. Absch. 70 zu 1 M. 29. 7. ותני לאה הוו רכיכין, daselbst Absch. 42. zu 1 M. 14. 5. ותני לה רכה, daselbst Absch. 45 zu 1 M. 16. 7. ותהא תמר, daselbst Absch. 88 zu 1 M. 40. 5. זעראוה תמר, daselbst Absch. 98 zu 1 M. 49. 3. דבאורה הגרא, דבלם חבריה; das. Absch. 80 zu 1 M. 34. 12. ותני והיה משאר, פפרינ, מזר ומשאר, gleich Jeruschalmi Targum durch u.a.m. Mehreres siehe Chajoth, Imre bina Absch. IV’ (1892: 1177, fn. 5).
I have chosen Michael L. Klein’s (1980: 44-45)\(^9\) text of the FragTarg’s of the Pentateuch to serve as basis for the targumic rendition of Genesis 1: 26-27 in Fragment Targums of the Pentateuch, as this is the only fragment that renders the said biblical text. In the English translation\(^{10}\) of FragTarg, departure from literalness is presented in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unvocalized Hebrew Text:</th>
<th>English translation(^{11}):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ראימר אלוהים נגעוה אדנים מבולמנים דמותנו ויחי</td>
<td>26. And God said: Let us make man (humanity) in our image after our likeness and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FragTarg:</th>
<th>English translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ראימר: אומר פומר דעם בעד הבני ימי ויאמר: ואמר</td>
<td>26. And he said: And the word of the Lord said: Let us create humanity in our likeness(^{12}) similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) Also available on CD from [www.logos.com](http://www.logos.com): *Logos Bible Software Series X*: The Targums from the files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project. The texts of the Fragment Targums come from Michael Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, Analecta Biblica 76, (Biblical Institute Press, Rome 1980). The CAL is indebted to the DJPA project directed by Dr. Michael Sokoloff and funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities for sharing this material. There are four recensions of the Fragment Targums: P = MS Paris 110. The repetition at Deuteronomy 7 of the Decalogue is split into a separate resource for the LDLS edition.VNL = Vatican Ebr. 440 // Nuernberg // Leipzig. J = JTS Lutzki 605 (ENA 2587). Br = BL Or. 10794. Preparation of this electronic database was made possible by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion.

\(^{10}\) The translation is my own translation and will be defended within the course of the subsection under discussion.

\(^{11}\) The English translation represents my own rendering throughout.

\(^{12}\) For the translation of דמות see Sokoloff (2002: 151).
And God created the man (Adam) in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.

FragTarg’s rendering of נעשׂה for the Hebrew נעשׂה is paralleled in N. The translation of נעשׂה will be discussed in correspondence with the discussion of N and in conjunction with Bernard Grossfeld’s comment under 5.4.1.1.

FragTarg (Gen 1: 26) renders בדמום כדמותו ובצלו ובצלו כדמותו as בדמום כדמותו and in the Aramaic. It avoids a translation of the Hebrew term צלם by substituting it with דמו. When in verse 27, FragTarg again avoids the translation of the term צלם by substituting בדמום ובצלו ובצלו with בדמום ובצלו ובצلو by substituting בדמום ובצלו ובצלו with בדמום ובצלו ובצלו and thus rendering בדמום ובצלו ובцלו by substituting the singular pronoun אתו with the plural אתו in his image in the image of God He created him (v. 27).

13 This is a standard genitive construction in Aramaic.
14 For a translation of יד cf. Sokoloff 2002: 173, 2# [1.].
15 On this rendering also compare my discussion on N’s translation in 5.2.
The emphasis in rabbinic theology on דמות is already notable in the LXX where דמות is translated with ὀμοιωσις, a term, which Plato uses in the sense of becoming like or assimilation, but in the NT refers to likeness or resemblance (Liddell 1999: 556). According to E.W. Bullinger (1975: 971), the Greek term ὀμοιωσις depicts דמות in the sense of similitude and is not used in the sense of an explicit image. The deviation from literalness in FragTarg is particularly significant since the term צלם does, in fact, exist in the Aramaic; however, it is used in the context of iconic representations, specifically idols or statues (cf. Sokoloff 2002: 465). Rabbis must therefore have had reason to avoid צלם in the rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 and substituting it with the broader term דמות (resemblance) (cf. 3.3.3). The elimination of צלם in FragTarg is in accord with other sage literature dating from the same period. Evidence in this regard was gained from the comparative study of tannaitic and amoraic Midrashim in Chapter 4, where I showed that sages had a supramythological and supranatural conception of the Deity. Accordingly, the deity falls into the category of celestial creatures, like the ministering angels (cf. GenR 8: 11 in 4.3.1). The implication is that unlike terrestrial creatures, the celestial creatures can not be seen with the human eye. The connotation is that the existence of celestial creatures can not

---

16 No accents have been added to the Greek text on account of discrepancies that occur with different computerized systems. The Greek Text (LXX), Genesis 1: 26, reads και εἶπεν ο θεὸς Ποιησομεν ανθρώπον κατ' εἰκόνα ημετεράν καὶ καθ' ὀμοιωσιν (Ralphs 1979: 2).

17 The Greek translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 is discussed in greater detail by Alan F. Segal (2002: 184-85). In regard to God’s guises, Alan F. Segal discusses several instances in midrashic literature, where the interpretation that God changes aspect, could implicate separate divine figures. He shows clearly how orthodox counter-interpretations of dangerous Scripture developed in rabbinic circles, with the emphasis on God’s unity (2002: 33-59).

18 Cf. also PesR 48: 2 and NumR 16: 24 on Gen. 1: 27 (in Chapter 3, 3.3.2). Here sages quote Genesis 3: 22, Behold man is become like one of us, where ‘us’ refers to the deity and the angels. With the reference to ‘us’, the inference that the deity belongs to the category of celestial beings is deduced, indirectly, from the notion that the ministering angels are celestial beings.
be proven scientifically and therefore they can not be represented iconoclastically. Sages solved the problem of an invisible deity by arguing that God reveals Himself to human vision in various likenesses. Sages certainly did not have in mind many gods, when they referred to various likenesses. Rather the various likenesses were, in their opinion, different manifestations of the One and Only God (cf. PesR 21: 6 in 4.3.3). The reasoning follows a theological train of thought, where the idea of a single deity is demonstrated through the moral behaviour of humanity and not iconoclastically. In other words, man is like God in terms of his innate being. This innate being is defined as צלם by rabbis; its illustration takes place in correspondence with הדמה. In FragTarg (Gen. 1: 26) this rabbinic view is clearly reflected. It has instead of בצלמנו in our likeness instead of in our image. The substitution of צלם with דמה, by rabbis, can be explained from a comparison with midrashic passages such as I have analysed in 3.3.3 (c.f. Mek. Bachodesh 6: Exod. 20: 3-6; Mek. Bachodesh 8: Exod. 20: 12-14; PesR 21: 6; PesR 21: 19; and PesR 25: 3).

---

19 See Pesiqta Rabbati Piska 21: 100 and Pesiqta deRab Kahana 12: 25 for examples of sages’ reasoning on this aspect. In Neusner's analysis of Pesiqta deRab Kahana 12: 25, God’s variety features diverse images, which are all formed in the one model of humanity. Accordingly, the individuality and particularity of God’s Unity and Uniqueness rests upon the diversity of humanity (2002: 168-69). Although this exegesis is not entirely in line with the targumic reasoning, it nevertheless, demonstrates that sages saw humans as reflections of the divine image and likeness, where the human model reflects the innate character of the deity in diverse ways. The redaction and dating of Pesiqta deRab Kahana remains enigmatic. Martin Buber placed it into the third century C.E., while others believe its redaction to fall into the fifth century (in Strack & Stemberger 1982: 272-73).

20 The Midrash deals with the image of God in an indirect way by linking the aspect of the divine likeness (i.e. צלם from Gen. 1: 26) to the expression פנים פנים in Deut. 5: 4, The LORD spoke with you face to face in the Mount. The different ‘faces’ of God are interpreted in terms of diverse manifestations of the likeness of God. Cf. also Neusner (2002: 167).

21 On occasions where humans do not exhibit correct moral behaviour, the deity’s name is blasphemed, that is, chillul hashem takes place (see Lev. 20: 3).

22 In the light of this definition of צלם, rabbis argued that God’s image could not be represented through an icon; hence man could never be a little god. See Segal’s discussion.
Targumic research of the Aramaic combination בר נש shows that it is a generic form or a collective reference to people. B. Grossfeld suggests that the rendering of אדם for the Hebrew term אדם (v. 26) in FragTarg is indicative of the rabbinic notion that humanity reflects the variety of God. According to Grossfeld, the reason that FragTarg renders אדם for in the Hebrew Scriptures (Gen. 1: 26) is that rabbis viewed אדם without the definite article, in Hebrew, as collective for humanity. Grossfeld’s assumption is plausible in the light of rabbinic parallels that verify this interpretation (2000: 73) (see M. Yevamot 6: 6; BT Yevamoth 61b; PesR 108b).

By contrast, in verse 27 (HT), the term אדם appears in the determined state, with the addition of the article. The implication is that אדם has now become a known concept and therefore is specific. This sense is underscored in the Aramaic rendition of verse 27 in FragTarg, which renders אדם for the Hebrew term אדם, as opposed to בר נש for the Hebrew אדם, in verse 26. According to Michael Sokoloff, אדם without the article, in Aramaic, stands for ‘the first man’ (2002: 36, 2#). This means that, in Aramaic, אדם without the article refers to a particular person, who is referred to, in midrashic passages, as אדם הראשון the first man. The concept of ‘first man’ has received considerable attention in Ephraim E. Urbach’s study of rabbinic dicta (1979: 229-33). He notes (1979: 229):
In the various Gnostic doctrines the gods, and in particular the supreme deity, bore the names ‘the Complete Man’ (ο τελειος ανθρωπος)\textsuperscript{26}, ‘the First Man’, ‘the Man of Light’, and also just ‘Man’ (Ανθρωπος). Apparently the Amoraim at the beginning of the third century knew of such doctrines.

Urbach’s view is confirmed in a study by A. Segal (2002), who notes that sages absorbed remnants of myths\textsuperscript{27} concerning the creation of man, into their theology, voided them of their mythological content and superimposed on them their own principles of faith.\textsuperscript{28}

In orientation with Urbach’s and Segal’s research, Sokoloff’s information (2002: 36, 2#) – that אדם without the Article, in Aramaic, stands for ‘the first man’ – is correct. Summative, it may be concluded with a great measure of certainty that אדם, without the Article in verse 27 of FragTarg, is used in reference to the specific man called ‘Adam’. The assessment is underscored

\textsuperscript{26}Cf. fn. 16.

\textsuperscript{27}Rabbis were also confronted with a very early category of heresy referred to as ‘Two powers in heaven’ in the third century C.E. This is extensively discussed in a study by A. Segal (2002). He shows how earliest heretics believed in two complementary powers in heaven, while later heretics believed in two opposing powers in heaven. In reaction to such changing beliefs, rabbis of the age of formative Judaism compiled a number of dictums that addressed diverse aspects of these heresies (for examples, see Urbach 1979: 229-34).

\textsuperscript{28}Testimony to this practice is found in GenR 8: 9 (in Kantrowitz 1999-2004):

\begin{quote}
Said R. Hoshaiah, when the Holy One, blessed be He, created the first man, the Ministering Angels mistook him [for God] and wished to say before him, ‘Holy!’ To what can the matter be compared? To a king and a governor who were driving in a carriage ...and the citizens wished to cry ‘domine!’ to the king, and they did not know which was he. What did the king do? He pushed him [the governor] out of the carriage; then the people knew (who was) the king. So, too, when the Holy One, blessed be He, created the first man, the angels mistook him [for God]. What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He put him to sleep, and all knew that he was man. This is the meaning of the verse, ‘Cease ye from man’ etc. (Isaiah ii 22) (translated by Urbach 1979: 229-30). The Midrash argues the view that the ‘first man’ was not a god, but a human being.
\end{quote}
by the fact that the noun אדם is preceded by the direct object marker ית. Essentially, therefore, FragTarg’s rendering of verse 27 does not deviate from the Hebrew text in this aspect. The Hebrew Scriptures convey the same specification with the addition of the article, that is, האדם (v. 27).

FragTarg’s rendering of Genesis 1: 27 is strikingly similar to the midrashic approach used in a tannaitic precept (Mek. Pisha 14)\(^{29}\) and an amoraic Midrash (GenR 8: 11[ו: יא])\(^{30}\), which I compared in 4.3.1. Both passages refer to an intentional change that sages made to Genesis 1: 26-27 in a copy of the Torah for King Ptolemy. The renderings of Genesis 1: 27 in FragTarg, Mek. Pisha 14 and GenR 8: 11[ו: יא] are shown in the table below for comparison. The diversion from the Hebrew Text appears in italics in the English translation of each text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Source, and Language</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scripture Genesis 1: 27</td>
<td>ויברא אלהים את־האדם בצלימו בצלם אלהים ברא אתו זכר ונקבה ברעם׃</td>
<td>And God created the man (Adam) in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FragTarg Genesis 1: 27 (Dating is uncertain)</td>
<td>אדםמימריה דייי יתוברא ברא בדמותיה בדמו מן קדם ייי בראה יתהוןוזוגיה דכר יתהון</td>
<td>And he created: And his word [lit.] of the LORD created Adam in His resemblance, in resemblance from before the Lord He created them: male and his partner He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mek. Pisha 14 (Tannaitic text)</td>
<td>אלוהים ברא בראשית. אסרה אדם בצלם בצלם וברא.</td>
<td>God created in the beginning. I shall make man in an image and in a likeness. Male and his female parts(^{31}) He created him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{29}\) Lauterbach (1976[1]: 111-12).


\(^{31}\) Jastrow (1996: 930) translates slightly less literal, ‘with corresponding female parts’.
From Table 2, above, it can be seen that the particular focus of each translation is on the term נְקֵבָה in the HT: male and female, He created them. Against this, FragTarg renders: male and his partner He created them. The unvocalized text of Mek. Pischa 14 reads male and his female parts He created him, with the focus on the singular. By contrast, GenR 8: 11 retains the underlying plural focus of the Hebrew Scriptures male and his female parts, He created them.

In my earlier analysis of these two midrashic passages (3.3.1), I pointed out that the amoraic comment on Genesis 1: 27 (GenR 8: 11[ו: א]) largely matches the same text, cited in Mek. Pischa 14; however, with emendations and additions. The sole focus of the amoraic Midrash is on the unvocalized term נְקֵבָה, which Tannaim, earlier, substituted for נְקֵבָה in the HT. While Gen R 8: 11 (formulated by Amoraim) retains the tannaitic substitution נְקֵבָה (HT) and vocalizes it יונְקוּבָ, it discards the tannaitic alteration from the plural בראemy (in the HT) to the singular בראthem. Instead, GenR 8: 11 renders בראם He created them. Therewith it follows the HT.

The exegetical focus of the amoraic Midrash in GenR 8:11 was shown, in 4.3.1, to be on a comparative analysis between man versus celestial beings and man versus terrestrial beings, where the term נְקֵבָה was midrashically expanded with the emphasis on the interpretive perspective of ‘his openings / female parts’. In this point GenR 8: 11 follows the tannaitic substitution נְקֵבָה (in Mek. Pischa 14) for נְקֵבָה (HT). Against these two midrashic presentations,
FragTarg renders *
{Targum}
instead of


In comparison with FragTarg’s rendering, the midrashic changes (in Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8: 11) from


introduce increased differentiated readings to the Hebrew Scriptures than FragTarg. While FragTarg changes the general term נקבות (HT) to a specific term his partner


with the addition of a pronominal suffix to the Aramaic synonym of נקבות, and thus creates an obvious connected pair (ברא יתהון male and his partner, He created them) from two opposite entities in the Hebrew Text (ברא זכר ונקבה male and female, He created them), Mek. Pischa 14 eliminates the idea of plurality, altogether, with the creation of a single unit that consists of diverse parts (ברא זכר ונקוביו male and his female parts, He created him). GenR 8: 11, on the other hand, appears to link the phrase in Mek. Pischa 14, זכר ונקוביו male and his female parts with the clause in FragTarg ברא יתהון He created them, and as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FragTarg</th>
<th>מדרוזוגיהבראיתוהון</th>
<th>male and his partner, He created them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mek. Pischa 14</td>
<td>זכרונקביוברא</td>
<td>male and his female parts, He created him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenR 8: 11</td>
<td>זכרונקביובראם</td>
<td>male and his female parts, He created them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 3, it can be observed that GenR 8:11 retains the idea of a single unit (as opposed to a pair) as in זכרונקביו male and his female parts (Mek. Pischa 14), incorporating it into a plural context בראם He created them (FragTarg). GenR’s synthesis of a single and a plural focus is, strikingly,

32 Grossfeld remarks that the term זוג is generally understood as referring to one’s wife (2000: 73).
paradoxical. It, however, seems that the addition of a plural context He created them, avoids the implication that God is male and female, which can be drawn from the expression זכר וּנְקָבָיו male and his female parts.

The fact that FragTarg amends the HT by adding a specifying suffix his partner in its translation of נְקֵבָה female indicates that sages were addressing a controversy underlying the Hebrew Text (cf. the controversy that is addressed in GenR 8:11 [4.3.1]). The amendment וְגֵרָם his partner, in FragTarg, infers that נְקֵבָה in the HT was to be understood in terms of a relationship between a man and his wife.

The observed link between FragTarg, Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8:11 (cf. Table 3) demonstrates the correspondence between targumic rendering and midrashic activity, noted by Strack and Stemberger (1982: 226) and Neusner (1986: 89) (cf. Chapter 4). The main point in argument in this instance is that Genesis Rabbah (GenR) is an exegetical Midrash whose traditions are believed to have been associated with the delivery of early Synagogue sermons or proems (cf. Moshe 1972; Heinemann 1971). Joseph Heinemann shows how the structure of the early proem was based on the play of words referred to as charizah (connection; lit. stringing of beads). The preacher made use of a chain of expositions and interpretations until he would, at the end of the proem, arrive at the first verse of the pericope with which he concluded (1971: 101). Heinemann’s particular emphasis lies in the connection of the proem with the customary Torah reading (1971: 109). He

---

33 Genesis Rabbah (GenR) or Bereshith Rabbah is viewed as one of the oldest, systematic Jewish commentaries (expositional midrashim) to the book of Genesis (Strack 1983; Neusner 1988). Traditionally its composition is ascribed to Oshaia, a first generation Palestinian Amora. Its date of redaction is thought to be ca. 400 C.E (Neusner 1998: 101).
also refers to a rule in Soferim xiv 12\(^{34}\) that mentions the Aramaic translation of the pericope (the customary weekly reading in the Torah) in conjunction with the sermon. In the light of this rule, he proposes that homiletic Midrashim should be consulted for parallels to Targum texts that contain midrashic additions to the Bible (1971: 100). Etan Levine similarly connects Targum to homiletic Midrashim, saying that the latter frequently contain in explicit expanded form the Midrash to which the Targum refers or alludes (1988: 10). The connection of this Targum with the Synagogue context is further underlined by Hamburger’s observation that Targum Jerushalmi differs from Targum Pseudo-Jonathan in that it only uses of the Haggadah and the Halakhah, which sheds light on the biblical text, ‘Die Aussprüche von beiden [Agada und Halacha] sind bei ihm nur wegen des Textes da, aber der Text nicht für sie, um für ihre Lehren, Gesetze und Legenden Nachweise in der Bibel aufzusuchen. So unterscheidet es sich auch dadurch von dem Targum des Pseudojonathan’ (brackets added) (1892: 1178). Hamburger’s argument is that Targum Jerushalmi only rendered what was necessary for the context of the Synagogue, nothing more.

The play of words between נקב of the HT and נקביו of the two midrashic passages Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8: 11, as well as the indirect correlation between the midrashic expansion זכר ונקביו male and his female parts and the targumic rendering הזכר וזוגי male and his partner illustrates that exegetical activity surrounding the Hebrew Scriptures was complex. From the preceding study (taking נקב as an example), it may be observed that in rabbinic exegeses of the Hebrew Scriptures Targum is associated with midrashic activity. This connection is not always clear-cut, but indirect, as between

\(^{34}\) Quoted from Higger’s edition: XIII 15. Cf. also XII 7 in Heinemann (1971: 110).
FragTarg’s rendering זוגיה his partner, and נקביו his female parts in Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8: 11.

Notwithstanding the apparent correspondence between FragTarg’s rendering of Genesis 1: 27 and GenR 8: 11 – the fact that it is a fragmented version – makes it an unreliable source for establishing the relation between targumic rendering and midrashic activity. The comparison between Midrash and Targum will therefore be repeated with N’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27. N is a complete Targum and represents a standardized version (cf. 5.4.1.1; 5.4.1.2 and 5.5).

5.3.1 Conclusive Remarks on FragTarg

In comparison with the Hebrew Scriptures, FragTarg shows two significant departures from literalness (i) it substitutes בצלמות in our likeness for בצלמנת in our image (Gen. 1: 26) and (ii) it renders זוגיה his partner for נקביה female.

FragTarg shows markedly some indirect correspondence with other midrashic exegeses on verse 27 in sage literature, that is, Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8: 11 (זוגיה his partner (FragTarg) / נקביו his parts (Mek. Pischa 14 and GenR 8: 11)). Its correspondence, in verse 27, is closer to GenR 8: 11 (an amoraic Midrash [ברא שמו He created them (FragTarg) and ברא שמו He created them (GenR)]) than to Mek. Pischa 14 (a tannatic precept [ברא זוחל He created him] (Mek.)) (cf. Table 3).
5.4 Neofiti 1

One of the Palestinian Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch is a text known as Neofiti 1 (N). It was discovered in 1956 in the Vatican Library by Alexander Diez-Macho. The Codex is written in a very clear, square hand with extensive marginal and even occasional interlinear glosses (McNamara 1972: 184). Martin McNamara notes that marginal glosses are by several hands (1972: 188). Occasionally they contain corrections of the text, but more often they represent variant readings from other targumic renderings. This is confirmed in B. Barry Levy’s study of Neofiti 1 (1986). In his view, N is both a literal rendition of the Hebrew text as well as a creative amplification of it. He points out that many passages, ranging from the size of a word or phrase to a column of text, were not part of the original document. They are additions to the literal translation. The seams of the literary layering of the text are, in many cases, still evident. The end-result of this targumic rendition is thus composite – a collection of elements deriving from different dates (Levy 1986: viii-ix).

The composite nature of N is the reason why the origin of N’s final recension is still debated by scholars. While W.F. Albright (in McNamara 1972: 186) places N into the second century C.E., Diez-Macho and Menahem Kasher (both referred to in McNamara 1972: 186) suggest an even earlier date, placing its original composition into the pre-Christian era. The theory of a pre-Christian origin of N would imply that some of its elements derive from an early oral developmental phase (see my discussion on Targumic rendering in the Synagogue 2.5.3.1). The theory correlates with Levy’s argument that

---

35 See B. Barry Levy’s in-depth discussion on the existent text (1986: 3-10).
36 McNamara does not supply a detailed bibliography here; he just refers to a comment made by Albright in the context of a congress at Oxford in 1959.
the types of standardizations, borrowings and inaccuracies present in N are normally associated with orally transmitted material (Levy 1986: 13).

However, it is necessary to distinguish between early oral elements in N, which date from a pre-Christian era and the actual compilation of a standardized text as it evolved in the aftermath of the destruction. In this respect there appears to be an unresolved difference between Alexander’s notion that N was never standardized (in Mulder & Sysling 1988: 249) and McNamara’s proposal that N could have been a semi-official text in Palestinian Judaism - and therefore a text that was submitted to standardization (1972: 187). Alexander bases his view on the notion that N’s language reflects the younger dialect of Jewish Targumic Aramaic (JTA), while McNamara points out that N’s rendition agrees with the rules of the Mishnah (1972: 187; cf. also Levy 1986: 20).37 In argument against Alexander, Kaufman identifies N’s dialect as JTA, which is liturgical by nature and does not correspond to the vernacular. For this reason, it is classified as a sub-dialect of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic which, according to Flesher (2001: 22), was the spoken Aramaic dialect of Jewish Galilee in the third century. It is also notable that N holds collections of elements, which derive from different dates. In this regard McNamara (2002: 354) thinks it quite conceivable ‘that the text of the Palestinian Targum as represented by Neofiti 1 may well be a product of early Amoraic times, coterminous with Genesis Rabbah, and that both of them derived their aggadic material from an older tradition which was prevalent in Palestine during the early centuries of the common era.’ The implication of McNamara’s analysis (2002: 354) is that N is a Targum that underwent a process of redaction. In line with McNamara’s analysis is Grossfeld’s conclusion that N is an official Targum.

37 See Grossfeld (1968, abstract). Cf. also McNamara’s discussion on its liturgical divisions (1972: 184).
Grossfeld undergirds his conclusion by referring to the fact that N accurately conforms to rabbinic regulations (1968: 431). What is more, the existent text of N constitutes a complete Targum; in other words, it is a full rendition of the Pentateuch into Aramaic. This stands to reason in view of the standardization of the Synagogue service in the aftermath of the Destruction (cf. 2.4.1). The process of standardization also explains the existence of fragmented Targums. It may be assumed that rabbis, during the process of standardization, discussed and compared fragmented targumic renderings against *Proto-Onqelos* (Proto-O) and reworked them for the Synagogue (see my arguments in this respect in 2.5.4 and 2.5.5).

