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Scholars have noted that one of the themes in the Targumim, especially that of Onkelos, is to avoid or paraphrase many of the terms which appear to attribute human qualities and emotions to God in the Hebrew Bible. The tendency of Onkelos is to remove an action connected with God which might lower his dignity or degrade his character. It is not our concern to go deeply into the origins of the objections to anthropomorphisms; that is whether they were the result of Philonic teachings and Greek philosophical influence in general or, rather, whether they grew up within Judaism itself. The essential fact is that Onkelos is dominated - one might say obsessed - by anti-anthropomorphism and his aversion to attributing human form, passions and emotions to God, is quite apparent in his Targum. There are, however, exceptions which will be considered below.

At this stage, before illustrating with examples some of the anti-anthropomorphisms of Onkelos' Targum, and Rashi's attitude towards them, which is our main subject, it may be worth mentioning briefly that the Torah itself contains some anti-anthropomorphic assertions and implicit indications. Thus we read in (Ex. 20:4-6) in the second commandment the prohibition of making graven images which is one indication that God cannot be compared to any material or corporeal form. The fact, too, that "No man could see me (God)
and live" (EX.33:20) - shows the anti-anthropomorphic insistence of the Torah.

In more specific terms in DEUT.4:15 - we read that Moses said to the Israelites that "On the day when the Lord spoke to you out of the fire on Horeb, you saw no figure of any kind" (cf. DEUT.4:12). Moreover certain expressions of the Torah such as - 'ת"ל" - "the glory of the Lord" (EX.16:10) or - 'ת"ל" - "And the glory of God abode upon Mount Sinai", or - 'ת"ל" - "And all the people on earth shall see that the Lord has named you as his very own", etc., or - 'ת"ל" - "The cloud of the Lord" (EX.40:28) manifest the anti-anthropomorphic tendency of the Torah. The writer was careful to say that it was only the glory of God that abode on Mount Sinai, and not God himself, as this might be considered a degradation and disrespect to the Deity. The fact, too, that the presence of the intermediary - "the angel of the Lord" is called upon quite frequently in the Torah points to the fact "that God was considered to be a transcendent being who revealed himself through other means than direct theopanies". In other words what Eichrodt calls "die Vergeistigung der Theophanie" - the Spiritualization of the Theophany by means of such intermediaries as the angel of the Lord."
However the most paradoxical thing is that while some parts of the Old Testament explicitly repudiate anthropomorphic ideas about God, there is generally a quite uninhibited resort to anthropomorphic language. Thus the Torah says that God speaks (EX.16, EX.11) breathes (EX.15) sees (GEN.6) hears (DEUT.1, GEN.3) walks (DEUT.1, GEN.3) and goes down (EX.19). In some places God is even described as if he has a human form and thus the Torah speaks of - "eyes of the Lord" (DEUT.11) - "the right hand of the Lord" (EX.13; EX.33; DEUT.4, DEUT.5; DEUT.7; DEUT.26). This anomaly is apparent, too, in the prophetical books and the prophets who, on the one hand insist on the holiness of God and his Divine transcendence, while on the other hand they use the most unrestricted anthropomorphic language.

Finally, the Sopherim in their massoretic list were careful in avoiding or changing conceptions which denote some apparently flagrant anthropomorphisms or which appear to lower the dignity of God or degrade his honour. But it may be noted that many others are passed over in silence. There are eighteen emendations of the Sopherim which are termed "Tikune Sopherim". It is not our subject here to enumerate and discuss the Tikune Sopherim,
but for our purposes it may be useful to give two examples of how the Sopherim changed the wording of the Torah when they saw that the text as it stood was unbecoming to the Deity.

The first one is: - GEN.18:22 - "But Abraham remained standing before the Lord".

According to massoretic tradition the original reading was:-

"But the Lord remained standing before Abraham". 14

"To stand before" another sometimes denotes a state of servitude 15 and therefore the Sopherim altered the text so that God would not appear as if He were paying homage to Abraham.

The other case is:- NUM.11:15 - "And let me, (i.e. Moses) not see my evil case".

Here the original reading was as follows:-

"And let me not see your evil case" 16 (i.e. God's).

This reading apparently associates evil with God and therefore the Sopherim modified the text from - כרוצך - " your evil case" to - " my evil case". 17
Having said all this let us now proceed to consider the Targum of Onkelos, and his attitude to anthropomorphisms found in the Old Testament. Onkelos is known throughout his translation of the Torah for being anti-anthropomorphic. Maimonides and other scholars praised Onkelos for adopting this method. In many places he has added a word or even a whole phrase in order to remove any anthropomorphic conception from the Deity. Thus in GEN.11 - 'And the Lord came down to see the city etc". Onkelos who objects to the literal sense of - translates - "And the Lord revealed himself". Quite often, as said above, Onkelos avoids or moderates conceptions of human qualities and emotions attributed to God in the Hebrew text, and therefore periphrases like - 'From before the Lord" or the intrusion of - the Word of the Lord, or - "the Glory of the Lord", or the "Angel of the Lord", or the "Shechinah" are quite common in his translation.

There are, however, several inconsistencies in Onkelos (in fact in all the Targumim) and in several places he has retained the most unrestricted anthropomorphic language. Thus while in EX.8 - Onkelos translates - "The finger of
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the Lord" - by "A blow from before the Lord" - in EX.31:18 and DEUT.9:10 - "Written with the finger of the Lord" - Onkelos translates it literally. Also whilst in GEN.46:4 - "I will go down with you to Egypt". Onkelos is not careful and translates - "I will lead you to the land which I swore with uplifted hand to give to Abraham".

Again in some instances Onkelos attempts to avoid the more naive expressions in the Torah that make God to appear as a man with human form. Thus in EX.6:8 (cf. NUM.14:30) - the Hebrew text reads: - "I will lead you to the land which I swore with uplifted hand to give to Abraham".

Onkelos paraphrases the text and translates - "And I will bring you unto the land concerning which I did promise by my word to give to Abraham." However, here too, there are inconsistencies for in EX.13:3 - where the text speaks of "the hand of the Lord" or EX.15:6 - "the
right hand of the Lord" - Onkelos translates literally.

Finally, when the Torah speaks about - אִיבְּרִים וְאַף יְהוָה "the eyes of the Lord" - Onkelos in some instances avoids these representations which would appear to invest the Deity with human eyes. Thus EX.33:12 - 

マイד buffering 'יד - "thou hast also found favour in my eyes" - Onkelos translates לְאָסֵכְמֵהו - "and thou hast also found favour before me". Similar cases of this nature where the text refers to אֵית - "the eyes of the Lord", and Onkelos translates יִסְרָאֵל - "before the Lord" - can be seen in GEN.6:8; GEN.38:7; EX.33:13; EX.33:15; EX.33:17; EX.34:9; LEV.10:19; NUM.11:15; NUM.23:27; NUM.24:1; NUM.32:13; DEUT.4:25; DEUT.6:18; DEUT.9:18; DEUT.12:25; DEUT.12:28; DEUT.13:19; DEUT.17:2; DEUT.31:29.

However here too we find inconsistencies in Onkelos' Targum for in DEUT.11:12 - where the Hebrew text reads - יִיתְנָהו - "The eyes of the Lord your God are upon it". Onkelos translates literally.31

- יִיתְנָהו - "The eyes of the Lord your God are upon it". Onkelos translates literally.31

With regard to the Hebrew verb יִתְנָהו - there are also inconsistencies, for sometimes Onkelos translates - יִתְנָהו - "it was revealed before the Lord",32 and sometimes literally33 - יִתְנָהו -.
It may, however, be that these inconsistencies were due to the fact that Onkelos' Targum and indeed all the Targumim were originally mainly oral and there was no early standard version to this effect. The Targumim are not a uniform work either by a single author or from a single period. In short, in their present form there is no Aramaic Targum which is older than the fifth century C.E. Furthermore, the "Meturgemanim" (Interpreters) who explained the Torah to their congregants every Sabbath, varied in their approach from one to another. And while one Meturgeman felt the need to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the text, another did not see the need and translated the text as it stood. Most likely it all depended on the kind of audience the "Meturgeman" had and its ability to grasp the deeper meaning of the anti-anthropomorphisms. As we have said in the Halachic Section ("Summary", footnote 34), the Targum Onkelos was priori a translation, strictly literal and only in time, somehow, Halachot, Midrashim, and anti-anthropomorphisms were inserted into Onkelos' Targum. Because of the various Meturgemanim and their attitude towards anthropomorphisms of the Torah one can now understand the various inconsistencies found in Targum Onkelos. One can further understand the reason for several texts being interpreted literally,
while others are anti-anthropomorphically dealt with. This was because it was left completely to the judgement of the "Meturgemanim" who expounded the text according to the time in which they lived. Furthermore, we cannot expect a consistent policy in Onkelos' Targum (or in all the other Targumim) to overcome all the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew Scriptures. For after all Onkelos' Targum is only a translation from the Hebrew to Aramaic, and is therefore subject to the same limitations of language as the original. Moreover the Targum Onkelos merely reflects the tendency of the theologians and philosophers who exerted great influence on the Jews of the time to study Scriptures in the light of anti-anthropomorphisms. It may, therefore, be said that despite a marked tendency there is no total consistency on this subject in Onkelos' Targum.

Having explained briefly the anthropomorphisms of the Torah and Onkelos' attitude to them, it is possible to concentrate on the extent to which Rashi relies upon Onkelos' translation in this area.

Some scholars are of the opinion that Rashi was certainly not worried about the anthropomorphisms contained in the Old Testament. This statement proves to be inaccurate when one delves more deeply
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into Rashi. We shall also prove that in some instances Rashi goes even further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple. First of all although Rashi did not write prefaces outlining his exegetical methods, these can sometimes be reconstructed from occasional statements; and what he has to say in connection with certain bold similes applied to the Deity is of relevance to the consideration of Rashi's attitude to anthropomorphism, in which language is used which rather than comparing God's activity to man's, apparently credits God with human actions and reactions. Thus for example, Rashi in EX.19 has this to say - "As a lion does He (God) roar" (HOSEA 11). But who gave the lion power, if not He, and yet Scripture compares Him only to a lion? But the reason is that we describe Him by comparing Him to His creatures in order to make intelligible to the human ear as much as it can understand. Again (EZ.43) - "And His (God's) voice was like the sound of many waters". But who gave the waters a thunderous sound except He, and yet you describe Him by comparing Him to His handiwork - it is to make it intelligible to the human ear". Rashi here has indeed laid down an important rule for the students of the Bible, namely that the Old Testament speaks in "the language of man" when it is referring to the Deity. It is thus quite natural for the Bible to describe super-human occurrence by means of human speech. And for the same reason God's
revelation of himself to man can be described in terms of a person who speaks, breathes, sees, and hears. And all this was written just to enable the human ear to grasp as much as it can understand. And whenever the occasion arose, Rashi, throughout his commentary on the Torah reminded the students of the Bible of this important rule.

We shall now proceed to illustrate with examples the many instances where Rashi, like Onkelos, is concerned to avoid anthropomorphism and in some instances goes further than Onkelos.

A division of the main points regarding "Anthropomorphism" in the Hebrew text into 9 groups facilitates comprehension of Rashi's utilization of the anti-anthropomorphic comments of Onkelos. The groups are as follows:

Group A. Motion and Place denied God.

Group B. References to Human Form and Organs.

Group C. References to Human Emotions. (Anthropopathisms).

Group D. References to Physical Reaction.
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Group E. References 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.
We shall start by examining certain verbs in the Torah ascribing the ideas of motion and place to the Deity and the way in which Onkelos and Rashi avoided the gross anthropomorphism of the text. In certain places of the Hebrew text where the idea of Motion and Place were used in connection with the Deity such as verbs like - קָרַב, יַרְאָה, יַרְאָה, יַיָּרֵד, - the Targum Onkelos transferred this idea of Motion to the intermediaries who stand between the Deity and His world. The intermediary terms became known in the targumic literature as "Memra" - "Shechinah - "Yeqara", and the Angel of the Lord. This idea of intermediary was highly developed by the Targumim and especially by Onkelos. The development of this idea was mainly due to the fact that the concept found in the Torah, God meeting with man, or the idea of God dwelling in certain places, is wholly unacceptable due to the spiritualization of the Theophany. Consequently the "Memra" and the "Shechinah" were used as terms to interpose between God and His interests in the world.

