'TARGUMIC ADDITIONS' IN TARGUM PSEUDO-JONATHAN
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[A]

A careful and detailed comparison of the Biblical text and its Aramaic Targums* reveals multiple modes of translation. The most common is the 'word-for-word translation' in which an equivalent is given for each scriptural unit (a word or phrase), following their order. For example:

*These are the Targums that will be discussed in this article:
FT(p) - The Fragment Targum, Ms. Paris
FT(v) - The Fragment Targum, Ms. Vatican
FT(n) - The Fragment Targum, Ms. Nürnberg
MN - The marginal notes in Ms. Neophiti 1
Pšj - E. G. Clarke, Targum Pseudo Jonathan of the Pentateuch - Text and Concordance (Hoboken 1984)
TG - Genizah fragments of Targums, according to: M. L. Klein, Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, I-II (Cincinnati 1986)
TN - A. Díez Macho, Neophiti 1 (Madrid and Barcelona 1968-1979)
TO - A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic: Targum Onkelos (Leiden 1959)

The present article concentrates around the texts that are usually and conveniently entitled 'The Palestinian Targums' (FT, MN, Pšj, TG and TN), while the 'babylonian' Targum Onkelos will be mentioned only for the sake of comparison.

1 In using this term I follow: M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Exegetical Exercises in Comparative Targum Study: Genesis 15:1," in: Salvacion en la Palabra...en memoria...Alexander Díez Macho (Madrid 1986) 379.

2 The question whether this mode of translation reflects the oldest custom of translating Scripture into Aramaic is still open to debate and should be discussed separately. See: Y. Komlosh, The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations (Tel-Aviv 1973) 21-22.
This mode of translation is frequently referred to as 'literally' or 'verbally'. The proper use of these terms should be limited to describing a formal correlation between the Hebrew verse and its translations: a correlation that takes form—but not meaning—into consideration. A 'verbally' or 'literally' translation means that the translator adhered to the biblical verse and offered an equivalent for each and all of its words and phrases, following their scriptural order; these terms should not be used to imply that the translator succeeded in expressing the verse's 'meaning'. Such an argument is both subjective and arbitrary. Consider, for example, these famous Targums:

Gen 1:1:

בְּכָּל מֶֽהָּ יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה

TO:

כְּכָל מֶֽהָּ יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה

PsJ:

נְּפַלִּמְּלָא בְּרָא אֲלָכָּר יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה

FT(n):

בְּכָל מֶֽהָּ יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה יִֽתְּמַטְּמֶֽה

All three Targums offer an equivalent for בראסית. Are there any valid or undisputable criteria for deciding which one conveys the singularly 'true' meaning of [Hebrew]; M. Goshen-Gottstein, 'The 'Third Targum' on Esther and Ms. Neofiti 1,” *Biblica* 56 (1975) 313-315.


4 TN offers here a special conflation: מְלַּכְדְוֵי נַבְּהֶה (Cf.: R. Kasher, "Targumic Conflations in the Ms Neofiti 1," *HUCA* 57 [1986] 23-24 [Hebrew]). FT is reading בתכתי, while a marginal note in FT(p) reads: מְלַּּכְדְוֵי (= TO?)
the biblical word (if such a meaning exists at all)? While most scholars may agree that הבורא is not the apparent and 'simple' meaning of Scripture—dismissing it as a 'midrashic' interpretation which declares that God created the world with wisdom—they will disagree in regard to זן אולא (= in the beginning) and בקדיים (= in antiquity). Deciding which is a better translation of יראיה is a question of interpretation and should not be confused with the unequivocal description of targumic techniques. All three translations (including בהזמנה) are 'word-for-word translations', in which each Meturgeman closely follows the pattern of the biblical verse, substituting each of its components with an (Aramaic) equivalent.