Presumably, the process of standardization began in the Mishnaic and early post-Mishnaic periods (cf. Safrai 1987: 71). As the process of standardization gained momentum in the period of the Amoraim, a homogeneous version for the Synagogue would have evolved and this could well have been an earlier version of the *Neofiti 1* manuscript (cf. also Flesher 1999: 35-79). Indeed, the targumic recension that is preserved in the manuscript of *Neofiti 1* can be described as a master-piece of collective authors (cf. Bowker 1969: 16-21). N’s complexity and collective authorship concurs with Bernard Grossfeld’s conclusion that some of N’s early fragments match up to Cairo Geniza targumic fragments dating from the period between the seventh to the ninth century (1968: 8). In regard to the extant copy of N, Levy found that it was copied in about 1500 C.E., apparently by at least three different people, who were not native speakers of Aramaic. His assumption is that the copiers’ knowledge of Aramaic primarily derives from the dialects found in Onqelos and the Babylonian Talmud. In argument, he points out that the spelling inconsistencies in the copied text provide evidence for this lack of knowledge:

---

**Notes:**

38 In his study of N, P.J. Alexander (in Mulder & Sysling 1988: 218) comes to similar conclusions.
(i) the interchange of letters (ii) uses of final Aleph and Heh for the article (iii) *plene* and defective spelling of the same word in one verse (iv) interchange of pronominal suffixes (v) confusion of the relative *d*- and the conjunction *w*- (vi) confusion of letters that look alike (vii) changes in the tenses of verbs or the states of nouns (viii) potentially significant words have been added or deleted (ix) approximately equivalent grammatical forms have been interchanged, and (x) spellings have been altered (1986: 3).

Levy’s findings leave little doubt that the extant copy of *Neofiti 1* is a late copy of this Targum. However, the fact that N represents a complete Targum, the fact that it its dialect is liturgical by nature and also that its rendition agrees with the rules of the Mishnah, thereby accurately conforming to rabbinic regulations; these factors underscore McNamara’s hypothesis that N was compiled in correspondence with the move of post-temple sages to produce a standardized Targum for use in the Synagogue service. This assumption will be probed further in connection with N’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 and exegeses of the biblical passage in Midrashim dating from the age of formative Judaism.

5.4.1 N’s rendering of Gen. 1: 26-27

In the following, I will investigate how N corresponds to FragTarg and other exegetical sources of tannaitic and amoraic origin in the rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27. To investigate this relationship, N’s text

39 The text is available on CD from www.logos.com. Targum Neofiti was completely collated against the microfilm of the manuscript, and re-read again for marginalia by M. Abegg and S. Kaufman. (For Neofiti, lengthy marginal readings are given separately. Isolated lexical interlinear and marginal variants are marked inline by 1 and 2 respectively.) The CAL is indebted to the DJPA project directed by Dr. Michael Sokoloff and funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities for sharing this material. Preparation of this electronic database was made possible by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, USA (Libronix Digital Library System).
paradigmatically, in a table, against texts that bear evidence of correspondence to the exegesis of Genesis 1: 26-27 in the age of formative Judaism. Paraphrases and exegeses of the Hebrew Text (HT) are indicated with italics in the English translation.

### 5.4.1.1 Gen. 1: 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Texts of verse 26</th>
<th>Translation of verse 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unvocalized Hebrew Text:</strong></td>
<td>26. And God said, Let us make mankind in our image after our likeness and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יאמרי אלהים נעשׂה אדומים בצלמנו וירדו בנות ומכים והשׁמים ובבומחה ובכלי־הארץ</td>
<td>26. And the Lord said, Let us create mankind in our likeness similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נברא בר נוש בדּמָן כד נפק בן</td>
<td>26. And the Lord said, Let us create mankind in our likeness similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neofiti 1:</strong></td>
<td>26. And the Lord said, Let us create mankind in our likeness similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FragTarg:</strong></td>
<td>26. And the word of the Lord said: Let us create mankind in our likeness similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

---

40 For the translation of דמָּת consult Sokoloff (2002: 151).
Whereas N moves towards a literal rendition of והיא אלהים and God said, by translating והיא מימריה דלל and the LORD said, FragTarg is more expansive rendering והיא מימריה דלל and the Word of the LORD said. On the other hand, in the translation of נושאת אלהים בצלמנו both Targums adopt a non-literal approach and agree with each other in their translation of the HT.

According to Grossfeld (2000: 60), N’s rendering of נברא for the Hebrew נעשׂה is in line with a Midrash in GenR41 IV: 6, wherein Ben Zoma raises a commotion in the rabbinic academy in connection with the verb נעשׂה that is used in Scripture, Genesis 1: 7, instead of the typical נברא, which Scripture normally uses in relation to God’s creative acts (verse 27 [HT] has ויעשׂ אלהים׳ את־הרקיע so God made the firmament …). The verb נברא usually refers to something that comes into existence in a speech-act of God whereas the verb נעשׂה is connected with the process of work (the Midrash pays no further attention to the obscurity). Grossfeld is of the opinion that Ben Zoma’s shock became the reason why in N all the other instances of the Hebrew נעשׂה, in Chapter 1 of Genesis, are rendered with נברא where the divine creation of the world is implicated. Ben Zoma was a second generation Tanna (90-130 C.E.),42 who functioned at Yabneh43. Grossfeld’s argument is only tenable on the assumption that sages did indeed assemble, review and rework circling targumic fragments to align them with oral traditions for the Synagogue service. Such editorial activities correspond with Schiffman’s illustration that the second generation of Tannaim took the lead in reconstructing Jewish life in Palestine, by gathering together the traditions of their pre-70 C.E. pharisaic and tannaitic forebears (1991: 183). The fact that Ben Zoma’s statement stands loose from the remainder of the Midrash in GenR 4: 6 in that the

---

obscurity is not resolved, further increases the probability that we have here an early exegetical comment that was assembled, in the process of redaction, together with later traditions. In the event where N was compiled from a collection of traditions (deriving from different dates), which were reworked in the context of rabbinic academies, a comment like that of Ben Zoma would have influenced the rendering of N in relation to the use of אשה in Genesis in Scripture. By contrast, the tannaitic precept held in Mek. Pischa 14 appears to miss, entirely, the dubiety raised by Ben Zoma in regard of Genesis 1: 26, since it retains the use of אשה. More than likely, the tannaitic tradition did not figure in discussions relating to Targum compilation for the Synagogue, because the saying derives from the Mek. de-Rabbi Ishmael, which is a Midrash compilation with the focus on Halakhah. Another reason why the tannaitic precept misses Ben Zoma’s dubiety – if one takes Schiffman’s allusion into account – can be that a looser agglomeration of earlier material was collected in the Mekilta texts over a longer period of time (1991: 199). This could mean that the comment in Mek. Pischa 14 had, at the time, not been assembled to the standard collection of tannaitic precepts. On the other hand the change in Mek. Pischa 14 from the plural נשבר, in Scripture, to the singular נשבר, is so radical that rabbis might have resolved not to introduce it into the text of the standardized Targum version (cf. 4.3.1).

N renders אדם as נשבר in verse 26. This is similar to FragTarg (verse 26). Grossfeld’s argument is that the use of נשבר here refers to the creation of the human specie as opposed to the use of the Aramaic term אדם in verse 27, which deals with the creation of an individual (1968: 34-37). Indeed, the

---

44 As many proems show, GenR is a midrashic commentary that was used in the context of the Synagogue concurrently with the standardized liturgical version held in Neofiti 1.

45 In Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (Lauterbach1976[1]: 111-12).
particularization in verse 27 is functional in FragTarg and N. Whereas בר נש in FragTarg (verse 26), is replaced with the specifying Aramaic term אדם ‘the first man’ (verse 27), N retains the compound בר נש in both verses; however, in verse 27, emphasis is likewise placed on the individual with the addition of an Alpeh, viz. בר נש. This renders the compound בר נש into the determined state and equals the Hebrew (cf. 5.4.1.2).

Grossfeld\textsuperscript{46} further notes that N’s substitution of the Hebrew term בצלמנו with הבצלות was probably motivated by the underlying theological difficulty inherent in בצלמנו. The controversy is underlined in that rabbis ask the question ‘How could man be created in the image of God?’ (1968: 35). (Grossfeld’s assumption matches up to my own research of sage literature on Genesis 1: 26-27 [see Chapter 4], from where it emerged that rabbis were decidedly against a literal translation of צלם [cf. also 5.1]). A literal translation of צלם where image implies the shape and figure of God would have entailed that God must be corporeal. Such a conception was negated in terms of rabbinic theology. Rabbinic parallels pointed out by Grossfeld\textsuperscript{47}reinforce the theological view underlying N, for example, in Tanchuma\textsuperscript{48} (quoted in Grossfeld 1968: 35-36)\textsuperscript{49}:

\begin{quote}
ואם בצלם דיוקנינו? מהו בצלמנו כדמוננו, ויאמר אלהים ונעשׂה אדם בצלמנו כדמוננו (Isaiah 40:18)

והכתיב ואל מי תדמיון אל ומה דמות תערכו לו

כשהוא אומר, וناس, יםكنבצלם אחר אם (Genesis 9: 6)\textsuperscript{50}

אלהים עשה את האדם כי בצלם שפחותי (Genesis 9: 6)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. also Grossfeld (2000: 64).

\textsuperscript{47} He does not translate or discuss them, though.

\textsuperscript{48} No details are given.

\textsuperscript{49} Tanchuma: Edition Buber (1885).

\textsuperscript{50} Grossfeld’s reference to Scripture is erroneous here; it must not be Genesis 9:16, but rather Genesis 9: 6 (1968: 36).
And God said, ‘Let us make man’ כצלמנו כדמותנו. But what is כצלמנו כדמותנו? If with כצלם is our figure, then [consider] what is written in Isaiah 40: 18, But unto whom will you liken God? And what likeness will you compare unto him?

And if כצלם has another meaning here: ‘He made us’, just as it says (Genesis 9: 6), Whoever sheds the blood of the human being, by the human being his blood must be shed; because כצלם אלהים He made the human being. And how so: ‘Is not he bone within himself like an animal?

Then the implication of כצלמנו כדמותנו is: in our innermost – which implies here ‘perfect below, just as I [God] am [perfect] above’.  

Here rabbis use logical reasoning processes to show that כצלם in Genesis 9: 6 refers to God’s inherent character. Their inference is that, just as God is perfect in heaven, so man should be perfect on earth (the moral character is implied). Neusner explains the rabbinic principle saying that rabbis attributed the disruption of the balanced order in the world to man’s possession of freedom of will. In his assessment, the characteristic of free will accords with the likeness of God most pertinently. Through this trait, man is endowed with the same power that the Creator has. However, if man does not accord with God in this characteristic, for example, if man disrupts the balance in the world by murdering a fellow human being, the resultant imbalance can only be counteracted if moral justice is carried out, in accordance with Genesis 9: 6 …by the human being his blood must be shed. Only man, not animal, has been given the ability to retain a just balance on earth. This ability is shown to correspond to man’s moral behaviour (Neusner 2002: 183). In line with Neusner’s explanation, rabbis in the above Midrash, argue that man’s moral

---

51 Own translation
integrity has nothing in common with his corporeality, which is בּוּן פְּנֵי עַצָּמָו "bone within himself like an animal. The connotation is that in his corporeality, man corresponds to animal, but in his moral behaviour he corresponds to the צֵלֶם of God, which is His innate character.

In another rabbinic parallel taken from Tanchuma (quoted in Grossfeld 1968: 35), the rabbinic contention with צֵלֶם is similarly echoed:

אמר ר–באדם הראשון כיצד כשברא הקבּ–ה בامة, אבא בר כהנא
שנאמר ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו

‘With respect to the first man: In what manner did the Holy One, blessed be He, create the first man?’ – Said R. Abba bar Kahana, ‘He created him בדמויות, according to what is said, and God created the man בצלמו (Genesis 1: 27).

Here too, the Hebrew term בּוּן צלֶם in Genesis 1: 27 is substituted with בדמויות in His likeness in the rabbinic argument. In other words, צלֶם image is again substituted with דמויות likeness in this Midrash.

The elimination of צלֶם and the disposing of the phrase בדמויות כּד נפק in Genesis 1: 26 was also noted by Levy and McNamara. While Levy attributes N’s rendering of כּד נפק בדמויות כּוּנְבּ כּוּנְבּ דַמְורֵי כּהַנָּשָׁה to a desire among rabbis to eliminate some of the anthropomorphic qualities of the Hebrew (1986: 89), McNamara is of the view that N renders כּוּנְבּ כּוּנְבּ דַמְורֵי כּהַנָּשָׁה together with כּד נפק as a pair, just as where the Hebrew text uses דמויות צלֶם and כּוּנְבּ דַמְורֵי כּהַנָּשָׁה in conjunction. Hence, McNamara translates the pair ‘in our likeness, similar to ourselves’ (1992: 55). Grossfeld, on the other hand, presents the most striking argument in connection with the translation of כּוּנְבּ כּוּנְבּ in N. He reckons that N’s rendition of כּוּנְבּ כּוּנְבּ (HT) as כּוּנְבּ כּוּנְבּ is a literal Aramaic translation of

---

52 No detail is given by Grossfeld.
the common mishnaic Hebrew idiom ‘כָּאָבָא ב... ‘similar to’
53. In his analysis, the expressions ...כָּאָבָא ב... and ...כָּאָבָא ב... amount to a non-literal rendering of אֶפְּשָׁא לְהוֹר בֶּנְהוֵד אֵנָנֵד (cf. Gen. 2: 18). They are also in contrast to the literal equivalent of TO and PJ (2000: 73-74).

At all events, Grossfeld, Levy and McNamara agree that rabbis understood the phrase ...כָּאָבָא ב... to mean how humanity was similar to God in terms of his moral character and not image-wise. This is particularly obvious in N’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, where ...כָּאָב... is consistently substituted with ...דיָמָת... The consistency bears out that rabbis were intent on defending the view that ...כָּאָב... must not be understood in terms of corporeality (cf. 4.3.3).

In reference to ...דיָמָת... McNamara (1992: 55) remarks that N ‘...avoids use of the word image (šlom)...’ and renders it with the more ‘...abstract “likeness” (dmwt)...’ However, he does not explain why he regards the term ...דיָמָת... more abstract than ...כָּאָב... He might have been influenced by Franz Delitzsch (quoted in Jónsson 1988: 31), who concluded that the term (šelem is more rigid, that of ...דְּמָא... more fluctuating, and so to speak more spiritual; in the former the notion of the original image, in the latter that of ideal predominates’. The problem with McNamara’s definition of ...דיָמָת... is that it does not aptly capture the theological view of rabbis, for reason that the dichotomization of man into spiritual and physical entities is a distinctly Hellenistic differentiation. From Urbach’s discussion of Philo, it is apparent that Philo was strongly influenced by Hellenist philosophy since he uses abstract concepts in speaking of the creation of man.54 He specifically distinguishes between

53 The expression ...כָּאָב... occurs 55 times in the Mishnah with the meaning ‘similar to’, 186 times in the Babylonian Talmud, 119 times in the Palestinian Talmud and 385 times in Midrash Rabbah (cf. Kantrowitz 1991-2004). In this context, Grossfeld refers to J. Levy’s Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targums. Leibzig, 1881, s.v. עשֶם.
54 Urbach discusses Philo’s view in some length (1979: 226).
man’s body and soul (1979: 226). Sages, however, applied the phrase בצלמנו כדמותנו to man in his entirety in that they saw in it a reference to the unity of body and soul.55 A dictum from Leviticus Rabbah 34: 3,56 illustrates the rabbinic notion that the phrase בצלמנו כדמותנו corresponds to the unity of body and soul:

‘A kind man benefits himself’ – this is said of Hillel the Elder. As Hillel the Elder was taking leave of his disciples, he continued to walk along with them. His disciples asked him: ‘Master, where are you going?’ He answered them: ‘to perform a mitzvah [good deed].’ They asked him: ‘And what is this mitzvah?’ He answered them: ‘To bath in the bathhouse.’ They continued to inquire: ‘Is this a mitzvah?’ He answered them: ‘Yes! Just as with the icons of kings - which represent him in the houses of theatres and in the houses of circuses - whoever is in charge over them cleans and washes and they [the kings] provide him with portions; however, not only when he celebrates with the great ones of the kingdom - how much more so I [should clean and wash], who have been created in the [Divine] image and likeness, as it is written ‘In the image of God made He man!’ (Explanatory notes added in brackets)57

Although rabbis understood the God’s image in terms of man’s morality, they made it clear that moral behaviour was linked to the body. This

55 In his study on N, Golomb’s points out that both terms contained in the phrase בצלמנו כדמותנו were considered to be identical by the targumist (1985: 31).
57 Own translation
principle is illustrated through the above parable. Just as the one who is in charge of the icons - which represent kings in theatres and circuses - also washes and cleans his own body, and is provided with sustenance, so Hillel viewed the act of bathing his body as corresponding to the act of teaching his disciples. The story illustrates the rabbinic view that body and soul are co-dependent.

5.4.1.2 Gen. 1: 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text verse 27</th>
<th>Translated Text verse 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unvocalized Hebrew Text:</td>
<td>27. And God created Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְבַרָה אֲלֹהָם אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצֵלָמוֹ בְּצֵלָמוֹ אֲלֹהָם</td>
<td>27. And God created Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neofiti 1:</td>
<td>27. And the word of the LORD created the human [specific] in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created him: male and his partner, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְבַרָה מִמְמָרָה יִיַּיְי וּבְרָא בּוֹ</td>
<td>27. And the word of the LORD created the human [specific] in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created him: male and his partner, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FragTarg:</td>
<td>27. And the word of the LORD created the man [Adam] in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created them: male and his partner, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְבַרָה מִמְמָרָה שָׁמָרָה בּוֹ</td>
<td>27. And the word of the LORD created the man [Adam] in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created them: male and his partner, He created them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both FragTarg and N render וּבְרָא אֲלֹהָם and God created expansively, as מִמְמָרָה יִיַּיְי and the Word of the LORD created. In N, this could possibly be in connection to God’s speech (Levy found that references to God’s speech in N

58 The plene spelling of מִמְמָרָה, מִמְמָרָה, with additional yodh, is not substantially different from the N’s defective spelling of מִמְמָרָה. Cf. Meyer’s discussion of plene and defective spelling (1992: 52).
59 For a translation of מִמְמָרָה, cf. Sokoloff (2002: 173, 2# [1').'
are translated in conjunction with [cf. 1986: 25-51]). The assumption is plausible, since N sticks to a more direct rendering of the subject in verse 26 (and the LORD said) than in verse 27.

Further N renders the articulated Hebrew term מָרָה with בִּרְאָנָה. In other words, here N’s translation is literal. This rendering corresponds with FragTarg, which translates the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים the man (i.e. Adam) with אדם אֵת־הוֹיָם (cf. 5.3). By contrast, whereas FragTarg renders the Hebrew singular pronoun בָּרָה יִתְהַה he created him in the plural בָּרָה יִתְהַה he created them, N retains the literal sense of the HT by translating בָּרָה יִתְהַה he created him.

N’s rendering of the phrase בְּדַמְוָה מִן קְדֵמוֹ יִי in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD for בְּזַלְמָה אֱלֹהִים in the image of God, accords with FragTarg. Here both traditions deviate from a literal translation of the HT. According to Levy, the interpolation קְדֵמוֹ יִי is another instance where rabbis make use of a rendering that avoids speaking of God in anthropomorphic terms (1986: 89). However, M.L. Klein submits conclusive proof in a study on the preposition קְדֵמוֹ that its introduction by various Targums ‘is not for the avoidance or circumlocution of biblical anthropomorphisms.’ Rather, קְדֵמוֹ is commonly used as a substitute for the nota accusativi אֲלֹהֵי in divine as well as human contexts in the Targums, where it occurs as an expression of deference to a respectable person or institution (e.g. the king). He adds that it could also simply occur ‘as the translation of a biblical phrase that was understood figuratively’ (italics added) (1979: 502-07). In the light of Klein’s investigation, the use of קְדֵמוֹ in conjunction with בְּדַמְוָה clearly underlines the fact that rabbis understood the Hebrew text בְּזַלְמָה אֱלֹהִים in the image of God
figuratively. In other words, צלם was understood in a moral sense, not in a physical sense.\(^{60}\)

Notably, N uses the Aramaic term נקבת, just as FragTarg does, to render נקבת (HT). This aspect is dealt with comprehensively by Grossfeld, who shows that the distinction was made in N to refer to man’s feminine counterpart not merely as ‘female’ (נקבת) but rather as ‘his mate’. This Targum applies the term נקבת to animal females rather than human ones (1968: 37-40).\(^{61}\)

Lastly, although this may seem insignificant, it should be noted that both targumic traditions (N and FragTarg) consistently render אלהים with either only יי or המר יי (In my analysis of the use of אלהים and יהוה by tannaitic and amoraic sages, I showed [4.3.2] that they either substituted the plural noun form אלהים with the formula הקדוש ברוך הוא The Holy One, blessed is He, or with the Tetragrammaton יהוה in order to counter the contention of Christians, who argued that the plural verb form נעשה stands in a direct relationship to the plural noun form אלהים and, therefore, was an indication for the Trinity. The consistent use of the Tetragrammaton in the context of Genesis 1: 26-27 could thus have been theological motivated. On the other hand, it is true that rabbis made use of circumlocutions to avoid direct references to God.

5.5 Conclusive Remarks on FragTarg and N

Overall, FragTarg and N show remarkable similarity in their translation of the HT of Genesis 1: 26-27. Furthermore, both are composed in Jewish Targumic

---

\(^{60}\) Cf. Golomb’s discussion of חכם (1985: 31).

\(^{61}\) Compare also my discussion on this rendering in FragTarg under 5.1.
Aramaic (JTA). The dialect is indicative of their use in the context of the Synagogue service (see my discussion of JTA in 2.3 in relation to the theory of a scholarly Targum [fn. 23] and 2.5.3.3). In comparison with FragTarg’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, N shows a slightly greater tendency towards a literal translation of the HT. Presumably this can be attributed to N’s degree of standardization. In other words, the assumption of scholars that we have in N a copy of the final compilation of the standardized Targum for the Synagogue, which was used in Palestine about 350 to 400 C.E. is given further credibility by its leaning towards literalness. By contrast to FragTarg, which is not a complete Targum, N represents a full rendition of the Pentateuch into Aramaic and therefore constitutes a complete Targum. The entire picture agrees well with the theory that several preliminary targumic renditions circled in Palestine, while rabbis were in the process of compiling a standard Targum for the Synagogue. One of these preliminary versions could have been FragTarg. The implication is that FragTarg’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 represents a slightly earlier translation of the passage than that of N.

The manner in which FragTarg and N render Genesis 1: 26-27, that is, avoiding the use of צלם in preference to דמות, corresponds with the theological views of amoraic sages, who argued that man is similar to God in terms of His innate being (cf. GenR 8: 11 [4.3.1]; NumR 16: 24 [4.3.2]; PesR 21: 6 [4.3.3]). In comparison with Midrashim, FragTarg and N thus show closer correspondence to amoraic traditions, than to those of tannaitic origin. The implication for the dating of FragTarg and N is that they both fall into the period of Amoraim.

---

62 In McNamara’s view (1972: 187) Neofiti ‘may have been a semi-official text in Palestinian Judaism’.
Targum Onqelos (TO) is defined as the official Targum to the Pentateuch.\(^1\) It is also called the Babylonian Targum. This name appears to be in correspondence with its link to the Babylonian schools. Most scholars assume that its final redaction was carried out in Babylonia.\(^2\) W. Bacher reckons that it was committed to writing and redacted as early as the third century, but it only gained its official status later in the Babylonian schools (1906: 2). E. Nestle (n.d.) agrees with Bacher that TO’s text could already have been fixed in the third century, but surmises, it did not find official recognition before the fifth century.\(^3\) This view is likewise held by G. Dalman (in Stenning 1911: 2), and I. Drazin (1999) who reckon that its final form can not be earlier than the fifth century, which it acquired in Babylon, probably about the fourth century C.E. B. Metzger (n.d.) also reiterates this process of revision. He holds that TO was in use in the third century of the Christian era but later revised in Babylonia. Against these views, G. Stemberger argues that TO reached official status already early in Judaism. However, he agrees (1977: 81-82) that it was subjected to a constant process of revision, saying ‘…nicht nur mußte seine Halakha dem jeweiligen Stand des rabbinischen Denkens entsprechen, sondern auch sein Bibeltext hatte genau mit dem offiziellen Text übereinzustimmen.’ Scholars are thus in accord with the idea that TO went

\(^1\) See Metzger (1993: 35ff.); cf. also Bacher (1906).

\(^2\) Cf. also Aberbach & Grossfeld (1982: 9) on this issue.