Rashi follows this principle of Onkelos and quite frequently, in a subtle way, substituted the Divine Name for that of the "Shechinah" or the "Angel". It is worthy of note that although several remarks of Rashi can be found in the Midrash and Talmud,
yet the fact that he incorporates them into his commentary, and his style is different to that of the Midrash, proves that Rashi shares the view that the text as it stands is unbecoming of the Deity. Here are some examples to illustrate this point:

1. The verb - רוח - to walk - EX.34 9
   "If I have indeed won thy favour, 0 Lord, then may the Lord go in our company".
   The ascription of motion (ך) to God is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down and translates - "If indeed the Shechinah had dwelt among us, then let the Lord go among us".
   In other words, Moses asked for the Shechinah of God to go with Israel but not God Himself. Rashi follows the same principle and interprets that Moses had requested that the "Shechinah" of God should rest with Israel only and not on other people.

2. LEV.26 12 - "And I will walk among you..."
   Here too the ascription of motion to God is unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down:
   "And I will cause My Shechinah to dwell among you".
   Rashi goes further and says: - "I will walk with
GROUP A

you in the Garden of Eden as though I were one of you".

As God is incorporeal it will be impossible for Him
to walk, in real life, with human beings. Consequently,
Rashi says that the text refers to life after death
when the spirit which is immortal will be able to
perceive and walk (so to speak) with God. In so far
as the "walking" of the righteous in the world to
come is understood to be something other than normal
human walking, it is less problematical theologically
to credit the Deity with sharing in this mystical and
half-metaphorical "walk". 4 The expression in the
Siphra, Parashat Behukotai, (ch.3,15) is — הקב"ה
"In time to come the Holy One Blessed be He will be
walking with the righteous people in the Garden of
Eden". Thus Rashi has, so to say, "defused" the
anthropomorphism by changing the setting and under­
standing the text metaphorically.

3. Similarly, EX.33 14 - The expression — "My face shall go
with thee" (which is another way
of saying I myself will go) is a strong anthropomor­
phism and Onkelos tones it down by translating
— "My Shechinah shall go". 5
Rashi also realised the naive conception and he
therefore explains:- ככף, נלך —
"Understand this as the Targum renders it: My Shechinah will go - I will no longer send a (mere) angel with you, but I myself will go (Myself - means the Shechinah and not a mere - בגדי נא)."

4. Similarly - GEN.5:22 - דַּעִיתָ שְׁפֵכָהָ נַפְרַת חֹסֶם - "And Enoch walked with God".
This idea of man being able to walk with God, which expresses intimacy and close fellowship with God, is an anthropomorphism of a sort, albeit not so strong a one as the crediting of walking to the Deity itself. Onkelos avoids this by translating - אִישׁ חָרֵד וְלֹא נָגָד - "And Enoch walked in the fear of the Lord". Rashi, too, takes the same view - צֵדָיו יָדֹע - "He was a righteous man, but his mind was easily induced to turn from his righteous ways and to become wicked". One can see from his interpretation that Rashi has not taken "walking with God" in its literal sense.

5. Again in GEN.5:24; GEN.6:9 - "And Noah walked with God". Onkelos translates - בְּחֹדֲשֵׁי עֵשָׁו - "In fear of God Noah walked". Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation. Thus, since Enoch and Noah are not allowed to walk with God, it may be
GROUP A

said, also that God does not walk with them and so by implication motion is denied God.

6. GEN.17 1 - "Walk before Me and be thou perfect". This expression is figurative and it denotes the complete obedience to God. Although this expression "to walk before" - is not directly anthropomorphic, (see previous examples, Nos. 4 and 5) yet even here, Onkelos and Rashi did not take the verb - הרחקמ - in its literal sense - but rather in the sense of "worship and service". Thus Onkelos translates:

- "worship before Me". 10

Rashi also says:

Understand this as the Targum takes it: - "Worship before Me - cleave to My service".

Sometimes, however, Rashi goes further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple.

7. The expression DEUT.20 4 - "For the Lord your God will go with you". - Onkelos translates almost literally - "For the Lord God is He that leads (as a guide) you". Rashi, on the other hand, palliates this anthropomorphism and thus he says - "The text refers to the camp of the Holy Ark". (The camp that has the Holy Ark in its midst, i.e. the camp of
the Levites - see Bab.Tal.Sot.42b).
In other words, it is not God who walks before the
Israelites, but rather the Ark of the law. And even
if it were to be supposed that the Divine presence
is localised in proximity to the Ark, Rashi’s silence
obeys the theological problem that this would
pose. Thus his substitution of the Ark for - הַעֲדוֹת
is in effect, an anti-anthropomorphic device.

8. Similarly EX.13 21 - "And the Lord went before them by day a pillar of
cloud to guide them on their journey". Here also
while Onkelos translates fairly closely - קְסֵם
רָאָתְכֶם הַמַּגִּיסָא יָדִיעֲךָ תְּצוּרָה בְּפַרְצֵי לַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
Rashi explains the text as follows:- The - הַעֲדוֹת
- is punctuated with "Patach", and it is
like - הַעֲדוֹת - to make them be guided (infin-
itive Hiphil) - by means of an Agent - who is the
cloud of Glory. In other words the guidance was
performed not by God but by the cloud of Glory.
Although Rashi’s main concern here is to make the
text conform with the rules of grammar, nevertheless,
he avoids the anthropomorphism by substituting the
cloud for God himself as the Agent.
9. The verb - נבא - to come. - EX.20 - 'וכן בכו הנביא - An altar of earth..., wherever I cause my name to be invoked, I will come unto you and bless you". The flagrant anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text - נביא - is obvious. Onkelos, therefore, substitutes the verb - נבא - by - שלם - to send. "ובכן נביא כל מקום, שאмент נבון בכו נביא - In every place where I may cause My Shechinah to dwell thither will I send My blessing and will bless thee". Rashi, also realising the ascription of motion to God interprets": - הנביא - נביא, שדני뚜י, מ" - "I will make My Shechinah rest upon thee".12

10. In some instances where the Deity is the subject of the verb - נבא - to come - the subject is modified by Onkelos to incorporate the Divine Word - קבר - "And the word came from before the Lord". e.g. 
GEN.20 - "And the Lord came to Abimelech".
GEN.31 - "And the Lord came to Laban."
On the other hand in -
EX.19⁹ - נָעַם וְאַדְעָם לַעֲבֹר הָעִים - "Behold I (God) come unto thee, (Moses) in a thick cloud".
EX.20¹⁷ - כִּי יָבֵשׁ רֹאשׁ וְאֲנִי מֵאֶלֶף הָעֵצִים - "For God is come in order to test you".
DEUT.33² - אַל-כֹּנְכָּן - "The Lord came from Sinai". Onkelos translates the verb - ואַל - by - ויִתְנַכָּה - and the Lord "revealed" Himself, retaining the Deity itself as subject.

In all these cases, however, motion is denied God.
It appears that when God is said to come (verb - ואִל) to Moses or Israel - ויִתְנַכָּה - is used. Most probably this is done out of consideration of the inspired quality of the prophets of Israel.¹³ But when God appears to the heathen the Targum does not use the verb - ויִתְנַכָּה - but - ויִתְנַכְּחוּ - "And the word came".¹⁴

This subtle distinction of Onkelos was followed by Rashi, who comments on NUM.22⁸ - "The Holy Spirit rested upon Balaam at night time only. Similarly, in the case of all the prophets of the heathen peoples; similarly (it came) to Laban in a dream.
at night, as it is said (GEN.31:24) and God came to Laban in a dream of the night". On the other hand, God appeared to Moses and the prophets of Israel with - קָנֻיָתָו - i.e. revelation of his Presence. (See Rashi NUM.12:4-8).

One can see from Rashi's comments that he was fully aware that - קָנֻיָתָו - "And God came" - is not in its literal anthropomorphistic sense but it simply means - קָנֻיָתָו - vision of the divinely spoken message, i.e. "Divine communication".

11. The verb - יָרָה - to go down - EX.19:20 -

"And the Lord came down upon Sinai".

This ascription is a gross anthropomorphism, Onkelos, therefore, translates - בָּנָה - And the Lord was "revealed" on Mount Sinai. Rashi, while he explains the contradiction of the two verses, at the same time avoids the implication of the verb - יָרָה - and thus he says:- "One might think that God actually came down upon it! Therefore, it states, (EX.20:19)

You have seen that I have spoken to you from heaven. These two texts teach us that He bent down the upper and lower heavens and spread them out over the top of the mountain like a bed-spread over a bed, and the throne of Glory descended upon it."
It was therefore the throne of Glory—a term for "Shechinah"—that came down and not God Himself.

12. Again GEN.11—

"And the Lord came down to see the city...."—
Here, too, the ascription of motion to the Deity has been toned down by Onkelos—
"And the Lord was revealed to punish etc"...Rashi, too, in his own way, explains:—"He really did not need to do this ( ), but Scripture intends to teach the judges that they shall not proclaim a defendant guilty before they have seen the case and understood the matter in question". Rashi's words— denotes his "theological sensitivity" and his understanding of the naive conception used by the Hebrew text.

13. Similarly GEN.18—

"I will go down and see etc..."
Onkelos explains—
Rashi also avoids the idea of motion and gives two interpretations:—
This is a metaphor for there was no need for God to go down and see; it merely teaches the judges that they should not give decisions in cases involving capital punishment, except after having carefully looked into the matter.

Another explanation of – יָרֵד - is: I will go down to the very end (i.e. get to the very bottom) of their doings. In other words - יָרֵד - should not be taken in its literal sense, but rather in the sense of – "I will fathom the depths of their wickedness". One can see that while Rashi explains the text, at the same time he avoids all sorts of anthropomorphism.

14. The verb - יָרֵד - to pass.

Ex. 34:6 - יָרֵדָהוּ וְלֹא עֵינָיו "and the Lord passed before him".

This ascription of motion is unbecoming of the Deity. Onkelos, therefore, translates - 'שֵׁרִיבֶך ה' שְׁכִינָתִי "And the Lord made His "Shechinah" pass before his face".

Rashi follows Onkelos' principle and in verse 8 he comments - "When Moses saw that the "Shechinah" passed by he immediately prostrated himself".
15. Similarly - EX.12\(^\text{12}\) - For I will pass through the land of Egypt etc....

Onkelos translates - EX.12\(^\text{19}\) - "And I will appear in the land of Egypt etc."

Here, too, Rashi was aware of the ascription of motion and thus he explains:

"This is not to be taken literally (it is here used metaphorically of God) but is speaking of God as one speaks of a king who passes from place to place, etc." If the anthropomorphism is not exactly eliminated, its immediacy is (as in instances noted above) palliated and thus rendered less theologically startling.

16. The verb - הוס - to leap - EX.12\(^\text{13}\) - "And when I see the blood I will leap over you".

The idea of God "springing over" from house to house is a disturbing anthropomorphism; Onkelos therefore paraphrases by - "I will spare you." Rashi gives two interpretations. Firstly like Onkelos and Menachem Ben Seruk that - חוסין - is to be interpreted as - חוסין - and I will spare you, and then his own explanation that the root - חוס - means leaping and springing over. (חסין - חוסין - והואAwesome Sabbath Shabbat Hayom)
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In Ex. 12 on the same verb Rashi says - אַלְּשָׁנַּיִּים - the verb - אַלְּשָׁנַּיִּים signifies - to spare - He will spare; the term - מַלְשָׁנַּיִּים is a rare formula in Rashi and what he means by it is - "strictly speaking" - one should translate it - מַלְשָׁנַּיִּים and "he will leap over them". In all likelihood, Rashi means that in these passages the verb - אַלְּשָׁנַּיִּים should be taken metaphorically in the sense of "sparing" although (as he is fully aware) its literal meaning is "springing over". It may be said that Rashi was compelled to do so in order to avoid the strong anthropomorphism which this expression involves.

