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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$bb$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>$gg$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>$dd$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$j$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$, $ch$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( - marked where essential only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p$, $f$, or $ph$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ts$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$ or $k$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$sh$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ (including - $ס$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few frequently occurring terms have been treated for the purpose of this Thesis as loan-words in English, and consequently left without technical translation: thus Peshat is written rather than Peshat (מְשַׁ בּ), as against Peshitta (פְּשִׁ תָּ בּ), Gaon and Geonim rather than Ga'on, Ge'onim, Onkelos (not 'Onqelos) etc.

The English translation of each verse is taken from the N.E.B. (Oxford University Press - Cambridge University Press 1970) except in a few places and especially in the Section of "Anti-anthropomorphisms" where the N.E.B. paraphrases the text. In these places I have pointed out that the translation is taken from the Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. (Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, n.d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tal.</td>
<td>Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bab.</td>
<td>Babylonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palest.</td>
<td>Palestinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. Jonathan.</td>
<td>Pseudo Jonathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targ.</td>
<td>Targum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanh.</td>
<td>Sanhedrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. (s)</td>
<td>Chapter (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerit.</td>
<td>Keritut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitt.</td>
<td>Gittin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sot.</td>
<td>Sotah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ket.</td>
<td>Ketubot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shab.</td>
<td>Shabbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rab.</td>
<td>Rabbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned.</td>
<td>Nedarim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.D.B.</td>
<td>Brown - Driver - Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irub.</td>
<td>Irubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men.</td>
<td>Menahot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hag.</td>
<td>Hagiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tam.</td>
<td>Temurah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanh.</td>
<td>Tanhuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalk.</td>
<td>Yalkut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macc.</td>
<td>Maccot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pes.</td>
<td>Pesahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bech.</td>
<td>Bechorot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid.</td>
<td>Kiddushin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber.</td>
<td>Berachot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>New English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.B.</td>
<td>New English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naz.</td>
<td>Nazir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeb.</td>
<td>Yebamot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh-Hash.</td>
<td>Rosh Hashanah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeb.</td>
<td>Zebahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shek.</td>
<td>Shekalim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg.</td>
<td>Megillah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>Negaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohal</td>
<td>Ohalot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kel.</td>
<td>Kelim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. Zara.</td>
<td>Abodah Zara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez.</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos.</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud.</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td>Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam.</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex.</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General Introduction

2. Halacha

Introduction

**Group A (I)** -Where Onkelos interprets against the accepted Halacha of the Talmud and Rashi makes no comment.

**Group A (II)** -The Targumim contain pre-tannaitic Tradition.

**Group B** -Where Onkelos interprets "Halachic verses" literally and thereby fails to explicate the Halacha whether designedly or otherwise.

**Group C** -Rashi quotes Onkelos, but only in a few instances he remarks without labouring the point that Onkelos is against the expositions of the Rabbis.

**Group D** -In a few instances Rashi quotes Onkelos for no apparent purpose, since the same "Halachic interpretations" occur in the Talmud or other sources of Jewish literature.
In at least 55 cases Onkelos expounds "halachic verses" in accordance with talmudic tradition but Rashi passes him over in silence.

In cases where Rashi follows one tannaitic opinion and Onkelos another, Rashi never adds that Onkelos' view corresponds to the other opinion.

Rashi and Halacha.
In some cases Rashi interprets against the current Halacha. Furthermore in places where the tannaitic Rabbis were at variance Rashi interprets not in accordance with the accepted ruling of the Talmud.

Summary
3. **Midrash**

Introduction

**Group A**

Rashi quotes Onkelos for no apparent purpose since the latter's "haggadic interpretations" occur in the Midrash.

**Group B**

When Onkelos' haggadic interpretations differ from those of the Midrash, Rashi quotes Onkelos and fits his interpretations in line with the wording of the text.

**Group C**

Onkelos' haggadic interpretations correspond to those of the Rabbis, yet Rashi ignores him and quotes only the Midrash.

**Group D**

Rashi fuses Onkelos' haggadic interpretations with those of the Rabbis.
Group E - Rashi's exegesis in relation to Peshat and Derash.

This group is subdivided in the following way:

Group E(a) - Origin and Development of Halacha.

Group E(b) - Peshat in the Talmud.

Group E(c) - Rashi and Peshat.

Group E(d) - Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept.

Group E(e) - Rashi and Derash.

Group E(f) - Rashi's Correlation of Peshat and Derash.

4. Table One - Where Peshat and Derash are quoted in Juxtaposition.

Table Two - Where Rashi quotes Onkelos' Targum by Name.

Table Three - Where Rashi follows Onkelos without quoting Him.
5. Rashi as Philologist.

Introduction.

Chapter 1. - Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs.

Chapter 2. - Rashi's Use of the Targum without identifying Onkelos.

Chapter 3. - Free Translation.

Chapter 4. - Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.

Chapter 5. - Injection of "Derash and "Halacha" in Onkelos' Targum.

Chapter 6. - The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.

Chapter 7. - Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.

Chapter 8. - Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk.

Chapter 9. - Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.

Chapter 10. - Rashi and the Text of Onkelos.
6. Anti-anthropomorphisms.

Introduction

**Group A.** - Motion and Place denied God.

**Group B.** - Reference to Human Form and Organs.

**Group C.** - Reference to Human Emotions.

**Group D.** - References to Physical Reaction.

**Group E.** - Reference to Human Senses.

**Group F.** - Prepositions implying Motion or other Corporeality.

**Group G.** - Intermediary Elements.(Divine Name Elaborated or Substituted).

**Group H.** - Direct and Indirect Softening(Or Free Substitution).

**Group I.** - References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation.
7. Reverence to God.

8. Veneration of the Patriarchs and their Descendants.

Introduction

**Group A** - Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and their Wives.

**Group B** - Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarch's Sons.

**Group C** - Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses.

**Group D** - Veneration and Idealization of Aaron, the Priests, The Elders of Israel and the People of Israel.


10. Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets.

11. Notes.

Before we analyse Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos' Targum which is our main subject, a brief introduction dealing with Rashi's life, as well as about his adopted approach and method with regard to his commentary on the Pentateuch, may facilitate comprehension of his treatment of Onkelos' Targum. Rashi (1040-1105) was born at Troyes - France. His father was a scholar whom Rashi quotes in his commentary on the Talmud (Ab.Zara 75a). Very little is known about his early life except that he attended the academies of Mainz and Worms. At about the age of 25 he returned to Troyes and since then his influence was notable. Around 1070, he founded an academy which attracted many pupils from different parts of the world. Most likely during that period he began to write his comments on the Bible and Talmud. His style is clear and concise. Quite often he solves a difficulty by adding a single word. One or two words suffice for him to explain an obscure verse or refute a false interpretation. It has been said that in Rashi's time "a drop of ink was worth a piece of gold". "The scholar and bibliographer H.J.D. Azulai, scarcely exaggerated when he said that Rashi could express in one letter that for which others needed whole pages". At times his
 terseness in not quoting the full text of a Siphre (e.g. DEUT. 1\textsuperscript{3}), or of the Talmud,\textsuperscript{6} is due to his assuming that the reader is fully aware of the relevant details. In consequence, it is a mistake to assume that Rashi's commentary was intended exclusively for the masses. His vast knowledge enabled him to translate almost the whole Talmud, but his mastery lies essentially in his commentary on the Torah. His grandson, Jacob of Rameru, (Ramerupt) known as Rabbenu Tam,\textsuperscript{7} the leader of the Tosafists, said "I could also write a commentary on the Talmud like my grandfather, but as for his commentary on the Bible, I have not the intellectual strength for that work and cannot do it".\textsuperscript{8} Later generations accorded him the title of Parshandata.\textsuperscript{9}

Rashi's commentary on the Torah is an ideal example of the methodology of the French exegetes. Having a wide knowledge of Biblical and Rabbinical literature, Rashi was able to incorporate in his commentary not only Halacha,\textsuperscript{10} Midrash\textsuperscript{11} and Peshat, but also a fairly large measure of philological and grammatical observations.\textsuperscript{12} To do this Rashi took his interpretations from different sources such as the Midrashim, Siphre, Siphra, Mechilta, Mishna and the Talmud and last, but not least, Onkelos' Targum.
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In the field of grammar and philology he derived his principles from Rabbinic literature and the Hebrew work of the Spanish lexicographers Menachem Ben Seruk and Dunash Ben Labrat. Not being versed in Arabic literature he never learnt of Judah Ben David Hayyuj's work or Jonah Ibn Janah's work on triconsonantalism. However, scattered throughout his commentary there are several comments on syntax, tenses, conjugations, and transposition of word order. One of the characteristics of Rashi's exegesis is the manner in which he formulated his comments. In many instances he did not quote a midrash literally, but either abridged or augmented it and several times he even altered its wording. His prime concern was to elucidate the biblical text for which purpose his commentary was written.

Another characteristic aspect of Rashi's exegesis is the deliberate juxtaposition of Peshat and Derash. "Table One" will show the student Rashi's concern for the "Peshat" of the text, and that even though he quotes the "Derash" the Peshat is by no means sacrificed. In fact his emphatic mode of expression shows his concern for the Peshat method. "There are many midrashic explanations and our teachers have already collected them in their appropriate places in GEN. Rabbah and in other Midrashim."
I, however, am only concerned with the plain sense of Scripture and with such Aggadoth that explain the words of Scripture in a manner that fits in with them. His commitment to the Peshat led him to put not only the Peshat and the Derash side by side, but also the "Peshat Halacha" with that of the "Derash Halacha". However, quite often he interprets the text in the light of the "Derash Halacha" only, but sometimes his prime concern for the Peshat of the text led him to reject the "Derash Halacha".

For this reason too, if the Mechilta offers several halachic interpretations Rashi selects such specimens of "Derash Halacha" that do the least violence to the Peshat of the text. Similarly in cases of controversy where the Rabbis argue as to the interpretation of a halachic text, Rashi adopts the halachic opinion which is nearer to the Peshat of the text although it is not the accepted ruling of the Talmud. Rashi was fully aware that the prime purpose of his commentary is not to deduce Halachot, but rather to afford insight into the depth of the biblical sense. His prime concern, therefore, is not whether he is deviating from the "established Halacha," but rather to impart what he considers the true sense of the text. (And at any rate, to Rashi, his Peshat halachic
deductions are within the framework of the biblical text). However, as said above, even when he is dissatisfied with the current Halacha, he nonetheless, puts side by side his own halachic deductions with those of the talmudic Rabbis. The deliberate juxtaposition of the two interpretations show that the "Peshat Halacha" and the "Derash Halacha" do not conflict, but on the contrary, the juxtaposition characterises the validity of both interpretations.

However, despite his assertion about the importance of the Peshat, he does not keep to his rule and quite often, for no apparent reason, he falls back upon the Midrash, or at least, he does not offer the Peshat of the text. At times Rashi makes it clear that the text could be understood through the aid of the Midrash only. He does so even when the scriptural text offers no difficulty.

At this stage, it is worth mentioning that Rashi has not always taken the term "Peshat" to mean the literal meaning of the text, as in fact we understand today, but rather follows the looser talmudical understanding of this term. And so long as the Derash does no violence to the text, Rashi considered it in order to call it Peshat.
Rashi, perhaps was the first one, at least in France, to introduce the above mentioned method of biblical exegesis, i.e. the deliberate juxtaposition of Peshat and Derash. This new trend may have been due to the Franco-German environment of his days. The Jewish public was imbued with midrashic exegesis and was not ready to abandon it. Rashi, therefore, who realised that the Peshat ought not to be disregarded, projected a new method by putting Peshat and Derash side by side, thus catering not only for the emergence of the new school of thought which considered Peshat exegesis as paramount for the understanding of the text, but also for the old school of thought which cared merely for midrashic exegesis and was not prepared to abandon it. This, too, would explain Rashi's incorporation of Philology and grammatical points in his commentary. Most likely his intention was to awaken the interest of Ashkenaz (Franco-German) Jewry to study the Bible from a philological concept and not solely according to the Derash method.

Another contributing factor to the growth of Peshat exposition in France, may have been the result of discussion with Christians on the interpretation of biblical passages, and in particular to counter
their christological interpretations. No doubt, too, the rise of the Karaites in the eighth century in Spain, and in particular in the Middle East, contributed to the advancement of Peshat method. The Karaites rejected the Oral law (the Talmud) and held exclusively to the scriptural texts. The controversy between the Rabbanites and the Karaites with regard to the interpretations of biblical texts, brought into existence a new method of exegesis, independent of the Midrash and the Talmud. To suppress the Karaites' views, Saadia Gaon (892-942) and his followers were compelled to seek new methods and the Peshat, the natural method, was applied for the interpretation of biblical texts. Although Rashi and his school were not familiar with the works of the Karaites undoubtedly they had heard of their existence and their methods in interpreting the biblical texts. Consequently to safeguard the masses from following the sect's views Rashi postulated the Peshat and the Derash side by side, the two methods by which a scriptural text could be interpreted. Rashi, therefore, impresses on his generation that both methods are legitimate for the understanding of the text. At a later time, however, the Peshat method reached its zenith and the Derash was
completely rejected as can be seen from Samuel-ben-Meir's commentary. We may even say that the Peshat became so indispensable that the French Jewry was in danger of creating its own "Karaite schism". Rashbam's commentary and the like certainly had strengthened and intensified the new schism, and their views, namely that biblical texts do not invariably indicate the laws as known to the Rabbis, e.g. the wearing of the Tephillin.

As has been said above, one of Rashi's main sources was Onkelos' Targum. It seems that he was the first one, or at least among the French Rabbis, who made extensive use of Onkelos' Targum. He used it not only because of its popularity, but also due to the fact that he assumed that the Targum which goes under Onkelos' name was, in its present form, written by Onkelos the proselyte, the disciple of Rabbi Joshua and Rabbi Eliezer. Rashi's extensive use of this Targum may also have been due to the fact that on the whole Onkelos' Targum is close to the text, and in matters including philology (or rather semantics) this was a great help to Rashi. The fact, too, that Hebrew and Aramaic are related Semitic languages, may well have been the reason for Rashi to turn to Onkelos.
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In addition, Rashi was fully aware that the Targum was intended for use in the public worship of the Synagogue and, therefore, it could be assumed that any rules of translation adopted by the Targum would have been laid down and approved by the Rabbis, for no teacher could expound the law for the public unless his exposition was approved by the Sages. Rashi, therefore, revered the Targum Onkelos so much that even though his own interpretations are supported by the Talmud, nonetheless he quotes the support of Onkelos. Indeed through the aid of Onkelos’ Targum, Rashi was able to illuminate several midrashic and halachic passages in the Talmud itself. Rashi turns to Onkelos not only in the fields of Derash Aggadah and Derash Halacha, but even more extensively in the field of philology. His mastery of the Aramaic language enabled him to explain also the various ways adopted by Onkelos in translating a text. Thus in GEN. Rashi has this to say:

"We find that the Targum renders this by - because unlike Hebrew - the same verb cannot be used in
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Aramaic for taking money and for taking a person [with one]. In the case of an object that can be taken by hand, Onkelos uses - בון - "he carried", whilst in the case of a person who is conducted by verbal persuasion, Onkelos uses - הושב - he led(away). 45

When Onkelos' interpretation seems to be detached from the context of the text, Rashi endeavours to conform his interpretation in line with the text and thus he says in GEN. 20 16 - לִֽשֵּֽׁעַ "Onkelos translated in a different manner, and the words of the text fit in with the Targum in the following way". If Onkelos uses a verb different from the expected one Rashi explains the cause for the change. Thus in GEN. 43 14 Rashi has this to say: - עֵֽלֶּנְיָֽהוּ מִשְׁלַֽשׁ תֵּלְעָֽנָה וְאֵין נַעֲלוּ בָּֽאָרֶֽזְוַֽשָׁ. "Render - מִשְׁלַֽשׁ - as the Targum has it, may He release him from his bonds....It would not have been adequate to translate it in the Targum by - מִשְׁלַֽשׁ (the same root - מִשְׁלַֽשׁ) and may He send to you, your other brother - because as a matter of fact they were themselves going to where he already was. 47
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In grammatical points, when the Targum seems confusing due to the numerous changes of tense in the Hebrew, which it attempts to mirror, Rashi endeavours to explain the reason. Thus in GEN. 29:6 - רָאָלָתְא בַּעַר - "Rachel his daughter is coming" - the Targum has בַּעַר - but in verse 9 - רָאָלָתְא בַּעַר - the Targum reads בַּעַר - and "Rachel came". In other words the Targum distinguishes between the former, which is a participle and the latter, which is a past tense.

Quite often after explaining an obscure word according to Onkelos, Rashi supports his translation from similar expressions (or words) occurring either in the Bible, the Mishna, the Talmud, the midrashic literature or from Onkelos' Targum itself. With the aid of Jonathan's Targum on the prophets and other Palestinian Targumim, Rashi was also able to shed light on several obscure texts of the Torah.
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In several instances Rashi quotes the exact wording of Onkelos without identifying him, by use of such convention as or - or - or - and sometimes he refers to Onkelos by the talmudical expression -

Rashi, not being acquainted with secular sciences, was not troubled as were some Spanish commentators on the Bible when they were confronted with a difficult biblical passage. But one does not have to be acquainted with science to appreciate a logical inconsistency or a chronological impossibility. Thus in GEN.12 - "And the Canaanite was then in the land" - Rashi contented himself with the following comment: "They (the Canaanites) were gradually conquering the land of Israel from the descendants of Shem". The comment is explicable only on the premise that Rashi saw, and expected any Bible-reader to see the difficulty occasioned by the word then - since the writer is Moses. He also refrained from dealing with problems associated with philosophy. Perhaps this was due to the fact that in Rashi's time the study of philosophy was not taught in Ashkenaz (Franco-Germany). In consequence the question of reconciling philosophy with the Bible did not arise. At any rate unlike Nahmanides, Rashi did not call on mysticism in aid to achieve a solution.
Scholars have noted that one of the themes in the Targumim and especially that of Onkelos, is to avoid or paraphrase many terms which appear to attribute human qualities to God in the Holy Scriptures, whereas some scholars maintain that Rashi on the other hand, was not worried about the anthropomorphisms contained in the Old Testament. In the chapters termed - "The Anti-anthropomorphisms of Onkelos, and Rashi's attitude" - it is shown that this statement is inaccurate and that in many instances Rashi follows Onkelos in avoiding or toning down expressions or conceptions attributing human form, passions and emotions to God. Furthermore there is abundant evidence that in some instances Rashi went even further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple.

Throughout his Targum, Onkelos followed by Rashi, displays great respect for the Patriarchs, their wives and their sons, the prophet Moses and his brother Aaron, and in general to the people of Israel. Whenever the biblical phrases reveal their characters in an untoward light, Onkelos suppresses the literal meaning and substitutes
an alternative phrase or word, thus avoiding any adverse implications.

As said above, Rashi - undisturbed by the radical questions which may be raised by allowing full range to a lively intellect - never doubted the authenticity of a biblical passage. His simple and perfect faith led him to believe in the integrity of the divine origin of the Pentateuch. He relied unquestioningly on the Massorah and naturally assumed that the Pentateuch, in the exact form in which he himself knew it, was also in the hands of Onkelos. Thus when the Targum elaborates, Rashi is quick to realise that Onkelos' elaboration is purely "an addition on his part having no words in the Hebrew text to correspond to it". In other instances Rashi is quick to note that Onkelos' elaboration is because he interpreted the text in two different ways, and fused them into one without indicating the fact, by use of such convention as: -"another interpretation. Rashi's comment is merely to warn against entertaining what would be to him ex hypothesi a misconception, namely that Onkelos had a different text from the current one.
Sometimes Rashi makes it clear that a verse is elliptical and "the Targum explains what is implied by the terseness of the Hebrew text". Again this remark is purely made in order to prevent the student of the Targum from thinking that Onkelos had a different version in that particular text. Through the aid of this method Rashi warns the readers of the Torah, as he goes along, that certain verses are elliptical. Thus in GEN.41:13 - "He restored unto my office". Rashi explains: "he means Pharaoh etc. The phrase is elliptical not stating explicitly who is the subject of - בִּשְׁמֹן - , for it is not necessary to be explicit (who restored): Obviously the one who has the power to restore viz., Pharaoh. This is the case with all the elliptical verses".

With Rashi's comment in mind we can now understand Onkelos' method in adding one or two words in many of his translations. Thus in LEV.23:44 - "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the appointed festivals". Onkelos translates: - The word - בִּשְׁמֹן - is purely an addition on the part of Onkelos, having no word in the Hebrew text to correspond to it.
Moreover, the terseness of the verse might lead to misinterpretation. Onkelos, therefore, followed by Rashi, eliminates possibilities of confusion. Thus in Ex.21:35 - "And if an ox hurt etc." Rashi says: "The ox of a man". In other words the - is in the construct state, so that the object of - is not - but - . Onkelos by paraphrasing the construct by use of - avoids the possibility of misinterpretation: 'אֶתָּם יְהוָה יְהוֹיָדָע. Similarly, Ex.22:4: "And shall devastate the field etc." Rashi explains:

In the light of the foregoing, it is most important to note that when Onkelos does not give a precise Aramaic equivalent for the Hebrew word in his translation, we should not automatically assume that Onkelos had a different version in the text, but should rather assume that he was not meticulous in his translation. Thus in Gen.43:16 - כֵּן אֲשֶׁר יִכְכֵּר.
"For the men shall eat with me at noon". Onkelos translates — הבשרות א — by — שישב—with — שבועות א — in Aramaic means — "meal", and the Aramaic word for — משובות א — is — "noon". Rashi, who was aware that Onkelos translates freely has this to say: In other words, he understands Onkelos to have inaccurately extended the semantic range of — שבועות א — to mean "[midday] meal".

Again, in NUM.5:21— on the words — הבשרת אברGIN — Onkelos translates — כשר נפשו — instead of — כשר נפשו — as indeed Ps. Jonathan translates. In several instances, Onkelos' prime concern is not the philological meaning of a textual word, but rather what it conveys within the framework of the whole subject in question.

Furthermore, it appears that Onkelos' reason for translating freely certain biblical texts is purely to inject midrashic and halachic traditions. Moreover, there are certain Hebrew idioms if translated as they stand would certainly have made
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no sense to the Aramaic reader unless he was conditioned to treat them as a "calque" of the Hebrew. Onkelos, therefore, paraphrases the text and keeps the meaning intact. Thus, in GEN.17:

- "Walk before Me" - Rashi explains:
- "Understand this as the Targum takes it: - "Worship before Me". In short, there is a strong tendency in Onkelos (in fact in all Targumim) to eliminate obscure, obsolete, or metaphorical expressions and to substitute factual statement. We must also bear in mind that certain biblical phrases have their origin in Aramaic and they must, therefore, be understood in the light of that language.

As has been said above, since its first appearance Onkelos' Targum became very popular and widely read in the Synagogues, with the result that many corrections were made by various Rabbis and scholars. Several of these corrections were inserted in the Targum itself by later copyists. Almost in every single manuscript text of the Targum, therefore, we have different versions. Among the many scholars who endeavoured to establish the correct reading in the Targum are A. Berliner and A. Sperber. The latter collated more than 650 variant versions in...
the Targum. Rashi also has not failed to remark on the incorrect reading of the Targum, and now and then points out the correct one. Many of Rashi's corrections have been inserted in the Targum Onkelos by various copyists. Others, however, can still be seen throughout his commentary. A. Berliner believes that each time Rashi says - ויתרוא, the intention is to correct the reading of Onkelos' text. This is incorrect for in GEN.41; EX.8; EX.16, Rashi points to the correct reading in the Targum without saying - ויתרוא or - ויתרוא - or - ויתרוא. Furthermore some commentators of Rashi would like us to believe that if Rashi quotes Onkelos' translation first, and then that of the Midrash, it is a sign that Rashi favours Onkelos' interpretation: If, vice versa, then it is an indication that the Midrash interpretation is the correct one and that of the Targum serves only as a less acceptable alternative. These rules need no refutation when one bears in mind that Rashi did not write prefaces to his commentary, or the method to be pursued. We may even say that at first Rashi wrote his commentary for himself (as was the custom of the Rabbis in the middle ages), and it was only at a later time, when most probably he was urged by his disciples to
to publish it that it became popularly known. Bearing this in mind, it is futile to contemplate finding out the rules and method Rashi pursued, for Rashi works unsystematically and in some places he quotes Onkelos' Targum first and then the Midrash and in others the "Derash" first and Onkelos last, as we have indeed pointed out throughout the midrashic section.

Rashi made extensive use of Onkelos, not only in the fields of philology, grammar and Peshat, but also in the field of Haggadah. Several scholars believed that Onkelos' Targum is just a "literal translation" and has nothing to offer in the field of Haggadah. These scholars, however, failed to account for the substantial number of instances of free translation and midrashic elements which exist in Onkelos' Targum. In order to appreciate fully the great contribution of this Targum in this field one has to study it in the light of the Palestinian Targumim, for Onkelos usually abridges and modifies the interpretations of these. Although some scholars have failed to notice haggadic interpretations in Onkelos, yet mediaeval Jewish commentators, such as Rashi and Nahmanides, were fully aware of the midrashic elements found in this Targum as can be
seen from their commentaries. In particular, Rashi, as we show in our Midrashic Section, made extensive use of Onkelos' midrashic interpretations, and although the latter's interpretations are identical with those of the Midrash, nonetheless, Rashi quoted Onkelos only. Furthermore when Onkelos' interpretations differ from those of the Midrash, Rashi has not failed to quote Onkelos and put his Derash in line with the text. Similarly, when Onkelos' "Halachic Derash" differ from that of the current Halacha, Rashi tries to put his interpretation in line with the text. In cases where Rashi disagrees with Onkelos' translation, Rashi nonetheless, sometimes makes sure that one tannaitic opinion is in line with that of the Targum. Moreover even when the text is comprehensible and does not call for a midrashic interpretation, yet Rashi has not failed to quote Onkelos' Derash. Onkelos' brief and concise translations might lend themselves to being misunderstood and lead to confusion. Rashi, therefore, for the sake of clarification fuses Onkelos' interpretations with those of the Midrash. Thus Onkelos' comment is fully vindicated. Sometimes, Rashi uses the Targum as the basis of his own interpretation, and sometimes he shows preference for the Targum over the Midrash. Thus, GEN.4926 -
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"Understand this as the Targum takes it: the one who was separated from his brothers". The word נגir - is from a root signifying separation as in LEV.22 - and ISAIAH 1 - "they (the Israelites) have separated themselves from God turning backward". In adopting this explanation Rashi has ignored the Midrash's interpretation which takes it from - in the sense of Nazarite. Again, Rashi EX.11 - "translate this as the Targum does: cities which are places for treasures". In adopting Onkelos' interpretation Rashi has ignored the two midrashic interpretations given by Rab and Shemuel in Bab. Tal. Sot. 11a.

Rashi, who often quotes Menachem Ben Seruk supports his translations from Onkelos' Targum and sometimes he rejects them because they are not in line with Onkelos' Targum, or because they are not in accordance with Hebrew grammar.

However, despite the great reverence Rashi has for Onkelos, nonetheless his desire for the truth enables him, on several occasions, to differ from
him and even, at times, to reject his interpretations entirely. Sometimes because they do not fit in with the sense of the text or the wording of the text; because they are not according to the Peshat of the text, or because they imply inadequate appreciation of the poetic imagery of the Bible, or again because they do not conform to the rules of grammar. Rashi's mastery of the Aramaic language permitted him to feel competent to use strong terms in refuting Onkelos' explanation where he felt that he had given the wrong Aramaic word. In points where grammar must affect lexicography he prefers Menachem-ben-Seruk's explanation to that of Onkelos. In some instances, he favours the interpretations of Rabbi Mosheh Hadarshan (the preacher) in preference to those of Onkelos. And at others he prefers the Midrash's explanation to that of the Targum e.g. Ex.24:11 - "אַחֲרֵי יְמֵי תּוֹרָהּ אֶל לֹא שָׁמַר יְהוָה אֶל הַנֶּוחַ לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אֶל הַנֶּוחַ לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם לֹא שָׁמַר אָדָם L
"But the Lord did not stretch out his hand towards leaders of the children of Israel". Rashi explains: "לֹא שָׁמַר אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנָשִׁים לֹא שָׁמַר אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנָשִׁים לֹא שָׁמַר אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנָשִׁים L"
"This implies that they well deserved that God should stretch forth his hand against them; they arrogantly gazed at Him in the course of their meal. Thus does the Midrash Tanhuma explain it. Onkelos, however, does not translate the text this way. [i.e. Onkelos does not take it in a depreciative sense that the Elders acted improperly. His translation is: ]

"They beheld God's Glory and rejoiced over their offerings which were accepted as though they were eating and drinking." In departing from Onkelos' interpretation, Rashi is simply implying that the words - לֹ֔א שָׁמָּ֣ת חַוֹּ֑יִם - do not fit well with this interpretation. At times he even rejects the Peshat of Onkelos and apparently for no sound reason resigns himself to the Derash of the Rabbis. Thus in NUM.16 - לֹ֔א שָׁמָּ֣ת חַוֹּ֑יִם - "You take too much upon yourselves you sons of Levi". Onkelos explains - בֵּן - by- שָׁמָּת - "enough" and this fits well with the sense of the text. Rashi, however, derives - בֵּן - from root - בָּרֵז - strive, and refers it to "God", and thus he says:

"A great responsibility have you taken upon yourselves in opposing the Holy One, blessed be He".
With regard to translation of obscure biblical words always Rashi does not/quote Onkelos which suggests that he is not satisfied with his translation. Thus in DEUT.234 - Rashi explains it as meaning "men" and rejects Onkelos' translation - "strong men". Again EX.111 - Rashi says: it has the meaning of "tribute", i.e. the officers who exact the tribute of labour from them. Onkelos' translation in this respect is regarded as unacceptable - And they appointed over them "evil-doing" governors. 110

Again, NUM.3355 - Rashi explains: "As pins which prick out your eyes". The Targum translation of "pins" or "pegs" is - Rashi points out that the Targum itself supports him and therefore, Onkelos who translates: "groups carrying arms against you" - is incorrect or at any rate paraphrastic in his translation. 113

Finally, Rashi's zeal for the truth enabled him to reject not only Onkelos' interpretations but also those of the Rabbis when they do not fit in with the plain sense of the text, or when they do not conform with the rules of grammar. Even in places where the Midrash's exposition is supported by
Onkelos' Targum, Rashi is not concerned and rejects both interpretations, if they are not in line with the sequence of the text.\textsuperscript{116}

Bearing in mind the foregoing analysis, we may conclude that Rashi's approach to the Talmud is different from his approach to the Bible. For in his commentary to the Talmud Rashi is the faithful servant of the text. His main objective is to explain the rules and views of the "Tannaim" and "Amoraim". He never suspected that they might be "wrong" in the sense of being subjective, arbitrary or even perverse in the way in which they link their halachic or midrashic derivations and interpretations with the biblical text. Nowhere do we find him arguing with them or rejecting their exegesis. On the contrary, here and there, we find him groping to clarify their way of thinking and the method they have adopted. In contrast to this fundamental principle, Rashi in his commentary on the Torah appears to give himself a "free hand", selecting only those interpretations which fit well with what was for him the true meaning of the text, i.e. that aspect of it which he felt to be primary. On the whole, his approach is a selective and systematic enquiry into the biblical text. Thus we find him, now digressing from the midrashic text and paraphrasing in his own
words, now arguing with the interpretation and again rejecting the midrashic and halachic derivations as not being in accordance with the sense of the text. The method therefore, he has adopted in explaining the biblical text is fully understandable. It is possible that Onkelos' own independence in treatment of the pentateuchal sources may have influenced Rashi to take his own line. We may, also, add that thanks to the stimulus of his commentary, the study of the Torah became the subject of critical thinking, particularly in the fields of philology and Derash.
As said in our General Introduction Rashi's commentary consists of Peshat, Derash Aggadah and Derash Halacha. To do this Rashi took his interpretations from different sources such as Midrash Rabbah, Siphra Mechilta and Talmud. However, one of Rashi's main sources was the Targum Onkelos. Separate chapters will be dealt with to show Rashi's attitude towards midrashic elements and translation of obscure words and philological observations in Onkelos' Targum. However, regarding "halachic matters" Rashi, to a great extent, ignored Onkelos, and there is an almost complete silence on the part of Rashi, not only when the Targum is in harmony with current Halacha but even when Onkelos interpreted against the traditional interpretations expounded in the Talmud. Before setting out the details of Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos' Targum, we give a summary classification of his treatment.

A division of the main points regarding "halachic matters into 7 groups facilitates comprehension of Rashi's utilisation and neglect of the halachic comments of Onkelos."
The groups are as follows:

**GROUP A (I)**
Where Onkelos interprets against the accepted Halacha of the Talmud and Rashi makes no comment.

**GROUP A (II)**
The Targumim contain pre-tannaitic tradition.

**GROUP B**
Where Onkelos interprets "halachic verses" literally and thereby fails to explicate the Halacha whether designedly or otherwise.

**GROUP C**
Rashi quotes Onkelos, but only in a few instances he remarks without labouring the point that Onkelos is against the expositions of the Rabbis.

**GROUP D**
In a few instances Rashi quotes Onkelos for no apparent purpose, since the same "halachic interpretations" occur in the Talmud or other sources of Jewish literature.
GROUP E
In at least 55 cases Onkelos expounds "halachic verses" in accordance with talmudic tradition but Rashi passes him over in silence.

GROUP F
In cases where Rashi follows one tannaitic opinion and Onkelos another, Rashi never adds that Onkelos' view corresponds to the other opinion.

GROUP G - Rashi and Halacha
In some cases Rashi interprets against the current Halacha. Furthermore in places where the tannaitic Rabbis were at variance Rashi interprets not in accordance with the accepted ruling of the Talmud.

SUMMARY
In several instances Onkelos' interpretations are against current halachic expositions in the Talmud, and Rashi has failed to notice that Onkelos is against the current Halacha. However, he has not invariably failed to notice, for we do find that in a few places Rashi has in a subtle way pointed out that the Targum is against the interpretations of the Rabbis. ¹

Here are a few examples to illustrate the main point.

1. GEN. 9:6 - "He that sheds the blood of a man, for that man his blood shall be shed..."

Onkelos interprets - "_whosoever shed a man’s blood before witnesses according to the word of the Judges, shall his blood be shed"_. The plural nouns - and - are significant. However, this being against the current Halacha, for the Bab. Tal. Sanh. 57b states that a "Ben Noah" can be sentenced to death by a single judge on the evidence of a single witness. ²

2. EX. 21:31 - "If the ox goes a son or a daughter, the same rule shall apply".
Onkelos translates "Whether it has gored a male Israelite or female Israelite".

From this interpretation, we can only assume that the Targum intended to exclude "proselyte victims", but this is unlikely; Onkelos himself, its reputed author, was a proselyte. At any rate this is against the tradition for the Mechilta states clearly that this law includes proselytes - Ps. Jonathan is like Onkelos - Neofiti also interprets likewise - It appears we have in the Targumim a pre-tannaitic tradition, namely that the "proselyte victims" are excluded.

"But if the animal is found alive in his possession, be it ox, ass, or sheep, he shall repay two". This is N.E.B's translation, and it agrees with Onkelos' translation that the stolen ass was found alive - But the Mechilta, quoted by Rashi links - i.e. two living animals shall he repay, and he shall not give dead
animals in payment; either living animals, or else the value of living animals is to be paid. Rashi, however, does not comment on Onkelos, who translates differently from the accepted tradition.

4. EX. 23:19 - 
"You shall not boil a kid in its mother's milk".
Rashi, following the Rabbis' interpretation in Bab. Hul. 115b explains that the law prohibiting kid-seething occurs in three different passages; once for the purpose of prohibiting the eating of meat food with milk food, once to prohibit us from deriving any other benefit (אמהר חַע) from such mixture and once to prohibit the boiling of meat with milk. However, in all these three places Onkelos explains only the prohibition of eating meat and milk together and seems to ignore the prohibition of "cooking" and "deriving benefit" - לֹא טִיכְבֵּל חוּר בַּעֲרֵי בַּחֲמִיתם
There is, however, no comment by Rashi. Ps. Jonathan mentions the prohibition of "cooking and eating" - זו לֹא טִיכְבֵּל חוּר לוֹא תִּכְכָּל בַּעֲר בַּחֲמִית וְאֵינוֹ תִּכְכָּל בַּעֲר בַּחֲמִית
but not the prohibition of - "benefit". Neofiti translates likewise - לֹא טִיכְבֵּל חוּר תִּכְכָּל בַּעֲר בַּחֲמִית.

5. LEV. 5:24 - 
"Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely, he shall even pay it in the principal and shall add the fifth part".
Rashi - "By using the plural - במשמעת- the Torah includes in this law of restitution the many additional fifths possible in respect to one principal [ר"ם] so that if he denies the "fifth" (i.e. he asserts that he has repaid both capital and fifth, but has not in fact paid the latter) and takes an oath that he has paid it but afterwards admits the claim then he must pay a further fifth to the original fifth etc". Rashi's interpretation is taken from the Bab.Tal.Baba. Kamma 108a, but Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who is against the Halacha, for he translated - במשמעת- in the singular - במשמעת-

6. LEV.11

"Of creatures that live in water these you may eat: all those that have fins and scales". Although the biblical text is in the singular - קן וקן - "fin and scale", Onkelos translates these two words in the plural - קן וקן - "fins and scales". However, by translating them in the plural it appears that he holds that one fin and one scale are not enough, and this is against the accepted Halacha for in Mishna Hullin 59a, the Rabbis hold that the kashrut of a fish can be determined by the presence of one fin and one scale.
7. LEV. 11:14 - "The kite and every kind of falcon".
Onkelos translates - רחצת כל חיות ברחצית לא ניתן. However, in
DEUT. 14:13 - "the kite, every kind of falcon, every kind of
crow". Onkelos translates - רחצת כל חיות ברחצית לא ניתן.
Onkelos takes - רחצת כל חיות克拉cit as one kind, whereas
he takes - חיות克拉cit as two different kinds of
birds. This is contrary to the Talmud Hullin 63a,
and Rashi in DEUT. quotes the tradition that - כם
and - דינא - mean one and the same,19 but
he does not remark on Onkelos, who takes - עיר דינה
and - דינא - as three separate birds.

8. LEV. 21:4 - "Nor shall he make himself unclean for any married
woman among his father's kin, and so profane himself".
Rashi takes - ישר - as husband; a [priest] husband shall
not defile himself by proximity to his wife's body
while it is among its people, i.e. unburied (for she
is not - המ פלuida). This refers to such a one who by
such conduct could become - ונחל - and thus disqualified
from priestly duties. This is in fact the accepted
interpretation of the Rabbis in Siphra.21 Onkelos,
however, translates - אוסר במעיה שנחלודית.
He does not take - ישר - in the sense of husband but
in the sense of - ר' של - "Master". In other words the
priest who is a Master [i.e. High Priest] among his
people should not defile himself. Rashi\textsuperscript{22} does not comment on Onkelos.\textsuperscript{23}

9. LEV.22\textsuperscript{13} - ובת כהן Ка ויהי ליט לית לוהו

but if she (the Priest's daughter) is widowed or divorced and is childless...."

Onkelos translates - ובת כי Ка ויהי לית לוהו "And if a Priest's daughter be a widow or divorced, and she has no son...." It is difficult to understand why he translates - בור - as "son" and not just as "child", as also in GEN.15\textsuperscript{3}, for according to the talmudical law,\textsuperscript{24} there is no difference in this respect between a son and a daughter. Ps. Jonathan translates - לוד - by - לוד - Neofiti reads - לוד -

10. LEV.24\textsuperscript{21} - המה באהמה שלמהו וממה שמה ארצה והמכה יימיה

"And he that smiteth a beast....and he that smiteth a man shall be put to death".

Rashi who follows the tradition\textsuperscript{25} interprets that Scripture is speaking here of one who smites his father or mother, in which case he is punishable by death for merely smiting them without fatal results. Scripture put this case in position with "smiting a beast" - מכה באהמה (מכה באהמה) in order to teach us that a person is subject to the law only if he smote it whilst it was alive.

Similarly, one who smites his father is punishable only
if he smites him whilst he is alive, thus excluding the death penalty if one smites his father's dead body. Rashi, however, fails to comment on Onkelos who translates not in accordance with the current Halacha: "And he that killeth a beast, he shall pay for it; but he that killeth a man should be put to death". In this vein, Ps. Jonathan interprets Scripture speaks of one who inflicts a wound upon the beast and not of one who kills it. Similarly with regard to Scripture is speaking of one who smites his parents, in which case he is punishable by death for merely smiting them without fatal results. Perhaps, however, the Targumim hold like - who hold that Scripture speaks of one who kills a man. (See Bab. Keth. 35a). Maimonides has this to say - who hold that all beasts excepted from the señal, only one of these two cases - "Those which only chew the cud or only have a parted or cloven hoof, you may not eat..."
Rashi interprets - "as "a certain animal which has two backs and two spinal columns." This is, in fact, the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab. Hul. 60b that - here is not an adjective but a noun and means a specific "animal". However, Onkelos does not follow the traditional view and interprets - "cleft ones" (hoofs divided into [two] nails). Ps. Jonathan, however, follows the traditional view -

12. DEUT. 21:18 - "When a man has a son who is disobedient.....or pay attention when they punish him". Onkelos translates - "When a man has a son... and though they teach him etc". This is, however, against tradition, for the Babylonian Talmud Sanh. 71b by means of analogy deduces that - "scourging". In DEUT. 22:18 regarding the calumny of his wife's virginity Onkelos renders -"they shall chastise him" by - and they shall flog him. Again Rashi makes no comment. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos' interpretation. In DEUT. 21:18
he translates - וַיַּלֵּא מִרְבָּבָו אֵלֶּה מִנָּהוּ - and in DEUT.22 he
translates - יַֽעַבְּדְךָ יִרָּכָּר. In both places, however,
Neofiti reads - יִרְדָּחֵן.

13. DEUT.25 - "His brother's widow shall go up to him... and spit
in his face......"
Rashi interprets - יְרֵךְ בּוּשֶּן - על גֵּבֶר, יְרֵךְ
The word - בּוּשֶּן - means on the ground (and not in his face). This is the traditional view in Siphre  that the spitting must be on the ground before the Elders of Israel. Onkelos translates - יְרֵךְ בּוּשֶּן. "and she shall spit in his face". Ps. Jonathan, however, follows the traditional view - יְרֵךְ בּוּשֶּן - "she must spit before him an expectoration visible to the Sages". Neofiti also reads - יְרֵךְ בּוּשֶּן.

The fact that the Targumim contain pre-tannaitic traditions, may have caused the Rabbis in the Siphra - שְׁמַע פָּרָשָׁה - אָכַר, מְפִלָּֽהּ לְאֵלֶּה מִנָּהוּ - לֹא חָבוּץ. As
(בִּין שְׁמַע פָּרָשָׁה - אָכַר, מְפִלָּֽהּ לְאֵלֶּה מִנָּהוּ - לֹא חָבוּץ
כִּי שָׁמַעְתָּ אֲנָא לְחָבוּץ, אָכַר כִּי מְפִלָּֽהּ לְאֵלֶּה מִנָּהוּ - לֹא חָבוּץ. אָכַר
רָבָּה לְאֵלֶּה מִנָּהוּ - לֹא חָבוּץ. אָכַר כִּי שָׁמַעְתָּ אֲנָא לְחָבוּץ, אָכַר כִּי מְפִלָּֽהּ לְאֵלֶּה
לֹא חָבוּץ. אָכַר כִּי שָׁמַעְתָּ אֲנָא לְחָבוּץ, אָכַר כִּי מְפִלָּֽהּ לְאֵלֶּה
לֹא חָבוּץ.
See Siphra Vienna 1862 and I.H. Weiss, p. 46) to declare that the Targum is not "Horaah". As said in
the "Summary" of the Halachic Section, the weekly reading of the scriptural passages, in the Synagogue, followed by an oral interpretation in Aramaic became an integral part of the Service. The Meturgeman would mention several Halachot that he deemed necessary for complete understanding of the text. No doubt these Halachot became widely known and practised by the general community. But once the Mishna was formulated the Rabbis may have felt that its laws should be given prominence and these pre-tannaitic Halachot should be eradicated from the mind of the public. Hence the above statement, the Targum is not "Horaah". In other words the Halachot contained in the Targum should be disregarded.

(However, in Bab.Tal. Kerit. p.13b - the reading is and not - 11אק תכרוע - 11אק הלשה -
In Group A(I) we have shown that Onkelos (in fact this is true also of Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti) does not interpret in accordance with the views laid down by the Mishna and the Talmud. Can we then safely assume that the Targumim contain a pre-tannaitic tradition? P. Kahle and other scholars are in fact of the opinion that some of the Targumim's interpretations contradict the current Halacha. Kahle's weighty evidence to this theory is EX.22

"If a man shall lay waste a field or vineyard and shall send in his beast of pasture, and shall devastate the field of another; the best of his field, and the best of his vineyard shall he pay". The Geniza fragment [as well as Neofiti Targum] translate - וּמִלֶּהֶם - to mean "fire" and not as the Mishna and the Talmud which explain that the whole text deals with damage caused by the "tooth" of the animal (that eats up by grazing). Therefore, since the interpretation of the Mishna and the Talmud became authoritative, it was no longer feasible to accept the Neofiti's translation. Nonetheless, we can conclude that Neofiti contains a pre-mishnaic tradition. H. Albeck, however, strongly criticised this view. In his opinion the Meturgemanim had no scholarly authority and so it would be completely wrong to suggest or to assume that their halachic
interpretations would automatically be accepted by the Sages of their time. J. Heinemann 7 defends Kahle and believes that Albeck's argument is far from convincing. "Admittedly" Heinemann writes, "the Targumists were not by definition the greatest of halachic scholars, but neither were they ignoramuses; on the contrary, they were the bearers of a tradition and experts in their field. Certainly not everyone was permitted to act as a Maturgeman in the Synagogue; it appears that the Targumists were professionals, who received payment for their work. The case of interpretations contradicting the Halacha advanced by Bible commentators cannot be considered analogous, since the Aramaic Targum had a permanent and definite function in the prescribed liturgy of the Synagogue, and its task was to render faithfully into the vernacular the written text read in public. In this it differed, for example, from the exegeses of Rashi and Nahmanides, or even from the discourses of the Aggadists, neither of which was a regular and essential part of the public service." It is not our purpose here to go at length on this issue and it suffices to make a few observations. First of all Albeck's assertion that the Targumim should be regarded as non-scholarly works is certainly untenable in the
light of many halachic and midrashic interpretations which conform with Rabbinic literature and which show that the Meturgemanim were indeed of great standing. At any rate, even if Albeck's assertion is correct, nonetheless, he and others have failed to see that behind each Meturgeman there was a "Hacham" who instructed the Meturgeman according to the rules and laws laid down by the Mishna. The prime duty of the Meturgeman is to translate the text literally and had no right to change or add without the full approval of the Hacham. This would explain the reason for allowing even a minor to act as a Meturgeman. Had it not been for the fact that the Hacham is behind the minor to guide him accordingly, he would not have been allowed to act as a Meturgeman. In short the Meturgeman was merely the "mouthpiece" and the "spokesman" of the Hacham and the expansion of the text and especially of a "halachic text" was completely in the hands of the Hacham. The basic rule laid down points indeed to this very fact. And the Meturgeman was permitted to add only if he, himself, was a great scholar. In Mishna Meg. we read that a Meturgeman who rendered LEV. not according to the Halacha "was silenced with a sharp
rebuke". Most likely, this also applied to any Meturgeman who wished to deviate from the traditional Halacha. The Sages, who were most concerned as to how the Meturgeman was allowed to declaim his Targum, were even more concerned about the contents of the Targum itself that it should be within the framework of the Halacha. Consequently when the ban on writing the Targum was lifted, most probably only experts on halachic traditions were permitted to insert them in the Targumim for posterity.