\(^3\) Although Hamburger believes that Babylonia was the place where Targum Onqelos’ (TO) final recension took place, he places the drawing up of TO into the third century CE on the grounds that the Torah teachers of the fourth century, for example, Rav Joseph, Rav Schescheth, R. Nachmannb. Jizchak, Abaji, Raba and others made use of it and cited it (1892: 1188).
through two stages of development, an early and a later one. They disagree on the time when it reached official status. The notion of Bacher (1906) and Stemberger (1977: 82) of linking TO to the academies, suggests that the existing version of TO emerged from an earlier version\(^4\) on the basis that it reflects a process of standardization after the age of innovative learning had reached its peak during the Second Temple period.\(^5\) This means that it was edited already at a fairly early stage (cf. Bernstein 2003: 143). The picture corresponds with Flesher’s hypothesis of an earlier Targum, Proto-O, which he assumes is TO’s predecessor\(^6\). He traces the origins of Proto-O back to the Second Temple period in Palestine (cf. 2001: 3ff.). Passing by the detailed analysis of the theory of Proto-O (cf. Flesher 2001; see also my earlier discussion in 2.3), I will now turn to a brief discussion of the problems that confront researchers when it comes to a comparison of TO with extant Palestinian Targum traditions.

### 6.1 TO and the Rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27

In my earlier survey of targumic activity in the age of formative Judaism (cf. Chapter 2), I proposed that TO was compiled in correspondence with the Old Palestinian Targum tradition. The theory is that rabbis revised Proto-O concomitant with the redaction of the Mishnah for the purpose of implementing Halakhah in the *beth din*. The idea stems from the unresolved dilemma of TO’s relationship to the other Palestinian Targums. It raises the question as to why the compilers and revisers of TO would have thought it

\(^4\) Cf. also Komlosh (1973: 21, 30ff.).

\(^5\) Hamburger illustrates this process of standardization in TO by way of numerous examples (1892: 1185-95).

\(^6\) Cf. also Hamburger’s discussion of this aspect of TO (1892: 1188-89).
necessary to allow for two official Targum-traditions in Palestine, particularly if they were aware of the existing Palestinian Targum traditions (cf. Bowker 1969: 25). The inquiry into this question links to a number of secondary matters. There is, for one, the reality that different places and different groups have different needs. Further, the matters of religious tolerance or reaction to other religious views are significant. Lastly, and most importantly there is also the question of standardization in the aftermath of the Destruction (cf. 2.3; 2.4.1 and 2.4.1.1).

Of all extant Targums, TO is the most literal rendition. Presumably this is due to the process of standardization that it was submitted to, first, in Palestine and thereafter, in Babylonia (cf. 2.4.6.1). Not much is known about the process of revision that TO went through, before it obtained its final form. Therefore, it is presently not possible to conduct an accurate comparison between other extant Palestinian Targums and TO. We simply can not yet point out throughout the extant text, which stage of TO’s development is reflected. In other words, we must assume that we are currently comparing, for the most part, that edition of TO, which evolved from the second stage of its development, in Babylonia. We have no proof, what its earlier version looked like, that is, how TO was composed in the time when it was still in Palestine. Notwithstanding, it should still be possible to discern some details of the different layers of exegetical activity in the extant edition. The problem we are facing is that not enough detailed comparative studies have been done, to date, between TO and other Palestinian Targums, to establish how the two Targum-traditions compare in relation of exegesis and historical context. Although there is this uncertainty, I will, nevertheless, attempt a comparative analysis of Genesis 1: 26-27 between the HT, TO, FragTarg and N in the

---

7 But compare Hamburger’s attempt to illustrate this process (1892: 1185-95).
following. As I compared FragTarg and N in Chapter 5, I will add TO, below, against FragTarg and N in the form of a table for the purpose of comparison.

Table 1 (below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text of Genesis 1: 26</th>
<th>English translation of Genesis 1: 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ויאמר אלהים נעשׂה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו וירדו בדגת הים ובעוף השׁמים ובבהמה ובכל־האר ובכל־הרמשׂ הרמשׂ על־הארץ׃</td>
<td>26. And God said: Let us make man in our image after our likeness and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO*:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. לְטוּן וְיִשְמוּתַנָא כִדְמַנָא  בְצַלְאֲנָשָא נַעֲבֵיד  יויוַאֲמַר בָּא׃שָא דְרָחֵיש עַל אַרְרִח</td>
<td>26. And the LORD said; Let us make man in our image after our likeness and they shall rule over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heaven, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the crawling things that crawl on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. אאמר ויו נברא בר נש בדמותן ואמר (כד נפק בן) וירדו בדגת הים ובעוף השׁמים ובבהמה ובכל־האר ובכל־הרמשׂ הרמשׂ על־הארץ׃</td>
<td>26. And the LORD said, Let us create a human in our likeness(^9) similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FragTarg:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\) The Jewish Literary Aramaic version of the Pentateuch from the files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, USA. Stephen A. Kaufman, Editor-in-Chief. The main text is that prepared by M. Cohen for his new multi-volume publication Mikraot Gedolot HaKeter (Bar Ilan University Press, 1992- ), based on the best available mss. for each text.

26. And the word of the LORD said: Let us create a human in our likeness similar to us and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.

Source Text of Genesis 1: 27
Scripture:

27. And God created the man /Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.

TO:

27. And the LORD created Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female He created them.

N:

27. And God created the human in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created him: male and his partner, He created them.

FragTarg:

27. And the word [lit. his word] of the LORD created the man (Adam) in His resemblance, in resemblance from before the Lord He created them: male and his partner, He created them.

From the above table, it is evident that TO deviates substantially from Scripture only where it substitutes אהלים with the Tetrgrammaton, which is completely in line with targumic rendering of the name of God.

10 For a translation of אהלים cf. Sokoloff (2002: 173, 2# [1]).
Regarding TO’s use of the term אֲנָשָא in verse 26, M. Aberbach and B. Grossfeld (1982: 24-26) note that two Tiberian versions of TO have אדם corresponding to the Hebrew text. They explain that the difference is significant, since אֲנָשָא indicates that man is referred to as species\textsuperscript{11} here, while from the moment of his actual creation he is dealt with as Adam, the individual man. In the Hebrew Text אדם, without the definite article, stands for collective of humanity.\textsuperscript{12} The two Tiberian versions that have אדם corresponding to the Hebrew text could be indicative of later versions, where אֲנָשָא was substituted with אדם.

At all events, corresponding to the use of אֲנָשָא in TO, is בר נש in N. The construct בר נש in N, is in the singular undetermined state and can be equated to בר אֲנָשָא. In Palestinian Aramaic בר נש, as a unified term, is used in the sense of referring to ‘a person’ or ‘someone’.\textsuperscript{13} Against that, the term אֲנָשָא also occurs in N, specifically 26 times in 22 instances in the form of a singular noun in the determined state or in an applied manner. Whereas בר נש ‘person’ in N is applied in the formal, more particular sense of ‘a human being as individual’, N’s use of אֲנָשָא, which is in the determined state, is used in reference to the human being in a more general or collective sense, that is humanity. By contrast, the noun אֲנָשָא in its undetermined state points to the more particularized aspect of the indefinite category, that is, ‘someone’ (Deut 5: 11) or ‘anyone’ (Deut 5: 21). Together with כל as כל אֲנָשָא the combination becomes more generalized again, referring to ‘everyone’ (Deut 5: 16). In 44 occurrences in 24 instances, N uses אֲנָשָא in conjunction with בני as בני אֲנָשָא ‘lit. sons of the

\textsuperscript{11} This is in line with Jastrow (1996: 53). The word אֲנָשָא is noted as being used in reference to the human being as specie, that is, in terms of a generalization.

\textsuperscript{12} This is already evident from Scripture in Genesis 5: 1-2, where אדם is only used in the collective sense.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon. 2004; \textit{Targum Lexicon}. Hebrew Union College.
man’. In this case אֲנָשָא has the function of a plural noun in the determined state. The construct plural בני אֲנָשָא ‘lit. sons of the man’ appears to be in correspondence with the construct singular in בר נש ‘lit. son of someone’. The plural connotation of בני אֲנָשָא in N, corresponds with TO, where we find the same construct relationship occurring 64 times in 38 instances as בני אֲנָשָא.

Passing by the above analysis of this plural construct, we now turn again to a comparison between TO, N and FragTarg regarding their translation of אדם and אדם in Genesis 1: 26-27. Against N’s use of בר נש in Genesis 1: 26, it translates בר נשא in verse 27. The differentiation is from the general sense / a human as individual to the specific sense / the human as individual (cf. my analysis in Chapter 5). The same approach is reflected in TO. Whereas אֲנָשָא is used in reference to the human being in a more general sense in Genesis 1: 26, the term אדם in verse 27, is specific in combination with the preceding direct object marker Rit. Thus both N, as well as TO, move from the general (v. 26) to the specific (v. 27) in correspondence with Scripture where אדם, in verse 26, has the general connotation against את אדם in verse 27, with the implication of the specific. Furthermore, the fact that TO renders ית אדם in verse 27, similar to FragTarg where FragTarg translates אדם in the sense of first man (cf. my discussion in Chapter 5), suggests that TO’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 derives from or is related to an early redactional stage [as significant to this assumed early stage of TO is that אֲנָשָא is listed in the Targum Lexicon 15 1616 times in 1479 instances under the category of Jewish Literary Aramaic (Palestinian)]. TO’s use of אֲנָשָא is here in support of the Palestinian Aramaic dialect, which is indicative of an early stratum in TO’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27.

Further, Aberbach and Grossfeld are surprised that TO renders the entire Hebrew phrase בצלמנו כדמותנו quite literal. They submit (1982: 25):

Surprisingly, TO renders MT quite literally in spite of the obvious theological difficulty of the text. This is all the more astonishing in view of the deliberate change from the plural form of the verse into the singular in the rabbinic version of the “Septuagint”; of MRY מסכתה דפסחא XIV, p. III; T.Y. Meg. I, 11, 71d; T.B. Meg. 9a:

Aberbach and Grossfeld further assume that the explanation for TO’s literal rendition lies in the fact that a deliberate emphasis on the Unity of God was no longer so essential at the time when the Targum obtained its final form. Their deliberation is (1982: 25), ‘for Jews had long ceased to question the monotheistic basis of their faith’. If we presume that we have here an edition of TO that stems from its second stage of development, then Aberbach and Grossfeld are probably right in their reasoning. However, we do not know whether an earlier version of TO also rendered the HT literal; it could have been non-literal too. If TO had rendered Genesis 1: 26-27 non-literal at an earlier stage, it would have been in line with the rabbinic emphasis on the Unity of God, particularly in their confrontation with the Trinitarian speculation of Christians, which began in the second century with Athenagoras (Ferguson, Wright & Packer, 1988: 692).

Verse 27 too, is rendered literal in TO. Referring to the way in which TO translates it, Aberbach and Grossfeld reason (1982: 26) that despite TO’s slightly different vocalization of בצלם אלהים, it leaves בצלם of the MT in the original Hebrew ‘with a view to avoiding the need for awkward theological explanations required for the masses.’ In my view, this explanation is somewhat forced. There is no suggestion, why the masses should not have required a theological explanation for בצלם, considering that rabbis did in fact
change the rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 in Targums that were distinctly compiled for use in the Synagogue service.

Still on the matter of TO’s literal rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, Alex Luc in a fairly recent study also expresses surprise at TO’s literal translation of the image-of-God problem that presents itself from the Hebrew Vorlage. He observes (1999: 220 fn. 5) 16,


Luc has no explanation for the factual manner in which TO handles the image-of-God problematic. The first explanation that comes to mind for TO’s literal rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 is that it reflects the process of standardization that took place in the face of increasing sectarianism (cf. Hamburger 1892: 1185-95). If, on the other hand, one considers the probability that TO was used, for the most part, in the context of halakhic studies, then it makes sense that rabbis would not have emphasized a passage like the image of God, which primarily links to matters of theology.

Against the surprisingly literal translation of Genesis 1: 26-27, it is important to note that most Targum scholars comment on the fact that TO contains halakhic as well as haggadic portions. These means that TO does not, as a rule render Scripture literal. There are definite instances of halakhic or haggadic additions. Hamburger, first, drew attention to this fact (1892: 1189-90) and thereafter, Bacher (1906), who traces these additions back to the input

16 Cf. also Luc (1999: 221, fn. 7).
of the school of Akiva, and especially to the Tannaim of that period. Next, John Stenning (1911: 3) observes that there are evident traces of halakhic and haggadic expansions in TO, while Bowker (1969: 23) submits, ‘Onqelos contains a great deal of interpretive material, both haggadic and halakhic…’ (Italics added). Stemberger is the first to make a distinction between the use of halakhic and haggadic material in TO, noting that TO’s translators (into Aramaic) aimed to reflect on how Halakhah could be accomplished in the legal portions (1977: 82). Aberbach and Grossfeld are even more explicit in their analysis of the deviations in TO. They note (1982: 10):

Thus, despite the reputation of T.O. for its literal rendering of the M.T. there are thousands of deviations – some obvious ones, but many more of a rather subtle type –which cannot be imputed to accidental misinterpretation or to scribal errors. If anything, the contrary is true. Because of the careful revision undergone by this authoritative translation of the Torah, nearly all deviations from the M.T. are meaningful in terms of theological, halakhic or patriotic ideology or, alternatively, as pedagogic devices in the form of explanatory additions, updating names and places and ethnic groups, and avoidance of metaphors and abstract expressions.

From the above breakdown, the following questions transpire:

(i) For what reason would rabbis intentionally have composed a Targum with ‘thousands of deviations’ from the MT, in the presence of other official Palestinian Targums?
(ii) Why was the extensive Haggadah in TO eventually reduced and compressed, sometimes to a single word?\(^\text{17}\)

\(^\text{17}\) Bowker (1969: 23-24) observes in this respect, ‘Often Onqelos uses exactly the same words in its translation of the Hebrew as other recensions of the Palestinian Targum, but leaves out the full interpretations’. For more detail on this subject see Bowker (1967: 51-65). Cf. also Vermes (1963: 159-69).
(iii) Why does TO place so much emphasis on correct halakhic terminology, to the point of incorporating up-to-date referencing of names, places and even ethnic groups?

(iv) Why, furthermore, is TO composed in *Literary Aramaic* which, as Dalman (quoted in Bowker 1969: 23) rightly points out, neither corresponds with the Aramaic dialect of the Babylonian Talmud, nor the Aramaic dialect of the Palestinian Talmud, but is written rather, according to P. Kahle (quoted in Bowker 1969: 23) ‘…in a language which had become the official Aramaic language in the Persian Empire’?

(v) Finally, why is only TO fitted with *Masorah*, while none of the other Targums are?

In the light of Etan Levine’s analysis of Palestinian Targums, it appears that Targums were compiled for different contexts. The picture agrees well with the different types of Targums we have to date. Levine became aware of the abundance of homiletic Haggadah in the Palestinian Targums, which he believes, testifies to their populist nature. Explaining his observation, he elaborates ‘…*haggadah* was a genre to which the masses had ready access’ (1988: 41). Levine’s crucial point is that the popular nature of the Palestinian Targums is indicative of the purpose for which they were composed. What is more, Levine’s distinction is in support of the assumption that Targums were used in different places, among different groups and for different purposes. Other studies done on extant Palestinian Targums confirm that their main focus was the Synagogue service (cf. Flesher 2001: 23; Bowker 1969: 18; McNamara 1972: 86-89). Notwithstanding the popular nature of Targums used in the Synagogue service, David Golomb (1985: 6-8) and Lester L. Grabbe (2000: 164) point out that none of the extant Targums are suggestive of a spontaneous oral rendition in the Synagogue service. Rather, in their
analysis, all extant Targums are *learned* versions, which were compiled in an academic setup with a specific purpose in mind. Significant in this debate is Isidore Singer’s remark that whatever concerns the formative history of the Targums, their use in the liturgical context of the Synagogue was certainly only one aspect of targumic renditions (n.d.: 57). This point is reaffirmed by Grabbe, who points out that Targums were also operational in educational instruction. Elaborating, he states (2000: 164) that specific examples of the educational sort are the Targums from Qumran and TO, both of which appear to be ‘the product of a scribe or an academy of some sort.’

From this discussion, it appears that scholars are not yet clear on the matter of differentiation between Targums that were used in the Synagogue service and Targums that were used for educational purposes. In my opinion, a systematic approach in differentiating between extant targumic renditions could assist us in contextualizing extant traditions with greater accuracy. The point in argument is that all the above and previous arguments focus on the ultimate purpose of a Targum (i.e. TO became the official Targum to the Pentateuch; cf. fn. 1), but from individual verses it may be possible to glean information on the more specific purpose that a Targum (in this case TO) served within a particular historical period. A first step in this direction is that of comparing synoptic passages such as Genesis 1: 26-27. The fact that *liturgical* Targums (like FragTarg and N) deviate from literalness in their translation of this passage while TO renders the same almost literal, warrants a reason for such disparity.

---

18 See my discussion of liturgical Targums in Chapter 2, 2.5.3.3.
At all events, in the following Mishnah (BT Sabbath 115a)\(^\text{19}\) two contrasting targumic renditions are indicated (cf. Smelik 1999: 265-66):

It is stated in respect of a written translation or [one which is] in any tongue [i.e. orally]:

Rab Huna said, ‘They must not be saved from burning.’ But Rab Chisda countered, ‘Those that must be saved from burning [are those translations] that accord with the view that states “they are to be given to be recited in them [i.e. in the Synagogues]”, which the entire world is not divided about that they must be saved. But the view is divided concerning [translations] about which it is stated, ‘they are not to be given to be recited in them [i.e. in the Synagogues]’.

Clearly, here a distinction is made between a translation that is *to be recited* in the Synagogue context and one that is *not to be recited* in the Synagogue. The Mishnah submits that rabbis agreed that translations, which were intended for recital in the Synagogue, had to be saved from burning, while they were divided in their opinion about translations, which were not intended for recital in Synagogues.

The crucial issue is: How did translations that were not intended for recital in Synagogues differ from those that were used for recital in Synagogues? In my view, the Mishnah presents two options. On one hand, the allusion could be to unofficial versions. Presumably, most of these were versions that were intended for private study. I take this from G. Wigoder’s argument that Targum Job might have been indicated in private and public study, since

\(^{19}\) Aramaic version taken from Smelik (1999: 265); own translation.
records do not show that Targum Job was ever read in Synagogue (1989: 689). On the other hand, the Mishnah could be referring to renditions, whose main focus was Halakhah. My reason for this latter assumption is that Halakhah could be recorded independent from Scripture and furthermore, that it was formulated in line with the current stance of rabbinic thought, which made it subject to change. Significantly too, Halakhah emerged mostly from small companies of sages and their disciples, who in turn were closely connected with the populace (cf. Safrai 1987: 167). Consequently Safrai (1987: 167) defines Halakhah as ‘the product of a learning community, in which certainly the Sages played a leading role, but not without a close and reciprocal relationship with the people at large.’ Safrai further points out that Halakhah encompassed the Jewish way of life as well as the fixed laws - independent from Scripture - that emerged from the thought and study of the pharisaic sages and other circles within Jewish society (1987: 121). It is therefore to be expected that halakhic laws - with the exception of fixed laws - involved an element of subjectivity, which implies that Halakhah could be adjusted according to custom and historical context. In the light of this, it can be assumed that rabbis, who intended to bring stability to the Jewish nation in the aftermath of the Destruction, realized that the controversies and disputes surrounding halakhic matters only served to increase the already volatile situation in Judaism and thus thought it wise to focus more on the literal translation of the text than Halakhah in the Synagogue service. \textsuperscript{20} The premise rests on the theological focus that FragTarg and N demonstrate in their translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in contrast to TO, which shows negligible signs of engaging in theological matters in its rendering of the said passage, whereas otherwise there is evidence for thousands of deviations. As significant evidence to support this assumption is the discovery of R. Kasher

\textsuperscript{20} See Hamburger (1892: 1178).
and B. Grossfeld that certain texts in Palestinian Targums display ‘anti-halakhic’ characteristics (in McNamara 1992: 42; cf. also my discussion of Pentateuchal Targums: Different Dialects Dissimilar Designs in 2.5).

Although one would expect that the populist nature of the Palestinian Targums together with their oral recitation in the Synagogue service, made them more liable to change than Targums that were used in the context of learning and Halakhah, the opposite is actually true. The early process of standardization in the aftermath of the Destruction is testimony to this. This means that the liturgical rendition was no longer treated as an *ad hoc* Synagogue translation, but evolved to form a coherent and authorized body of a fixed, interpretive tradition. It was in the interest of rabbis that Jewish faith principles should be safeguarded against foreign influences. In the absence of the Temple, the Synagogue increasingly became the fitting place to educate and provide stability to the Jewish populace. It is from this perspective that I assume that the Mishnah’s ruling to save translations from burning concerns liturgical Targums. The underlying idea is that rabbis were not too concerned about saving translations from burning that involved divisive elements, because their use in the Synagogue could further destabilize the faith of the populace. Presumably learned Targums, whose focus was on Halakhah, did not play a decisive role in the Synagogue service (see my distinction between oral and written versions / popular and learned renditions in Chapter 2). From Stemberger’s observations on the use of TO in the Synagogue (cf. 1977: 82), it appears that the theory of the disposal of Proto-O from the Synagogue service and the abolition of rendering in literary Aramaic to the populace, is not implausible. Accordingly, the use of TO in Synagogues was limited due to the fact that it was written in literary Aramaic and its halakhic focus (cf. 2.5.3.3). Adduced as further evidence for TO’s halakhic character, is M. L.
Klein’s (in McNamara 1992: 42)\textsuperscript{21} observation that its redactors even went so far to replace ‘anti-halakhic’ texts, with ‘halakically-correct’ legal interpretations. The most striking substantiation of this aspect in TO, is Flesher’s study (2001). He found that the translation of TO is comparatively literal in contrast to the renditions of popular Palestinian Targums, which share across them as many as 539 added expansions\textsuperscript{22} (2001: 23).

This raises the question as to why would liturgical Targums, in particular, be more expansive in terms of the eclectic agglomeration of Midrash material, the filling of lacunae, addressing of doctrinal problems, illustrating of abstractions, narration, embellishments, inspiring of faith, and engagement in polemics (cf. Levine 1988: 40)? Presumably, rabbis intentionally designed them for the benefit of the Aramaic-speaking masses in order to educate the \textit{am ha’aretz}.

Two basic reasons can be suggested as to why rabbis would have made a concerted effort to compose a Targum for the masses. First, remnants of myths, legends and other categories of heresy that threatened to obscure the meaning of the biblical text consistently had to be rebutted in accordance with the principles of Jewish faith. J. Maier (1972: 68) attempts to explain this redactional process by submitting that oral and locally fixed targumic transmissions were, in time, combined into a uniform whole and eventually were arranged in literary format. Albeit, a \textit{written version} of the Palestinian Targum (or liturgical Targum) must still be excluded from the time of the middle second to the beginning of the third century C.E., since both R. Simon

\textsuperscript{21} McNamara quotes from M.L. Klein (1986: I, xxxiii).

\textsuperscript{22} Flesher (2001: 23) attributes the expansions to the Proto-PT Source. See also Bowker (1969: 18) and McNamara (1972: 6-7).
ben Gamaliel as well as R. Yochanan forbade the translation of the Pentateuch in any language with the exception of Greek (Stenning 1911: 4).

However, it is most likely that the prohibition on writing down targumic renditions, did not necessarily involve all versions; but specifically the liturgical Targums in the pre-Destruction period, in correspondence to their purpose. Indeed, from earliest times a clear distinction was made between the written Hebrew text and its citation or interpretation in the context of the Synagogue liturgy (Thomson 1939: 2911). This was done in the following fashion: the one who read from the Hebrew text was not to glance away from it and the one who recited it was not to glance at the written text. The reason for this approach is forthcoming: the populace was to understand that there was a vital difference between the actual Hebrew text and its interpretation. In the aftermath of the Destruction the added function of targumic rendering was to educate the ignorant masses in the theology of rabbinic Judaism (cf. Elbogen 1993: 153)\(^{23}\) in order that Judaism could continue to exist in a post-Temple era.

Maier attributes sages’ growing interest in matters of the general community\(^{24}\), to the reform that took place in the time of Ezra-Nehemia by arguing (1972: 68), ‘Seit der Reform unter Ezra-Nehemia erfüllte der Schriftgelehrtenstand eine öffentliche Funktion im Rechtsleben und nahm damit eine starke Position in und gegenüber der priesterlichen Hierokratie zugleich ein.’ He adds that the intense interest in the wellbeing of the community was commensurate with the establishment of an administration of

\(^{23}\) Maier (1972: 128) emphasizes the importance of the targumic rendition of Scripture into what he refers to as ‘die aramäischen Alltagsdiome’.

\(^{24}\) Cf. in this respect Hamburger’s insightful article on Sopherim, whom he places into a time span of 170 years, from 415 B.C.E.-219 C.E. (1892: 1133-34).
justice. Hamburger likewise places links the activity of the scribes (soferim) into the context of the Great Assembly saying, ‘Als Mitglieder der großen Synode bildeten sie die Oberbehörde des wiederbegründeten jüdischen Staates in Palästina und hatten als solche die oberste Leitung des Staatswesens, die Gesetze und Anordnungen zu treffen, Gerichte einzusetzen, die Behörden des Landes zu überwachen, geeignete Persönlichkeiten für dieselben zu ernennen u.a.m.’ (1892: 1134). Taken from this perspective it can, therefore, not be excluded that justice in the Great Assembly and later Sanhedrin was administered in correspondence with a (written?) priestly Targum in the Second Temple period. In this context, targumic rendering would have happened in correspondence with legal interpretation. At all events, this view is held by John F. Stenning (1911: 4), who submits that a tolerably fixed Targum tradition existed in Palestine ‘from quite early times.’ He adds that it is impossible to hold that TO was the only representative of Targum tradition that existed among the Jews down to the seventh century C.E. Stemberger’s (1977: 81-82) assessment of the literary history of TO is in a similar vein. Although it appears to have received little notice among scholars of TO, it is worth stating at this point. He writes,
In the meantime, Flesher (2001: 6-7) has reaffirmed Stenning’s assumption
and Stemberger’s theory by putting forward a viable hypothesis that a written
version of a Targum in JLA could well have preceded the arrangement of the
standard liturgical Targum (cf. my discussion of this aspect in 2.5.3.3; 2.5.4
and 2.5.5).