17. The verb - מָהַס - to meet.

Ex. 19 - לְמָהַס וֹאֲכָל מֵהָאָמֶר לְקָרַב הָאֱלֹהִים - "And Moses brought the people out from the camp to meet God".

The idea of God meeting the people is somehow unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by saying - מָהַס נֵלַיָּה - to meet the "Memra" of God. In other words the people went out to meet not God, but rather His intermediary the "Memra". Although Rashi has not used the concept of the "Memra" in his commentary, yet he realised the anthropomorphism of this expression, and he also may have toned it.
down by saying — "It teaches that the "Shechinah" was going forth to meet them, as a bridegroom who goes out to meet his bride". The interpretation of Onkelos and Rashi is an example of the denial of localisation to God.

18. The verb — to meet.

EX. 4:24 — "During the journey, while...the Lord met him (Moses), meaning to kill him". This expression — "The Lord met him" — is considered totally unacceptable, Onkelos, therefore avoids it by saying — "וַיַּעַתֵּר מִלְּאֹתֵרָיו הַגְּדוֹלָהּ " — And the Angel of the Lord met him. Rashi, in his own way, also explains that it was the Angel who became like a serpent and sought to kill him. The exegesis is, of course, older than Rashi, who is selective in the Midrashim which he quotes and on the whole avoids quoting fantastic ones. The fact that he does so here may well be occasioned by his concern to eliminate a gross anthropomorphism in what is in any case a most perplexing passage.
19. The verb - רָצַם - to designate or point out, may have localising implications, since it can mean to meet by appointment. Thus another example of the denial of place to God is:

EX.29 - שֵׁם לְגַּבָּר הַיּוֹם - "And there I will meet with the children of Israel". The expression - יְצַלִּים - is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos tones it down - יְצַלִּים מְעַרְבּוֹר - "And I will appoint My "Memra". Rashi, in his own way, follows the same principle - יְצַלִּים - "I will meet together with them in a communication by speech. In other words the meeting between God and His subjects will not be in a physical sense, facing each other, but only in the - מְעַרְבּוֹר - through the medium of speech, or in Onkelos' words the "Memra". Furthermore, when delving into the second part of Rashi's interpretation one will undoubtedly see his sensitivity in moderating this anthropomorphism - יְצַלִּים מְעַרְבּוֹר - "This is not to be taken literally (it is here used as a metaphor) but is speaking of God as one speaks of a king who appoints a place of meeting, where he will speak with his subjects". The simile - יְצַלִּים - is purely to stress that - יְצַלִּים - should not be taken literally but rather metaphorically.
20. The verb - יִהְשָׁה - to dwell.

The idea of God dwelling in a place is, if construed literally, certainly unbecoming of the Deity and, here also Onkelos and Rashi avoided the anthropomorphism of the text. In this instance the situation is complicated by the fact that some of the biblical passages concerned had themselves generated the concept of the Shechinah - the Divine quality of "indwelling presence": a concept which, largely purified of geographical implications and impregnated with notions of immanence, constitutes a topic of major importance in Jewish theology.

The first example is NUM.53 ἀνέζωσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κατανυστήρου Ἰσραήλ. "And they shall not defile their camp in the midst thereof I dwell".

Onkelos interprets that it is the "Shechinah" that dwells in the midst of Israel. Rashi also takes the verse to mean - מִקְרוֹעַ שַׁפָּרָה - "the camp of the Shechinah" - and thus he explains in verse 2 - The text speaks about a person who had become unclean (by reason of a corpse - דְּמֵם יִנְמֵשׁ) and was not allowed to enter the camp of the "Shechinah". And so Rashi, while primarily concerned to explain the text, yet at the same time, avoids the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text.
GROUP A

21. Similarly NUM.35:34 - "For I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel". Onkelos, once again, translates: "For I the Lord whose Shechinah etc". Rashi follows the same concept - "For even when the Israelites are unclean the Shechinah remains amongst them".

22. Similarly the expression NUM.11:20 - "The Lord who dwells in your midst" - may be said to imply a verb of dwelling among you, and consequently Onkelos tones it down by saying - "Because you have rejected the Memra of the Lord whose Shechinah dwells among you". Rashi, as said above, follows this principle, and thus he says: "Had I not planted My "Shechinah" among you, your heart would not have become so arrogant as to enter into all these matters".

23. DEUT.33:16 - Onkelos translates - "whose Shechinah is in Heaven". Rashi says - "הכבה ינדלאי אלו בשמים".
"God who revealed Himself in the thornbush". Rashi was careful in saying - הָנַגֵּל - God who revealed Himself - and not - חַשָּׂא בּוֹדָר - God who dwells in the thornbush.

24. The verb - נָשָׂא - to lift up.

EX.19 - נָשָׂא אֲחֵכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל - "And how I bore you on eagle's wings". The idea of God lifting up Israel is certainly disturbing. Rashi therefore explains as follows: - "Onkelos translates נָשָׂא - as though it were - לֹנָה אֲחֵכֶם - viz., אֲחֵכֶם אֲנַחֲלוּ - And I made you travel; he adapted the expression in a manner that is consonant with the respect due to God's transcendent superiority."

25. Similarly DEUT.32 - כִּי נָשָׂא וְלֹא שְׁמִישׁ - "For I lift up my hand to heaven". Rashi (in his second interpretation) says: כִּי נָשָׂא - כִּי הַשָּׂא - "The first two words - נָשָׂא כִּי - are equivalent to כִּי נָשָׂא - "because I have lifted up" - and the text means: I always make the heaven the dwelling place of My Glory, as the Targum takes it. כִּי נָשָׂא - "My hand" - means the place of My Divine
Glory. Furthermore, even in his first interpretation Rashi does not take the text literally, but in the sense of oath. And so, once again, Onkelos and Rashi have toned down the ascription of motion to the Deity.
In their attempt to spiritualise the conception of God, Onkelos and Rashi to a great extent avoided these flagrant anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text, which if understood literally would credit the Deity with human form. Here are some examples to illustrate this point.

1. EX. 15:3 - "The Lord is a man of war." The idea of describing God as man is unacceptable. Onkelos, therefore, translates: "The Lord is the Master of victory in battles". Rashi, too, protects the incorporeality of God by explaining "that - שיא - does not mean "man" but rather - מנה - Master of war; just as (RUTH 1:3) - נאם דרחן - Master of Naomi. And whenever the words - שיא - and - כרשא - occur they must be translated by - מנה - Master".

2. NUM. 12:8 - "And the similitude of the Eternal shall he behold". The very idea of ascribing - סמיה - "form" to God is unacceptable as God has no shape or form. Accordingly Onkelos renders: "ויהovable הלה מטוסכלי - "And he shall behold the likeness of the Glory of the Lord. Accordingly, Moses beheld only
the Glory of God. Rashi in a remarkable way avoids the anthropomorphism:

This (similitude) refers to beholding the after-

[effects] of God's providence.

3. Similarly GEN.1

"Let us make man in our image and likeness..."
The word "likeness" is objectionable. It is interesting to note that while Onkelos translates literally

Rashi goes further and explains:

"with the power to comprehend and to discern". One can see how careful Rashi was in suppressing the anthropomorphism.

4. LEV.17

"I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood etc".
The ascription of - "face" to God is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by translating - And I will set my anger.

Rashi following Ps. Jonathan explains as follows:
"the word - נֵּ֣חַ - is taken by paronomasia as indicating - נֵּ֣חַ - "My leisure" - i.e. I will turn away from all My [other] affairs and concern Myself with him only".

5. EX.20 3 - "Thou shalt have no other gods before my face". Whatever the unusual expression - אֲגַ֛לְגֹלָ֔ה - may mean, its literal meaning is just unacceptable. Onkelos takes it to mean - זֵ אֲגַ֛לְגֹלָ֔ה אֲגַלְגֹּלָ֔ה - thou shalt have no other gods except Me. Rashi, also suppresses the anthropomorphism by taking - אֲגַ֛לְגֹלָ֔ה - to mean - כָּֽהֲנִּ֥ים שָׁמַ֤ן כָּֽהֲנִ֥ים - "so long as I exist".

6. DEUT.5⁴ - "The Lord talked with you face to face". Onkelos interprets: - מִמְּדֹֽדִי - "Word with word" (i.e. speech for speech) hath the Lord spoken with you". Rashi, too, avoids the naive conception of - מִמְּדֹֽדִי - and says - "Behold the seller (God) Himself is speaking to you". In other words it is(using Onkelos' expression)
the "Memra", the intermediary element, which you have heard speaking to you. Perhaps, however, Rashi mitigates the anthropomorphism by at least eliminating the reference to God's face and substituting (quite arbitrarily) "speech" to God.

This expression occurs once again in DEUT. 34 and it is most interesting to note that while Onkelos translates literally - "speech" to God.

Rashi palliates this by explaining: "And (Moses) spoke to Him (God) at any time he desired". In other words this familiarity which is expressed by - "speech" consisted of - "speech" only.

In most cases whenever the expression - "the eyes of the Lord" occurs in the Bible, Onkelos translates - "Before the Lord".

In DEUT. 28 - "For you will be doing what is good and right in the eyes of the Lord". - Rashi who realised this anthropomorphism has this to say: - This refers to an action that is proper in the eyes of Heaven.

The change from - to - is not accidental, but rather a deliberate one, in order to avoid the naive conception that God has human eyes.
8. NUM.9:18 "At the command of the Lord they encamped and at the command of the Lord they journeyed".

The word — פה — "mouth" — when used of God came to mean "command", as that which came from the mouth; and this was done in order to avoid the anthropomorphism that the Deity has a human mouth.

In this sense Onkelos, throughout the Torah, takes it — יָכוֹן חָיוֹת מֵעִמָּר עֲלוֹת — Rashi also explains that אַמַּוּר אֲשֶׁר חָיוֹת מֵעִמָּר עֲלוֹת — means:— יָכוֹן חָיוֹת מֵעִמָּר עֲלוֹת — through the signs of the "pillar of cloud", i.e.

if the pillar of cloud rolled itself up (contracted itself) and extended itself out above the camp of the sons of Judah, like a beam, then they journeyed.

If the pillar of cloud rose in a column and extended itself above the sons of Judah like the roof of a hut (HeaderText) then they encamped.

As said above, Rashi while he explains the text, at the same time, removes all sort of anthropomorphisms which are an affront to the Deity.

9. EX.33:22 — ושבעתי, כי אליך "And I will shelter thee with my hand while I pass by."

To avoid the anthropomorphism — ( יֶאְבֵן ) — Rashi quotes Onkelos: —(HeaderText) — שֶׁאֶרֶץ שָׁמַיִם זֶרֶךְ לְעָנִי לִבְּךָ מֶסֶם —
The Targum renders - 'שכית, כפ - by 'וָנֶא' - "I will protect thee with My word". This is merely a circumlocutary substitution in a manner more respectful to God's transcendent superiority; and the Targum did not translate it literally because God does not need to cover him (Moses) with the actual hand in order to protect him". Similarly on verse 23, Rashi further says - "וַהֲנִיָתָה - את כפ - "And I will remove My hand" - "וַתִּנְתָנֵה - מַעֲשֵׂי - "And I will remove the guidance of my Glory from before your eyes - to move forward from that place".