This mode of translation is the most common in the Targums apparently because it is convenient for memorization and facilitates the oral presentation of the Targum. The Meturgeman in the synagogue had to translate the reading from Scriptures intermittently with the reader, verse after verse—a custom reflected in various rabbinic rulings and in some manuscripts of Targum—and this 'made to


8. E.g: Kahorav boroh...la'aziyem lakhem mitzvot veyer emek hevar. (= One who reads the Torah...should not read to the Meturgeman more than one verse at a time [M. Megillah 3:4];); Eiz hakorav reshe lakhli harinum...u'vesal al mishka yivaro reshe lakhli (תורסא איזא ויליחא ויליסא מיסחי חלופא (= The Meturgeman is not permitted to begin the translation until the verse had been completed by the reader and the reader is not...)}
measure’ mode of translation was most probably the easiest to use. The biblical verse served as a mnemo-technical device for the Meturgeman and saved him from embarrassing forgetfulness. At the same time, this mode enabled the Meturgeman to offer his audience a text that was more or less equal in length to the biblical verse, thereby maintaining some balance between Scripture and Targum, while the listener had little difficulty in following the Targum’s words and comprehending its message.

Verses translated in principle by the ‘word-for-word’ mode are frequently expanded by the Targums with one or more additions (or interpolations),\(^{10}\) thus creating a new mode of translation: the ‘expanded translation’. For example:

\[
\text{Gen.22:9:} \quad \text{וַיְבָאָהּ אֶלָּ הַמַּכְסְהָא אָשֶׁר אָמַר לַהוּ יְרָכָּא שִׁנָּא אַרְבָּאָהִא אַתָּ הַמַּכְסְהָא מְעָלָא}
\]

\[
\text{TN:} \quad \text{אָמַר לֵאָה רָאָה דָּיָּו לֵי יַבְּנָא חַתָּא אֵבָּרָהִא יִתְמְרַבְּתָא חֵדֶר יִתְקִיפָא מַעָּדָא}
\]

\[
\text{PsJ:} \quad \text{יַבְּנָא חַתָּא אֵבָּרָהִא יִתְמְרַבְּתָא חֵדֶר יִתְקִיפָא מַעָּדָא}
\]

permitted to begin another verse until the translation had been completed by the Meturgeman (B. Sola 39b)).

\(^9\)The Lemmata that are found in some manuscripts of Targum (e.g: M. Klein, The Fragment Targums of the Pentateuch (Rome 1980) 38) and the numerous texts which bring intermittently both the biblical verses and their Targum (Cf.: Klein, Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch [Cincinnati 1986, I] xxii and n. 24) seem to follow this custom.

\(^{10}\)Already S. D. Luzatto, in his pioneering work on TO (Ohev Ger [Krakow 1895]), described the ‘addition’ (הוספת לָשׁוֹן) as a separate mode of translation. See also: M. McNamara, Targum and Testament (Shannon 1972) 30 and pp. 69-70 (“interpolated passages”); A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, Vol. IVb: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible (Leiden 1973) 198-210 (‘additions’); R. Syren, The Blessings in the Targums (Abo 1986) 76-78 (‘the additions’); Levi, (above, n. 5) 54-63 (‘interpolated Midrashim’). The terms ‘addition’ and ‘interpolation’ will be used in this article interchangeably.
While TN offers a 'word-for-word' translation, PsJ incorporates into the translated verse two interpolations, one long and aggadic\(^1\) and the other short (ט"ל), clarifying a small point. Both interpolations can be easily removed, leaving us with a text that is basically similar to TN.\(^2\)

The 'word-for-word' and the 'expanded' translations—as well as other modes of translation not mentioned here—are found in all extant targumic texts, although in various proportions.\(^3\) Their systematic study can serve as a doorway into the targumic world.

The following will deal with the 'expanded translation' as found in one targumic text only — the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum (PsJ). The justification for discussing this issue in connection with one Targum only is based on an important principle in targumic studies:\(^4\) the distinction that must be made between (a) targumic traditions that are exclusive to one targumic text and (b) traditions that are common to all (or at least to most\(^5\)) 'Palestinian' Targums to a given verse. For this distinction we have to bear in mind that very rarely do the different Targums contain different aggadic (or halachic) traditions in connection with the same

---

\(^{1}\)This tradition is repeated in PsJ to Gen. 3:23 and 8:20. For a parallel see Pirke deRabbi Eliezer, chapter 23, and for the theological implications of this tradition see: G. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden 1973) 209.