The implication of Flesher’s theory is that Stemberger’s notion of TO’s
rigorous process of revision, is correct. If Flesher’s theory holds true, then it
can not be excluded that TO is an edited version of Proto-O. However, then to
maintain, as do Elbogen (1993: 152) and Stemberger (1977: 82), that TO was
composed at the time of the first establishment of the Amoraic academies in
Babylonia (ca. 250), is to miss the association of the influences that Proto-O
had on both the development of Palestinian Targums and the compilation of
TO; particularly so, if we take into account that priestly sages - who were
absorbed into the ranks of rabbis (cf. 2.4.3) - were involved with the
compilation of TO. In that case, it is more feasible to endorse that TO
continued to remain in Palestine during its first developmental stage.
Although we have no proof for this period of TO’s existence, its constant
revision during the second stage in Babylonia, presupposes a similar scenario
when it still was in Palestine. Taken as a whole - from earliest times in
Palestine to the later period in Babylonia - the indications for its officiating
capacity in *halakhic decision-making* could not have arisen out of a vacuum.
Evidence for TO’s extended period in officiating capacity is its continued use
of Standard Literary Aramaic and its constant revision in matters pertaining to
Halakhah.  

25 Legal specifications have to be revised, of necessity; specifically with the aim of
formalizing and codifying them for the sake of verification.
We now turn to Grossfeld’s theory of TO. In his view, TO originated in Judea and was transferred along with Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the Mishnah, to Babylonia with the crushing of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 C.E., where it underwent further edition and development during the following centuries until it finally became the official Targum for Jews. Because this left a void in the Synagogues of the Land of Israel for a Targum, one of the several Palestinian Targum traditions was eventually adopted as the official Targum for Synagogue Scripture readings. In the ninth and tenth centuries, the Babylonian recension of TO was almost literal and entirely in accord with rabbinic opinion and was regarded as of the highest authority among the Jews. In this capacity, it replaced Neofiti 1 in the Palestinian Synagogue (2000: xxx-xxxi). The problem with Grossfeld’s theory is that it does not take cognizance of a number of key issues:

(i) A significant percentage of the Proto-Palestinian Targum expansions derive from added words in TO (cf. Flesher 2001: 10).
(ii) The influence of priests in the composition of TO.
(iv) The standardization process that took place in Palestine with respect to Targums (see Chapter 5, 5.3).

The revision of targumic recensions must be seen against the background of the revolutionary transformation that took place within Judaism following the Destruction and the wars. It does not seem feasible from what is known about

---

26 Kaufman (1976: 61) argues that PJ represents a late revision of the Palestinian Targum (tradition) under the influence of TO and other midrashic sources.
the age of formative Judaism that a targumic recension would have been transferred to Babylonia without further interaction with Palestinian Judaism.

In the light of the foresaid, I want to propose a somewhat revolutionary conception of the development and use of Targum-traditions in Palestine. If rabbis purposefully composed a Targum for use in the Synagogue liturgy, it is plausible that they would also have used a Targum for halakhic decision-making (cf. Schäfer in Maier & Schreiner 1973: 398-99). The counterpart of the *liturgical* Targum would have been the halakhic Targum. Just as a liturgical Targum encompasses midrashic material, addresses doctrinal problems, is intent on illustrating abstractions, focuses on narration, includes embellishments and fills lacunae for the purpose of explanation and seeks to inspire faith, so the aim of a halakhic Targum would have been to create an authentic platform for halakhic disputes on the basis of Scripture, involving the monarchy, the priesthood and the judiciary (cf. Levine 1988: 41). Halakhah, according to Levine, is expressed in precise terminology and is based on objective criteria; in this capacity it forms the common ground of the Jewish body. He adds that juridical Halakhah was the preserve of the educated; it could clearly define the objectives of jurisdiction (1988: 41). As pertaining to TO, the definition of a halakhic Targum applies insofar that it was rendered in the officiating tongue, which automatically confined its use to a limited group of people, who were familiar with the terminology of jurisdiction and disputes involving of matters of the monarchy, the priesthood and the judiciary.

According to this analysis, TO fits the context and purpose of the *beth midrash* or *beth din*. However, this option has not yet been assessed by
It has simply been assumed in correspondence with TO’s second stage of development that the Synagogue always was the original *Sitz-im-Leben* of TO. Against this accepted view, Elbogen’s objection is that the introduction of TO into the Synagogue setup ‘was the death knell of the whole institution, which, having lost its purpose died out with time’. He argues that TO was no better understood than the Hebrew original; therefore it was of no assistance to the common people, who were not familiar with Standard Literary Aramaic (1993: 153).

In an earlier attempt to trace the development of diverse Targum-traditions, Schäfer alerted to the necessity of investigating the possibility of the existence of a comprehensive juridical Torah commentary, noting (in Maier & Schreiner 1973: 60):

> Eine wirklich sachgerechte Beurteilung der frühjüdischen Rechtstraditionen scheitert allein schon an der Quellenlage, sie würde nämlich die Existenz wenigstens eines kodexartigen Dokuments oder eines ausführlichen juristischen Torahkommentars voraussetzen.

If Schäfer’s reference to a comprehensive juridical Torah commentary is connected with TO, it might be possible to shape a much more objective view of the early Jewish judicial setup. TO’s artificial form of speech, its fairly literal character and faithful reproduction of the Hebraic original (therefore

---

27 Regarding the context of TO, Alexander Altmann offers a challenging alternative for explaining Onqelos’ unchanged use of the Divine name אֱלֹהִים in Genesis 1: 27, stating, ‘the reason for Onqelos’ procedure may be simply due to a desire to refrain from meddling with a phrase so much charged with theological ambiguity’ (1968: 237), adding, ‘It is obvious that what mattered to the rabbis was the possibility of translating the *imago Dei* concept into halakhic categories, to put it into pragmatic rather than theological terms’ (1968: 243). Altmann’s comments are in line with my own analysis of Genesis 1: 26-27, namely that TO avoids matters, which distinctly link to theology. Instead, the rendering of the said passage demonstrates TO’s inclination to Halakhah, thus alluding to its function in the *beth din*.
also the addition of *Masorah*) and furthermore, its limited use of haggadic interpretation, all indicate that its original function could have served the context of jurisdiction in the Sanhedrin.\(^{28}\) Although Flesher has altered the theory of his *Dialectical Model* (1999: 66), two observations of this model still remain relevant for the conjecture that TO was linked to *halakhic decision-making* in the first stage of its development, namely

- The dialect used by TO is the same as in the Bar Kokhba letters. It is known as Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) or Standard Literary Aramaic.
- A Targum, similar to TO was written in this period in Palestine.

The fact that TO is written in the same Jewish Literary Aramaic dialect as the Bar Kokhba letters could possibly be an indication that Proto-O already existed in writing in the second century C.E. As supportive of this theory is that TO retained the use of JLA in the process of revision. Presumably, this can be attributed to two reasons: first, to assert its authority for official documentation, second, to distinguish it from the standardized liturgical Targum.

The picture further suggests that the standardization of the liturgical Targum happened parallel to the revision of the early juridical Targum. This would explain Flesher’s conjecture that the Palestinian Targums appear to comprise a ‘dialectical translation’ of the *precursor* of *Onqelos* (2001: 7). Flesher’s assumption ties up with Moritz Steinschneider’s analysis that the general fixation and formularization of the Synagogue liturgy can be attributed, among other factors, to the influence of the schools and Halakhah (1967: 55).

\(^{28}\) Cf. in this respect also Nestle (n.d.: 130); Flesher (2001: 6) and Schülein (1912: 2).
The connection is that the repeated revision of the juridical Targum would have impacted the standardization of the liturgical Targum. There is little doubt that the *beth midrash* was the place where rabbis edited and wrote down the transmitted Targum traditions for their distinct purposes (cf. Maier 1972: 129). The system of learning is described by Bowker. He observes that the insertion of an integral system of interpretation, often by a single, but all-revealing word, acted as a kind of trigger to release Halakhot. He adds (1969: 24; cf. also 50-51),

…material was compressed as much as possible, not by eliminating parts of it, but by constantly reducing it to its shortest possible form. An ideal way of teaching was *derak qeṭerab*, the shortest way possible. A particular aspect of that principle was the constant search for *kelal*, a kind of total statement which would embrace more detailed particulars…frequently a *kelal* is used in the Mishnah to summarize a series of *halakhot*…a *kelal*, like a text of scripture, would act as a trigger to release more detailed elements.

This method was clearly reserved for the educated, as was also the compilation of halakhic rulings (cf. Levine 1988: 41). Bowker also found that TO represents a much more straightforward translation than the other recensions of the Palestinian Targum, but contains abbreviated interpretations, which appear to be a slightly variant form of the Palestinian Targum-tradition. In Bowker’s view, TO’s approach is not random but intentional (1969: 24-25). At all events, although Bowker’s study concerns the second stage of TO’s development, when it reached Babylonia, it still provides a perspective of learning activity in the rabbinic academies. There are comparatively more Palestinian targumic recensions but only one or at the most two Targums (Targum Jonathan), whose final redaction took place in Babylon. This can be ascribed to a more intense focus on Bible explanation by rabbis in Palestine. *‘Avoda Zara* 4a teaches that the intense focus on explaining Scripture was as a
result of the pluralistic society wherein Jews had to defend their faith against Christians, Samaritans and pagans. Nonetheless, in the end it was TO that acquired ‘canonical’ status. This happened when it reached Babylon. However, the comparative analysis with other N of Genesis 1: 26-27 shows, that TO had several stages in its redaction history. The sustained use of JLA reveals that the focus of TO was never first and foremost theological. It may therefore be inferred that its main concern lay with halakhic decision-making must therefore be tested against non-theological criteria. This is of course not the focus of this thesis; nevertheless, it may be assumed from TO’s literal rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 and its sustained use of JLA that its overall inclination is towards Halakhah. This propensity was also detected by Laura Lieber, who points out parallels between TO and PJ whereby the halakhic focus of TO is demonstrated. For example,

(i) Whereas in Scripture, Exodus 21: 2 reads,

כִּי תַקֵּן עַבֵּד עָבָרִי שֵׁשׁ שָׁנָה יַעֲבַר וּבֵשֵׁנָה יֵצֵא לְחָפֶשׁ נֶגֶב.  
When you buy a Hebrew slave, he shall serve six years and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing;

PJ renders,

אָרָם תִּזְבֹון עַבֵּדָא לַבַּר יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵּׁשׁ שְׁנִין יִפַּלַח וּבֵשֵׁבָה יִפְוק לַבַּר חֹורִין מַגָּן.  
If you buy a son of Israel; six years he shall serve and in the seventh he shall go out free of charge.

and TO renders,

אְרֵי תִזְבֹון עַבֵּדָא לַבַּר יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵּׁשׁ שְׁנִין יִפַּלַח וּבֵשֵׁבָה יִפְוק לַבַּר חֹורִין מַגָּן.  
If you buy a son of Israel; six years he shall serve and in the seventh he shall go out free of charge.
PJ’s rendering יבשותיה when he steals clarifies the ambiguous construct state of עבד עברי in the original Hebrew, by specifying that an Israelite becomes a slave when he steals (בעשותיה). Although TO does not refer to the offence of the person, it nevertheless also makes the nationality of the slave clear: כר ישראל עבד עברי denotes a son of Israel. Lieber points out that the Mekilta (1.2) links Exodus 21: 2 to the context of the beth din. The targumic renditions therefore appear to have been used to clarify the ambiguity of עבד עברי in Scripture for the context of the beth din.

(ii) In Scripture, Exodus 22: 27 reads,

אלהים לא תקלל ונסי בעמך לא תאר׃
God you shall not blaspheme, and a ruler of your people you shall not curse.  

PJ and TO as well as the Mekila (2.4) associate אלהים with the meaning of ‘judge’.

PJ renders,

עמי בני ישראל דייניךון׃ לא תקילון ורבנין דמתמנין נגודין בעמך לא תלוטון

Sons of Israel, My people, you shall not revile your judges, nor curse the rabbans who are appointed rulers among your people.

Here דייניךון is a plural noun in the determined state with a pronominal plural suffix referring to ‘your judges’. Judges are rendered to represent God in this context. The nasi (ruler) in the biblical context is replaced with ‘teachers.’ This denotation obviously refers to the

29 Literal translation of the Hebrew text
scholars of talmudic times. Some rabbis functioned as judges (Stemberger 1979: 90).

TO renders almost similar,

דַיָּינָא לָא תַקִיל וְרַבָּא בְעַמָך לָא תְלוּט׃

*The judge you shall not revile and the rab among your people you shall not curse.*

Here דַיָּינָא is a singular noun in the determined state referring to ‘the judge.’ The judge is rendered to be a representative of God in this context. Just as PJ, the TO also renders the biblical term *nasi* (ruler) with ‘teacher’. Stemberger notes that rabbis normally did not teach children, since their education exceeded that of a schoolteacher. He explains that their influence was particularly in the sphere of the *beth din* and the General Assembly, ‘Somit blieb als Einflußbereich vor allem das Gericht und die Gemeindeverwaltung’ (1979: 91). Lieber notes that the Mekilta discusses extensively what kind of *beth din* these judges constitute in relation to Exodus 21: 6. Clearly, both PJ as well as TO re-contextualize Exodus 21: 6. The new environment is the *beth din*, wherein judges and rabbis function as God’s spokespersons and therefore are to be honoured and respected.

Further, TO shows many elements, wherein ambiguous passages of Scripture are expanded for the purpose of clarifying *halakhah*, for instance,

(i) In Scripture, Exodus 21: 8b reads,

לָא מַעֲרִיר לְאֵירוֹת לְמַעְרֵה בְּנִוְרָה:

*To a foreign people he shall not have power to sell her, when he treats her unfairly.*
Here TO specifies ל pleasures by rendering,

\[ \text{לגרל אויר לא באה ללה רפרס עלות במשל בות.} \]

*To another man he shall have no permission to sell her when he has handled (from the root שלט) her.*

The noun רessor occurs in the Jewish Literary Aramaic dialect of the Palestinian Targums, where it can either mean ‘control’ or ‘permission.’ According to Jastrow (1996: 1581) and Kaufman (2004), the verb שלט appears in the peal in TO where it denotes ‘handling’. In Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, the verb is in the Pa ‘el where it means ‘to manipulate.’ In the Syriac, the verb conveys the meaning ‘to oppress.’ The translation of the Jewish Literary Aramaic dialect reflects the context of Scripture best.

(ii) In Scripture, Exodus 21: 9 reads,

\[ \text{ואם לבנו ייעדנה כמשפט הבנות יעשה ללה;} \]

*And if to his son he betroths her, according to the custom of the daughters he shall do to her.*

TO specifies כמשפט הבנות according to the custom of the daughters with the addition of identification, namely ישראל,

\[ \text{ואם לבריה יקימו חלה במלחת יהושע לבריה;} \]

*And if to his son he covenants her, according to the legal decision (halakhah) of the daughters of Israel, he shall deal with her.*

Apart from the fact that TO once again specifies the circumstances, the noun הלכה in TO, which substitutes משלסה, belongs into the category (or vocabulary) of Galilean Jewish Literary Aramaic (GJLA).
GJLA is characteristic of the dialect used in the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash in the Palestinian period in the context of legal decisions, in the Mishnah and in talmudic discussions.\(^{30}\)

(iii) In Scripture, Deuteronomy 22: 5a reads,

\[
לא־יהיה כלי־גבר על־אשׁה.
\]

*There shall not be an apparatus of a man on a woman ...*

TO specifies כלי an *apparatus* with the addition of תיקון זין *equipment of armor*, rendering,

\[
לא יי התיקון זין דיבר על אישה.
\]

*Not shall there be an equipment of armor of a man on a woman.*

Jastrow (1996: 395) translates the compound תיקון זין as ‘man’s outfit’. The noun תיקון appears in Jewish Literary Aramaic Inscriptions in Palestine. The noun זין is part of Palestinian Aramaic. The rendering of TO also corresponds closely with the Syriac tradition, which translates 'weapon.'\(^{31}\)

(iv) In Scripture, Deuteronomy 23: 18 reads,

\[
לא־תהיה קessed הבנות ישראל ולא־יהיה קessed בני ישראל׃
\]

*There shall not be a prostitute among the daughters of Israel, and there shall not be a sodomite among the sons of Israel.*

In this case, TO specifies what the terms קessed *prostitute* and קessed *sodomite* mean in the context of Israel:


\(^{31}\) Syriac vocalization as per Brockelmann (1982: 195).
A woman may not be from the daughters of Israel for a male servant and neither may a man be taken from the sons of Israel to be a maidservant.

Thus, TO give more details of /clarifies the ruling held in Scripture against the interchange of genders.

In some instances, Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (JBA) have similar words with slightly different meanings. These differences can be indicators for the place and time in which renderings were composed. Such slight differences may assist us in determining the redaction history of TO. A case in point is Exodus 22: 20, which reads in Scripture,

You shall not be violent toward an alien. You shall not oppress him, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.\(^32\)

Against this, PJ renders,

And TO translates,

Both PJ and TO clarify the ambiguity of גר in the Hebrew text, by substituting it with the term דיירין in the second half of the verse. The term גיורא can mean ‘stranger, alien or proselyte’. Whereas דיירין refers to ‘sojourners’ in JLA, it

\(^32\) Literal translation of the Hebrew text
stands for ‘proselytes’ in JBA. The rendering of ידירין ‘proselytes’ in JBA does not fit the context of Exodus 22: 20, since Israelites were never proselytes in the land of Egypt. Presumably, therefore, PJ as well as TO, are making use of JLA, where ידירין means ‘sojourners’. Since JLA was used in Palestine, it may be assumed that PJ’s and TO’s translations of Exodus 22: 20 fall into the Palestinian period.\(^{33}\)

In the matter of TO’s approach to priestly matters the theory of Flesher is that Proto-O was composed under the auspices of the priestly elite in Jerusalem prior to the destruction of the Second Temple (2001: 35). Nonetheless, when dealing with targumic rendering in the post-Destruction period, Etsuko Katsumata calls for a distinction, which should be kept in mind. He states (2001: 145):

> It appears that Targumim frequently insert additional descriptions to the scriptural chapters dealing with Temple rituals...We have to examine, however, whether these additional descriptions stem from their particular attitude toward the priesthood or whether they are merely part of the Targumim’s general approach to halakhic matters.

An example of this practice is, presumably, the replacement of the term כהן with משמיש in TO when rendering Genesis 14: 18 priest for God the Most High with ministering before God the Most High. In my view, the substitution shows the high regard, which rabbis had for the scholarly study of Torah; although it could also indicate that rabbis sought to avoid the use of the title of כהן. Jastrow (1996: 1602) points out

\(^{33}\) See the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon. 2004; Targum Lexicon. Hebrew Union College for a lexical source. Compare also my discussion of the Aramaic dialects associated with extant Targums in Chapter 2, in 2.2 and 2.5.

\(^{34}\) Katsumata (2001: 146-47) argues in this line.
that the term שֶׁמֶשׁ was used in talmudic times in the context of students who waited upon scholars (cf. *Berakhot* 47b; *Sotah* 47b). As priests were integrated into the ranks of rabbis (see Chapter 4), the formerly respected priestly role was increasingly taken over by rabbinic scholars (inclusive of priests), who believed that they served God in this capacity. Significantly, in a recent study, Katsumata (2001: 158) found that TO does not evince a pronounced interest in priests and priesthood. A possible reason for this could be that the purpose of TO was not, first and foremost, to serve the context of the Synagogue, but rather, it played a role in the formulation of halakhah. Dan Cohn-Sherbok (2003: 113) elucidates on this halakhic activity, stating that members of the rabbinic body were drawn from all sectors of society and attracted numerous students to hear their oral teachings. In other words, decisions, which were binding on the populace, were collectively reached by rabbis in the age of formative Judaism. *Halakhic decision-making* mainly took place in the contexts of the *beth midrash* and the *beth din*.

### 6.2 Exegetical and Historical Relationships in TO

From the comparative analysis of אֲנָשָא, בְּרִנְשׁ, אָדָם, בְּרִנְשָׁא, אָנָשָׁא in Genesis 1: 26-27 in TO and N, it appears that TO reflects elements of an early redactional period in Palestine. This assumption is underscored through its liberal use of Jewish Literary Aramaic. The entire picture suggests that it was subjected to a fairly lengthy and repeated editorial process in the land of Israel.\(^{35}\) However, the final redaction must have taken place in Babylonia, due

---

\(^{35}\) This aspect corroborates with Drazin’s theory (1982: 6) that it was composed and redacted in the land of Israel, but after the *Sifre*, in the late fourth or fifth century.
to the persecution of Jews in Palestine under Theodosius II (408-450) (cf. Maier 1972: 101). 36

The entire nature of TO’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27, when compared with N’s and FragTarg’s renderings of the same passage, suggests that TO was not used much in the context of the Synagogue service in its early redactional stage. There is hardly any correspondence with theological concerns that impacted the Jewish faith in the age of formative Judaism. The picture which is currently evolving from my research, agrees well with the hypothesis that the process of preserving, editing and standardizing the text of TO must have taken place in a scholarly setup, which presumably was the beth midrash. On the other hand, it could also have played a role in the beth din. This may be assumed from the number of instances where TO expands ambiguous passages of Scripture with the aim of clarifying halakhic concerns; also from the aspect that halakhah in TO was adjusted to correspond with the contemporary standpoint of rabbinic thought, so Stemberger (1977: 82). Similarly, the identification of juridical concerns, like the stipulation of the nationality of a slave, the exact specification of gender issues and the rendering of אלהים with ‘judge’ are indicators that TO might have fulfilled a function in the context of the beth din. At all events, for this purpose it had to reflect a certain amount of flexibility, since matters of halakhah were influenced by time and cultural changes.

36 Cohn Sherbok notes that Jewish scholars in Israel had collected together the teaching of generations of rabbis in the academies of Tiberia, Caesarea and Sepphoris by the first half of the fourth century (2003: 116). These discussions became the Palestinian Talmud. He adds that the views of the Amoraim (the Palestinian teachers) had an important influence on scholars in Babylonia (2003: 117). Maier attributes the fixation in writing of traditions and halakhic teaching material to the political instability that Jews faced under Theodosius II (1972: 101).
In the light of its lack of pronounced interest in matters of priests and priesthood one is led to conclude that its focus was not so much on ritual but more on jurisdiction. This does, however, not mean that priests were not involved in the process of jurisdiction. On the contrary, from earliest of times, Levitical priests had been in the office of judging the people of Israel (cf. Deut. 17: 9-12; 19: 16-18; 24: 8). But the main focus of the judicial context in which Levitical priests served, was not on matters of faith. Rather, the focus was jurisdiction. The literal rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 in TO supports this theory. If we accept that the focus and context of its precursor, Proto-O, was the Second Temple Sanhedrin, then it is to be expected that this focus was carried over into the post-Destruction Sanhedrin, which served matters of jurisdiction in the age of formative Judaism. The official makeup and halakhic thrust of TO also underscore this assumption. What is more, the fact that TO was later supplied with Masorah, which make note of targumic renderings that appear to deviate from the ‘norm’ and further, that the Masorah primarily aimed to preserve the translational choices made by earlier meturgemanim (cf. Klein 2000: 2), would have furnished the beth din with a basis from which divergences could be objectively observed.

From this perspective, it is reasonable that the introduction of TO into the Synagogue service, whose primary focus was Halakhah, ultimately suffocated the institution of targumic rendering in the beth knesset; at any rate, so is Elbogen’s conclusion (1993: 153).

37 See Deuteronomy 17: 9 the judge who is in office in those days; cf. also Deuteronomy 19: 17b.
Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* (PJ) is also referred to as Targum Yerushalmi I on the Pentateuch. The name *Pseudo-Jonathan* is the result of an erroneous citation in the first printed edition (Venice 1591) under the mistaken title of Jonathan ben Uzziel which is actually another name for the Targum to the Prophets.

In the past it was generally assumed that PJ was used in the context of the Synagogue, but this has not yet been established with absolute certainty. A particular aspect that scholars have grappled with in their analysis of PJ is its composite arrangement. Its integrated character of haggadic and halakhic dimensions and the fact that it has numerous expansions which are distinctive to it, have led researchers to believe that PJ is not an official Targum.¹ It simply has too many *midrashic* accretions and not less than twelve anti-halakhic passages. To maintain, however, as do the researchers Flesher (2001: 31-36) and Mortensen (1999: 39-71), that PJ is a thoroughly priestly Targum - on the grounds that PJ reveals a dominant interest in matter of concern to priests - is to miss the links that PJ shows to parallel rabbinic exegeses. The point in argument is that many of PJ’s numerous haggadic interpolations can not be explained from the priestly perspective.²

---

¹ S.J.D. Cohen (1989: 211) attributes the different types of Targums to different theories of translation. However, he does not expand on the different theories of translation.