10. DEUT. 33:3 - כָּכָּכָּכָל יִהְיֶשׁ תְּכֵנָה לְאָלָּמֵי - "All his saints are in thy hand, and they sat down at thy feet, etc". Again Onkelos and Rashi attempt to avoid these gross anthropomorphisms which credit the Deity with human hands and feet. Onkelos therefore translates: - כָּכָּכָל יִהְיֶשׁ תְּכֵנָה לְאָלָּמֵי - "with power, He took out of Egypt all the holy ones of the house of Israel, and they are the ones who were led under thy cloud". Rashi, also paraphrases the text and gives two interpretations:
Firstly - 'ברך - פשמח הצריךים וגרחיהם לאימת

The word "thy hand" - is not to be taken literally, but it means - the souls of the righteous are stored up with Him. - 'תרםך ' "thy feet" means - 'הרמך לברך ' "Within the underpart of the mountain unto thy foot - which is - at Sinai. Another interpretation - 'ברך ' - means - 'ברך ' - their righteous people clave to you. (i.e. worship you).

11. Similarly - DEUT.33

"And underneath are the everlasting arms". The meaning is perhaps vague, and nothing in the context determines that the arms are those of the Deity. Onkelos, however, assumes that they are and attempts to avoid a human conception of the Deity, as can be seen from his translation: רוחותיו ברך - בקמיהי אוחרבם רוח

With His "Memra" the word was made. For Rashi there is no problem of anthropomorphism, since he understands that the - 'ברך ' - "arms" - do not refer to the Deity - but - 'ברך ' - all the mighty men ("men of strong arms") such as Sihon and Og, and the kings of Canaan who were the strength and might of the world.
12. EX.13 - "Thy right hand, O Lord......"
Also DEUT.33 - "From His right hand went a fire of the Law for them".
It is strange to see that in these cases Onkelos translates literally - and respectively.
Rashi, on the other hand, remarked on this naive conception for in GEN.1 he comments on the verse (I. Kings, 22) "I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of Heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left - Has God, then, a right hand and a left hand? No, but it means that some stood "on the right side" to plead in favour of the accused and others stood "on the left side" to accuse. This comment shows Rashi's sensitivity in avoiding any human conception associated with the Deity.

13. DEUT.32 - "For I lift up My hand to heaven".
The word - "My hand" is certainly a crude anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, takes it to mean:
"For I have established in heaven the place of My Shechinah". Rashi, (in his second interpretation) who realises the naivete of this conception, quotes the Targum and says - "My hand" - means - the place of My Divine Glory.
Anthropopathisms

Human feelings are attributed to God in the Old Testament. God loves, hates, repents, fears and grieves. In other words, God is subject to all passions and emotions of a human being. (Sometimes called "anthropopathisms" rather than "anthropomorphisms"). As these emotions are objectionable in connection with God, some attempt has been made by Onkelos and Rashi to avoid or disguise these anthropomorphic conceptions. The following examples illustrate this point:

1. GEN. 6:6a - "And the Eternal repented". The idea of repentance is definitely a gross anthropomorphism, for as God knows the future, he can never experience the feeling of repentance. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - "And the Lord repented in His "Memra". 1 In other words, the repentance is not directed to God, but rather to His "Memra". Rashi, in a bold stroke weakened the anthropomorphism and took the verb - not in the sense to repent, but rather to comfort - and thus he says: - "It was a consolation to Him that He had created man on earth, for had he been one of the heavenly beings, he would have incited them to rebel against God".
2. GEN. 6:6b - רכז"ו "And it grieved Him in his heart". This conception is unfitting to the Deity. Consequently, Rashi quotes Onkelos who tones it down יאמ רכינד ס.pack מבייתב יקפייהו In the mind of God man became an object to be punished; it entered God's heart to grieve him. And in case this is not satisfactory, Rashi goes further and alludes to the story of Rabbi Joshua. A gentile had asked the latter to explain to him the text. Do you not admit that God knows what is to happen in the future? The Rabbi replied, "yes". The gentile retorted - but is it not written and "He was grieved in His heart"? He answered: "have you ever had a son born to you"? He replied, "yes, and on that occasion, I rejoiced and made others rejoice also". The Rabbi asked him: "But did you not know that he must die"? To this the heathen replied: "At the time of joy let there be joy, at the time of mourning, let there be mourning". The Rabbi then said: "such too is the way of God". By quoting this story from the Midrash, (GEN. Rabbah.27.4) Rashi is simply reminding the reader that "the Torah speaks the language of man".

3. DEUT. 32:27 - רכז"ו הינמ יס גוי ינב ל"ב "But I feared that I should be provoked by their foes". The idea of fear attributed to God is certainly disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, translates - יבכ"ב"א
Were it not that the wrath of the enemy would be gathered together". Rashi also without quoting Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism and takes - יאוס - not from the verb יאוש (a bye-form of יאוש) to fear - but from יאוש - to gather. And thus Rashi explains: "Were it not that the wrath of the enemy were heaped up - (יאוס) against them to destroy them".

4. LEV. 26:30 אָדוֹן לִשֵּׁהוּ אֶחָד וּמִלְכּוּ "And My soul shall loathe you". The idea of loathing and hating attributed to God is, once again disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, explains:

- "And My Memra shall put you at a distance". Rashi realising the anthropomorphism explains:

- ושיבセット - "This refers to the departure of the Shechinah from their midst".

However, in this area also, Onkelos does not follow a consistent policy for in several cases of emotions such as - כָּרַךְ - or - יַעַר - "the wrath of the Lord" - EX. 4:14; LEV. 26:28; NUM. 11:10; NUM. 25:3-4; NUM. 32:14; DEUT. 11:17; DEUT. 13:18. - Onkelos translates literally.
GROUP D

References to Physical Reactions

Human reactions are also attributed to God, in the Hebrew Scriptures, and here also Onkelos and Rashi avoid the anthropomorphistic conceptions. Two examples of this nature will suffice to illustrate this point.

1. EX. 32:11 - "And Moses besought the face of the Eternal", etc. The verb - חִלָּל - in the "Piel" means to make pleasant, (literally, sweet; Arabic - حَلَلَ) to appease, and used mainly with - פָּנָי - face. Thus Moses made the face of God sweet and pleasant. This strong anthropomorphism is avoided by Onkelos who renders the text - סֶפֶל לְמַעַן - "And Moses prayed before the Lord. Rashi also has taken it in the sense of praying and entreating. For in verse 10 on the expression - יָּ֥יקַם מְדִינָ֥ה - "Let me alone" - Rashi comments that by saying this God "opened the door" to him (offered him a suggestion) intimating that if he prayed for them He would not destroy them.

2. EX. 31:17 - "And on the seventh day He ceased from work and rested". The idea of God being refreshed or rested
is simply a misconception. To our surprise Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan translate closely: - רֹאַיָּה יִשָּׂא - שֵׁבַע - . Rashi, however, with his usual sensitivity, warns the reader of this expression, which seems to detract from the majesty of God. Thus he says: - נְפַשְׁעָה סֵטֵרְמוּא לָא, אָם שַׁכֵּסְכָּב בְּעָלָהוּ אֵאֲלַי ואֵלַו וְכָלַו בָּתֲקָאְר הַכָּלָה סְרָוַת לְעַבְּרָה, סְבָכַרְוַת, סְבָכַרְוַת, וְכָלַו מִיַּא מִיַּא, הַוְּלָה לְשָׁמוֹ - "Take the meaning of - עֲבֵרָה - as the Targum renders it - הָרוֹם - and He rested -. But God of whom it is written (IS. 40:28) ...."the Lord the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not nor is He weary", and whose every action is accomplished by his word , dictated a text which ascribes repose to Him. This is in order to make comprehensible to the human ear what it is capable of understanding.
Reference to Human Senses

In this chapter we shall deal briefly with human senses, attributed to God in the Old Testament. God revealed Himself to the Israelites as a being who has personal dealings with mankind. This personal conception of God has led to frequent anthropomorphic expressions about the Deity. Thus we read in Scriptures God breathes, sees, hears, smells and speaks. Although the writer concerned was it seems quite inhibited in his use of this kind of language, to later and more sophisticated generations those attributions were felt to be a disparagement of God's honour and to debase His Majesty. Onkelos and Rashi therefore endeavoured to eradicate these representations which apparently invested the Deity with human senses. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this subject.

1. Ex. 15:8 - "And with the blast of thy nostrils". The idea of God breathing is disturbing. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - "And by the word of thy mouth". Rashi with his usual sensitivity warns the reader about this anthropomorphism:

הנה אמש - בבב הכסות - "הנה אמש - בבב הכסות -"יקנין בأخبارו, לועמאת מלך בשכ' יז ש. כ' לועמאת מלך בשכ' יז ש. כ' לועמאת מלך בשכ' יז ש. כ'
"Scripture speaks - if this were at all permitted to say - of the Shechinah in the same manner as it does of a human monarch, in order to make people's ears hear the facts in accordance with what really happens so that they may understand the matter".

In other words, Rashi teaches that the Torah speaks in the language of man.²

2. LEV.1⁹ - "An offering made by fire of sweet savour unto the Lord".

The anthropomorphism is blatant, Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - קרבן דמות צבי בריהון קרבן ת' - "A sacrifice to be received with acceptance before the Lord". Rashi, in a remarkable exposition explains:

An odour of - "one that causes satisfaction to Me by the knowledge that I gave command and that My will was executed".³

3. EX.12¹³ - "And when I see the blood......"

Whilst Onkelos translates literally⁴ - "ואشهد כידם - ראייה - הבתר הדם, נא אולר" Rashi goes further: "הקב' נאם עת ניא על כלות שלומך והיה - ו חוזר, והיה עלי, כי כי שלום, כי"
But surely everything is manifest to Him (and He therefore did not need to look whether the blood had been put on the door posts). But the meaning is: God says, I will take notice of the fact that you are engaged in the performance of My commandments and I will spare you.5

In other places the verb - הָאָרְכֻּנָּה - in connection with God is translated by Onkelos as - 'אֲרָכָה - "It was revealed before the Lord". e.g. GEN.3112; GEN.2932; EX.37; EX.431; Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, Kafih edition, op.cit.v.1.ch.48, makes a subtle distinction between these two interpretations of Onkelos:- מָזוּשַׁלְתָּה כֻּלָּהוֹלָא (הָאָרְכֻּנָּה) מְזוּשַׁלְתָּה כֻּלָּהוֹלָא

In short, whenever the verb - הָאָרְכֻּנָּה - is connected with violence, wickedness, or injustice Onkelos translates - 'אֲרָכָה - (e.g. GEN.2932; GEN.3112; EX.225; EX.317; EX.39; EX.431; EX.329; DEUT.3219; DEUT.3236). But when the subject in question is regarded with favour by God, then Onkelos translates the verb - הָאָרְכֻּנָּה - by - נַחֲמֵה - (e.g. GEN.14; GEN.118; GEN.131; EX.34; EX.1213).

Maimonides noticed, however, that in the following three places, Onkelos translated the verb - הָאָרְכֻּנָּה -
by - although according to his fine distinction, Onkelos should have translated it by - 'נָתַתָּנָה' - GEN.6; GEN.6; GEN.29. Maimonides believed that Onkelos' version in these three places is incorrect.

4. Similarly when the verb - יָאִיר - to hear - is connected with the Deity, Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism and translates - 'נָתַתָּנָה יָאִיר' - "It was heard before the Lord". (e.g. GEN.21; GEN.29; EX.3; EX.6; EX.16; EX.16; EX.16; EX.16; NUM.14). In other instances, when the verb - יָאִיר - is connected with prayer, Onkelos translates it by - ָוָנָה - "accepting". e.g. GEN.16 - ָוָנָה יָאִיר יָאִיר - "Because the Lord hath heard thy affliction".  "For the Lord has accepted your prayer". c.f. EX.22; EX.22; NUM.20; DEUT. Maimonides praised Onkelos for being so careful in making these subtle distinctions and thus avoiding the anthropomorphism of the text. It is interesting to note that Rashi also was fully aware of Onkelos' distinctions and in GEN.37, he makes the following comment:-

by - although according to his fine distinction, Onkelos should have translated it by - 'נָתַתָּנָה' - GEN.6; GEN.6; GEN.29. Maimonides believed that Onkelos' version in these three places is incorrect.

