treatment on the part of the translator.@@1 Elsewhere@@2 we only- find references to certain passages of Scripture, viz., the stories of Reuben and Tamar (Gen. xxxv. 22 and xxxviii.), the two accounts of the golden calf (Exod. xxxii.), the blessing of the priests (Num. vi. 22 f.), the stories of David and Λmnon (2 Sam. xi., xii. and xiii.), which might be either read and translated, or only read and not translated, or (according to a different tradition) neither read nor translated. It is noticeable that none of the passages cited conveys any rules or information as to the character of the translation to be employed. Judging by the contents of our existing Targums, and the Targumic renderings given in Jewish literature, it is improbable that any definite system of interpretation was ever formally adopted, the rendering into the vernacular being left to the discretion of the individual *Meturgemān.* At first, no doubt, the translator endeavoured to reproduce the original as closely as possible, but, inasmuch as his object was to give an intelligible rendering, a merely literal rendering would soon be found to be insufficient, and he would be forced, especially in the more difficult passages, to take a more elastic view of his obligations. To prevent misconception he must expand and explain what was obscure, adjust the incidents of the past to the ideas of later times, emphasize the moral lessons to be learned from the national history, and, finally, adapt the rules and regulations of the Old Covenant to the conditions and requirements of his own age. As time went on the practice of introducing additional matter of an edifying character grew in popular favour, and was gradually extended. Thus, by degrees, the reproduction of the original text became of secondary importance, and merely served as a pretext for the discussion of topics that had little or no bearing on the context. The method, by which the text was thus utilized as a vehicle for. conveying homiletic discourses, traditional sayings, legends and allegories, is abundantly illustrated by the Palestinian and later Targums, as opposed to the more sober translations of Onkelos and the Targum to the Prophets.

It would, however, be incorrect to suppose that the transla­tion of the text was left entirely to the individual taste of the translator. The latter is rather to be regarded as the repre­sentative of the age in which he lived, and his interpretation is to be taken as reflecting the exegesis of that period. That there were certain limits beyond which the translator might not venture, without incurring the censure of the authorities, may be inferred from the few instances of translation which are mentioned with disapproval in the Mishna and elsewhere. Thus the rendering of Lev. xviii. 21*a* by “ Thou shalt not give any of thy seed to an Aramean woman to make her conceive ” is censured, presumably because the prohibition of Molech worship is thereby ignored.@@3 In the same Mishnic passage it is forbidden to render Lev. xviii. 7 as if the text had “ *his* father ” and “ *his* mother.”@@4 Yet another translation (that of Lev. xxii. 28) is mentioned with disapproval in the Jerusalem Talmud,@@5 though it has been preserved in the Targum Pseudo­Jonathan *ad loc.@@6* A definite rule for guidance in translating is apparently preserved in the *Tosefta,@@7* where it is stated that “ he who translates quite literally is a liar, while he who adds anything is a blasphemer,” Exod. xxiv.10, “ and they saw the God of Israel ” is cited as an example. It is argued that the literal rendering of this passage is inadmissible, because no man has ever seen God; on the other hand, the insertion of the word “ angel ” before God would be blasphemous. The correct rendering is stated to be “ and they saw the glory of God.” But it is doubtful if the rule here given was ever intended to

apply to more than the particular type of passage exemplified: if it had been applied generally, it would have clashed with the whole trend of Midrashic and Targumic paraphrase.

There can be little doubt that the Targums existed for a long time in oral form. They belonged to the class of tradi­tional literature which it was forbidden to write down, and, so long at least as the Targum tradition remained active, there would be little temptation to commit it to writing. But it is highly probable that this prohibition, in the case of the Targums, was mainly enforced with respect to those parts of the Old "Testament which were read in the synagogal services, *e.g.* the Law and the Prophets, and that it was less rigidly observed in regard to the other portions of Scripture: a written trans­lation of the latter would be of special value for the purpose of private study. Hence there is no need to reject the tradition as to the existence of a written Targum on Job in the time of Gamaliel I.@@8 (1st century λ.d.), especially as references to Targum MSS. occur in the Mishna and elsewhere@@9 But, as Dalman has pointed out,@@10 it was not these manuscripts, but the living tradition of the learned which was recognized as authoritative throughout the period which closes with the compilation of the Talmud. . . . The official recognition of a written Targum, and therefore the final fixing of its text belongs to the post-Talmudic period, and is not to be placed earlier than the 5th century.

I. Targums on the Pentateuch

(1) The so-called Targum of Onkelos admittedly owes its name to a mistaken reference in the Babylonian Talmud.@@11 In its original context, that of the Jerusalem Talmud@@12 the passage refers to the Greek translation of Aquila. With the exception of this one reference, the Targum is always intro­duced in the Babylonian Talmud by the phrase “ as we trans­late ” (pwι∏D∙c), or “ our Targum" (pn cum): it is pro­bable, therefore, that the name of the author, or authors, was unknown to the Babylonian Jews. It is first quoted under the title of the Targum of Onkelos by Gann Sar Shalom (d. a.d. 859). According to Dalman,@@13 its language differs in many material par­ticulars from the Aramaic dialects of the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, and is more closely allied to the biblical Aramaic. On the linguistic side, therefore, we may regard Onkelos “ as a faithful representative of a Targum which had its rise in Judaea, the old seat of Palestinian literary activity.” It is not, however, to be regarded as a reproduction in written form of a Palestinian trans­lation, but rather as an official translation of the Law, in the Judaean dialect, which was carried out in Babylon, probably about the 4th century a.d. : in its final form, according to Dalman (*l.c.*) it cannot be earlier than the 5th century. The translation, as a whole, is good, and adheres very closely to the Hebrew text, which has not been without its influence on the Aramaic idiom; at times, especially in the poetical passages, a freer and more paraphrastic method is employed, and the version shows evident traces of Halakhic and Haggadic expansion. The Hebrew text used by the translators appears to have been practi­cally identical with the Massoretic. The version was held in high esteem in Babylon, and, later, in Palestine, and a special Massora was made for it. The latest edition is Berliner’s reprint (1884) of the *Editio Sabbioneta* (1557).

Of all the extant Targums that of Onkelos affords perhaps the most characteristic and consistent example of the exegetical methods employed in these works. Two principles may be said to have guided the translators. On the one hand, they had, as their primary object, to produce a faithful rendering of the original which at the same time would be intelligible to the people : for this purpose a purely literal translation would be insufficient. On the other hand, they regarded it as necessary to present the sacred text in such a manner as best to convey the particular form of interpretation then current. But later Jewish exegesis was espe­cially concerned to eliminate everything in the sacred writings that might give rise to misconception with respect to God on the part of the unlearned. Hence we find various expedients adopted in the Targums for avoiding any reference to the Deity, which might be misunderstood by the people, or which involved apparent irreverence. Examples of this peculiarly Targumic method are: (1) the insertion of “ word" (rido), “ glory ” (κιρ,), “ presence ” (κr2r>) before the divine name, when God is referred to in his
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