\(^{2}\)Some of the minor differences between TN and PsJ (mainly those in orthography [לאזרא etc.] and morphology [יד אבר > דאבר]) can be attributed to PsJ's partial dependence on TO which reads: 'א었던 לרנדו אבר על הזבצ החברות על מברכה פורר (ל) וסוכא אבריה על מברכה על פורר פורר. See also below, notes 35 and 44.

\(^{3}\)It goes without saying that many times different parts of the same verse are translated in different modes: its beginning in the 'word-for-word' mode and its end, for example, as a paraphrase and so forth. This fact is irrelevant for the present study.

\(^{4}\)I would like to believe that this principle was proven in my dissertation (above, n. 6).

\(^{5}\)'Most' means in this context the majority of the 'Palestinian' targumic texts (FT, MN, PsJ, TG and TN). The fact that some targumic traditions are missing occasionally from one of the texts seems to be the unavoidable outcome of the complicated transmission of targumic material, passed on orally and in writing.
verse;\textsuperscript{16} in almost all cases they perpetuate the same tradition, with minor and secondary variations in vocabulary, length, syntax and similar aspects affected mainly by the process of oral and written transmission. The differences between the Targums can almost always be attributed to the variation on or omission of a particular tradition. A common heritage is carried on and shared by all the Targums, hereafter referred to as 'the targumic tradition'. This tradition is exhibited in the translation of a few hundred verses scattered throughout the biblical text, and it seems that we can formulate some rules that may explain why these and not other verses were chosen to be expanded by 'the targumic tradition'.\textsuperscript{17}

Each of the extant targumic text exhibits a different blend of the common 'targumic tradition' with its own additional unique elements. As far as PsJ is concerned\textsuperscript{18} there is no doubt that this text is composed of at least two well-defined and different strata: one, earlier in time, which essentially corresponds to 'the targumic tradition', and one which is exclusively its own. 'Targumic additions' that are unique to any one targumic text are found in the second stratum of PsJ close to six thousand times(!)\textsuperscript{19} while their appearances in each of the other Targums (such as TN or FT) are relatively few and trivial. Dealing with the additions which are unique to PsJ is therefore a significant part of any description of that Targum.


\textsuperscript{17}Such as the Targum's tendency to expand those verses which mark the beginning or the end of the weekly reading portion from the Pentateuch. For details see my article: 'The Numerical Introduction' in the Aramaic Targums,' Jerusalem Studies in Hebrew Literature 12 (1990) 85-102 (Hebrew).

\textsuperscript{18}For recent publications on PsJ see the literature in: R. Hayward, 'The Date of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments,' JJS 40 (1989) 7-30. See also the works cited below in notes 21, 32 and 37.

\textsuperscript{19}This number is an estimate, based on a systematic counting of the interpolations found in randomly chosen groups of thirty consequent verses, each taken from a different book of the Pentateuch.
Although to a lesser degree, 'Targumic additions' are also found in verses that are treated by 'the targumic tradition'. This group of additions will be put aside for the time being. We will deal with it later on, after discussing two interrelated issues concerning each one of the targumic texts: (a) the number of additions which may be attached to a certain verse, and (b) their location within the targumic sentence.

Number of Additions

A survey of all the Targums reveals that 'targumic additions' which are unique to a specific text are found, as already mentioned, approximately six thousand times in PsJ, but significantly less in any other targumic text. This remarkable difference in quantity is supplemented by a further observation: only in PsJ are there more than three additions attached to the same verse. As an example we may examine the following verse, whose translation includes four different interpolations:20

Gen 21:12: רואים אלוהים את אברים אל ישת 개념 pronounced: ישות קשת

TN: אמר אליהם לא יבואו ב הייתיבלתי על כל יםแผהלים חל אמה

PsJ: אמר אליהם לא יבואו ב是否会י על כל יםแผהלים חל אמה

Or the following which contains five different interpolations:

20TN, which usually exhibits a 'word-for-word translation', will be cited in the following examples for comparison with PsJ.