² This is also R. Kasher’s criticism of Mortensen’s study, ‘…but the author greatly extends the scope of “priestly topics” and interprets every targumic expansion as an instruction directed to priests. What grounds does she have for this?” (2007: 412).
In the light of the above concerns, I will revisit the question of PJ’s function in the context of formative Judaism in this Chapter. My approach will be to compare PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 with the renderings of FragTarg, N, and TO of the said Scripture. In the process, I will single out expansions in PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, which are distinctive to it and investigate how these expansions correspond with parallel rabbinic exegeses. However, before I focus on PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, I believe it is necessary to discuss a number of issues that contribute to PJ’s composite arrangement and integrated character. For the sake of clarification, I will be repeating some of the aspects that I put forward earlier in Chapter 2.

### 7.1 PJ’s Composite Arrangement

Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* is not a simple rendition. Researchers have not only recognized that it has several layers, but also that it is written in three different dialects. These aspects will be briefly set forth in the following.

#### 7.1.1 Different layers in PJ

Both G.H. Dalman (1905: §6, 4) as well as W. Bacher (1906: 4) see in PJ a later development and even a final redaction of TO.³ Bacher bases his opinion on the claim that PJ holds many elements that are earlier than TO, whose final form he places into the third century. He argues that the earlier elements in PJ were part of a very old Palestinian Targum of which TO

---

represents a reworked edition. Against this breakdown of PJ’s redaction history, G. Stemberger suggests that PJ was revised in a number of places against TO. He does not believe that PJ is, as often assumed, a late work of the seventh or eighth century, but proposes that it goes back to a much earlier time. Accordingly, the mention of a wife and daughter of Mohammed are a later addition to PJ and so too are many other insertions and marginalia (1977: 82). Flesher offers the most advanced theory of PJ’s redaction history by combining the views of Bacher and Stemberger. He concurs with Bacher in the point that PJ drew its Onqelos-like translation from an earlier version (Proto-O) and holds with Stemberger that PJ generally agrees with the translation of TO and some of its added words. In correspondence with Mortensen’s detailed study on PJ’s additions - who found that four fifths of PJ’s expanded passages attach to verses that are untouched by the other Targums, and present new ideas (1999: 39-71) - , Flesher offers a strong case that the composite character of PJ differentiates it from the true Palestinian Targums (2001: 8). I agree with Flesher in respect of PJ’s differentiation from what is referred to as ‘true Palestinian Targums’ and concur with Hamburger that the latter form the basis from which PJ evolved (1892: 1179). In Hamburger’s assessment, PJ in its present composition, ‘…vereinigt in sich eine Menge Bestandtheile aus den entlegensten Zeiten und von entgegengesetzten Richtungen’ (1892: 1179). In the following I intend to set forth and argue my own view concerning the purpose and place of PJ in the age of formative Judaism.

---

7.1.2 Dialectical differences in PJ

Apart from indications that PJ consists of different redactional layers, a number of Aramaic dialects are also reflected in it. Flesher points out that many of PJ’s additions are written in the dialect of *Late Jewish Literary Aramaic* (LJLA). He attributes these additions to the work of priests on the premise that they ‘reveal a dominant interest in matter of concern to priests’. The reason for his assumption is that the additions in PJ primarily portray the affairs of priests and their activities in and outside of the temple (2001: 11; cf. also Mortensen 1994: 75). From Flesher’s study it is evident that he believes only priests made use of LJLA. There is, however, no suggestion to suppose that LJLA was confined only to priests. Although the late dialect shows that the additions derive from a late period in post-Destruction Judaism, it does not imply that priests were the only ones, who were involved in the redaction of PJ. Rather, taking into account the context of formative Judaism from which PJ emerged, it is reasonable that priests were integrated into rabbinic learning in post-temple Judaism (cf. Neusner 1991: 162). I showed in Chapter 2 that priests together with pharisaic sages gradually formed a new group of learned Jewish teachers, referred to as ‘rabbis’ after the destruction of the Second Temple. These rabbis or ‘new priests’ of the post-temple period held a two-fold position, wherein they fulfilled both the role of judge (in the contexts of the *beth midrash* and *beth din*) as well as the role of guardian of the written Torah (in the context of the *beth knesset*). From this it may be inferred that those of PJ’s additions, which refer to priests as judges, demonstrate the activity of rabbis, who were actively seeking to propagate and reserve for themselves an authoritative status in matters of jurisdiction; a sphere that formerly had been confined to the priesthood (cf. Newman 1950: 80-81).

---

5 Cf. 2.2 (iv).

The new status that rabbis had after the destruction is evident from their strong regard for the garment of ordination and from the practice of Semikhah (cf. 2.4.4). The reason for this, according to J. Newman’s study, is that rabbis strove to attain a degree of resemblance to the Second Temple priesthood in their position within the community, by wearing the garment of honour. What is more, educated Jewish men, not exclusively from the priesthood, could attain the title of ‘rabbi’ with ordination. Some of these were also qualified to pronounce judgment in the Land of Israel (1950: 119; 130-33).

Another significant aspect of PJ pointed out by Flesher pertains to a high presence of LJLA dialect expansions in Leviticus, followed by Exodus and Numbers. In Flesher’s analysis, Leviticus averages 10.4 expansions per Chapter; Exodus has 8.8, and Numbers 8.5 expansions. Genesis has only 7.5 expansions per Chapter (2001: 32). Presumably, the presence of such a high ratio of LJLA expansions in PJ derives from allusions to TO during juridical discussions among rabbis (cf. Bacher 1906: 4). Notably, TO was written in an earlier dialect, namely Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA). By implication the reworked passages from TO, in PJ, would be in LJLA. The point in argument is that it was not unusual for rabbis in the age of formative Judaism to remodel older textual traditions. This practice is discussed in some detail by M.S. Jaffee. He shows how Amoraim intentionally reconfigured oral written tannaitic material (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 28&37).

Flesher also found that LJLA additions in PJ introduce lexical items from two nearby related Aramaic dialects, namely Christian Palestinian and

---

7 The dialect used by Onqelos is the same as in the Bar Kokhba letters. It is known as Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) or Standard Literary Aramaic (cf. Flesher 1999: 66).
Samaritan. He shows that LJLA borrows lexically from Syriac and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (JBA), and concludes that their lexical affinities with LJLA, as well as the signs of linguistic decay in LJLA\(^8\) are added proof that PJ was composed at a slightly later stage in Palestinian Judaism than the other Palestinian Targums (2001: 34). Flesher presumes that PJ’s redactional process was, at the earliest, completed in the mid-fourth century (2001: 31). By implication, this would mean that PJ was composed during the time of amoraic learning. Still other expansions in PJ are written in Jewish Targumic Aramaic (JTA)\(^9\), which is the dialect of the Palestinian Targums (PalTargs) (Flesher 2001: 22ff.). As noted in Chapter 2, the PalTargs (FragTarg and Neofiti I) were used in the Synagogue service. The presence of JTA additions together with JLA and LJLA expansions shows that its redactors belonged to a group of people, who had knowledge of both the Synagogue and Temple set-up. In the light of Flesher’s analysis, we can assume that these people were Amoraim, a group made up of pharisaic sages and priest sages. Significantly, both groups carried with them remnants of traditions from the fields of the Synagogue and Temple, some of which are reflected in PJ.

Although the use of these three different dialects in PJ appears to compound the question of PJ’s purpose, it may ultimately assist us in discovering PJ’s *Sitz-Im-Leben*. Passing by a detailed analysis of the different dialects (JTA, JLA and LJLA) in PJ, we now turn to the question of PJ’s character.

---

\(^8\) Flesher (2001: 34) attributes the decay to pressure from a dominant language.

\(^9\) This is a sub-dialect of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA), which was spoken by the populace in Palestine. Flesher links this dialect with the liturgical context of the Synagogue (2001: 22ff.).
7.2 The Integrated Character of PJ

It was stated earlier that PJ has haggadic and halakhic dimensions as well as numerous expansions which are distinctive to it.¹⁰ This aspect forms the defining point of PJ’s character. Sometimes it follows the Palestinian Targums¹¹ and at other times TO, with its main emphasis on Halakhah. Clearly however, it was not subjected to the same process of authorization as was TO (cf. Levine 1988: 25). In this section, I will endeavour to explain how the different dialects correspond with the additions in PJ and what this integration tells us about PJ’s function.

Past research has shown that expansions in PJ, which are written in JLA and LJLA primarily reflect halakhic concerns. On the other hand, insertions that are composed in JTA are mainly concerned with Haggadah.¹² What is more, some haggadic portions in PJ¹³ clearly link to the popular perspective of the Palestinian Targum (Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum).¹⁴ However, this does not necessarily imply that all of PJ’s haggadic additions originated in the Synagogue service. The point in argument is that, for the most part, PJ does not fit the context of a Synagogue. Most of its additions are simply too complex for a popular audience. What is more, during the age of formative Judaism, rabbis sought to standardize circling Targum

---

¹⁰ Levine (1988: 25) notes that PJ incorporates a wealth of homiletic and juridical additions to the Biblical text, thus virtually representing a complete Targum.

¹¹ Cf. J.F. Stenning (1911: 4-5).

¹² Stenning (1911: 4) notes that every form of haggadic expansion is utilized by the targumist in homilies, legends, traditional sayings and explanations.

¹³ Mortensen (1999: 40) indicates that PJ interpolates the most extra-biblical material of the Pentateuchal Targums by a factor of four.

¹⁴ As illustrated in J.W. Etheridge (1862). Cf. also Stenning (1911: 5).
traditions in opposition against the Hellenizers (cf. Hamburger 1892: 1171).\textsuperscript{15}

There is no doubt that early recensions of the Palestinian Targum were specifically composed for the Synagogue service, as a comment by Judah ben Barzillai from the early twelfth century confirms (quoted in Bacher 1906: 5):

The Palestinian Targum contains haggadic sayings \textit{added} by those who led in prayer and who also read the Targum, insisting that these sayings be recited in the Synagogue as interpretations of the text of the Bible (italics added).

There is also strong evidence that N\textsuperscript{16} had been completed as official Targum for the Synagogue during the mid-fourth century C.E., that is, before PJ was compiled.\textsuperscript{17} This is evident from the fact that PJ shows traces of N, whereas N lacks references from PJ (McNamara 1972: 186-89). This raises the question as to why there would have been need for a second Targum in the Synagogue Service. I assume that PJ was compiled for a different reason.

Adduced as further evidence against PJ’s use in the Synagogue, is PER Â. Bengtsson’s study of the Passover-events in PJ (2001). Although Bengtsson initially connects PJ’s four Passover-events with the Synagogue setting, he concedes that this Targum does not fulfil the needs of ordinary uneducated Jews. Instead, the involved hermeneutic activity suggests the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} See McNamara’s discussion of this aspect (1972: 186-89). E. Levine (1988: 25) notes that \textit{Neofiti I} ‘has the distinction of being the earliest complete Targum to the Pentateuch’.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Mortensen argues convincingly that PJ most likely arose during the period of hope for a rebuilt Temple in the mid-fourth century C.E. (1999: 39-71).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
setting of a study-house. He comes to the conclusion that PJ is a literary work addressed to intellectual readers of the academies where Haggadah was not necessarily practiced in distinction from Halakhah (cf. 2001: 12, 27). The Tosefta illustrates the latter aspect; even in the context of formal learning, haggadic homilies were often drawn on to clarify some of the halakhic issues. In the light of this, it should be possible to contextualize PJ’s accretions with greater accuracy (cf. Schiffman 1991: 187). The point in argument is that Haggadah was not only used to illustrate the contemporary relevance of specific biblical texts (cf. Cohn-Sherbok 2003: 133), but more to set forth the theological program of interpretation of sages through the use of specific and diverse types of narrative (cf. Neusner 1998: 189-233). This means that the haggadic accretions in PJ could give us an indication of the period from which they derive, if we can link them to specific rabbinic names.

At all events, the compelling question is why, in PJ, rabbis integrated insertions of a priestly focus with additions that clearly derive from a popular context? We can also ask why PJ was compiled in different dialects, some of which derive from a literary context, while others reflect the Aramaic spoken by the people of Palestine. The answers to these questions link to the development of formative Judaism in Palestine; more specifically, to the context of rabbinic learning. Although these aspects were already discussed comprehensively in Chapter 2, I will now correlate them briefly with the question of PJ’s composition.
7.3 Rabbinic Learning in Formative Judaism and PJ

Although priests and pharisaic sages appear to have opposed each other to some degree in the early post-Destruction period, I showed in Chapter 2 that priests were ultimately absorbed into the ranks of rabbis. However, we do not know for certain, when this process was completed. S.J.D. Cohen assumes that the absorption of priests into the ranks of rabbis could not have happened earlier than the seventh century, but he does not supply reasons for his assumption (1989: 221). Therefore it is difficult to accommodate his view in the context of the rabbi / priest debate.

There are two main indicators for an early integration of the roles of priest sages and pharisaic sages after the Destruction: (i) the rabbinic Sanhedrin replaced the Second Temple Sanhedrin (chaired by the high priest) as early as the beginning of the second century and (ii) the officer in charge of the regulation of the calendar after the Destruction was a nasi or patriarch instead of a priest (cf. Cohen 1989: 222). The nesi'im derived from the line of David of whom many had been pharisaic sages. The process of integration was, however, not free of tension, as Cohen distinctly points out: within the two Talmuds a number of stories reflect the tension between priests, rabbis and patriarchs (1989: 223). Crucial to this process is the shift from diverse Second Temple Judaism’s into the form of normative rabbinic Judaism after the Destruction. In the light of this shifting paradigm, it makes sense that pharisaic sages from the Second Temple period, with the inclusion of priest sages, saw in the absence of the Temple an opportunity to advance and develop their ‘extra-temple piety’ (Cohen 1989: 218). The new group of ‘rabbis’ began to collect information that pertained to priestly practices and their activities to make sense of the heritage of the Temple cult in a world where the Temple no longer existed. Rabbis can be divided
into generations of Tannaim and Amoraim according to when they lived in the age of formative Judaism. The Tannaim were the main collectors of circling traditions of Oral Torah, while the Amoraim set themselves the task of reconfiguring tannaitic collections. The rabbinic academy of amoraic times had a setting wherein rabbinic scholars and their students recited and memorized haggadic and halakhic traditions, which had been preserved and passed on in various dialects by earlier generations of sages. Much of the discussion in the educational context of academies was directed towards integrating Temple concerns with halakhic principles, as reflected first of all in the Mishnah, but also by the expansions in Leviticus in PJ. It is to be expected that halakhic as well as theological issues were addressed and debated in the context of the amoraic academy. Presumably, rabbis made use of targumic rendering in the academies, since it was not permitted to recite the Hebrew Scriptures from memory. The biblical text had to be read, to distinguish it from the targumic rendering, which was recited orally (cf. Shinan 1991: 353). Golomb found evidence for this practice in Sifre Deuteronomy 161, where it is stated that R. Akiba’s early training involved the study of Bible and Targum. Targum is mentioned in this Midrash as a branch of study that lies between Mikra and Mishnah (1985: 7). A similar procedure was followed in the pre-Destruction Synagogue service, with the distinction, that oral material in the early Synagogue service was integrated into translated passages of Scripture in a direct and unmediated manner. It appears that this latter aspect was

18 See Mishnah Meg. 32a: so that people will not say Targum katubh ba-torah ‘the Targum is written in the Law’. Also compare Golomb (1985: 13, fn. 19) on this matter.

19 Targumic rendition already was prevalent in the time of Jesus (cf. Luke 4: 17- 30). Jesus on occasion was handed the scroll of the prophet Isaiah to read the Haftarah portion. It seems that he did not adhere to the accepted targumic rendition of the Hebrew Text; consequently those who were present in the synagogue at the time, sought to throw him down the cliff outside the town (cf. also 2.5.3). A. Shinan (1991: 35) sees the
carried over from the pre-Destruction Synagogue into the context of the rabbinic academy; PJ abounds with what presumably are deposits of ancient traditions of learning.

From the integration of Halakhah with Haggadah in PJ, a context of learning can be assumed, wherein deposits of Oral Torah were integrated, emended and added into the base text of an existing targumic rendition. This base text was more than likely TO. Presumably, rabbis compared TO with other renderings of Palestinian Targums and oral traditions. In the process, they compiled a new Targum from the Vorlage at hand, by inserting into it, at distinct places, remnants of Oral Torah. The nature of interpolations in PJ reminds of oral material that was reformulated into sizable mnemonic entities. Presumably, such entities were compiled during rhetoric debates. The point in argument is that the presence of an existing base text, like TO, would have furnished rabbis with an authentic source text into which mnemonic units could be integrated for future accessibility.

As significant to this theory is Shinan’s allusion to recent studies done on PJ, all of which show that it stands out as unique among other Palestinian Targums regarding the extensive editorial process and adaptation it underwent. In Shinan’s analysis, PJ is the literary creation of a relatively

incorporation of ancient oral traditions into the translated Scripture of early targumic renderings as a direct result of this unmediated recitation.

20 Smelik (1999: 251-53) believes that one of the functions of the Targum was its communicative link between the academy and the Synagogue. Cf. also Neusner (1988: 41). However, many passages in PJ would have remained enigmatic for the uneducated populace. They specifically reflect the oral learning setting of the beth midrash.

21 For a reflection on this aspect of the oral-performative instructional setting, consult Jaffee (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 28, 41-44).
late editor, who rewrote a genuine targumic text, ‘expanding it with various and numerous additions that consequently transformed its literary nature in many ways’ (1991: 363-64; cf. also Grossfeld 2000: xxx and Flesher 2001: 34). Particularly intriguing is also J.F. Stenning’s finding of obvious points of contact between PJ and the Palestinian Talmud (PT) (1911: 4). Correlating with this discovery is Strack and Stemberger’s conjecture (1982: 169) that the redaction of the PT took place in Tiberius before 429 C.E.\(^\text{22}\), a time in which, according to Jaffee, Amoraim mastered, discussed, and transmitted diverse tannaitic textual traditions (in Elman & Gershoni 2000: 29). This date almost coincides with the redactional process of PJ which, in correspondence to current research, was not earlier than the mid-fourth century. Stenning’s finding of obvious points of contact between PJ and the PT, are underscored by Strack and Stemberger, who define the PT as the *Mishnah*-commentary of the Palestinian Amoraim (1982: 164). Y. Elman and I. Gershoni argue similarly, noting that the PT’s exegetical engagement with the Mishnah ‘seems aware of both written and oral transmitted sources’ (2000: 11). Jaffee too, draws attention to the aspect that the PT provides the rhetorical background to Mishnah exegesis (e.g. PT *Yoma* 4: 6). Jaffee adds that the PT is ideologically committed to the concept of an unwritten rabbinic tradition, whose materials were integrated into the substance of an oral performance in the setup of the academy (in Elman & Gershoni 2000: 28).\(^\text{23}\)

At all events, the apparent relationship between the PT and the Mishnah underscores the theory that rabbinic traditions, which had not yet been

---

\(^{22}\) Cf. also Jaffee’s dating proposal (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 28, 30).

\(^{23}\) For more detail on the rabbinic *bet midrash* see Jaffee (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 31, 45).
fixed in writing, were tested in rabbinic academies in the context of rhetorical debate with the aim of integrating them into the PT. Presumably, where mishnaic statements had to be substantiated from Scripture for integration into the PT, the use of targumic rendering is implicated. The underlying supposition is that Amoraim continued, in emulation of their predecessors, the Tannaim, to uphold the practice of meticulously distinguishing between the biblical text and the interpretation of it, (e.g. *Orla* 3: 9; cf. Neusner 1988: 41). Crucial to an understanding of the rabbinic learning environment is the aspiration of rabbis,

(i) To guard the sanctity of Mikra in relation to its oral interpretation in their talmudic discussions, by using a language that was distinctly different from Scripture.

(ii) To test the validity of and the authoritative status of unwritten / oral traditions under the scrutiny of the official rabbinate.

(iii) To attribute scriptural evidence for the PT’s exegetical engagement with ancient halakhic and haggadic traditions.

(iv) To furnish themselves with a feasible mnemonic repository of ancient oral traditions from which they could tap material for the compilation of the Talmud.

24 Jaffee (in Elman & Gershoni 2000: 28) stresses the importance that the aspect of mastering the rhetorical debate had for rabbinic training in Roman Galilee, by explaining what the purpose of this learning process was: ‘…rabbinic training bore strong scholastic orientation, focused on guiding young men in the mastery of a literary tradition whose values they would personally embody. Like these men [the Sophists], rabbinic students were preparing in many cases for lives of public service in political, judicial, or ecclesiastical institutions. Finally, like the students of the rhetorical schools, many of those who studied in the rabbinic beit midrash would make their professional mark beyond it through skilled, effective public speech’ (square brackets added).

25 See also Jaffee (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 44).

26 In this regard, Smelik remarks that rabbis strove to bind the Targum to the Hebrew original in both study and performance (1999: 253).
(v) To provide an opportunity for rhetorical training.\(^{27}\)

In the light of the above observations on rabbinic learning and the parallels that exist between ancient Jewish exegetical traditions and the PT, a study of the relationship between PJ, the PT and other rabbinic traditions may shed further light on the role of mediation that targumic recitation fulfilled between Mikra and Oral Torah in the context of the rabbinic academy.\(^{28}\)

The crucial point in this regard is that rabbis and students had knowledge of previously memorized texts. To this effect, Jaffee illustrates how rabbis trained their memories: In a reading of the PT *Pesachim* 4.1, 30d on M. *Pesachim* 4.1, two scholars transmit a tradition of Rabbi Meir, while two other scholars transmit the same tradition according to Rabbi Yose. As a result, a state of confusion occurred in the academy: students did not know which customs should be adhered to. In order to bring about clarity, the meturgeman was asked to cite Deuteronomy 14: 1 since it was not permitted to quote Torah other than by way of targumic rendition\(^{29}\) (in Elman & Gershoni 2000: 46&48). The main idea put forward from this illustration is that disputants were obliged to recite from memory details of oral tradition, without consulting written texts (cf. Shinan 1991: 356). At all events, the compelling constraint of rabbis to distinguish, meticulously, between Scripture and their interpretation of it, and also, to create links between different exegetical traditions should not be underestimated. The entire picture of rabbinic learning agrees well with ‘links’ that PJ shows to

(i) Scripture, with the incorporation of Hebraisms;

---

\(^{27}\) This aspect has already been addressed previously, but not conclusively, by A.D. York. He discusses how Targums negotiate between Scripture and oral tradition (1979: 74-86).

\(^{28}\) See also Jaffee’s theory (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 10-11).

\(^{29}\) Cf. Golomb (1985: 14, fn. 19).
(ii) Midrashim, with the integration of Haggadah to set out theological views and clarify halakhic issues;

(iii) the PT with the incorporation of archaic Aramaic forms.

Compiled within the context of rabbinic learning, PJ would presumably reflect elements of rhetoric, mnemonics and Gematria. It can also be expected that its interpolations will reveal hidden responses to potentially divisive variations in custom.\(^{30}\) Lastly, it would not be surprising to find remnants of ancient oral traditions integrated into the base text. It is probable that Amoraim would have aspired to link early oral traditions to Scripture from the basis of a targumic rendition. In this manner, they would be emulating their predecessors, the Tannaim, who aimed to link ancient precepts of Oral Torah to Scripture with the compilation of the Mishnah.

In order to investigate whether the presuppositions relating to PJ are reasonable, PJ will have to be studied, as proposed earlier on, in correspondence to and in comparison with other Palestinian Targums, as well as midrashic traditions and the PT, all of which derive from the period of the age of formative Judaism. I will attempt this in the following, by investigating how PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 correlates with interpretive traditions on the passage in the said sources.

---

\(^{30}\) The point is based on Jaffee’s observation (in Elman and Gershoni 2000: 46).
7.4 Gen. 1: 26-27 in PJ

In the table below, the Aramaic translation of Genesis 1, 26-27 appears together with the renderings of the same passage by TO, N and FragTarg for comparative purposes. Targumic extensions of Scripture are highlighted and their translation appears in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text of Genesis 1: 26</th>
<th>English translation of Genesis 1: 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scripture: 26</td>
<td>26. And God said: Let us make man in our image after our likeness and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רואם אלהים נשעה אדם בצלמנו דמותנו ירדו בדגת הים ובעוף השמים ובבהמה בכל הארץ בכל הלמשי והלמשי על הארץ:</td>
<td>PJ: 26. And God said to the angels that minister before Him, who were created on the second day of the creation of the world: 'Let us make man in our image after our resemblance and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl which are in the atmosphere/air of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 The Jussive is translated in agreement with Bowker (1969: 97).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;:</th>
<th>26. And the <strong>LORD</strong> said; Let us make man in our image after our likeness and they shall rule over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heaven, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the crawling things that crawl on the earth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
<td>26. And the <strong>LORD</strong> said, <em>Let us create a human in our likeness</em>&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt; (similar to <em>us</em>)&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt; and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FragTarg:</strong></td>
<td>26. And the word of the <strong>LORD</strong> said: <em>Let us create</em> man in our likeness similar to <em>us</em> and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the heavens and over the cattle and over all &lt;the earth and over all&gt; the creeping things that creep on the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Text of Genesis 1: 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>English translation of Genesis 1: 27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scripture:</strong></td>
<td>27. And God created the man /Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female, He created them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 The Jewish Literary Aramaic version of the Pentateuch from the files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, USA. Stephen A. Kaufman, Editor-in-Chief. The main text is that prepared by M. Cohen for his new multi-volume publication *Mikraot Gedolot HaKeter* (Bar Ilan University Press, 1992- ), based on the best available mss. for each text.