In the light of the above Albeck's view is certainly unacceptable.

We agree, however, with Kahle's view (supported by Heinemann and others) that the Targumim contain pre-tannaitic traditions as, in fact, we have shown in Group A(1). But Kahle's evidence to this theory from EX.22 mentioned above is just not convincing, for a distinction must be made between where the Targumim contradict clearly the current Halacha and when they translate literally and fail to embody the necessary explication of the Halacha by way of supplement. In other words, although we would expect the Targumim to embody the Halacha, nonetheless, translating the text according to the "peshat method" does not necessarily render their translation against
the Halacha. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that each undertaking of the Meturgeman depended on his temperament and his approach to the biblical text at that particular Sabbath. Thus at one Sabbath the Meturgeman would explain the text according to the Peshat method, and at another the Derash (Derash Halacha or Derash Aggadah) and again the dual exegetical approach for the clarification of the text. This method can easily be seen from all the Targumim available to us, including that of Ps. Jonathan where many verses are translated literally, whilst others according to the Derash; and sometimes in one verse the dual exegetical approach is displayed. It all depended not only on the mood and inclination of the Meturgeman but above all on the kind of audience he had and their ability to grasp the deep meaning of the text. Bearing this in mind, we should, therefore, be able to comprehend Neofiti Targum in translating סירוב by "fire" and not as the Talmud takes it since his translation is within "the framework of the Peshat". On that particular Sabbath the Meturgeman in question did not find it necessary to expound the text in accordance with the requirements of the Halacha. Most likely the audience was not receptive and ready to enter into the legal side of the text in mentioning the "four causes of damages", as in fact neither Ps. Jonathan nor Onkelos found it necessary to mention them.
The other weighty piece of evidence according to Heinemann and others that the Targumim contain pre-tannaitic tradition is found in the Targum to the Book of Ruth 1:

Again, according to the Targum the fourth institution is ("hanging") whereas according to the Mishna, it is ("strangulation"). This also can safely be discarded since the Targum in question is full of errors and mistakes as Melamed has rightly pointed out, and therefore, no attention should be paid to this Targum. At any rate I submit that the author in question seems to preserve an old Sadducean Halacha for he translates - by - which is contrary to the Mishna which states that the body is not burnt and that only "a burning wick is thrown to his mouth". The Mishna relates that when Rabbi Elazar Ben Zadok reported to the Sages that he had seen a Beth Din who fulfilled the institution of - by burning he was told that it was a "Beth Din of Sadducees" who translate - in its literal sense. In the light of this no evidence should
be deduced from any Targum in this respect unless we know positively that its author belongs to the school of the Pharisees. Bearing this in mind we may even "suspect" that it was a heterodox interpolation on the part of the translator in Neofiti who rendered - מדרש - by - "fire" for he refused to explain it as the Pharisees did.
In Group A, it has been shown that in some instances Rashi has ignored the fact that Onkelos' interpretations are against the accepted Halacha in the Talmud. There are, however, numerous verses in the Torah from which the Rabbis have derived several laws, but Onkelos translated them literally, which rendered them against the Halacha, or rather he failed to embody the necessary explication of the Halacha by way of supplement. Despite this Rashi did not comment on his interpretations. Here are several examples to illustrate this point.

1. EX.12:15 - "For seven days...on the very first day you shall rid your houses of leaven etc". Rashi follows the tradition that the "first" day means the "eve of Passover", but he fails to comment on Onkelos who translates it literally - 

2. EX.13:9 - "You shall have the record of it as a sign upon your hand and upon your forehead as a reminder etc". Onkelos here translates the verse literally - 
and Rashi who explains it according to the tradition, that the verse is about - יִּשְׁמָעֵל - fails to comment on Onkelos who does not incorporate the accepted Halacha. Ps. Jonathan incorporates the Halacha -

אַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּעַלְפָּיו וְיַעֲשֶׂהוּ אֵלֶּה לַעֲבוֹר יֵשָׁבָע

Neofiti translates literally - על ימים מעונים -

This is a rule, and you shall keep it at the appointed time from year to year".

Rashi interprets - מְיַמִּים שלש "from year to year". Rashi here goes according to Rabbi Akiva who holds that the verse speaks about the "Paschal Lamb" and not with Rabbi Jose Hagalili who takes "yamin" as days and, therefore, understands the verse to speak about "tefillin". But Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who translated - לְמֵימִּים שלש "from time to time".

"But if the slave should say, I love my master..... and the man shall be his slave for life".
Onkelos here translates literally - ἢ ὁ νεκρὸς ὑπείρασεν πάλιν - without taking into consideration the tradition that for "ever" means until the jubilee year. Rashi who interprets like the tradition fails to comment on Onkelos.

5. EX. 21:16 - "Whoever strikes his father or mother shall be put to death".
Rashi interprets that death here is by an act of strangulation. This is in accordance with the tradition, but Rashi fails to comment on Onkelos who translates the verse literally - "וְאֶפְשָׁר אֶתָּחַל אֵת אָם שָׁלֵם - Ps. Jonathan is in line with tradition - וַיַּכְכֶל בָּשֵׁם - "הָיוּ יְשַׁנְוָה לָאֲבָה - Neofiti translates literally - מַכְכֶלָה - "יהב

6. EX. 21:16 - "Whoever kidnap's a man shall be put to death, whether he has sold him etc...."
Here, too, Rashi interprets that it means strangulation, but says nothing on Onkelos who fails to incorporate tradition - רָכְבָה רֵפֶעַ - Ps. Jonathan follows the tradition - רָכְבָה -"יהב
7. **Ex. 21**^17^ - "Whoever reviles his father or mother shall be put to death".

Once again Rashi says that the Rabbis^10^ have taught that sentence of death here means death by "Sekila" - "stoning" - but he fails to comment on Onkelos who does not incorporate the accepted tradition^11^ - ר"וי לו ל'עבשי -Ps. Jonathan, however, incorporates the tradition - נמקה ט伝え חמש פעולות אבניא.

8. **Ex. 21**^20^ - "When a man strikes his slave... and the slave dies on the spot, he must be punished".

Rashi explains that "avenging", i.e. punishment is exacted by - מ"עכט -"sword", which corresponds with tradition. But he does not comment on Onkelos who substitutes for - נ"כ - "avenged" - נ"כ - "He shall be judged".

9. **Ex. 21**^24^ - "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot".

Here Onkelos translates literally - עין לעין, ש"ע ש"ע, י"ע י"ע - and ignores the interpretations of the Rabbis^13^ that in all cases "monetary"
compensation is intended, and not a corporal retaliation. Rashi, of course, interprets all these cases according to the Talmud, but does not comment on Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan follows the tradition -

Neofiti is likewise -

10. **Ex. 21:29**

"If, however, the ox has for some time past been a vicious animal, and the owner has been duly warned but has not kept it under control, and the ox kills a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and the owner shall be put to death as well". Rashi here interprets according to the Talmud, that "his owner too shall be put to death" means suffer death - ("by a visitation from God" and not "by human agency". "For a murder committed by himself you shall put him to death, but you shall not put him to death on account of a murder committed by his ox". However, Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who translates the verse literally, which fails to render explicitly the tradition. Nahmanides, who realised the difficulty in Onkelos says - "I do not know any reason for Onkelos' interpretation".
Ps. Jonathan corresponds with current Halachic interpretation -

Neofiti, however, translates like Onkelos -

11. EX.21\textsuperscript{30} - "If, however, the penalty is commuted for a money payment he shall pay etc."

Rashi quotes from the Mechilta\textsuperscript{18} that the ransom of his soul must be assessed according to the value of the injured person. This is the view of Rabbi Ishmael. Rabbi Akiva,\textsuperscript{19} however, says that it means the value of the person who caused the injury. But Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who translates literally -

12. EX.22\textsuperscript{17} - "You shall not allow a witch to live".

There is an argument among the Rabbis\textsuperscript{20} - Rabbi Ishmael holds that she shall be killed by the "sword" (기간) but Rabbi Akiva holds by "stoning" (сан). Onkelos translates literally\textsuperscript{21} -
13. EX. 22:18 - "Whoever has unnatural connection with a beast shall be put to death".
Rashi explains that the sentence of death here is by "stoning", which corresponds to the interpretations of the Rabbis. But he fails to comment on Onkelos who does not explicate the tradition.

14. EX. 22:19 - "Whoever sacrifices to any god but the Lord shall be put to death under solemn ban".
Onkelos, here, substitutes the colourless by - without specifying what kind of death is meant, and Rashi as usual does not comment.

15. LEV. 15:1 - "In this way you shall warn the Israelites against uncleanness in order that they may not bring uncleanness... and so die".
Rashi, here, follows tradition that the penalty of "excision" (כדרות) to which one who defiles the Holy place is subject (cf. NUM. 19:13) is here simply called "death". Onkelos translates literally -
from which it appears that a stranger who enters the Temple whilst he is unclean is not necessarily punishable by excision; since he does not translate by - רכש שבעת ימי - his regular equivalent for the word - הָיָה. Therefore, although his literal translation is from the traditional point of view inadequate, Rashi does not comment.

16. LEV.24:19-20 - '[label:19]"When one man injures and disfigures his fellow-countryman, it shall be done to him as he has done; fracture for fracture, etc..."

Rashi, once again, follows the interpretation of the halachic treatment of EX.21:24 (i.e. compensation) but he does not comment on Onkelos, who translates the verse literally - "עֹלֵב אָדָם וְשָׁם נָפָל הָעָלָה - חַזֵב אָדָם מִזְאוֹן...

17. LEV.25:1 - 'label:25"When a man sells a dwelling-house... for a time he shall have the right of redemption".

Rashi takes the word - מֵעָלָה - to indicate a full year.
which corresponds with tradition. But Onkelos paraphrases —  עליות — תים "time and time".  
Ps. Jonathan reads — כו ויהו ויאמלו ימות

18. NUM.1 51 — ונסוח הטמון="עליות... חובר יקרב" ימיות
"The Levites shall take the Tabernacle down.....any unqualified person who comes near it shall be put to death". 
Rashi follows the tradition 31 that "death" here is by an act of God — ביה יאמן — and not by sentence of the court. But he says nothing about Onkelos, who translates literally — שהה דקרב יקרב יקרב — Nahmanides in EX.21 29 believes that Onkelos holds like Rabbi Akiva 32, that in the case of a "stranger" (i.e. non-priest) who served in the Temple, the sentence of death is carried out by "Hanek" 33 — " strangulation" (i.e. and this is why Onkelos translates literally). Neofiti, too, translates literally — ויהו דקרב יקרב יקרב יקרב — Ps. Jonathan, however, follows the tradition — ויהו דקרב יקרב יקרב ויהו ויאמלו ימות
19. DEUT. 16:6
"But only in the place which He will choose... you shall slaughter the Passover victim in the evening"...
Rashi follows the interpretation of the Talmud\(^\text{34}\) that there are three different points of time, from the sixth hour onwards you shall slaughter it.... Here, too, Onkelos translates the text as it stands -

20. DEUT. 16:7
"You shall boil it and eat it in the place etc...."
Rashi\(^\text{35}\) says that \(\text{בשלית האוכלת במשוך}\) is to be regarded as equivalent with \(\text{שלא וינא לה - roasted with fire}\), but he does not comment on Onkelos who translates the word \(\text{נתן בשר - literally}\) -

21. DEUT. 16:8
"For six days you shall eat unleavened bread...."
Rashi, following the tradition\(^\text{37}\) of the Rabbis resolves the contradiction of this verse with EX. 12:15 - "for seven days you shall eat unleavened bread", but fails to comment on Onkelos who translates literally -
22. **DEUT. 25:6**

"The first son she bears shall perpetuate the dead brother's name so that...."

The Rabbis interpret - קָוָשׁ אַל שְׂמֵ יָהוּ - regarding the "laws of inheritance" - i.e. that the brother (שָבָא) who performed the levirate marriage should inherit the estate of his deceased brother. Rashi quotes the traditional view in verse 5, but fails to comment on Onkelos who translates the verse literally - וְיַהֲנָה וְאֵד אֹהֶל.

23. **DEUT. 25:12**

"You shall cut off her hand and show her no mercy".

The traditional interpretation of - קָרָא־לָהּ אַל כּוֹפֶן - is not literal but "monetary" compensation is intended. The woman must pay the equivalent money of the shame she caused to the man. Rashi interprets the verse accordingly, but fails to comment on Onkelos who translates the text literally - וְיַכְּאוֹל.
We have shown that in some instances Onkelos either contradicts the accepted tradition (Group A) or he does not explicate the Halacha (Group B) and Rashi kept complete silence regarding his interpretations. However, even in the few instances when he does quote him, the reader will be surprised to see that Rashi failed to notice, or at least did not remark that Onkelos is not in explicit agreement with the Halacha or is even contrary to it. To illustrate this matter here are a few examples.

1. **LEV. 21**20 - "Or that hath a speck (סָלָם) in his eye". Rashi explains that - סָלָם - is anything that causes a mingling in the eye, such as a white line intersecting the black. This is also the interpretation of the Mishna. And then Rashi goes on to say - the Targum's rendering of - סָלָם - is - טָלָא - connected in meaning with - טָלָא - (a kind of worm). Rashi does not seem to raise any objection to this interpretation although, in fact, the Mishna in Bech. takes - סָלָם - and - טָלָא - as two different kinds of blemishes.
2. Deut. 23:16 - "You shall not surrender to his master a slave who has taken refuge with you."

Rashi explains - render it as the Targum has it:—

— the "slave of the heathen nations". Another explanation is that even a Canaanite (i.e. gentile) slave belonging to an Israelite who fled from a foreign country to Palestine, should not be handed back to his master's residence outside Palestine. Rashi here brings, side by side, the interpretation of Onkelos with the interpretation of the Rabbis, without commenting that Onkelos is against the accepted opinion of Rabbi Ahi ben Josiah.

3. Ex. 24:8 - "Moses then took the blood and flung it over the people etc...."

Rashi says - means "sprinkling" - and the Targum renders -"and he poured it (the blood) upon the altar as atonement for the people". The Talmud, however, quotes an argument between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua regarding a convert who underwent "Milah" (circumcision) without "Tebilah"
(ritual bath). The former holds that a convert needs no "Tebilah", but only "Milah" as was the case with the Israelites in the Wilderness; Rabbi Joshua said that in the Wilderness there was also "Tebilah", since there is a deduction that "sprinkling" cannot take place without "Tebilah". Rashi does not remark on Onkelos that according to the Talmud the sprinkling was done towards the people, and not on to the altar as Onkelos takes it. However, though Rashi in several places did not remark on Onkelos' interpretations, nevertheless we cannot say that he failed completely to notice their discrepancy, for in some instances Rashi points to the fact that Onkelos is against the Halacha, e.g.-

"You shall not be led into wrongdoing...nor when you give evidence in a lawsuit, shall you side with the majority to pervert justice". Rashi here quotes the Talmudic interpretation and then says "(The 'I here means but)"But Onkelos interprets differently," which shows his critical mind and apparently only out of respect to Onkelos Rashi refrains from highlighting the difference.
5. Similarly in Deut. 23:

Joshua 24:18

"No Israelite woman shall become a Temple prostitute and no Israelite..."

Rashi interprets - קרש - to mean prostitute, and מָיִן - is one prepared to indulge in homosexuality. This is the opinion of Rabbi Ishmael, but - מאיה - Onkelos translates an Israelite woman should not become the wife of a slave etc... By saying "but Onkelos" (מאיה) Rashi indicates his awareness that Onkelos is against the accepted interpretation of the Rabbis and therefore he is at pains to reconcile Onkelos' interpretation with that of the Rabbis. And so Rashi says "such a woman may also be termed a - קרש - because she, too, must be reckoned a prostitute (since, at least in theory, she might have intercourse with anyone she chooses) because no marriage ceremony with her can be valid".

Sometimes Rashi points out in a more forceful manner, that Onkelos took a different view from that of the Rabbis, e.g. Ex. 22:

"If the sun shone upon him..."

Rashi, following the interpretations of Rabbi Ishmael says - מִשְׁלֹה: אֶרֶץ כְּרִי ... "This is only a metaphorical expression......but, Onkelos, however, took a different view from that of the Rabbis". This shows clearly his observation
that Onkelos is against the traditional view. Sometimes, Rashi refutes Onkelos in stronger terms and points out that he is mistaken in his interpretations.

DEUT. 17:5

Then bring the man or woman who has done this wicked deed to the city gate....

Rashi says - the Targum in rendering - the gate of thy court, is in error, for we have learned (through the means of analogy) that it means the gate (the city) in which he has worshipped the idol. Rashi who could not conceive for a moment that perhaps Onkelos disagrees with the Halacha which has been developed in Babylon concludes that the Aramaic translation of the word to "your city" [gates].

Thus, Rashi strives to modify the Targum's version in order to bring it into line with the accepted Halacha. It is clear, therefore, that Rashi has not completely failed to point out the various interpretations of Onkelos which are out of step with Halacha.
In some instances, although Onkelos' interpretations are not in flat contradiction to the current Halacha, nevertheless Rashi in a subtle way rebukes him for interpreting differently, e.g. LEV. 22:16 - "They shall not let men eat their holy-gifts and so incur guilt...."

Rashi says - ה"ז Chủ - means and they (the priests) would burden themselves (reflexive) with sin: - הם את קרשיהם - when the Israelites would eat their holy things. Onkelos, however, who translated - בהב לאר - by "when the priests eat them in their uncleanness" has translated it thus unnecessarily.
In several instances where Rashi does quote Onkelos regarding halachic matters, one wonders what the purpose was in quoting him as the same interpretations occur in Siphre, Talmud and Siphra. To illustrate this point here are some examples.

1. **EX.21** - "If etc....and shall see that he is cured".
   Rashi says - translate it as the Targum does - "he shall pay physician's fee". It seems Rashi quotes Onkelos for no purpose unless he is interpreting like Nahmanides who quotes the Targum too - "that he should not give the money to the injured man but rather to the physician who actually attends him". However, despite this there is no need for Rashi to quote him as this law is clearly mentioned in the Bab. Tal. 2

2. **EX.22** - "You shall not eat the flesh of anything in the open country killed by beasts...."  
   Rashi quotes the Targumic rendering (without saying - "flesh that is torn off from a living animal". 3
Rashi quotes Onkelos for no purpose, as the same thing is in Bab. Tal.

3. EX.23 - "You shall not spread a baseless rumour".
Rashi explains - "render it as the Targum, you shall not accept - a false report. This is a prohibition against accepting a slanderous statement, and also to a Dayan that he should not hear one party to a suit before the other". Both opinions occur in Mechilta and Rashi unnecessarily quotes Onkelos for the first one.

4. EX.34 - "Neither shall the sacrifice of the festival of the Passover remain overnight unto the morning".
Rashi explains - "understand it like the Targum - "There shall not remain overnight away from the Altar till the morning the fat of the sacrifice"."
One wonders why he had to quote the Targum when, in fact, the same interpretation occurs in Bab. Tal. Zebah. 8

5. LEV.116 - "He shall take away the crop and its contents in one piece...."
Rashi says - the word - נאצות - is anything which is loathsome. This is also what Onkelos means when he translated - בהלבשין - with the "digested food" found in the entrails. This is likewise the interpretation of Abba Jose Ben Chanan 9 who states that the Cohen removes the stomach ( קורא קרב) with the crop.

6. LEV.20 - "A man who has intercourse with his uncle's wife.... and put to death".
Rashi says - "translate this as the Targum renders it - חסר אמה - childless". (اصرירם - חסר אמה גבירה). If he has children he will bury them, if he has no children when the sin is committed he will die childless. There was no need for Rashi to quote the Targum as this law of 'Karet' - excision - is explicitly explained in Bab. Tal. Yebamoth 55a 10
7. LEV. 21: 20 - "...or mis-shapen brows......or has a testicle ruptured". Rashi says - מיכום אשר - לן השברים מיכום - פ.Interopי' שיענים שלוה חתות - according to the Targum - כרתי עין - signifies one whose testicles are crushed. Rashi quotes the Targum unnecessarily since this is a Mishna and Rabbi Ishmael holds the same. 11

8. LEV. 23: 16 - "The day after the seventh Sabbath will make fifty days...."
Rashi says - משבת השבעה ויividad - כבדיה - Once again Rashi unnecessarily quotes Onkelos for in verse 15, Rashi follows the Pharisees' tradition that - משבת השבעה - means "from the morrow after the first day of the Passover festival". Consequently, the word - שביעה - on verse 16 can only mean "week" and not literally Sabbath. 13 Perhaps, however, in all the above cases Rashi is merely pointing out that Onkelos' Targum is in accordance with current Halacha; thus giving further support to - ספק ר"ל דבר - of the Rabbis.
9. NUM. 6:3 -  "He shall abstain from wine and strong drink"
Rashi says - render it like the Targum - he shall abstain from "new wine and old wine". The same is in the Siphre, and Rashi thus quotes Onkelos unnecessarily. On LEV. 10:9 the Targum has - "wine and intoxicating drink". This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Judah in the Bab. Keri. 13b that the "Cohanim" (priests) are forbidden to drink anything which is intoxicating. But Rashi does not quote Onkelos' interpretation on LEV. 10:9.

10. NUM. 35:16-17 - "If the man strikes his victim with anything made of iron and he dies, there he is a murderer etc". Rashi says - "This comes to teach that with whatever instrument one kills, it is necessary that it must have a size sufficient to cause death, because in the case of all of them (vv.17, 18) it is said - an instrument from which one may suffer death". And the Targum translates - an instrument of such "size", that one may die through it, except in the case of iron, for it is known before God that iron kills whatever size it may be. Therefore, the Torah does not assign a size
to it. This law that a vessel of wood or a stone needs a "size" but not an instrument of iron is in Siphre and also in Bab. Tal. \(^{15}\) To what purpose, therefore, does Rashi bring the Targum?

11. **DEUT. 23** \(^{16}\) - לָא תַּעֲבֹר עַבָּדְךָ אֶל אֲרוֹםוֹת יְהֹוָה.

"You shall not surrender to his master a slave...." Rashi gives two interpretations, firstly understand this as the Targum. The "servant of the heathen nations" i.e. a "gentile" (Canaanite) slave whose master is a heathen - (לָא תַּעֲבֹר עַבָּד אֱמוּם לֹא יְהוָה). Another explanation takes it to mean, even a gentile slave belonging to an Israelite who fled from outside the land into the land of Israel". Here, again, these two interpretations occur in Bab. Tal. Gitt. 54\(^{a}\) and while the latter opinion is that of Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah the former one is of "Tanna Kamma" (anonymous first authority). Therefore, one wonders for what purpose Rashi quotes the opinion of the "Tanna Kamma" in the name of the Targum. \(^{16}\)

12. **DEUT. 25** \(^{7}\) - וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵעָבְדוּ בְּתוֹנָתָיו בְּכָל הָעָרֶים הַשְּׁעַרֵי
d "But if the man is unwilling to take his brother's wife, she shall go to the elders at the tower gate etc". Rashi says - "שעריה - שעריה, לְעָרֵי בְּתוֹנָא, "gate" - means "Beth Din" as the Targum renders. However, the same is found in Siphre. \(^{17}\)
In many cases Onkelos interprets "Halachic Verses" in accordance with the tradition of the Rabbis. Furthermore, in those places where the tannaitic Rabbis were at variance, Onkelos interprets in accordance with the accepted ruling. Rashi, however, neglects to quote him although he held the identical opinion. Here are a few examples to illustrate these points.

1. Ex. 21 - "When you buy a Hebrew slave, etc...."
Rashi interprets the words "Hebrew slave" to mean a servant who is himself a Hebrew (as opposed to construing as a construct, i.e. a slave previously owned by a fellow-Hebrew). This interpretation corresponds with the Mechilta and Onkelos interprets the same but it is not quoted by Rashi.

2. Ex. 21 - "If he takes another woman, he shall not deprive the first of meat, clothes and conjugal rights".
Rashi takes - as - "food" and - as "marital duty". This is indeed the opinion of Rabbi Josia in the Mechilta (Parasha 3) but Rabbi holds that - is "marital duty", and
- is food. 4 Onkelos 5, too, follows the opinion of Rabbi Josiah - but is not quoted by Rashi.

3. EX. 21 - "When, in the course of a brawl, a man knocks against a pregnant woman, the offender must pay...after assessment". Rashi explains - is not to be understood literally, but it means that they shall exact money from him. And then, Rashi continues to explain - means - "according to the decision of the judges". Rashi follows the interpretation of the Rabbis, but failed to note that Onkelos, too, interprets like tradition. 7

4. EX. 21 - "When one man's ox butts another and kills it, they shall sell the live ox...and also share the dead beast". Rashi explains that Scripture teaches us that the (which is the animal spoken of here - one that has inflicted injury for the first time) pays only to the extent of its own value
So in case it gores another and itself dies, the claimant gets at most the carcass of the ox that caused the damage, and if that does not amount to one-half of the damage he has to suffer the loss. This is indeed the interpretation of the Rabbis. Onkelos interprets by—and they shall also halve the money of the dead one". By adding the word "money" — Onkelos had in mind the tradition that a — pays to the extent of its own value only.

5. EX. 22 — "Then shall on oath of the Eternal... and the owner shall accept it and he shall not pay". Rashi interprets — to mean that the owner shall accept the oath. Rashi's source is the Talmud, and Onkelos too, follows the tradition explicitly, but is not quoted by Rashi.

6. EX. 22 — "If it has been mauled by a wild beast, he shall bring it in as evidence..." Rashi interprets — to mean, "Let him
bring witnesses that it has been torn by accident
and he shall be freed from liability". Although
the text says clearly - "one witness", never-
theless, Rashi follows the Rabbis' interpretation
that two witnesses are needed.
Onkelos, too, follows the traditional view -
This is also the view of the other Targumim. Ps.
Jonathan -
Neofiti -

7. Ex. 22:28 - "You shall not hold back the first of your harvest,
whether corn or wine".
Rashi explains - הבכורים - the"first
fruits", and - ה缬ים - means - the heave
offering". Thus our Rabbis explain these two
words. Onkelos, however, takes - הבכורים - as
which corresponds to tradition, but he
reproduces - הבכורים literally. Rashi, however,
does not quote Onkelos.
8. **EX. 23** - "You shall not make common cause with a wicked man by giving malicious evidence".

According to Rashi - i.e. do not promise him (i.e. the one who makes a false claim against his fellowman) to give evidence for him that will result in wrong being done. This is the traditional interpretation.

Onkelos by rendering the same exegesis, but is not quoted by Rashi.

9. **EX. 23** - "And do not cause the death of the innocent and the guiltless".

Rashi interprets according to the Halacha that in the case that a defendant left the Beth Din (Court) after being found guilty, and someone says, "I have something to plead in his favour", he should be brought back to the court, because Scripture says, "וְאָדָם". If, on the other hand, he left the court after he has been acquitted, and someone says, "I have something to say against him," then he should not be brought back to the court, because Scripture says - אֲנָהּ. Onkelos interprets in accordance with tradition.
10. **EX.23\textsuperscript{18a}**

"You shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice at the same time as anything leavened".

Rashi - "You shall not sacrifice the Paschal lamb... before you have removed the leavened bread from the house". This is the interpretation of the Mechilta, and Onkelos interprets likewise - The fact that Onkelos translates proves that he is in accordance with tradition.

11. **EX.23\textsuperscript{18b}**

"The fat of my festal offering shall not remain overnight till morning...."

Rashi interprets that the fat of the sacrifice should not remain away from the altar until morning. (It is in order so long as the fat is not on the floor by dawn). This interpretation is taken from the Mechilta and Onkelos, too, follows the tradition - "There shall not remain overnight away from the altar till the morning the fat of the sacrifice".
12. **EX.24** - "He then sent the young men of Israel and they sacrificed".

According to Rashi - by the "lads" was intended the first-born sons. This is the accepted Halacha\(^\text{26}\) that, before the erection of the Temple, the service to God was conducted by the first-born sons, but afterwards they were replaced by the Cohanim. Onkelos\(^\text{27}\) interprets similarly\(^\text{28}\) and is quoted by Nahmanides, but ignored by Rashi.

13. **LEV.13**\(^\text{33}\) - "Then he shall be shaven, but the scalp shall not shave".\(^\text{29}\)

According to Rashi - "means "round the scalp", but - the scalp itself he shall not cut - this means that he leaves a row of two hairs quite close to it, that it may become discernible if the scalp spreads. This is, in fact, the law purported in the Mishna Neg.X.5, and in Siphra (133) - "Onkelos follows the tradition and interprets accordingly -"
“And he shall cut round the scall, but what is with it (namely the hair round the scall) he shall not cut”. In this particular verse, Nahmanides, after quoting the Siphra, says that Onkelos, too, followed the same interpretation, but Rashi does not quote Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan interprets as does Onkelos - הבמה חמש תחתא לא אופר והו....

14. LEV.13:45 - וצרוה מענה מענה עזה והן פורים ולאשא - "One who suffers from a malignant skin disease shall wear his clothes torn, leave his hair dishevelled, conceal his upper lips, etc...."

Rashi explains that - פיורות - means "torn" and - גיד - signifies "his head shall be overgrown with hair" and - על שם עזר - signifies "as one who mourns for the dead" (כבר). This is too the interpretation of the Rabbis and Onkelos likewise, but is not quoted by Rashi.
15. **LEV.16** - "He (Aaron) shall lay both his hands on its head and confess...and send it away into the wilderness in charge of a man..."

Rashi explains - "one who was held in readiness for this purpose from the previous day" - Rashi's source is the Talmud and Onkelos incorporates this tradition.

16. **LEV.18** - "You shall not take a woman who is your wife's sister...and to have intercourse with her during her sister's lifetime".

Rashi explains that - comes to show that if a man divorces his wife he is not allowed to marry her sister so long as the former is still living. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab.Tal. Yeb.8 and Onkelos interprets likewise.

17. **LEV.19** - "You shall not treat the deaf with contempt".

Rashi interprets as follows - I have here to understand only the law that one must not execrate the deaf: whence do I know that any person is
Included in this prohibition? Because Scripture states (EX. 22:27) — "Thou shall not curse any one among your people". This is indeed the interpretation of the Rabbis in Siphra (34) and Onkelos, too, follows this view for he translates this verse by — "Do not curse anyone even beyond his own hearing."

i.e. behind his back". The fact that he had translated — by — and not by — presumably shows that he had in mind the traditional interpretation.

"When a man has intercourse with a slave girl who has been assigned to another man and neither ransomed nor given her freedom..." Rashi gives the following interpretation — redemption is always by money" — nor freedom was given her through a deed of manumission. This is the interpretation of the Siphra and Onkelos, too, adopts the accepted halachic interpretation — "When a man has intercourse with a slave girl who has been assigned to another man and neither ransomed nor given her freedom..."
19. **LEV. 19:28** - "You shall not gash yourselves in mourning for the dead; you shall not tattoo yourselves"...

Rashi follows the tradition that מָחַטְתָּה - means "no cuttings for the dead" should be made; and קִרְעֵי - means "a writing engraved into the flesh that remains black for ever". Onkelos interprets in accordance with tradition.

20. **LEV. 22:28** - "You shall not slaughter a cow or sheep at the same time as its young".

Rashi explains as follows: - This law applies only to the female parent, i.e. it is forbidden to slaughter the mother and its male or female young in one day, but it does not apply to the male parent, and it is permissible to slaughter the father animal and its young, whether male or female, in one day. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis and Onkelos is in accordance with tradition. The Tosafoth in Hul. 78 quote Onkelos in support of the Rabbis. Nahmanides on this verse and Rabbi Asher (Rosh) on Tractate Hul.
quote Onkelos too. It is strange, therefore, to see that Rashi ignored him completely. 49

21. LEV.23 11 "He shall present the sheaf......on the day after the Sabbath, so as to gain acceptance for yourselves". Rashi explains that - ממאתת שבת - means on the morrow of the first day of the Passover festival (on the 16th of Nisan) etc. This explanation corresponds to tradition 50 and excludes the views of the Sadducees 51, who hold that - ממאתת שבת - means - (ممאתת שבת בראשית) - on a Sunday. (On the first day after the Saturday) Onkelos 52 once again follows the tradition - "And you shall count for yourselves on the morrow from after the holy day."

22. LEV.23 40 "On the first day you shall take the fruits of citrus trees, palm fronds and leafy branches...." Rashi interprets according to the tradition 53 that by "Hadar", "Etrog" is meant and "branch of palm tree" means "Lulavim". 54 Onkelos is in accordance with tradition 55.
23. NUM. 4: 20 — וַיֵּאוֹרָהּ לְרָאוֹזָה בְּבָלָן אֵת הָכֵרָה... "And the Kohathites themselves shall not enter to cast even a passing glance (lit. to look as they swallow) on the Sanctuary on pain of death".

Rashi says — כְּבָלַת אֵת הָכֵרָה — each into its covering. Rashi here follows the view of the Rabbis in Bab. 56 Yoma 54a that the "Levites" are guilty if they uncover what has been covered of the holy things. Onkelos 57 follows the traditional interpretation. The Palest. Targum and Ps. Jonathan render as does Onkelos — וַתִּשְׁמַע מִן בֵּית קוֹהֲנָם נַעֲשִׂים לְפָרָתָם... "And the Levites shall not see when the Cohanim (priests) are encasing the vessels of the Temple, lest they die". Neofiti, also, interprets in accordance with tradition — "וְלֹא יֵלֶּכֶם לִפְרָתָם כֹּסֶת כְּשֵׁכֶךְ לְכָּבוֹד... "

24. NUM. 5: 17 — לִקרְמָה מְכֻּרָה, מִיָּשֶׁר קְדָשִׁים... "He shall take clean (or holy) water in an earthenware vessel etc...."

According to Rashi — מִיָּשֶׁר קְדָשִׁים — "holy water", i.e. water that has become holy through being in the laver (不克בך). This is the interpretation
of the Rabbis and Onkelos interprets likewise.

25. NUM. 6 - "During the whole term of his vow he shall eat nothing whatever, shoot or berry (or from the kernel even to the husk)."
Rashi - means kernels, and - are the husks. Rashi here follows the opinion of Rabbi Josi in Siphre (Piska 24) and not Rabbi Judah who interprets the other way round. Onkelos is in accordance with Rabbi Josi.

26. NUM. "If someone suddenly falls dead by his side etc...." Rashi interprets as follows - This refers to a Nazarite who defiles himself under duress. - means This refers to one who does so negligently. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Siphre and Onkelos, interprets similarly.
27. NUM. 6:18 - וַגֵּרַם בן יִשְׂרָאֵל לָכֶם אֲשֶׁר שָׁעַר כָּאֵשׁ נוֹדֵעַ וּנְגַנֵּס

"The Nazarite shall shave his head....take the hair ....and put it on the fire when the shared-offering is burning".

Rashi interprets - הָעָבָדִים - i.e. under the "pot" in which the Priest boils the - שֻׁלַּחַן - the feast offering. Rashi's source is Bab. Nazir 45b and Onkelos, too, follows the current Halacha.

28. NUM. 18:9 - וַהֲיֹתִין לְפָרָשָׁהּ מִבָּדָע מִנָּהּ "Out of the most holy gifts kept back from the altar fire".

According to Rashi the preposition - מִן הָאָשׁ - "from the fire" is to be understood temporally - לֵאמֶר - "After the burning of the portions given over the fire". This is taken from Siphre and Onkelos also interprets in accordance with the Halacha.

29. NUM. 19:15 - וָדַּעְתָּ כֹּל אֱלֹהֵי אָדָם אֱלֹהִים פֵּטֵר, לְעָלָיו - "And every open vessel which has no covering tied over it shall also be unclean".

Rashi explains that Scripture is speaking - יוֹבֵל.
of an earthen vessel which is not receptive of uncleanliness through an unclean thing touching its exterior, but only by it being in its interior. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab. Tal. 68 Hul. 25a, and of Onkelos 69, but he is not quoted by Rashi.

30. **NUM.35** 31 - "You shall not accept payment for the life of a homicide...." Rashi explains that the murderer - ָך פירש במשנה - shall not be freed by monetary payment (as opposed to other consideration). This is the view of the Rabbis in Bab. Keth.37b that you shall not take money to exempt him from the death penalty, but he must be put to death. Onkelos follows this principle and translates - ָך תקריביו מים ַע לווש קָט - "and you shall not accept money to exempt him from death". 71

31. **DEUT.6** 8 - "Bind them as a sign on the hand and wear them as a phylactery on the forehead". According to Rashi - ִה כרסי רבח - means "the Tephillin that are placed upon the arm and - ִה תקריב - are the Tephillin that are placed upon the head."
This is the accepted traditional view of the Rabbis and Onkelos interprets in accordance with tradition with regard to ...  

32. DEUT. 17:8 - "When the issue in any lawsuit is beyond your competence... that is disputed in your Courts. (lit. your gates)".  
Rashi explains that - means that the scholars of the city (the Judges) be of different opinions in that particular matter, the one declaring it unclean, the other clean, the one sentencing the other acquitting. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Sanh. 87a, and Onkelos is in line with their interpretation.  

33. DEUT. 18:8 - "He (lit. the text is in plural) shall have an equal share of good with them, besides what he may inherit from his father's family".  
Rashi says that Scripture teaches us that they (the priests who come to Jerusalem on the festivals as pilgrims but are not in charge of that particular rota) can participate in the hides and the flesh
of the he-goats brought as sin offerings on account of the festivals. One might think that they participate also in sacrifices which are offered not on account of the festivals, as, for instance the continual burnt offerings, and vow and free will offerings. Scripture, however, states - בְּבֵית מַעֲבִיד שַׁלֵּמָה "except the sale of the fathers", i.e. except those things which their ancestors sold to each other in the days of David and Samuel when the system of rotas was established and they made, as it were, an agreement of sale, saying you take this week and I shall take the next week. This is indeed the interpretation of the Rabbis and Onkelos interprets accordingly.

34. DEUT.21:4 - וּבִיאְךָ אֲלֵיהַ תֵּבָא אִם מַעֲבִד אֱלֹהִים אֲלֵיהַ נִמְצָא "And bring it down to a ravine where there is a stream that never runs dry...."
Rashi says - מַעֲבִיד - means - קְשֵׁם שֶּ֛ם וְעֵבֶ֖ד "hard" one that has never been tilled. Rashi's source is Sot.45b and Onkelos, too, follows this interpretation.
35. DEUT. 21:8 - "Accept expiation, 0 Lord, for thy people Israel whom thou hast redeemed".
Rashi says that this statement is said by the "Cohanim" (priests). This explanation is in accordance with the traditional view of the Rabbis and Onkelos translates likewise but Rashi failed to quote him:

36. DEUT. 21:12 - "You shall bring her....pare her nails".
Rashi - means - she shall let grow her nails in order that she may become repulsive to her captor.
Rashi, here, develops the opinion of Rabbi Akiva in Siphere (Piska 212) but Rabbi Eliezer holds - "She shall cut them". Onkelos interprets in accordance with Rabbi Akiva - Nahmanides quotes Onkelos and states that his opinion corresponds to that of Rabbi Akiva.

37. DEUT. 21:20 - "They shall say to the elders of the town.....he is a wastrel and a drunkard".
Rashi, on verse 18, explains that the stubborn and
rebellious son is not liable to the death penalty until he proves to be a thief and eats at one meal a "tartimar" (a weight of half a Maneh) flesh, and drinks half a "log wine".

This is, in fact, the view of the Rabbis in Bab. Tal. 85 and Onkelos 86 follows the traditional interpretation in specifying both meat and wine.

38. **DEUT. 22**11 - "You shall not wear clothes woven with two kinds of yarn, wool and flax together".

Onkelos interprets as follows - מים - "joined" - to exclude the case where one might be wearing two garments (one wool and the other linen) one on top of the other, but not sewn together.

This is too the view of the Rabbis 87 but Rashi failed to remark on Onkelos' addition.

39. **DEUT. 22**18 - "The elders shall take the man and punish him".

Rashi explains that - מלחות - means - lashim - with "lashes" and this is in fact the explanation 88 of the Rabbis in Ket. 46a. Onkelos 89 interprets similarly -"לֹא לְכָּלַעְוֵי כָּלַעְוֵי חָטָאֵת יֶהוּדִיתה."

11 "לֹא תֹּכַּר שֵׁעָרְנוּ תֹּפָר וְשֵׁעָרְנוּ יְהוּדִיתה;"
85 Onkelos 86 follows the traditional interpretation...
87 This is too the view of the Rabbis...
88 This is in fact the explanation...
89 Onkelos 89 interprets similarly...
"You shall bring both of them out to the gate of the town..."

While Onkelos here translates the words - שער העיר - literally - לכניסה על הר הבית - in ch.21 (regarding the rebellious son) Onkelos translates - שעון מקוםו - by לכניסה לבית וארחות - "to the gate of the Beth Din of his place". The fact that in ch.22 he did not add - לכניסה בבית וארחות - to the "gate of the Beth Din" as he did in ch.21, shows that the adulterer is not stoned at the gate of the Beth Din like the rebellious son but rather in - שער בעיר - in the place where he committed adultery. Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to the traditional view, for in Bab.Tal. Ket. 45 the Rabbis are comparing this case to idol worship and as in the case of idol worship the idolater is stoned in - שער בעיר - in the place where he worshipped the idol, i.e. at the gate of the city, so in the case of adultery too, the culprit is stoned at - בחצר שער - and not at the gate of the Beth Din.

Rashi, however, in neither place remarks on Onkelos.
41. Deuteronomy 23:19 - "You shall not allow a common prostitute's fee, or the pay of a male prostitute".

Rashi says that - מותי מעיר - means that if the lover gave her a lamb as the hire of her prostitution it is unfitted for sacrifice. "律ה יב - if one has exchanged a lamb for a dog. Rashi's source is the Mishna Tem.29, 30 and Onkelos also interprets in accordance with tradition.

42. Deuteronomy 23:25 - "When you go into another man's vineyard, you may eat..." Rashi interprets מכתב מ胬ר - Scripture is speaking of a labourer (who is engaged in gathering the grapes). In verse 26 - "when you go into another man's standing corn...." Rashi, here, too, explains that Scripture is referring to a labourer in the field. This is, in fact, the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab. Baba Metsia 87, 89 and Onkelos follows the traditional interpretation.

43. Deuteronomy 24:1 - "When a man has married a wife....and he writes her a note of divorce...."
Onkelos translates — 
"and he should write to her a bill of divorcement and give it into her hands".
This is, in fact, the traditional view that means "GET". Ps. Jonathan takes it as —
Neofiti reads —

"No man shall take millstones or even the upper one alone, in pledge....."
Rashi interprets as follows —

i.e. if one comes to demand a pledge through the court for his debt he should not take as a pledge anything by which food is prepared. This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab.Tal. Baba Metsia 113b and Onkelos follows the tradition that — "life" here means — (life-sustaining) "food". In other words the creditor should not take as a pledge anything by which food is prepared.

"When a man is found to have kidnapped a fellow-countryman, an Israelite, and to have treated him
harshly and sold him...

According to Rashi - רָעַת עָלָיו - means that the kidnapper is not liable to death penalty until he uses him (as a slave). Rashi’s source is Siphre and Onkelos alludes to the traditional view for he translates - יִהְיֶה בָּא - רָעַת עָלָיו - and "makes merchandize of him". In other words using him as a slave.

According to Rashi - והיה אֵלָיו גֵּר וְאֶלֶף חָלָם אֵת רֹעֶשׁ - "Pay him his wages on the same day, before sunset, for he is poor and his heart is set on them". According to Rashi - והיה אֵלָיו גֵּר וְאֶלֶף חָלָם אֵת רֹעֶשׁ - means for the sake of this hire he exposes his life even unto death he climbs up a steep staircase or hangs on to a high tree to do his work. This is, in fact, the interpretation of the Siphre and Onkelos in a concise manner follows the traditional view - "and for the sake of this hire, he is sacrificing himself". Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum interpret similarly; Neofiti, also, reads -...
47. DEUT. 24:16 - נָא הוּא נְתֵנָה אֱלֹהִים לֵוֹבַעַג
"Fathers shall not be put to death for their children nor children for their fathers......."
Rashi gives the following interpretation - Fathers shall not die by the evidence of their children.  
This is too, the interpretation of the Siphre Piska 147 namely that Scripture is referring here to the law of evidence  
and not about the "sins of the fathers". Onkelos 108 follows the traditional view.

48. DEUT. 26:13 - וְאִמְרֵה לְהוֹרֵךְ בֵּרוֹרֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִן הַבָּרֶכֶת
"Then you shall declare before the Lord Your God:
I have rid my house of the tithe......"
Rashi, in following the Siphre 109 explains that Scripture is speaking of - המעשר שֵנִי - "the second tithe" which is termed - וְעֵשֶׂר (cf.Lev. 27:30 and Rashi thereon) Onkelos, too, interprets in accordance with tradition - וְעֵשֶׂר לֶדֶם - 'alav -  הקומ קוהי, only, it has not been interpreted as...
49. DEUT. 26:14 — "I have not eaten any of the tithe while in mourning, nor have I rid myself of it for unclean purposes...."

Rashi explains that from here we may derive that "sacred gifts" are forbidden to an [a technical term for the near relative of a deceased, from the period of death to burial]. This is, in fact, the halachic derivation of the Rabbis in Siphre and Onkelos interprets accordingly — לָא אֲכַלְתִּי בַּעַל מְוָנָה לֵאמֹר בָּרָעָה."