Ex. 18:20a:

וטבעה לוֹתָם את חֲדָךְ יִלְדָּךְ בַּעֲדָךְ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁע

TN:

תִּדְעֹת לְתוֹלָךְ יָדָךְ וְיַעֲלֶךְ בַּעֲדָךְ וְתֹאכָּלָה וְיַעֲבֹדּוּ

PsJ:

ותִדְעֹת לְתוֹלָךְ יָדָךְ וְיַעֲלֶךְ בַּעֲדָךְ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעָה וְיַעֲבֹדּוּ מִלְּשָׁוְא הַלֵּשָׁוְא

We even find examples of six different interpolations:

Nu. 27:17: אַשְׁרָא יְשָׁעַת אֶלֶּהוּ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת אֶלֶּהוּ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת

TN: נִזְכַּר תּוֹדָה וְכֵן אֵין לָהֶם רוּחַ

די יִזְכַּר קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת

ואִם מֵדְרֵי קָרְמוֹת בִּשְׁלֹשִׁים אוֹלֵי תִּדְעֹת נִזְכַּר בֵּינֵי כָּלָה דִּי יִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת

[two interpolations only]

PsJ: יִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת

תִּדְעֹת מִים דִּי בְּתוֹלָךְ וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת

בֶּלָּא תִּדְעֹת מִם בְּתוֹלָךְ וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת וְיִזְכַּר עִלֵּי קָרְמוֹת

In the relatively small number of cases in which any other targumic text expands a verse, the number of interpolations do not exceed three, usually amounting to one or two. Numerous additions are typical to PsJ, while their occurrences in other Targums are scanty and only minimally significant. Thus we are supplied with a formal and measurable criterion for pointing out PsJ's distinctiveness among the pentateuchal Targums. A possible explanation of this distinctive trait will be suggested further on.

22 For partial parallels see: The Mechiltot on the verse; B. Baba Meziah 30b (cf. B. Moed Katan 5b). Only PsJ (and the late compilation Sechel Tov) mention in this context the obligation of praying in the synagogue, seeing it as a command derived from the Torah (משאריאד). For a long discussion of this issue see: M. M. Kasher, Torah Sheleme, XV (Jerusalem 1973) 131-133 [Hebrew].

23 For a partial parallel see: Sifre Bemidbar 139: אַשְׁרָא יְשָׁעַת אֶלֶּהוּ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת אֶלֶּהוּ אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁעַת (cf. TN cited above).
Location of Additions

In all of the above mentioned examples the additions in the targumic text were incorporated into the middle of the translated verse. However, they may quite frequently appear before it as well. See the following:

Gen. 27:31:
ירוש גג הוז מตนים ריבה ואביי...

TN: 
מער אוח הוז הבשChildIndex האחת לאברה

PsJ: 
מצינת הבשChildIndex האחת לאברה

24

Gen. 39:14:
מקרא לאנשי ביתה אחרון שלום לאאכר

TN: 
קודת לאנאשה ביתה אחרון שלום לאאכר

PsJ: 
ורמה ההלוכה וביתמה בודרה וקרית לאנאשה ביתה אחרון

25

Additions may also follow the translated verse:

Ex. 12:29:
ויחנה הטפי הלילה והנה כל בקר באור ומצעי...

TN: 
והנה בטפי הלילה והנה כל בקר באור ומצעי...

24 Cf. PsJ to verse 33. The tradition about serving Isaac the flesh of a slain dog is found only in PsJ and I have described it (see my dissertation [above, n. 6] 55) as a popular and vulgar one. Hayward, (above, n. 18) 23 disagrees and sees this tradition - without any proof - as a 'learned' and 'sound homiletic' tradition, based on Is. 66:3 (which mentions רועית כל בקר ממעזה). See also the following note.

25 This tradition is exclusive to PsJ and seems to be a part of the Jewish popular literature of its time. For a discussion see my article: "Folk Elements in the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum," in: Studies in Aggadah and Jewish Folklore...presented to...D. Noy (ed. by I. Ben-Ami and J. Dan; Jerusalem 1983) 155 [Hebrew].
PsJ: ... והזה 법률גתו ליליאת דוממים ומפתיעים דודי קשל כל בוכרים או ערשים רמואים.