34 For the translation of *דמות* consult Sokoloff (2002: 151).

35 Cf. fn. 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PJ:</th>
<th>27. And God created Adam in His resemblance(^{36}); in the image of God He created him with two hundred and forty-eight pieces, with six hundred and sixty-five tendons. And he covered upon him the skin and filled him with flesh and blood: male and female in their body He created them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO:</td>
<td>27. And the LORD created Adam in His image; in the image of God He created him: male and female He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>27. And the word of the LORD created the human in His resemblance in resemblance from before the LORD He created him: male and his partner, He created them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FragTarg:</td>
<td>27. And his word [lit.] of the LORD created the man in His resemblance, in resemblance from before the Lord He created them: male and his partner(^{37}), He created them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{36}\) From the noun דיקן which in LJLA refers to ‘exactness’, ‘image’ (Levy 1867[1]: 17).

\(^{37}\) For a translation of וּברָא יָת אָדָם בְצַלַם אֲלֹהִים cf. Sokoloff (2002: 173, 2# [1.]).
7.4.1 Gen. 1: 26 in PJ

There are effectively two expansions in PJ’s translation of Genesis 1: 26. The first one introduces the aspect of angels למלאכיה דמשמשין קמעי (דארון) בימים תינין לבריית עלמא to the angels who minister before Him and who were created on the second day of the creation of the world. The second addition, דבאויר which are in the atmosphere/air, at first appears to be inconspicuous. However, on closer inspection, one can see that the idea of angels in the first expansion is set to correlate with the idea of fowls in the second expansion. These interpolations in PJ are not echoed in any other targumic rendition and must therefore be seen as peculiar to the character of PJ.

7.4.1.1 Genesis 1: 26 in PJ and midrashic traditions

During the amoraic period, angels figured prominently in theological expansions; specifically in conjunction with the presence of the God (e.g. PJ Exodus 15: 2; 33: 23). J. Bowker correctly assumes that the introduction of angels in PJ’s expansion of verse 26 is an attempt by sages to explain the plural reference ‘let us make’ in Scripture to indicate that angels were present when God created man (1969: 106). The rabbinic conjecture is that God had an audience whom He addressed on this occasion; hence, the unusual occurrence of a plural verb in conjunction with אלהים at this point in Scripture. Angelology ranked high among Christian and Gnostic teachings in the time of Amoraim (cf. Hamburger 1892: 1178). Indeed, numerous exegetical traditions appear to have been triggered by the fact that early Christians argued with sages that the plural verb form נעשׂה, in Scripture, referred to the Trinity. As significant to this point are also
writings dating from second century Christianity in the NT, which show that Gnostics attempted to describe both Christ and the Holy Spirit in angelic terms (cf. Ferguson, Wright and Packer 1988: 21). For Gnostics the presence of the plural verb נעשׂה entailed that angels were present and assisted with the creation of the world. In the understanding of Gnostics, angels were deities (cf. Jonas 1964: 357-58). As a result of such heresies, Jewish sages were beginning to develop a deliberately anti-Christian/anti-Gnostic exegesis by the third century C.E. (cf. Hanson 1959: 154).

A typical Midrash wherein rabbis debated heretic views is recorded in the amoraic tradition of GenR, under the name of R. Simlai. The Midrash appears to have arisen from an instance when Justin the Martyr tried to convince the Jew, Trypho that a number of persons were present when man was created. In response to Justin’s argument, amoraic sages constructed a range of counter-arguments. In fact, almost an entire parashah [ט-כ] is devoted to the question, בְּמִי נִמְלַךְ with whom did He take counsel? where ‘He’ refers to God. The third proposition in the string of arguments with which rabbis counter Justin’s heresy, introduces the subject of angels:

When He came to create the first man He took counsel with the ministering angels.

In subsections ח and ט (8-9), it becomes clear why Amoraim found it vital to ask the rhetorical question בְּמִי נִמְלַךְ with whom did He take counsel? It was to construct excuses to counter polytheistic doctrines based on the plurals אלהים and נעשׂה, which corresponded to the deity in Genesis 1: 26. Hence,

38 Part of the dialogue is quoted in Bowker (1969: 106-107).
the Midrash [נ] continues by posing the question to God, רבוֹן הָעוֹלָם מָה אַתָּה נוֹתֵן פּתְחוֹן פֶּה לַמִּינִים אֶתְמָהָא Sovereign of the Universe! Why, do you give an excuse of mouth to the minim – incredible!? (cf. 4.3.2). The interjection אֶתְמָהָא incredible expresses the shock of rabbis that Scripture could even take to imply the presence of more than one deity.

In PJ’s expansion of Genesis 1: 26 the plural verb form נעשׂה is used to re-contextualize the creation of man into the setting of a heavenly courtroom wherein God’s singularity is not compromised: a hierarchical structure is produced with the address of the superior, who is אלקים God, to the lesser מלאכייא ministers, angels who minister before Him. Significant too, is PJ’s time specification that the angels were created on the second day.

Again the aim was, clearly, to underscore sages’ refutation of Trinitarian and Gnostic teachings, to wit: God was addressing creatures He had created that were hierarchically lesser than Him; not other deities. The rabbinic supposition is strengthened with the addition of a descriptive clause קומוי מלאכייא who minister before Him, to specify the plural noun מלאכייא angels. The hierarchical arrangement is developed further with the addition of another interpolation to categorize the fowls, who are באוירשמייא in the atmosphere / air of the heavens. In sage theology, the deity is of the highest hierarchical order. Angels are similar to the deity because they do not die, like God does not die.⁴⁰ But sages stress that angels were created by God to serve God, by interpolating ביום תניין לבריית (איתברייוד)למלאכייא דמשמשין עלמא to the angels that minister before Him, who were created on the second

⁴⁰ A similar Midrash on Genesis 1: 27 is found in NumR 16: 24: אמר להם הקדוש ברוך הוא Said to them the Holy One, blessed is He: ‘I, even I said, if you do not sin then you will live and endure just like me; even as I live and endure for ever and from eternity to eternity. I even I said: “Gods you are and sons of the Most High, all of you” (Ps. 82: 6), like the ministering angels who do not die.’
day of the creation of the world. This interpolation places angels into a lower hierarchical order than the deity. Fowls, on the other hand are like angels because they fly like angels. But fowls, in turn, are in a lesser hierarchy than angels, because they are terrestrial creatures; hence, sages specify the noun עוף fowl, with the addition of the relative clause דבאויר which are in the atmosphere. The implied proposition is that fowl fly in the atmosphere, unlike angels, who fly in celestial space.

There is, however, no suggestion that PJ’s insertion on angels represents an official version of the oral tradition. On the contrary, it could have been one of a number of ancient versions that circulated. This is evident from a parallel rabbinic Midrash documented in GenR א: ג. Here, amoraic sages debate whether angels were created on the first, second or fifth day. For sages, the incentive for argument lay in the matter of disagreement, which in turn formed the basis for establishing an official consensus on a given matter. This approach is illustrated as follows through the said example, in GenR א: ג (1: 3):

A Palestinian Amora initiates the debate by posing a question, אֵימָתַי נִבְרְאוּ הַמַּלְאָכִים when were the angels created?

R. Yochanan responds: בְּרְאוּ הַמַּלְאָכִים נִא בְּב on the second [day] the angels were created, according to what is written, (Ps. 104: 3) וֹהֵם המקרִהוּ בְּמֵמֶשׁ עַל-חַיָּה Who has laid the beams of His chambers in the waters etc, and it is written, (Ps. 104: 4) עֵשָׂה מלאכיו רוחות making his messengers winds.

---

41 Bowker’s references in this regard are as follows, ‘According to Jub. ii. 2-3, II Baruch xxi. 6, Kit. alMaj. 91 a, Cave of Treasures (Budge, p. 44), their creation was on the first day’ (1969: 108).

42 Bowker notes that according to II Enoch xxix. 1ff., Tanch. Chay. 3 it was the second day. See also Tanch. B. i. 1, 12, Shem. R. xv.22, Yalqut on Gen. §5’ (Bowker 1969: 108).
R. Chanina counters, on the fifth day angels were created, according to what is written (Gen. 1: 20), let birds fly on the earth, and it is written (Isa. 6: 2), and with two he was flying.

R. Luljani son of Tabrin in the name of R. Yitzchaq coordinates the two opposing views. ‘Between the view of R. Chanina and the view of R. Yochanan all agree that none of them were created on the first day, so that it might not be said Michael was stretching at the south of the firmament and Gabriel at the north and the Holy One, blessed be He, measuring in between the two extremes, but (Isa. 44: 24) I am the LORD, who makes all things; stretching out the heavens by myself; spreading abroad the earth: who is with me? Qere: יتمعא עשה (by myself); ketibh: ויהי עשה (who was with me?) – Who went into partnership with me at the creation of the world? – Another thing: because great are You and doing wonders. Ordinarily in the world, when a king of flesh and blood is praised in a country, the great ones of the country are praised with him, because they assist him with the burden. But the Holy One, blessed be He, is not so, since He by Himself created the world; He alone is to be praised in the world, He alone is to be glorified in His world.’

R. Tanchuma resolves the argument by stating the inherent issue at hand, ‘since You are great and do wonders; why? Because You are God, you alone, You by Yourself created the world!’

The above Midrash uses the art of rhetoric, in the following manner:

43 Defined by A.S. Hornby (2001: 1010) as speech that is intended to influence people, but that is not completely honest or sincere.
As the midrashic discussion proceeds it becomes clear that the main incentive for the argument was not to prove on which day angels were created, but rather to verify from Scripture that the world was created by a single deity. In other words, the introduction of the ‘angel theme’ simply served the objective of rabbis to safeguard their belief in one God. Sages used the rhetorical approach to prove from Scripture that the plural verb נעשׂה in Genesis 1: 26 does not stand for a plurality of deities.

Presumably, the Midrash from GenR א: ג (1: 3) and PJ’s interpolation of angels that were created on the second day derive from the context of rabbinic learning in the third and fourth century C.E. The entire nature of their rhetoric demonstrates an oral setting wherein ancient interpretive traditions were intentionally correlated with targumic renderings. The reason for rabbis to initiate dispute on a given topic was, clearly, to set in motion specific objectives of rabbinic ingenuity:

(i) Rabbis were stimulated to recall from memory similar traditions on a topic: the debate thus was the thrust to recollect diverse ancient oral traditions on a given subject.

(ii) The authenticity of rabbinic theology was established by linking Scripture to sages’ oral traditions.
(iii) Rabbinic students were trained in the art of rhetoric.

Coming back again to the time specification in PJ’s addition (Gen. 1: 26), ‘the second day of the creation of the world’; with the insertion of a time specification, sages created an awareness of historical sequence, of ‘before’ and ‘after’. The idea is that God created angels before He created man. The implication of sequence is underscored in the BT Sanhedrin 38b in a conversation that God is said to have had with the angels:

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: ‘When the Holy One, blessed be he, wished to create man, he created a host of ministering angels, and he said: “Do you agree to our making man in our image?” They said, “Lord of the uninverse, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man that thou visitest him?”’  At that he stretched out his little finger towards them and consumed them with fire. The same happened with a second number. The third host (of angels) said: “Lord of the universe, what use was it that those before us spoke to you? The whole world is yours, so whatever you wish to do there, do it.”

The above Midrash ultimately yields a proposition that is attributed to R. Yochanan (the response in GenR א 1: 3 is likewise attributed to him): ‘The Holy One blessed be He, does nothing without consulting the company of the heavens’. In the talmudic parallel to the Midrash, sages formulate the idea of historical sequence more explicitly than in PJ by arguing expressly that God first created hosts of ministering angels before creating man. Their subsequent conclusion draws logically from the previously established sequence. In other words, since angels were created before the fashioning of man, it was possible for them to be consulted on

---

44 In accordance with Bowker’s translation (1969: 108)

45 Ps. 8: 4(5).

the question whether man should be created or not. The point in argument is that the addition in PJ forms an ideal incentive to initiate further debate on the subject of God.

To sum up, the entire nature of PJ’s additions in Genesis 1: 26 amounts to an expression of reactive rabbinic theology. It can be assumed that amoraic sages intentionally inserted interpolations into the targumic rendering of Genesis 1: 26 to fence out heretic interpretations.47

7.4.2 Genesis 1: 27 in PJ

PJ not only adds two expansions to Genesis 1: 27, but also makes an obvious change to the Hebrew Text:

(i) The rendering בדיאקניה in His resemblance, which represents an altered version of בצלמו in His image in Scripture.

(ii) The expansive interpolation, במאתן וארבעין ותמני איברין בשית מאה with two hundred and forty eight pieces, with six hundred and sixty five tendons. And he covered upon him the skin and filled him with flesh and blood.

(iii) The short expansion, בגוונהון in their bodies.

PJ’s expansions in Genesis 1: 27 have no parallels with the other Palestinian Targums, whereas the substitution of בדיאקניה with בדיאקניה in PJ, parallels N and FragTarg’s non-literal rendering of בדיאקניה as opposed to TO’s literal rendering of בדיאקניה. Scholars have not reached consensus on

47 Cf. in this regard also J. Cook (1987: 48-58).
the translation of דמיון in Aramaic for the Hebrew דמיון. The noun מיתו occurs in LJLA. M. Jastrow (1996: 297) sees in דמיון a reverential transformation of איקון, which equals the Greek term εικών, while J.L. Levy (1867[1]: 170) derives it from two Greek words, δυω and εικων. In Levy’s analysis, the term can denote either ‘exactness’ or ‘image.’ Similarly, Dalman (1987: 96) translates דְּיוֹקְנָא as ‘Bild, Ebenbild.’ However, these lexical explanations do not by themselves do justice to the contextual appropriation of דמיון in PJ, since both דְּיוֹקְנָא as well as בצלמו are rendered in verse 27 for the one term צלמה in Scripture. Further, on closer inspection, it becomes clear that the parallel renderings of בְּדיוקניה (PJ) / בְּצַלמֵיה (TO) / בְּדַמְוּת (N and FragTarg) for בצלמו do not necessarily convey the same meaning in each case. Rather, in every instance the context must be taken into account.

TO’s rendering of בְּצַלמֵיה in His image for בצלמו is a literal translation. Against this, the replacement of בְּצַלמֵיה with בְּדַמְוּת in N and FragTarg amounts to a non-literal rendering. It is derived from the noun דמיון, which stands for ‘like’ (JPA). The letter ה is only used with suffixes and when the word is in construct. Thus with the pronominal suffix 3msg, בְּדַמְוּת is translated ‘like him/resembling him’. Against these three traditions (TO; N and FragTarg), PJ’s substitution of בְּדיוקניה with בְּדַמְוּת is problematic in the sense that the noun דמיון is used to translate both דמיון (cf. Gen. 5: 1) as well as צלם (Gen. 1: 27) in Scripture. To determine the function of בְּדיוקניה in PJ Genesis 1: 27, I will compare PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 27 with midrashic traditions that derive from the context of formative Judaism in an attempt to gain some insight into the problem of its translation.

---

48 No accents are used due to possible misplacement in printed versions.

7.4.2.1 Genesis 1: 27 in PJ and midrashic traditions

PJ retains the idea from general to specific that is set forth in Scripture from אדם in verse 26 to אדם in verse 27. The change in PJ is indicated with the addition of the direct object marker י in verse 27, whereas אדם in verse 26 comes without it. The implication is that אדם in verse 27 refers to Adam’s personal name, where י indicates the determined state of the noun אדם. On the other hand, in verse 26, without the preceding direct object marker signifies an undetermined rendering of אדם, where אדם stands for man in general (similarly Gen. 5: 1-2).

The term צלם is found in several, if not all Aramaic dialects and is translated straightforward as בצלמא the image in PJ (Gen. 1: 27). The aspect of צלם (in PJ Gen. 1: 27) rendered as בדיעיותו is, however, specifically linked to the physical composition of the human body:

בצלמא אלקים ברא יהו היית במאתן וארביען והمري והprimir ובשחית מאה והישראל
המשוא נודי וקרם עילוי מושכא ומלי יתיה ואדמא דכר ונוקבא בגוון

…and in the image of God He created him with 248 pieces, with 365 tendons.
And he covered upon him the skin and filled him with flesh and blood: male and female in their bodies He created them.

Bowker (1969: 108) notes that the analysis of man into 248 limbs was common. According to ancient Jewish traditions, the 613 mitzvot are made

---

50 Bowker (1969: 97, fn. d) suggests that אדם could alternatively be translated as Adam instead of man, but he does not give reasons.

51 Translate not 665, but 365 in accordance with Bowker’s version (1969: 97).

52 Italics indicate the targumic expansion.
up of 248 positive commands and 365 prohibitions. The tradition already circulated in Palestinian sources around 250 C.E. and in Babylonian sources around 290 C.E. (Strack and Billerbeck 1922: 900). It was specifically connected to the rule of the evil and good yetzer over the body, as the following analysis from Aboth deRabbi Nathan\textsuperscript{53} 16 shows:

When a man excites himself and goes to act immorally, the whole of his body obeys him, because the evil yetzer rules over his 248 limbs. When he goes to do something good, his limbs are heavy, because the evil yetzer rules over his 248 limbs, and the good yetzer is like a prisoner in captivity, as it is written, ‘For out of prison he came forth to be a king’ (Ecclesiastes 4, 14).\textsuperscript{54}

According to Stemberger, Aboth deRabbi Nathan derives from the third century C.E. and acts as a type of Tosefta or Gemara to the Mishnah tractate Aboth (1977: 80). Presumably, therefore, it was connected to the context of amoraic learning. The point in argument is that Amoraim correlated their knowledge of the human anatomy (248 pieces of the human body; cf. PJ Gen. 1: 27) with the diverse moral aspects of a good and an evil intention. The aspect was linked to the practice of Judaism, for a person to make an active decision to obey the 248 positive mitzvoth. Keeping the commandments involved the entire body; thus the illustration of 248 pieces. A decisive effort is implicated in keeping the commandments; therefore the Midrash says that ‘his limbs are heavy’. The inference is that man’s good intentions are weighed down through his bodily desires. The Midrash expresses this metaphorically, ‘the good yetzer is like a prisoner in captivity’ (Bowker 1969: 108-109). On the other hand, to do what is prohibited (365 prohibitions), comes naturally to man, ‘because the evil yetzer rules over his 248 limbs’ (Bowker 1969: 108-109).

\textsuperscript{53} Aboth deRabbi Nathan appears in two recensions (Stemberger 1977: 80).

The interpretive exercise shows how sages practiced the rule of *Neged* ‘Corresponding Significant Number’ (27th Middah of the thirty-two Middot).\(^{55}\)

The second part of PJ’s expansion shows obvious points of correspondence with a Midrash from the PT *Kil’ayim* 8, 4 (quoted in Urbach 1979: 218)\(^{56}\):

The white is formed from the male, out of which brain and bones and sinews are formed; and the red is from the female, out of which the skin and the flesh and the blood are made; and the spirit and the life and the soul are from the Holy One, blessed be He. Thus all three have a share in Him.

PJ appears to form the core statement from which the midrashic exposition in the PT derives: Whereas PJ reads וּכְרֵם עַלָיוּ מִרְשָאָה מַלַי יְהוָה בִּסְרָא וּאֶדְמָא ‘and he covered upon him the skin and filled him with flesh and blood: male and female in their bodies He created them’, the talmudic expansion ‘white’ and the subcategories, brain, bones and sinews correspond to ‘male’ in PJ. By contrast, red and the subcategories, skin, flesh and blood correspond to ‘female’ in PJ. A third main category in the PT expands on the subject קרם *he covered* in PJ. The expansion alludes to the deity ‘Holy One, blessed be He’ to which the subcategories spirit, life and soul are ascribed. The significant point in the expansion of the PT is the emphasis, which is placed on God’s share of the human body: ‘Thus all three have a share in him’. The concluding talmudic expansion, ‘Thus all three have a share in him’ correlates with Rabbi Simlai’s teaching in GenR ח:ט (8: 9), namely that לָא אִישׁ בְּלֹא אִשָּׁה וְלֹא אִשָּׁה בְּלֹא אִישׁ וְלֹא שְׁנֵיהֶם בְּלֹא שְׁכִינָה ‘not man without woman and woman without man’.

\(^{55}\) Strack (1931: 295) gives an example of this use: to the 40 days in Num. 13: 25 correspond the 40 years in Num. 14: 34.

\(^{56}\) Urbach (1979: 218) ascribes this Midrash to tannaitic origin, but he does not substantiate his assumption.

not woman without man and neither of them without the Shechinah [the Divine Spirit]’. In other words, all three aspects, the male, the female and the Holy One, have a share in the creation of a human being. In the Midrash (GenR ח: 9 [8: 9]), the association between the two specific cases is placed against against the general rule:

He said to them: ‘In the past man was created from the earth, Eve was created from Adam (from henceforth and further in our image after our likeness) [refers to]:

לְשֶׁעָבַר אָדָם נִבְרָא מִן הָאֲדָמָה חַוָּה נִבְרֵאת מִן הָאָדָם

‘(In the past man was created from the earth, Eve was created from Adam) from henceforth and further in our image after our likeness) [refers to]:

לֹא אִשָּׁה אִישׁ לֹא אִשָּׁה בְּלֹא אִישׁ וְלֹא שְׁנֵיהֶם בְּלֹא שְׁכִינָה

(not husband without wife and not wife without husband and neither of them without the Shechinah [the Divine Spirit]).

When the Midrash here is analysed, we see that two different passages, which possess similar qualities are linked to a third passage of Scripture, which expresses the generative rule in relation to the detail derived from the two foregoing passages.

(i) הָאֲדָמָה נִבְרָא מִן אָדָם (Gen. 2: 7) [wordplay between אדם and אדםה]; the first man is created from HaAdamah.

(ii) חַוָּה נִבְרֵאת מִן (Gen. 4: 1) [absence of wordplay]; the first woman is created from HaAdam.

(iii) בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ (alluding to Gen. 1: 26) [poetic parallelism between צַלְמֵנוּ and דְמִינוּ]; a generative for the propagation of humanity in relation to the formula set forth by God.

What is more, GenR ח: 9 (8: 9) sets of an explicit aspect in (i) against an implicit aspect in (ii). The explicit aspect is demonstrated with the use of wordplay, where Adam the first man derives from a specified context אדםה HaAdamah. Against this, the implicit aspect is apparent in the absence of
wordplay between חַוָּה and הָאָדָם inasmuch as the first woman derives from a specific first man HaAdam. The two passages have similar qualities in the sense that together they refer to the creation of the first human pair from specified contexts. Thus one ruling can be applied to both (cf. Hillel’s 4th rule: binjan ab mis-shne ketubim\(^57\)). A general ruling יכֶלְצֶמֶנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ, which is inferred in the second part of the Midrash from the two preceding passages, follows in (iii). It is introduced with the words, פיַעִיאוּ, but henceforth and further. Thereby the implicit similarities between the first two passages are linked to the general rule, which is expressed in Genesis 1: 26 as נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, Let us create man in our image, after our likeness. Here the term Adam is used in the general sense. The aim of the Midrash is to connect the specific explicit and implicit aspects from the two passages of Scripture to the generative principle set forth in the formula יכֶלְצֶמֶנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ in Genesis 1: 26. The practical demonstration of the rule is marriage in relation to God as expressed in לא אִישׁ כָּל אִשָּׁה. אֵילָךְ, אִישׁאאִשָּׁה בְּלֹא שְׁכִינָה, not husband without wife and not wife without husband and neither of them without the Shechinah. The institution of marriage demonstrates the closest relationship that two human beings can experience. Rabbis infer from this example that man is like God in terms of his ability to have a relationship.

Through the midrashic lesson the heresy of polytheism, inferred by heretics from the plural verb נַעֲשֶׂה, is refuted (cf. also 4.3.2, GenR 8: 11[פ, ז]). This becomes apparent from the wider context of the Midrash, which reads:

\(^57\) Cf. Strack and Stemberger (1982: 29); Unterman (1952: 108); see also in respect of the reference to earlier and later bible verses in the Midrash, Eliezer’s 32nd rule Mukdam u-me’uchar shehu’ bepashrioth ‘many a biblical section refers to a later period than the one which precedes, and vice versa’. The school of Ishmael taught אין מוקדם ו שָׁעַר בְּתֵオリジナル, ‘there is no earlier and no later in the Torah’ (cf. Strack 1974: 98&296; see also Strack and Stemberger 1982: 40).
R. Simlai said: Wherever you find a point [which apparently] supports the
heretics, you will find the refutation at its side. They asked him again: ‘What
then is this that is written, נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ? He answered them: ‘Read
what follows it: it is not said [and gods created the man in their images] but [and God created the
man in His image] (Gen. 1: 27). When they went out, his disciples said to
him: ‘You have dismissed them with a mere makeshift, but how will you
answer us?’ He said to them: ‘In the past man was created from the earth,
Eve was created from Adam; but henceforth and further [refers
to]: not husband without wife and not wife without husband and neither of
them without קֶשֶּכֶם [the Divine Spirit].

The midrashic context here demonstrates that the refutation of polytheistic
heresies evolved from a live context of instruction. The Midrash opens with
an allusion to the official and broad context of learning, ‘Wherever you find
a point [which apparently] supports the heretics, you will find the
refutation at its side...’ and demonstrates that learning even continued in an
unofficial and personal context, ‘When they went out, his disciples said to
him...’ Ultimately the entire lesson, of official and unofficial capacity, was
incorporated into the final recension of Genesis Rabbah.