50. DEUT. 33:10 — "They offer thee the smoke of sacrifice, and offering on the altar".

According to Rashi — לָא — means — דֵּרֶךְ "a burnt offering", which is entirely ( כָּל יְדֵי ) consumed on the altar. The Talmud, too, in Bab. Yoma 26a takes — לָא — as — דֵּרֶךְ "burnt offering", and Onkelos interprets likewise — לָא — (he translates — דֵּרֶךְ — by — כָּל יְדֵי — "whole" — for a burnt offering is consumed totally).
In the case where Rashi follows one tanaite opinion and Onkelos another, Rashi never adds that Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to the other opinion. Here are a few examples to illustrate this point.

1. EX.21 22-23

"When in the case of a brawl, a man knocks against a pregnant woman... whenever hurt is done, you shall give life for life".

Rashi writes that "our Rabbis differ as to the explanation of the text - השות התשה - life for life. There are some authorities who hold that it actually signifies life for life, and others who hold that it only means monetary compensation". This is the argument between the Rabbis and Rabbi Judah the Prince. Onkelos who translates - ננו והנשו - appears to follow the view of the Rabbis. Rashi, however, does not concern himself to say that Onkelos is in line with the view of the Rabbis.

2. Ex.22 27

"You shall not revile God".

Rashi explains that here we have the prohibition of blasphemy (cf. LEV. 24:16) and the prohibition of
cursing a judge(who is also termed \( \text{כmares נל} \) - cf. EX.22\(^7\)). Rashi, here, had fused the opinions of Rabbi Ishmael\(^6\) who holds \( \text{כmares לנון} \) - of non-divine reference (\( \text{לנון} \)) and Rabbi Akiva who holds \( \text{כmares לנון} \) - here to be \( \text{כmares ישיר} \) - (referring to God). Onkelos,\(^7\) here, follows the opinion of Rabbi Ishmael: \( \text{כmares לנון נל} \). Rashi, however, does not concern himself to say that Onkelos is like Rabbi Ishmael.\(^8\)

3. LEV.6\(^3\) - \( \text{ליבר} \) \( \text{כמך כדו בד} \)
"The priest having donned his linen robe..."
Onkelos translates - \( \text{נברא דدعاء בון וכרום} \). By translating - \( \text{כרום} \) - in plural, Onkelos intended to include the view of Rabbi Johanaan, i.e. \( \text{ידיימ נ(hero) ישיר} \) - for the removal of the ashes the Cohen needs the four garments.\(^9\) Resh Lakish, on the other hand believes that the Cohen should wear only two garments (\( \text{עיין - shirt, and - קינון - trousers} \) as in fact is stated in the text itself.\(^10\)

4. LEV.10\(^9\) - \( \text{לעקר ה' תשת ותקנובך} \) - "You and your sons with you shall not drink wine or strong drink".
Rashi explains - \( \text{לעקר והכזרא} \) "do not drink
wine in a manner that exposes you to its intoxicating force". (i.e. the second word - רכיב - is defining the first word - י" -). This is the interpretation of the Rabbis in Siphra 11 (Piska 35) that the word רכיב - is not intended to include other drinks but just to define the manner in which a Cohen transgresses if he drinks wine. (י"(א"ב' רכיב שכרות). Onkelos, however, translates - 'Do not drink wine and (other) drinks". It appears that he follows Rabbi Judah 12 who holds that other drinks too are forbidden to the Cohen. Rashi, however, does not point out that Onkelos 14 is in agreement with Rabbi Judah.

5. LEV.16 "And the Lord spoke to Moses after the death of Aaron's two sons, who died when they offered illicit fire..."

Onkelos translates - 'when they offered a strange fire before the Lord". There is an argument in Siphra (Parasha 1) between Rabbi Josi Hagalili who holds that Aaron's sons died because they entered into the Holy of Holies, and Rabbi Akiva who holds 16 that the cause of their death was because they offered a"strange fire". Onkelos 17 who adds - as an object of the verb - בקריבתא -
shows clearly that he holds like his teacher Rabbi Akiva.

In Bab. Tal. Keri 18 11a, there are several expositions to our passage. Rabbi Akiva holds that Scripture is speaking of a Canaanite handmaid who has paid part only of her ransom, so that she is partly a שבורה and partly a בור. Rabbi Ishmael holds that Scripture is speaking of a Canaanite handmaid who is "betrothed" to a Hebrew slave. Ps. Jonathan translates that Scripture is speaking of a Canaanite who is a handmaid and simultaneously a (partially) free woman. In other words he follows Rabbi Akiva's view. The fact that Onkelos translates only - הדָּוָה אִמָּה - "handmaid" shows that he holds like Rabbi Ishmael. 19
7. LEV.19:2 - "You shall rise in the presence of grey hairs, give honour to the aged".
Rashi explains that - מאון שבעת תכשיט ורחבוד בן,f which might lead one to think that reverence is likewise due to an uncultured old man, therefore, Scripture says - "which denotes only one who has acquired wisdom. Rashi here seems to follow the opinion of the Rabbis, (Bab.Tal.Kid.32b) who hold that - "old age" alone is not enough; he must acquire wisdom too. Onkelos interprets as follows - מי רמס רסמר בכולת אים who theorises (i.e. studies the law) - תכשיט ורחבוד בן. It appears that Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Josi that even a young man who has acquired Torah should be respected, (הסבך דסבך אמסל) but he also adds that even a - "an old man, you should honour which is in fact the opinion of Isi ben Judah. No comment, however, on Onkelos from Rashi.

8. NUM.5:28 - "But if a woman has not let herself become defiled.... she will bear her child".
Rashi interprets as follows - לנהו -if hitherto she used to bear children in pain, she will from now bear with ease, if up till now she used to bear "black"
(ugly) children, from now on she will have "white" (beautiful) children. Rashi follows here the opinion of Rabbi Ishmael in Siphre, but Rabbi Akiva holds that if she was barren she shall from now on conceive. Onkelos, however, follows Rabbi Akiva.

NUM.6:11 - "The priest shall offer... and shall make expiation for him". Rashi interprets - מיעוט תועה על הנلوم - to mean that the man has not been on his guard against defilement of a corpse. Rabbi Elazar ha-Kapper said his sin was because he had afflicted himself by abstaining from the enjoyment of wine. These two interpretations occur in Siphre (Piska 30). Onkelos, is in accordance with the first view (which is Rabbi Ishmael's view).
In Group A we have shown that Onkelos contradicts the current Halacha. This also holds true of Rashi who interprets several texts either 1) not in accordance with traditional Halacha or 2) in places where the tannaitic Rabbis were at variance, Rashi interprets against the accepted ruling of the Talmud. Before we set out Rashi's reason for doing so we shall give first the following examples to illustrate the above two points.

1. LEV.13

"When the priest examines him...if the sore has faded and has not spread in the skin the priest shall pronounce him clean".

Rashi explains - "Consequently, if it remains in its true colour or if it has spread he is unclean". His interpretation is not in line with the Mishna, as Nahmanides rightly remarked that Rashi's conclusion is correct according to the Peshat of the text, but contrary to the Mishna in Negaim 1. 3, namely if the sore remains in its true colour he is clean.
2. Again DEUT. 4:34 - "Or did even a god attempt to come and take a nation...."

This is also Rashi's interpretation and therefore here is - לֵילֵי. According, however, to the Rabbis and Onkelos (וֹנֵקְלֹס) the name - יִשְׂרָאֵל is - שִׂירֵי.

Sometimes, Rashi states clearly that the "Derash Halacha" of the Rabbis is unacceptable as it does not fit in with the sense of the text. For this reason, too, when he is dissatisfied with the way the current Halacha is being deduced, he does not hesitate to put side by side his own halachic interpretation with that of the Rabbis. Rashi believes that his halachic deductions are within the framework of the Peshat of the text, and that the two methods are equally legitimate and fruitful of results.

Rashi, as said in our Midrashic Section, Group E (f) had to cater not only for the old school of thought which cared about "Midrashic exegesis" (whether Derash Halacha or Derash Aggadah) but
also for the new school of thought which considered "Peshat exegesis" as paramount for the understanding of the text.

3. Thus again in EX.12:4 - "But if a household is too small for one lamb".

Rashi explains - "Now, if so, a small household does not have a lamb. Why are we mentioning another household? So that if there is another household that is too small, then let him and his neighbour etc. This is what these words imply according to the Peshat of the text. But there is also a derivation from it of an halachic character, that the text teaches us that after they have formed themselves into a group, they may reduce their number by withdrawing from the party and
register themselves for a different lamb; but this
must be done only whilst the lamb is alive and not
after it has been slaughtered". More examples of this nature where Rashi is stressing the
importance of "Peshat Halacha" together with that of "Derash Halacha" can further be seen:

EX.12 2; EX.12 10; EX.21 28; EX.22 8; EX.23 2; EX.23 5; EX.29 36;
EX.34 20; LEV.4 3; LEV.5 13; LEV.13 52; LEV.15 3; LEV.16 2;
LEV.19 3; LEV.19 5; LEV.19 15; s.v - י"ע; LEV.20 9;
LEV.20 21; LEV.24 3; LEV.25 14; LEV.25 15; LEV.25 24;
NUM.19 9; NUM.19 16; NUM.31 23; NUM.35 25; DEUT.16 15;
DEUT.22 1; DEUT.22 26.

Furthermore, Rashi believed that the "Peshat Halacha" is paramount for the understanding of the
text and therefore it should not be ignored nor considered of subordinate nature to the "Derash Halacha". For this reason, too, where there is a halachic dispute in the Mishna or the Talmud as to how a scriptural text ought to be explained, Rashi follows the view that is more fitting with
the Peshat of the text, although it is not the accepted halachic ruling of the Talmud. Here are a few examples to illustrate this point.

4. EX.12⁹ - "You are not to eat.....but roasted, head, shins and entrails".
Rashi has this to say - "One roasts the paschal lamb all in one, with its head and with its legs and with its inward parts and one places its entrails inside it after having rinsed them". The last statement that the entrails, also should be placed inside it, is against the accepted Halacha, for it is the view of Rabbi Jose, the Galilean, whilst Rabbi Akiva, whose view is followed¹² (הלכה כרבי עקיבא ממחניכו) holds that the entrails were to be roasted outside the body.

5. Again EX.21⁶ - "And his master shall Pierce his ear with an awl".
Rashi explains that not only a slave's ear ought to be pierced but also that of - (one who sold himself through destitution, having
committed no theft). But once again, this is only the minority opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who holds that the ear of the - חידר עבד - has also to be pierced, but according to the accepted opinion of the Rabbis the ear of the - שעובר עבד - should not be pierced.

6. EX. 21 - "The owner of the pit shall pay...."15

Rashi explains - יָּרְאֵה תַּכֵּלָה חַּבֵּר שֵׁם צֶּדַּק לְעֹד אֱלֹהִים שֶׁל שְׁנֵי שִׁיָּרָה לְעֹד. "This means the one who occasioned the damage.

Although the pit was not his - for he dug in the public thoroughfare - scripture regards him as its owner". This is in fact the view of Rabbi Ishmael, but Rashi ignored the accepted view of Rabbi Akiva.

7. EX. 22 - "In every case of law breaking involving an ox... which may be claimed....."
Rashi explains - "Our Rabbis explained that no oath can be imposed upon the bailee unless he admits a part of the other's claim asserting that so and so much I owe you and the rest has been stolen from me".

This explanation is against the accepted view of Rabbi Chijah Ben Joseph who holds - "Our Rabbis explained that no oath can be imposed upon the bailee unless he admits a part of the other's claim asserting that so and so much I owe you and the rest has been stolen from me".

In other words the last paragraph is misplaced and the words - (which intimate the oath) refer to the subject of loans (EX. 22:24).

8. NUM. 5:19 - וְהַשְּׁבוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ לְךָ - "And the priest shall put the woman on oath...."

On the words - והשבו אתixo - Rashi follows the view of Rabbi Chanina Ben Gamliel 19 who holds - "(from a negative statement you deduce its converse, the positive statement) - but the accepted view of the Talmud is that of Rabbi Meir who holds that on the contrary - מוכן - לא עשה שמעת כה -"
9. Again NUM. 5\textsuperscript{24} - Rashi, in his interpretation follows the view of Rabbi Simeon\textsuperscript{20} with regard to the proceedings of the drink - ordeal of the suspected adulteress mentioned in verses 24, 26 and 27 - and not according to the fixed Halacha of the Sages, who argue with Rabbi Simeon.

10. Again NUM. 9\textsuperscript{10} - Rashi interprets the words - "Away on a long journey" - according to Rabbi Eliezer\textsuperscript{21} and not according to the accepted view of Rabbi Akiva\textsuperscript{22} who holds that the man in question is on a long journey and unable to reach the Temple for the slaughtering of the paschal lamb at the proper time.

11. Again DEUT.21\textsuperscript{22} - Rashi follows the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer\textsuperscript{23} who holds - that all who are put to death by stoning must afterwards be hanged. But the Sages, according to whom the Halacha is fixed, hold that only in cases of blasphemy and idolatry, do both penalties apply\textsuperscript{24}. 
It is interesting to note that in most of these cases enumerated above, E. Mizrahi points out that Rashi follows the view which is more in accordance with the Peshat of the text and its setting. 25

Furthermore, Rashi was fully aware that the purpose of his commentary is not meant to deduce Halachot but rather to afford some intellectual insight into the depth of the biblical text. His prime concern is not whether he deviates from the "Derash Halacha" or from the accepted ruling of the Talmud but rather to impart the real sense of the text. Thus in EX.22 12

"If it has been mauled by a wild beast, he shall bring it in as evidence...."

Rashi explains - "Let him bring witnesses that the animal was torn in pieces involuntarily and he shall be freed from liability".

In the Mechilta, 26 there are, in fact, several
halachic interpretations given by various Rabbis, but Rashi selects the above interpretation. Most likely, as said above, because it does the least violence to the Peshat of the text.

In conclusion Rashi's method in deviating here and there from the current Halacha is fully understandable.
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After having analysed the evidence to support the classification presented in the Introduction, we have now to attempt to explain Rashi's attitude for quoting Onkelos in halachic matters in a few instances only, see Groups C and D, whilst on the whole ignoring him (see Groups A, B, E and F). "By Onkelos" is here meant our present Targum Onkelos, without regard to the problem of the relationship of that Targum to Onkelos Hager, its traditionally reputed author. Having said that let us now delve into Onkelos' own reason for interpreting sometimes according to the Halacha and sometimes literally. Perhaps the answer to this question might throw some light on Rashi's attitude which is the main concern of this thesis. This question has indeed occupied the mind of several scholars of earlier generations. The first one who dealt with this question was Solomon Judah Rapaport. He believed that matters which have to be dealt with by the Beth Din, Onkelos translated literally, e.g. EX.21\(^{24}\) - "Eye for eye". DEUT.22\(^{14}\). These matters are in the hands of the Beth Din and they would undoubtedly know that an "eye for an eye" is not meant literally but refers to monetary compensation. But in matters such as separation of milk and meat, traditionally linked to the text of EX.23\(^{19}\) - which concerns the general public,
Onkelos was careful in translating them according to the Halacha, for a layman needs the guidance of the Halacha. Rapaport's opinion was accepted by Rabbi Hirsch Chajes in his book Imrei Binah. Although this explanation at first glance appears to be plausible, nevertheless it is impossible to accept it, for in several instances Onkelos elaborately incorporated into his translation several Halachot, which are in part the province of the Beth Din, and not for the man in the street. e.g. Deut. 21:8; Lev. 19:20; Deut. 21:20; Deut. 24:1; Ex. 22:10; Deut. 24:16; Num. 5:17; Ex. 22:22; Ex. 24:15; Ex. 23:18 (the latter example has to do with the priests who might be expected to be fully aware of their duties, yet nevertheless, Onkelos inserted the halachic interpretation). One needs only to look in Group E to see many more examples of this kind.

N. Adler in Netinah-Lager gives a different answer to this puzzling question. According to him it is only in cases where the Sadducees had denied the interpretations of the oral law, that Onkelos endeavoured to explain "halachic verses" according to tradition. Thus the public would not be misled by the views of the Sadducees, or their successors. This theory would have been more persuasive had we
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had other sources about the "halachic expositions" (supposedly) of the Sadducees than the Targum Onkelos, but since there are no other substantial records to this effect are we to assume (with Adler) that every time Onkelos explained a text according to tradition, we have here an echo of argument between the Sadducees and the Pharisees? Furthermore, even in places where we actually know that there were arguments, between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, Onkelos, nevertheless, translates several verses literally and not according to the Halacha, despite Adler's claim. To illustrate this point here are a few examples. DEUT. 19

"You shall treat him as he intended to treat his fellow". The Mishna Macc. ch.1. gives the following explanation. We should do to him (the false witness) as he had intended to do, but not as he had actually done. Hence, if on the perjuror's evidence the defendant has already been executed, he (the false witness) should not be put to death. But if the defendant has been saved in time, then the false witness must die. The Mishna goes on to say, that although this is the traditional view, the Sadducees argued with the Rabbis. One would expect thus Onkelos, on Adler's premises, to add a word or two to adjust this verse in question with the
Pharisees' view. But in actual fact Onkelos translates it literally. Similarly LEV.16 "And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Eternal..." The traditional interpretation is that the incense must be placed in the censer only when the High Priest is inside the Holy of Holies. The Sadducees, however, believed that the incense must be placed in the censer before the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies. Once again, if Onkelos were concerned to exclude the Sadducees' view, one would expect him to interpret this verse according to the traditional view, but in point of fact he translates it literally.

Again, NUM.27 "When a man dies leaving no son, his patrimony shall pass to his daughter". The Rabbis interpret this to mean that if a father dies, the son inherits his estate and not the daughter. If on the other hand, the son dies, then his daughter (son's daughter) inherits and not the sister (of the deceased). This is the traditional view but the Sadducees hold that if the son dies, then his sister has the right to inherit and not her brother's daughter. Here, too, Onkelos translates the verse literally, and he did not attempt to add even one word to align the words "and have no son" with the traditional interpretation.

N. Adler in Netinah-Lager gave two further
reasons to the above question. 1) Onkelos interpreted certain verses in accordance with the Halacha, in those cases only where the layman was casual through ignorance of tradition. 2) Onkelos added certain "Halachot" in those places only where the tannaitic Rabbis were at variance, and Onkelos decided to interpret the verse in accordance with one opinion.

These two points, however, need no refutation, as in several cases the matter is one reserved to the Beth Din, and not the concern of the layman, and despite this Onkelos interprets them according to the Halacha. Similarly there are other cases where there are no arguments among the Rabbis as to how the "halachic verses" should be explained, and nevertheless Onkelos inserted "halachic points" in his translation, e.g. Deut.21:8; Deut.22:18; Lev.19:20; Num.5:17; Ex.24:5.

It appears to me, that the following considerations might help us in comprehending Rashi's attitude to Onkelos' Targum.

1). Firstly, Rashi was fully aware that in several cases, Onkelos contradicted the current Halacha as developed in Babylonia, as can be seen from Groups A and B. Rashi, therefore, felt that it would be appropriate to quote only the accepted Halacha, and not Onkelos' Targum.
Although Rashi himself contradicts the Halacha as we have shown in Group G nevertheless the cases should not be considered analogous, for Onkelos' Targum, (and other Targumim) had a definite and permanent function in the liturgy of the Synagogue. The weekly reading of the scriptural passages, in the Synagogue was followed by an oral interpretation in Aramaic. The person who did the interpretation was called Meturgeman. The task of the Meturgeman was to render faithfully the written text in accordance with the traditional Halacha. In this the position of the Targumim differs from that of Rashi, for although admittedly, he deviates, too, from the accepted Halacha, yet nevertheless his exegeses were never part of the public service.

2). From the above cited "groups" one can see the great confusion which exists in Targum Onkelos. For now he translates in accordance with the Halacha (Group E), now against the Halacha (Group A), and now again he translates literally (Group B). Therefore, perhaps this confusion caused Rashi, on the whole, to avoid citing this Targum where halachic issues are involved.

3). Rashi believed, too, that Onkelos himself had before him some sort of Mishnayoth (though not in
the form we have them) and no doubt too, "halachic expositions" of Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Ishmael. Consequently, there was no need for Rashi to quote Onkelos, as the latter himself drew on earlier sources also available to Rashi.

4). One has to bear in mind, too, that Rashi "did not write prefaces to his works setting forth the contents of the book and the method to be pursued". He did not organise nor systematise his commentary on the Torah. He drew inspiration from different sources without quoting them. The Talmud, Midrash and the Targumim were summarised or used selectively for erecting his great edifice. In some instances he even interpreted a "halachic passage" not in accordance with the accepted opinion in the Talmud. In fact he was concerned with systematisation, as his prime concern was to facilitate, and elucidate a text obscure to the student of the Torah for whose sake his commentary was written. Bearing this in mind it would be simpler to comprehend Rashi's attitude for quoting Onkelos unnecessarily (as in Group D) and sometimes not quoting him at all though he corresponds within the framework of the Halacha (as in Group E).
5). Another factor which caused Rashi to ignore the "halachic expositions" of the Targum may have been the lack of knowing Onkelos' sources. Although, we are told in Bab.Meg.3\textsuperscript{a} that "Onkelos translated the Torah at the dictation\textsuperscript{23} of Rabbi Eliezer", nevertheless the authenticity of this statement is questionable, for in several instances Onkelos interpreted against Rabbi Eliezer's opinions.\textsuperscript{24} The authenticity of the above statement is further weakened when one takes into consideration the "strong terms\textsuperscript{25} Rashi has used against Onkelos' interpretations.\textsuperscript{26} Furthermore, even if we accept this statement at its face value, nevertheless, Rabbi Eliezer\textsuperscript{27} belonged to the school of Shammai and the "fixed Halacha" of the Talmud is to follow the opinion of the school of Hillel. For these reasons Rashi ignored to a great extent Onkelos' Targum.

6). In order to understand Rashi's attitude towards the Targum Onkelos, it is of great importance to delve briefly into the origin of the Targumim. The conventional account may be here cited uncritically, since it is the way in which the situation will have been understood by Rashi himself. With the return of the Jews from Babylon, Aramaic superseded Hebrew as the spoken language of the unlearned and Hebrew became exclusively the language of learning, and the Synagogue service. Nehemiah, in ch.13, verse 24, deplores the lack of knowledge of Hebrew among the Jews of Palestine of his time. Because of this it was felt necessary to make the Scriptures available to the
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unscholarly who were unable to understand the Hebrew original. Later on, the weekly reading of the scriptural passages, in the Synagogue, followed by an oral interpretation in Aramaic soon became an integral part of the services. The person who did the interpretation was called "Meturgeman (interpreter). Later, and especially in the diaspora, the lack of knowledge of Hebrew, became prevalent and the position of "Meturgeman" became a communal office. There were several definite rules as to how the "Meturgeman" was to proclaim the Targum. The reader should read to the "Meturgeman" verse by verse from the Pentateuchal reading, because of the legal and religious content of the law. The "Meturgeman" had complete freedom to interpret freely and to depart from the language of the original "covenant" in order to make the meaning of the text clear to his contemporaries (providing he keeps to the rules laid down by the Halacha). For this reason he would mention many Midrashim and Halachot that he deemed necessary for complete understanding of the text. When the ban was lifted and a standard version of Onkelos' Targum became known, no doubt the "Meturgemonim" made extensive use of it. But most probably as the Targum Onkelos was originally a literal translation, each Meturgeman was forced to take a more elastic view of his obligation and added several Halachot and Midrashim that he deemed
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necessary for his congregants. On one Sabbath he might expound the text according to the conditions and requirements of his own age, and at another he might translate it literally. Everything depended on the kind of audience he had and their ability to grasp the deeper meaning of the text. In time, somehow, these Halachot and Midrashim were inserted into Onkelos' Targum. Because of the various "Meturgemanim" and their interpretation of the Halacha one can now understand why in some places Onkelos' halachic expositions do not tally with the current Halacha, (as in Groups A and C): One can further understand the reason for several "halachic texts" being interpreted literally (Group B), while some correspond with the Halacha (Groups D and E). This was so because it was left completely to the judgment of the "Meturgemanim" who expounded the text according to the time and age in which they lived. Having said this, one can further understand that, because of the various "Meturgemanim" and the "confusion" of Halacha which exist in this Targum, Rashi's principle of not paying full attention to Onkelos' Targum, is understandable. Bearing in mind the foregoing analysis. Rashi's understanding of the development of the Targum goes beyond any simplistic acceptance of it as being identical with the Aramaic version made by Onkelos himself under the supervision of Rabbi Eliezer— which account he certainly knew from Tal.Meg, p.3a.
As said in our General Introduction, Rashi made extensive use of Onkelos, not only in the fields of Halacha, grammar and Peshat, but also in the field of Haggadah.

Several scholars believed that Onkelos' Targum is just a "literal translation" and has nothing to offer in the field of Haggadah. E. Schurer speaks of the "painful literalness" of Onkelos' Targum.

R.J. Roberts is also of the opinion that "in the main the translation is literal", except passages, such as GEN.49\textsuperscript{10} and NUM.24\textsuperscript{17} which are messianically interpreted. R.H. Pfeiffer, taking a non-commital stand, remarks that "Onkelos is strictly literal except for some paraphrases of the poems and some prose sections".

These scholars, however, failed to account for the free translation and midrashic elements found in Onkelos' Targum. A. Berliner whose work appeared in 1884\textsuperscript{4} was definitely mistaken in providing only a list of seventeen examples of Haggadot found in Targum Onkelos on the book of GENESIS. G. Vermes,\textsuperscript{5} rightly remarked that this figure is incomplete and that he himself had counted "over sixty haggadic interpretations and increments in this
book (GENESIS) alone, without taking into account anti-anthropomorphic expressions or considering GENESIS 49, an almost completely midrashic chapter. In actual fact, however, no figure is accurate as several hundred examples could be given, when one observes the numerous free translations and haggadic interpretations which this Targum contains. Onkelos usually abridges and modifies the Palestinian Targumim and consequently Onkelos should be studied in the light of the Palestinian tradition, or possibly a Babylonian reworking of it. For Onkelos' Targum, although primarily a Palestinian product, is nevertheless, in its present form, certainly the result of a Babylonian revision. Thus we can account for several Halachot and midrashic elements found in Onkelos which correspond to talmudical tradition.

Although, as said above, some scholars have failed to notice haggadic interpretations in Onkelos, yet it would be misleading to suggest that all scholars have failed to do so. Mediaeval Jewish commentators such as Rashi and Nahmanides were well aware of the midrashic elements found in Onkelos and made use of them in their interpretations of the text. Rashi made extensive use of Onkelos' haggadic interpretations so that, although the latter's interpretations correspond to those of the Mechilta,
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the Midrash Rabbah, the Talmud and other Rabbinic
sources, yet Rashi quoted only from Onkelos, which
leads one to ask why he chose to quote him? In
some instances where Onkelos' haggadic interpretations
differ from those of the Rabbis, Rashi quotes
Onkelos and endeavours to fit his interpretations
with the wording of the text. In some places,
however, Onkelos' haggadic interpretations correspond
to those of the Rabbis and yet Rashi quotes from the
Midrash of the Rabbis and ignores Onkelos. Further­
more, even when the Hebrew text is comprehensible
and does not call for a midrashic interpretation,
yet Rashi has not failed to quote Onkelos' midrashic
interpretation. Onkelos is generally known for his
brevity and conciseness. He is unlike the other
Targumim such as Ps. Jonathan and the Palestinian
Targum which elaborate on the text, but rather one
or two words suffice for him to explain an obscure
text, or to allude to a midrashic interpretation.
Rashi, however, who was fully aware of Onkelos' method,
realised that the latter's brevity was simply inadequate
to convey the full meaning of the haggadic interpretation.
Rashi, therefore, after quoting Onkelos, bridges the
gap by supplying the haggadic interpretation of the
Rabbis, thus fusing Onkelos' Targum with the Midrash.
Rashi revered Onkelos to the extent that in some
instances, he rejected the haggadic interpretation
INTRODUCTION

of the Rabbis and accepted only that of Onkelos. Sometimes, however, despite his reverence and respect towards the Targum Onkelos and the Midrash of the Rabbis, he nevertheless refutes their interpretations. According to Rashi, this is mainly due to the fact that he cannot make their interpretation fit in exactly with the words of the text, or because their interpretation does not conform with the rules of grammar.

Having made this short survey of Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos' Targum and before presenting it in detail, a division of the main points regarding midrashic interpretations into 5 groups can be made. This will facilitate comprehension of Rashi's utilization and neglect of the haggadic comments of Onkelos.

The groups are as follows:

**Group A.** Rashi quotes Onkelos for no apparent purpose since the latter's "haggadic interpretations" occur in the Midrash.

**Group B.** When Onkelos' haggadic interpretations differ from those of the Midrash, Rashi quotes Onkelos and fits his interpretations in line with the wording of the text.
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Group C. Onkelos' haggadic interpretations correspond to those of the Rabbis, yet Rashi ignores him and quotes only the Midrash.

Group D. Rashi fuses Onkelos' haggadic interpretations with those of the Rabbis.

Group E. Rashi's exegesis in relation to Peshat and Derash.

This group is subdivided in the following way:

c). Rashi and Peshat.
d). Rashi's occasional reversion to the talmudic concept.
e). Rashi and Derash.
f). Rashi's correlation of Peshat and Derash.
In several instances Rashi quotes Onkelos' haggadic interpretations for no apparent reason as his interpretations occur in the Midrash or other sources of Jewish literature. Here are some examples to illustrate this point.

1. GEN. 4:7 - "If you do well, you are accepted; if not, sin is a demon crouching at the door etc".

Rashi says - Its meaning is as the Targum explains it. "If you will improve your doings, you shall be forgiven etc".

Substantially the same interpretation, however, occurs in the Midrash Rabbah, ch. 22, para. 6 - "Another interpretation reads: if thou doest well, I will forgive thee; but if not, the sin of that man (i.e. thy sin) overflows the brim". In other words, Onkelos and the Midrash see in this verse the assertion of man's free will, able to conquer his evil inclination.

Ps. Jonathan explains it in the same way: "If thou servest well, thy service well, your guilt will be forgiven; but if thou doest not thy service well in this world, thy sin is retained unto the day of the great judgement etc".
2. GEN. 27 - 
"May God extend Japheth's bounds, let him dwell in the tents of Shem".
Rashi says - הבט. The Targum renders the verb by - הבט meaning, "may he extend". יבשת - may He make His Divine presence (Shechinah) dwell in Israel. Rashi, quoted Onkelos for no apparent reason as the same interpretation is given in GEN. Rabbah, ch. 36.8 - הבט. Perhaps Rashi quotes Onkelos since although the Midrash implicitly conveys the notion of "extension" [sc. of the existence of the Temple], it does not contain any word which focuses explicitly on הבט = 'עלית' = 'רחי ב'.

3. GEN. 16:14 - על דןזכר bietet באה לתי רח',
"That is why men call the well Beer-lahai-roi, it lies between Kadesh and Bered".
Rashi says - 바로 נבוש. Understand it as is in the Targum - באה ofrecם כיقيامו עתרה. "The well at which the 6 angel of the living had appeared to her".
The same interpretation occurs in the Midrash GEN.
4.

Rabbah, ch. 45, para. 10 - רבקת בעב דתמרה ר"א דנמא.

Rabbi Joshua ben Nehemiah says, it was through the mediation of an angel.

4. GEN. 20:13 "When God set me wandering from my father's house, I said to her, there is a duty towards me etc". Rashi says - אונקלוס תרגם על שכרהש - Onkelos translates it in his own way. - [carefully transcribed text]

"And it came to pass when the people worshipped idols, God brought me near to worship Him etc". Although it appears that Rashi does not favour Onkelos' interpretation and that is why he proceeds to offer his own, nevertheless, Onkelos' interpretation is in line with that of the Midrash Rabbah, ch. 52, para. 11 - 

when the nations of the world sought to mislead me, the Holy One blessed be He appeared to me and said: - "Go out of thy land".
"To Sarah he said, I have given your brother a thousand pieces of silver, so that your own people may turn a blind eye on it all, and you will be completely vindicated".

Rashi explains... Behold the money (Abimelech gave to Abraham) and respect, will put a covering over the eyes of all who are with you, so that they shall not hold you in light esteem. Rashi goes on to say...

Onkelos translated in a different manner, and the words of the text fit in with the Targum in the following way: Behold here you have a "garment of honour", on account of my eyes which have gazed upon you and upon all who are with you etc....

There are midrashic explanations, but I have explained the exact meaning of the text. Rashi, however, failed to notice or, at least did not remark, that Onkelos is in line with the midrashic interpretation...
6. GEN. 22:2 - "...God said, take your son Isaac, your only son, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah". Rashi explains as follows: The land of Moriah is Jerusalem, but our Rabbis have explained that it is called "Moriah" because from it (the Temple) - הַיּוֹרֵא-אֱלֹהִים - instruction came forth to Israel. Onkelos translates it by לאוין אלוהים - "the land of the Divine Service". He takes it as referring to the offering of incense brought in the Temple in which there was myrrh and other spices. Here, too, the Midrash quotes, in juxtaposition interpretation of the Rabbis with that of Onkelos.

7. GEN. 22:14 - "And Abraham named that place "Hashem - Yireh". The saying is: In the mountain of the Lord it was provided." Rashi says: מעברא ומיכהש... שבע יראת א' ומיכהש... that place is named "Hashem - Yireh" because when the offering of incense was brought in the Temple, God provided a place for it.
Its real meaning is as the Targum renders it; the Lord will choose and select for Himself His place to make his Shechinah reside in it and for sacrifices to be offered there etc. The midrashic explanation is: "May God see this binding of Isaac every year to forgive Israel and to save them from punishment". Here, too, both interpretations occur side by side in the Midrash.  

8. GEN.26 - "Abimelech came to him from Gerar with Ahuzzath his friend and Phicol the commander of his army". Rashi explains as follows - as the Targum takes it: which means a company formed from his friends, the meaning from. However, there was no need to quote the Targum as the same interpretation occurs in the Midrash GEN. Rabbah, ch.64, para 9 - Rabbi Judah said his name was "Ahuzzath Mereehou", Rabbi Nehemiah said a company formed from his friends.
9. GEN.4910 - "The sceptre shall not pass from Judah...until he comes to Shiloh".
Rashi interprets - שִׁלֹחְךָ - מחזא מעשה משלו, של זה גודל עילית
Shiloh, means the King Messiah, whose will be the kingdom.
Thus, too, does Onkelos render it - מַהְיוּת יְהוָה עַד רֹאית מַעֲשָׂתוֹ עַד לְיוֹדוּתוֹ מִסְּתָר צְדָקָה.
He who exerciseth dominion shall not depart from the house of Judah...until the Messiah comes whose kingdom it is.24
There was no need for Rashi to support himself from Onkelos as in all midrashic literature,25 we find that Shiloh refers to King Messiah.

10. GEN.4911 - "To the Wine he tethers his ass, and the colt of his ass to the red Wine, etc."
Rashi interprets as follows - וְאֵלֶּה - מַעֲשֵׂה בָּנֵי אֵדָה - מַעֲשֵׂה בָּנֵי אֵדָה - אֵלֶּה מַעֲשֵׂה בָּנֵי אֵדָה - מַעֲשֵׂה בָּנֵי אֵדָה
To the Wine he tethers his ass, and the colt of his ass to the red Wine, etc.
Jacob prophesied about the land of Judah that it would run with wine like a fountain etc. But Onkelos translates the verse as having reference to King Messiah - שרכ - the vine symbolises "Israel". - העיר - the city - as Jerusalem. - The vine alludes to "Israel" as the prophet exclaims (JER.2:21) "yet I had planted thee a noble vine". - הבניאת - they will build His Temple, connecting this word with the expression - שער המקדש - (see EZ.40:15). Onkelos further renders this verse in another manner, namely - הבניאת - the vine represents the righteous. - הבניאת - those who occupy themselves with the Torah by teaching it, with an allusion to the idea expressed in JUDGES (ch.5:10). "Ye that ride on white asses" etc.

There was no need for Rashi to quote Onkelos as the latter's interpretations occur also in the Midrash Tanhuma, almost word by word. The Tanhuma offers another explanation that the verse refers to the study of the Torah. In GEN. Rabbah 98:9 - הבניאת - is also taken in the sense of - רם שבחר - "strong sons will spring from him" - which is the second interpretation of Onkelos. We may, however, say that although Rashi was fully aware that Onkelos' midrashic
interpretations correspond to those of the Rabbis, nevertheless, for the sake of the student of the Targum, Rashi preferred to quote Onkelos and fitted his interpretation in line with the text.

11. GEN. 49:22 - "Joseph is a fruitful tree by a spring with branches climbing over the wall".
Rashi interprets - "בְּרֵית יוֹסֵף...בּוֹנֵות אִצּוּרִית וְיָכוֹרֶת לֶשׁ שְׁרוֹץ".
The translation of Onkelos of - "בּוֹנֵות אִצּוּרִית - is "two tribes will come out of his sons", etc., and according to this Scripture writes - (and not - בְּרֵית - as one would expect) with reference to the women of Manasseh - the daughters of Zelophehad who received a portion of land on both sides of the Jordan. And in accordance with this paraphrase, the Targum translates the preceding words - by - בְּרֵית - my son Joseph shall increase and become two tribes connecting - by - בְּרֵית - fruitfulness and increase.

Onkelos' interpretation is also alluded to in GENESIS Rabbah ch.98. para. 18 - בּוֹנֵות אִצּוּרִית וְיָכוֹרֶת לֶשׁ שְׁרוֹץ.
"You find that when Joseph went forth to rule over Egypt, daughters of kings used to look at him through the lattices and throw bracelets. Said the Holy One blessed be He to him: You did not lift up your eyes and look at them. By your life I will give your daughters an ornament in the Torah; what is the ornament? 'A section'. The Midrash is obviously alluding to the daughters of Zelophehad who descended from Joseph and received a portion of the land. (See NUM. 27:1-11).

12. GEN. 49:24

"But their bow was splintered by the Eternal and the sinews of their arms were torn apart".

Rashi explains - יִתְגַּדְדוּ בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה סְפַּרַּכְתָּם רָעַב וְהוֹנַּא אֵשֶׁת בָּשָׂר וּשְׁלֵחוּ אֹתָם לְפַרְקֵי הָאָרֶץ... אֲנִיָּהוּ אֵשֶׁת כְּלֶם כְּלֶם בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל.

This refers to the placing of the king's signet ring on his hand etc. Onkelos also translates it in this manner - מְלָטָה בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה עַל בָּשָׂר... and therefore gold was placed on his arms. This is, too, the interpretation of the Midrash Hagadol; that is referring to the signet ring.
13. GEN. 49.26a - "And the blessings of your father are stronger than the blessings of the everlasting hills and the bounty of the eternal hills..."

Rashi explains - "وفر טאות לך, כי הבוגר הוא תיאודס לוס - \( \text{רב תאות, כי הבוגר הוא תיאודס לוס} \)". The word - \( \text{תחואות} \) - means - boundaries. It is connected with the verb - \( \text{תאות} \) - in NUM. 36. "And ye shall mark out the ends unto the entrance of Hamath". Onkelos translates - \( \text{תאות} \) - in the sense of \( \text{תאות} \) desire and longing, and takes - \( \text{תחואות} \) - as a figurative expression for "the great ones" like (I SAMUEL II.8). The "pillars of the earth" meaning the righteous of the earth - referring to the blessings which his mother so much desired, that she forced him to take steps to obtain them.

For no apparent reason Rashi quotes Onkelos as the same interpretation occurs in the Midrash.

14. GEN. 49.26b - "They shall be on the head of Joseph, on the brow of the prince among his brothers".

Rashi takes - \( \text{לפיון} \) - as Onkelos interprets it - \( \text{לפיון כהן לƗוורו, "the one who was separated from his brothers".} \)
This, too, is the Midrash's interpretation - "אִמְ UIB אִמְ UIB - i.e. his brothers have shunned him. There are, however, another two interpretations in the Midrash:

1. Rabbi Isaac of Magdala interpreted: Thou art the crown of thy brethren. In other words, taking - in the sense - crown.

2. Another interpretation: Rabbi Levi said: He was literally a Nazarite, for during the whole of the twenty-two years that he did not see his brothers he tasted no wine. Perhaps, this is why Rashi quoted Onkelos to show that he is not in favour of these last two midrashic interpretations.

15. GEN.49:27 - "Benjamin is a ravening wolf: In the morning he devours the prey, in the evening he snatches a share of the spoil". Rashi explains - "Even after the sun of Israel will have set, through Nebuchadnezzar, who will exile them to Babel - he will
divide the spoil, viz., Mordechai and Esther, who will be of the tribe of Benjamin, will divide the spoil of Haman". But Onkelos translates it as having reference to - '_PAYMENT אכילה' תכלה "the portions which the priests received of the holy sacrifices in the Temple". 41

These two interpretations occur side by side in the Midrash Tanhuma, GENESIS Rabbah and Rashi brings the second one in the name of Onkelos.

EX. 10:10 - "He (Pharaoh) replied, very well then..., but beware there is trouble in store for you".

Rashi interprets - 'From חוכה אכלה ככלה תכלה את ארץ מכר, באה אחרorraine בראש אכלה ובראש אכלה' 42 Understand this as the Targum takes it: See, the evil you are about to do will turn against you.

The wording of the biblical text is certainly ambiguous and calls for an explanation. The LXX interprets it to mean that an evilness will befall you. 43 Onkelos, however, seems to interpret the text midrashically, i.e. - מכר תכלה אכלה 'measure for measure'.

In this sense, too, the Midrash 44 takes it:-
He (Pharaoh) said to them. It is usual for the young and the old to offer sacrifices; but surely not for children and little ones? He who makes such a request only has one object in mind - to flee. See, ye, therefore, that what you plan - to flee - that shall come back before your face, for you will not depart from here.

17. EX.13:18 - "And the fifth generation of Israelites departed from Egypt".

Rashi explains - "This verse is interpreted as a reference to the fifth generation of Israelites after the destruction of Egypt, in which all the firstborn were slain."

The word - מַשְׁמַרְתּ - means provided with weapons etc. Onkelos, too, translated it by - מַכִּירִים - which signifies made keen [to fight].

Another explanation is: Only one out of five went forth from Egypt, and four parts of the people died during the three days of darkness because they were unworthy of being delivered.

There was no need of quoting Onkelos as the two interpretations occur side by side in the Mechilta.
18. **EX.15** - אָשָּׁר אֶלֶּה, וּכְאֹדֶה גַּאֲזָה

"I will sing to the Lord, for he has risen up in triumph..."

Rashi interprets - **אֶלֶּה גַּאֲזָה - בָּנָר זֶה - וְלָיָּב אָמֶנֶּה**

Understand this as the Targum does: For He is exalted above the self-exalting, i.e. arrogant ones, but real exaltation (supremacy) is His alone.

This is also the interpretation of EXODUS Rabbah 48 Parasha 23, para.13: - **כִּי לָיָּב אֶלֶּה, הַכְּלִיל מַעֲשָׂה וְזֶה**

All things exalt themselves over something else: Darkness exalts itself over the deep etc., and the wind exalts itself over the water etc., and fire exalts itself above the wind and the heavens exalt themselves over the fire, etc., but God is exalted over everything - hence He is highly exalted.

19. **EX.15** - "וְהָנִי, וּמְרָאֶת... אָמַד... וְלָיָּב אֲלִילָמוֹרֵם..."

"The Lord is my refuge and my defence, he has shown himself my deliverer. He is my God, and I will glorify Him."
GROUP A

Rashi explains - "Onkelos translates this in the sense of a dwelling, viz., I will build Him a Temple, as in Isaiah 33:20. Another explanation is that it has the sense of beauty, and the meaning is: I will relate His splendour and praiseworthiness to the inhabitants of the world etc". These two interpretations occur side by side in the Mechilta and Rashi brings the first one in the name of Onkelos.
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come let us deal cleverly with them (i.e. sentencing them to death by water in order that they might not wage war against them) God, therefore, gave the waters this sense of cleverness that they might wage war against the Egyptians.

21. EX.18\(^{11}\) - "Now I know that the Lord is the greatest of all gods, because he has delivered the people from the power of the Egyptians who dealt so arrogantly with them".

Rashi explains - "Understand this as the Targum does: for by that very thing with which the Egyptians thought to destroy Israel were they themselves destroyed - they had thought to destroy them by water and they were themselves destroyed by water". This interpretation, too, occurs in Rabbinic literature.

22. EX.20\(^{5}\) - "You shall not bow down to them... I punish the children for the sins of the fathers to the third and fourth generations of those who hate me".
Rashi explains - לַשְׁנֵי - מְקַמְּרָא, יָסָרָא, מְקַמְּרָא מְקַמְּרָא
אַבְּוִיתַם בְּיִדֵיהֶם, יוֹנֵךְ מַתְדַּרְצֶשׁ שְׁאָלֵה לְשָׁלוֹשׁ
שְׁכֵר אָר לַעֲלֵיָס, כּוֹר וְלָהוּ...
"Render this as the Targum does; when they follow the example of the evil doings of their ancestors; and He keeps the mercy which a person does, to give a reward for it to the thousand generations of that person's descendants." There was no need to quote Onkelos as the same interpretation occurs in the Talmud.

The Israelite women possessed mirrors into which they used to look when they adorned themselves. Even these they did not hesitate to bring as a contribution towards the Tabernacle, etc. This is what it refers to when it states - מְרוּאָת מְצַבָּא - "the mirrors of the women who reared the hosts". And it was for this reason that the laver was made of the mirrors, because it served the purpose of promoting peace between man and wife, etc.
Thus did Rabbi Tanhuma explain the term מראות - (i.e. mirrors and not just appearance or vision). And so does Onkelos render it: "And he made the laver of brass, and its base of brass, of the mirrors of the women who came to pray at the door of the Tabernacle".

NUM.10:31 - "Moses said, do not desert us, I beg you....and you will be our guide". Rashi says - the verb is in the past tense and we have to understand it just as the Targum renders it. You have known our encampments in the wilderness and all the mighty deeds that have been wrought for us you have seen with your own eyes. Another explanation is that the verb is in the future tense: Whatever thing will be hidden from our eyes, you will enlighten our eyes about it. Still another explanation is that the passage means that you will be held in affection by us as our "very eye balls". These three interpretations occur side by side in the Siphre and Rashi quotes the first one in the name of Onkelos.
25. NUM.11:25 - "...as the spirit alighted on them, they fell into a prophetic ecstasy, for the first and only time".

Rashi interprets - "... as the spirit alighted on them, they fell into a prophetic ecstasy, for the first and only time".

They prophesied only that day alone. Thus is the phrase explained in Siphre.61 Onkelos, however, rendered it by - "... and they did not cease, meaning that the gift of prophecy never again departed from them. 62

There was no need for Rashi to quote Onkelos as the same interpretation is given in Bab. Tal. 63 Sanh.17a:

26. NUM.21:18-19 - "The well, which the princes digged..... And from the wilderness to Mattanah; and from Mattanah to Nahaliel."