Gen. 25:29:

ויודיע העקב ויבא עשה עם חסד והוה עך

TN:

ובשל יעקב עשה וישמע את עשה ומפי ברת ויהוה משלא

PsJ:

ובחרה תורה וָסִיר חַד בַּרְשָׁאי יִשָּׂעֵךְ תְּבַשֵּׂלָּהוּ כִּכְּלָלָה וְעַל הַלֹּאֹתָה לָאֹבִיב וְאֵין עַל בֵּטַח וְתֹא אִישׁ מֵאָם מֵאָם פָּרָשַׁת יִנָּבָר נְכֵרָה וַאֲדֹמֶה תְּכַכֶּלֶת מַכְשֶׁר בֶּלֶטַח וְאָדָם ונַבְּרָה.

26 For parallels see: Mekhilta on this verse; Pesikta deRav Kahana 7:9; Tanchuma Bo 9. The addition of מִלְכוֹת is exclusive to PsJ (see: D. Rieder, Targum Yonathan b. Uziel Al HaTorah, I (Jerusalem 1984) 118 [Hebrew]).

27 For parallels see especially: Genesis Rabbah 63:11; Exodus Rabbah 1:1; B. Baba Batra 16b and L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, V (Philadelphia 1925) 276-277, notes 37 and 41. See also PsJ to Gen. 25:32.

28 For examples, three from each book, see: Gen.- 3:4; 22:19; 40:14; Ex. - 1:15; 24:10; 32:3; Lev. - 9:23; 10:16; 24:10; Nu. - 3:7; 11:33; 23:1; Dt. - 6:5; 17:15; 28:12. For the complete list see my dissertation (above, n. 6) 39-83.

29 The only two exceptions to this rule are: (a) the formula 'וער עמים ובני ישראל', which precedes the translation of various verses in all 'Palestinian' Targums, and was intended to capture the attention of the Targums' audience. The most complete list of verses which are preceded by this formula is found in: M. M. Kasher (above, n. 22), XXXV (Jerusalem 1983) 154-160 [Hebrew]; (b) the few short introductory remarks which determine the identity of the speaker (such as אריר יִעַקֵּב [Gen. 49:18 - PsJ, TN, FT]) and which must be placed before the translated verse. Their small number allows us to ignore them in the present discussion.
does not adhere to this practice, which may be related to the oral presentation of the Targum in public. The best way of memorizing and reciting the Targum is by adhering to the structure and word order of the biblical verse. The importance of beginning the translation with the first words is clear, because they supply a rigid framework within which to perform.

The two phenomena peculiar to PsJ—the great number of additions attached to some verses and the location of some of them before the translated verse—should now be discussed together. The Targums were recited in public only by heart, without consulting any written document, under very pressing conditions of time and space. This fact leads to the conjecture that the Meturgeman would usually be content with a ‘word-for-word’ translation, which follows the structure and word order of the biblical verse and is expanded upon here and there with but one or two additions. PsJ, on the other hand—with its numerous additions found in many verses and with its habitual breaching the framework of the verse by preceding it with different words—seems to be the product of a scribe, sitting at his table and expanding a text with as many different interpolations as he could. PsJ—according to a hypothesis which was already suggested in the past, although on a different basis—was not created in the oral setting of the targumic world, in the synagogue, but is a written text that was never meant to be recited by heart in public. The anonymous scribe who is responsible for producing PsJ.

30 The Meturgeman was prohibited from using any text while reciting the Targum in public (cf. Y. Megillah 4:1 [74d] and parallels), but there is no reason for assuming that he could not write down targumic material for study or for non-public use. Regarding this issue see: P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (New Haven 1907) 47-49; York and Alexander (above, n. 6).

31 For a description of these conditions see: Ch. Rabin, “The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint,” Textus 6 (1968) 1-26.