As significant to the creation of man from a unity of three (man / woman /
Shechinah) in GenR ה: יפ (8: 9) is the threefold expansion the creation of
man in PJ Genesis 2: 7,

וֹרֵחַ יֵי אֲלֹהִים יִתְחַלֶּם יִתְחַלֶּם וּלְבָנָה יִתְחַלֶּם וּלְבָנָה יִתְחַלֶּם וּלְבָנָה יִתְחַלֶּם

And the LORD God created man with two inclinations; and he took the dust from
the house of the sanctuary and from the four winds of the world and mixed from

58 All Aramaic quotations from PJ are taken from the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon,
all the waters of the world and he created him red, black and white; and he breathed into his nostrils a living soul and the soul was in the body of man for inspired speech [communication], for illuminated eyes [perception] and for listening ears [understanding].

In the above instance, in my own assessment (Gen. 2: 7), PJ distinguishes the three categories of red, black and white; in correspondence with these, it attributes to the soul a threefold function of (i) communication (ii) perception and (iii) understanding. All three functions are connected to the human intellect. We find a parallel to this threefold expansion in PJ Genesis 3: 5,

 Yet she knew that the tree was good to eat [mouth]; and that it was medicine for the enlightenment of the eyes [perception], and a desirable tree by means of which to understand [implied is: to be deceived].

The comparison between the two renderings (PJ Gen. 2: 7 and PJ Gen. 3: 5) shows an interesting correspondence in that A is the prerequisite for B (see Table 3 below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. PJ Genesis 2: 7</th>
<th>B. PJ Genesis 3: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A LIVING SOUL</td>
<td>The TREE OF LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with two inclinations 59 for</td>
<td>was good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspired speech</td>
<td>to communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illuminated eyes</td>
<td>to perceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive ears</td>
<td>to understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

59 Hereby is implied the free will, the ability to choose between good and evil.
The above examples from PJ Genesis 2: 7 and PJ Genesis 3: 5 are included here to demonstrate how PJ uses listing methods to create categories for memorization. This is an ancient method of oral learning (see Appendix for more examples in PJ). Already in Scripture, listing is common, e.g. Job 33: 29; Eccl. 4: 12; 1. Chron. 21: 10, 12; Exod. 23: 14-19; Prov. 30: 15, 18, 21, 29; Amos 1: 3.

We now turn back to the aspect of צלם in PJ. In tannaitic as well as the amoraic sayings, man is substantially held to be made up of a synthesis of earthly and heavenly substances. We have a good taxonomist illustration of this by Palestinian Amoraim in GenR 8: 11 [60] (cf. also 4.3.1), whereby the divergent aspects in man are highlighted:

He created in him four creations from above and four from below: eating and drinking like the beast, fructifying and multiplying like the beast and excreting dung like the beast and dying like the beast. From above: standing like the ministering angels, speaking like the ministering angels, he has insight like the ministering angels and he sees like the ministering angels. However, an animal can not see (from the side) – incredible! But this one (can

---

see) sideways.’ Rabbi Tifdai in the name of rabbi Acha: ‘The celestial beings were created in an image and in a likeness.’

The synthesis between man’s bodily and spiritual dimensions, which is expressed in the above Midrash is in sharp contrast to Plato’s philosophy, which divides man into three distinct parts: a body fashioned from clay, the animal-like vitality of the body and the soul into which the mind is instilled. In correspondent with this Midrash (GenR 8: 11[סא]), it becomes highly significant that PJ links the spiritual aspect בצלמה אלקים in the image of God (Gen. 1: 27) with the physical aspect, that is, the composition of the body, namely, בנווהם in their body. PJ thereby expresses the functional aspect of man. From this it is reasonable to suggest that PJ’s replacement of בצלמו in Scripture, with ב디וקניה in the targumic rendering, is intentional.

Referring to the diverse aspects of the human constitution, sages demonstrated the idea that man is essentially an integrated being. There is no indication that sages attempted to dichotomize the synthesis of spiritual and physical in the rendition of PJ; the terms בדיאוקניה and בצלמה are not differentiated any further. Presumably Amoraim did not expand on בדיאוקניה, to create the impression that the term forms a synthesis with the slightly distinguished aspect, which is implied in בצלמה. This unifying aspect in PJ is in distinct opposition to Philo, who set apart the physical and spiritual being of man. Furthermore, he advocated the philosophy that the body was not created by God, because He could not be connected to something evil.

The fundamental dualism between material and non-material was central to

---

61 See Urbach’s discussion on this subject (1979: 221).
62 Urbach illustrates sages’ differentiation of man’s spiritual attributes and his bodily needs in a number of Baraitas and additional sayings of sages (1979: 220-21).
63 See Urbach’s discussion of Philo’s views (1979: 226).
Philo’s entire approach (Ferguson et al 1988: 510). It stands to reason that sages aimed to provide an active defence against the influences of a dualistic anthropological philosophy, which was propagated at the end of the Second Temple period (cf. Urbach 1979: 223). The point in argument is that God, in rabbinic theology, constituted a unity. Sages inferred the unity of God from בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ to the unity of man in terms of his body and soul (cf. Urbach 1979: 226). In correspondence with the idea that God is a Unity, PJ emphasizes the aspect of man’s unity by setting off the summative expression of וּבְגִוָּזְנוֹ to the unity of man in terms of his body and soul (cf. Urbach 1979: 226). In correspondence with the idea that God is a Unity, PJ emphasizes the aspect of man’s unity by setting off the summative expression of וּבְגִוָּזְנוֹ in their bodies against the taxonomic illustration of the diversity of its various parts (v. 27): ובGroupId וארבעין ותמני מאאיברין בשית מאה ושיתין וחמשא גידין וקרם עילוי מושכא ומלי יתיה ביסרא ואד with two hundred and forty eight pieces, with six hundred and sixty five tendons. And he covered upon him the skin and filled him with flesh and blood.

7.5 Exegetical and Historical Relationships in PJ Gen. 1: 26-27

PJ’s interpolations in Genesis 1: 26-27 show definite signs of the development of a reactive theology. Intentional changes to the HT of Scripture together with interpolations that illustrate sages’ use of hermeneutic rules and rhetoric are strong indicators that the Sitz-im-Leben of PJ was a learning environment. It can be assumed that PJ’s interpolation in Genesis 1: 26 not only served to counter arguments of heretics but also acted as catalyst for establishing paradigms of rabbinic logic. The repeated reference to R. Yochanan as an authority on the topic of angels in the context of rabbinic debate presumably derives from an oral learning setting (cf. 7.4.1.1). GenR’s language is mostly neo-Hebraic mixed with a variety

---

64 For a comprehensive discussion on Sages’ teaching on the relationship between body and soul refer to Urbach (1979: 224-51).
of Galilean Aramaic (cf. Strack 1931: 217). Neo-Hebrew was spoken in the context of the rabbinic academy. Presumably, haggadic traditions which became part of GenR were still loosely bundled during the compositional phase of PJ and the PT. Apart from halakhic traditions, Haggadah was also incorporated into Talmudic sayings to bring home the immediacy of right doing as opposed to the theoretical significance that is attached to Halakhah in the Talmud (cf. Strack 1931: 90-91). However, it seems that ultimately haggadic material was sorted into separate Expositional Midrashim for functional\textsuperscript{65} reasons.

Scholars generally agree that both GenR and the PT fall into the period of Palestinian Amoraim of the third and fourth century. It thus appears feasible that GenR’s final redaction took place either concomitant with the PT and/or with PJ. The point in argument is that rabbis set themselves to test and analyse all orally transmitted material during talmudic discussions before they reworked and integrated it into written compilations. Individuals could not merely introduce laws into an official written compilation without majority ruling, for reason that the intent and significance of many old laws and customs had been forgotten in the troubled and uncertain times in the aftermath of the destruction. The authenticity of past laws thus had to be reviewed under a new system of assertion and argument. For this purpose scientific and logical methods were developed and implemented (cf. Unterman 1952: 104-106). Hence it was crucial for rabbis that oral traditions should be scrutinized for

\textsuperscript{65} E.g. Expositional Midrashim reflect the structure of proems in the early Synagogue service.
coherence with Scripture, before they were passed as being authentic and valid.66

In relation to the above, it must be stressed that the process of authorization could only have happened in the context of public learning in the rabbinic academy, where the backing of collective rabbinic approval was carried out. The practice of linking compilations of Oral Torah to the names of prominent sages - e.g. GenR’s ascription to the Palestinian Amora of the first generation, Oshaia or Hoshiaia in whose name the first proem begins - was to validate the authoritative status of a recension after it had been collectively compiled in the academy. It stands to reason that recensions of Oral Torah, which date back into the age of formative Judaism, were not the work of individuals. Jewish learning could simply not have functioned effectively without the context of communal discussion. The wide utilization of the method of Derash, although never used to the point of exclusivity, was bound to specific rules of interpretation that could hardly have been applied successfully in the absence of debate and communal education. Also the fact that recensions of Oral Torah are interspersed with numerous discussions in the names of both outstanding and lesser eminent teachers is an allusion to the collective learning environment, which they derived from.

In my view, the practice of linking recensions of Oral Torah to the name of a prominent rabbi must be seen as part of sages’ system to certify a completed work. A similar practice can be supposed when later additions

66 See Neusner’s introduction on this process (1988). According to Unterman (1952: 106) talmudic scholars were forced to fence every tradition with the complete and unquestioned authority of the Torah.
were integrated into existing recensions of Oral Torah. In such instances the name of the prominent sage in whose name the work was edited would be linked to the addition. Chronological continuity does not seem to have been a concern in this regard. For example, Chapter II of *Pirkeh Aboth* begins with Rabbi, showing that there is no chronological continuity between this Chapter and the first. Moreover, the dicta of Rabbi and his son in Chapter II are followed by more sayings of Hillel, who was already alluded to in Chapter I, 12.  

The additions were authenticated by linking Rabbi’s name to them. More than likely, most compilations of Oral Torah derive from an official context of skilled learning, wherein the rabbinic rule of majority versus minority could be exercised.

### 7.6 The Problem of Priestly Entitlements in PJ

Mortensen found that PJ expanded on priests’ gifts according to themes, which she specifies and discusses in her study. She sets apart the character of the tribe of Levi in this Targum (1999: 43). Thus, the entitlement for priests to receive gifts depended on membership in the tribe of Levi (PJ Gen. 32: 2 5; Deut. 18: 2). The system whereby the priest received his share depended on the operation of the Temple (1999: 44). PJ implies that Cain’s gifts of first fruits constituted an insufficient Passover offering,

---

**67** R.T. Herford believes that the inclusion of Rabbi and his son at this point in *Aboth* shows that additions were made to the text after the time of Rabbi (1962: 40).

**68** Unterman (1952: 103-104) describes the process of approval as follows: ‘Several scholars give their opinions and each supports his opinion by arguments and facts. Mountains are built and as quickly torn down. Brilliant images flash every now and then. Here someone has fallen into a trap and desperately tries to extricate himself, giving a number of new logical arguments and thus emerges as the victor. It is a legal chess game which intrigues and stimulates, sharpens the intellect, and teaches one to think critically and analytically.’
since he is said to have brought the seed of flax of first things at ‘the end of the days on the fourteenth of Nissan’. The gift should have been a lamb (1999: 39-71).

According to PJ (Gen. 27: 9), Rebecca also knew of the feasts since she prepares one (kid) for the sake of Passover and one for the sake of the Feast of Tabernacles. The operational ground for the feast of Passover is noted as the Temple in PJ (Exod. 19: 4), "מן פילוסין ואובילית יתכוןאתר בית מקודש ל นอกจาก והקרב原标题 יתכў in respect of Pelusin I brought you to the place of the house of the Temple to celebrate there the Passover.

Mortensen shows how PJ (Num. 25: 13; Lev. 2: 13; 7: 19 and 22: 3) injects immediacy into the entitlements of priests. Priests are rightfully entitled to receive money as well as food (PJ Lev. 19: 24; Exod. 30: 13). People are expected to give willingly to priests (PJ Exod. 25: 2; 35: 21; 38: 24-25). Numerous occasions for sacrifice are also pointed out in PJ (e.g. Lev. 17: 4; Deut. 12: 27; Exod. 38: 8; Num. 18: 9, 15; 29: 39; Deut. 23: 22 & 24) (1999: 48-57).

Although Mortensen is certainly correct in her proposition that PJ is strongly in support of priests, her argument (1999: 46) that this Targum is a ‘handbook for priest’s entitlements’, does not take into consideration all the academic elements that are incorporated into PJ’s rendition. She tries to solve this dilemma by suggesting a scenario where priests split from one of the rabbinic schools and in the hope that the Temple will be rebuilt soon, they undertook ‘to resurrect the profession of the priesthood in a fresh way’ (1999: 62). Mortensen argues that the targumic shapers nonetheless concluded their work, although the priestly euphoria was dashed with the death of Julian in 363 (1999: 63)

69 Cf. Jastrow (1996: 1535) in respect of

כַּלֶּשׁות.
A more feasible hypothesis, and one that fits the context of formative Judaism better, is that PJ was compiled in the context of a rabbinic school, where many of the rabbis came from priestly lineages; in this capacity they could actively and significantly influence the configuration of the oral-learning environment by means of targumic rendering. The fact that PJ shares fifty expansions with N and expands on them (Mortensen 1999: 45), underlines the probability that N was known and referred to in the context of scholarly debates during which PJ was compiled. This theory corroborates with the current dating proposals for N and PJ. Scholars overwhelmingly place both of them into the context of fifth generation Palestinian Amoraim (c. mid-fourth century C.E.). Both Targums reflect an affinity with the PT and GenR, which stem from the same period of time. Moreover, the study of M. Maher (1994) shows that PJ stands between TO and N in matter of translation technique.

There are thus increasing indications that PJ represents a mixed lineage of targumic traditions.70 What is more, the combination of grammatical elements from JLA, JPA and lexical items from Samaritan Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac and JBA add to the theory that PJ evolved from the context of scholarly debates of Palestinian Amoraim. It must be assumed that targumic rendering of Scripture was an imperative during such debates.

Given a hypothetical setting in an amoraic academy, wherein targumic renderings of Scripture were correlated with the recitation of ancient collections of oral traditions to set the tone for Talmudic discussions, my

70 S.A. Kaufman (1976: 61) notes that ever since the time of Zunz, Frankel, Bacher, and Ginsburger there has been scholarly consensus that PJ represents a late revision of the Palestinian Targum (tradition) under the influence of TO and other midrashic sources.
hypothesis for the compilation of PJ in the *beth midrash* suggests the following modus operandi into account:

PJ was created as rabbis compared existing targumic versions (Onqelos, Palestinian Targums and Neofiti 1) in the academic context. The debate was the means through which diverse oral traditions on a given topic were called to memory, compared, sorted and tested for authenticity through rhetorical activity. By making use of rhetoric in their discussions, rabbis compiled a rabbinic theology that was linked to Scripture and therefore ultimately derived its authenticity from Scripture. PJ, presumably, evolved as rabbis recollected from memory diverse ancient oral traditions and linked them to Scripture via targumic rendering from official traditions like TO and N. The comparative exercise with oral circulating midrashic traditions was sure to stimulate debate on selected topics. It is reasonable that ultimately a revised targumic rendering was fashioned as scribes in the academy captured and reworked rabbinic discussions into a number of written compilations, of which each had a separate reference function:

(i) PJ and the PT for the context of the rabbinic academy and

(ii) Midrash Rabbah for the context of the Synagogue.

In my view, the retention of several dialects in PJ reflects the different layers of oral traditions, which were integrated into this targumic recension. It was in the interest of rabbis to retain the unique style and dialect of transmitted traditions in the editing process,\(^71\) making it possible for future generations to identify which sources contributed to a specific collection of rabbinic traditions. PJ illustrates the intention of rabbis to retain a

---

\(^71\) Already in the Mishnah, the unique style and language of scholars were preserved primarily in the speeches (Unterman 1952: 66).
demarcation line between diverse ancient traditions. In my analysis, these traditions can be divided into the following main categories:

(i) TO written in JLA

(ii) PalTargs written in JTA/JPA

(iii) Priestly matters written in LJLA

(iv) Expansions exhibiting mnemonics, Gematria, and rhetoric.

The learned character of PJ is particularly striking from the manner in which its expansions are constructed and what characteristics they display.

7.7 Conclusive Remarks in Matters of PJ Gen. 1: 26-27

The study of Genesis 1: 26-27 in PJ has yielded guidelines for discerning two interrelated aspects in this targumic rendition, that is, its purpose, and how this purpose relates to its composition.

I found that the exegetical expansions in PJ Genesis 1: 26-27 can be linked to rhetorical exercises, which were conducted, overwhelmingly, in amoraic circles. The said expansions are distinctive to PJ; in other words, they do not form part of official targumic renditions such as TO and N. This indicates that PJ addresses theological aspects wherein prospective rabbis were instructed, to school them in their refutation of heretic elements.

The fact that PJ Genesis 1: 26-27 holds a haggadic tradition on which there was not general consensus, suggests that PJ may have served the purpose of presenting a scriptural basis for initiating and improvising authentic rabbinic arguments against prevailing Gnostic and Christian teachings or
non-Jewish influences. The point in argument is that haggadic interpolations in PJ Genesis 1: 26-27 link up with rhetoric rebuttals on theological issues that confronted sages such as:

(i) Views, which propagated the Trinity doctrine (i.e. the plural interpretation of נעשׂה (v. 26), in reaction to Minim)

(ii) Dualistic conceptions of God and man (i.e. three gods, the dichotomization of body and soul (v. 27), in reaction to Minim and Hellenistic influences)

The said interpolations in PJ may, furthermore, have served to direct the course of the educational exercise in an organized manner.

My findings, regarding the rabbinic character of PJ, coincide with L. Lieber’s research (2000: 89-119). She and her investigating team found that PJ does not favour the opinion of any single rabbi. Different levels of correspondence can be found in a single verse between texts compared with PJ, more particularly ‘identical matches, more vague resonances, divergent interpretations, and unparalleled insertions’. The hypothesis of Lieber’s team is that ‘the differences or choice of similarities was driven by audience or context of use’. The researchers conclude that the insertions are clearly in the ‘rabbinic’ spirit. The text, which PJ was primarily compared with in their instance, was the Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael. The latter is a tannaitic text, which appears to be named after the ‘school’ that is believed to have been led by Rabbi Ishmael (cf. Stemberger 1977: 84).

---

72 This was done in conjunction with a team of investigators. The team prepared the Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets at the Kampen Theological University in 1999; also Dineke Houtman of the BCTP project, Stephen A. Kaufman and Jerome Lund of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati and the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon project. Laura Lieber finalized the findings in a paper (2000: 89-119).
Overwhelmingly, evidence of my own research of PJ and past research projects on PJ suggests, that in its early stages (as opposed to later versions), this Targum was used in the context of an amoraic academy for the purpose of educating rabbis in the art of rhetoric reasoning. The reasons can be summed up as follows:

(i) An integrated Targum like PJ, which consists of a compound selection of traditional interpretive material, lends itself ideally to the context of rhetorical debate. Indeed, it has the potential of initialising discussion, particularly in conjunction with the recitation of divergent, unparallelled or vague views.

(ii) PJ’s rabbinic spirit and scholarly character fits the context of an amoraic academy.

(iii) PJ’s dating coincides with N, GenR and other sources of Oral Torah. Presumably therefore, PJ was compiled to assist with the redaction of the PT.

However, much more research needs to be done in terms of the hypothesis that I sketched above in view of PJ. This became very clear to me when towards the end of my research on PJ, I came across Hamburger’s analysis of PJ (1892: 1179-84). I am not sure, whether the Gothic German script has of late been a deterrent for researchers to take cognizance of what Dr. J. Hamburger (‘Landrabbiner zu Strelitz in Mecklenburg’) had to say on the subject of PJ; but it struck me that his analysis of the said Targum has not so much as even been noted in recent research studies. I am therefore closing this Chapter with a comprehensive quote from his article on ‘Targum Jonathan zum Pentateuch’ in his work *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*. In his assessment, PJ is a reworking of Targum
Jerushalmi, dating from the middle of the eighth century. In my assessment of PJ, his motivation for the compilation of PJ is strikingly plausible:

Significantly, Hamburger recognizes that PJ integrates ancient oral Jewish traditions with Scripture. His theory is interesting: He sees in PJ a Targum that took over the secret teachings of Jewish mysticism, which were linked to earlier Jewish Hellenism (1892: 1181). In his analysis PJ is therefore a Targum ‘das der Mystik huldigt’. He adduces abundant textual evidence for his view, albeit in a summarized style (1892: 1181-83). Hamburger’s relatively late dating of PJ is reiterated by Kasher (2007) in his criticism of Mortensen’s recent work (2006). For Kasher an early dating of PJ to the mid-fourth century is problematic.
From the aforesaid it is clear, that the question concerning the dating and character of PJ has not been resolved. The debate must continue. Within this debate we should, anew, take cognizance of theories set forth by early researchers, like Hamburger. Their insights can provide new incentives and perspectives for future research. The theories of Hamburger and Mortensen each shed light on specific aspects that characterize PJ. So does my hypothesis. Taking all three perspectives – the mystical, the priestly and the academic – into account in a future research project, might bring us nearer to solving the riddle of PJ.
SUMMARY AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In modern times, numerous scholars have ventured to interpret Genesis 1: 26-27 in Scripture, but the analysis of this passage has continued to remain enigmatic for reason that past researchers have arrived at distinctly separate and diverse conclusions. On these grounds, it has been referred to as the *imago Dei* problem. The problem of its interpretation can be traced as far back as ancient rabbinic writings, from where it is evident that exegeses of this biblical passage by tannaitic and amoraic sages were motivated by anti-heretical and apologetic tendencies. Further, the interpretation of the passage can be linked directly to the development of Judaism’s principal creed.

Targumic renderings are of the earliest textual witnesses to interpretive approaches of ancient Jewish sages, because they do not only translate the biblical text, but also incorporate ancient Jewish oral traditions by adding words, phrases and/or expansive interpolations into the translated text. Since Targums fall into the same historic period as do midrashic traditions of tannaitic and amoraic origin, their rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 can be correlated with passages from these Midrashim, which likewise focus on the interpretation of the said passage in Scripture.

In this thesis, midrashic traditions on Genesis 1: 26-27 from tannaitic and amoraic origin were compared with each other and also with targumic renderings of the said passage, to establish how they are at variance and/or how they are similar to each other. I argued that, as significant to this perspective, is the reception history of these interpretive traditions in the context of formative Judaism, on the grounds that the historical developments
in the aftermath of the destruction of the Second Temple influenced the way in which Jews confronted their faith issues. A major change, which is noticeable from the transition of Second Temple to post-temple Judaism, is the standardization of its oral traditions. This is particularly evident from the increased focus on redaction and writing down of circling oral traditions. The Targums are no exception in this matter. The thesis shows how the transition from Temple to Synagogue worship, together with the realignment of diverse Jewish political and religious groups of the Second Temple period into an integrated group of new Jewish religious leaders, shaped the evolvement of rabbinic learning. In the process, diverse targumic traditions were revised and standardized for the context in which they were to serve. This is evident, for one, from the use of the Aramaic dialects in them, popular, literary of a mixture of several kinds. Second, the approach of targumic rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27, in a particular version, also provides clues to its function for which it was compiled and from which period an oral rendering derives. Here the comparison with other Jewish interpretive traditions of Genesis 1: 26-27 is of particular value. The thesis demonstrates how tannaitic and amoraic midrashic traditions correlate with targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27. This comparative exercise, in turn, reveals with which period in the age of formative Judaism the respective targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 correspond most expressly and how the Sitz-im-Leben, where a Targum tradition was functional influenced its rendition.

The research on the interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in targumic renderings of the Pentateuchal Targums (FragTarg, N, TO and PJ) was conducted within the perimeters of the history and theology of formative Judaism. To place my research into the greater context of Judaism’s pre-history I showed, in Chapter 3 that it was the prohibition to make graven images of God, which set off ancient Israel against its heathen neighbours. The said prohibition is declared
in the second commandment, in Exodus 20: 4-5, in Scripture. Israel actively opposed iconography throughout its history. Concomitant with the advance of Israel’s iconoclasm, its belief in the invisible God was transmitted through the medium of writing. In post-biblical and particularly in post-Destruction times, writing as a medium of transmitting Judaism’s theology became even more pronounced.