4. Similarly when the verb - יָאִיר - to hear - is connected with the Deity, Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism and translates - 'נָתַתָּנָה יָאִיר' - "It was heard before the Lord". (e.g. GEN.21; GEN.29; EX.3; EX.6; EX.16; EX.16; EX.16; EX.16; NUM.14). In other instances, when the verb - יָאִיר - is connected with prayer, Onkelos translates it by - ָוָנָה - "accepting". e.g. GEN.16 - ָוָנָה יָאִיר יָאִיר - "Because the Lord hath heard thy affliction".  "For the Lord has accepted your prayer". c.f. EX.22; EX.22; NUM.20; DEUT. Maimonides praised Onkelos for being so careful in making these subtle distinctions and thus avoiding the anthropomorphism of the text. It is interesting to note that Rashi also was fully aware of Onkelos' distinctions and in GEN.37, he makes the following comment:-
The Targum renders - יושמע - "And they hearkened" by - הקיבלח מרשמה - "And they accepted it from him". Wherever the verb יושמע means acceding to a person's instructions as here, and as GEN.28 יושמע - הביך - "And Jacob had hearkened to his father"; and EX.24 ירשמה - "We will do and we will obey" - it is translated in the Targum by - קיבך - "accepting". But whenever it merely means physically hearing with the ear, as in GEN.3 יושמע - ויהי יושמע לפני הקב' - "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden" - Onkelos translates - יושם - "And they heard". Similarly GEN.27 יושם - "And Rebecca heard" - by - יובך שמעת - GEN.35 יושם - "And Israel heard" - by - יושם שמעה; EX.16 יושם - "I have heard (שמעתי) the murmurings of the children of Israel" - by - שמיע שמעתי - "It was heard before Me". Although Rashi is primarily a commentator on the Torah yet, quite often, he quotes Onkelos and explains his distinctions and his avoidance of the many anthropomorphisms of the text.

5. EX.33 יושם - "And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face". This expression may be felt to indicate a relationship between God and his creatures, and the direct
speech between Him and His mortal beings seems, somehow disrespectful to the Deity. Rashi, therefore, following the Targum has weakened the anthropomorphism considerably.

The verb — according to the Targum, is in the Hithpael — i.e. "He used to speak to Himself with (in the presence of) Moses — which is an expression of respect used with reference to the Shechinah". To avoid too intimate a relationship between God His mortal beings. Rashi goes further to illustrate his point: A similar expression is NUM.7:89 — "Then he (Moses) heard the voice speaking to him". The text does not read — but — i.e. the (contracted) Hithpael form for —. Where the reading is — its interpretation is: The voice was speaking to itself. (i.e. it was not directed to any particular person) and the ordinary man naturally heard it. (Because he was there and he could not help hearing it). But when the text reads — it implies that the king was conversing with the ordinary man.

In EZEKIEL 2:1 — "And I heard him that uttered Himself unto me". Rashi
It implies that the Shechinah speaks independently, through the instrumentality of its Glory.¹²
Prepositions Implying Motion or other Corporeality

A few examples on this subject will further illustrate how Onkelos and Rashi toned down the prepositions of the Hebrew text, which implied the corporeality of the Deity.

1. EX. 19:4 - אֶחָדָּה אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה - "And I brought you unto Myself". To avoid the anthropomorphism which the preposition - לְ - "to Me" - implies. Rashi simply says:- הָרְשָׁיָמָנוּ - Explain this as the Targum does: - הָרְשָׁיָמָנוּ - "And I have brought you near to My service". Although the verb - לְ - makes it impossible completely to eliminate the idea of motion in the preposition, it can be played down to a point at which - לְ - can be substituted by - ל - "to", i.e. for the sake of worship. 1

2. EX. 25:2 - נְצֵרָה - that they take for Me an offering.

The preposition - ל - might be thought to imply corporeality of the Deity. Onkelos, therefore, avoids this by translating - נְצֵרָה - "that they set apart before Me a separated portion". Rashi, who remarked upon the anthropomorphism explains:- לְ - "For Me" - means to the glory of My name.
3. Similarly - EX.25⁸ - "And let them make me a Sanctuary". Here, also, Onkelos translates the preposition - ל - by - מבקע - "And let them make before Me a Sanctuary". Rashi, too, tones it down: - "משי - "Let them make to the glory of My Name a place of holiness".

4. EX.29²⁵ - "It is an offering made by fire for the Eternal.
   The preposition - ל - is felt to be problematic.
   Onkelos, therefore, tones it down - 'קרבנה נא לכוֹת - It is a sacrifice before the Lord. Rashi, with his usual sensitivity, weakens the anthropomorphism by explaining - ליה - "To the Name of the Omnipresent.

5. EX.30³⁷ - "The incense prepared...you shall treat it as holy to the Lord".
   Here also the preposition - ל - "For the Lord" - is simply a degradation of God's honour, for it implies that God may need to use it. Onkelos, therefore, translates: - 'קרבנה נא לכוֹת - it shall be unto thee holy before the Lord; thus distinguishing the nuances of the preposition in - ל - and - ליה.
Rashi weakens the anthropomorphism considerably - "לָיְדוּ - שְׁמֵעָה אַל ה' שְׁמַעַת - this means that you must not make it except in honour of My Name.

6. Ex. 31:15 - "But on the seventh day there is a Sabbath of sacred rest, holy to the Lord". Here, too, Onkelos explains the preposition - by - holiness before the Lord. In other words the implication of the preposition that God needs the sanctity of the Sabbath is, of course, unfitting to the Deity. Therefore, Onkelos, tones it down by saying - the holiness "before the Lord". Rashi also avoids the implication - The observance of its holiness shall be to the glory of My Name and by My command.

7. Lev. 3:11 - "The priest shall burn it at the altar as food offered to the Lord". The implication that God needs the food of the offering is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, translates - "יַהֲזֵהּ כְּבֹרָה לֵוֶת כְּ -
the food of the sacrifice (which is offered) before the Lord. Rashi, too, in a subtle way explains:

"It is the food of the fire in honour (in the Name) of the Lord".

8. LEV.25 - "...the Land shall keep Sabbaths to the Lord".
If the preposition - י - is taken to indicate a "rest for the Lord" - i.e. that the Lord himself rests, then an anthropomorphism is involved - Onkelos, however, translates - ר"פשת לע "the sabbatical year before the Lord". Rashi, on the other hand, gives a fine interpretation: ר"פשת לע "a rest in honour (in the Name) of the Lord (in other words not a rest for the Lord). Rashi goes further to say that this should be compared to - ר"פשת לע - to the weekly Sabbath (lit. the Sabbath of Creation) - EX.20 - where - י - cannot mean "a day for God to rest" - but rather a rest in honour of the Lord.

9. DEUT.13 - "...and burn both city and goods as a complete offering to the Lord your God".
The preposition - י - may imply somehow, that God
requires the burning of the city for Himself. Onkelos as usual weakens the anthropomorphism by translating - קָרָץ - "Before the Lord". Rashi, realising the implication of the text explains: - יְהֹוָה - "For the honour of His Name and for His sake". In other words the burning of the city is purely for the glorification of His Name. Having mentioned a few examples, one can see that Rashi's aim in emphasizing constantly the idea of - "for the honour of His Name" was purely to avoid, or at the very least to weaken or disguise, the anthropomorphisms implied by these prepositions.

10. NUM.3:12 - והז נ الغذ לק학 אֶת חִוֵּשׁ... תשח...ותח...וְּשׁוֹשָׁו - "I take the Levites for myself...as a substitute for the eldest male child...the Levites shall be mine". The anthropomorphism of the preposition - יָּאָה לָּהֶם - is blatant, and Onkelos avoids it by translating - ויָהָמר נְעָםְךָ יְהֹוָה לִי - "And the Levites shall minister before Me". Rashi also gives the same interpretation. - אָנָּא מַחְיָה מִכָּה - בַּכָּה, מַזָּהֲלִים בָּשָׁם שֶׁהָיָה שֵׁרָאֶל שׁוֹבֵעָם נַעֲמָם | שֵׁהָלָה לָּם ? אָוָא, הָבָּשָׂרְוֹת...לְפָרְשָׁתָו | móhpay be-kashov.
"On what grounds do I claim the right over the Levites, that the Israelites should have to hire them for my service"? It is through the firstborn...for originally the priestly functions were performed by the firstborn, etc.

"In the morning the Lord will show who are His and who is holy and will cause him to come near to Him; even him whom He may choose will He cause to come near unto Him".

The anthropomorphism which these prepositions - (ל - and - ל) imply, are obvious. Onkelos, therefore, explains as follows: -

In the morning the Lord will make known who is fit to Him, and him who is holy and He will bring him near before Him; and him in whom He takes pleasure he will bring to serve Him.

Although Rashi's prime concern is to explain the repetitions of the verse which seem somehow, superfluous, yet at the same time, he quotes the Targum and avoids the anthropomorphism. Thus he
explains:

Who are His— for the Levitical service; and him who is holy— for the priesthood. The Targum proves that this is so (i.e. that Scripture alludes to two different matters) for it renders the first phrase by "He will bring near before Him," and the second by "He will bring near to His service".

The direct speech between God and His mortal beings, which the preposition—לע—implies, is of course a gross anthropomorphism. It is most interesting to know that while Onkelos translates literally:— yapıך ל"ע... ואמין דבר עלי... אמר לי ... "And who spake unto me". Rashi, however, weakens the anthropomorphism considerably and indirectly criticises Onkelos for translating literally:— דבר לי... אמר לי ... "And who spake unto me".
The word יִיָּד - means - "in my interest", just as (I KINGS II.4) "which He spoke concerning me". (לְיָד). In the same way, in every case where יִיָּד - or יִיָּד - or יִיָּד - follow after the verb רֵעַ - they must be explained in the sense of יִיָּד - "concerning" - and in the Targum they should be rendered by יִיָּד - "regarding me", or יִיָּד - "regarding him", or יִיָּד - "regarding them" - for with this verb רֵעַ - in the sense of speaking to a person the preposition יִיָּד - and יִיָּד - and יִיָּד - are not the appropriate ones, but rather יִיָּד - and יִיָּד - and יִיָּד - , and the renderings in the Targum should be by the preposition יִיָּד - "to speak with" me and יִיָּד - to speak with him, and יִיָּד - to speak with them. 7

As said above, although Rashi's prime concern here is to conform the Hebrew text with the rules of grammar, yet at the same time he avoids the anthropomorphism which these prepositions imply.
GROUP G

Intermediary Elements

(or Divine Name elaborated or substituted).

The protection of the transcendence of the Deity by means of intermediate terms such as the Shechinah, the Memra, the Angel of the Lord or the Glory of the Lord is highly developed by the Targumim and especially by Onkelos. The development of these intermediaries were mainly due to the fact that the notion found in the Torah, of God dwelling in a certain place or God meeting with man is wholly unacceptable. Consequently the intermediaries were used by Onkelos to interpose between God and His interests in the world. It is not necessary for us to enter into the question of whether (and if so, to what extent) the Targumists and others who resorted to these intermediary terms really thought of them as constituting independent entities that could extend between man and God, or whether they used them merely as "surrogates" - in Hebrew, i.e. as substitute terms the use of which might seem somewhat less shocking in anthropomorphic contexts, inasmuch as they would disguise the reference of the unacceptable language to the Deity itself. The theological difficulty is not, of course, disposed of in this way; but it is rendered less immediately obvious, and the faith of ordinary readers would, it is apparently hoped, be less troubled by it. In the case of the insertion of - an intermediary individual seems
clearly envisaged; but this need not apply to the other terms employed.

This subject has been discussed in the introduction of this section, as well as in Group A - Motion and Place denied God. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves here to a few examples, proving that Onkelos and Rashi have suppressed the gross anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text by utilizing these intermediate terms.