32 This assumption was made in my dissertation, (above, n. 6), and was reconfirmed from a different angle by: Y. Maori, “The Relationship of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Halakhic Sources,” in: Studies in Talmudic Literature in Post Biblical Hebrew and In Biblical Exegesis (= Teuda 3; Tel Aviv 1983) 235-250 and esp. p. 244 [Hebrew].

33 The Targums also functioned outside of the synagogue (in the House of Learning and elsewhere. Cf: York [above, n. 6] and especially: R. Kashe, “The Aramaic Targumim and their Sitz im Leben,” Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Bible Studies (Jerusalem 1985) 75-85), but first and foremost they served the public reading from Scripture and this should be the main socio-cultural setting for their research.
sought to create an Aramaic composition, that would retell the biblical account with numerous additions and expansions—in the long established tradition of 'the Re-Written Bible'—and chose to do it by expanding for this purpose a targumic text, similar to TN. While doing it he was influenced to some extent by TO and used a vast collection of aggadic and halachic traditions derived mainly from rabbinic literature. To these literary traditions he most probably added some popular ideas and some of his own thoughts. In the process of completing this task, PsJ made use of a special 'exegetical vocabulary,' employing terms such as הבש, משל, והשך and the like for weaving the interpolations into the translated verse. In its eagerness to include many aggadic and halachic traditions in its work, there were created, though unintentionally, some contradictions between additions that were derived from independent sources.

[C]

Our discussion has so far disregarded 'the targumic tradition'—the verses which are expanded in a similar way in all (or most) of the Targums—and concentrated for the sake of clarity on the traditions which are found exclusively in any one of the targumic texts. Taking 'the targumic tradition' into consideration, however, will both complicate and enrich the picture.

A survey of the few hundred verses that are treated by 'the targumic tradition' reveals that in some cases they too contain more than three additions, and

---

34 For this term see: Vermes (above, n. 11) 67. It designates a variety of compositions that attempt to tell the biblical story anew, expanding it with post-biblical traditions (for example: The Book of Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, Midrash Pirke deRabbi Eliezer and Sepher haYashar).

35 On this issue see: D. M. Splansky, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Its Relationship to Other Targumim, Use of Midrashim, and Date (Ph.D Dissertation - Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1981) 22-40. Splansky believes that “the dependency of PsJ on TO has been clearly demonstrated” (p. 40), but it seems that a more cautious statement is in place.

36 For examples see: Splansky (above, n. 35) 41-77.


38 Such as: Gen. 28:10 (FT, MN, PsJ, TN); Ex. 12:42 (FT, MN, PsJ, TG p.221, TN); Lev. 22:27 (FT, MN, PsJ, TG p. 309, TN); Nu. 12:12 (FT, MN, PsJ, TN); Dt. 1:1 (FT, MN, PsJ, TN).
that likewise they tend at times to precede the translated verse with different words. See the following as examples for each of these phenomena:


TN: יָפְתַּתִּים קָכָּרוּ אֵלֵּֽךְ בְּגָונִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתְּבִין לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָונִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ. יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנוֹי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנוֹי דָעֶמֶּשׁ יָשָׁמַתּוֹ לַכִּלִּיּוֹתֵיָם בְּגָנִי דָעֶמֶּשׁ.

(Six interpolations)


TN: וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ. וּרְאוּ בִּימְֱּּנִּים חָכָּךְ יָרְקָּךְ.

(a long sentence is preceding the translated verse)

The fact that the two features, so far unique to PsJ, can be found also in all other texts seems to contradict our previous remarks. On the basis of these two examples and similar ones, one may indeed come forward with the reverse argument, claiming that (a) the two abovementioned phenomena are common to all the Targums and (b) that PsJ, for unknown reason, is simply preserving them in its translation more than the other texts!

This argument can not be supported. In order to prove this claim we shall now turn to a third issue concerning the 'targumic additions', the extent to which interpolations are successfully integrated into the translated verse.