From the age of formative Judaism, it is notable that rabbinic theology links the second commandment to its interpretation of Genesis 1: 26-27. I showed in Chapter 4, how tannaitic and amoraic sages based their understanding of God on the premise that God is an Absolute Unity and that He is Unique. From the examples, which I set forth, it became evident that both Tannaim and Amoraim rejected a dualistic interpretation of the Divine Being. This stance developed as a result of their contentions with non-Jewish doctrines. Their overall approach was shown to be reactive. I found that sages’ (Tannaim and Amoraim) defense in relation to Genesis 1: 26-27 consistently aimed to justify Judaism’s belief that God does not compare with man in terms of physicality, but rather functionally. In other words, for sages, the term צָלֵם did not imply God’s iconoclastic representation. On the contrary, in their interpretation, צָלֵם denoted God’s spiritual being from where they made the comparative link to דָּמָּה. Thus דָּמָּה was understood in some rabbinic sources to refer to man’s moral behaviour after the pattern set forth by the Torah. Torah, in turn, revealed the workings of God’s mind. The entire picture continues in line of development with ancient Israel’s understanding that the deity can not be represented in an icon. Tannaitic and amoraic sages demonstrate the importance, which Torah continued to have for the ratification of their belief system over against the arguments of their antagonists, who based their notions on mental reasoning processes alone. It is, in fact, striking that all sages’ arguments, without exception, are linked to
Scripture. Throughout their refutation of polytheistic doctrines, the plural nouns and verbs that are linked to the deity in Genesis 1: 26-27, were consistently argued from the basis of other Scriptures to refer to God in the singular sense. Significant in relation to ancient Israel’s prohibition of graven images in Exodus 20: 4-5, is that both Tannaim and Amoraim implicate the second commandment in their discussion of the functional aspect in Genesis 1: 26-27, that is, הָדָוָה.

From a point of comparison between tannaitic and amoraic responses, my research showed that Amoraim followed tannaitic exegeses closely. Amoraic sages continued to propagate the innate ideas of Tannaim, albeit with more advanced methods of rhetoric. Whereas Tannaim stayed with the simple method of inferring their argument from a scriptural proof-text, Amoraim added illustrations and expanded by way of rhetorical argument to demonstrate what Scripture meant for them.

Within the context of formative Judaism, Sages propagated the defense of Judaism’s principal creed, that God is One, with renewed vigour. This happened in the aftermath of the Destruction with the evolvement of the new culture of pharisaic Judaism, wherein tannaitic and amoraic sages revised the expression of their faith in line with the development of their Oral Law. I found that concomitant with this revision came the standardization of the Synagogue Liturgy. I argued that the reason for this was that the spiritual leaders of the Jewish nation sought a way to unify their confused and distraught people in the absence of the Temple. A leading figure in this time of turmoil was shown to be R. Yochanan ben Zakka, under whose charismatic leadership, stemming from his position as priestly אב בית דין and student of the renowned Hillel, Jews were given a common point of reference in the immediate aftermath of the Destruction. This happened when R.
Yochanan ben Zakkai was able to secure Yabneh from the Romans to establish a new centre of learning for Jews in the absence of the Second Temple. My point in argument in my thesis is that R. Yochanan ben Zakkai was able to introduce revolutionary reforms to Judaism after the Destruction, on the strength of his priestly lineage and position as *av-beth-din* of the Second Temple period. His influence did, however, not only depend on his knowledge of the Temple setup and authority as a priest, but also on his capacity as a leading Torah scholar during the Second Temple period. These combined aspects equipped him to cope with the challenge of establishing a post-Destruction Sanhedrin in Yabneh and preserving the identity of the Jewish people within a pluralistic worldview. To his personal detriment, he made little of former priestly privileges and powers in the new religious context. This made him increasingly unpopular within the ranks of the priesthood. What is more, the fact that he was succeeded by the pharisaic sage, R. Gamaliel II, as leader of the Sanhedrin in Yabneh, further diminished the prospect for priests to restore their waning autonomy. In that R. Gamaliel II was a relative of the esteemed Hillel, he had enough prestige to significantly frustrate the pluralistic tolerance that had existed in Judaism during the Second Temple period and to advance the aim of pharisaic sages, to revive and decentralize the study of Torah. Together with the declining influence of priests and the rise of the *nesi’im*, came the advancement of *Semikhah* (ordination) whereby sages were ordained and bestowed with the title of ‘rabbis’. In specific cases, this title could grant them additional judicial powers. In this setup, the separate groups of pharisaic sages and priest sages gradually fused to become known as the ‘rabbis’\(^1\) of the formative age of Judaism. The first generations of rabbinic scholars can, respectively, be subdivided into Tannaim and Amoraim.

\(^1\) The term was already used in the Second Temple period, but not in relation to *Semikhah.*
Concomitant with the advance of rabbinic learning was the development of two separate forms of study called Mishnah and Midrash, where Mishnah denotes the development of Halakhah and Midrash a specific technique of interpreting Scripture. Evidence for these two forms of study is found in the respective groups of tannaitic Midrashim and amoraic Midrashim. As significant in this respect is the makeup of the Pentateuchal Targums. In my assessment, they fall into similar categories of more haggadically and more halakhically inclined recensions. The reasoning here is, however, not so much that the Targums reflect diverse traditions of interpretation but rather that they were compiled with distinct purposes in mind. Evidence in this regard was set forth from the different ways in which Pentateuchal Targums render Genesis 1: 26-27. FragTarg’s most significant departure from literalness in Genesis 1: 26 is its replacement of דברי with דמות. The underlying premise is that rabbis viewed the correspondence between God and man from a functional rather than physical level with the connotation of man’s moral behaviour. In comparison with other interpretive traditions of Genesis 1: 26-27, FragTarg rendering of the said passage corresponds closest to the sayings of Amoraim.

N’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 has the implication that בצלמנו כדמותנו must be understood in terms of man’s moral character. In other words, there is no physical connotation between God and man. This is underlined by the fact that דמות consistently replaces כולם in N’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27. In comparison with other Jewish exegetical traditions of the same period, it was shown that rabbis associated the link between כולם and דמות with moral behaviour, which is lived out in a human body. From this I argued that N promotes the idea that כולם is to be understood in a moral sense. Further, the consistent use of the Tetragrammaton in N’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 corresponds with my research of tannaitic and amoraic exegeses, which
substitute the plural noun אלהים with the singular יהוה to refute arguments of heretics, that the deity has pluralistic connotations in Scripture.

Both FragTarg and N translate the passage in the popular Aramaic dialect of JTA, by way of non-literal and expansive rendering. The use of the popular dialect indicates that they were both used in the context of the Synagogue service. Concerning their translation technique; where they add words to the translation, these comprise less than half of the number of translated words. The added words are also carefully fitted between the translated words. On the force that N shows a greater tendency towards a literal translation than FragTarg, I propose that FragTarg is what its name suggests; a targumic fragment that sages referred to during their compilation of N. Moreover, since N is a complete Targum, I put forward that we have in it a copy of the standardized targumic version for the Synagogue, which was used in Palestine about 350 to 400 C.E.

In contrast to FragTarg and N, TO renders Genesis 1: 26-27 quite literal. My assumption is that it reflects elements of an early redactional period in Palestine. This is underscored through its liberal use of JLA, an official Aramaic dialect, which was used in Palestine. The point indicates that it must have been subjected to a repeated editorial process before it received its final form in Babylonia. In comparison with FragTarg and N’s translation of Genesis 1: 26-27, it does not look as if TO could have been extensively used in the context of the Synagogue service during its early stage in Palestine. My point in argument is that there is hardly any correspondence with theological concerns in TO. I agree with Flesher in my analysis, that the early redaction of TO happened in correspondence with Proto-O, a hypothetical Targum, which was presumably memorized by priests during the Second Temple period and reworked into the Targum tradition known as TO. My proposition is that TO played a role in the context of the post-temple Sanhedrin. My point
in argument is here that it tends to expand on ambiguous passages of Scripture with the aim of clarifying *halakhic* concerns. This is in contrast to its literal rendering of theological aspects, specifically Genesis 1: 26-27. Its juridical thrust is further set forth by the fact that it is written in Standard Literary Aramaic, a dialect that was also used in the Bar Kokhba letters. The implication is that TO must have been used in the public domain, for purposes of Halakhah.

Against the literal translation of Genesis 1: 26-27 in TO, and FragTarg and N’s non-literary rendering, PJ deviates by way of phrases and sub-phrases from Scripture. In other words, its translation is a free structured rendering, which incorporates ideas and words into the text of Genesis 1: 26-27 that are not directly linked to the Hebrew Text, but remain tied to the structure of the Hebrew Text. Exegetical expansions, which are integrated into PJ’s rendering of Genesis 1: 26-27 concur with rhetorical arguments used by Palestinian Amoraim in the PT and GenR. What is more, these insertions are distinctive to PJ. The entire nature of PJ demonstrates a context of learning. My final proposition for PJ is that it was used in the context of amoraic learning for the purpose of educating rabbis. The fact that its time of composition falls into more or less the same period as N, Gen R and other sources of Oral Torah adds to my impression that PJ was used in conjunction with the compilation of the PT. Taking into consideration theories like Hamburger’s and Mortensen’s, who have pointed out specific foci (mystical and priestly) in PJ’s rendering and further, taking note of Kasher’s and Hamburger’s notion that PJ derives from a later date than the fourth century, my suggestion is that PJ was compiled in stages. These stages are evident from the later additions, as well as from the different dialects in which it is written. The final recension of PJ is therefore much later than the initial stages of its redaction.
In conclusion, I propose, from the principal results of my research that the diverse targumic renderings of Genesis 1: 26-27 demonstrate that rabbis, in the age of formative Judaism, compiled the different renditions of Palestinian Targums each with a particular purpose in mind. By implication, they were not used in the same contexts. It pertains to infer that FragTarg and N were used in the Synagogue service, whereas the most fitting context for TO and PJ appears to have been the rabbinic academy.
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EXAMPLES OF INTERPOLATIONS IN PJ

In order to investigate, whether PJ’s learned approach in rendering Genesis 1: 26-27 is a true reflection of its character throughout its rendition I have scrutinized various interpolations in the PJ starting with the book of Genesis through to Deuteronomy. In the examples the Scripture is first given, followed by the English translation and the Aramaic rendering in PJ.

PJ Genesis

The following characteristic categories of interpolations can be identified in PJ Genesis:

(i) Law and commandments

Gen. 2: 15; 3: 15; 3: 23-24; Gen. 49: 14 (Issashar is an ass in the law… therefore he bowed his shoulders to labour in the law
(يشשכר nutzen למלעי באורייתא));

(ii) Angels

Gen. 3: 6 (Sammael the angel of death
(למלאך מותאustria)); Gen. 3: 22 (ministering angels
(램לאכייה 리 משמת קומייצ); Gen 6: 4 (Schamchazai and Uzziel
(שמחצאיא וה사무אל); Gen 11: 7 (70 angels
(70 קומייצ, having reference to 70 nations
לשבעון קומייצ, 70 שבעים שמות; Gen. 18: 2, 16
(three angels in the likeness of men
(שלושה מלאכים בדמות גברים); Gen. 18: 20 (And the LORD said to the ministering angels
אמרו לי;
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(iii) Names associated with character traits

Gen. 22: 19 (Shem, the Great; Gen. 28: 12 (Jacob, the Chasid; Gen. 50: 13 (Esau, the Wicked);

(iv) Beth midrash

Gen. 22: 19 (and the angels on high took Yitzchak and brought him into the bet midrash ; Gen. 47: 27 (and they built there [in Egypt in the land of Goshen] schools;)

(v) Unity of God

Gen. 3: 22 (Adam is sole on earth, as I am sole in the heavens);

(i) Counting according to the Jewish calendar

Gen. 7: 11 (the month of Marchesvan, for hitherto the months had been counted from Tishri which was the beginning of the year at the completion of the world; Gen. 8: 4-5 (this is the month of Nisan; until the tenth month the month of Tammuz; in
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Tammuz, in the first month … (עד ירח עשירייה ירח תמוז בתמוז בחד לירחא); similarly Gen. 8: 14, 22; Gen. 27: 1; Gen 30: 14);

(ii) Listings

Gen. 25: 29 (five transgressions he [Esau] had committed אורות חמש (עב עבד; Gen. 28: 10 (five miracles were wrought for our father Jacob המשה נס� וארתעביו ליעקב);

(iii) Godly men in Scripture represented as scribes

Gen. 5: 24 (and he called his name [Henoch] Metatron the Great Scribe окרא שמיה מיטטרון ספרא רבה);

(iv) The use of an ancient hermeneutical rule according to the school of R. Yishmael: ‘There is no before and after in the Tora’ (Sifre Num. § 64),\(^1\) applied to Gen. 30: 6 …and given me [Rachel] a son; and so it is to be that He shall judge by the hand of Shimson bar Manovach, who shall be of his seed; and has he not delivered into his hand the people of the Philistaee? Therefore she called his name Dan ויהב לי בר והיכדין עתיד למידן על יד שמשון בר מנוח דמן זרעיתיה ולמימס ברידיה ית עמא דפלשתאי בגין כן קרת שמיה דן 30\(^{th}\) rule: Notrikon \(^2\) ‘breaking up a word into two or more [words]’ applied to Gen. 46: 21 (בלש דאמבולס) מנייה ובכבר הוהו בוכרא אטרימא והיכלו דחקל בשריבא בר אטרימא בר אטרימא בר אטרימא.

---

\(^1\) From which probably derived the 32\(^{nd}\) rule of Rabbi Eliezer: ‘Many a biblical section refers to a later period than the one which precedes, and vice versa.’

\(^2\) Cf. Strack (1931: 97) (refer to preceding bibliography).
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(v) Bath kol

Gen. 38: 26 (and the bath kol fell from heaven)

(vi) The number three

Gen. 40: 12 (The three branches [of the vine] are the three fathers of the world, Abraham, Yitzchak and Yakob; Gen. 40: 18 (The three baskets are the three enslavements with which the house of Israel are to be enslaved)

PJ Exodus

In PJ’s rendering of the book of Exodus, the following characteristic categories of interpolations were sorted:

(i) Pairs

Exod. 1: 11 (Immediately Jannis and Jambres, the chief of the magicians, opened their mouth and answered Pharaoh)
Exod. 2: 13 (And he [Moses] went out the second day and looked; and behold, Dathan and Abiram, men of the Jehudaee, contended; and seeing Dathan put
forth his hand against Abiram to smite him... (ויתואר נבום את המ עוס להintestinal
(ויתואר נבום ואת המ يوس החרא על אברים לפגוע)

(ii) Angels

Exod. 3: 2 (And Zagnugael, the angel of the LORD appeared to him [Moses]; Exod. 5: 2 (I [Pharaoh] have not found in the book of the Angels the name of the LORD (אשכחתי הספר מלאכייא כתיב ית שמא לי
(אשכחתי הספר מלאכייא כתיב ית שמא לי
Exod. 12: 12 (and with me [God] ninety thousand myriads of destroying angels (ועימי תשעין אלף רבוון מלאכין מחבלין
Exod. 24: 1 (And Michael, the Prince of Wisdom said to Moses (ולות משה אמר מיכאל סרכן חכמתא
Exod. 24: 10 (Gabriel descending, made bricks thereof (נחת גבריאל ועבד מיניה
Exod. 33: 23 (And I will make the host of angels who stand and minister before Me (ואנער ית כיתי מלאכים דקימין ומשמשין

(iii) Reference to an interpreter / meturgeman

Exod. 4: 16 (and be to you a meturgeman and you shall be to him for a rav (וזה יוהי לךumatגרמין אתה综合体 להילבר

(iv) Opposites of wicked and righteous

Exod. 9: 20-21 (Job, who reverenced the word of the LORD ... Bileam, who did not set his heart upon the word of the LORD (יותר ולייבימרי מضةמעא ודיי ... בילעם דלא שוי ליבי ילפנותא ודיי
Exod. 10: 23 (But among all the sons of Israel there was light, that the wicked among them who died might be buried, and that the righteous
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might be occupied with the precepts of the law in their dwellings

(v) Listings

Exod. 12: 12 (I will execute four judgments); Exod. 12: 37 (Protected by seven clouds of glory); Exod. 12: 42 (four nights are written in the Book of Memories); Exod. 20: 2-3 (The first word...; the second word...)

(vi) Jewish Calendar

Exod. 12: 40 (in the hour that He spoke with him [Abraham] on the fifteenth of Nisan)

(vii) Use of the ancient hermeneutical rule according to the school of R. Yishmael: ‘There is no before and after in the Tora’ (Sifre Num. § 64) applied to Exod. 14: 17 (These are the dry bones which the Word of the LORD restored to life by the hand of Hezekiel the prophet, in the valley of Dura); Exod. 14: 13 (Four parties were made among the sons of Israel on the shore of the weedy sea); Exod.

---

3 Could also reflect the use of an ancient hermeneutic rule ascribed to Rabbi Eliezer 32nd rule: ‘Many a biblical section refers to a later period than the one which precedes it, and vice versa.’ In Stemberger’s words (1982: 40): ‘Mancher Bibelanschnitt bezieht sich auf eine frühere Zeit als ein vor ihm stehender und umgekehrt’ (refer to preceding bibliography).
26: 28 (And the middle bar ...shall be from the tree which Abraham planted in Beara of Sheba: for when Israel crossed the sea, the angels cut down the tree and cast it into the sea...)

Similarly Exod. 36: 33.

(viii) Ten trials

Exod. 15: 25 (and there He tried them with the tenth trial)

(ix) Reference to rabbans and judges / Sanhedrin

Exod. 18: 25 (Moses selected...rabbans of thousands ...rabbans of hundreds etc.)
Exod. 22: 27 (Sons of Israel...you shall not revile your judges, nor curse the rabbans who are appointed rulers among thy people)
Exod. 28: 15 (And you shall make the Breastplate of Judgment by which are made known the judgments of Israel that are concealed from the judges)
Exod. 32: 26 (And Moses stood in the Sanhedrin gate of the camp)

(x) Mishnah

Exod. 26: 9 (And you shall join five curtains together corresponding with the five books of the Law; and six curtains together,
corresponding with the six orders of the Mishnah

(xii) The hermeneutic rule of Gematria

Exod. 28: 30 (because in them is engraved and expressed the Great and Holy Name by which were created the 310 worlds)

(xii) Mishkan Ulpan / beth midrash

Exod. 33: 6 (And Moses took and hid then in his Tent of the Instruction of the Torah)

(xiii) The hermeneutic rule of Mashal

Exod. 35: 27 (And the clouds of heaven went to Pishon

---


house of Judah and of the King Meshicha...Jehoshua, chief of the Sanhedrin of his people...Gog and his confederates
PJ Leviticus

PJ Leviticus has the least evidence of periphrastic interpolations that connect to rabbinic activity per se. There is, however, one expansion (Lev. 24: 11-12) that attributes to Moses the title ‘Rab of Israel’ and links him to the ‘chiefs of the Sanhedrin of Israel. The expansion also shows evidence of listing and refers to the process of decision-making ‘by the dictate of the word על פום מימרא’. The instructions in this expansion appear to allude to rabbinic students, who should ‘be prompt in judgments respecting money, but slow in judgments that affected life’ and ‘not to be ashamed to inquire for counsel in cases that should be too hard for them’:

This is one of four judgments which were brought in before Moses the prophet, who decided them by the dictate of the word. They were judgments about money and about life. In the judgments on money Moses was prompt; but in the judgment on life he waited. And to each party Moses said, ‘I have not heard’: so that he might teach the chiefs of the Sanhedrin of Israel, who were to arise after him, to be prompt in judgments respecting money, but slow in judgments that affected life; and not to be ashamed to inquire for counsel in cases that should be too hard for them, since Moses, their Rab of Israel, had to say, ‘I have not heard’.
PJ Numbers

PJ Numbers exhibits similar evidence for a rabbinic learning environment as is found in Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus.

(i) Reference to the title of Rabba /Rav /Riboni

Num. 2: 25 (And the rabba set over the hosts of Dan was Achiezer bar Ammishaddai ורבא דוהי עלייהו שבטי יבנ דאר; similarly Num. 2: 27; Num. 3: 21 (And the rav of the house of the father … אוחוור בר טמי שרי; similarly Num. 3: 30 and 35. Num. 11: 28 (Ribboni Moses, pray for mercy ריבוני משה בעי רחמין; Num. 36: 2 (And they said to Ribbonי ואמרו ית ריבני פקיד ייי למיתן;)

(ii) Extended Aaronic Blessing (Num. 6: 23-27)

Speckled with indicators of rabbinic instruction for the context of the synagogue ‘Thus you shall bless the children of Israel, while spreading forth the hands from the high place [some kind of small raised platform in the cult דוכנא] in this tongue it must be spoken to them [the Hebrew, which is read from the HT and paraphrased into Aramaic], demonic spirits (Lilith’s, vile things, midday demons, malignant spirits and phantoms), the LORD make his
face shine upon you, when occupied in the law [בمعنى בואריתא]

23 מילוי עם האחד ועם בני למתי יכו המברכים כי בט ישראל למו רגא

24 יברכים כי בכל עיסק וטרנגו מילוי ומוויי ובחרר ובי הפרי

25 ומייק טלן

26 תברך כי טבר אפרים בלמעסק וברונית וגויזי ומוויי והיה יברך

27 ורשום חירך שמי על בני ישראל ואנא במימר אברכים והיה ביר

(iii) The hermeneutic rule of Gematria

Num. 7: 84-88 (…twelve silver bowls, answering to the twelve tribes…twelve golden pans, answering to the twelve signs…130 shekels…answering to the years of Yochebed when she bore Moses…70 shekels…answering to the 70 elders of the Great Sanhedrin…golden pans, answering to the princes of Israel…the weight of ten shekels answering to the Ten Words; all the gold of pans, 120 (shekels), answering to the years lived by Moses the prophet…all the oxen for consecrated victims, 24, answering to 24 orders (of the priests); the rams 60, answering to the 60 years which Yitzchak had lived when he begat Yakob; the goats, 60, answering to the 60 letters in the benediction of the priests; lambs of the year, 60, to atone for the 60 myriads of Israel. This was the dedication of the altar by anointment on the day they anointed it.
(iv) Matters of judgment

Num 9: 8 (This is one of the four matters of judgment; this interpolation is a reduplication of the expansion in PJ Lev. 24: 11-12. The expansion is similarly found in the Jerusalem Targum Num. 15.

(v) The rebellion of Korah is connected with talith and tzitzit
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Num. 16: 2 (took his robe which was all of hyacinth and rose up boldly and in the face of Moses appointed a [different] observance in the matter of the hyacinth. Moses said, I have heard from the mouth of the Holy One, whose Name be blessed, that the *tzitzit* are to be of white with one filament of hyacinth; but Korach and his companions made garments with their *tzitzit* altogether of hyacinth, which the LORD had not commanded)

(vi) *Bath kol*

Num. 21: 6 (And the *bath kol* fell from the high heavens)

(vii) Pairs

Num. 21: 14 (*Eth* and *Heb*, who had been smitten with the blast of leprosy, *אֶת הָבֵית דְוֹרוֹן בְּעֶרֶבָּא דְסֶרֶרָא*); Num. 21: 32 (And Moses sent Kaleb and Phineas to examine Makbar)

(viii) Titles

Num. 21: 18 (the well which the Fathers of the World, Abraham, Yitzchak and Yakob dug: the Great Men who were of old dug it, the Chiefs of the People: Moses and Aaron, the Scribes
of Israel found it with their rods.

(ix) Names associated with character traits

Num. 21: 34 (this is Og the Wicked);
Num. 23: 9 (Said Bileam the Wicked);
Num. 23: 10 (when Bileam the sinner saw the house of Israel);
Num. 33: 40 (and Amalek the Guilty heard);

(x) Listings

Num. 22: 28 (Ten things were created after the world had been founded);
Num. 25: 8 (Twelve miracles were wrought for Phinehas);
Num. 27: 5 (This is one of the four cases of judgment brought before Moses the prophet);

(xi) Beth Din

Num. 30: 3 (but the beth din can absolve him).

PJ Deuteronomy

The pattern of interpretation in PJ Deuteronomy continues as with Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.
(i) Reference to rabbans

Deut. 1: 15 (Rabbans of thousands etc.

(ii) Listings

Deut. 1: 18 (Ten words which you are to practicebout judgments of money and judgments of life

Deut. 32: 4 (the LORD was dividing the day into four portions

Deut. 34: 5 (four good crowns [crown of the law, crown of the priesthood, crown of the kingdom and crown of a good name]

(iii) Beth Din

Deut. 17: 8 (with words of controversy in your beth din

(iv) Sages / Judges / Chief Court of Justice

Deut. 21: 2 (from the chief court of justice shall two of the sages proceed and three of your judges

Deut. 21: 3-4 (chief court of justice… sages of the elders of the city

(v) Bath kol

Deut. 28: 15 (then the bath kol fell from the high heavens

similarly Deut. 34: 5.)
(vi) The hermeneutic rule of *Gematria*

Deut. 32: 3 (he [Moses] dedicated his mouth at the beginning of his hymn with 85 letters, making 21 words)

(בַּהֲמַכֵּן וְהַמָּשִּׁים עַתָּן דְּדוֹנֵנָן עַשְׁרִים וְחֵודִים)

(vii) Angels

Deut. 32: 9 (Michael opened his lips and said…Gabriel opened his lips with thanksgivings)

(פתח מיכאל פמיה ואומר ארום חולק טב דשום מימרא
ディיי עמש מיכאל פמיה גבריאל פמיה בתושבא)

The above listing of interpolations is by no means complete; there are many midrashic passages that I have not included, which further illustrate the teaching force of PJ, in correlation with other sources of Oral Torah. The use of lists, *Gematria, Notrikon* are known to aid the process of memorization. Apart from such recognized methods of learning, PJ also illustrates that rabbinic academies made use of associative learning methods of which I have identified the development of pairs, titles, names associated with character traits, *bath kol* and opposites. Furthermore, references to the Mishnah, rabbans, Jewish calendar months, specifications of laws concerning *taliyth* and *titzit*, the *beth din* and the *beth midrash* are all indicative of a learning environment and association with halakhic matters.