Rashi says - "The well, which the princes digged..... And from the wilderness to Mattanah; and from Mattanah to Nahaliel."

Understand this as the Targum does:..... and after the well had been given to the Israelites as a gift, it descended with them to the valleys 65.

This is also the interpretation of the Midrash and Rashi quotes it in the name of Onkelos.
27. NUM.22:41 - "In the morning Balak took Balaam and led him up to the heights of Baal...."

Rashi interprets - Understand this as the Targum does: to the heights of his god; Baal is the name of the idol.

There was no need for Rashi to quote Onkelos as the same interpretation occurs in the Midrash where the latter identifies him as the god of Peor.

28. NUM.23:9 - "From the rocky heights I see them....I see a people that dwells alone that has not made itself one with the nations".

Rashi says - Understand this as the Targum does - They will not be exterminated with the other nations.

This idea that the Israelites will not be exterminated is also indicated by the Midrash Tanhuma on the words - "Far from the top of the rocks I see him". It reads as follows:

From the top of the rocks I see Him, in order to make known the hatred of that wicked man [Balaam]
from whose blessings you may know his thoughts etc. In this strain did that villain argue. Why, he said, should I curse each tribe separately? I shall go to their roots! But when he came to touch them he found it hard work. (Presumably - כַּקָּנַט - is suggested by - וֵרֵיד - in the text). Accordingly, when he said: "Far from the top of the rocks I see him", he was alluding to the Patriarchs and when he said: "From the hills I behold him", he was alluding to the Matriarchs.

29. NUM. 24:17 - "I see him... a star shall come forth out of Jacob, a comet arise from Israel..."

Rashi - כָּלִי חָנוֹן - חָנוֹן מִלְּבָה מִלְּבָה יִיטְרֵבָה וּיְהֵשׁ בָּהּ אֲשֶׁר יִרְאוּן.

Understand this as the Targum does: A king will arise from Jacob, and the Messiah be anointed from Israel. This is, too, the interpretation of the Rabbis - that the verse speaks about king Messiah.

It is reported in the Palestinian Talmud that Rabbi Akiva referred this verse to the warrior Bar Kochba - כָּלִי חָנוֹן מִלְּבָה - כָּלִי מִלְּבָה מִלְּבָה. כָּז. וּרֵאוּן.

When Rabbi Akiva saw Bar Kochba, he proclaimed, here is the king Messiah.
Group A

Num. 24:23
"And he took up his parable... Alas, who shall live after God hath appointed him." 72

Onkelos translates the verse as follows -

אָמְרָה אֱלֹהִים וְצִירָה וְאָנָךָ אֲנָךָ עִבְרֵי אֲוָדָה יִתְאַלֵּף...

"Woe to the wicked who may live when God doeth this".

It seems Onkelos translated the word - הַנַּקְבָּה - in the sense of - אֱלֹהִים - "God," and also in the sense of - אָנָךָ - "these". From his translation one can see that Onkelos is conveying the eschatological concept, i.e. in the end of days the wicked will suffer. In this sense, too, Rashi takes it -

אָמְרָה אֱלֹהִים וְצִירָה וְאָנָךָ אֲנָךָ עִבְרֵי אֲוָדָה יִתְאַלֵּף...

"Who will be able to save himself alive, so that He who decrees (God) should not place upon him these things, for Sennacherib, king of Assyria, shall rise up and bring all the nations into confusion". This is also the interpretation of the Rabbis. 73

Eich. - He erhält nicht, und es lügt nicht die Lücke zwischen beiden

Deut. 19:5
"These commandments the Lord spoke in a great voice

......then He said no more...."

Rashi interprets

עָנָא אֲנָךָ - מַתְגִּדְנָהּ אֲנָךָ לְשׁוֹם אֲנָךָ -

"and He said, 'You also shall be gathered together to this place of assembly, and you shall be brought to a place of witness, and you shall be utterly cut off no more. A boy and a girl shall be there in the streets".

לִכְרָא אוֹתָהּ."
We render this in the Targum by \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \lambda \) and "He did not cease". Because it is characteristic of a human being not to be able to utter all his words in one breath (but he must make pauses) but the characteristic of the Holy One, blessed be He is not so, for His voice is strong and goes on continuously. Another explanation, he did not again ever reveal himself with such publicity.

The first interpretation of Rashi in the name of Onkelos is also in Bab.Tal.Sanh.17 and, therefore, for no apparent reason Onkelos is quoted.

DEUT.32:10
"He found him in a desert land, in a waste and howling void. He protected and trained him, he guarded him as the apple of his eye".

Rashi, after explaining the verse says - "Onkelos, however, rendered - by: He provided them with all they needed in the wilderness. - Onkelos renders this by: He made them abide round about His Divine presence - the tent of Congregation in the middle and the divisions of the tribes (lit. the banners) on the four sides."
Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to that of the Midrash Haggadah. 77 -

Our Rabbis explained it as a promise referring to the future and so, too, does Onkelos render it -

The Lord alone will prepare them to dwell in a world which is destined to be renewed (or created) and the worship of idols shall not be established before Him.

34. DEUT. 32:17 - המלך פרסיס לא אולף —

"Understand this as the Targum does: They sacrifice unto devils in which there is no utility, for if there were
at least any utility in them to the world (e.g. the sun, moon and stars) the provocation to anger would not be so intense".

For no apparent reason Rashi has quoted Onkelos, as the same interpretation occurs in Siphre. In fact the second part of Rashi is almost the exact words of the Siphre. 81

35. DEUT. 32:32-33

"Their vines are vines of Sodom... the clusters bitter to the taste. Their wine is the venom of serpents the cruel poison of asps".

Rashi explains "Their vines are vines of Sodom... the clusters bitter to the taste. Their wine is the venom of serpents the cruel poison of asps".

What they deserve is a bitter drink, according to their actions should be their punishment. Onkelos, also, renders it thus: The recompense of their actions shall be according to their bitterness. Their wine is the poison of dragons - Understand this as the Targum does: Behold like the gall of serpents is the cup of the drink of their punishment. The venom of asps is their cup which bites cruelly, which means a cruel enemy will come and exact punishment from them".
In Sipbre, there is a difference of opinion between Rabbi Judah and Rabbi Nehemiah with regard to the interpretation of these verses (the section from v.26 onwards). Rabbi Judah expounds the whole of it as having reference to Israel, whilst Rabbi Nehemiah refers these verses to the other nations. It appears that Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Judah, and perhaps Rashi quotes Onkelos as his interpretation is clearer and fits well with the text.

36. **DEUT.** 33

32 - "...And he said...from His right hand went a fire of the law for them."

Rashi - המלך וש לメו

Another explanation understand this as the Targum has it -

"That which was written with His right hand, the law he gave us from the midst of the fire."

This is, too, the explanation of the Rabbis in the Sipbre
This verse teaches us that the words of the Torah are compared with fire and, as fire was given from heaven so were the words of the Torah.

Ps. Jonathan, also interprets like Onkelos - קתוב שֵׁמוֹנֶ הָבְרָא - The writing of His hand and His Torah were given from the flaming fire. He gave them His commandments.
In some instances when Onkelos' haggadic interpretations differ from those of the Midrash, Rashi has not failed to quote both interpretations and at the same time explain Onkelos' Derash in line with the biblical text.

In these instances, as said in Group A, Onkelos' haggadic interpretations should be studied in the light of other contemporary Palestinian Targumim, which no doubt influenced his way of thinking.

Here are a few examples to illustrate this point:

1. GEN. 28:22

"And this stone which I have set up as a sacred pillar shall be a house of God".

Rashi explains - "I shall serve the Lord upon it".

Explain it as the Targum translates it - "I shall serve the Lord upon it".

Onkelos, here, is in line with the interpretation of Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. Onkelos and the Targumim are no doubt concerned to exclude the possibility of God being localised in the stone. There is, however, no comment on the part of the Midrash.
2. GEN. 43:32 - "They served him by himself, and the brothers by themselves and the Egyptians who were at dinner were also served separately, for Egyptians hold it an abomination to eat with Hebrews".

Rashi explains - כ' חרב - שבך שיאם אֵלֶּה תֵּבֵּרַתות מי זכרוייָם. "It is a hateful thing to the Egyptians to eat together with the Hebrews".

Onkelos, however, states that the reason being because "the animals that the Egyptians worshipped the Hebrews did eat". Although it may be thought more plausible to assume that the reason is because the Hebrews were foreigners in the eyes of the Egyptians and a noble Egyptian would have no intercourse with a foreigner, nevertheless, Rashi has not failed to quote Onkelos' midrashic interpretation.

There is no comment on the part of the Midrashim available to us.

3. GEN. 49:9 - "Judah you lion's whelp... and crouch and stretch like a lion..."

Rashi explains - "If you are a lion's whelp, show your strength, show your might, show your might. You are a lion's whelp, show your might, show your strength."

2. GROUP B

170
A young lion - He prophesied this with reference to David who, when he began his military career, was but as a whelp - as it states (2 SAM.v.2): "When Saul was king over us etc., - but who later on became as a lion when they made him king over themselves. That is what Onkelos means by translating it". A ruler he shall be - בָּשָׂר - at the beginning.

4. GEN.49:12 - "Darker than wine are his eyes, his teeth whiter than milk."

Rashi says - The word 'יִשְׂפָּר' denotes redness as the Targum renders it. They shall become red etc. According to the Targum - מְלִירִים - means mountains, which are so called because from thence as a point of observation one can see afar off (i.e. the mountains are red with wine). Onkelos further translates the text in a different way, taking - מְלִירִים - in the sense of fountains and continuous flow of the wine press. The word - מְלִירִים - which Onkelos uses signifies
his wine presses etc... The words - בַּקְרֵי - are the Targum of - לוּּ֑בַֽי - taking the second word in the sense of - שְׂרֵי לָעָרִים - rocky crags. 10

In some instances, however, Rashi does not quote Onkelos' Derash - even though it is different from that given by the Rabbis in the Midrash.

5. e.g. GEN.49 13
"Zebulun dwells by the seashore, his shore is a haven for ships...."

Rashi interprets - לֵ֔ךְ אַהֲבָה - מַחֲאֵת יַחְצֵי מַכְרוֹר הִּעְלָה
"Zebulun will constantly be at the haven of ships - the port - where the ships bring merchandize. For Zebulun was engaged in business and provided food for the tribes of Issachar whilst the latter engaged in the study of the Torah" 12

Onkelos, however, gives two interpretations to - חַוֹּל
a). - וְנָהֳבִיתָה בְּכַפֵּרוֹן - He will subdue provinces with ships. 13

b). - וְלָכְבִּית בְּכַפֵּרוֹן - and will eat the good of the sea. 14

Perhaps Zebulun's strength was emphasized by Onkelos because of his victories over Sisera. (See JUDGES, ch.4 6 and ch.5 18. I.CHRONICLES, ch.12 33).
6. GEN. 49:14 - "Issachar, a gelded ass (or bony) lying down in the cattle pens". Rashi explains: "Issachar is a bony ass, he bears the yoke of the Torah. Onkelos, however, translates differently - "Issachar rich in substance, etc." Palestinian Targum and Neofiti interpret "Issachar is a strong tribe". Ps. Jonathan adds - "Issachar likes the law; and a strong tribe, knowing the order of time". Rashi, however, makes no reference to Onkelos.

7. GEN. 49:15 - "He saw that a settled home was good and that the land was pleasant, so he bent his back to the burden and submitted to perpetual forced labour". Rashi explained - "And he (Issachar) inclined his shoulder to receive the burden of studying and teaching Torah to others. Onkelos, however, explains it differently. He bowed
GROUP B

his shoulder to wage wars and conquer new districts - for he (Issachar) dwelt on the marches -. And the enemy became tributary to him". The Midrash interprets like Onkelos. See GEN. Rabbah 98, 12 -

"Naphtali is a spreading terebinth putting forth lovely boughs".

Rashi explains -

"In a good land will the lot of Naphtali be cast, and his inheritance be fruitful; over them will they give praise and benediction".

Rashi goes on to say that our Rabbis explained the verse as an allusion to what happened on the day when Jacob was buried, when Esau claimed the cave of Machpelah. They delayed the burial whilst Naphtali ran rapidly back to Egypt and brought the title - deeds of the cave etc., as is related in Babylonian Talmud Sot.13a.

"But his bow abideth in strength, and the arms of his
hands remain supple and vigorous...from thence he became the feeder, the stone of Israel".  
Rashi explains - for this reason - the stone of Israel.  

This refers to the placing of the King's signet etc. Onkelos also translates it in this manner: His translation of the verse is as follows - and the prophecy was fulfilled in them (the brethren) i.e. the prophecy contained in the dreams, because he observed the law in secret - this is an addition made by Onkelos bearing no words in the Hebrew text to correspond to it. And he set [God's] might as [the base of] his confidence is the translation of the Hebrew words - the following is how the wording of the Targum fits in with the Hebrew text: His prophecy was fulfilled because the perpetual might of the Holy One, blessed be He, served him as his bow and trust; therefore, gold was placed on his arms etc... - Onkelos takes - as an abbreviation of - and therefore renders it by - the fathers and children, Jacob and his sons.
GROUP B

Our Rabbis interpret the verse in connection with his mistress as is related in treatise. Sot. (p.36b).
Here, too, Onkelos takes an independent line and Rashi conforms his midrashic interpretation in line with the text.

10. GEN.49:25 - משב אתך ותורך...ברכויות שדימך וرحمך
"By God of your father - so may he help you....The blessings of breast and womb".
Rashi - אביך ותורך - ברכויות שדימך - ברכות דאם ואמם
Unkelos renders this by blessings of fathers and mothers, i.e. may the men be blessed in that they may not prove sterile and that women may not have miscarriages.
Rashi, who is not ready to accept the literal translation of these two words "breast and womb" turns to the midrashic interpretation of Onkelos that - ישתת - alludes to a father for the seed of man shoots (verb - שות - to shoot) as an arrow.
Here, also, Onkelos takes an independent view from the other Targumim as well as from the Midrashim available to us.
11. EX. 24:11 — "But the Lord did not stretch out his hand towards the leaders of Israel. They saw God; they ate and they drunk".

Rashi interprets — "they gazed at him uninhibitedly (אלו השבעה) as though their association with Him were a matter of eating and drinking. Thus the Midrash Tanhuma explains it. Onkelos, however, does not translate the passage this way".

Onkelos, in fact does not take it in a depreciative sense as implying that Nadab and Abihu acted improperly. His translation is as follows — "They beheld God's glory and rejoiced in their offerings, which were accepted, as though they were eating and drinking".

Perhaps Onkelos interpreted so only out of respect to Nadab and Abihu, thus covering for their sins which Rashi pointed out.

12. NUM. 23:9 — "From the rocky heights I see them....I see a people that dwells alone...."

Rashi explains — "The people shall dwell alone — This is what their ancestors have given them as a prerogative: To dwell
in the world alone - as is the sense given to the passage by the Targum - this people is alone destined to inherit the world. Rashi goes on to say - ל' חמשים ושלמים ו' ומות עמקים ל' כלורו. Another explanation is when they rejoice no other nation rejoices with them, as it is said (DEUT.32:12) "The Lord will lead him alone to future bliss".

Onkelos' interpretation is nowhere mentioned in the Midrashim except in the Targumim. Ps. Jonathan reads as follows - משלולב נגועים עמיים לא מגברין. "Behold this people alone are to possess the world, because they do not conduct themselves by the laws of the nations".

13. NUM.23:10 - "Who hath counted the dust of Jacob, and the number of the fourth part of Israel...."

Rashi says - ארבע אנקב יאנקב أثناء שהבחריון ארבע ואנקב ארבע אנקב יאנקב ארבע אנקב יאנקב ארבע אנקב אטפני. Understand this as the Targum does: "Who can count the infants of the house of Jacob of whom it is said, they shall increase as the dust of the earth". (GEN.13:16). The words - מאידך寬ש תואר - in the Targum mean, who can count even one of the four banners (i.e. camp) of Israel. Another interpretation of - ר尋 תחקי-
is countless are the commandments which they practice in connection with "dust" e.g. (DEUT. 22:10). "Thou shall not plough with an ox and an ass together" etc. Here, too, Onkelos' interpretation is nowhere found in the Midrashim.

14. NUM. 23:21a

"He has discovered no iniquity in Jacob and has seen no mischief in Israel...."

Rashi interprets

клон לבט לבקב - חלומו אסורכים
לִכְיָהּ בְּנֵי אָדָם בְּבֵית יְהוָה. הַבָּרָאָה נַחֲרָה בְּשׁוּפָא חַדָּוָה

Understand this as the Targum has it: I have seen that there are no worshippers of idols in the house of Jacob. Another explanation: According to its plain sense, it can receive a beautiful midrashic exposition. The Holy One, blessed be He, does not see the iniquity (which is in Jacob. When they transgress His words, He does not deal so strictly with them as to scrutinize their acts of oppression etc.
"The Lord their God is with them, acclaimed among them as king".

Rashi interprets - is an expression for love and fellowship as (II SAM.15:37) - the friend of David - (The translation is therefore, "and the fellowship of their king is still with them"). In this sense, too, does Onkelos translate it: And the Shechina of their king is among them. Rashi, here, quotes only Onkelos' interpretation and ignores the Midrash's interpretation which takes - in the sense of "blowing" - over 12 occur with יתכן ורבכיה יבתו ים מים מ🅐. An occurrence also shows a plain blast and a tremolo and brings down a wall. (Reference to the fall of Jericho; see JOSH.6:20).

Balak said to him (Balaam), since you are unable to touch them because of Moses, their minister, see what type of person will be the one who will succeed him. - Said he: He also will be hard to conquer, like his predecessor; for the shouting (or trumpeting) of a king is in him, he (Joshua) blows a plain blast and a tremolo and brings down a wall.
Behold a people rearing up like a lioness...he will not couch till he devours the prey and drinks the blood of the slain.

Rashi interprets -

When they rise from their sleep in the morning they show themselves strong as a lioness and as a lion to perform the divine precepts - to wear the "talith" to read the "Shema" and to put on the "tefillin" etc....Another explanation is as the Targum has it: Behold the people dwells as a lioness and as a lion has he raised himself; he will not dwell in his land until he has slaughtered and he will inherit the wealth of the people. Here, too, Onkelos' interpretation is supported by other Targumim.

But now that Balaam knew that the Lord wished him to bless...he turned towards the desert.

Rashi says -

Understand this as the Targum has it. (Rashi's Targum reads as in some editions). He directed his face
towards the calf that the children of Israel had made in the wilderness). This interpretation is found only in the Targumim and Rashi has not failed to quote it.

18. Num. 24:4 - "The very word of him who hears the words of God, who with staring eyes sees in a trance the vision from the Almighty".

Rashi - "The very word of him who hears the words of God, who with staring eyes sees in a trance the vision from the Almighty".

Its plain sense is as the Targum has it (lying down when it was revealed to him) meaning, that God revealed Himself to him only at night when he was lying on his bed. And the midrashic explanation is: When He revealed Himself to him he had no strength to stand on his feet, and he therefore, fell on his face - because he was uncircumcised etc... Onkelos, here, takes an independent line from the Midrash and the other Targumim.
19. NUM.24

"The water in his vessels shall overflow...so that his king may be taller than Agog, and his kingdom lifted high."

Rashi interprets this as meaning out of his springs, and its explanation is as given in the Targum. (The king appointed from amongst his sons shall be great and shall rule over many nations.) Onkelos follows here the Derash of the Palestinian Targumim.

20. NUM.24

"When he reclines he couches like a lion, like a lioness, and no one dares rouse him."

Rashi interprets this as the Targum does (He will have rest, he will dwell in strength like a lion), meaning, they will be settled in their land in strength and might. This, too, is the interpretation of the other Targumim.
21. DEUT. 32:13-14

"He made him ride on the heights of the earth... and oil from the flinty rock, curds from the cattle, milk from the ewes..."

Rashi interprets -

The entire text (vv 13 and 14) is to be understood metaphorically as the Targum has it etc. "The produce of the fields". - This refers to the fruits of the land of Israel which are quicker to form and to ripen than all the fruits of other countries, etc. And oil out of the flinty rock - this refers to the olives of Giscala. (v.14) - Clotted cream - This was in the days of Solomon etc. Fattened lambs - This was in the days of the Ten Tribes etc. One may also expound these two verses according to the Targum of Onkelos which reads: He made them dwell upon the strong places of the earth etc. He gave them the spoil of the rulers of cities, and the wealth of the settlers in strong cities (v.14). He gave them the spoil of their kings and their rulers etc... and the blood of their heroes will be poured out like water.
"I lift my hand to heaven and swear: As I live for ever..."

Rashi explains - הַלְּכָה יָשָׂרָה - וּמַגֵּרֵם אֵיךְ מַעֲרֵה - מְדַלְּשָׂת שְׁיִיטָן. בְּשָׁלְשָׁם וְגֵרַת אוֹלָם אֵיךְ אֵיקָנָה בְּשָׁפֵר.

"The first two words - כִּי יָשָׂרָה - are equivalent to כִּי יָשָׂרָה - and the text means: I made the heaven for ever the dwelling place of My Glory".

Rashi follows Onkelos although the Siphre 63 takes - כִּי יָשָׂרָה - in the sense of an oath. 64
In many instances, Onkelos' midrashic interpretations correspond with those of the Rabbis found in the midrashic literature. Rashi, however, who interprets the text midrashically, makes no reference to Onkelos. Without further elaboration, here are many examples to illustrate this point:

1. GEN.2

"And the man became a living creature".

Rashi - לƍע היח' כאב ובמה וידח פרעה דמש חות א'וי

Also cattle and beasts are called - דעש חרות
(ch.120,22,24), but the soul of man is the most lively of all of them, because to him was granted understanding and speech. This is also Onkelos' interpretation - "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and it was unto Adam for a spirit of speech".

2. GEN.3

"The Lord God made tunics of skins for Adam and his wife and clothed them".

Onkelos interprets - "And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife vestments of honour (or glorious vestments) upon the skin of their flesh and clothed them". Most probably Onkelos is alluding to the midrashic interpretation.
In Rabbi Meir's copy of the Torah there was a reading - תֵּכְנוֹת הָרוּם - . According to this version Rabbi I. Rabiya explains that the nature of garments of חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - were smooth as a finger-nail and as beautiful as pearls. On the reading - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - the Midrash explains that they were so thin that they clave to the skin. Onkelos is apparently concerned to embody both opinions into his translation - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - for - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - - וַיָּשֶׂה בְּשָׁרֵיהּ - and - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - The wording of Onkelos - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - may also allude to the view of Shemuel (Bab.Tal. Sot.p.14a) who holds - חֲטֹנִית הָרוּם - "clothing affording comfort for Adam and Eve". Rashi quotes the two interpretations of the Midrash without explaining that one of them can be understood only in the light of Rabbi Meir's version in the Torah. However, be that as it may, Rashi passes over Onkelos' midrashic interpretation.

3. GEN.322 תִּהֲבֵה הָאָדָם כֹּל לָוֶות עָלָיו - "The man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil".
Rashi interprets - כִּהֵנֵי-הוֹדֶעֹת יְהוָה לְבַיָּסָע כֶּשֶׁל בְּעָלָיוּטֵי יָחָה לְיִלֻּוֹת לְעֵדֶּכֶּה יְחָד בַּעַד. He is unique (in the sense of - יִמְשָׂד - and - סֶמָּרִים - in the plural) among the terrestrial ones, even as I am unique among the celestial ones; and his uniqueness consists in knowing good and evil.

The translation - כִּיִּדְוֹחֵי-כֶּּנֶּר - "One of us" certainly represents a doctrinal problem since this plurality cannot refer to God. In GEN. Rabbah7, therefore, Rabbi Pappus explains the verse as meaning - "Behold the man has become as one of the ministering Angels". The translation of the verse would, therefore, be as follows - "Man is unique among the terrestrial ones as God is unique among the ministering Angels". According to this Rashi's source is GEN. Rabbah. Onkelos, however, seems to differ from Rashi's interpretation - כִּיִּדְוֹחֵי-כֶּּנֶּר - "Behold Adam has become the only one in the world: It is of [i.e. up to] him to know good and evil". Onkelos' interpretation is somewhat mysterious and it appears that he takes - סֶמָּרִים - in the singular. We may say that Onkelos follows the interpretation of Rabbi Akiva8 - "אמרו לו" (לֹאִים) "הָאֱלֹהִים בְּבַיָּסָע שָׁעָי - והַכָּבֶּד בְּהָאֱלֹהִים שָׁעָי וְלֹא אָמְרוּ פְּנֵי-יהוָה לְעַד לְעָלָיוּטֵי יָחָה לְיִלֻּוֹת לְעֵדֶּכֶּה יְחָד בַּעַד".
"The Holy One, blessed be He, placed before him two ways, that of death and that of life, and he chose for himself the way of death". Rabbi Akiva understood - כהן - to signify "of himself", he knew good and evil of himself.9 Perhaps Onkelos should be understood in the light of other Palestinian Targumim. Ps. Jonathan interprets as follows - ברא הארץ ויטר וכר並將 תבקש משם עאוזו ואתייוו לארץ קדושה,מך כייץ凭 ומקשרין בוצב לשבש. "Behold Adam has proved to be the only one in the world, as I am the only One in the heavens above etc., and from him shall rise those who shall know how to distinguish between good and evil". This is also the interpretation of the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti. It appears that the Targumim take - כהן - as an integral part of the second half of the sentence so that the words "of him" are connected with the words "to distinguish between good and evil". Comparing Onkelos with these Targumim, one can see that his translation is just an elliptic one. Perhaps Rashi, also, can be understood in the light of these Targumim. Thus Rashi and the Targumim follow Rabbi Akiva's interpretation.
4. GEN. 4:10 - "And he said what have you done? Your brother's blood, that has been shed is crying out to me from the ground."

Rashi explains - the expression - is in plural "bloods", his blood and the blood of his descendants. This is also the interpretation of Onkelos - . What has thou done? The voice of the blood of generations which were to come from thy brother etc. Although Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to that of the Rabbis in GEN. Rabbah, yet Rashi passes him over in silence.

5. GEN. 4:23 - "Lamech said to his wives.....I kill a man for wounding me, a young man for a blow".

Onkelos interprets: And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, give ear to my saying: I have not killed a man in respect of whose death I bear any guilt, nor have I wounded a child in respect of whom my own seed should be exterminated. Most likely, Onkelos here had in mind the Derash
quoted by Rashi that Lamech by mistake killed his forefather Cain and his child Tubal-Cain. However, Rashi quotes here the Midrash Tanhuma\(^1\) and not Onkelos.\(^2\)

6. GEN.4\(^{24}\) — דְּשַׁבֵּרָתָה קַמָּה...וְלֹא שְׁבִיט עַל עָשָׁיו... "Cain be avenged seven times, but Lamech seventy seven".

Rashi in the name of the Midrash Tanhuma\(^{19}\) explains the verse as follows —:

"If in the case of Cain who killed with premeditation the punishment was suspended for him until the seventh generation, in the case of myself who slew (his child Tubal-Cain — see the previous note GEN.4\(^{23}\)) inadvertently does it not necessarily follow that it should be suspended for me until many heptads of generations".\(^{20}\)

Onkelos\(^{21}\) interprets also this verse exactly as the Midrash Tanhuma, but Rashi passes over him in silence.

7. GEN.4\(^{26}\) — וַּלֵּא עַל אֵשׁ כְּעָנִים אֵשׁ וְלֹא הָלֵא אֵשׁ... "Seth too, had a son, whom he named Enosh. At that time men began to invoke the Lord by name."\(^{22}\)
Rashi interprets - נחלת בניו - to mean - מין - profanation, viz., calling the names of men and the names of idols after the names of the Holy One, blessed be He, making them the objects of idolatrous worship and calling them deities". This is in fact the Midrash's interpretation and Onkelos interprets likewise - בד זיימויו ובני אשמה: כַּלָּאֵת אַשְׁמֵא כִּלָּא. By the word - אֲרוּם - Onkelos implies the midrashic interpretation, that in Enosh's time they ceased praying to the true God, but instead to idols. Rashi, however, does not comment on Onkelos.

8. GEN. 5:24 - "Having walked with God, Enoch was seen no more, because God had taken him away". Rashi says that "Enoch was a righteous man, but his mind was easily induced to turn away from God and become wicked, therefore, the Holy One, blessed be He, killed him before his time". And so Rashi takes - מֵאָרָא - in the sense of - מֵאָמָה - "death". Onkelos also interprets likewise - שְׂמֵא אֲרוּם - "and he was not, for the Lord killed him".

Rashi makes no comment on Onkelos. There is,
however, a different version in Onkelos' text which reads as follows:

and he was, for God did not kill him.

9. GEN.6 - "My life-giving spirit shall not remain in man for ever; he for his part is a mortal flesh: He shall live for a hundred and twenty years".

Rashi explains - "For 120 years I will be long suffering with them, and if they repent not, I shall bring a flood upon them". This is also the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis that if they should repent there would be no flood. In this spirit Onkelos also interprets the text.

10. GEN.125 - "He (Abraham) took his wife Sarai, his nephew Lot... and all the dependants they had acquired in Harran..."

Onkelos interprets the words - by - and the souls whom they had made subject to the law in Harran. By this interpretation Onkelos had none other
than the midrashic interpretation quoted by Rashi that Abraham and Sarah brought the "souls" of Harran, beneath the sheltering wings of the Shechinah and converted them to recognise the true God. But, once again, there is no comment on Onkelos.

11. GEN.13:13 - "Now the men of Sodom were wicked, great sinners against the Lord". Rashi says that - "wicked" in their persons and "sinners" with their wealth. This is indeed the interpretation of Rabbi Judah in Babylonian Talmud Sanh. (p.109a). But the Toséfta interprets vice versa - "wicked" with their wealth, and "sinners" in their persons. It is interesting to note that while Rashi follows Rabbi Judah, Onkelos interprets according to the Toséfta; Rashi fails to remark on Onkelos - And the men of Sodom were wicked in their riches, and guilty in their bodies before the Lord greatly.
12. GEN. 18:12

"And he took clotted cream... and he stood by them under the tree and they did eat".

Onkelos interprets - "...and he served them". In this sense too the Talmud takes it. Rashi, however, does not comment on the text.

13. GEN. 18:13

"I must go down and see whether their deeds warrant the outcry which has reached me. I am resolved to know the truth."

Rashi explains the verse as follows - "If they persist in their rebellious ways an end will I make of them; if however they do not persist in their rebellious ways, I shall know what I shall do - punishing them only with suffering, but I will not make an end of them".

Onkelos has this to say - "I will now reveal myself and will judge; if according to the complaint which came before me they have in fact done, I will deal with them thoroughly (finish them off) if they fail to repent but if they do repent, I will not punish them."
Onkelos and Rashi see in this verse the concept of repentence and its strength to save the wicked from punishment. But Rashi does not quote Onkelos. The Midrash GEN. Rabbah also takes it in this sense.

Rabbi Abba Ben Kahana said: This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave them the opportunity of repenting. For it says, I will go down etc.

If they have done thus completely, then it is an end - they must be completely destroyed; and if not, I will know, i.e. I will teach the world through them that the attribute of justice exists. Rashi, however, does not comment on Onkelos.

14. GEN.24:63 - "And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at the time of the evening."

Rashi explains - this means to pray.

This is also Onkelos' interpretation - "And Isaac went out to pray in the field at the time of the evening".

The Midrash also takes it in this sense.
GROUP C

15. GEN. 24:67 - "Isaac conducted her into the tent... and he loved her and was consoled for the death of his mother".
Rashi says - he brought her into the tent and she became exactly like his mother Sarah, for whilst Sarah was living a light had been burning in the tent from one Sabbath eve to the next, there was always a blessing in the dough, and a cloud of glory was always hanging over the tent, (as a divine protection) but since her death, all these had stopped. However, when Rebecca came, they re-appeared. This is indeed the interpretation of the Midrash, and Onkelos in his usual concise way conveys the same interpretation. The Targum reads as follows - "And Isaac brought her to the tent; and he saw that her deeds were good as the deeds of Sarah his mother, and he took Rebecca and she became his wife", etc. Rashi, however, failed to remark on Onkelos.

16. GEN. 25:27 - "The boys grew up... but Jacob led a settled life and stayed among the tents".
Rashi, who follows the Midrash takes - "םַעַלְךָ... מְגַשְׁתָּם וּמַעְצָבְתָם..."
"tents" in the sense of "schools" and he, therefore, explains that these tents were the tent of Shem and the tent of Eber. In this sense, also, Onkelos understands the verse - יִקְרֵּב-גְוָרָר שֵׁם-אֵבֶּר. "And Jacob was a perfect man, undergoing training as a disciple, in the house of instruction". The Midrash and the Targumim had to explain "tents" in the sense of "schools", otherwise what connection is to be established between "dwelling in tents" and being "a perfect man"? They, therefore, translate them as schools: Rashi, however, does not comment on Onkelos.

17. GEN.28

"They answered, we have seen....let the two of us put each other to the oath and make a treaty that will bind us".

Rashi explains - אָבַר בְּרֵעוֹתָנוּ - to mean "let the oath that has existed between us since the days of your father continue now between us and you".

Onkelos interprets likewise - יָאִישׁ בְּרֵעוֹתָנוּ - to mean "And we said let the oath that has existed between our fathers be now re-established between us and you, and let us make a covenant with you".
Because of the repetition of .... the Targum and Rashi were compelled to say that is referring to "our fathers". In this sense too the Midrash takes it - and says "We have seen your deeds and the deeds of your fathers etc".

18.GEN.27 "By your sword shall you live....but the time will come when you grow restless and break off his yoke from your neck".

Rashi says the word - (root ר"ז) signifies grief and it means when Israel will transgress the Torah and you will have reason to feel aggrieved with regard to the blessings, then - you shall break off his yoke from your neck.

Rashi’s source is the Midrash and Onkelos in his usual concise style conveys the same interpretation:

19.GEN.37 "Now is our chance, let us kill him....Then we shall see what will come of his dreams".

Rashi says - "Rabbi Isaac said this verse calls for a homiletic explanation."
The Holy Spirit said this: They (the brothers) say let us slay him, and the Holy Spirit concludes and says - מְיוֹרַח יַדְעוֹרֵב - "we shall see whose words will be fulfilled - yours or mine". Onkelos by translating - אוֹקַלְוָס מְדַד יַד נבּוֹקַלְוָס חֲלוּמֹרֵד - "and we shall see what will be the end of his dreams" - seems to allude to this midrashic interpretation.

20. GEN. 39:11 - יִהְיֶה חַיָּה חַיָּה... יִהְיֶה בְּיִתֵּה לַעֲשׂוֹת לְוַעֲשָׂר מִלְּוַעֲשָׂר - "One day he came into the house as usual to do his work, when none of the men of the household were there indoors."

Rashi on the words - מְיוֹרַח יַדְעוֹרֵב - quotes the argument between Rab and Shemuel, as to what this means. Rab holds - מְיוֹרַח יַדְעוֹרֵב - his actual house work; Shemuel holds that his "work" here has a more dramatic meaning: Joseph was on the point of yielding to temptation to associate with Potiphar's wife, but a vision of his father's face appeared to him and he resisted temptation and did not sin.

Onkelos by translating - מְיוֹרַח יַדְעוֹרֵב - "And he came to the house to examine his account ledgers" - is consistent with Rab's opinion.
21. GEN. 41:45

"And Pharaoh named Joseph Zaphenath-paneah; and he gave him as wife Asenath...."

Rashi following the Midrash explains that "Zaphenath-paneah" signifies - מפריש האפונא "explainer of hidden things".

In this sense, too, Onkelos takes it:

וַעֲנָא פַרְעֹה שָׂוָה יְוָאָ שְׁבָעַת דְּמַשְׁכֵּרָה אֲנוּר לְיהוָה

"And Pharaoh called the name of Joseph, the man to whom mysteries are revealed".

22. GEN. 45:12

"You can see for yourselves....that it is Joseph himself (lit. my mouth) who is speaking to you".

Rashi explains - מַה יִּסְמָכֶר אַלְכֵּץ "in the holy language". This is taken from the Midrash and Onkelos interprets likewise:

לְקֹרֶה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אוֹתָם. אוֹתָם שֵׁם אֲבוֹת אֲנוּר מַכָּל לֵבָנָא

"Behold in your own language, I speak to you".

23. GEN. 45:27

"But they told him all that Joseph had said....and the spirit [of Jacob their father] revived".

Rashi says - וַיְתַחְדָּסָה וַיִּרְכֹּס אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וַיֵּתָן בְּיִּשְׁכָּב מְעֹרָה means that the "Shechinah that had departed from him
rested again upon him". In this sense, also, Onkelos interprets the text.

"And the spirit of prophesy came to rest upon their father Jacob".

24. GEN.48

"I give you one ridge of land (Shechem)...I took it from the Amorites with my sword and my bow". Rashi, who follows the Midrash, does not take literally, "with the sword and with the bow", but rather by means of his spiritual weapons - i.e. his wisdom and his prayers. Onkelos also interprets the text midrashically but is ignored by Rashi:

25. GEN.49

"Reuben, you are my firstborn....excelling in pride, excelling in might".
Rashi interprets - רָאָה מַחְיָה לָמוּד תַּכְר יִרְאָה בְּחַנְעָה שָׁמַיָּא דְּפֹת וּרְאָה יִרְאָה בָּכָל לֹא חוֹדֵי
Since you were the firstborn it was proper that you should be superior to your brothers by being endowed with the priesthood. (This term - שָׁמַיָּא - "lifting up" alludes to the - דְּפֹת - to the priestly benediction). - וּרְאָה יִרְאָה - meaning in royal rank. In this spirit the Midrash 73 and Onkelos 74 also interpret:

"Reuben, you are my firstborn, three portions should have been yours - the birthright, the priesthood, and the kingdom". Rashi, however, does not quote him.

26. GEN.49.4

"Turbulent as a flood, you shall not excel; because you climbed into your father's bed; then you defiled his concubine's couch".

Rashi - וּרְאָה יִרְאָה בָּכָל לֹא חוֹדֵי דְּפֹת אֶלְתָּא בְּכִירוּת שָׁתָא וּרְאָה יִרְאָה בָּכָל לֹא חוֹדֵי דְּפֹת

"The precipitancy with which you so hastily showed your wrath, just like water, has caused you not to
receive all these many prerogatives that were proper to you etc....You have profaned Him who hovered over my couch - the Shechina that used to abide above my couch". 75

Onkelos, on the whole, follows Rashi's interpretation: "Because you have proceeded perversely (lit. towards your face i.e. you pleased yourself) like water (that rushes crookedly), therefore, you have not benefitted thereby, you will not receive an additional portion etc....All this, because you have profaned my bed. My son you went up". Onkelos' ending - is somewhat obscure and unintelligible. I am inclined to believe that Onkelos has incorporated Ps. Jonathan's interpretation:

"You sinned, but shall sin no more, and your sin shall be forgiven".

This is also the interpretation of the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti. 77

We may, therefore, safely assume that this is also Onkelos' opinion. This idea that Reuben's sin had been forgiven is also mentioned in GEN.Rabbah (98 para.4) -
"Rabbi Eleazar of Modim said: A ritual bath is made not of wine or oil but only of water; so hast thou made thyself a bath of water; and purified thyself". In the light of all this Onkelos by saying - has no other explanation than that of his teachers, Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua who both hold that because of his repentance his sin was forgiven.

They take - to mean rise up from your sin, hence forgiveness. (printed - imperative).

27. GEN.49 8a - 'יהיה אחיה ירל אחיך
"Judah, your brothers shall praise you...."
Rashi interprets -
"Because he rebuked the first [three tribes] in harsh terms Judah began to move away, that he (Jacob) should not censure him for the incident with Tamar etc".

Onkelos has this to say: 'יהיה אחיה ירל אחיך
"You have confessed and you were not ashamed, therefore through you, your brothers shall utter praise".

Onkelos is, of course, referring to the story of Judah and Tamar and understands Jacob to be
praising him for admitting his guilt, thus saving Tamar from being burnt.
Ps. Jonathan makes it clear that the reference is about Tamar:

"Judah, you have admitted your guilt with regard to the story of Tamar because of this your brothers shall praise you and by your own name shall they be called Jews". 83

In this vein, too, the Midrash 84 explains the text.

"The Holy One blessed be He said to him (Judah):
"Thou didst acknowledge thy part (or guilt) in the incident of Tamar: thy brethren shall acknowledge thee king over them".

28. GEN. 49

"Your hand is on the neck of your enemies, your father's sons shall do you homage."

Onkelos interprets - "Your hand shall prevail against your adversaries, your enemies shall be dispersed; they will turn their necks (lit. - קהל - neck) 85 before you, and the sons of your father will come before you
with greetings (or with salutations). There are three interpretations in Onkelos on the words: "Thy hand is in the neck of thine enemies", as N. Adler has rightly remarked. This is, too, the interpretation of the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti, and Ps. Jonathan merely adds - "Your hand shall punish your enemies by throwing arrows at them". The Targumim here are clearly vindicating the strength and power of Judah over his enemies.

Rashi in the name of the Midrash explains that this prophecy was fulfilled in the days of David, a descendant of Judah, who subdued all his enemies. It is interesting to note that Onkelos did not translate - literally by - "thy father's sons shall prostrate themselves before thee" - for certainly Jacob did not entertain in his mind that Judah should be worshipped by his brothers like a god - Onkelos therefore translated - "And the sons of your father will come before you with salutations".
Judah, you lion's whelp, you have returned from the kill, my son.

Rashi interprets - לארשי האלוהים מקו מופיע ערב יוסר חיה - ולך 것이다 הוי כליך ערב יוסר חיה. והריódigo סריך את השם המכר המח. "From the deed of which I suspected you when I said (GEN.27:33). Joseph is torn in pieces, an evil beast hath devoured him" - and by that Judah was meant, who was likened to a lion - ויהי יונ - from that murderous deed you cleared yourself saying (ibid.v.26) "What profit is it if we slay our brother". And similarly did he act, when Tamar was condemned to death, for he confessed that "she is righteous".

Onkelos in his concise manner conveys the same Derash: "...because from the sentence of death, my son, hast thou removed thy soul".

Ps. Jonathan makes it clear that the reference is to Tamar and Joseph. Consequently, Onkelos must be studied in the light of Palestinian Targumim.
GROUP C

30. GEN. 49:15

"Issachar saw that a settled home was good and that the land was pleasant..."

Rashi explains - מנהלו כיío - ראה שם ארץ מבורכת ושבה ימיה.

"He chose as his portion a land that was blessed and well fitted to produce fruits".

This is also Onkelos' interpretation - זוחל חלך - אֲרָךְ צָבִית יִתָּהֵרֵם פָּרֹעַ.

Onkelos, therefore, takes - מנהלה - in the sense - לְעֵתִיר - portion (inheritance) and - מַכוֹן - in the sense - good for producing fruits. In this sense, also, GEN. Rabbah 98.12 - takes it:

פָּרֹעַ, שָׂלָל יָעֲבָר יַסְדֶּל מִי.

31. 49:16-17

"Dan shall pronounce judgement on his people, as one of the tribes of Israel. Dan shall be a serpent by the way...."

Rashi interprets - יָעֲבָר נַפּוֹת יָעֲבָר כְּמוֹ שֵׁם נָבָא לַאֲדֹנָי.

"Dan will take vengeance for his people from the Philistines etc. The prophecy alludes to Samson".

Although Onkelos does not mention Samson by name yet, in v.17, he makes it clear that the allusion is to Samson: הַתְּכֵרָה לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵי עִבֵּרִים עוֹלֵבָא דָּרוֹמָה מְהַלָּוָה...
"A man will be chosen and arise from the house of Dan, and his terror shall fall upon the peoples and his blow will be strong against the Philistines etc". Ps. Jonathan, Palestinian Targum, Neofiti and the Midrashim mention Samson by name.

32. GEN.49:19

"Gad is raided by raiders and he raids them from the rear".

Rashi explains: ליגור יארז� גזרו נאנו ורדן תים שארבך עת - It means "troops will troop out of him" signifying that the Gadites will cross the Jordan with their brethren, all armed for war, and remain with them until the land will have been conquered.

Onkelos gives the same interpretation - מעריסי את מעריסי את צביה ויד הדרפנрук ודרמה עד - "From the house of Gad will armed hosts go over the Jordan before their brethren to the battles etc". In this spirit, too, Ps. Jonathan, Palestinian Targum, Neofiti and the Midrashim interpret the biblical text.

Onkelos, however, takes the second part of the verse - "And with much substance will they return unto their land".
GROUP C

It appears that Onkelos takes - בְּכֵן - in the sense of - בְּכֵן - reward (cf. GEN. 26:5; DEUT. 7:12; PSALMS 19:12) and - רָבָּה - in the sense of - רָבָּה - (םוֹךְ) - gathering. - Thus the Gadites shall gather much substance.

33. GEN. 49:20 - ... "Out of Asher cometh his fat bread, and he shall give dainties for a king". 99

Rashi interprets - שָׁם שָׁם לְךָ וְלִרְכָּב מִקְצֵי שְׂפָרִים - "The food that will come from the territory of Asher will be fat, for there will be numerous olive trees in his territory, etc".

In this sense, also, Onkelos 100 and the Midrash 101 take it: לָאשֶׁר מִבְּנֹת אֲרוֹרֶת וּמִבְּרִימ בְּמַמְמוֹרִים כְּרוֹעֵי "As for Asher his land will be good; and he will increase the dainties of the kings". 102

34. EX. 13:19 - ... וַיִּקְרָא מִכְּהָן "Moses took the bones of Joseph with him..."

Onkelos here takes the verb - לָקָם - to mean - לָקָם מָכָה - "And Moses raised up". In this sense, too, Ps. Jonathan 103 translated it. It is indeed strange.
GROUP C

to translate the verb - קָמַךְ - in this way, and I therefore believe that Onkelos is alluding to the legend that the bones of Joseph were lying in the river Nile, and on the day of the going out of Egypt, Moses stood by the Nile and brought them out. 105

35. EX. 15 7 - ...verbs אשר קמר קמי
"In the fullness of thy triumph thou didst cast the rebels down...."
Rashi interprets - ממך - הפך אחרון ירמיך קמך והקמיש
his strength, and overthrew them by his might. 106
"Thou always overthrewest those that rise up against thee. And who are those who rise up against Him? They are those who rise up against Israel".
This is indeed the interpretation of the Mechilta.

קמר - מלכי למבאול ומלך שלם נברד אף עלarme
Thou in the greatness of thy might thou hast broken
Onkelos in his concise manner conveys the same meaning: יבוא קמר וברכתך עליהhyperlinks_kay_107
"And in the greatness of your might you have broken down those who rose against your people". 108
GROUP C

36. EX. 17:16 - "My oath upon it: The Lord is at war with Amalek generation after generation".

Rashi interprets - "The hand of the Holy One, blessed be He is raised to swear by His throne that He will have war and enmity against Amalek to all eternity".