1. GEN. 32:30 - "For I have seen God face to face".
The idea of man seeing God is unacceptable and especially when the Torah itself says: EX. 33:23 - "But my face shall not be seen". - Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by interpreting - "I have seen the Angel of the Lord face to face". Rashi, too, in GEN. 33 explains - by - "the sight of the Angel".  

2. EX. 29:43 - "And it shall be sanctified by my glory".
The textual wording - - shows that the text itself is anti-anthropomorphic, Onkelos, therefore, translates it as it stands:
And it (i.e. the place) shall be sanctified by My Glory. Rashi goes further and explains that כבדה means that the Shechinah will rest therein.

3. Similarly NUM.14:10 "....And the glory of the Eternal appeared in the appointed tent...."
Onkelos takes by נקרת סכנין - "And the Glory of the Lord was revealed in the tent of meeting".
In other words even the "Glory" of the Lord was not "seen" as the text has it, but rather אזכרה - "revealed" - conceivably in a prophetic vision to the Israelites.
Perhaps, however, the expression אזכרה is so common and automatic a targumic substitute for ראה that it may have been largely "blunted" into no more than a rather indirect way of saying "was seen". However, be that as it may God himself was not seen, but rather the intermediate, the Glory was. Rashi goes further and explains that כבלר merely means הרעם - the intermediate, "the cloud" descended there.
In NUM.16:19 Rashi, once again, translates by יייאו יבגעל - Onkelos, however, translates
4. **EX. 29**

"I shall meet the Israelites there".

The expression - וְיִבְרָא, is certainly a gross anthropomorphism, Onkelos tones it down by explaining - וַיִּבְרָא - that it was the "Memra" which met the Israelites and not God. Rashi also conveys the same principle - "I will come together with them in a communication by speech. In other words, the meeting will not be in its literal sense, God facing His subjects, but rather through the medium of - וַיִּבְרָא - "speech", or in Onkelos' words, the "Memra".

5. **EX. 33**

"My face shall go with thee" (which is another way of saying I myself will go).

Here also Onkelos suppresses the anthropomorphism and explains that it is the intermediate, the "Shechinah" - שֶׁכֶּיחֲנָה - who will go with the Israelites. Rashi follows Onkelos and says - Understand this as the Targum renders it.
6. Ex. 34 - "If I have indeed won thy favour, O Lord, then may the Lord go in our company".

Needless to emphasize that the verb - קָלָל - in this context is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos suppresses it: - תַּקְלֶל כֵּן יְעַשֵׁהוּ לְךָ, בְּעַרְבּוֹת - "Let, I pray, the Shechinah of the Lord go among us". In other words, Moses' request was simply that the intermediate of the Lord - "the Shechinah" - should go with them. Rashi follows the same principle that Moses' request was simply - וְיֹאמֵר לְהַעֲשֵׂהּ שֶׁיֵּעַשֶּׁהּ בְּעַרְבּוֹת - that the intermediate "Shechinah" should be with Israel only, and not with other people.

7. Ex. 13 - Sometimes, however, Rashi goes further than Onkelos in anti-anthropomorphic scruple, e.g. Ex. 13 - וְיַלְדוּ עַל בְּרֵאשָׁה בְּעַרְבּוֹת - Rashi explains the text as follows: The - יִגְוַהְוָה - is punctuated with "Patach", and it is like - וְיַגְוָהְוָה - to make them be guided (infinitive Hiphil) by means of an agent - who is "the cloud of glory". In other words the guidance was made not by God Himself, but
rather by His intermediate - "the cloud of Glory".\(^7\)

8. EX.4:24 - הַרְאָה הַבָּשָׁן בְּהַר שְׁנַיִּים

...the Lord met him and sought to kill him". The expression "The Lord met him" is disturbing. Onkelos therefore tones it down by explaining that Moses was met by the intermediate - "the Angel of the Lord". - קַנְדַּק בְּרֵד. Rashi also follows Onkelos and explains that it was "the Angel" of the Lord who became like a serpent and sought to kill him.\(^8\)

9. DEUT.4:37 - וַיָּקָם עַל בָּשָׁן - "And brought thee out with His very presence". The word - בָּשָׁן - is a naive conception unbecoming of the Deity. Consequently, Onkelos explains - נַחֲלֶת בְּכֶם מִרְמָה - "And brought thee out with His Memra". Rashi following this principle explains that the word - בָּשָׁן - refers to the intermediate the "Angel" of the Lord, who took them out of Egypt as it is said (EX.14:19). The Angel of God, who had kept in front of the Israelites, moved away to the rear.\(^9\)
GROUP H

Direct and Indirect Softening
(or Free Substitution)

In this chapter we shall deal with several examples in which Onkelos and Rashi have purposely toned down those expressions which somehow seem to disparage the majesty and honour of God. We shall deal with certain expressions of the Hebrew Bible which associate God with some physical or tangible object. We shall further examine in the next chapter Group I - certain expressions which appear to imply the admissability of polytheism.

1. GEN. 33:20 - There he set up an altar and called it El Elohe Israel.

The expression associating God with the altar seems to discredit the honour of God. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down: אָנַּקְסָן תָּמָּן מְרָבָּתָה נְפֶלֶת וְצָלַת קָרֵי אָלָּאָוָּל אָלָּאָוָּלָוָּל

"And he erected an altar and worshipped upon it before God, the God of Israel".

Rashi, in a notable way follows the same principle:

"It does not mean that the altar was named "The God of Israel", (thus bearing a Divine Name), but because the Holy One blessed be He, had been with
him and delivered him, he called the name of the altar by a term that had an allusion to the miracle, so that the praise of God might be recalled when people called it by its name. ¹

2. Similarly, EX.17 "Moses built an altar and named it "Hashem Nissi". The word "Nissi," means "my banner" and so literally the name is "The Lord is my banner". Onkelos, however, cannot equate God with a banner, and accordingly renders: "And Moses built an altar, and ministered upon it before the Lord who had wrought miracles for him.² Rashi also follows his explanation: The Holy One blessed be He, here performed a miracle for us. It does not mean that the altar was named "the Lord, my banner", but the reason for so calling it was that anyone mentioning the altar's name would thereby remember the miracle which the omnipresent had performed.
3. NUM. 23:22 - "It was God that brought them out of Egypt, to whom belongs the strength (literally perhaps uplift of the horns) of a buffalo. Comparing God to some feature that can stand for the strength of that of a buffalo is, of course, disrespectful to the Deity. Onkelos accordingly renders: - "The strength and height (echoing the root of - cf. -  in Psalms 95) are His". Rashi also avoids the anthropomorphism - "God brought them out of Egypt in accordance with the strength [befitting] His sublimity and loftiness".


When it says - - this refers to the vivid "appearance" of the Divine communication i.e. that I enunciate my communication unto him in the clearest form in which it can be put (literally
through visible appearance of the face, i.e. aspect of meaning contained therein) and I do not obscure it in riddles etc. For, should one however, think that it refers to the "appearance of the Shechinah" (i.e. that he saw God) this is excluded by the text (Ex.33:20) — "My face you cannot see".

5. Ex.34:24 — "When you go up these three times to enter the presence of the Lord your God".

The expression "seeing the face of the Lord" is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by saying — לַחֲצָהוּת קְרֵסֵת — "to be seen before the Lord". Rashi, also, interprets likewise:

"And you may be far from the Temple and you will then not be able to appear before Me continually". Rashi was careful to change the preposition, saying — לֹא יְאוֹבֵּית לְךָ — as against the textual expression.

6. Ex.16:33 — "And Moses said...take a jar and put an "Omerful of Manna" therein and lay it up before the Lord".

The idea of putting the jar of manna next to God is
inappropriate. However, while Onkelos translates - לֶחֶם - literally - "before the Lord", Rashi obviates this by explaining: - לֶחֶם - "Before the Ark". In other words the jar of manna should be next to the Ark in the Temple. Thus Rashi weakened the anthropomorphism considerably. 6

7. Similarly LEV. 15 "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord etc..." The idea of slaughtering the animal before the Lord is certainly disturbing. Onkelos again translates literally: - יָדַעְתָּ לֹא בָּרִים לֵבָשׂ - Rashi avoids this by explaining: - לֶחֶם - "In the forecourt of the (Temple - here tacitly identified with the - צֵד - of the Tabernacle) Tabernacle.

8. EX. 33 21 - "Here is a place beside Me. Take your stand on the rock". The expression "there is a place beside Me" is certainly a gross anthropomorphism for it implies that God, like any other human being, can be localised 7. Onkelos translates - הַגָּם אֲחֵי, לָצֵב אֵל אֵל - "Behold there is a place prepared..."
before Me". Rashi has this to say:— מוקים שאשכנז שמח מברך, שומרי המקה אבד אודו אוכל
אזכ בעמקים, שוקוב העמק עלי, עלי והו ימי מקומיו. — A midrashic explanation is that by the word — מקה
Scripture is speaking of the place where the Shechinah is and that He, therefore said, "the place is beside Me", but that He did not say, "I am in the place": because the Holy One, blessed be He, is the place of the Universe (contains the Universe) but His Universe is not His place, (does not encompass Him). One can see how, with a marked theological sensitivity, Rashi has weakened the anthropomorphism considerably.

9. GEN. 6:2
"And the sons of God saw the daughters of men etc..."
The expression "the sons of God" is unacceptable. Consequently Onkelos interprets:— בון ברייב יא "And the great men saw". Rashi, also, tones it down:—
"The sons of princes and rulers". In order to avoid any misunderstanding Rashi goes further and says:—
"Wherever the word — מקה — occurs in the Scriptures it signifies authority and the following passages prove this: (EX.4:16) "And thou shalt be his
GROUP H

- מְלֹא--master", and (EX.7) "See I have made thee - מַלֶּהֶךָ - a master". (See this section - Group I notes 5 and 6).

10. GEN.7 - יַעֲלָהֻה הַכְּנֶסֶת

"And the Lord closed the door on him".

The expression - לְהַעֲלָהֻה - is a gross anthropomorphism. Onkelos tones it down:

- אִמְנַה הֵבִיתָיוֹן לְהוֹדַע - "And the Lord protected him by His word. Rashi follows Onkelos:

- לְהַעֲלָהֻה הֵעֲלָהֻה שֶׁבּוֹרָה - "He (God) protected him so that they could not smash up the Ark".

11. EX.21 - יָדַעְתָּ בְּכֵן עָלָיו בְּגֵרָה

"Then his master shall bring him to God".9

The idea of bringing the slave to God is inappropriate.10 Onkelos, therefore, tones it down by explaining:

- "וַיְבוּשֶׁהְמָה בֵּנוֹ יִרְדָּס - לְךָ נִיא."

"Then his master shall cause him to step before the judges". Rashi takes it in this sense:

- מַגוֹלֵת - לְבֵי הִדָּתָה.
12. Similarly EX. 22 7 - "But if the thief is not found, the owner of the house shall appear before God etc."

The expression "to appear before God" is, once again, unsatisfactory. Onkelos, therefore, explains - ילךפ יניא that the matter must be settled before the "judges". Rashi, too, takes it in this sense:

13. NUM. 24 6 - "like lign-aloes planted by the Lord".

The idea of God planting aromatic plants is certainly objectionable. However while Onkelos translates literally - כמותך robe רועש - Rashi palliates this by explaining - נועש כ - "This plantation is in "Gan Eden". In other words it is less problematical theologically to credit the Deity with sharing in this mystical and metaphorical "plantation".