39 A similar tradition is found in FT and PsJ (cf. also MN). For parallels and a discussion see: Hayward (above, n. 18) 22-23.
40 A similar tradition is found in FT(p) and FT(n), MN (see: S. Lund and J. Foster, *Variant Versions of Targumic Traditions within Codex Neofiti 1* [Missoula 1977] 86), PsJ and TG, p. 57. I found no parallel outside of the targumic literature, in which the same theme appears three more times - in the translation of Gen. 28:10 (FT, PsJ, TN), 29:10 (PsJ) and 29:13 (PsJ). Cf. McNamara (above, n. 10) 145-146. See also the following note.
Quality of Integration

In many cases the weaving of the interpolations into the translated verse causes some changes in the ‘word-for-word’ translation. For example:

Gen 18:16: יקומ מכם ואנחנו ישקוף על פניך חכם

TN: קום מהן נבריא וען כפל חכם

PsJ: קום מהן מלאכיא רוח מבריא דסי רבוע את שרה פלך לשמי

While TN exhibits a ‘word-for-word’ translation, the two aggadic interpolations41 in PsJ brought about some minor changes in the translated verse: the addition of a lamed before הפשים (=גרנירא) and the omission of the conjunctive waw before רשיכים (=אדריךא). These necessary changes ease the integration of the interpolations into the verse, so that a listener—who is not familiar with the biblical text—will not be able to distinguish between them and the translated verse.

But many times the incorporation of the interpolations into the verse is jarring and can only be understood in a written text. Two simple examples will suffice:

Gen. 14:15: יחלו עליתם שלכם והעבורי יכים וירדפו על חובה אשת משה

TN: etc. עליתם שלכם והשכטafürת יוכלו ידידות על חובה

PsJ: etc. עליתם שלכם ... אייך העבדים המתייענים והות諮詢 מת.Millisecond על חובה.

41 For the first interpolation see also the Targums to v.2 (TN and PsJ: מלאכיא בכריא) and 22 (PsJ: מלאכיא דריינריא בכריא). For the second see the detailed description of the different roles played by the three ‘men’ who visited Abraham: v. 18 (FT, MN, PsJ, TN), 10 (PsJ), 22 (PsJ), 19:17 (PsJ). For parallels and a short discussion see my above mentioned article (n.37) 78 and: A. Chester, Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim (Tübingen 1986) 35. These interpolations are a very good example of PsJ’s tendency to repeat ‘the targumic tradition’, attached originally to one verse only, in its translation of various verses (see also the previous note).
As with some of the Midrashim, PsJ found the order of the verbs רכש ורבדס to be problematic (because רכש was understood as 'he killed them') and solved the problem in his own way: רבדס is related only to those enemies who were not killed at once by Abraham. Nonetheless, the insertion of רבדס shows some carelessness; instead of רבדס we would have expected רבדס מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָהְי. Whoever added מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָהְי into the already existing text (that read: מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָהְי etc.) was not fully aware of the changes necessitated by this addition.

Num. 14:37:

PsJ: נַעֲמָוֶת לֵבָנָהְוּ הֵרָבָּה... רַעְבְּהֵרָה הַבּוֹאָה מְאוֹדֶה קֵרָה הַמּוֹדָה

PsJ: נַעֲמָוֶת לֵבָנָהְוּ הֵרָבָּה... רַעְבְּהֵרָה הַבּוֹאָה מְאוֹדֶה קֵרָה הַמּוֹדָה

This long aggadic interpolation is not smoothly linked at its end to the translated verse: the phrase 'רַעְבְּהֵרָה הַבּוֹאָה מְאוֹדֶה קֵרָה' is unintelligible and should be seen as an unsuccessful result of a careless interpolator who was anxious to add a bizarre and picturesque tradition to the translated verse (PsJ), without ascertaining that the sentence he created was completely clear.

Examples of such awkward combinations can be brought only from PsJ. This fact is a vital proof of PsJ’s written origin. A Meturgeman who performs in front of 42See Genesis Rabbah 43:3 (טיר קא רוחד הרוגה); Leviticus Rabbah 1:4 and parallels. By the way, the Genesis Apocryphon (XXII:9) solves the problem in a different way, reading: מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָה (cf. M. R. Lehman, “1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim,” Revue de Qumran 1 [1958] 261).