This is indeed the explanation of the Mechilta.

Onkelos also explains it in the sense of an oath.

"With an oath hath this been declared from before the Awesome One, whose Shechina is upon His glorious throne; that war shall be waged before the Lord of Amalek, etc."

37. EX. 32:10 - "Now, let me alone to vent my anger upon them..."

Rashi explains - "So far we have not heard that Moses had prayed on their behalf and yet He says "Let Me alone", (which implies a refusal to his entreaty). By saying this He (lit. opened the door) offered Moses..."
GROUP C

a hint intimating to him that if he prayed for them He would not destroy them".

Rashi's source is the Midrash 115 and Onkelos in his usual concise manner gives the same interpretation:

וכך הוה said הקדש

And now refrain from [presenting] your prayer 116 before Me.

38. EX.34 7 •

".....forgiving iniquity, rebellion, and sin and not sweeping the guilty clean away".

Rashi interprets - and 

將יהוה - These are sins committed presumptuously
(with premeditation) - כפשעים - these are sins committed rebelliously. Our Rabbis have explained
- והקרם - He clears those who repent - but does not clear those who will not repent. 117

This is indeed the interpretation of the Rabbis in Bab. Tal. Yoma, p.36⁷ and Yoma p.86⁸ respectively, and Onkelos follows this interpretation to the letter:

 Forgiving iniquity and rebellion and guilt: Pardoning those who return to His law, but not acquitting those who do not return. 118

The correspondence between ידוע - and - makes it probable that ידוע - correspond to -.
39. LEV. 18:5

"You shall observe my institutions and my laws: The man who keeps them shall have life through them. I am the Lord".

Rashi explains - "He shall live through them in the world to come, for if you say it means that he shall live in this world, is it not a fact that in the end he must die". This is the interpretation of the Rabbis and Onkelos interprets likewise - "And he shall live through them eternal life." I am the Lord.

40. LEV. 23:43

"So that your descendants may be reminded how I made the Israelites live in arbours...."

Rashi explains - "This does not mean literally "booths" but, "the clouds of Glory" by which they were sheltered". This is the explanation of our Rabbis and Onkelos follows it to the letter - That your generations may know that by the clouds [of Glory], I have sheltered (lit. made to dwell) the children of Israel."
"I will make the sky above you like iron and the earth beneath you like bronze".

Rashi explains - "This threat is even severer than that of Moses, etc....

Here, however, Scripture threatens that the heaven will not exude moisture, just as iron does not exude, and there will therefore be drought in the world, whilst the earth will exude (be too humid) just as copper sweats, and it will consequently make its fruits perish".

Onkelos in a concise manner conveys the same Derash quoted by Rashi.

Onkelos should be understood in the light of Ps. Jonathan who interprets exactly like the Rabbis.
GROUP C

to destroy its fruit. 125

42. LEV. 26
"Those who are left shall pine away in an enemy
land... and with their fathers' iniquities upon
them too, they shall pine away as they did".
Rashi interprets -
"It means if the iniquities of their fathers shall
be with them, i.e. if they persevere in the doings
of their fathers". 126 This is, too, Onkelos'
interpretation -
"And also for the sins of their fathers, the evil
deeds which are held fast in their own hands shall they pine away".

43. LEV. 26
"The land shall be rid of its people... and they
shall pay in full the penalty because they rejected
my judgements and spurned my statutes".
Rashi explains -
It means a retribution - and in retribution, too,
for that they have rejected My ordinances".
The word - קנה - is a noun from the root - כנ -, "to answer", "to correspond". The noun - קנה - is usually used to introduce the reason for giving reward or punishment, both of which may be denoted by - כלמה -. Rashi, here therefore takes it as a noun: this is a response - כלמה - and that, too, (כלמה) a response for rejecting My ordinances.

Rashi had in mind the characteristic of - חסד צדקה - "measure for measure" - "because you have rejected My ordinances, I shall also punish you". To this sense, too, the Siphra alludes -

It is in this sense of - חסד צדקה - retribution that

Onkelos, also, takes it - נשים ילב בכה入り, יפי צדקה - "He brought upon them curses instead of blessings".

Ps. Jonathan makes this idea even clearer:

"Curses instead of blessings shall come upon them, measure for measure".

NUM.11.4 - "Now there was a mixed company of strangers who had joined the Israelites".

Rashi explains -" Now כב שנותינו יהיית - ביצה מקרר, ישנה ובו עיטורה ובעלו הכהן.
"This was the mixed multitude that had gathered themselves unto them when they left Egypt". (And they caused the children of Israel to murmur against God).
Onkelos gives the same interpretation -

"And the mixed multitude who were among them asked many questions".
The Siphre, also, explains likewise -

Miriam and Aaron began to speak against Moses. They blamed him for his Cushite wife.
Rashi explains... "This teaches us that all agreed as to her beauty just as all agree as to the blackness of an Ethiopian": the words - cannot mean because of her having been divorced by Moses.
According to the Rabbis in the Midrash the words - cannot mean that Miriam and Aaron made Zipporah the subject of their gossip, i.e. because she was black (for, on the contrary they take "Cushite" to mean "beautiful") but that they spoke in her interest, they regarded her to
GROUP C

have been wronged by Moses through his divorcing her. This is clearly evident from their complaint, (v.2). "Hath the Lord indeed spoken by Moses; hath He not also spoken by us?" In other words, Moses arrogated to himself the right to separate from his wife; God, however, had spoken also to them, and yet they had not relinquished their marital duties.

Onkelos in his concise way conveys the midrashic interpretation - אֲוֹלָהֵת עָלָי מְשֶׁרֶת לְשׁוֹאָל אַלּוֹ וְקָטַת: שֶׁפּוּרֵט בַּעֲרֹבֶּה יְהוָה, וְאֵין אֶשְׁכַּח שֶׁפּוּרֵט בַּעֲרֹבֶּה קֹטֶנּ.

"And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses, because of the fair woman" he had taken, for the fair woman he had taken, he had put at a distance (divorced).

46. NUM.12:12 - ... ani le tail hashem b'sakatru melahmam nemah

"Let her flesh be like something still-born, whose flesh is half eaten away when it comes from the womb".

Rashi explains - אֱלֹה יְהוָה שָׁמְתָא אָמִיתָא אָמִיתָא מָאָשָּׁה - "Let not this our sister be "as one who is dead"

- Aaron said this because a leper may be reckoned as dead." - מָכָּה אֵין - It ought to have stated

- מָכָּה אֵין - "of our mother's womb", only that Scripture modified the expression.
GROUP C

This is the interpretation of the Siphre and Onkelos seems to convey the same interpretation -

"Let not this one be separated from among us, for she is our sister. Pray, now, over this dead flesh which is in her that she may be healed".

The Targum - is simply treated as a "leper" - for a leper is set apart from the rest of society. The Targum - is simply the elucidation of the ambiguous text - .

47. NUM.13 22 - "They went up by the Negeb, and came to Hebron"...
Rashi explains -

"Caleb alone went there and prostrated himself on the graves of the Patriarchs, offering prayers that he might be helped not to give way to the enticement of his colleagues and join them in their counsel".

Onkelos, however, translates literally -

In several instances, Onkelos takes the text in the plural form, although the text is couched in the singular.
We may, therefore, say that since Onkelos left the text as it stands, he is indeed alluding to the midrashic interpretation quoted by Rashi.

48. NUM.14 18 - "The Lord, long suffering, ever constant, who forgives iniquity... though he does not sweep them clean away". Rashi interprets - This is the interpretation of the Rabbis and Onkelos interprets likewise - "He forgives those who return to His Torah, but does not clear those who do not return" (repent).

49. NUM.31 10 - "They burnt all their cities... and all their encampments. Onkelos translates - by - "place of worship". In several instances is taken by the Targum as "palace", e.g. in EZEKIEL, ch.25, the word - is translated by the Targum as - which means "palace". Perhaps because of the fact that the Israelites worshipped the gods of Midian, that
Onkelos took - תֵּאָרְכָּה - not in its usual sense, but rather in the sense of "houses of worship".

In this sense, too, Rashi who follows the Siphre 151 explains it - "The dwelling-place of their priests, those well acquainted with their laws".

"These are the words that Moses spoke...in the wilderness, that is to say in the Arabah opposite Suph, between Paran on the one side and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab on the other".

The plain meaning of the text is that all these are purely names of places. 152 Rashi, however, follows the interpretation of the Siphre 153 that these are words of reproof and that Moses is enumerating here all the places where the Israelites had sinned against God. He therefore explains as follows - "These are the words that Moses spoke... in the wilderness, that is to say in the Arabah opposite Suph, between Paran on the one side and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab on the other".

The plain meaning of the text is that all these are purely names of places. 152 Rashi, however, follows the interpretation of the Siphre 153 that these are words of reproof and that Moses is enumerating here all the places where the Israelites had sinned against God. He therefore explains as follows - "These are the words that Moses spoke... in the wilderness, that is to say in the Arabah opposite Suph, between Paran on the one side and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab on the other".

Rashi, however, follows the interpretation of the Siphre 153 that these are words of reproof and that Moses is enumerating here all the places where the Israelites had sinned against God. He therefore explains as follows - "These are the words that Moses spoke... in the wilderness, that is to say in the Arabah opposite Suph, between Paran on the one side and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab on the other".

The plain meaning of the text is that all these are purely names of places. 152 Rashi, however, follows the interpretation of the Siphre 153 that these are words of reproof and that Moses is enumerating here all the places where the Israelites had sinned against God. He therefore explains as follows - "These are the words that Moses spoke... in the wilderness, that is to say in the Arabah opposite Suph, between Paran on the one side and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, and Dizahab on the other".
GROUP C

The calumnious statements they had made regarding - the manna, which was white in colour.
The story of the spies in the wilderness of Paran -
The Insurrection of Korah -

He reproved them on account of the golden calf which they had made.

Onkelos in his concise manner gives the same interpretation -

"He (Moses) reproved them because they had sinned in the wilderness, and had provoked (the Lord) to anger on the plains opposite the Red Sea in Paran, where they scorned the manna; and in Hazeroth where they provoked to anger on account of flesh and because they had made the golden calf."

51. DEUT. 6:5 - "And you must love the Lord your God with all your heart and soul and strength".

Rashi explains -
"This signifies with all your property. You have people whose property is dearer to them than their lives, and it is on this account that this was mentioned".

This is the explanation of the Rabbis in Siphre 156 and Onkelos interprets likewise - 

52. DEUT. 7:10 -  מנהות שרגאיה אֶפְנֵיהֶנְהַי מְאֶזְבּוּ כֵּלָה לְאָבְדָיו מִנִּים רַחְמָיו

"But those who defy him and show their hatred for him he repays with destruction: he will not be slow to requite any who so hate him".

Rashi interprets - מנהות שרגאיה אֶפְנֵיהֶנְהַי מְאֶזְבּוּ כֵּלָה לְאָבְדָיו מִנִּים רַחְמָיו

"He repays them during their lifetime their good recompense, in order to cause them to perish from the future world". 158

This is, too, Onkelos' interpretation and according to A. Berliner, Rashi's source is Onkelos 159 - מנהות שרגאיה אֶפְנֵיהֶנְהַי מְאֶזְבּוּ כֵּלָה לְאָבְדָיו מִנִּים רַחְמָיו

"He repays, however, those who hate Him the good which they do before Him during their lifetime [in order] to destroy them" [in the world to come].
GROUP C

He delays not, to do good to His enemies: for the good they do before Him during their very lives He repays them.

53. DEUT. 16:1

"Observe the month of Abib... for it was in that month that the Lord your God brought you out of Egypt by night".

Rashi explains - נָטַן לְךָ אַפֶּרֶךְ וּרְשָׁאֵת לְאֶחְוָא אִלֵּךְ "Did they not in fact go forth by day? But it states that they went out by night because it was at night that Pharaoh gave them permission to go".

Rashi's source is the Siphre and in order to avoid the latter's question, Onkelos interprets the verse as follows - אָנָּה בִּרְטִמָה וְאֵםְבֵּנָה אָסְקַל ה' לְאֶלְכוֹת מְעָרֵי יְרוּדָה "For in the month of Abib, the Lord your God took you out of Egypt, and performed miracles for you at night".

Onkelos addition - אַנָּה בִּרְטִמָה וְאֵםְבֵּנָה אָסְקַל ה' לְאֶלְכוֹת מְעָרֵי יְרוּדָה - is purely to avoid the difficulty in the text, dissociating from אָנָּה בִּרְטִמָה וְאֵםְבֵּנָה אָסְקַל ה' לְאֶלְכוֹת מְעָרֵי יְרוּדָה.
54. DEUT.26 - "Then you shall solemnly recite before the Lord your God: my father was a homeless (or wandering) Aramaean who went down to Egypt".

Rashi explains - "ארמי אבי -护身符طعمו - את כל אשרカメラ את עמק ושבים לו..."

"The Aramaean Laban wished to exterminate Jacob".

Onkelos also identifies the Aramaean as being Laban.

55. DEUT.32 - "For their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being umpires".

Rashi translates - שופטים - as - judges, and in this sense also the Siphre and Onkelos take it - "Our, לא מצקה, מעפילים, עין,ذهبני - our judges"

"For our strength is not like their strength and our enemies became our judges".

In other words because of the strength of the enemy, we are being judged severely. It is approximately in this sense that the Siphre interprets the verse - כבש, לא מצקה - לא מצקה, מעפילים, עין,ذهبני - כבש מערכת, מעפילים, מעפילים, מעפילים, מעפילים.
56. DEUT. 33:6 - 
"May Reuben live and not die out, but may he be few in number".

Rashi - "ויי ראבּעָן בְּעָליַהוּ חָוָה וְאֵלֶּיהוּ לְזוּלָהוֹ לְבָּנָהּ."
"Let Reuben live in this world; and let him not die in the world to come; that the incident of Bilhah be not remembered unto him".

Rashi's source is the Siphre and Onkelos explains likewise - "וְיִשְׁבָּה בִּלְחָדָה לְקָנָה לְקָנָה לְקָנָה לְקָנָה - "Let Reuben live in the world to come(lit. eternal life) and not die a second death...".

57. DEUT. 33:9 - 
"Who said of his parents, I do not know them".

Rashi explains - "כֵּשָׁמֵהּ בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא בֵּשָׁמְא - "When they sinned in the matter of the golden calf and I said, "who is on the Lord's side etc"., (EX. 32:26), all the sons of Levi gathered themselves unto me, and I ordered them each to kill his mother's father...."

Onkelos translates - "כֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ בֵּשָׁמוֹ - "He (Levi) had no mercy upon his father and his..."
mother when they were found guilty in judgement. Onkelos' addition - is in line with the Rabbi's view that only those who worshipped the golden calf and were found guilty in court (i.e. - ) were sentenced to death.

58. DEUT.33:12 - לָבֶן מִן אָמֶר ... וישָׁמֵי שַׁבָּעַן ... "Of Benjamin he said.....and he dwells under his protection (lit. between his shoulders)".

Rashi...... וְנֵכְבִּיתוּ שְׁם - להבך המותחיםほか importância בבל "On the highest spot of his land was the Temple built".

Onkelos is also in line with this Rabbinic interpretation - "And in his land shall dwell the Shechinah". (i.e. the Temple).

59. DEUT.33:18 - "Of Zebulun he said, rejoice, Zebulun when you sally forth, rejoice in your tents, Issachar".

Rashi - מַאמֵר שְׁמַעְתָּם בֵּעַתַּקְרֵךְ וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ בְּשָׁמָּהָם - "When you sally forth, rejoice in your tents, Issachar".
"Rejoice Zebulun - be successful when thou goest out to trade. And Issachar, be successful when thou sittest in thy tents to study the Torah - to sit in the Sanhedrin and to intercalate the years and to fix the day of New Moon etc".

Rashi's source is the Midrash\(^{177}\); and Onkelos,\(^ {178}\) whilst he disagrees with the explanation of the first part of the verse, seems to conform with the second part:

- "לובדו אתי חי, והם חסיק חסיך לנגסה קרבה עלי, והם חסיק חסיך למשה חסיך ו🧬" [Aramaic translation: "And unto Zebulun he said: rejoice, Zebulun, when thou goest out to war\(^ {179}\) against thy adversaries, and thou Issachar when thou goest to compute the time of the festivals in Jerusalem". To Onkelos, Moses' blessing was that Zebulun shall be successful in war rather than in business. Rashi, however, does not comment on Onkelos.]

60. DEUT.33:19 - "They shall summon nations to the mountain, there they will offer true sacrifices".

Rashi - "עמעש - של שבת, ישראל מכ'קראו - לעם ה'่วยו - ה'osoph כ'нская על'גי קריאת הנה ועם criança - בכרוצים ובעני, איך אمرك."
"The peoples of the tribes of Israel assembled themselves at Mount Moriah to offer sacrifices of righteousness on the festivals". It appears that Rashi's source is Onkelos for the latter translates as follows:

According to Onkelos the word "עקרך" refers to the tribes of Israel and not, as the Siphre and the Midrash take it, that it refers to the nations of the world who will sacrifice in the Temple.

61. DEUT. 33:21 - יִרְאֶה נְאֵшְׁתִי לֹּא יָשֶׁם חֲלֵקְךָ מְחֵקְךָ - 'He chose the best for himself, for to him was allotted a ruler's portion'....

Rashi - כִּי שָׁם חֲלֵקְךָ - כִּי יָמֶה שָׁם בָּגַדְתּוּ חֲלֵקְךָ שָׁם - קְבֻּרֵת מְחֵקְךָ וּמִזְמָא מְשָׁה.

"Because he knew that in his territory was the portion where Moses, the lawgiver, was buried". This is indeed the opinion of the Rabbis that Moses was buried in the territory of Gad and Onkelos interprets likewise.

Although Moses died on Mount Nebo which is in the territory of Reuben, legend has it that the body of the lawgiver was borne on "the pinions of the Shechinah" and interred in the land of Gad.
In some instances Onkelos' brevity and conciseness was simply inadequate for the student of the Targum for whose sake Onkelos' Targum was written. His brevity can sometimes lead to confusion and misunderstanding for it is not easy without full knowledge of the background to decipher the true meaning of his haggadic interpretations.

Rashi, who was fully aware of Onkelos' method, bridges the gap by supplying the interpretations of the Rabbis to that of Onkelos, thus fusing Onkelos with that of the Midrash.

Without further elaboration here are a few examples to illustrate this point.

1. GEN.37 3 - "Now Israel loved Joseph...because he was a child of his old age".

Onkelos translates that Jacob loved Joseph "because he was a wise son to him" - all that he had learnt from Shem and Eber he taught him.

While the first part of Rashi is from Onkelos the second part is purely a midrashic interpretation. To say that Joseph was "wise" over- summarises, Rashi, therefore, bridges the gap by supplying
the Midrash which states that his wisdom consisted of Torah.

2. EX.18:11 - "Now I know that the Lord is the greatest of all gods because he has delivered the people from the power of the Egyptians who dealt so arrogantly with them".

Rashi - "Now I know that the Lord is the greatest of all gods because he has delivered the people from the power of the Egyptians who dealt so arrogantly with them".

Understand this as the Targum does - [for by that very thing with which the Egyptians thought to judge Israel were they themselves judged] - "they had thought to destroy them by water and they were themselves destroyed by water".

The punishment by "water" is not mentioned in the Targum - but rather in the Midrash. Rashi, however, fills the gap as he felt that it is clearly implied from Onkelos' interpretation.

3. EX.20:5-6 - "I punish the children for the sins of the fathers... of those who hate me. But I keep faith with those
who love me and keep my commandments".

Rashi interprets —

"This must be explained in the same sense as the Targum takes it: [visiting the iniquity on the children] when they follow the example of the evil doings of their ancestors; but He stores up the mercy which a person does to give a reward for it to a thousand generations of that person's descendants". The first part of Rashi is taken from the Targum but the source of the second part (v.6) is from the Tosefta Sot. ch.4. Rashi, once again, realised that Onkelos' interpretation is incomplete, and he therefore supplements it from the midrashic literature, thus making the Hebrew text more comprehensible.

4. DEUT.17 - "You must be impartial and listen to high and low alike etc".

Rashi —
Understand it as the Targum has it: [you shall harken unto the words of the small as to those of the great] i.e. that you should not say: this is a poor man and his opponent is rich, and is in any case bidden to support him; I will find in favour of the poor man.

Another explanation is: that you should not say, "how can I offend against the honour of this rich man because of one dinar? I will for the moment decide in his favour and when he leaves the court I will say to him, "give it back to him because in fact you owe it to him".

This elaboration on the part of Rashi is taken almost word by word from the Siphre and Rashi is supplying the latter just to make Onkelos' translation more comprehensible to the student of the Targum.

5. Deut. 31:7 - יַעֲבֹדָה מָשָה לֹֽויֶשָּׁעַ - בִּקְרֵאת אֲבֻדָּה אַתָּה הֵשָּׁע - "Moses summoned Joshua and said to him......Be strong, be resolute; for it is you who are to lead this people into the land...."
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Rashi explains - 

Moses said in effect to Joshua: the Elders of the generation will be with you: everything has to be done according to their opinion and their advice. But the Holy One blessed be He, however, said to Joshua (v.23) -

"For thou shalt bring (Hiphil) the children of Israel into the land".....everything depends on you [alone]: if necessary take a stick and beat them over the head: there can be but one leader for a generation, and not two leaders for a generation.

Onkelos has rightly distinguished between the two verses -

In view, therefore, of the talmudic source it may be summarised that Onkelos was aware of the distinction which Rashi makes explicit: but his rendering of the Hebrew here is literal, and no feature is added to hint at the difference between the divine directive to him and that of Moses.
6. DEUT. 32:17 - "They sacrificed to foreign demons that are no gods...."

Rashi - "Understand this as the Targum does: they sacrificed unto demons in which is no useful advantage, for if there were at least any advantage in them to the world [e.g. the sun, moon and stars] the provocation to anger would not be so intense".

The second part of Rashi is taken from the Siphre and Rashi is supplying the latter just to make Onkelos' interpretation more intelligible to the student of the Targum.

7. DEUT. 32:20 - "I will hide my face from them, he said.....sons who are not to be trusted".

Rashi - It has the same meaning as "faithfulness" as the Targum takes it - [בֵּינֵי אַחֲרֵי פְּעָלִים]
At Sinai they said, we will do it and we will harken, but after a very short time they broke their promise and made the golden calf. 

The addition on the part of Rashi is taken from the Siphre and his intention is merely to explain the unfaithfulness of Israel which Onkelos did not explain.
Rashi's achievement as an exegete concerned to preserve and strengthen Jewish tradition was acclaimed already in his lifetime and endorsed by the following generations who accorded him the title "Parshandata"\(^1\), "Interpreter of the Law". Rashi draws inspiration not only from Onkelos' Targum and other Targumim but also from the Midrash and the Talmud. The two methods which are conspicuous and widely used by Rashi are the "Peshat" and the "Derash". In other words there are two ways of understanding the text, either as closely as possible to its most literal meaning or to interpret it more expansively and dynamically, particularly with the object of combating theological misconception or other untoward conclusions. Several times the literal rendition might cause gross errors with regard to the apparently naive conceptions of God in the Hebrew Scriptures.\(^2\) Sometimes, also, the literal meaning might appear to be in conflict with the current accepted Halacha in the Oral law,\(^3\) and sometimes the literal sense itself can be unintelligible. As to the Midrash two clear distinctions could be made. If the matter concerns jurisprudence then it is termed "Halachic Derash" - legal exegesis; on the other hand if the subject matter deals with dogma or morality and ethics then it is called "Midrash
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Haggadah" - which may be loosely termed "Ethical Exegesis". To write even a general outline as to whether the Halacha resulted from midrashic exegesis or rather gave rise to it is certainly outside the scope of this work. But to confine ourselves to mediaeval scholars close to Rashi's own generation - Judah Halevi, A. Ibn Ezra, and Maimonides believe that the Halacha did not result from midrashic exegesis but was the cause of it. They trace the origin of the Halachot to tradition given to Moses on Mount Sinai. Many modern scholars, however, believe that the Halacha arose from the midrashic exegesis. The deductions of the Rabbis appeared to them to be correct expositions on the biblical text. Among the followers of this view are I.H. Weiss, Lauterbach and S. Rosenblatt.

In my opinion the older conservative view cannot be completely dismissed. The talmudic appeal to - אָנָּהּ - (support) - וּפָרֹפֶה - and - הַמַּשְׁהִנָּה - (an allusion) as such - rather than regarding the texts appealed to, or alternative text, as basic authority for halachic practice - would surely be inapposite if the practice itself were a complete innovation for which retrospective biblical authority was being sought. The situation rather presupposes a body of traditional institutional practice, much but not all of which has a foundation
GROUP E (a)

(or at the very least a long-standing association) with the biblical text; and the very existence of this body of halachic practice has stimulated the growth of some types of midrashic interpretations as a reflection of itself.

The fact, too, that the Rabbis have used the same mode of reasoning and deductions with regard to "Halachot de-Rabanan" (Rabbinical laws) in supporting them from a biblical text when in fact they do not call for support as they are purely "independent Halachot", shows clearly that the text is a "mere support" or "mnemotechnical aid". Hence it would appear that the fact that a biblical verse was sought does not necessarily prove that the law deduced was regarded by the Rabbis as inherent in the text.

In connection with this subject C. Taylor has this to say: "Rabbinic citations of Scripture are not intended always as absolute proofs of the doctrines and ideas in connection with which they are deduced". Most likely the Rabbis were compelled to support the "traditional Halachot" from biblical verses simply because of the approach of the Sadducees and the Samaritans who did not believe in the Oral Law and insisted that everything should be adduced from a biblical text.
Before we proceed to explain the exact meaning of the Peshat and Derash which Rashi employed in his commentary, it may be of interest to say that to the Rabbis of the Talmud the plain sense of the text was of subordinate interest to them. Their main concern was to deduce legal matters and ethical conduct. Nevertheless, we do find some literal and straightforward interpretations which are scattered in the Talmud and the Midrashim. The famous formula... is usually translated, "A verse cannot escape its plain meaning". This statement is cited time and again by all scholars to prove that although the Rabbis were saturated by midrashic exegesis of the Bible, they were nevertheless fully aware of the "Peshat" that the plain meaning of the text was the definitive one. However, the frequent citation of this by modern scholars is overdone. This formula is used as a form of protest only, (Siphre DEUT. Piska 1) at exaggerated deductions from the biblical text by manipulating or perverting it.

A brief study of the following sources reveals that what the Rabbis meant by the word "Peshat" is something completely different from the meaning
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which is given to it today, namely the "literal" meaning of the text. Perhaps the first one to distinguish between Peshat and Derash as we understand it nowadays at least, in French schools, was Rashi and all scholars have wrongly applied it to the talmudic use of this word. At any rate it appears that the distinction of the Rabbis was not between the literal and the homiletical meanings as in fact we shall prove from the following examples.

GEN.49:11-12 - "וַיָּבֹא אֶל הָעֵרָה - כֶּשֶׁם בָּשָׂם חֲבָשָׁה."

"Binding unto the vine his foal and to the vine branch the son of his she ass.... His eyes are red from wine, and the whiteness of his teeth is with milk".

This passage in question is discussed in Bab. Tal. Ket. p. 113b. - ב אֶת אֵת כֶּשֶׁם בָּשָׂם חֲבָשָׁה..."אֶל הָעֵרָה - כֶּשֶׁם בָּשָׂם חֲבָשָׁה."

Here we may see this distinction clearly. The foal is compared to the vine branch, and the son of the she-ass is compared to a person who is drunk. The eyes are red from wine, and the teeth are white from milk.
"Rab Dimi said there is not a single grapevine in the land of Israel [so poor that it] will not need the inhabitants of a whole city to harvest it etc. And since you might say that it is suitable for young people but unsuitable for old, it was explicitly stated "And his teeth white with milk", read not "teeth white" (shinnayim) but "to him who is advanced in years" (leben shanim). In what sense is the plain meaning of the text to be understood?

When Rab Dimi came he explained: The Congregation of Israel said to the Holy One, blessed be He, Lord of the Universe give me a hint with thine eyes which will be sweeter to me than wine and show me thy teeth which will be sweeter than milk".

The question of the Talmud, "what is the Peshat of the verse" and the subsequent interpretation of Rab Dimi seems to imply that His first interpretation, since it is not Peshat, must be considered "Derash". But in actual fact one can also see that His "Peshat interpretation" is purely another "Derash" and it cannot be called "Peshat" by any stretch of the imagination. The range of מְשָׁאָר - is here interchangeable with that of מְשָׁ֑ר the only difference being that for the former (משאר) a link with the text ( וּמְשָׁאָר) has been discovered, albeit leading to a far from literal interpretation, whilst
for the latter (שדים), results that are equally far from literalism have been achieved through the assumption - be it casual and erroneous, or deliberate and midrashically intended - that - יָרָא - is to be derived not from - יָרָא - (ass - cult) parallel to - בֵּן נַחֲרִיָּה - in the same verse, but from - יָרָא - (city).

Again, let us consider the following example -

PROV. 23 - 2

"When thou sittest to eat with a ruler consider well him that is before thee, and put a knife to thy throat if thou be a man given to appetite".

This passage is quoted in Bab. Tal. Hul. 6a. Rabbi Meir understood from this verse that the drinking of wine prepared by the Samaritans should be discouraged. The Talmud asks - what is the Peshat of the verse? Thereupon the Talmud replies that the reference is to a disciple sitting before his master. (Identifying teacher with - מַהֲרָה). If the disciple knows that the teacher can answer any question, he should enquire, but if not, he should leave him and seek another teacher. Once again, one can see that the text quite plainly deals with "table etiquette" and the interpretation of the Rabbis is purely Derash and not Peshat. As a matter of fact
while the Talmud calls this latter exegesis Peshat, in his commentary on Proverbs specifically Rashi calls the same exegesis "Derash" זב' שעיב דר'אש - מקזכ' וברח לי ה(entן) מש' ואר עניי זכר ואיפיק והרבינוו דרשו יבב'ימיייון קים לפי חוהו... "When you sit to eat with a ruler, consider carefully whether he is well - or ill-disposed towards you etc. Our Rabbis, however, have given the midrashic explanation that the reference is to a teacher and his disciple". Rashi, therefore, was fully aware that the talmudical use of the word Peshat should not be taken in its literal sense.

Again PROV. ch.25:20 - "As one that putteth 5 on a garment in cold weather, and as vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth song to heavy heart". This verse is quoted in Hull. p.133a, in connection with the priestly portions and Abaye thereupon said to Rab Dimi - אשתמך חכימה יב', כותיב What does the Peshat of this verse refer to? And the reply was that it refers to a teacher who teaches a wicked disciple. The heavy hearted person is the wicked pupil to whom it is useless to (sing) to teach him the Torah. The Peshat here offered by Rab Dimi is merely a confirmation of the foregoing non-literal exegesis.
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In the same talmudical passage Rabbi Zira offers the same explanation on PROV. 26:16: "As he that bindeth a stone in a sling, so is he that giveth honour to a fool."

According to Rabbi Zira the text means that he who teaches an unworthy pupil is as he who casts a stone on the heap of Mercury. Once again, in his commentary on Proverbs Rashi specifically quotes Rabbi Zira's interpretation and calls it Derash, and not Peshat as the Talmud asserts.

Having cited these examples we may, therefore, suggest that in talmudical times the word Peshat had a different connotation and it was taken to mean a thorough investigation into the relevant text. Primarily the word Peshat is derived from the verb - שבת - to stretch forth. (e.g. SHAB. ch. 1. Mishna 1 - שבת והר桙 - to straighten, flatten, hence to give a detailed exposition. In this connection the verb - שבת - is synonymous and interchangeable with the verb - לברוח - to expound or with the verb - לברוח - to study. Thus Rabbi Yanai is described as having been expounding the various accounts in the following manner. Sometimes as - ווושב יתנש - or as - ווושב ותנש - which all mean expounding the relevant accounts thoroughly.
This would explain further Abaye's assertion with regard to the law of incitement to apostasy of "thy brother the son of thy mother"; two sons of the same father might be less likely to entice each other because one reduces the patrimony of the other, whereas in the case of two sons of the same mother (but of different fathers) one is more likely to be able to entice the other to apostasy, since neither affects the other's heritage. Although this is surely not the literal meaning of the text nonetheless to Abaye this is - קינון בשרפין. To Abaye the noun "Peshat" means the "natural" and deeper meaning of the text rather than its literalism. A similar meaning can be seen from the revealing passage in the Midrash Tanhuma: Rabbi Akiva was asked by the "Chazan" (Cantor) to read publicly the scriptural portion but he declined saying, that "the only reason I refused to do so simply was that I had not gone over the reading two and three times". One is permitted to read the Torah publicly only until he studied it thoroughly. The famous Amora Raba uses both terminologies interchangeably in one sentence. Also the famous Amora Abaye speaks of two meanings in one instance and somehow fuses - קינון ובראשית ובראשית. All this shows that in talmudical times the "plain" exegesis of the
text (in the modern sense of plain) was of subordinate interest.

The clearest place, perhaps, where the noun Peshat has the current meaning is in SHAB.63. Rabbi Eliezer permits the bearing of arms on the Sabbath since they are an adornment. The Talmud supports him from PSALMS 95:4 - "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one, thy glory and thy majesty". When Rabbi Kahana objects and says that this verse refers to the Torah, Mar Bar Rabina answers him - נְמֵרַע יָגְדוּלָּה - "สะפנ". In other words presumably the Peshat is that sword means sword.

M. Gertner's attempt to distinguish between - ושׁוֹשֵׁנ - and - ושׁוֹשֵׁנ - needs no refutation as R. Loewe who made a thorough investigation on this subject has rightly observed that this assertion is untenable in the light of several passages in the Talmud and Midrashim.

In conclusion the assumption that Peshat in the Mishna, Gemara or Midrashim means always "plain exegesis" just cannot be substantiated. At any rate, we should not determine for ourselves what exactly the Rabbis meant by - והָשִׁישׁ - and then impose this on their exegesis, for this is just to confuse and misrepresent their true aim of the study of the Bible which is, as said above, to deduce legal matters and ethical conduct. The Rabbis have used this term in a very "loose" way
and its explanation is modified according to the subject matter. In other words as I.H. Weiss rightly remarked "that what is to be regarded as plain, straightforward exposition is a question to which different periods, intellectual climates, and even individual temperaments will give varying answers; so that we should not be justified in disallowing a claim by early Rabbinic comment to be prosecuting literal exegesis merely because it conflicts with our own notions of rationalism". The fact, too, that the Rabbis have warned against translating a verse with formal literalism (ןו-

reinforces the idea that they did not understand the word "Peshat" as we understand it today. It is, therefore, clear from the foregoing brief study that "notions of plain literalism as a formal branch of Rabbinic exegesis ought, up to the end of the period of the Talmudim and the Midrashim, be abandoned". For groping into that direction can only lead to inflated claims and distort the whole concept of the Rabbinic approach to Bible exegesis.
Although Rashi did not write prefaces to his works and indicate the method to be pursued yet, it appears that his prime concern is the Peshat of the text as can be seen from his forceful expression: "There are many midrashic explanations and our teachers have already collected them in their appropriate places in GEN. Rabbah and in other Midrashim. I, however, am only concerned with the plain sense of Scripture and with such Aggadot that explain the words of Scripture in a manner that fits in with them.\textsuperscript{1} The emphatic expression - נְקֵבָּה בַּשָּׁם - indicates his commitment to the Peshat and that it should not be subordinated to the Derash. The phrase - יְנַשֵׁה בַּיָּה - occurs in PROV.25\textsuperscript{11} and Rashi translates it - שָׁנָה - "on its base". In other words there should be complete harmony between the text and its interpretation so that its natural sense can be vividly seen in the wording of the text. "Table One" will show to the student Rashi's concern for the Peshat of the text, and that even though he quotes the Derash the Peshat is by no means sacrificed. This Table is by no means exhaustive and the reader is bound to find many more examples of this nature. In this Table, we have confined ourselves to the Pentateuch only, but the reader will no doubt see that his commitment for the Peshat method is common throughout his commentary on
the Bible.

In the first instance it appears that Rashi took the word Peshat as we understand it today. Thus in

1. GEN.8:7 - 
   ישן את ה lul ויהי
Rashi says - "The real Peshat of the text is what it plainly implies". Onkelos also follows the Peshat of the text - 
   עד paginate ביום מין - "until the waters were dried up from the earth".

2. Again, GEN.12:3 - 
   הבכית בל כיсложнות הארובה
Rashi says - "There are many Aggadot concerning the text but the Peshat is as follows - "A man says to his son, mayest thou become as Abraham". This is, too, Onkelos' translation -"Because of you shall the families of the earth be blessed".

3. In some instances Rashi remarks that Onkelos is in accordance with the Peshat of the text. Thus in
   GEN.14:7 - 
   "On their way back they came to En-Mishpat, which is now Kadesh".
Rashi explains -

"It is here named En-Mishpat (the well of judgement) in reference to what would happen there in the future - where Moses and Aaron would once be judged because of what occurred at that fountain. It is identical with the waters of Meribah. (cf. NUM.20:1 and 13). Onkelos, however, translates according to the Peshat of the text: "They came back to the plain [where the people of the district used to gather] for the dispensation of lawsuits".

4. Again, GEN.46:30 - "All of it is for me. Now I am ready to die".

Rashi explains -

Its literal meaning is as the Targum renders it -

"If I were to die now etc...".

5. Sometimes Rashi says, not -

but just - "And the king of..."
Sodom went out... to the vale of Shaveh.

Rashi explains - "empty plain" - clear of trees and all impediments.

6. Again, GEN.46:28 - "And he sent Judah before him... to direct him unto Goshen".

Rashi explains - Render this as the Targum does: to clear a place for him and to show him how he should settle in it.

7. Again, GEN.25:28 - "Isaac favoured Esau because he kept him supplied with venison".

Rashi explains - Understand this as the Targum renders it: In Isaac's mouth (i.e. Isaac ate the venison he brought home).

Furthermore, Peshat in its strictest sense can further be seen by his stylistic expression - or other similar expressions. The emergence of Peshat in Rashi's time could be seen further by
the discussion Rashi had with his grandson Samuel-ben-Meir, known as Rashbam, and his confession about the need to revise his commentary in the light of new "Peshatim" that appeared daily. Rashbam himself complained about his predecessors who were so deeply imbued by midrashic interpretations that they ignored the profundity of the Peshat.

No doubt Rashi was influenced in regard to the Peshat method by the Spanish lexicographers Menahem ben-Seruk and Dunash Ibn Labrat whom he quotes constantly in his commentary. Most likely, also Rashi was influenced by Rabbi Joseph Kara and Menahem ben-Helbo, who favoured the Peshat method. Perhaps he learnt about their interpretation through his grandson Samuel ben-Meir.
Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept

We have said above that Rashi has taken the word "Peshat" to mean the literal meaning of the verse as in fact we understand it today. Nonetheless, here and there we find that he falls back on the looser talmudical understanding of this word, and so long as the Derash does no violence to the text, to Rashi it is in order to call it Peshat. Thus in

1. GEN. 22:14 - נִקְרָא אֲבָרָהָם... ה' יִרְאָה

Abraham named that place..."Hashem-Yireh".
Rashi explains - נִקְרָא אֲבָרָהָם... ה' יִרְאָה

"Its real Peshat is as the Targum renders it: the Lord will choose and select for Himself His place to make His Shechinah reside in it and for sacrifices to be offered there. The Midrash Aggadah, etc...."

2. Again NUM. 24:8 - נַפֵּץ אֲנָלִי עִנָּה

"Falling (Balaam), but having his eyes uncovered". Rashi explains - נַפֵּץ אֲנָלִי עִנָּה

"Its Peshat is as the Targum has it: (seeing lying down, asleep when it was revealed to him) meaning,
that God revealed Himself to him only at night when he was lying on his bed. And a midrashic explanation etc....

3. Again, GEN.14:13 - והִבְּאָרָעַלֵעַ לְעַבְרָאֶם וְהָבַע אֶלְמָאֶה "But a fugitive came and told Abraham etc."

Rashi explains: - אֲעַלָּה יִפְשָׁצִיו בָּא יָא וּעַבְרָא According to the "Peshat" this was Og who had escaped from the battle.

The above cited interpretations are purely "Derash" and cannot be called "Peshat" by any stretch of the imagination. Rashi had not always taken the word "Peshat" as we understand it today but rather in the looser talmudic sense of something traditionally accepted. Normally to Rashi, Peshat is the "natural" sense of the text and the accepted meaning as it was generally taught rather than its "literal" sense. Thus we find him changing his stylistic expressions, sometimes - פְּשָׁצִיו בָּא וּכְלַרְכָּעַו - and sometimes כְּלַרְכָּעַו פָּרַשּׁו - where in fact all mean the same.

We should not be disturbed by this attitude of Rashi since quite often he makes it clear that the Peshat must be studied in the light of the piel meaning of - בָּשַׁה. The verb - בָּשַׁה - means to settle, to put
in place, to arrange evenly⁸ - hence to clarify the text by harmonising contradictions and removing all obscurity. To Rashi, therefore, all these requirements cannot be fulfilled if we are to understand the text according to its "literal" meaning. This is a justifiable procedure in his view, especially with regard to passages concerned with Halacha,⁹ even though it has to be recognised as being part and parcel of a scholastic approach which contemporary attitudes to scholarly research would consider illegitimate.
Rashi, perhaps, was the first one, at least in France, to introduce a new trend of biblical exegesis, i.e. the deliberate juxtaposition in putting the Derash and the Peshat side by side, or (what he regarded as) the Peshat of Onkelos with the Derash of the Rabbis. However, despite his assertion that - his prime concern is the Peshat, nevertheless the Derash was by no means ignored. This is because Rashi considered the two methods to be equally legitimate and fruitful of results. Rashi, says Berliner "employed an in-between method, in which the Peshat and the Derash were easily united owing to the care he exercised, to chose from the one or the other what most directly approximated the simple meaning of the text. Rashi was free in his treatment of traditional legends, now transforming, now lengthening, now abridging them or joining several narratives in one, according to expediency." Although Berliner's opinion is fairly comprehensive it is not, however, completely accurate. As a rule, it is correct to say that when the Midrash does no violence to the text, Rashi is inclined to adopt its interpretation. If there are also several midrashic interpretations of one textual verse Rashi's prime motive is to choose the one that accords best with the natural sense of the text.
Quite often on midrashic interpretations, Rashi remarks that a verse should not be detached from its setting. However, despite his assertion about this, nonetheless he does not keep to his rule and quite often for no apparent reason, he is apt to fall back upon the Midrash and ignores or, at least, he does not offer the Peshat of the text. He does so even when the passage offers no difficulty.

1. Thus in GEN.32 - "And Jacob sent messengers...."

Rashi explains - "He sent actual angels".

Onkelos, on the other hand, translates as messengers - "as messengers" -

2. Again GEN.32 - "And there wrestled a man with him."

Rashi explains - "Our Rabbis explained that he was Esau's guardian angel".

For no apparent reason Rashi had to interpret this midrashically when the text says clearly - Onkelos, once again, translates literally - a man.
3. Again GEN. 37 — "he being a lad - Rashi, again, has this to say - "טוער - שהייתי צעיר מער彈כ. "טוער - טוער. מַעַרְכָּכָה, מַעַרְכָּכָה, מַעַרְכָּכָה."

His actions were [foppishly] childish: "he dressed his hair, he touched up his eyes so that he should appear good-looking. Onkelos (not quoted by Rashi), Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate "ובָּאָבָא" by "בָּאָבָא" - "brought up". And Joseph was brought up together with the sons of Bilhah. (Speaker's text reads "ובָּאָבָא".)

4. Again GEN. 37 — "וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֲחָשָּׁב - "And a man found him".

Rashi explains - "וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֲחָשָּׁב - "This was the angel Gabriel".

Onkelos follows the literal meaning of the text - "וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֲחָשָּׁב - "And a man found him".

5. GEN. 37 — "וַיְרַגֵּר נַחַל אָגָר - "And we shall see what will become of his dreams". The text, here, is merely adducing a colloquial expression, most likely common in biblical times, but Rashi who was deeply imbued by midrashic literature, is not prepared to accept this, and offers a midrashic interpretation - "וַיְרַגֵּר נַחַל אָגָר - "And we shall see what will become of his dreams". The text, here, is merely adducing a colloquial expression, most likely common in biblical times, but Rashi who was deeply imbued by midrashic literature, is not prepared to accept this, and offers a midrashic interpretation - "וַיְרַגֵּר נַחַל אָגָר - "And we shall see what will become of his dreams".
Rabbi Isaac said, this verse calls for a homiletic explanation. The Holy Spirit said this latter part of the verse. They said "let us slay him" and the Holy Spirit interrupts their speech and concludes - and we shall see what will become of his dreams: we shall see whose words will be fulfilled - yours or mine. The Targumim again translate the text as it stands. Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

Onkelos reads -

6. Again GEN.49:6 - רַקְרַק שָׁוֶיה - Rashi follows the Midrash that - שָׁוֶיה - refers to Joseph מְלֹודֶת אֲרֵי - 1010 שְׁנָיֵים מְשְׁכָרִים. He does not attempt to quote Onkelos who takes - שָׁוֶיה - in the sense of - שָׁוֶיה - a wall, fortification, stronghold.

7. Again GEN.42:2 - כִּיָּדוּם שָׁמַעְתָּ - "go down thither and buy grain", etc.

8. Again LEV.26:12 - "And I will walk to and fro among you". This, too, is no more than a common phrase showing God's love towards Israel that His Divine glory will always watch over them. In fact, Onkelos takes it in this sense - "I will walk with you in the Garden of Eden". 15

9. NUM.13:20 - "and does it grow trees or not". The text here is self-explanatory and Onkelos, as well as the other Targumim translate literally. Rashi, however, for no reason comments - "whether there is a righteous man amongst them who will protect them by his merits".

10. NUM.13:31 - "They are stronger than we are". The word - may mean "from him" or "from us". Onkelos, who follows the literal meaning of the text takes it in the latter sense - Rashi, however, takes it in the former sense -
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- הדיבוה ירה מקלד אתרא - so that the Israelites said: they (the Canaanites) are stronger than him than God 19.

In all these cases 20 Rashi follows the Midrash unnecessarily and does not attempt to say - 19 לשכשועו - or - הכשועו - as he does in other cases 21.

11. Again DEUT. 16 - "And judge fairly between man and man, whether fellowman, countryman or resident alien". The literal meaning of - א - is a stranger. Onkelos translates it by - יהו אינא - "proselyte". Rashi, however, explains - ולحياء דינא שלושא עלוף רבכימ "This is his opponent in the lawsuit who merely heaps up - (לワ) words against him" 22.