14. DEUT. 10 9 - "Wherefore Levi hath no portion nor inheritance...the Lord is his inheritance...."
The idea that God is the inheritance of the Levites is certainly objectionable in that it appears to make God an inheritable chattel. Onkelos, therefore, tones it down:

"The gifts (the dues from the sacrifices) which the Lord gave him are his inheritance". 12 Rashi follows Onkelos:

"He (the tribe of Levite) receives his daily portion made ready for him from the King's house". In other words, in the Temple, he receives the dues from the sacrifices.
GROUP I

References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation

1. GEN.3:22 - "Behold, the man has become like one of us", etc. The expression - is certainly disturbing when we bear in mind that Judaism is at war against all polytheism and believes firmly in the idea of monotheism. Rashi, therefore, tones it down by explaining: "He is unique among the terrestrial ones even as I am unique among the celestial ones. And his uniqueness consists of knowing good and evil etc". This interpretation is in accordance with Onkelos who translates: "Behold the man is become unique (alone) in the Universe: it is from himself that he has to learn etc.

2. GEN.1:26 - "We will make man in our image...." Here also the expression - in the plural form is certainly alarming. And it is most interesting to see that while Onkelos is literal, Rashi weakens this expression considerably:
Although no one assisted Him (God) in forming him (the man) and, although this use of the plural may give the heretics an occasion to rebel, yet the text is not inhibited from teaching proper conduct and the virtue of humility, namely, that the greater should consult and take permission from the lesser; for had it been written, I shall make man, we could not then have learnt that God spoke to His judicial council, but to Himself only. And as a refutation to the heretics it is written immediately afterwards (verse 27) and "God created (singular) the man", and it is not written and "they created".

3. Similarly GEN. 11 - "Come, let us go down there and confuse their speech". The expression - דַּעַרְדֵּים in the plural is misleading and could give rise to the idea of polytheism. Onkelos translates closely: -ֶ ובַּאֲרִיָּה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה - "Come, we will be manifested and will confuse their language there etc". Rashi, being aware of this difficulty gives the following explanation.
"He took counsel with His judicial Court because of His exceeding meekness". By this interpretation, Rashi avoided the idea of polytheism, remaining (apparently) blythely oblivious of the anthropomorphic element that he was himself introducing.

4. GEN.20:13 - "When God set me wandering from my father's house". The verb - ויקח - in the plural apparently denotes the concept of polytheism. (We may ignore the possibility that this is deliberate here: Abraham is speaking to Philistines, and may be represented as accommodating himself to the idiom which they would understand). To avoid this, Onkelos, translates: "And it was when the people erred after the works of their hands, that the Lord brought me near to the fear of Himself."

In other words, the verb - ויקח - is not referring to God, but rather to the people worshipping idols. Rashi, who realised the difficulty offers two interpretations. a) - לכו ויקח - that the verb - ויקח - can be explained as Onkelos does. b) - והכרמא כה אשר נאמר ויקח - The verb is in the plural, but do not be puzzled by
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this for in many passages words denoting Godship or denoting authority are grammatically treated as plural, 6 e.g. - נַעֲשֵׂה־אֱלֹהִים - (II SAM.7:23) "Whom God went to redeem". "A Holy God" (JOSH.24:19) - יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים -

5. EX.4:16 - נַעֲשֵׂה־אֱלֹהִים -
"And you will be the god he speaks for".
Taking the text in its literal sense, it means that Moses will be a god to Aaron. To avoid this misunderstanding, Onkelos explains: - נַעֲשֵׂה־אֱלֹהִים - "And you shall be to him as a Master". Rashi follows Onkelos: - לֹא־אֲנִי מֵעָלֶיךָ - "A superior and chief".

6. Similarly EX.7:1 - רָאהָ נָעַשְׂתְּךָ אֱלֹהֵי - "See I have made thee a god to Pharaoh".
The literal meaning of the text is objectionable. Onkelos, therefore, takes - אֱלֹהֵי - in the sense of - מֵעָלֶיךָ "Master". Rashi also takes it in the sense of - מֵעָלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים - a judge and castigator. (cf. this section, Group H, note 9).
7. EX.20 - "Thou shalt have no other gods before My face". Rashi in a notable way displays a fine exegetical feeling: Other gods - which are not in fact gods, but others have made them gods over themselves (i.e. gods of others). It would not be correct to explain this to mean "gods other than Me", for it would be blasphemy of the Most High God to term them gods together with Him. In this comment, Rashi diverges from Onkelos (without quoting him) who actually explains it in this manner. But Rashi goes further as he regards Onkelos' interpretation (which he must of course have known) to be blasphemy to the Most High God.  

8. DEUT.32 - "They sacrificed unto demons, no gods, gods that they knew not". Although the text rejects the worship of the demons as gods, nevertheless the mere fact of calling them gods before the Most High God is certainly objectionable. Rashi, therefore, who realises this implication comments:
Understand this as the Targum does: They sacrifice unto demons which serve no useful purpose for if they were at least any usefulness in them to the world (as e.g. in the sun, the moon and stars) the provocation to anger would not be so intense. In other words, as the demons are of no advantage to the world, they cannot be termed as gods.

In these few examples one can see how Onkelos and Rashi have excluded opportunities for saddling the biblical text with polytheistic interpretations.

**SUMMARY**

In conclusion, one can see from the above classified chapters how Onkelos followed by Rashi have purposely toned down these conceptions which somehow seem to disparage the honour of God. We may say that on the whole, Rashi is also concerned to eliminate possibilities of anthropomorphic interpretation and throughout his commentary his tendency is to remove any action connected with God which might lower his dignity or degrade his character, even if in his anxiety to get rid of the obvious anthropomorphism he sometimes offers exegesis implying, albeit less starkly, anthropomorphism or anthropopathism of another kind.
We have seen also how he endeavours to avoid or moderate many of the representations or conceptions of the human qualities and emotions attributed to the Deity in the Old Testament. Rashi further denied God all attributes of human form, motion, passions and the like. In short, although Rashi was imbued with knowledge of the Halacha and midrashic patterns of thought which were the presupposed in the education and literature of his generation, yet he did not fail to remark on the many instances of anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text and Onkelos' subtlety in disposing of them exegetically. We may therefore conclude that in this field as well as in other fields, Onkelos was certainly a guide and a teacher to Rashi. We may even say that in some areas, as has been proven, the disciple improved upon his master's examples.
We have shown in previous chapters (those on Anthropomorphism) how Onkelos suppressed or moderated many of the anthropomorphisms and apparently naive conceptions of God in the Hebrew Scriptures. In particular, Onkelos substituted positive statements in the place of rhetorical questions found in the Torah. Most probably this was due to the fact that some rhetorical questions could by their very formulation admit the possibility of doubt about the ability of God in executing His will, or in meting out justice to His subjects on earth. Other rhetorical questions as they stand, might seem to cast doubts about the whole concept of monotheism which is fundamental to Judaism.

Without further elaboration we shall now proceed to give a few examples in order to illustrate these points.

1. GEN. 18:25 - "Shall not the judge of all the earth do what is just? The question could imply that God does not mete out justice to His creatures. As this is a blasphemy Onkelos, therefore, couched it in a positive way...:... "He who judges all the earth will surely do justice".
2. **EX.15**: "Who is like thee, O Lord, among the gods". Although it is a rhetorical question, nevertheless the text implies the possibility that there is more than one God, consequently Onkelos tones it down by couching it into a positive statement -

"There is none beside thee, for thou art the God, O Lord."

3. **NUM.23**: "Hath He said, and shall He not do it? Or hath He spoken, and shall He not establish it?" The rhetorical question as it stands could cast doubts on God's ability in executing His will. Consequently Onkelos substitutes it into a positive statement:

"What He hath said He will perform, and His every word is steadfast".

4. **DEUT.**: "What god is there in heaven or on earth who can match thy works and mighty deeds"? Here, too, because of its implication, Onkelos turned it into a positive statement:"..."
"For thou art God, whose Shechinah is in the heavens above, and thou rulest in the earth, and none can do according to thy works, or according to thy might".

Rashi, however, in all these cases does not seem to be concerned with the implication that these rhetorical questions pose and in most of them Rashi simply says: - לשון דאמרי - "The words express a question". Perhaps, however, what Rashi means by - לשון דאמרי- is - "This is a [rhetorical] question"; and he expresses it in this way, due to lack of brief terminology in Hebrew for "rhetorical".

However, in other instances where the biblical phrases seem to impugn the majesty of God or to degrade His character Rashi followed Onkelos, and both endeavoured to tone down the meaning of the biblical text, thus avoiding any adverse implications. Here are a few examples to illustrate this point.

5. GEN.20:13 - "When God set me wandering from my father's house etc...." In addition to the unusual plural (heirofit) as used with - אליהם - when this is - קשר - the idea that God caused Abraham to err is somehow a degradation of God's character. Onkelos, therefore,
translates it - 'מעמם יתברךUb."

"And it was, when the people erred after the works of their hands, the Lord did bring me near to the fear of Himself, etc"...In other words, it was the people who have erred after their idols, but Abraham was brought near to the worship of the true God. Rashi, who was fully aware of the implication of the text comments:- "Onkelos translates it in his own way". In other words the theological difficulty can be circumvented in the light of Onkelos' interpretation.

6. GEN.216 - התאמה שרה שלח עשת ל, אהליס
And Sarah said "God hath made me a person to be laughed at"...... This expression as it stands, could certainly raise curious speculations regarding God's character. Onkelos, therefore, takes the word - מוהו - (laugh) to mean - עשת - joy:

"And Sarah said the Lord hath made me to have gladness; everyone who heareth will rejoice at my [fortune]."

Rashi also takes it in this sense: - 'מעמם - שמה ל.
It means whoever hears it will rejoice on my account.
In the same way the N.E.B. translates: - "God has given me good reason to laugh, and everybody who hears will laugh with me".

Sometimes, however, while Onkelos translates literally, Rashi goes further and removes all sorts of improprieties which could be imputed to God's character. - e.g. EX.21:12-13 - מַעֲשֵׂה יְחָוָן - אַשְׁרֵי לְאֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה יִשְׂרֵאֵל לְאַחֲרֵיהֶם

"Whoever strikes another man and kills him shall be put to death. But if he did not act with intent, but they met by act of God, etc...."

The question, however, arises if the man did not premeditate the blow why should this be brought about by God? While Onkelos translates literally: - "וַיְנַשֵּׁב מֵאֵימוֹ נַחֲשָׁב לוֹ אֵלֶיךָ יִשְׂרֵאֵל לְאַחֲרֵיהֶם לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאָשׁוּךָ לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי לְאֵרֵי L - Rashi explains the cause and reason, and thus avoids any possible maligning of God's character - "Scripture, here is speaking of two men, one of whom killed a person with premeditation and the other killed inadvertently, and in neither case were there witnesses to testify about the matter. Consequently, the former was not put to death and the latter was not forced to go to a city of refuge (cf. NUM.35:11). Now God brings them together to the same inn (רֶוְרֵשָׁת - lodging
place). He who killed with premeditation happens to sit beneath a ladder, and the other who killed inadvertently ascends the ladder and falls, [when descending it12], upon the man who killed with premeditation and kills him. Witnesses now being present they testify against him, so compelling him to be banished to one of the cities of refuge. The result is that he who killed inadvertently is actually banished and he who killed with premeditation actually suffers death”.13 This rehearsal by Rashi of the hypothetical elaboration of this text as treated in his Rabbinic sources is simply to avoid all theological awkwardness which might arise from the scriptural text regarding apparently arbitrary action on the part of God.

8. In EX.157 - 'יהוה ק_moves - "Thou hast overthrown them that rose up against thee". To say that God has enemies sounds disrespectful. Onkelos, therefore, paraphrases the text: - 'יהוה ק_moves "And in the greatness of thy might thou hast broken down those who rose against thy people". Rashi in the name of the Mehilta makes it clear that the enemies of Israel are considered God's enemies.14
LEV. 24:11 - "He the Israelite woman's son uttered the Holy Name in blasphemy".