43A parallel is found in B. Sota 35a: מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָה מְאוֹדֶה קֵרָה הַמּוֹדָה. A perfect punishment for slander and defamation.

44A comparison with TO is here in place (see above, notes 12 and 35): מַדָּא יִתְשַׁא תּוֹרָה מְאוֹדֶה קֵרָה הַמּוֹדָה.

45For other examples see my dissertation (above, n. 6) 171-177. Regarding TN see also Levi (above, n. 10) and Kasher (above, n. 33). Levi and Kasher convincingly point out the difference between the language used by TN in its translations and in its interpolations -
a live audience will not create such unintelligible phrases; they make sense only as written glosses. Furthermore, the fact that in many instances the literary sources used by PsJ in its interpolations are quite clear\(^{46}\) strengthens the hypothesis which sees PsJ as a literary creation that came into being in writing, albeit on the basis of a Targum.

The smooth integration of 'the targumic traditions' interpolations into the translated verses justifies a distinction between two apparently similar phenomena. The existence of more than three additions in the translation of one verse and the location of an addition at its beginning—phenomena that are both attested in PsJ (quite frequently) and in 'the targumic tradition' (to a lesser degree)—are not to be seen, in light of the last paragraph, as identical.

True, 'the targumic tradition' was also acquainted with the custom of inserting many interpolations into one verse or even preceding it with a few words, but these rare phenomena are found in a small group of verses. 'The targumic tradition' exhibits a solid and common custom as to the number and location of verses that may be expanded in these ways. Of course, such a common custom had also to be memorized, but its infrequent appearance did not make this task a burden. When a Meturgeman had to translate in one occasion 21-40 verses—the average weekly portion of reading from Scriptures—he could easily memorize 'the targumic tradition' relating to one or at most two verses; the rest he translated mainly in the convenient 'word-for-word' mode. Expanding in each occasion the translation of but one or two verses enabled the Meturgeman to adhere to the biblical account on one hand – maintaining a balance between Scripture and Targum without distracting the listener's mind to remote issues – and to emphasize the important verses on the other. This should be our understanding of the peculiar pace which characterizes TN and portions of TG: a quiet stream of 'word-for-word' translation, interrupted abruptly here and there by long and colourful additions or expansions.

viewing a number of them as secondary. Nonetheless, the interpolations in TN seem to be smoothly incorporated into the translated verse.

\(^{46}\)See above, notes 11, 22, 23, 25, 26. In many cases there is almost no doubt that PsJ is using well-known texts such as the Mekhilta and Sifer Bemidbar (cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "Qumran and the Halakha in the Aramaic Targumim" in: Proceedings (above, n. 33) 45-60 and Maori (above, n. 32, esp. p. 246) or Pirke deRabbi Eliezer. I intend to deal with this point separately.
The first and basic stratum of PsJ shared this common pace; the second—which abounds with additions—is different, and should be attributed, as stated above, to a different setting. A further question may still be asked: Is it possible that the compiler of the second stratum of PsJ set its first stratum, 'the targumic tradition', as a model for his work and tried to imitate it while translating on his own verses that were not treated by 'the targumic tradition'? To be more specific: Is it possible that PsJ's tendency to incorporate more than three interpolations into one translated verse, and to place an addition before the verse, was influenced by the few verses that were thus translated in the common 'targumic tradition'? I tend to answer this question in the affirmative. 'The targumic tradition'—and not only in regard with the phenomena discussed here\(^\text{47}\)—seems to be a very important pattern according to which PsJ carved its own path.

\* \* \*

The detailed study of the 'targumic additions' in PsJ—carried out against the background of all other targumic texts—leads us to a better understanding of the nature and history of this interesting Targum, and reconfirms previous assumptions of the late date of the scribe who gave PsJ its final form or, at least, to his dissociation from the live targumic world.\(^\text{48}\)

\(^{47}\)For other phenomena that point to a similar conclusion see above, notes 40-41 and the article mentioned in n. 37.

\(^{48}\)For recent literature on these issues see above, n. 18.