Another explanation given by Rashi is - לך על עוק - ליהו בן יولوج אתרשי - "Also in a matter concerning a dwelling house - (לואז - to dwell) in the division of property amongst brothers" 23.

Rashi, however, seems to ignore the Talmud 24 which takes it as Onkelos does.
GROUP E (f)

Rashi's Correlation of Peshat and Derash.

Bearing in mind the foregoing analysis Peshat and Derash in relation to Rashi - it might be appropriate to add that Rashi's interest in the Peshat, as seen above, poses the question of how are we to assess his determined adherence to midrashic exegesis so far as he can do so. To this question we put forward four possible explanations:

a). This may be due to the Franco-German environment of his days. The Jewish public was imbued by midrashic exegesis and was not ready to abandon it. The masses in his lifetime were not so cultivated that he could confine himself to a purely grammatical point or the Peshat method. The Pentateuch in "Ashkenaz" (France-Germany) was studied not so much for its own sake, but rather because it was believed to enshrine the best of ethics and morality, the code of civil and religious laws. In short it was the source of all hopes. "Every thought, every feeling bore an intimate relation to Scriptures. The Midrash, (therefore) exercised an irresistible attraction upon simple, deeply devout souls". Rashi, therefore, who realised that the Peshat cannot be disregarded, projected a new method in his commentary, by postulating Peshat and Derash side by side, as can be seen from Table One, thus catering not only for the emergence of the new school of thought which considered "Peshat exegesis"
as paramount for the understanding of the text, but also for the old school of thought which cared about "midrashic exegesis" and which at the time were not prepared to abandon it. However, to the latter school, Rashi was indeed a teacher and guide, warning the reader as he goes along, not to fall into the pitfalls of the Derash hermeneutics, as quite often they do not fit in with the natural sense of the text. Thus, for the benefit of this school one can see the careful planning and selection of Rashi in choosing only - [מַרְכָּבָּתָם חַיָּה] - midrashic exegesis that commends itself as plausibly consistent with the text. And for this purpose, in many instances, he did not quote a Midrash literally but either abridged or augmented it, or even altered its wording. All this was done in order to explain and elucidate the text which was his prime concern. At the same time Rashi had also warned the new school of Peshat not to reject completely the Derash for there are certain verses - [הַכְּרִיךְ נָהוּ] - which call for a midrashic interpretation. Having said this we should not therefore be disturbed nor disheartened by the constant shifting of ground which exists in his commentary from the midrashic exegesis to the Peshat exegesis and vice versa,
for Rashi, as said above, had to cater for the two schools which existed in his lifetime.

b). We may also say that this "dual" exegetical nature - Peshat and Derash - was caused by the fact that his commentary was not written in one go but rather in stages as he has done for the Talmud (and this is why he was known by "the name Kuntras" i.e. Commentaries), and each undertaking depended on the temperament of the commentator and his approach to the biblical text at the particular time of writing. Thus at one time the evaluation of Peshat was paramount in his mind, and at another the Derash and again the dual exegetical approach for the clarification of the text. It all depended on the mood and inclination of the commentator when he approached the biblical text. His final realisation that the Peshat and Derash are two separate worlds and that they should be detached from each other came quite late in his life, most likely when his commentary had been completed and widely known in the Rabbinic circles as can be seen from the discussion he had with his grandson Samuel Ben Meir. According to the latter Rashi had confessed that had he had time he would have re-written his commentary in conformity with "explanations that suggest themselves day after day". At this stage it may be worth mentioning that even had he had the opportunity of revising his commentary although we would have certainly seen a greater inclination towards the Peshat method, nonetheless
one may doubt whether Rashi would have gone so far as to reject the Midrash altogether or to ignore at all times the Halacha for the sake of the Peshat, which indeed his grandson, himself introduced into his commentary.  

A third reason for this "dual" nature which Rashi displays might be due to Onkelos. Rashi was greatly influenced by the latter and his method. The Targum as we have seen contains Peshat exegesis as well as midrashic and halachic hermenetics. And although on the whole Onkelos is closer to the Peshat nonetheless the shifting of ground from Peshat to the Derash and vice versa is quite evident also in his Targum, and as indeed our Halachic and Midrashic Sections prove. Onkelos and Rashi were fully aware that the Pentateuch cannot be explained just according to the Peshat method for it contains not only the history of the fathers of the Jewish people - Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his children, but also civil and religious laws, ethics and morality. Consequently the Peshat and the Derash must both be deployed if the significance of all these aspects were to secure appreciative understanding by the Jewish public.
d). A fourth reason for this "dual" exegetical nature which Rashi evidences, may have been as a precaution on his part in order to avoid any suspicion by the Jewish public that he believes in the doctrines of the Karaites and their method in interpreting the Pentateuch. Although Rashi and his school were not familiar with the works of the Karaites, they undoubtedly had heard of their existence and their methods in interpreting the biblical texts. To the Karaites the Peshat of the text was fundamental in the understanding of the text and the Derash hermeneutics were completely rejected by them. In Rashi's time the Karaites schism was very strong and not long before him Rab Saadia Gaon (882-942) the greatest opponent of the Karaites had to combat their mode of interpreting the Bible. Whilst to Rab Saadia Gaon and his followers it is impossible to comprehend the Bible without the help of the Oral law (Mishna and Talmud), to the Karaites the Scriptures are the sole and direct source of religious law, to the exclusion of the Oral law. The Karaites were convinced that their teaching represented the pure original Mosaic law, free of Rabbanite distortion and corruption. Therefore, had Rashi been determined to adhere to the Peshat method only, he would have been accused of Karaism.
Although admittedly his commentary on the Mishna and the Talmud would have sufficed to repudiate this criticism, nonetheless certain elements of suspicion could easily have arisen: if on the Pentateuch, the source of all things, Rashi had ignored the Oral Law and made his comments according to the method pursued by the Karaites. Thus Rashi's juxtaposition in putting Peshat and Derash side by side is fully understandable. This theory is not far fetched when one bears in mind the following points: a). In Rashi's time, as said above, the Jewish public in Ashkenaz (Franco-Germany) was solely imbued by midrashic exegesis and was not ready to abandon it. And, therefore, in those circumstances had Rashi introduced the "Peshat method" only, he would have certainly been accused of "Karaism". b). At times, Rashi states that the Halachic Derash of the Rabbis does not give the literal interpretation of the passage; at others he interprets a text contrary to the decided Halacha in the Talmud. Might not this statement smack of Karaism? If he were to remain an impeccable adherent of Rabbanism, how would he justify his actions in interpreting several biblical texts not in accordance with the Oral Law? On the other hand seeing that Rashi interpreted many biblical texts in accordance with the Rabbanite's view,
and in view also of the fact that on numerous occasions he puts the Peshat and the Derash side by side, we may ignore the fact that he has sometimes ignored the Derash Halacha of the Rabbis. For his main intention was purely to draw the attention of the student not to ignore the "Peshat Halacha" which is also paramount for the understanding of the text. c). Furthermore, had Rashi adopted the literal meaning only of the text he would certainly have been accused of heterodoxy as in fact happened to his grandson Samuel ben Meir, who was too extreme in his comments in adopting the Peshat method and ignored the Derash Halacha of the Rabbis. "The Iggeret Hashabbat" \(^{11}\) of Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra with regard to the interpretation of GEN.\(^{15} \) is directed against Rabbi Samuel ben Meir and, self-evident that Rabbi Samuel was accused of heresy \(^{12}\). The omission of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir's commentary of GENESIS,ch.1-36 inclusive, from all the editions of the Pentateuch is further support to this very accusation.
TABLE ONE

Where the "Peshat" and "Derash" are quoted in juxtaposition.

In this Table, too, the terms "Peshat" and "Talmudic" are emphasised.

1. Although this list is substantially complete it does not claim to be exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 9:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 12:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 12:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 12:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 15:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 18:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 19:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 19:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 20:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 20:16</td>
<td>...ותמרנה את אלהים אבד רועה ל느냐 חכמה פרעה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 21:11</td>
<td>...והוא יושב ב הצדיקים של אמריו ידך אפשע המלך...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 22:14</td>
<td>... 념יהו - ב.tableViewה הגדולה... ומזכיר את המכון...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 23:17</td>
<td>...ויכן שרה אבכורה מארץ, וเมน הופעתו של מכון...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 25:3</td>
<td>... גם ג öz ארבעה הגד instantiated חסרה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 25:27</td>
<td>... איש שם - הכפשתו והזק אלוהים בבראשו...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27:28a</td>
<td>...ולא יחלוף يتم, ולא יפושט הזה ברויא זכרו...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27:28b</td>
<td>... בפש דמות - הכפשתו,UIAlertני الجمهور של הבני...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27:41</td>
<td>...עוד פעם - הכפשתו והוזר של הקהל של העם...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27:42</td>
<td>... מחיוכל להם - ת التجارية... ואתם嗥ת... ולא פשטו אפילו...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 33:8</td>
<td>... כל המגזר - פושחלו על מכון, והזא... ומאם... ומאם...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 33:20</td>
<td>... עקרם שמעו... חל רע, וזכרו נזרו... ואתה פשטו של)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 35:16</td>
<td>... בכרת הקרי - מרבד בפיו... זכרת... והזא... והזא...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 37:16</td>
<td>... משא ומת.... זוו אחר בשר פושחלו על מכון לחיי ברכ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GEN. 37:2 | ... כתב על המעשהhé... }
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 37:17</td>
<td>נַעֲלוֹ הָעָיוֹן הַﬠַדִּיק תֵּאֵל אֶל עֲבוֹדֵי עֲבוֹדֵי אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 37:35</td>
<td>אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים לֶ֛פֶן שָׁוָאָהוּ אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 42:1</td>
<td>לָמֶה תְכַרְרוּ אֶתְכֶם אֶחְזֵיכֶם נַעֲלוֹ הָעָיוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 42:14</td>
<td>אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים לֶ֛פֶן שָׁוָאָהוּ אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43:7</td>
<td>הָלְוָא הָעָיוֹן לָמֶה תְכַרְרוּ אֶתְכֶם אֶחְזֵיכֶם נַעֲלוֹ הָעָיוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43:14</td>
<td>מֶעָרָה הָאָרֶץ דַּלֶּה שָׁוָאָהוּ אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 44:18</td>
<td>כְּעַטְחָה אָבִי בֵּית גָּלֶת לֵאָנֶיהוּ אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 45:24</td>
<td>אַּחֲזַּקְוֻנָּה אֱלֹהִים לֶ֛פֶן שָׁוָאָהוּ אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 46:30</td>
<td>עִם הֵצִיתְוָא אֱלֹהִים אֶל עֲבֹדֵי אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49:6</td>
<td>כְּבָא הֵאָמִיר אֱלֹהִים אֶל אָבָנָי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49:22</td>
<td>בְּלֵי בִּרְכָּה אָבָנָי אָנֹךְ אֵלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 50:5</td>
<td>אָזְעַר כרְכָּתוּ אֱלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים אִיזָּרוּ אֱלֹהִים אֱלֻּבָּא אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EX. 2

EX. 2

EX. 2

EX. 2

EX. 2
TABLE ONE

EX. 15 1

EX. 15 2

EX. 15 8

EX. 15 26

EX. 18 9

EX. 19 13

EX. 19 17

EX. 21 28

EX. 22 8

EX. 22 24

EX. 22 29

EX. 23 2

EX. 23 20

EX. 25 12
## TABLE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EX. 3110</th>
<th>56, פָּשָׁעְתִי בְּעַשֵּׁהַ הָאָרֶץ</th>
<th>בֹּקֶר בּוֹקֶר</th>
<th>בֹּקֶר בּוֹקֶר</th>
<th>בֹּקֶר בּוֹקֶר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX. 325</td>
<td>• • •</td>
<td>• • •</td>
<td>• • •</td>
<td>• • •</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX. 3313</td>
<td>לִכְּהֵן</td>
<td>לִכְּהֵן</td>
<td>לִכְּהֵן</td>
<td>לִכְּהֵן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX. 3321</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX. 347</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX. 3420</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 116</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 43</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 513</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 1015</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 1352</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 1355</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 1356</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 153</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE ONE

<p>| LEV. 16:2 | ...וֹתֵּ֣קְרָֽהַ֔וֹת, וּפָשׁוּֽאָהּ, וְלֹ֩אָ֣בִֽדָּ֔הּ | ...וֹתֵּ֣קְרָֽהַ֔וֹת, וּפָשׁוּֽאָהּ, וְלֹ֩אָ֣בִֽדָּ֔הּ |
| LEV. 19:3 | ...וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ | ...וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ |
| LEV. 19:5 | ...שׁוֹפֹ֣טֶת, וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ | ...שׁוֹפֹ֣טֶת, וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ |
| LEV. 20:9 | ...שָׁמַ֣רְתָּם | ...שָׁמַ֣רְתָּם |
| LEV. 20:17 | ...לֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...לֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 20:21 | ...אֲדֹנָ֣י חֵֽן | ...אֲדֹנָ֣י חֵֽן |
| LEV. 21:4 | ...וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ | ...וְלֹ֑אָֽבִּ֖דָּהּ |
| LEV. 21:12 | ...וּלְךָ | ...וּלְךָ |
| LEV. 23:16 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 24:3 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 25:8 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 25:14 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 25:15 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |
| LEV. 25:24 | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ | ...וְלֹ֑א הַֽעֲמָדָּ֖הּ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT.</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT.</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT.</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT.</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT.</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT. 28:2</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:4</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:5</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:6</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:7</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:8</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:9</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 28:10</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Rashi quoted Onkelos’ Targum either by saying -םלוכ - or -םלוכ - or just by quoting his exact words.

| GEN.3 15 | GEN.15 2 |
| GEN.3 24 | GEN.15 11 |
| GEN.4 19 | GEN.17 17 |
| GEN.6 6 | GEN.17 18 |
| GEN.9 27 | GEN.18 14 |
| GEN.11 6 | GEN.18 19 |
| GEN.12 17 | GEN.18 20 |
| GEN.12 20 | GEN.18 23 |
| GEN.13 11 | GEN.19 8 |
| GEN.14 6 | GEN.19 14 |
| GEN.14 7 | GEN.19 15 |
| GEN.14 14 | GEN.19 18 |
| GEN.14 17 | GEN.20 16 |

1. To the best of my knowledge this list is exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN.20</th>
<th>GEN.26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.22</td>
<td>GEN.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.22</td>
<td>GEN.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.22</td>
<td>GEN.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.24</td>
<td>GEN.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.24</td>
<td>GEN.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.24</td>
<td>GEN.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.24</td>
<td>GEN.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.25</td>
<td>GEN.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.25</td>
<td>GEN.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.25</td>
<td>GEN.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.25</td>
<td>GEN.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.25</td>
<td>GEN.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.26</td>
<td>GEN.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.30²⁸</td>
<td>GEN.37²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.30³⁸</td>
<td>GEN.38²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.30⁴¹</td>
<td>GEN.38²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.30⁴²</td>
<td>GEN.3⁹²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3¹¹⁰</td>
<td>GEN.⁴⁰¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3¹³⁴</td>
<td>GEN.⁴⁰¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3¹³⁹</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3³¹²</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3³¹⁹</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3⁴²⁷</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3⁵⁸</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹⁴⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3⁷³</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹⁴¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3⁷²⁵</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹⁴³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.3⁷²⁶</td>
<td>GEN.⁴¹⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 41 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 41 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 42 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 42 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 43 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 44 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 44 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 45 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 45 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 46 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 46 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 47 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 47 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 48 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 48 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 21a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 21b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 49 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.49 25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.49 25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.49 26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.49 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.49 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN.50 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.1 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.1 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.2 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.3 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.3 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX.4 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.9&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;2a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.9&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;2b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.9&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.10&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;8a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.10&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;8b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.10&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.11&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.12&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.13&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.14&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.16&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.14&lt;sup&gt;26a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.16&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.14&lt;sup&gt;26b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.16&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.14&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.16&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.15&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EX.16&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^10</td>
<td>EX.21^19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^11</td>
<td>EX.21^25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^15</td>
<td>EX.22^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^18</td>
<td>EX.22^15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^22</td>
<td>EX.22^30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^26a</td>
<td>EX.23^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^26b</td>
<td>EX.23^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.18^26c</td>
<td>EX.23^8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.19^4</td>
<td>EX.23^8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.19^18</td>
<td>EX.23^22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.20^5</td>
<td>EX.23^27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.21^3</td>
<td>EX.24^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.21^13</td>
<td>EX.24^10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.21^18</td>
<td>EX.24^11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.25^4</td>
<td>EX.25^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.30\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11e}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.30\textsuperscript{29}</td>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.30\textsuperscript{34}</td>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.30\textsuperscript{35}</td>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{22}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.31\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{23}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.31\textsuperscript{10}</td>
<td>EX.34\textsuperscript{5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.31\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>EX.34\textsuperscript{24}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.32\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>EX.34\textsuperscript{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.32\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>EX.34\textsuperscript{33}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{9}</td>
<td>EX.35\textsuperscript{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11a}</td>
<td>EX.38\textsuperscript{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11b}</td>
<td>EX.38\textsuperscript{27}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11c}</td>
<td>EX.39\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33\textsuperscript{11d}</td>
<td>EX.40\textsuperscript{22}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX. 40&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 1&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 9&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 18&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 11&lt;sup&gt;3a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 20&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 11&lt;sup&gt;3b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 21&lt;sup&gt;20b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 11&lt;sup&gt;3c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 22&lt;sup&gt;24a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 13&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 22&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 13&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 24&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 13&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 26&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 14&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 28&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 16&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 30&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEV. 16&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEV. 32&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 25^4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 25^31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 25^47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26^21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26^36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 1^50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 1^51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 2^20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 4^26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 5^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 5^18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 5^21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 7^14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 8^25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 9^17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 10^31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 11^5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 11^8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 11^17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 11^20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. 11^25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.11</td>
<td>NUM.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUM. 23</th>
<th>NUM. 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE TWO

NUM. 33\textsuperscript{55a}
NUM. 33\textsuperscript{55b}
NUM. 35\textsuperscript{16}
NUM. 35\textsuperscript{17}
NUM. 35\textsuperscript{20}
NUM. 35\textsuperscript{22}
NUM. 35\textsuperscript{33}

DEUT. 1\textsuperscript{17}   DEUT. 5\textsuperscript{18}
DEUT. 1\textsuperscript{29}   DEUT. 5\textsuperscript{19}
DEUT. 3\textsuperscript{4}   DEUT. 6\textsuperscript{12}
DEUT. 4\textsuperscript{10}   DEUT. 7\textsuperscript{13}
DEUT. 4\textsuperscript{28}   DEUT. 11\textsuperscript{14}
DEUT. 4\textsuperscript{35}   DEUT. 11\textsuperscript{29}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEUT. 12:30</th>
<th>DEUT. 27:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 14:5a</td>
<td>DEUT. 28:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 14:5b</td>
<td>DEUT. 28:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 14:6</td>
<td>DEUT. 28:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 17:5</td>
<td>DEUT. 28:64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 17:18</td>
<td>DEUT. 28:65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 19:5</td>
<td>DEUT. 29:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 22:8</td>
<td>DEUT. 29:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 22:9</td>
<td>DEUT. 29:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 23:13</td>
<td>DEUT. 30:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 23:16</td>
<td>DEUT. 31:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 23:18</td>
<td>DEUT. 32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 24:5</td>
<td>DEUT. 32:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT. 25:7</td>
<td>DEUT. 32:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:12</td>
<td>Deut. 33:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:13</td>
<td>Deut. 33:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:14</td>
<td>Deut. 33:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:17</td>
<td>Deut. 33:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In non-midrashic interpretations Rashi follows Onkelos, but he does not quote him. Here are several examples:

**GEN.1** - "But the earth was desolate."

Rashi interprets - אָרְרָא חָצִי עֵזְרָא
It signifies emptiness and empty space. This is also Onkelos' translation - "And the earth was waste and empty".

Again, **GEN.8** - Rashi follows Onkelos that - שְׁעָנָה - means - מָלַךְ - "and the waters rested".

More examples of this nature are as follows:

**GEN.4**

s.v - לא חמת

**GEN.6**

s.v - כֹּבֵי לָשֶׁת

**GEN.6**

s.v - בִּנְכָּמֵי

**GEN.6**

s.v - מִכְּמֹם מַפְנַעֵת

**GEN.8**

s.v - בִּכְשָׁת הָרוֹם

**GEN.8**

s.v - יִנְנָה

---

1. Since the question of Rashi's dependence on Onkelos is subjective in regard to this section this list can obviously not be considered exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN. 8</th>
<th>s.v -</th>
<th>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 21</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 24</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 24</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 24</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 25</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 26</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 26</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 26</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 27</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 32</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 34</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN. 36</td>
<td>s.v -</td>
<td>לַאֲשׁוּבֹתָה</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>s.v.</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN.38:2</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>כונן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.38:29</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>פֶּרוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.41:16</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>בֶּלֶוֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.41:40</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>הָכָאו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.41:45</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לַעֲרֹת יָרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.43:12</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>קֶנֶּר מֵשֶׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.43:31</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>וֹרָאָש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.45:28</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לֶב צֶד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.47:21</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְעַרַי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.49:15</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.49:16</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>קֵץ הֲעַטְיוֹן עֵשָׁב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.49:19</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>זְרָא אָרוֹד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the words EX. 7

Rashi explains — "The water which happened to be in vessels of wood and in vessels of stone. This is, too, Onkelos' interpretation.

Similarly, EX. 8

Rashi explains — "I will separate".

Onkelos is likewise —

Again, EX. 8 — the abomination of the Egyptians.

Rashi explains — by — the "god" (idol) of the Egyptians. The same is given by Onkelos.

More examples of this kind can be seen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EX.</th>
<th>s.v.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>קָנָרָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>חֹלֶלְהַה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>אָבוֹ צֶרֶם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>עַרְבֵּה הַבָּשָׁמָי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>נַחַת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>נִשָּׁה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>נָכַב בָּאָו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE THREE

EX.15⁷ s.v - קמי

EX.15⁸ s.v - בֵּרָה אַזָּר

EX.15⁹ s.v - תְמוּנָה מֹא

EX.16³⁶ s.v - אֵף

EX.19¹³ s.v - יִהְוָה יְרֵה

EX.19¹⁷ s.v - בְּצֵאת הָעָר

EX.19²² s.v - מֵי פִּיר

EX.21¹⁰ s.v - שָׁאָרָה

EX.21¹⁹ s.v - מְשָׁרְקָה

EX.21²²¹ s.v - צָעָר עָרֶש

EX.21²²² s.v - לְבֵנָה בְּנָה

EX.22¹⁰ s.v - לָךְ בְּעָלָה

EX.23⁵ s.v - רָאָב חַדָּב

EX.23¹⁸ s.v - מִבְּנֹת
| EX.25^2 | שונית | s.v |
| EX.26^15 | חרבש | s.v |
| EX.26^36 | למקי | s.v |
| EX.28^4 | אבסן | s.v |
| EX.28^11 | מחשך מרח | s.v |
| EX.28^14 |.communication | s.v |
| EX.28^32 | כפז, תחתך | s.v |
| EX.28^38 | הושא אדרון | s.v |
| EX.29^18 | חיים נחמ | s.v |
| EX.30^1 | עקרת עקר | s.v |
| EX.30^7 | במשבר | s.v |
| EX.30^8 | בחריות | s.v |
| EX.30^34 | בֵּין הבר | s.v |
| EX.31^4 | וחושך חמה | s.v |
### TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX.32(^{16})</td>
<td>s.v - מים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.32(^{17})</td>
<td>s.v - ברק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.32(^{20})</td>
<td>s.v - ים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{3})</td>
<td>s.v - חוח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{5})</td>
<td>s.v - לפי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{6})</td>
<td>s.v - לפי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{7})</td>
<td>s.v - את מים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{13})</td>
<td>s.v - את ארץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{16})</td>
<td>s.v - עמק נהר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.33(^{22})</td>
<td>s.v - בקרת חיזור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.34(^{2})</td>
<td>s.v - ברון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.34(^{6})</td>
<td>s.v - מקום עץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.34(^{19})</td>
<td>s.v - בֶּשָּׁל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX.35(^{5})</td>
<td>s.v - כל שלב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the words LEV.1^{16} נא מיקום הרש " - רashi follows Onkelos who interprets לארת שלושה אשפומת - קומרא - to a place where they throw the ashes.

Similarly, in LEV.2^{14} אכש כוכיל on the words " - רashi explainsoteric למשה שבכה ומיתנה: כוכיל בירוב הנך מדע שיתבושך למ. The word " - אכש - is an expression for breaking and grinding. כוכיל - means when the crop is yet fresh and full in its stalks. (The word כוכיל is compounded of כ - and מ - כלה). Onkelos in his concise manner, interprets likewise - "beaten (or broken) and tender".

LEV.1^{9} נמות
LEV.1^{11} 'ר
LEV.4^{3} הכתה למושה
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Three</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 5:21</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>בַּעֲשִׁים יִךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 6:19</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>נַחֲנָה לַאֲוֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 7:19</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>יַבֶּשֶׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 9:19</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>הַקָּנָס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 10:3</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>יְדָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 13:5</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>בַּעֲנִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 13:22</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>יָרְשָׁהָ תַּכִּית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 13:45</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>פְרָוָת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 14:4</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>מִרְבַּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 14:41</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 16:21</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>אִישׁ אָרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 17:7</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>לַשְׁעֵר יִרְשָׁה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 18:5</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>לָהַבָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 18:18</td>
<td>שָׁם -</td>
<td>בְּכָרִי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 19:14</td>
<td>s.v - אֶתָּבַי מְשֹׁש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 19:20</td>
<td>s.v - נֶפֶשׁ לַאֲחֶם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 22:23</td>
<td>s.v - שָׁוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 23:11</td>
<td>s.v - מְחָרֶת מְשֹׁש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 23:40</td>
<td>s.v - הָלָך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 23:43</td>
<td>s.v - כְּבֹדֹלֶך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:1</td>
<td>s.v - יָתֶם מְשֹׁש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:13</td>
<td>s.v - קִומֵי-וֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:19</td>
<td>s.v - שְׁמוֹכוּס בְּאֶרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:22</td>
<td>s.v - יָשָׁלוּhetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:25</td>
<td>s.v - נֵכֶם בָּרְיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:39a</td>
<td>s.v - בֵּינֵי אַבָּאָס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 26:39b</td>
<td>s.v - מָרְת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In NUM.11 - Rashi interprets "prepare yourselves". This is also Onkelos' interpretation.

Again NUM.11 - Rashi follows Onkelos that means "put them into prison" and not "destroy them". (See Rashi's second interpretation).

More examples of this kind where Rashi follows Onkelos without quoting him are:

- NUM.2 s.v - לשבך חון
- NUM.3 s.v - לﶊ להכתי
- NUM.3 s.v - והנה
- NUM.4 s.v - והנה
- NUM.4 s.v - כנה אווכס
- NUM.4 s.v - לא תהיי
- NUM. s.v - לא נא
- NUM. s.v - לא שוץ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Three</th>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUM.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ס. ו. קְלָוָתָס</td>
<td>קְלָוָתָס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ס. ו. נָעָה</td>
<td>נָעָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.6</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>ס. ו. מִנְצַרֵה</td>
<td>מִנְצַרֵה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.6</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>ס. ו. ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ס. ו. יְשָׁר</td>
<td>יְשָׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ס. ו. מַמְאו</td>
<td>מַמְאו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ס. ו. ב</td>
<td>ב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ס. ו. י</td>
<td>י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ס. ו. מְנַסֵר</td>
<td>מְנַסֵר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>ס. ו. מַע</td>
<td>מַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ס. ו. שָׁב</td>
<td>שָׁב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ס. ו. הָמָּא</td>
<td>הָמָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ס. ו. בֵּש</td>
<td>בֵּש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ס. ו. לִי</td>
<td>לִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יבג</td>
<td>יבג</td>
<td>ומא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE THREE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14^45</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15^30a</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15^30b</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16^14</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16^15a</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16^15b</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17^20</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18^1</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18^8</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18^9</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20^10</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20^19</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21^1</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21^5</td>
<td></td>
<td>数 1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 21</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 21</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 21</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 21</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 21</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 22</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^3a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 22</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^3b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 22</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 24</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 24</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 24</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 24</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 25</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM. 25</td>
<td>a.v</td>
<td>s.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26   | לֹא | 314
| 27   | כא | 314
| 30   | אֶ֔זֶר | 314
| 30   | יָבֹא | 314
| 313  | רָכֵ֖ם | 314
| 3126 | שָׁמַא | 314
| 1     | אֹמֶ֣כֶךָ | 314
| 411   | יִכְרָעְסֶ֖ךָ | 314
| 412   | מָנָ֣א | 314
| 4031  | וְנִסְח֖וּכֶּ֣ר | 314
| 4032  | לֹא נִסְח֣וּכֶּ֣ר | 314

In DEUT.1:37 - Rashi explains - "He was filled with anger". This is also Onkelos' interpretation.

More examples of this kind where Rashi follows Onkelos without quoting him are:

1. DEUT.1:17 s.v - аН - מ"ג גולו
2. DEUT.2:5 s.v - מִּיַּה קָרָב - מִיַּה קָרָב
3. DEUT.2:6 s.v - תכּו - מְכּו
4. DEUT.2:11 s.v - ראָדְי - מְכּו
5. DEUT.2:37 s.v - בֵּין נַחַל - מְכּו
6. DEUT.3:5 s.v - מְרֶר, הֵפְרוּ - מְרֶר
7. DEUT.3:9 s.v - שַׁנְי - מְרֶר
8. DEUT.3:11 s.v - כְּמַת אָשִּׁים - מְרֶר
9. DEUT.3:23 s.v - מְרֶר - מְרֶר
10. DEUT.3:25 s.v - מְרֶר - מְרֶר
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deuteronomy</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְסֹכָן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְעֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>חֲנַנְךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לֵעָבוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְהַעֲבָרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>תַּעַבְּרָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>הָנָוְי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:8</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>עוֹת שָמַי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:9</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>מַה אָסְרו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְבָכֵם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:5</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לְלָבָשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:17</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>אָסָמְנוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:26</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>לָכוּנָל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>נִחְגְּרוּנָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.15:18</td>
<td>כִּמְשַׁרְתִּו שֵּׁכָר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:1</td>
<td>מַמֵּלָּכָה לְיִלּוֹד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:4</td>
<td>קָרָא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:8</td>
<td>זַרְעֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:9</td>
<td>מַהְמָה מְצָר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:18</td>
<td>יָשָׁשִׂים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.16:19</td>
<td>רָכֵּב, חוֹלָּךְ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.17:8a</td>
<td>כְּעַל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.17:8b</td>
<td>בָּנָי, רוּבָלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.20:19</td>
<td>כְּרָחָם עַר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.20:20</td>
<td>כָּרְתִּי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.21:4</td>
<td>מַלּוֹךְ אָשֶׁר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.21:12</td>
<td>וַעֲשֵׂה אֶת אַבְרָהָם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEUT.21:17</td>
<td>בּוֹשֶׁה -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy Reference</td>
<td>Textual Entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 21:18</td>
<td>s.v - הָרָם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 22:1</td>
<td>s.v - לְכָלָם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 23:14</td>
<td>s.v - אָנוּל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 25:2</td>
<td>s.v - וּמָה יְחַלֶּכֶת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 25:18a</td>
<td>s.v - אָשֶׁר לֹנַח</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 25:18b</td>
<td>s.v - גָּנַחְלוּךָ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 26:5</td>
<td>s.v - וּכֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 26:13</td>
<td>s.v - בֵּרֵית הָקָר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 26:14</td>
<td>s.v - בֹּא נֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:20</td>
<td>s.v - וְאָכְאוֹם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:23</td>
<td>s.v - הַנַּעַר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:28</td>
<td>s.v - בְּכָֹל הָבֶּב</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:57</td>
<td>s.v - בְּשֵׁלֵית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:65</td>
<td>s.v - אֵּשֶׁת יָרְשָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 28:6</td>
<td>שֶׁבֶס חֵינָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 29:17</td>
<td>שֶׁרֶשׁ פֶּרֶךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 29:18</td>
<td>בָּשָׂר יָדוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 29:19</td>
<td>לְנָהֹלָתוֹ בַּנַּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 29:28</td>
<td>הַנָּשֶׁר הָרָד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 30:3</td>
<td>אָשֶׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 31:17</td>
<td>הָוָלָתָהוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 31:20</td>
<td>לָאַשהַוָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 31:19</td>
<td>חֶשְׁרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:6</td>
<td>וְהָרָבָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:10</td>
<td>בֶּטֶלָה לֹא לָעֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:18</td>
<td>בֵּשֶׁם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:24</td>
<td>לָכְבָּ תְמוּנָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:27</td>
<td>אַלָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:31</td>
<td>שָׁפָרָהּ פִּילָיוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:35</td>
<td>זָרַעְתָּ כ֪וּם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:36</td>
<td>כָּחֹלְךָ יִכ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:2</td>
<td>נָהֵר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:3</td>
<td>נְחָבָהּ עָמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:6</td>
<td>יִתְנֶה תַּנְבוֹל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:10</td>
<td>יְהוָ֑עַצְפּוּל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:7</td>
<td>שֵׁם נְתָנָה יְוָדִיח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:12</td>
<td>חֵפָך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:14</td>
<td>וְרָשׁי יֵרָמִיש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:15</td>
<td>גְבוּלָתוֹ אִוָז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:17</td>
<td>בּוֹכֶרוֹ שֵׁרוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:23</td>
<td>יָשׁוּרֵנָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:24</td>
<td>בּוֹרֶק מְבוֹזָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Three**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 33:25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 33:26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 33:27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 33:28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 33:29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEUT. 34:7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rashi, having a wide knowledge of biblical and Rabbinical literature, was able to incorporate in his commentary on the Torah not only Halacha, Midrash and Peshat, but also a fairly large measure of philological and grammatical observations. Most probably this was due to the fact that Rashi's intention was that his commentary should be widely read by all sections of Jewry and cater for different tastes. The incorporation of grammatical points may also be to awaken the interest of Franco-German Jewry to study the Bible in a philological manner and to discourage exclusive concern with midrashic interpretations as was in fact the custom in those days. However, in almost every section of the Torah we see him drawing attention to many peculiar grammatical constructions and comments on them. Quite often, with the aid of biblical and Rabbinic literature, he was able to substantiate cases of normal grammatical formations. But when he was confronted with unusual grammatical forms or obscure words, Rashi was compelled to draw upon parallels occurring either in different parts of the Bible or in the Mishna, or in the Targum itself. Being a man of traditional piety Rashi, of course, believed in the authenticity and integrity of the Massoretic text. He never entertained in his mind that the Massoretic text is doubtful. Consequently when he had certain difficulties he had to draw upon parallels cited in different parts of the Torah.
Rashi's philological competence must of course be set within the context of his age. His awareness of linguistic problems was perhaps stimulated by his Hebrew-French bilingualism and his knowledge of a second Semitic language - Aramaic - but he was limited by his inability to use Jewish grammatical works written in Arabic. Of the Spanish grammarians and lexicographers he could use Dunash Ben Labrat and Menachem Ben Seruk whose works were available in Hebrew; but to Judah Ben David Hayyuj's work or Jonah Ibn Jonah's work on tri-consonantalism he had no access.

Grammarians have already noted that Rashi's grammatical knowledge was inadequate as can be seen from his treatment of some peculiar grammatical forms. But it must be recalled that in Rashi's time there were no text books and only a century before him Saadia Gaon, Dunash Ben Labrat and Judah Hayyuj, with the aid of Arabic began to formulate rules of Hebrew grammar. Menachem Ben Seruk had written a Maḥberet in Hebrew where he was solely concerned with the treatment of Hebrew philology. The Maḥberet consists of a systematic summation of the lexicographical and grammatical knowledge of the time. Menachem believed that letters of the root that disappear(fall away) in conjugation
are not radical and consequently established on a "synchronic" level, triliteral, biliteral and even uniliteral roots. Menachem wrote his Maḥberet in Hebrew and to Rashi who did not know Jewish Arabic literature, this was of great help, and quite often he quotes Menachem for philological purposes. With the aid of Menachem and the Targum Onkelos, Rashi was able to advance sound philological theories and conclusions, either to obscure words and their terminology, or to peculiar grammatical formations. It may, therefore, be said that in this particular field Rashi's master was also Menachem. Nonetheless, despite his high regard for Menachem he did not slavishly copy his master for on many occasions, as will be shown in this section, he discards his classifications or sub-divisions of certain words. This shows Rashi's critical mind and his scientific approach to the treatment of the subject.

On several occasions Rashi worked independently and formulated his own grammatical principles which were not always accurate according to the standard of grammar known to us. Perhaps one of Rashi's limitations lies in the fact that when he tackled a grammatical point his prime concern was not to establish it for the sake of grammar, but rather to establish the sense and the underlying idea
behind the text. Perhaps, as said above, this was due to the fact that Rashi paid tribute to the taste of his environment, and the masses who were not educated to appreciate purely grammatical expositions, as their brethren in Spain. However, scattered throughout his commentary there are many remarks on syntax, tenses, conjugations, collective nouns, prepositions required by certain verbs and transposition of word order. For linguistic purposes, sometimes he formulates rules and discusses the shades of meaning of various synonyms. Another characteristic aspect of Rashi's commentary was his great reliance on the cantillation signs as an indication of clause division and construction of the period, but sometimes he disagreed with them.

To discuss and value in detail all the grammatical points raised by Rashi in his commentary on the Torah is certainly beyond the scope of this work. At any rate J.P. Mendoza, in his excellent monograph illustrated Rashi's endeavours in this field of study and his scientific approach to the subject in question.

We should therefore confine ourselves to the treatment of the etymology of some obscure words as well as to linguistic forms which Onkelos had employed in his Targum and Rashi's attitude towards their treatment. In this field Rashi, sometimes identified
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Onkelos by name and sometimes uses him without identifying him. In other instances Onkelos followed by Rashi, does not translate the text literally but rather freely. He does not focus on philological consideration. His prime concern is not the philology of a textual word but rather what it conveys within the framework of the whole subject in question. The avoidance of translating literally on the part of Onkelos, may also be due to the fact that certain Hebrew idioms and terminologies if translated as they stand would certainly have made no sense to the Aramaic reader. Onkelos, therefore, paraphrases the text and keeps the sense intact. Furthermore, it appears also that Onkelos' motive in translating freely certain biblical texts was purely to inject midrashic and Halachic traditions which were current in his lifetime. We must also bear in mind that Hebrew and Aramaic are related and therefore certain biblical words with Aramaic cognates are consequently to be understood in the nuance which the Aramaic usage embodies.

It seems Rashi was the first, at least among the French Rabbis, who made extensive use of Targum Onkelos. He used Onkelos' Targum not only because of its popularity, but also due to the fact that he assumed that the Targum which goes under Onkelos' name was, in its present form, written by Onkelos,
the proselyte, the disciple of Rabbi Joshua and Rabbi Eliezer. Perhaps, also, its popularity is due to the fact that on the whole Onkelos' Targum is more faithful to the biblical text than the other Palestinian Targumim and this would explain its acceptance in the Synagogue. However, be that as it may, because of its popularity the Targum was constantly revised with the result that many corrections were made by various Rabbis and scholars. Many of their corrections were inserted in the Targum itself by later copyists. Consequently in almost every text of the Targum we have different versions as to the exact textual word used by the author himself. Among the many scholars who endeavoured to establish the correct reading in the Targum was Rashi. Time and again, Rashi, in his commentary warns the Aramaic student that the textual reading in Onkelos is incorrect, either because it is not in accordance with the sense of the text or with the rules of Hebrew Grammar. Although many of Rashi's corrections were inserted in Onkelos' Targum by various editors, nonetheless, several more of his corrections can still be seen throughout his commentary.
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Before setting out the details of Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos, we give a summary classification of his treatment. A division of the main points regarding "philological matters" into 10 Chapters may facilitate comprehension of Rashi's utilization and neglect of the philological assumptions of Onkelos.

The Chapters are as follows.

Chapter 1. Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum With Regard to Nouns and Verbs.

Chapter 2. Rashi's Use of the Targum Without Identifying Onkelos.

Chapter 3. Free Translation.

Chapter 4. Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.

Chapter 5. Injection of "Derash" and "Halacha" in Onkelos' Targum.

Chapter 6. The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.

Chapter 7. Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.

Chapter 8. Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk.
Chapter 9. Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.

Chapter 10. Rashi and the Text of Onkelos.
CHAPTER 1. Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs.

In our foregoing introduction we have said that Rashi's derivations of certain words are from biblical texts, the Mishna, the Talmud or from the Targumim. In particular Onkelos' Targum served as a base where philological obscurities occur. No wonder, therefore, we see Rashi in this connection, turning to Onkelos for guidance.

Without further elaboration, the following are some examples of Rashi's usage of Onkelos' Targum to explain certain nouns and verbs.

1. GEN. 3:24 - Rashi accepts Onkelos' translation that - חית - means - "blade" and supports him from the Talmud. (Sanh.82a) - אשת הש - "He drew his blade".

2. GEN. 15:2 - Rashi follows the Targum that - נבז - means - עבורו כל בית - "The man by whose orders all my household is fed".

3. GEN. 9:27 - Rashi quotes the Targum - חית - means - "to extend, to enlarge."
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4. GEN.18\textsuperscript{14} - Onkelos followed by Rashi explains - תַּפּוּ הָאָדוֹן by - אָדֹנֵי - "is anything hidden". The verb - אָדֹנֵי - is to distinguish, to separate from the ordinary, hence be unusual, surprising.

5. GEN.18\textsuperscript{23} - Onkelos takes the particle - יָדֹן - not in its natural sense but in the sense of "anger". Rashi, therefore, puts his interpretation in line with the text - נַעַק שֶׁאֶבֶּשׂ עָזַר יָדֹן "will your anger urge you to destroy righteous with wicked". Ps. Jonathan, Neofiti and GEN. Rabbah (49.8) take it also in the sense of anger: The latter reads as follows - אֵלֵךְ אוֹרָה וַיָּבֵד אֶת הָאָדֹן וַיָּרֵא בֶּן עָזַר יָדֹן... - אַף אַף אוֹרָה אֶת הָאָדֹן וַיָּרֵא בֶּן עָזַר יָדֹן.

6. GEN.11\textsuperscript{6} - Rashi, with the aid of the Targum takes - בָּשָׂר - in the sense of - (כִּנָּרָה - בָּשָׂר) - restraining.\textsuperscript{4}

7. GEN.19\textsuperscript{15} - Rashi explains - לְאָדֹנוֹ - as the Targum - לְאָדֹנֵי - "and they urged". From the root - פָּנָה - to press, to hasten.\textsuperscript{5}
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8. GEN.27:15 - Rashi says - הושעוה - means, "the clean ones" as the Targum has it - מְנוֹלָה - . The usual meaning of this word is not "clean" but rather desirable.

9. GEN.27:36 - Rashi follows the Targum that - 'יְרָאָה - means - יְרֵךְ - "and he lay in wait for me". The verb - ראה - means to follow at the heel, to overreach, hence the meaning of the text is - "and he (Jacob) hath over-reached me now twice". Rashi supports Onkelos from the Targum itself - DEUT.19 - ברק - which means - רֶחֶם.

10. GEN.30:3 - Rashi follows the Targum that - בָּחַר - means - בָּחַר - to rear. The verb - בחר - means "to kneel"; a child is usually weaned on the knees of his mother, hence, to rear.

Rashi believes that certain biblical words have their derivations from Aramaic. He therefore derives the proper name - יְרָאָה (GEN.4:22) from the Aramaic word - יְרֵךְ - spices, which improve the flavour of food. Hence, Tubal - Cain refined and "improved upon" the work of Cain by providing
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weapons for murderers.

12. Again in GEN.43 \(^{30}\) - Rashi takes - רכמ ו - from the root - חמר - "to grow hot". In Aramaic \(^{8}\) we have (Bab. Tal. Pes.58\(^{a}\)) - בָּמֵיכֵמוּר בְּשֵׁר - "the meat drying up" (through the heat).

13. GEN.41 \(^{47}\) - Although Rashi follows Onkelos in saying that - בְּגֵרֶנֶשׁ מַעֲרָה - means - "the inhabitants gathered", nevertheless he makes it clear that - מַעֲרָה - does not really lose its literal meaning of "doing" or "making". In other words, the word - מַעֲרָה - is only paraphrased by Onkelos.

Other references in GENESIS of Rashi's use of Onkelos with regard to nouns and verbs can be seen:

GEN.3 \(^{15}\) - s.v - יִשָּׂרָאֵל; GEN.15 \(^{2}\) - בְּנֵי יָהָּוֶה; GEN.30 \(^{20}\) - s.v - בְּרֵרָת; GEN.30 \(^{28}\) - s.v - רָאָס; GEN.25 \(^{29}\) - s.v - יִשָּׂרָאֵל; GEN.27 \(^{33}\) - s.v - הַעֲרָה; GEN.30 \(^{38}\) - s.v - יִשָּׂרָאֵל; GEN.31 \(^{10}\) - s.v - בְּרֵרָת; GEN.31 \(^{39}\) - s.v - אֲשֶׁר בַּעֲרָה; GEN.40 \(^{11}\) - s.v - אֲשֶׁר נָשָׁתוּ; GEN.41 \(^{23}\) - s.v - רַעְשָׁנָה; GEN.41 \(^{34}\) - s.v - אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂרָאֵל; GEN.48 \(^{14}\) - s.v - שִׁכְלָן; GEN.49 \(^{5}\) - s.v - יִשָּׂרָאֵל.
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14. In EX.19 he explains that the Aramaic word for "midwives" - מַיָּלֵיָות - hence the term מַיָּלֵי - in this verse.

15. EX.917 - Rashi takes מַיָּלֵי - (from מַיָּלֵי באַמּוּ) in the sense of the Targum - בָּאַמּוּ - "Thou pressest down my people". The word מַיָּלֵי is of the same derivation10 as מַיָּלֵי - which we render in the Targum by מַיָּלֵי תְּבִשֵּׁה - firmly founded, trodden path.

16. EX.103 - Rashi follows the Targum to the effect that מַיָּלֵי - means מַיָּלֵי תְּבִשֵּׁה - "to be humbled". It is of the same derivation as מַיָּלֵי - "poor". In other words Pharaoh refused to be poor and lowly before God.

17. EX.3035 - Rashi says מַיָּלֵי (from מַיָּלֵי) should be taken in the sense of the Targum מַיָּלֵי - "mixed". This is because the mariners stir up the water with oars when they propel the ship.
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For more references in EXODUS, see Rashi, EX.8:10 s.v. - המירון; EX.9:9 s.v. - סותר; EX.9:33 s.v. - י Förder; EX.11:1 s.v. - הפך; EX.13:18 s.v. - ימשר; EX.14:24 s.v. - מבאר; EX.14:27 s.v. - ינער; EX.15:9 s.v. - שחר; EX.22:15 s.v. - טוב שהים; EX.23:22 s.v. -ftar
See A.M. Silbermann Rashi’s commentary in English, p.126, note 2. EX.25:12 s.v. - כימי. See Ibn Ezra on this particular word. EX.26:18 s.v. - יפרים; EX.26:36 s.v. - יתועב; EX.30:12 s.v. - יתשא.

18. LEV.1:16 - Onkelos translates - by - דעלת - "feather", but from the root - הער. In other words the priest should remove the stomach together with its excrement. 12

19. LEV.14:40 - Rashi follows the Targum in saying that - יושшибка -(from - יוסבל)means - "to remove", "pull off". It is similar to DEUT.15:9 - יוסבל חפף - "she shall remove his shoe". Rashi is merely pointing to the Targum so as not to interpret this verb in the sense of - יוסבל חפף (NUM.32:17) which means to equip for war.
20. LEV.18\textsuperscript{17} - Rashi explains that - רעת - means - רעה - an "evil plan", just as the Targum renders it - יַעֲשֶׂה רְעָה "a sinful plan". Rashi takes - רעה - in the sense of - רעה - "to plan", "to devise".\textsuperscript{14}

21. Again LEV.20\textsuperscript{20} - Rashi takes - מָרָף - from - מָרַף - (or - מָרַף - or - מָרַף -) to strip oneself, to be naked, hence the Targum\textsuperscript{15} explains - מָרַף - having no children".

For more references see LEV.11\textsuperscript{3} s.v - מָרַף ; LEV.13\textsuperscript{33} s.v - מָרַף ; LEV.18\textsuperscript{28} s.v - מָרַף ; LEV.25\textsuperscript{4} s.v - מָרַף ; LEV.26\textsuperscript{21} s.v - מָרַף .

22. In NUM.1\textsuperscript{50} - Rashi with the aid of the Targum explains that - מָרַף - means - מָר - "to appoint".\textsuperscript{16}

The verb - מָרַף - has several meanings. It can be "to visit", e.g. - מָרַף - (GEN.21\textsuperscript{1}). Also GEN.50\textsuperscript{24} or EX.3\textsuperscript{16} or in the sense of be missing - מָרַף - "And not one of us is missing" (NUM.31\textsuperscript{49}) - or in the sense of - מָרַף - "But the Levites... were not numbered (NUM.1\textsuperscript{47}). Rashi, therefore, quotes Onkelos in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the text in question.
23. In NUM.5\textsuperscript{21} - Rashi, with the aid of the Targum, takes - הָעָבַד - to mean - עַבְדֹּה - "to swell".\textsuperscript{18}

24. NUM.11\textsuperscript{17} - Rashi says, understand - הָעָבַד - as the Targum does - הָעָבַד - "And I shall induct into a position of authority. The verb - הָעָבַד - seems in the context to mean "to withdraw", and perhaps it is more appropriate to take it in the sense of - הָעָבַד - "to set apart". The Targum, therefore, by translating - הָעָבַד - by - הָעָבַד - was translating paraphrastically\textsuperscript{19} and most probably he meant "I will set apart"\textsuperscript{20} (i.e. to raise) the 70 Elders to greatness by means of the spirit which is upon you, for I will place it upon them. The Targum is thinking of a kind of anointing (cf. מַעֲנֵי רְבִּirt), with the spirit in place of oil and Rashi has appreciated this.

25. Again, NUM.12\textsuperscript{11} - וַיַּחֲלָה - Rashi takes - וַיַּחֲלָה - from - מַעֲנֵי - "be foolish", and he, therefore, says understand this as the Targum does - מַעֲנֵי - "We have acted foolishly".
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26. Again, NUM. 14 - The verb - can either mean to inherit or dispossess. Rashi, with the aid of the Targum explains that in this context the meaning is - literally, to divorce, hence, to dispossess, or even to impoverish. Incidentally, Rashi reads in the Targum - We have, however - "And I will destroy them".

27. NUM. 22 - Rashi says - Understand this as the Targum does (an expression denoting trifling, scorn and disdain).

28. Again, NUM. 22 - Rashi says - Understand this as the Targum does - "have I ever learnt to do this to you? Onkelos, once again, may not have been precise, for the verb - means "to be of service" as in I KINGS - "and let her become servitress to him" (King David). Consequently our text should be translated as follows: Have I ever shewn the habit of serving you, (or behaving towards you) in this manner.
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29. NUM.23 - The Targum, followed by Rashi, translates - " . . " to mean - "alone". Ibn Ezra takes it from - bare place, or height as in ISAIAH 41; 49. In the same section verse 41, we read that Balaam went up to "Bamoth Baal", - therefore, may mean that Balaam went up to the height of the mountain to enable him to see part of the people of Israel.

30. NUM 24 - The Targum, followed by Rashi, translates - "open eyed". Others, however, explain it in the sense of - "closed eye". This is in accordance with the Rabbi's interpretation that in one of his eyes, Balaam was blind. Most probably the Targum had to translate in the sense of "open eyed" because of the following verse - which makes it clear that he was not blind.

31. Again NUM.35 - Rashi says - "You shall not make the land 'guilty'. Primarily the verb - means "pollute" as in fact Ps. Jonathan translates - hence, do not make it soiled and thus "wicked".
Other examples in the book of NUMBERS where Rashi follows Onkelos in the terminology of biblical words are:

NUM.1\(^{51}\) s.v - א"ר יד י - NUM.2\(^{20}\) s.v - ע"רי

NUM.11\(^{8}\) s.v - ש"רג'ה - NUM.13\(^{19}\) s.v - ש"רג'ה

NUM.14\(^{4}\) s.v - ל'ג'ס ר"ם - NUM.16\(^{1}\) s.v - ל'ג'ס ר"ם

NUM.20\(^{29}\) s.v - כ"ס ל - NUM.22\(^{24}\) s.v - כ"ס ל

NUM.23\(^{21}\) s.v - ל"רג' ת"ש - NUM.24\(^{5}\) s.v - ל"רג' ת"ש

NUM.24\(^{8}\) s.v - א"דה - NUM.24\(^{17}\) s.v - כ"ס - NUM.31\(^{3}\) s.v - ע"ד - NUM.32\(^{39}\) s.v - ע"ד - NUM.33\(^{55}\) s.v - א"דה - NUM.35\(^{20}\) s.v - א"דה -

32. In DEUT.1\(^{29}\) Rashi takes - ל"רג' ת"ש - to mean an expression denoting "breaking", as the Targum translates it - ח"ג - "You should not let yourselves be broken by them". Primarily the verb ל"רג' ק - means to tremble, to dread, hence metaphorically to be broken.

33. Again DEUT.7\(^{13}\) Rashi in the name of Menachem Ben Seruk explains that - ח"ג - is parallel to - ל"רג' ק - which means: "the strong bull of Basham" (Psalms.22\(^{13}\)). It seems that Menachem takes it from - ל"רג' - "to make strong", "to harden" or perhaps from - ל"רג - to "be strong", "substantial", 
hence to be rich. Onkelos, however, is not clear, for he translates it "and the flocks of thy sheep". The Rabbis who state "why is their name called? Because they enrich their owner" seem to take it from to be rich.

34. Again, DEUT.17 - Rashi takes the word منענע from חמש to repeat, to double, hence, the idea of writing two scrolls of the Law; one that is placed in the king's treasury and another which he carries everywhere with him. Onkelos renders מער by "a copy".

35. DEUT.22 - With the aid of the Targum, Rashi explains that דרכי השומע should not only be taken in the sense of holiness, but also in the sense "to set apart" or withdrawal, from anything which is unclean or unfit for use, hence the Targum translates by something with which a man has reluctance to come into contact, be it on account of its sublimity, or be it on account of some bad quality.
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36. Again DEUT.29\textsuperscript{27} - Rashi follows the Targum that 
\textit{- משמש} - means - \textit{ואלף א"ל}. Onkelos translates 
freely\textsuperscript{34} for the verb - השם - means to forsake, to 
leave, hence - \textit{אלף א"ל} - to carry away\textsuperscript{35} to 
exile.

37. Again, DEUT.32\textsuperscript{2} - Onkelos translates - \textit{כשך—if}\ by - \textit{אמתך} - "like winds that bring rain". 
This is also the translation of the Palestinian 
Targumim. Most likely, as Rashi explains, they have 
taken it from - \textit{ז"ז} - "storm"\textsuperscript{36} (the -ז. and -ז. 
interchanging). S. Luzzatto, however, connects it 
with - \textit{ש"ע—from} goats, after the constellation, and 
suggests that in ancient times the belief was that 
these particular stars had the power to bring down 
the rain .\textsuperscript{37}

38. Again, DEUT.32\textsuperscript{20} - Rashi takes - \textit{עב} - to mean 
either, to support, to nourish, hence to bring up,\textsuperscript{38} 
or in the sense of faithfulness, and fidelity as in 
fact the Targum takes it: "Children in whom there is 
no faithfulness".\textsuperscript{39}

39. Again, DEUT.32\textsuperscript{24} - \textit{ש"ע—from} Rashi says, Onkelos 
rendered this by - \textit{ש"ע—from} - "swollen by hunger".
Rashi, however, admits that he has no convincing proof for this meaning. Rabbi Samuel ben Meir takes it as Onkelos - ("חכורה ליזי"), however, it as Onkelos. He further connects it with the talmudical word (Bab.Tal. Hul.45b) - "to be softened" - (or - דמות"פ). We also find Tos. Hul. - an animal whose brains softened. See also Ps. Jonathan, GEN.334 - 'ף" תבכ רבע - "to be softened" - (or - א"פ). In other words through hunger a person becomes weak and soft. A. Ibn Ezra takes it - ""burnt through famine". Ps. Jonathan, Palest. Targum and Neofiti take it as Onkelos. Rashi, not being satisfied with Onkelos' etymology turns to Rabbi Moses, the preacher of Toulouse who takes - 'ף" - as an Aramaic word, meaning "hair" - as e.g. in the phrase (Bab.Tal. Meg.18a) - "He was busying himself with his hair." (cf. also Bab.Tal.Ned.50a and Sanh.110a - "she loosened her hair.

40. Again DEUT.332 - "A law which was written with His right hand He gave us from the midst of the fire". The Siphre41, the Targumim42 and all classical commentators43 seem to take - 'ף" as two words. However, Abu Omar Ibn Jakwa, the Spanish commentator44 of the tenth
century takes it as one word and signifies a "place". (cf. DEUT. 3:17 - י sesión). Grammatically speaking, if the word - וְיָדָם - means the Torah, then one would expect - וְיָדָם - and not - וְיָדָם.

Other references in the book of DEUT. where Rashi quotes Onkelos are:

- DEUT. 4:10 s.v - יִלְּךָ; DEUT. 4:35 s.v - הַרְאוּ הָאָרֶץ;
- DEUT. 5:18 s.v - נַעֲדוּ; DEUT. 12:30 s.v - שָׁמַע;
- DEUT. 22:8 s.v - מֶרֶךְ; DEUT. 2:23 s.v - הַשִּׁמֵּשׁ;
- DEUT. 23:16 s.v - הָסֹנֶגֶר; DEUT. 24:5 s.v - אוֹסֶם;
- DEUT. 27:9 s.v - הָמֵס; DEUT. 28:65 s.v - לָכֶנֶּשׁ;
- DEUT. 29:18 s.v - יְהוֹ שֵׁד; DEUT. 30:11 s.v - גַּפֹּלֶנֶּשׁ;
- DEUT. 32:10 s.v - יְגָדוּל; DEUT. 32:24 s.v - מַעְרָב;
- DEUT. 32:26 s.v - הָאֵיתָם; DEUT. 32:33 s.v - מְמַעְגֹּנֶשׁ;
- DEUT. 32:34 s.v - הַסּוֹסֶג; DEUT. 32:43 s.v - כָּפֵר;
- DEUT. 33:3 s.v - מִרְבָּאָה; DEUT. 33:19 s.v - אִשָּׁו;
- DEUT. 33:22 s.v - יָדָם;
CHAPTER 2. Rashi's Use of the Targum without Identifying Onkelos.

In the field of philology, Rashi explains the etymology of biblical words according to Onkelos, but he does not quote him.

Without further elaboration here are some examples to illustrate this point:

1. GEN.26:35 - Rashi explains - מַמְרֶךְ - by - הָלְכוּ כְּמוֹ מַמְרֶךְ מִפְּרִי - "The expression means opposing the spirit of a person. The word מַמְרֶךְ - is of the same root as DEUT.9:24 - "You have been rebellious". Onkelos translates likewise - כְּמוֹ מַמְרֶךְ - "And they were rebellious and irritators". Onkelos and Rashi do not take מַמְרֶךְ from מַמָּר - "bitter" - but from מַמָּר - "to rebel", despite the grammatical impossibility.

2. GEN.27:42 - Rashi takes מַמְרֶךְ to mean מַמְרֶךְ - "He regrets the brotherly relationship.....and he now lies in wait to kill you". Onkelos translates מַמְרֶךְ - by מַמְרֶךְ - "to lie in wait". Rashi and Onkelos do not take it in its usual sense as GEN.6:7 - מַמְרֶךְ - or in EX.13:17 - מַמְרֶךְ - in the sense of regret, change one's mind, but rather in the sense of מַמְרֶךְ - which is in Hebrew מַמְרֶךְ - "to lie in wait". Most likely the continuation of the verse מַמְרֶךְ caused Onkelos and Rashi not to translate the verb in its usual sense.
3. EX. 12: 38 - Rashi takes - ובו לבר - to mean - "a mingling of various nations who had become proselytes". Onkelos also takes it in this sense - וIEnumerable. In NEH. 13 we read - וייבßen יכלי ורבע מֵעֵרנָא - "and they separated from Israel all the alien mixture". Similarly in the Mechilta of Rabbi Shimon -

"This teaches us that together with Israel, proselytes and slaves went out of Egypt".

4. EX. 30: 34 - Rashi follows Onkelos that - והבב יב - means - מַכֵּה בְּמַכֵּה - "weight for weight", i.e. these four ingredients mentioned here shall be equal, as the weight of one so shall be the weight of another. Rabbi David Kimhi argues with Onkelos and Rashi and takes it in the sense - והבב יב - כֵּלִי מַכֵּה שֵׁיךְ וְהָעֵרֵב כֶּלֶל הַמַּכִּים - "one by one i.e. each ingredient should be ground by itself. This is also A. Ibn Ezra's interpretation. Rab. Saadia Gaon seems to explain it as Onkelos does - והבב יב - "aequalis ponderis". The Vulgate also takes it as Onkelos - "aequalis ponderis."
5. In LEV.2:14 - Onkelos explains - "broken and soft". Rashi interprets likewise - "It means broken whilst it was yet fresh." is an expression for breaking and grinding. This is also what Onkelos meant by the word - broken. As to the word - Rashi, following the Rabbis as takes it/ a word compounded of - i.e. the crop is fresh and full in its stalks. And this is also what Onkelos meant by translating - soft, fresh.

6. NUM.11:1 - Onkelos translates - by - The verb - is to go around, hence the people were fomenting evil against God. It appears that Onkelos takes it from - to meet, encounter, seek occasion - and not from - to complain, murmur. Rashi follows Onkelos - The expression - denotes people who seek "a pretext" - they were seeking a pretext how to separate themselves from following the Omnipresent. B.D.B. however, takes our text in question from - "to murmur". Ps. Jonathan
also explains it in this sense: 

גַּלְעָשׁ אֲבֹתֵךְ

And they were wicked men of the people, who being discontent, devised and muttered evil ( - לְאֵרָא - from - חֲגִיגָה - to moan, growl, mutter). Neofiti makes it even clearer - 

הָיוּ הַכְּפַרְכֶּרֶם חַיִּים בְּשַׁנָּה

M. Jastrow, p. 1021 explains the Targum in question - "as though an evil (mourning - מַעֲמָר - ) had befallen 15 them".

7. NUM.18 1 - Onkelos translates - ( עֶשָּׁה עֲמֹרֶה מְפֶרֶשׁ - by - חָסֵּם - to cause forgiveness - "You (the priests) shall make reconciliation on account of transgressions". Rashi also takes it in this sense - 

עִקְוּבֵּךְ עַל מִשְׁפָּט עוֹשֶׂה מַעְמי מִשְׁפָּט

"Upon you I impose the punishment 16 for any strangers who may sin (inadvertently) in respect to the sacred objects which are entrusted to you". 17

8. NUM.21 30 - Onkelos explains - ( אַבְרְסֵה מְעָלוֹת - by - אַמּוֹלַה בָּשָׁר - מְשַׁבְּרָה - "And the kingdom hath ceased from Heshbon". Once again, Rashi follows Onkelos.

Onkelos and Rashi do not take - לְיָרָם - from - לְיָרָם - to throw, to shoot - as indeed Ibn Ezra and other
modern commentators take it - but rather from - רע to till \(^{18}\) (yoke) - hence the yoke of the kingdom, as in I KINGS. 11\(^{36}\) יְרוּם יְרוּם רַע לְכֶם, i.e. that his family may remain on the throne.\(^{19}\)

9. NUM.22\(^{32}\) - On the obscure word - רֶם (רָכָּל | 단; - רֶם- Rashi gives three explanations a) Our Sages, explain it as an acrostic - רֶם - she feared
- רֶם - she saw and - רֶם - she turned aside\(^{20}\) - because the journey is against me. b) According to the literal meaning it is equivalent to - רֶם - "trembling". - רֶם - being associated in meaning with - רֶם - trembling, panic. c) An expression denoting - רֶם - "being pleased". In other words it is an elliptical verse and the meaning is: Balaam who is taking the journey desires only - רֶם - to be contrary to me. Onkelos seems to favour the third explanation of Rashi - רֶם - "because it is seen before me that thou art willing\(^{21}\) to go in the way contrary to me".\(^{22}\) Ps. Jonathan\(^{23}\) seems to fuse the Sages' interpretation with that of Onkelos - רֶם - because it is seen before me that thou art willing to go in the way contrary to me.
10. DEUT. 32:24 - Rashi explains - by "The destruction caused by a demon whose name is - ".

The Siphre and the Midrash also take it in this sense.

Onkelos also is in line with this interpretation:

The word should not be taken in the sense of "winds" - but rather in the sense of (evil) spirits. I. Levy in his Dictionary translates: Schadliche Winde - "evil winds". This is incorrect and Onkelos should be understood in the light of Ps. Jonathan who translates - . The word - is in the sense of "demon" and so the text speaks about demons and evil spirits.

11. DEUT. 32:36 - Rashi explains - as follows:

"When He (God) sees that the power of the enemies is becoming progressively stronger over them". This is also Onkelos' interpretation. - 

"For it is known before Him, that in the time when the stroke of their enemy would prevail against them,
they would be exiled and forsaken". Most likely, Rashi took it from Onkelos.

12. DEUT.33 - Rashi explains - יָאַהְוִין (מַרְכָּבְזָה) in the sense of - יָאַהְוִין - "with Him" and thus he explains - יָאַהְוִין - "and with Him were a part of the myriads of the holy angels etc". In other words - יָאַהְוִין - should not be translated - "and He came from the myriads of holy angels", i.e. He left them and came alone. Rashi therefore points out that the prefix - כ - of - יָאַהְוִין - is the partitive, denoting a portion is taken out of the whole class. Once again, without quoting him, Rashi follows Onkelos - יָאַהְוִין - and with Him the myriads of holy angels. Ps. Jonathan, Palestinian Targum and Neofiti explain it also in this sense.

13. DEUT.33 - On the words - וְאֵלֶּה שְׁנֵי - Rashi offers two interpretations a) That - וְאֵלֶּה - should be taken in the sense of - "moon", and the text means: "there are some fruits which the moon brings to maturity" b) - וְאֵלֶּה - means - "months", and it means, the fruits which the earth puts forth
and produces from month to month. Whilst the first interpretation is taken from the Siphre^33 the second one is taken from Onkelos who interprets - אָבֵּרָּה יָדוֹת רַחַשׁ יְרוּשָׁלִּים - Ps. Jonathan, the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos' Targum. The Targumim's interpretation is more plausible for if - יָדוֹת - means "moon" as the Siphre takes it, one would expect - יָדוֹת - in singular.34

14. DEUT.33^25 - Rashi takes - אָבֵּרָּה יָדוֹת רַחַשׁ יְרוּשָׁלִּים - (רָבָרִי) - to mean: אָבֵּרָּה יָדוֹת רַחַשׁ יְרוּשָׁלִּים - The days that are your best i.e. the days of your youth, so shall be the days of your old age which (in general) flow away and decline". Onkelos also takes it in this sense - יָּדוֹת אָבֵּרָּה יָדוֹת רַחַשׁ יְרוּשָׁלִּים - "And as the days of thy youth shall be thy strength". In other words even in your old age your strength will not fail you. The Palestinian Targum^35 makes this point clearer: - יָּדוֹת אָבֵּרָּה יָדוֹת רַחַשׁ יְרוּשָׁלִּים - It appears, as Nahmanides rightly remarked, that the Targumim take the verb - אָבֵּרָּה - in the sense of - בַּעַל - "to flow" (the 'ל- and 'י- interchanging) hence the days of your old age will flow as the days of your youth. Onkelos, therefore, in his usual concise way conveys the same idea. At any rate as
we have said in our introduction to the Midrashic Section, Onkelos should be studied in the light of other Palestinian Targumim. The Siphre also appears to take \( \text{בּוֹאָלָמ} \) in the sense of \( \text{לְוָאָלְמָא} \) "to flow";

"all the countries will make silver and gold flow into the land of Israel".

B.D.B. however takes \( \text{בּוֹאָלָמ} \) from the Arabic word \( \text{بُوءَلَم} \) "rest". In other words, "all your days will be peaceful".
CHAPTER 3. Free Translation.

We have said in ch. 2 that in many instances, with regard to the etymology of words, Onkelos does not translate accurately and literally, but rather freely, according to the context and subject matter. His prime concern is not the philology of a textual word but rather what it conveys within the framework of the whole subject in question. Rashi follows his master Onkelos either by identifying him or by explaining the etymology of words in line with his interpretations.

Here are several examples to illustrate this point:

1. GEN. 3:8 - Onkelos and Rashi do not translate מות '/' ממור - literally - "at the wind of the day", (or at the breathing of the day). Onkelos says: מות יומא i.e. "in the evening" 2 (When the day comes to rest). Rashi without quoting him has this to say: מות יומא sensually & in the evening: "In the direction ( - מות - in the sense of direction) to which the sun travels, which is the west, for in the evening the sun is in the west". In GEN. Rabbah, Parasha 19, 8 - we have an argument מות יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל מות יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל מות יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל מות יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל מות יומא Rubin: מות שמה אוכל

It appears, therefore, that the Targumim and Rashi follow the opinion of Zabdi ben Levi. 3 According
to another opinion in the same Midrash - לִרְוֹת דֶּתֶם - is taken to mean - לִרְוֹת דֶּתֶם - "after the day's respite".4

A. Berliner,5 believes that Onkelos took - לִרְוֹת דֶּתֶם - in the sense of - לַיְלָה דַנְעָם - (the - לַיְלָה - and - לַיְלָה - interchanging), hence he translates - לַיְלָה דַנְעָם - . This suggestion is far fetched, and it is more plausible to put Onkelos in line with the Midrash where - לַיְלָה דַנְעָם - is taken in the sense of direction.6

2. GEN.614 - Onkelos does not translate - כְּעַנְעָם - literally as he does in DEUT.22 - כְּעַנְעָם - "nest" - but rather in its wider sense - כְּעַנְעָם - cabins, rooms.7 Without quoting him, Rashi follows him: - כְּעַנְעָם - "Separate cabins for each kind of cattle and beast". The N.E.B. reads: "cover it with reeds". It seems to take - כְּעַנְעָם - in the sense of "reeds" (כְּעַנְעָם).

3. GEN.1511 - Onkelos does not translate - לָשֶׁם - literally "to blow", but rather in its wider sense - לָשֶׁם - "and Abram drove them to fly away". In this vein Rashi translates : - לָשֶׁם - "it is an expression of blowing upon a thing and making a thing fly away". The Palestinian Targumim
interpret the text in a paraphrastic manner. Ps. Jonathan takes - שָׂנָה - as - לְנַחְתָּנְנָה - to shelter: - הָיוּ הָעִם לָאֵבֶרֶתָם מָעַלָם לְעֶזֶרָם. The Palestinian Targum reads: - וָכֵי לָאֵבֶרֶתָם אֶלִּיָּהּ מַעַּלָם יְהוָה. Neofiti, however, reads: - נָעָבָה. The LXX reads - אֶלִּיָּהּ - Abraham sat next to the carcasses. S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger (p.33) quotes other versions of Onkelos' Targum. Some have - אָפיּ - the Aramaic for - יִשָּׂע - (and Abraham brought back), others read - אֵילַיָּה - the normal rendering of Hebrew - וָכֵי. Rab. Saadia Gaon translates a vocalisation - אֵילַיָּה. In other words the carcasses were revived once they were killed, and this was a sign given for Abraham that his children would come out of Egypt free from all oppression. Dunash ben Labrat argues with Saadia's interpretation: - וָכֵי אֶלִּיָּה (כִּי אֶלִּיָּה) וָכֵי אֶלִּיָּה וָכֵי אֶלִּיָּה וָכֵי אֶלִּיָּה וָכֵי אֶלִּיָּה. In other words the carcasses were revived once they were killed, and this was a sign given for Abraham that his children would come out of Egypt free from all oppression.
4. GEN.20:17 - Onkelos does not translate "יולד - literally "and they bare children" - but rather - "and they were relieved. Rashi who quotes the Targum explains: הָכַּרְמַנְתָּו, פְּרִיסָיו, נְקָבְּיָה - "and their channels were opened" and they brought forth [their secretions], and this is - "as far as they are concerned."

5. GEN.37:4 - Onkelos does not translate צבקו לועה (בענה מעוה) by the usual translation - but rather by its wider implication - "they did not want". Onkelos may be alluding to the midrashic interpretation quoted by Rashi: "they did not speak dishonestly, saying one thing with their mouth and having another thing quite different in their hearts".

6. GEN.40:13 - Rashi translates "ושם (ברעה את דם השך) to mean: - "to count" - when he musters his servants to serve him during the meal he will count you also among them". In EX.30:12 Onkelos translates (......) - by - . However, in the verse in
question, he translates according to the subject of the text and thus he says:— "In three days Pharaoh will remember you". It is most interesting to note that in verse 19 with regard to the baker, Onkelos translates the same word:— "At the end of three days Pharaoh will remove your head. This is because as said before, in some instances, Onkelos does not take the philological consideration in mind, but rather the subject of the text plays an important part in his commentary. Rashi, however, who interprets "to count", seems to reject Onkelos' translation. 15

7. Again, GEN. 41 47 - Rashi translates "they stored up the grain handful upon handful, fist upon fist". 16 Rashi appears to reject Onkelos who translates it as "storehouses". In actual fact, Onkelos 17 is fully aware that the literal meaning of is not "storehouses" but, once again, his prime concern is not the philology of a textual word but rather what it conveys within the framework of the whole subject. Onkelos, therefore, merely points out that there was so much grain that they needed to store it in
storehouses. Furthermore, as said throughout our thesis, Onkelos should be understood in the light of other Palestinian Targumim.

Ps. Jonathan translates:

"And the earth brought forth (so much) that every blade made two handfuls in the seven years of plenty, until all the storehouses (or granaries) were full".

In this spirit Onkelos should be understood, for Ps. Jonathan's method is to augment and expound on the terseness of Onkelos' Targum.18

8. GEN.43:16

"For these men shall eat with me at noon". Onkelos translates:

Onkelos is not precise in his translation for in Aramaic means - "meal", and the Aramaic word for - is - "noon".

Rashi was fully aware of this peculiar translation of Onkelos and, by means of a perhaps delicate indirectness, points out that:

However, Onkelos should be understood in the light of Ps. Jonathan, who indeed explains the brevity of Onkelos:
"For the men shall eat with me at the time of the meal at noon". 19

In some places Rashi makes it clear that Onkelos was not careful in his philological interpretation. 9.

Thus in GEN. 43 18 - on the text -/J'//' ~'J":'I~' 'J·f,~t,":n~J­
Onkelos translates."We are brought in so that they may assume superiority over us and to seek occasion against us". Rashi has this to say: -

"It means - that there may be rolled upon us an accusation regarding the money...and according to Onkelos who rendered - לְּכַלְכֵּל יָבֹא - it signifies seeking an occasion - just as we render in the Targum the words (DEUT. 12 17) -לְּכַלְכֵּל הַכְּלָיָמ - "a pretext", by - לְּכַלְכֵּל הַכְּלָיָמ - "intrigues" - but his translation does not fit in with the exact sense of the text.

10. GEN. 47 17 - בַּלָּא גַּהֲנֵה - Onkelos translates: -
- לְּכַלְכֵּל הַכְּלָיָמ - "and he fed them with bread". Similarly LXX and Vulgate. The basic meaning of לְּכַלְכֵּל הַכְּלָיָמ - is "and he led them" as Rashi, in fact, points out, but Onkelos does not translate literally.
11. GEN. 50:5 - Rashi says: - take it in its literal sense; "the grave which I have digged". Onkelos, who translates - "the grave which I have prepared" - was not exact in his translation. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti take it like Rashi - (from to dig). The Peshitta reads: - i.e. "which I bought". Most probably in honour of the Patriarch, Onkelos refused to take it in the sense "to dig", so as not to make him "a grave-digger". In actual fact, the Midrash Tanhuma (Parasha Vayehi 6) also refuses to take it in this sense:

12. EX. 13 - Onkelos translates freely - by - "lest the people be afraid" (the Aramaic גיה = גח). Rashi on the other hand has this to say:

"lest they have second thoughts about having gone out and set their hearts on returning" Ps. Jonathan reads - "lest the people be affrighted".
Another fine example where Onkelos translates freely and not according to the literal meaning of a textual word can further be seen from EX.33 - "and called it the appointed tent". Onkelos translates: "and called it the Tabernacle of the house of Instruction". Wherever the words - occur in the Torah Onkelos translates - . But, once again, Onkelos interprets according to the subject matter and the text supports him - Consequently the tent of meeting in question must be - "a tent of Instruction". Rashi, who follows his teacher, has this to say - "a meeting place for those who sought instruction in the Torah".

LEV.18 - Onkelos translates - freely - by - "to prevail with her". The verb - is to lie stretched out, lie down, hence, in this context, to submit.

NUM.10 - "to search out a resting place for them". Wherever the word - occurs in the Torah, Onkelos translates.
In our text in question Onkelos translates according to the context of the text - לַעֲמֹדָה לְאָבוֹת - to prepare for them a place for encampment”.

Rashi also takes it in this sense 33: יִהְיֶה כָּפַר לְםָכָה - וה Goth. יַכִּפְרוּ לְמָכָה - "and they were chosen". The use of the Niphal form of this verb implies that the Israelites refused to go to war until they were "handed over" against their own will. 34 Perhaps in honour of Israel, 35 Onkelos refused to take it in this sense for this would only prove that the Israel's soldiers were cowardly and could not face the enemy. Hence Onkelos' interpretation - לַעֲמֹדָה לְאָבוֹת. In other words, under the circumstances, a selection of soldiers was made.

Ps. Jonathan 36 fuses Onkelos' translation with that of the Derash quoted by Rashi: אֲשֶׁר־כָּפַר לְםָכָה - לַעֲמֹדָה לְאָבוֹת.
17. Similarly, DEUT.1 - Onkelos translates freely - . In honour of Israel Onkelos refused to use the verb - to crush, to grind, which is a strong term to use. He, therefore, tones it down by using the verb - to drive away, banish.

18. DEUT.30 - "Is not too difficult for you". Rashi's interpretation - is supported by Onkelos who renders DEUT.17 - "If there be concealed from thee". In the text in question, however, Onkelos is not careful and translates - "It is not separated from thee". Rashi, therefore, by means of a perhaps delicate indirectness, rejects Onkelos' translation.

19. DEUT.32 - Onkelos translates - not in its literal sense, but in the sense of - "to provide" - "He (God) provided them with all they needed in the wilderness". Rashi believes that the Targum took it in the same sense of - - "How can the sheep and oxen be slaughtered that would be enough for them" (NUM.11). Perhaps, however, Onkelos' intention is to avoid the anthropomorphism.
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To say that God found Israel in the wilderness, is certainly a misconception; Onkelos therefore tones it down by taking it in the sense "to provide". Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti do not avoid the anthropomorphism, for both translate - אֲרוֹן יָרֵד - "He met them".

20. DEUT. 32:34 - חֹזֵה לְעֵינֵי צְדָקָא - Onkelos appears not to take - הָסִדּוּ - in its apparently literal sense, from - מָסַבְּל - to hide, store away, i.e. "Is not this laid up in store with Me" - but rather in the sense of - יָפַה - "revealed", "open" - נֶפֶשׁ הָאָדָם - "Are not all their secret doings open before Me? But, as said throughout our thesis, Onkelos must be studied in the light of other Palestinian Targumim. Ps. Jonathan has this to say: - לֹא יָבָךִין לְעֵינֵי שְׁמִי בְּשֶׁמֶרֶךְ לְמָךְ מָלֵךְ וּלְיָדֵי אֲדֹנִי "Are not all their secret doings revealed before Me"? In this spirit Onkelos' translation should be understood. The Palestinian Targum and Neofiti translate - מְסִי - by - נֶפֶשׁ. Rashi quotes Onkelos and fits his interpretation in line with the text. 41
21. More examples of this nature are Onkelos GEN.24 s.v - נקש; Rashi GEN.43 s.v -  ורשלא; LEV.26 s.v - את מתיאת; NUM.11 s.v - ושב משה; NUM.14 s.v - יヂכ; NUM.32 s.v - ירהש. 
Hearing in mind the foregoing analysis in Chapter 3 it may also be of interest to mention that the avoidance of translating literally on the part of Onkelos is due to the fact that certain Hebrew idioms, if translated as they stand, would certainly have made no sense to the Aramaic reader unless he was conditioned to treat them as a "calque" of the Hebrew. Onkelos, therefore, paraphrases the text and keeps the inner meaning intact. This is quite common when one has to translate from one language to another.

1. Thus, GEN.26:11 - וַחֲדָשֹׁם בָּאָם הָיָה - "Whoever touched this man". Most probably the verb נגע is considered too imprecise if rendered literally. Onkelos, therefore, explains: - יַעַקְבְּלֵבָא עַל - "He that damages this man".

2. GEN.11:44 - ...וַיָּמָת יִשָּׂא אַתָּה זִקְנָי ... And Pharaoh said...but without your consent no man shall lift hand or foot etc...."
Rashi follows Onkelos who explains this obscure idiom: - טכְּרֹגָם נָבָא מִמְּאָרָךְ לָא יִזָּאֵב אַתָּה זָקַן - "He that damageth this man".
"Without your authority no man shall raise his hand to take up a weapon or raise his foot to mount a horse".

3. GEN.17:1 - The biblical idiom - may be strange in Aramaic if it were translated literally. In order to give it a meaningful message, Onkelos had to grope for an equivalent Aramaic idiom - thus the translation - "Worship before Me" - is very appropriate within the context of the text. Rashi, in fact, explains that this particular idiom should be understood in the light of the Targum:-

4. EX.21:19 - The biblical idiom - would be as negative in Aramaic as it is in Hebrew if it were translated literally. Onkelos, therefore, interpreting in a positive sense, translates -. The Mechilta and Rashi also take it here as a metaphorically positive expression for the "strength" ( upon which a person relies.

5. EX.22:2 - Again the biblical idiom - would be strange if it were translated literally. (cf. 2 Samuel 7:13...).
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Onkelos and Rashi take it as a metaphorical expression and Onkelos renders it "If the eye of the witnesses fall upon him". 3

6. EX.10 26 - Rashi follows Onkelos who translates the biblical idiom by "Nothing will remain in Egypt".

7. NUM.10 31 - Again the idiom might appear imprecise to the Aramaic reader if it were to be translated literally. Rashi, who follows Onkelos has this to say: The verb is in the past tense and we have to understand it just as the Targum renders it: For you know when we were living in the wilderness, and all the mighty deeds that have been wrought for us you have seen with your own eyes." Onkelos, elation seems to be coloured by his reference of to the past.

8. NUM.14 9 - "For they are our food". Although this idiom is scarcely unintelligible
(LXX and Peshitta retain it) Nevertheless Onkelos makes clear the meaning of the text - "For they are delivered into our hands." In this sense Rashi interprets: "we shall consume them like bread".

9. DEUT. 28:44 - "He (the enemy) will be the head and you the tail".

Again, this Hebrew metaphor is transferable into Aramaic, however, Onkelos translates - "He will be strong and you will be weak". Rashi, apparently finding the idiom self-explanatory, has no comment.

In short there is a strong tendency in Onkelos (followed by Rashi) to eliminate metaphor and to substitute factual statement.

Similarly, certain biblical verbs cannot always be translated by a same root, otherwise as said above they will be misleading. Thus the Hebrew verb "to hear" sometimes is translated literally and sometimes by "to accept". Rashi, who is fully aware of Onkelos' method has this to say in GEN. 37:27 - "Hebrew verb - הביא - הביא - הביא - הביא - הביא...

כָּלָהּ, וְאֶבֶךְ שְׁמַרְתָּ... וְאֶבֶךְ שְׁמַרְתָּ..."
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The Targum renders this by "and they accepted it from him" (i.e. they agreed). Wherever the verb - שמע - means agreeing with a person's statement, as here, and as GEN.28 and Jacob had hearkened to his father, it is translated in the Targum by - קנה - "accepting", but wherever it merely means hearing with the ear as in GEN.3 "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden", and GEN.27 "and Rebecca heard", all these cases are rendered by the Targum by the various forms of - שמע.

11. Similarly, with regard to the Hebrew verb - לקח - "to take" - Rashi makes us aware of the various forms used by Onkelos in translating this verse in Aramaic. Thus in GEN.43 - Rashi says: - 'וכל הכרכם בבראשית לא יכלו לנהל קצף". "We render this in the Targum by - מבלש - and they led Benjamin away" - because the same expression cannot be used in Aramaic for taking money and for taking a person. In the case of an object that can be taken by the hand the Targum uses - נתן - "and he carried" (for the Hebrew verb - נתן -) whilst in the case of a person who is taken by
persuasion the Targum uses - "הברר".

12. Again the verb to explore (יהלום) - as in NUM.13:21; NUM.13:21 - or the verb - למד - to search out as in DEUT.1:22 - are near synonyms - and Onkelos translates both by יד -

13. Again NUM.11:12 - המ.learning from את אתי מתבע - "Am I their mother"?

Onkelos declined to interpret - יד - in its literal sense ['to conceive] and making Moses as a mother for this biblical idiom if translated as it stands, would have seemed incongruous to the reader. Onkelos, therefore, translates: - לה緩 את zam ומע "Am I father to all this people"?

In short, certain idioms of the Bible cannot be translated literally, otherwise the whole message will be lost, and the translation into Aramaic will be incomprehensible. Thus in this field, the avoidance of translating literally on the part of Onkelos is understandable.

14. On the other hand, Onkelos is capable of taking over literally into Aramaic an idiomatic Hebrew combination, e.g. GEN.32:21 - ויאמר ילק - Onkelos - נזבם - (Ps. Jonathan -
Rashi, apparently finding the idiom self-explanatory in the context, has no comment.

15. Similarly, Ex.5:21 - אָבֵדַרְדַּה אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה רְשׁוּת בְּעֵינָיְךָ is rendered literally by Onkelos, without comment from Rashi. Again Deut.22:17 - וְאֵלֶּה בְּשֵׁם הָאֱלֹהִים - Rashi, however, takes it as a metaphorical expression.

But the exploration of this aspect of the subject is a separate matter which would take us too far afield. The examples in the present Chapter are restricted to cases of single items which could not be translated literally into Aramaic without causing perplexity, confusion, or in the Targumist's view, proving insufficiently specific.
CHAPTER FIVE.

Injection of "Derash" and "Halacha" in Onkelos' Targum.

Further to our analysis in previous Chapters - 3 and 4 - it is also of paramount importance to mention that sometimes the avoidance of Onkelos in translating literally, is in order to inject midrashic or halachic interpretations in his Targum. In our midrashic and halachic sections respectively, these two points in relation to Onkelos, have been discussed at length, therefore, in this Chapter, we shall confine ourselves in mentioning some examples only to illustrate the above mentioned point.

1. GEN.28 - שֵׁמַעְתָּם - Onkelos does not translate - מִשְׁמַעְתָּם - "In the east of Eden He (God) planted the Garden" - which is the literal meaning of the word - but rather - שֵׁמַעְתָּם - "at the beginning". Rashi, in fact, argues and takes it in its usual sense: שֵׁמַעְתָּם. Perhaps this translation on the part of Onkelos is deliberate in order to inject a Rabbinic tradition namely "Seven things were created before the creation of the world - Torah, Repentance, Gan Eden, Hell, the Throne of Glory, the Temple, and the name of the Messiah". According to Rabbi Samuel Bar Nahman, in GEN.Rabbah 15,2 - the word - שֵׁמַעְתָּם - is not referring to the creation of the Universe, but before the "creation of Adam". Neofiti follows Onkelos -
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but Ps. Jonathan makes it clear that the text refers to the creation of the Universe.

2. GEN.159 - Rashi explains - לְךָ מַעָּלָה - to mean לְךָ מַעָּלָה - "three heifers". He also takes לְךָ מַעָּלָה - to mean "three goats and three rams". Rashi's source is the Midrash3 and Onkelos interprets likewise: קרב קְדִימָה אֲגָלִים Ibn Ezra who is not in favour of the "Derash" has this to say: "In my opinion, the heifer was to be three years old". It is interesting to note that whilst Onkelos interprets midrashically, Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti interpret like A. Ibn Ezra: קרב קְדִימָה אֲגָלִים.

3. EX.1318 - Onkelos explains - שְׁוָיִם - by שְׁוָיִם - "armed". Onkelos was influenced by the Derash of the Rabbis5 who explain that the Israelites were provided with weapons in order to forestall the question, with regard to the war with Amalek and the war with Shihon and Og and Midian, whence they obtained them.
4. **EX.15** Rashi too interprets:

Onkelos translates - "heap" (cf. SONG 3) - but from - "craftiness", "prudence". In other words the water displayed their cleverness. The Mechilta also takes it in this sense:

"In the measure the Egyptians meted out to the Israelites was it meted out to them. They had said, come let us deal cleverly with them, you (God), too, gave the waters this sense of cleverness that they might wage war against the Egyptians". Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti, however, take it from "heap":

Rashi criticises Onkelos and interprets the text like Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.

5. **EX.22** "You shall not hold back the first of your harvest whether corn or..." Onkelos infused the Derash Halacha by translating - "the first fruits". Ps. Jonathan interprets
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in accordance with tradition.\textsuperscript{10}
Rashi agrees with Onkelos' interpretation.

6. EX. 23\textsuperscript{18} - Onkelos does not translate - 'ל'א שִׁמְעָה
literally - but rather - 'ל'א שִׁמְעָה - . This is done
deliberately in order to inject the Rabbinic
tradition\textsuperscript{11} that the (דָּם מְסָפַר, "Paschal lamb"
is meant here and not - "לֶבֶן הָעָכָר - the
"daily sacrifice". In this sense, too, Rashi
interprets the text.\textsuperscript{12}

7. LEV. 20\textsuperscript{5} - "I will set my face against man and family".
Onkelos does not translate - "וְיֹבְשֵׁנִי - literally - but - "those who help him"
or shelter him). Perhaps Onkelos was influenced
by the Derash quoted by Rashi:

"Rabbi Simeon asked, "But how did his family
sin that it should be punished? The family
is mentioned to teach you [that as a rule] there is
no family in which there is a publican\textsuperscript{13} whose
members may not all be considered as publicans, for they all try to protect him. 14
Ps. Jonathan makes it even clearer: - לבן זכר היה - Onkelos, therefore, should be understood in the same way as Ps. Jonathan. 15

8. LEV. 2228 נא לשתה את בנך "You shall not slaughter a cow or a sheep at the same time as its young". The Rabbinic tradition (as Rashi explains) is that this law applies only to the female parent, i.e. it is forbidden to slaughter the mother and its male or female young in one day, but it does not apply to the male parent, for it is permissible to slaughter the father animal and its young, whether male or female in one day. 17
Onkelos translates: - אמר ענבי - which shows that Onkelos' intention is purely to inject the Rabbinic tradition. 18

9. LEV. 2411 - Onkelos by translating - מביא - by - instead of the usual word - ליגע - is alluding to the halachic insistence that unless articulation
(פִּיסְמָ) of the Tetragrammaton occurs there is no infringement of the prohibition of blasphemy.

Rashi, in fact, who remarked on Onkelos' translation has this to say: -

10. DEUT. 32

Onkelos translates - בּוּסָס - יַראְךָ - "pleasant", "sweet". Onkelos may be alluding to the Derash of the Siphre:

This is also the translation of the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan, however, translates:

"My doctrine shall smite upon the rebellious like heavy rain". It appears he takes - יַראְךָ - in the sense of (DEUT. 21:4) "and they shall strike off the heifer's neck".

Rabbi Eliezer also takes it in this sense:
Rashi without identifying Onkelos, rejects his translation and takes - from the root - "to drop" - as in DEUT.33 -.

11. DEUT.32 - "I would scatter them into corners".
Rashi makes it clear that Onkelos who interprets it by - follows the Derash of the Siphre which divides this word into three words - [In my] anger I said [I will make them as if they are ] - where? (i.e. nowhere, non-existent, hence - and consume them). Rashi rejects his explanation because it does not conform with the rules of grammar and accepts that of Menachem Ben Sheruk who interprets - "I would make them as grain left in the corner of the field". (i.e. - free for all). Ps. Jonathan also seems to take it in this sense:- "I will leave only few among them; as a man who reaps his field and leaves but one portion".

The Palestinian Targum takes it as Onkelos:

Neofiti interprets:
Furthermore, it is interesting to note that even into "geographical places", which one might expect to be translated literally, Onkelos infuses a midrashic interpretation. Thus in GEN.22:\textsuperscript{2} - "the Land of Moriah" is translated by Onkelos: - "the land for the Temple Service". Rashi in fact explains that Onkelos understood it to be the land of myrrh and other spices used in the Temple.\textsuperscript{29}

Onkelos translates - " Perhaps Onkelos alludes to the Derash of the Rabbis (Bab.Tal.Irub.53\textsuperscript{a} - quoted by Rashi) - "It is called so on account of the couples who are buried there". In other words, as Rashi explains (GEN.23\textsuperscript{2}) that it was so called [Kiryat Arba, the city of the Four] because of the four couples who were buried there (man and wife) - Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Leah".\textsuperscript{30}

- the word - was not translated by Onkelos as the name of the town as indeed the LXX takes it, but as. Most likely Onkelos alludes to the "midrashic" interpretation
quoted by Rashī. "Jacob arrived safely, [in good health], whole as regards his possessions and perfect in his knowledge of the Torah."\(^{31}\) (cf. Neofit - "עֲלֵם רַעְבָּם שָׁלוֹם בְּעָנָף, שָׁלוֹם בְּמַעֲמָרָה" - "Israel's return to plenty, peace in the wilderness")

15. In NUM. 21:18-19 - Geographical place-names such as "Midbar", Mattanah" and "Naḥaliel" are interpreted midrashically by Onkelos. Rashī, who follows his master explains: - "understand this as the Targum does". "And after the well had been given them, it descended into the valley". Onkelos alludes to the Derash that Miriam's well accompanied the Israelites in all their journeys.\(^{32}\)

16. Again in DEUT. 1:1 - "In the wilderness" - is interpreted by - (Moses) - "reproving them because they had sinned in the wilderness". Onkelos is alluding to the incident mentioned in EX. 16:3.

17. Again, the geographical place - is interpreted by Onkelos - "where they scorned the manna".
18. The place - הַמִּצְרָא - is interpreted - "And in Hazereth where they provoked to anger on account of meat". Onkelos is alluding to the incident of the quails which occurred in "Kibret-Hattaavah" (NUM.11:33).

19. The place - ובְּזוֹרוֹת - is translated - "And because they had made the golden calf".

All these interpretations are in accordance with the Derash of the Siphre quoted by Rashi in his commentary.

20. In DEUT.3:25 - Onkelos takes - תֵּאָרֶשׁ - to mean - מִשְׁפָּרָת - "The Temple". Perhaps Onkelos refuses to accept that Moses' wish was purely to see the nature and beauty of Lebanon, he therefore resigns himself to midrashic interpretation that by Lebanon the Temple is meant - "The goodly mountain is Jerusalem" and Lebanon is the Temple". Rashi agrees with Onkelos' interpretation - שְׁמַעְתָּם - "Furthermore, in Onkelos' time several geographical places had become known by different names from
those enumerated in the Torah. Onkelos, therefore, identifies these archaic names for the benefit of the students of the Targum.

21. Thus, GEN.8\textsuperscript{4} - "the mountains of Ararat" are identified by Onkelos as - the mountains of Kardou". Perhaps it is identical with the modern name Kurdistan.\textsuperscript{35}

22. Again, GEN.10\textsuperscript{14} - Cappadocia\textsuperscript{36} is meant. Rashi has no identification for - .

23. In GEN.11\textsuperscript{2} - is identified by Onkelos and Rashi as - Babylon.\textsuperscript{37}

24. Again GEN.14\textsuperscript{18} - identified\textsuperscript{38} by Onkelos, Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti as - "Jerusalem". Rashi does not comment on - .

25. In NUM.13\textsuperscript{22} - becomes - Tanis.\textsuperscript{39}
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26. In NUM.13:26 - רשתה - is identified by רחם.

27. In NUM.21:15 - the city - ירע - is identified by יריע.


29. In NUM.24:21 - the tribe of - הַלְּנָה - is identified by הַלְּנָה.

30. In NUM.24:24 - כְּתַבֵּן - are identified as the רמים - Romans.

31. In DEUT.3:14 - Onkelos identifies - וַיְהַעֲלוּ - by - מַעֲלֵי. Perhaps the town Epikairos in Greece is meant.

32. Onkelos also simplifies the figurative language of the Torah, thus in GEN.3:15 - זרע - "seed" is substituted by - ב"son".
33. Again GEN.37:25-27-28 - אֲרָמִים - are identified as - עָרֶב - "the Arabs." 45
The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.

The fact that the Pentateuch contains one Aramaic phrase alongside its Hebrew equivalent may possibly have influenced Onkelos in regard to his treatment of certain Hebrew words as being borrowed from Aramaic. In some instances, of course, such treatment may be mistaken, particularly if the root concerned is one deriving from a common Semitic stock which may have divided semantically, whether slightly or more radically, as between its occurrences in Hebrew and in Aramaic.

Here are a few examples to illustrate this point:

1. GEN. 6:14 - Rashi has this to say: "ן"נפנ" - It is an Aramaic term meaning "pitch", and in the Talmud (Shab. 67a) we find the noun - "כורה" - "pitch". כורה - in the sense of pitch occurs here only (contrast כורה" in EX. 2), Rashi consequently assumes that it is a loan word from Aramaic - כורה. Onkelos in fact uses the same terminology:

2. GEN. 32:20 - "I will appease him". רשיי הנאש רבאוה רבא והלט" - Rashi explains: רmenuItem הושאר רבעה אטפ"ו הבאר ייז. בר, לכו פורז, ייזבכמ" בראבא.
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"I will appease his anger (wiping away). It is an Aramaic expression occurring frequently in the Talmud: He wiped his hand off - ק娱乐场 - and he wants to wipe - יمشاهג - his hands off on this man (i.e. he desires to put the responsibility upon me. See Bab. Tal. Gitt.56a). Onkelos (not quoted) explains it likewise: יمشاهג לודויה.

3. GEN.32:24 - ויאבק אשת לいま - and a man wrestled with him.
   Rashi explains: ייאבק - בני, ראה שמעה עצום ותקשר לいま - וארכו היא - בהכרח הביא את אבר.ߣ לא ימאק לいま - שה לועב שמעך עמי שמעתך עמי ואין... I am of the opinion that it means "he fastened himself on", and that it is an Aramaic word as (Bab. Tal. Sanh. 63b) "after they have (ליאבק) joined it", and (Bab. Tal. Men.42a)"and he twined the fringes with loops". Accordingly Onkelos who translates - ישתפלו בכרא is not exact in his translation.2

4. Again, GEN.41:8 - Rashi believes that the word - הרברא - has its origin in Aramaic: י’Bועדנה. בות ведьות ע-labelledby אבר.
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"The word - אורים - in this verse means bones in Aramaic. In the Mishna (Ohal.17 cf. Rashi NUM.5) we read - "a house that is full of bones". In order to foretell the future the magicians need to enquire of the bones of the dead. Onkelos translates - контекстуально. (see also section ch. 20 note 32).

5. GEN.41.23 - Again Rashi says: - המ욜יעל, כי ביך חומ חולם עד שחר צה' כפים, ונו הבו כמם לבנים קנים, בני מבנה them blossoms are stricken 3 - there was nothing in them but the blossom, because they were empty of grain.

The word - אורים - derives from the Aramaic word - אורים - which signifies a "rock". They (ears) are like wood without moisture and as hard as a rock. The Targum [supports this] and it is translated by - their blossom is stricken 3 - there was nothing in them but the blossom, because they were empty of grain.

6. GEN.41.43 - Onkelos translates - אביך - by - רבי ה' - "This is the father of the King". Rashi who quotes Onkelos points out: - רבי ה' - that in Aramaic the word - רבי - signifies "King". 4 The Bab. Tal. Baba Bathra p.4a.
also takes it in this sense - רכז... מפי רכז, ופיוון, רכיבו וקריז 5פין אנוך.

Another midrashic interpretation is given by Rabbi Judah in the Siphre:

"The appellation means that Joseph is "a father" (בן in wisdom and tender (衽) in years".

Ps. Jonathan fuses Onkelos' interpretation with that of Rabbi Judah.

The phrase - פירות - means a graceful son, and it is an Aramaic expression: e.g. "Let us treat gracefully Rabbi Simeon" (Bab.Tal.Bab. Metsia 119a).

Rashi explains that the word - שתה - in Hebrew has its origin in Aramaic, for in EX.19 the Targum translates - ירה是一项 - "he shall be hurled to his death".

7. GEN.49:22 - A fruitful son.

Rashi says:

The phrase - פירות - means a graceful son, and it is an Aramaic expression: e.g. "Let us treat gracefully Rabbi Simeon" (Bab.Tal.Bab. Metsia 119a).

8. GEN.49:25 - Rashi explains that the word - שתה - in Hebrew has its origin in Aramaic, for in EX.19 the Targum translates - ירה一项 - "he shall be hurled to his death".

9.
9. GEN. 49:26 - רashi explains that רִעָה is an Aramaic word synonymous with the Hebrew words הבש and של - "prey, which are rendered in the Targum by עֵירָה.

10. EX. 34:33 - וְיֵלֵדָהּ עֲנֵיהֶם וְמִצְוָה - and Moses put a veil over his face.
Rashi explains: מָזוּזָה מֵעַרְגָּם עַכְּתֵּא, אֵי, לֹא יִתְגַּלה - כְּּבָּאָלָדָהּ קָרָב לְבָּד, אוֹרַב בָּאָלָדָהּ, וּמִצְוָה כְּּמָזְכִּית קְרִית בְּכִלֵּי בֲּעָלָדָהּ.
Render - מֵעַרְגָּם - as the Targum does: "a cover for his face". The word?action- is an Aramaic expression (from the root - לֹא - to look) and it occurs in the Bab. Tal. (Ket. 62) "her heart (לֹא) perceived", and again in Ket. 60a - "he gazed at her".

11. LEV. 20:17 - רashi explains: לָשׁוּנָהוּ מִיֵּרֶבֶץ מְנַשֶּׁה - It is an Aramaic expression, the Hebrew - מִיֵּרֶבֶץ - being in that language 13 - מִיֶּשׁעַ - .

13. NUM. 23 - Rashi follows the Targum to the effect that 'шим שופ' means "alone". Rashi believes that this word has its origin in Aramaic and it means "to be quiet", "at ease". In Bab. Tal. Gitt. 73a we read: "גבעה גבעה רבע שבעא... וו שפ ליב - "go and pacify (or settle with) him".

Similarly, Bab. Metsia 70a: "גבעה דרמשופ נכסיר אמות". "We look for a man whose property is at peace (undisputed by any claimants) and trustworthy".

14. DEUT. 32 - Rashi explains that 'שיע' is an Aramaic word and it means "hair" as in fact we find in the Bab. Tal. (Meg. 18a) "he was busying himself (אשף) with his hair".

The above examples indicate that Rashi's familiarity with talmudic Aramaic sometimes tempted him into unnecessary imputing of Aramaisms to biblical Hebrew, quite apart from such imputations with which he rightly or wrongly credited Onkelos in his Targumic renderings.
Although we have said throughout our thesis that Rashi's guide and teacher was Onkelos, nevertheless, he did not follow his master indiscriminately. His desire for the truth enabled him to differ from Onkelos in many philological and etymological explanations. In this chapter we shall give several examples to illustrate this point and the reader will be able to find many more examples of this nature.

1. In GEN.4:13 - עוז רם עון משישה - Onkelos translates אמלעש - "to forgive". Onkelos appears to take it in the sense of Cain's sin is so great that there can be no forgiveness. Rab Saadia Gaon also takes it in this sense.

Rashi, however, takes it in the sense of - לשון - to carry, to bear, i.e. "My punishment is greater than can be borne". Ps. Jonathan takes it also in this sense: - נאם קרה נין תכלת מונחין... ממלכתיו והרי תכלת קומך לוסבלייך יתייה.
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2. GEN.36:24 - Rashi translates - פֶּרֶדֵי שֶׁמֶשֶׁת: by - הָיָה - כְּחֵיָּם חָמַר עֲלֵיהֶם אַבֶּן רוּפֵא וְאָלֵיהֶם פִּירָן

"The mules" - He (Anah) crossed an ass and a mare, the offspring being a mule. Onkelos, however, translates it by - הָיוּ עָנָה לְאָם עַד אֶבֶן אָלֵיהֶם. "The mighty ones". It appears that Onkelos takes מִיסֶּר - in the sense of - מְחֵיָּם - "The strong ones". In other words Anah made a name for himself by fighting people who were very strong.

3. GEN.42:9 - Rashi explains - אֵלָיו - ערְוֹת הָאִרְם - "the nakedness of the land" - (from which side it might easily be conquered) such as in LEV.20:18 - "He hath made naked her fountain". Rashi goes on to say: - הָיָה הָאִרְוָה אֵדֵקֹל לָאָרְכָּא... אֵדֵקֹל לָאָרְכָּא לָא אָרְכָּה לָא אֵדֵקֹל. Onkelos renders it by "the breach of the land" (similar to II KINGS,12:6 - בֵּית הָבֵית - The breach of the house) - but he was not careful to translate it literally, according to the wording of the text.

This should be rendered by the Targum by — נְפָּרָא הָאֹגֶס — which means "when they finished" in the sense of making an end of an action. He, however, who has the reading in the Targum — הָאֹגֶס נְפָּרָא — when they had enough — is in error. The words in GEN.24.22 — "when the camels had finished drinking", are rightly rendered in the Targum — נְפָּרָא הָאֹגֶס — which means — when they had drunk sufficient for their needs — for that was the end of their drinking. Here, however, the phrase in question refers to the time when the food came to an end; therefore, we should render it in the Targum by — נְפָּרָא הָאֹגֶס —. In other words nothing was left over.

5. GEN.49.6 — Rashi interprets — עֲקֵרָה שָׁויָך — "they lamed an ox" — as referring to Joseph who is called — שֵׁיָךְ. Onkelos rejects this midrashic interpretation and takes — שֵׁיָךְ — in the sense of — שֵׁיָך — wall. "And in their self-will they destroyed the wall of the enemy" — וְגַרְצוּתֵיהֶם כַּרְבּוּ שֹׁרָא שִׁפְיוֹ. The Palestinian Targumim, however, interpret like Rashi.
6. EX. 11 - Rashi rejects Onkelos' translation that 'אָרְצָה - means - "Evildoing governors" 13 - and he, therefore, interprets 'חָוָה - "The officers who exact tribute of labour from them". Whilst Onkelos takes - מִים - from - אָרְץ - to dislike, to despise, Rashi takes it from - שָׁם - tribute. 14 Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti read: - רֵעֵבֵטִין מְפִּיחַ נֶ - "taskmasters".

7. EX. 159 - Rashi explains - רֵעֵבֵטִין - to mean "poor", "impoverish" - ( ישורון רמות וְרהָוִית ), i.e. "My hand shall make them poor". It appears Rashi rejects Onkelos who translates - נַשְׁתֵּנוֹן יִזֶּה - "My hand shall destroy them". Perhaps the word - חָוָה - "sword" - in the text caused Onkelos to explain it in the sense of destruction and extermination. In DEUT. 28 42 - Rashi, again, explains - רְמֹשׁ חָזֵּב - by - רְמֹשׁ מִלְמַפֶּרֶת - i.e. "the locust will impoverish" 15 the tree (make it bare) from its fruits". Rashi goes on to say that one cannot explain - שָׁם - as meaning ( של "inherit", "driving out", for if so, it ought to have been written - שָׁם - in the Kal (cf. GEN. 2110) nor can it have the meaning ( של ) of "driving out", for then it
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ought to have been written - שָׁבָע - the Hiphil. Here, too, one fails to understand the inconsistency of Rashi for whilst, here, he insists that the Hiphil of the verb denotes "driving out" (this is also his view in NUM.14:12; NUM.14:24; and NUM.32:39) in the verse in question (EX.15:9) he takes the Hiphil - סֶרֶף - in the sense of "impoverishing". It appears that Rashi fails to recognise, or at least is undecided, about the treatment of (class י"ו) this verb - שָׁבָע. It is interesting to note that whilst Rashi, here, does not accept Onkelos' translation that - כֹּסִי - means - "to inherit", the Bab. Tal. Baba Kam., p.116 favours Onkelos' view:

8. EX.32:25 - Rashi does not accept Onkelos' translation that - כֹּסִי - means - "And Moses saw that the people were unruly" (or made unemployed) - (cf. Onkelos. EX.5:4) - and he, therefore, translates:

"it means, uncovered - the people's shame and disgrace were revealed; the word has the same meaning as in NUM.5:18 and the priest shall uncover the woman's head". Nahmanides, Ibn Ezra and Rabbi S.Ben-Meir
support Onkelos from PROV.1:25 - "But ye have set at nought all my counsel".

9. EX.33:16 - Onkelos translates - "And miracles will be for me and for your people". It appears that Onkelos takes - wonder (as if - is written with an ). Nahmanides also takes it in this sense - . Rashi, however, explains it - "and we shall be distinguished (or different) from all peoples as in EX.9 - and the Lord shall separate the cattle of Israel etc." Ps. Jonathan explains that God's miracle will be that the "spirit of prophecy" will not rest upon the other nations:

10. NUM.24:19 - Rashi interprets - "and there will be yet another ruler from Jacob". Obedient to the massoretic pointing ( ) Rashi took it from the root - "have dominion", "rule". Onkelos who translates - seems
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to take it from the verb - דָּרָה - "to go down". The Palestinian Targumim, however, recognize the root דָּרָה.

11. NUM. 32 7 - Rashi explains - לַעֲמֹת תּוֹמָשְׁנָה - by תּוֹמָשְׁנָה, לְבַנְוַי מַעֲבֹר - "You will withhold their hearts from passing over". Rashi takes - תּוֹמָשְׁנָה - from - נָעַמ - to restrain, to frustrate. Onkelos translates - אֲגָנְא אַבְרָם. S.B. Schefftel 22 believes that Onkelos means - אֲגָנְא אַבְרָם; if so Onkelos takes - נָעַמ - from - נָעַמ - to maltreat, to vex [with words].

12. DEUT. 21 14 - Onkelos translates - לֹא תֵחֵכה בּ - by לֹא תֵחֵכה בּ - "You shall not make merchandise of her". In other words - תֵחֵכה - is taken in the sense of - תֵחֵכה - business 23 (from - תֵחֵכה). Rashi, however, takes it in the sense of "Servitude": - לֹא תֵחֵכה בּ - לֹא תֵחֵכה בּ - "You shall not use her as a slave". 24

13. DEUT. 32 10 - Rashi does not seem to favour Onkelos' translation that - קְרוּ מְדִינֶנָה - means - קְרוּ מְדִינֶנָה - He provided them with all they (the Israelites) needed in the wilderness.
CHAPTER 7.

Onkelos takes - מפריד - to be of the same meaning as (NUM.11:22) - How can the sheep and oxen be slaughtered that would be enough for them.  

Rashi, however, takes it in its literal sense and the meaning is as follows: - "He (God) found them to be faithful to Him in the desert, when they accepted His Torah, His sovereignty and His yoke, something that Ishmael and Esau had refused to do etc."

14. DEUT.32:24 - Rashi is not convinced that - כריב - means - ליער ימי - "swollen by famine", as indeed Onkelos takes it. He, therefore, prefers the view of Rabbi Moses the preacher of Toulouse who takes it as - שירף ים - "hairy through hunger" - for an emaciated person grows much hair on his flesh.

15. DEUT.32:36 - Rashi explains - כי עבדו ונתנו - as follows: - לא שומם זכר וטמון ולא זכר

"This is an expression for changing one's mind whether for good or for evil".

Onkelos here explains it by - יכסר - "vengeance", and thus he says: - ומרנגות עבדו, זכרין וטמון - "And He will execute vengeance for his servants"
the righteous".  

16. DEUT. 33 - Onkelos translates - י"ה יבש - by - י"ה יבש - "substance", "wealth". Rashi explains that Moses foresaw that Hasmonai and his sons would in future, war with the Greeks and he therefore prayed for them, because they were few in number. It appears that Rashi takes - י"ה - in the sense of "troops", "army".  

In short, as said in our General Introduction, Rashi rejects Onkelos' Targum when his interpretation does not fit in with the sense or the wording of the text.
In addition to Chapter 7, sometimes, for philological purposes Rashi rejects Onkelos' translations and prefers those of Menachem Ben Seruk. Thus in

1. GEN.30:41 - Rashi is not convinced that the word - התחלות - should be understood as Onkelos renders it: - התחלות - "the early-bearing sheep". He, therefore, prefers Menachem's view who classifies it under the same root as (II SAM.15:31) "Ahitophel is among - (הธรรมב) the conspirators". Primarily the verb -_activates- means to bind, to league together, hence to conspire. As to the verse in question, the meaning is as follows: - "those sheep that band themselves together in order to accelerate their pregnancy".

2. GEN.30:42 - Rashi appears to favour Menachem's translation who classifies - הטיל לו - under the same root as (IS.3:22) - הטיל לו - "the aprons and the mantlets". The word - הטיל לו - is from - הטיל - to envelop oneself in a garment. In other words the animals are sufficiently well wrapped up in their skin and fur so that they do not desire to be warmed by the males. Onkelos, however, renders it by - התחלות - the late bearing ones.
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3. In GEN. 49:26 - Rashi appears to favour Menachem's view in classifying - with the verb (NUM. 36:10) - "You shall mark out the ends etc". Onkelos, however, translates it in its usual sense - "desire" - 👈.

4. Again, EX. 15:8 - Onkelos takes - נריה תמי - in the sense of - זרימה מים - "subtlety" - (ה_phy ) the waters showed themselves clever. Rashi, however, supports Menachem who classifies it under the root (SONG. 7:3) - "a stack of wheat" (heaped together). In other words the waters formed themselves like a mound.

5. LEV. 26:1 - Rashi again follows Menachem that - is: - it means "covering", similar to the verb (EX. 32:22) - "I will cover thee with my hand". (From the root - תֵּחַּש - or - תֵּתָךְ - to cover). Rashi, without quoting him seems to reject Onkelos who translates it freely - - המיל - "Prostration stone".
6. NUM.10 - Rashi quotes Menachem who renders - by an expression denoting "rest". It is similar to (IS.30): "In rest (" and tranquility shall ye be saved". Onkelos, not quoted by Rashi, appears to be undecided about the true meaning of this word - . It seems he takes - not only in the sense of return (" - but also as Menachem takes it - "rest" (dwell).10

Furthermore, in some instances, Rashi rejects the Rabbis' explanation and prefers that of Menachem.

7. Thus in EX.13 - Rashi says: "two" in Kapti and - in Africa denotes "two". Menachem, however, classifies it under the same root as (EZ.21) - "And speak to the south"; so that - would be an expression denoting "speech". Rashi goes on to say that Menachem's derivation is correct and logical for whoever sees the Tefillin on his hand is bound to remember the miracle and "speak" about it.12

At this stage it must be said that it is not always the case that Rashi follows Menachem, for in several instances he challenges his derivations.13
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Here are a few examples:

8. GEN. 15:2 - Rashi challenges Menachem who explains - מֵאֵיִן - as meaning ( שָׁוֶה לָו ) "heir". In the verse in question it would therefore mean "without child or heir". Rashi, however, explains it in the sense of - בּוֹדֵד - "destruction". [A childless person being "destroyed" so far as his memory in future generations is concerned]. To this effect, Rashi quotes four biblical passages in support of his etymology.

9. Again, GEN. 30:8 - Menachem connects - יַעֲנָה - with - פֶּרֶשׂ פֵּשֶׂפֶּה - "a covering closely linked to it", so that the words here mean: By bonds from God have I been joined (equal) to my sister. Rashi, however, connects it with (DEUT. 32:5) - פָּרְשָׁה;) וּשׁוֹך - "perverse and crooked". In other words I have wrestled\(^1\) [persistently\(^1\)] with God that I may become like my sister.\(^1\)

10. EX. 11:7 - Rashi explains - פָּרְשָׁה;) וּשׁוֹך - as - חֲרֹן - "sharp". Menachem (not quoted by Rashi) takes it - פָּרְשָׁה;) וּשׁוֹך - "movement".\(^1\)
11. EX.2\textsuperscript{10} - On grammatical ground; Rashi also rejects Menachem\textsuperscript{17} who derives - הַשָּׁמָּן - from - שָׁמָן - (our - "י - root - שָׁמָן) and rightly says it should be derived from - חֲשָׁמָן - "drawing out".\textsuperscript{18}

12. Again EX.2\textsuperscript{13} - Rashi rejects Menachem who believes that - הָשָׁמָן - is of the same derivation as (GEN.27\textsuperscript{33}) - וַיֵּאָסֵף - "who was it that hunted and brought me venison" - for the - 'ה - [of - הָשָׁמָן] has no place in the verbal forms of the term denoting "hunting beasts". He, therefore, believes that it is of the same derivation as (I.SAM.24\textsuperscript{12}) - יִתְנְשָׁא - "yet thou liest in wait (רְנָשָׁא) - for my soul to take it".

13. EX.28\textsuperscript{22} - Rashi does not share Menachem's opinion that the second - 'ט - of - וּמָהָשָׁא - is redundant and believes that - וּמָהָשָׁא - in the Hebrew language is the equivalent of - וּמָהָשָׁא - in the Mishnaic language. (KELIM, ch.14.3).
In this Chapter we shall explain Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos' grammatical points. Rashi was in fact a man of very wide attainments. His interests were not solely confined to Derash and Halacha but also to a meticulous analysis of the language of the text. He was by the standards and within the feasibilities of his age both philologist and linguist and derived his grammatical principles from Rabbinic literature, Onkelos' Targum, and the Hebrew works of the Spanish grammarians, Menachem Ben Seruk and Dunash Ben Labrat. It is unfortunate that, not being versed in Arabic literature, Rashi never learned of Judah Ben David Hayyuj's work or for that matter Jonah Ibn Janah's work in Sepher ha-Riknah and Sepher Ha-Shorashim.

However scattered throughout his commentary there are many remarks on syntax, tenses, moods, conjugations, and prepositions required by certain verbs. In almost every page of his commentary we see him making grammatical observations.

As said in the Introduction of this section, Rashi as Philologist - to evaluate the extent and the reliability of Rashi's grammatical knowledge, in the light of modern scholarship is certainly beyond the
scope of this work. Our main task in this chapter is to point out that on several occasions Onkelos' Targum is drawn upon by Rashi for elucidation of certain grammatical forms. As far as possible he accepts Onkelos' Targum, regarding it, as a masterly work and one which is, on the whole, correct. However, despite Rashi's reverence for Onkelos, he deems himself free not to accept Onkelos in every particular instance. His originality enabled him, on several occasions, to differ from his predecessor and even, at times, entirely to reject his conclusions when they were not in accordance with the rules of Hebrew grammar. Thus in EX.23:27 - Rashi\(^2\) says that Onkelos who translates - 'ר"ש - by - ל"א - is in error for the root of - 'ר"ש - is - 'ד - to confuse\(^3\) and not - ר"ש - "to die". If it were from the same stem as - ר"ש - the - ' - in it would not be vowelled "patach" and its - ' - would not receive a "dagesh" nor be vowelled with a - א"א - (our holam) - but it would read - 'ד - comparable to (NUM.14:15) - ד"כ - . In addition the - ' - would receive a "dagesh" because it stands for two - ' - the first a radical (['ם) and the second a servile\(^4\) letter. ("ם"?)
2. Again, DEUT. 32:26 - Onkelos translates - מָּלַגֵּדְתִי - by - הָּלְבִּי - "My wrath (נָא) will fall upon them". Rashi remarks that this is not correct, for if it were so, one would expect the text מַּלְלַעֵד - with two "Alepha", the one as a servile letter (a prefix) and the other as a root letter, comparable to (IS. 45:5) - מַלְלַעֵד "I girded thee".

Similarly on grammatical ground he rejects the explanation of the Rabbis who take - הָּלְבִּי - (EX. 2:5) in the sense of - יָד - "hand" (cf. Bab.Tal. Sot.12b) - for if it were so, one would expect a "dagesh" in the - יָד - (דָּגֶשׁ - cubit).

Sometimes without quoting Onkelos Rashi refutes his explanation. Thus in DEUT. 23:15 - Rashi says:- לֹאָּ יָרָהוּ - חָמַת עַרְכְוָי - "that the Holy One blessed be He see not in thee something indecent". It appears that Rashi rules out the Targum which has - חָמַת - "there shall not be seen in thee" - taking the verb - חָמַת - in the passive (חָמַת נִסְפָּה) sense. Rashi, therefore, prefers to take "God" as the subject.
In this chapter mention has already been made that with the assistance of Onkelos, Rashi was able to elucidate certain grammatical forms, and takes the Targum rendering as the subject of enquiry and at the same time uses the opportunity to support it.

5. In explaining the difference between - מָנֵס - and - מִנְסֵי - (DEUT. 4:10) Rashi explains: Onkelos translates - מָנֵס - by - מִנְסֵי - and - מִנְסֵי - by - מִנְסֵי . Thus, with the assistance of the Targum, Rashi clarifies the force of the Kal and Piel conjugations of the verb - וָמֵס .

6. In DEUT. 24:5 - Rashi warns that - מָנֵס - should be translated in the Targum by - מִנְסֵי - "He shall gladden his wife". But he who reads in the Targum - מָנֵס - מָנֵס - "he shall rejoice with his wife" is in error for this is not the Targum equivalent of - מָנֵס - (Piel) - but of - מָנֵס - (Kal). (See section, Rashi and Ps. Tana'Kan' Targum note 24 p. 556).

7. In EX. 33:11 - Rashi quotes Onkelos that - וַיַּגְדוּל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל - is - מָגַדְּלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל . In other words Rashi clarifies the force of the participle, "he (Moses) used to return to the camp". (A continuous action). Similarly Onkelos translates verbs occurring in EX. 33:10 by participles. Thus - מָגַדְּלוּ - by - מָגַדְּלָה - and - מָגַדְּלָה - by - מָגַדְּלָה .
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8. Again in EX.25⁴⁰ - Onkelos translates - סֵכִית בְּכֶרֶךְ - by - רָאִית מָטָנוּ בְּכֶרֶךְ - "which thou hast been shown on the mountain". Rashi,⁷ who agrees with his translation, remarks that a distinction must be made between - נַגְּשֵׂי - (with a patach) the active participle and - נַגָּשֶׂי - (with kamets katan) the passive participle.

9. In EX.33¹¹ - He explains - נַגְּשֵׂי - as Onkelos - נַגְּשֵׂי. Thus clarifying the force of the Hithpael.⁸

10. In EX.35¹ - Rashi explains that - נַגְּשֵׂי - is Hiphil as in fact the Targum translates⁹ - נַגְּשֵׂי - (Aphel).

11. In LEV.16¹⁰ - Rashi explains that - נַגְּשֵׂי - is a regular Hophal form [it shall be made to stand by others] as in fact the Targum translates - נַגְּשֵׂי.⁸

12. In NUM.9¹⁷ - through the aid of the Targum, Rashi explains that the text is correct in reading the Niphal form - נִעֲרֶה יָעְשֶׂה - and similar in verse 21 - נִעֲרֶה יָעְשֶׂה - and not - נִעְרָה יָעְשֶׂה - the Kal form.¹⁰
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13. Again, NUM.20\(^3\) - Rashi follows Onkelos (not quoted) that - מָצוֹן - is a noun, (i.e. מָצוֹן בֶּת שֵׁם אֶלֹהִים) and not an infinitive for otherwise one would expect - תְּחָלָה - (holam). Onkelos\(^{11}\) also takes it in the sense: לֹא יְהַעֲרֵבִים בְּהוֹאְלָה לְאָכָלָה.

14. NUM.14\(^{32}\) - Through the aid of the Targum he explains the usual words - וּפֶרְשָׂכָה - as well as the personal suffix וּפֶרְשָׂכָה as well as the personal pronoun וּפֶרְשָׂכָה. He explains - עַל-כֵּן - לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן לְכֵן.

15. In EX.1\(^{17}\) - Through the Targum he warns not to confuse certain identical verbal forms such as the second (וֹסֶם אֵל אֵל הָיְתָה) and third feminine imperfect.\(^{12}\)

16. In EX.19\(^{18}\) - Rashi follows the Targum that - וֹסֶם - is a verb and not a noun. This is confirmed by Onkelos who translates: - וֹסֶם אֵל אֵל הָיְתָה.
17. However, despite his fine grammatical observations nonetheless, Rashi's faithfulness to the Midrash caused him to err at least in one particular instance. Thus in GEN.24 he takes as a noun. Rabbi D. Kimhi takes it as the Hiphil ( ). Onkelos takes it as a verb. Whilst Rashi takes as a noun, he rightly regards (v.25) in the same context as a verbal form.
On the whole Onkelos' Targum is more literal and faithful to the biblical text than the other Palestinian Targumim. Since its first appearance Onkelos' Targum became popular and widely read in the Synagogue. Because of its popularity the Targum was constantly revised with the result that several corrections were made by various Rabbis and scholars. Some of these corrections were inserted in the Targum itself by later copyists and publishers.

A. Berliner believes that the different versions were due to the variety of opinions which existed between the two Academies, Sura and Nehardea. These two versions were collected and published for the first time by A. Berliner. As a result of the various versions many scholars endeavoured to establish the correct reading in Onkelos' Targum. S. Luzzatto claims that he has checked 434 manuscripts and variant books of our Targum in order to establish the correct reading. However, the foremost scholarly work on this subject is that of A. Sperber who collected more than 650 variant versions in the Targum, out of which 270 are based on the text found in the British Museum No. 23663 and the remaining 380 are based on other manuscripts and various published editions of Onkelos' Targum.
Classical commentators such as Rashi and Nahmanides had also variant versions in Onkelos' Targum and they endeavoured to establish the correct reading. Berliner believes that each time Rashi says - his intention is purely to establish the correct reading and to warn the student of the Targum that the textual reading is incorrect, either because it is not in accordance with the sense of the text or with the rules of the Hebrew grammar.

It is natural that Rashi never entertained the theory that Onkelos might have had a different version of the biblical text itself, whence the different versions or the numerous additions in his Targum. Rashi in fact rules out this theory by simply stating that Onkelos' elaboration is purely "an addition on his part, having no words to correspond to it in the biblical text". To Rashi Onkelos' additions are merely there to make intelligible obscure textual words, or to allude to a midrashic or halachic interpretation. Be that as it may, many of Rashi's corrections were inserted by the various publishers into Onkelos' Targum. But nonetheless, several more of Rashi's corrections can still be seen throughout his commentary.
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Without further elaboration we shall give some of Rashi's corrections.

1. GEN.15\textsuperscript{11} - Rashi believes that the correct reading in Onkelos for the word - רפאים - "carcasses" is - נשים - [which has the sense of - כאר - something abhorrent and similar to - כאר - carcass] and not - פע赖以生存 - which is the Targum\textsuperscript{8} for - "halves", "parts".

2. GEN.18\textsuperscript{19} - Most likely Rashi had in his Targum - "For it is revealed before Me" - for the Hebrew text - " because" - does not fit into the sense of the text. Rashi, however, does not offer the correct version of the Targum. Most probably Rashi would accept the version in our editions: \textsuperscript{9}

3. GEN.19\textsuperscript{18} - In our editions of the Targum the reading is: - מלאי - for the Hebrew - מלאי - . Rashi who quotes the Rabbis' view (Bab.Sheb.35\textsuperscript{b}) that this name - מלאי - is "holy" ( - מ来る i.e. refers to God) - seems to be displeased with Onkelos'
reading and he therefore says: - קבר חרב. In other words it is incorrect to read in the Targum.

4. GEN.24 21 - והאיש אמר - "the man was wondering". Rashi says that one should not read in the Targum - עבך א受访 - but rather - ושכן - "the man lingered" (watching quietly). The word - כשון - certainly does not mean "drinking", for the root is - והשקה - and - ולא - of - קשתה - has no place in this verb.

5. GEN.26 22 - In some editions of the Targum the Hebrew words - אסרה וברך - are translated by - בך ברך - and "He will increase us". Rashi, therefore, points out that the correct reading is - ושכן - and we shall increase in the land.

6. GEN.27 36 - Rashi quotes two versions for the word - אוסר - a) - אוסר - "And he lay in wait for me". b) - אוסר - "He outwitted me" (lit. clever). Rashi appears to support the first translation for in DEUT.19 11 - the Hebrew word - המת - "And he lies in wait" - is rendered by the Targum by - מת - .
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7. GEN.28\textsuperscript{17} - Rashi explains: \( \text{ךֵּלֵי יֵדֶן - כְּלוּמָּה} \) "In the Targum it is translated by \( \text{ךֵּלֵי} \) - is this place; \( \text{ךְּלוּמָּה} \) - is a noun". It is difficult to understand why Onkelos translated the Hebrew adjective \( \text{ךֵּלֵי יֵדֶן} \) (a Niphal participle) by an Aramaic noun.\textsuperscript{13} Kerem Chemed\textsuperscript{14} (v.8) suggests that Rashi's text is corrupt and should read: \( \text{ךֵּלֵי יֵדֶן - כְּלוּמָּה} \) According to this Rashi corrects the editions of the Targum. Rashi states that the Targum should read - \( \text{ךְּלוּמָּה} \) - which is an adjective corresponding to the Hebrew adjective \( \text{ךֵּלֵי יֵדֶן} \) - and not - \( \text{ךֵּלֵי} \) - which is a noun.\textsuperscript{16}

8. GEN.30\textsuperscript{15} - Rashi explains: \( \text{ךַּאֲלָה - כִּי הָלָךְ} \) The correct reading in the Targum for the Hebrew infinitive \( \text{ךַּאֲלָה} \) - "to take" is - \( \text{ךִּי הָלָךְ} \) - and not as our editions\textsuperscript{17} read - \( \text{ךָאָלָה} \) (the second person singular feminine perfect) "and you shall take" (the Hebrew for \( \text{ךָאָלָה} \)).
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9. GEN.32\textsuperscript{17} - For the Hebrew words: - רכז א"ש - our editions in the Targum read: - וי"ג א"ש - Rashi believes that the correct reading is - ר"ג א"ש - "of whose [party] are you".

10. Similarly GEN.32\textsuperscript{18} - Rashi explains that the Targum should read - ו"י תובעך - [with the prefix - 'ו] for the Hebrew - "י תובעך - Our editions, however, read: - תובעך ח"ק - "of whose [party] are you".

11. GEN.33\textsuperscript{12} - Rashi takes the textual word - פ"ה - as imperative like - "ע" - which is the equivalent of - "" - "hearken". Similarly here - ק" - is equivalent of - "ע" - "travel on". Accordingly Rashi says: - ב"יראתך ש" קובות נוירך - In other words the Targum supports him.\textsuperscript{18} Our editions, however, read: - אמרству לך היראתך.

12. GEN.34\textsuperscript{31} - On the words - ר"ב א"ש - Rashi says that the Targum reads: - ר"ב א"ש - In other words - "" - should be taken as an accusative and it should not be translated - "" - "shall one do with our sister as one does with a harlot". However, some editions read\textsuperscript{19} - "".
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13. GEN.39\textsuperscript{22} - "And whatsoever they did there, he was the doer of it". Our editions in the Targum read - יתי ר"י והי - התכמ על מכומריה יהי העולם. - Rashi feels that it is more correct to read - בקימר יד - and not - בקימר יד -

14. GEN.41\textsuperscript{38} - Rashi reads in the Targum - ב"קיסר חל - for the Hebrew - בין חל - The word - בערים - may be either third masculine singular perfect, Niphal so that - בין חל - would mean "can there be found", or first plural imperfect, Kal, "can we find". Rashi therefore is pointing to Onkelos who takes it in the Kal form. (Peal). Had Onkelos taken it as a Niphal he would have said - בין חל. Our editions, however, read - בין חל - Ps. Jonathan, however, reads: - בין חל.

15. GEN.42\textsuperscript{21} - Rashi explains that the word - חבל - has the accent upon the - ל - because it is the past tense - i.e. the distress had already come upon them. Accordingly, Rashi therefore reads in the Targum - לחיים - which is the past (perfect) tense in Aramaic. Our editions, however,
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read - וַיַּלְיָּהָּ בְּיָתֶּרְדוֹ - . Popular editions which read - וַיַּלְיָּהָּ - should presumably be corrected to - (оборот) וַיַּלְיָּהָ - if they represent a genuine variant. 21

16. GEN.432 - Rashi makes it clear that the correct reading in the Targum for - שָׁאַלֵּשָּה - is - שָׁאַלֵּשָּה - When they had finished off [eating] - and not as many editions read - שָׁאַלֵּשָּה - "when they had had enough [to eat"]. 22

17. GEN.4923 - In Rashi's editions of the Targum - שָׁאַלֵּשָּה - is translated by - שָׁאַלֵּשָּה - (of the same root as - שֵׁאֵל - NUM.3136 (root those who were destined to divide with him the inheritance". Others, 23 however, read - שֶׁאָל - . In either version Onkelos does not take - בָּשָׁא - in the sense of "arrows", 24 (root - בָּשָׁא).

18. EX.523 - Rashi explains that the Targum for - וַיַּלְיָּהָּ בְּיָתֶּרְדוֹ - is - שֶׁאָל - the Aramaic Aphel corresponding to the Hebrew Hiphil. Rashi points out that the other version which reads - בָּשָׁא (or - בָּשָׁא) is incorrect. 25
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19. **EX. 7**¹⁴ - Rashi again remarks that the correct translation of the Hebrew word - יְרָעַץ - is - יְרָעַץ - "his (Pharaoh) heart is hard". (i.e. an adjective)²⁶ and not as our editions²⁷ read - יְרָעַץ - a verb - his heart has become hard.

20. **EX. 8**²⁰ - Rashi points out that the Targum should read - שְׁבַעַת לָם - for the Hebrew - שִׁישָׁם לָם - for the imperfect here has the force of a participle, (a continuous action) and not as some editions read - שְׁבַעַת לָם - "the land was destroyed".²⁸

In some instances it is impossible to know Rashi's reading in the Targum as his comment is very brief such as - כָּל הַשָּׁמַשׁ - Thus in **EX. 10**¹⁰ - כָּל הַשָּׁמַשׁ - "see how evil is before your face".²⁹ Rashi says:- כָּל הַשָּׁמַשׁ - Understand this as the Targum takes it. It is unfortunate³⁰ that he did not specify his reading in the Targum as there are several versions in Onkelos' Targum. Our editions, however, read - מִי אֶלָּא אֶלָּא בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ לָמָּה בֵּיתוֹ לָמָּה - "See the evil you are about to do will turn against yourselves".
22. EX.16\textsuperscript{14} - On the words - "fine as hoarfrost on the ground" - Rashi reads in the Targum:\textsuperscript{32} - "powdered like chalk, like hoarfrost upon the ground". Nahmanides, however, quotes a different version in Onkelos:\textsuperscript{31} - (whilst Rashi takes - to mean a "black colour", Nahmanides takes it as - "white dust" and that the manna was like heaps of ice lying upon the ground).

23. EX.19\textsuperscript{4} - On the word - "I bare you" - Rashi reads in the Targum\textsuperscript{32} - "I made you travel". Onkelos translates it as though it were - he adapted the expression in a manner that is consonant with the respect due to the Most High God. However, our editions read in the Targum - .

24. EX.20\textsuperscript{7} - In some editions Rashi explains that the repetition of the word - in the same verse should be understood in the light of Onkelos. The first - is - i.e. swearing about a stone pillar that it is of gold (cf. Bab.Tal.Sheb.29\textsuperscript{a}) and the second is - "for no valid reason",
i.e. swearing about a stone that is a stone. Our editions in the Targum, however, read the other way round, the former is - מַרְבָּעָה - and the second is - כִּפּוֹרָה -. A. Berliner believes that Rashi's comment is purely an interpolation by a later writer.

25. EX.23 - Rashi reads in the Targum - לֹא יִסְרֵאךְ לַעֲנֹתָהּ. Other versions in Rashi read: - חֲפַל יִסְרֵאךְ מֹרְבָּעָה - "Do not refrain from teaching when you are being asked your opinion in a legal matter". Others read in the Targum:-

26. EX.23 - "However unwilling you may be to help it, you must give him a hand with it."
Rashi reads in the Targum - וְיָכְלוֹשׁוּ מֵאֲחַשְׁרֶה לֵיה - (and you are inclined to keep back) from taking the load from off it. Our versions, however, read -

27. EX.23 - "and I will confound all the people". Rashi explains that he who translates - מַר വ - in the Targum by - יָכְלוֹשׁוּ.
is in error. For if it were derived from the verb - 'יָרָה - "death" - one would expect - יָרָה. He therefore reads in the Targum 35 - יָרָה. Our versions, 36 however, read - יָרָה - "and I will break".

28. EX. 26 36 - On the words - מַעְרַע כָּךְ - Rashi has this to say: מַעְרַע כָּךְ - שָׁוְיָה נֵכְסֵי לִי עַל הָאָמְנָוִי עֹבֶד - כָּךְ. The word - כָּךְ - is the name of the embroiderer and not the name of the embroidery (the art). The Targum, therefore, should read - כָּךְ - "embroiderer" and not - כָּךְ work of embroidery. Other versions, however, read as Rashi had in his text of the Targum. 37

29. EX. 34 5 - 'ךְּרָא יִבְשָׁם נֶ - "And proclaimed in the name of the Lord". Rashi explains - "we render this in the Targum by - מִפְסַר מַרְאֵה יִבְשָׁם נֶ - and he (Moses) called on the name of the Lord". Others, however, read in the Targum - 'ךְּרָא יִבְשָׁם נֶ - And He (God) called Moses by name. 38

30. EX. 35 1 - Rashi explains that - יִבְשָׁם - is the Hiphil form and therefore the Targum 39 should read
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- the Aphel form and not - the Kal as in fact some editions have. 41

31. LEV. 25 47 - "When an alien or a stranger living with you becomes rich". 42 Rashi explains: - , a stranger who is at the same time a settler as in fact the Targum renders it. Many of our editions, however, have in the Targum - with the co-pulsive - before the second word. 43

32. NUM. 5 2 - On the words - Rashi reads in the Targum: - , "Whosoever is unclean by reason of the bones of a human being". (The word - is an Aramaic expression for human bones). Other versions in the Targum do not read the word - - And others do not read in the Targum - - but - "uncleanness" - and not as Rashi who takes it to mean "human bones". 44
33. NUM.14:12 - On the word - נאראות - Rashi explains: - הקברות ל‰ל תרבות - to divorce, dispossess.
Our editions, however, have - הנהו - "And I shall destroy them". Most likely, Rashi had in his Targum 45 - לחיות חכון.

34. DEUT.17:15 - תַּחַת שְׁעִירֵיהֶן - "thy gates". Rashi says that Onkelos who interprets - קִרְבַּי לֶבַע - "to the gate of your court" is in error for we have learnt in the Bab. Tal.Ket. 45b - that - נְשׁוֹן שְׁעִירֵיהֶן means the gate [the city] in which he has worshipped the idol - בַּשְּעִירֵיהֶן . Therefore, the correct reading in the Targum is - יִקְרָא - "thou shalt bring him forth unto thy cities". However, many of our editions read - 47 יָקֵר - בַּשְּעִירֵיהֶן.