Onkelos does not translate: - יְבִי - by - יְבִי - (cf. EX. 21:17) but rather - יְבִי - and angered.
INTRODUCTION

Veneration of the Patriarchs and their Descendants

Onkelos displays great respect for the Patriarchs and Matriarchs and where the biblical phrases reveal them in an untoward light, Onkelos suppresses the literal meaning and substitutes an alternative phrase or word, thus avoiding any adverse implications. Without further elaboration the following verses illustrate this point:

1. In GEN. 31:30 יתני את כל בניו...לחצ גנבעת את אולר, - "I know that you went away... but why did you steal my gods?"

On the word - מְשִׁיט - "stolen", Onkelos did not translate literally as this would be a disrespect to the Patriarch Jacob, making him into a common thief, he therefore suppressed the literal meaning and instead translated it by לִיָּה נַסְכָּתָא יִבְּקַר - why have you taken אֱלֹהִים my god?

2. Similarly in GEN. 31:26-27 - The phrase - עָקַב בְּיוֹן - "that thou hast stolen away my heart, and (v. 27) עָקַב בְּיוֹן - "and steal away from me", idiomatic expressions for, to take advantage of a person’s ignorance (of יְהוָה) are once again toned down by Onkelos and in both cases he translates - (v. 26)

And Laban said to Jacob what have you done that you
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have concealed from me. In v. 27 - is translated by - and did
hide [it] from me. 3

3. Also in verse 32 - on the phrase - "And Jacob knew not that Rachel had
stolen them".
Onkelos translates - "And Jacob knew not that Rachel took them" (The Taraphim).
Once again to save the honour of Rachel, Onkelos evinces a subtle nicety of expression.

4. In GEN. 32 21 - "And he (Jacob) ran away with all that he had etc..."
The equivalent Aramaic word for - is - - and he fled, but once again to
protect Jacob from possible imputations of cowardice, Onkelos translates - - and he went. 5

Having illustrated with a few examples Onkelos' method of reverence to the Patriarchs and their wives, we may say that in general Rashi follows Onkelos' method. Before setting out the details of Rashi's attitude towards Onkelos in this connection, a division of the main points in this area may facilitate comprehension.
of Rashi's utilization of Onkelos' comments.
The Groups are as follows:-

**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.
1. **GEN.31:19** - "And Rachel stole the Teraphim" - Rashi says, "her intention was to wean her father (Laban) from idol worship".¹ Although Rashi has not suppressed the literal meaning of the word - יבשה - as Onkelos did, yet the reader can see that Rashi in his own way endeavoured also to play down the "sin of theft" and he, therefore, toned it down by the fact that Rachel's intention was for the good.

2. In **GEN.26:10** - יאמר אבימלך... כמעש себך אחור הערים - "And Abimelech said, why have you treated us like this? One of the people might easily have gone to bed with your wife and then you would have made us liable to retribution". On the words - חמשה ימים - Onkelos translates - ו фильм יומ‎ - "the one singled out from the people". In other words, not just an ordinary person for such casual availability would imply disrespect to the Matriarch Rebekah, Onkelos, therefore, takes --single- in the sense of - ראש - "special one". Rashi follows his interpretation exactly - ויאמריהו יבשה, אחור הערים and explains that this means the "singular", i.e. pre-eminent individual of the population viz., the "king".²
"And Rachel said, wrestlings of God have wrestled with my sister....and she called his name Naphtali". 

Onkelos, quoted by Rashi, does not render in the sense of "wrestling", for this might give rise to the misapprehension that the sisters were actually fighting one another. He, therefore, takes it in the sense of - "prayer". Thus, once again by suppressing the literal meaning, Onkelos and Rashi have protected the honour of the Matriarchs.

"The boys grew up... but Jacob led a settled life and stayed among the tents".

Onkelos refuses to accept that Jacob was just a "plain man" (unimpaired, i.e. of unimpaired integrity; but in Rabbinic Hebrew - simple, unintellectual), who abides in tents, like nomads and shepherds who tend their flock. Therefore, to save Jacob's intellectual credit, Onkelos takes in the sense of a complete (perfect) man. Rashi, once again, follows his method and thus he says - means - "as his heart so was his mouth" - in other words, his thoughts and his words tallied, as they ought to, in a "perfect man".
5. GEN.25\textsuperscript{27b} - With regard to - עָשָׂה אָבֵךְ לְיִשָׂרָאֵל - Onkelos portrays the great delight of Jacob in studying Torah and he therefore interprets - אָבֵךְ לְיִשָׂרָאֵל - not in its literal sense but rather - מַעְטָר בְּבֵית אֹבֵד - "And Jacob ministering in the house of instruction". Rashi\textsuperscript{6} also follows this interpretation and says that the Patriarch was studying in the schools of Shem and Eber.\textsuperscript{7}

6. GEN.27\textsuperscript{35} - "וַיֹּאמֶר בְּנוֹ וַיֵּשֶׂרֶב לֵבָן - "And he said your brother came treacherously and took away your blessing".

Out of respect for Jacob, Onkelos followed by Rashi (without quoting his name) declined to take the word בָּמְרָם - in the sense of "deceitfulness",\textsuperscript{8} - and they, therefore, translated it in the sense of - חַכָּם - "cleverness" and subtlety.\textsuperscript{9}

7. GEN.29\textsuperscript{17} - "וְיָיִן לְאָרָם יָרוּד - Leah was dull-eyed\textsuperscript{10} (ךְָרוּד - tender).

Out of consideration for the image of Leah, Onkelos refuses to accept that Leah was "dull-eyed", and he therefore explains - רֹדֲדָה - by - יָרוּד - "beautiful". Rashi who does not seem to suppress the literal meaning of the word - רֹדֲדָה - (ךְָרוּד - tender)
nevertheless palliates it by adding that Leah’s eyes were tender because “she thought she would have to fall to the lot of Esau and she therefore wept continually, because everyone said, Rebekah has two sons, Laban for has two daughters – the elder daughter/the elder son, the youngest daughter for the younger son”.

8. GEN.27:19

"Jacob answered his father, I am Esau, your elder son". Rashi who refuses to believe that the Patriarch Jacob deceived his father and told a lie, suppresses the obvious literal meaning of the text by dividing it and interprets – אֹדֶךָ לְעַשְׁיַ בְּכֵם – "I am" he[ that brings food to you ], and Esau is your first born". 12

In verse 24 – when his father Isaac asked him (Jacob) again, "Are you really my son Esau ?" Jacob replied – יְנָא – "I am". It is unequivocally clear from his answer that Jacob lied to his father. And yet, Rashi, once again refuses to accept this, and he therefore comments – ילָּא אָמַר אֶל֖וּ בְּעַשְׁיַ בְּכֵם – he did not say "I am Esau" – but "It is I". The reader can see that Rashi was compelled to do so as he could not acknowledge the possibility that the Patriarch Jacob would tell a lie. Ps. Jonathan and
Onkelos, however, showed no concern for this and translated the text literally. In other instances, however, while Rashi shows no concern and does not comment on the text, Onkelos to save the Matriarch's honour, paraphrases the biblical remarks which appear to cast a shadow on it.

9. GEN.27:13 - יתאפרל לי אמר עליי קדלייתך בן "His mother answered him, let the curse fall on me my son etc..."

Onkelos interprets as follows: - אמרת לי אימתיי - "And his mother said to him, Unto me it hath been said in prophecy, that there shall be no curses upon thee, my son; only obey me, and go and take for me".

Onkelos refuses to accept the possibility that the curses would accrue to the Matriarch Rebekah. It is also unacceptable to say that Jacob was satisfied and ready to meet his father Isaac, once his mother accepted upon herself any curse which Isaac might pronounce; for if that were the case then it would imply a complete disrespect to his mother, and Jacob would have transgressed one of the ten commandments - "Honour your Father and Mother" (EX.20:12; DEUT.5:16).
Onkelos, being confronted with this difficulty, paraphrases the text out of consideration for Rebekah and Jacob, and thus he separates the word -יל - "upon me" from the word -לאר - "your curse". And to fill up the gap he adds that -170 - "unto me it hath been said in prophecy that there shall be no curses upon thee my son". There is, however, no comment on this verse on the part of Rashi.

10. GEN. 31:39 'לארלעג א числеת ל...הברך ירי וกายני לוות 'I have never brought to you the body of any animal... you claimed compensation from me for anything stolen by day or by night".

The suffix of -יוניב - is not the first person singular possessive, but the "hireq compaginis". It appears that Onkelos declined to translate -יוניב - literally "my theft" because the similarity of -יוניב - to -יוניב - might give rise to the misconception that the Patriarch stole from Laban. He therefore subtly translates it by -ברואהו ירה - 'I kept", which is in fact the meaning implicit in the context. Rashi, too, although he is not worried about the wording of the text, in his own way, tries to defend the Patriarch by saying that
"everything I paid back whether, that which was stolen by day or, that which was stolen by night". 18

In several instances, Onkelos, followed by Rashi, in his textual interpretations understands the good characteristics of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs and emphasises their moral worth. Also both Onkelos and Rashi make prominent the Patriarch's great delight in the study of the Torah, the fear of God, and the worship of the God they have discovered. Here are a few examples to illustrate these points.

11. GEN.24:67 - "And Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent..." Onkelos gratuitously introduces references to the noble ways of Sarah: "למענה את הראשה וואז אווא - "And Isaac brought her to the tent, and he saw that her deeds were upright as the deeds of Sarah his mother".... Rashi, 19 who follows Onkelos elaborates on this subject and thus he explains: while 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".
12. GEN. 18:8 - "...And waited on them himself under the tree while they ate".

Onkelos interprets - "ויומד - by - משה - "And he (Abraham) served them". Although Abraham thought that the three Angels were merely Arabs, worshipping idols, yet he himself served them and came to their aid. Rashi does not comment on the word - and we can assume that he follows the interpretation of Onkelos as the latter interpretation is self-evident from the context itself by its combination - stand in attendance upon.

13. GEN. 12:5 - "And Abraham took Sarai... all the property they had collected, and the dependants they had acquired in Haran...."

Onkelos explains - "ויכו נפשותיו והשלים_continuous - by - קדשים - "And the souls whom they had made subject to the law". Rashi also emphasises their missionary endeavours by saying that Abraham and Sarah brought the "souls of Haran" beneath the sheltering wings of the Shechinah, and converted them to recognise the true God.
14. GEN. 24:63 - "And Isaac went out to meditate..."
Onkelos takes - לברוח - to mean - לברוח - to pray.
Rashi also takes it in this sense.

15. GEN. 48:22 - "I have given to thee... with my sword and with my bow".
Onkelos renders - בברווז - with my prayer and with my supplication. Rashi also explains likewise - "his (Jacob) wisdom and his prayer". According to Onkelos and Rashi, the Patriarchs were not warmongers who relied on their physical strength but rather on their spiritual weapons. In other words in prayer and supplication to God to save them from all troubles.
1. GEN.34:34 - "Jacob's sons gave a dishonest reply to Shechem and his father Hamor...."

Replying to Shechem with dishonesty is certainly difficult to reconcile with the ethics ideally presupposed in the Patriarch's sons. Consequently Onkelos tones it down by translating:

"And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father with subtlety etc".

Rashi, without quoting Onkelos, explains likewise:

"And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father with subtlety etc".

Rashi who follows Onkelos' interpretation renders the word - מְדִינָה - by - מְדִינָה - "merchant".

One can justify their interpretation only by assuming their similarity with the tradition, later embodied in Nahmanides's comment, that the Patriarchs and their sons were instructed not to intermarry with Canaanite
women. It is, therefore, almost impossible to contemplate that Judah transgressed this principle accepted among his family. Consequently out of consideration for Judah's honour Onkelos and Rashi suppressed the literal meaning of the text, and translated the word - 'דרן' - by "merchant". Sometimes in places where Onkelos translates literally, Rashi works independently and tries to save the reputation of the Patriarchs' sons. Thus in GEN.35.22 - "While Israel was living in that district, Reuben went and lay with his father's concubine Bilhah etc." Although the biblical text says clearly - בָּּּלֵל "And he lay" - Rashi, to save Reuben's honour, suppresses the literal meaning of the text and comments that "because he had disturbed Jacob's couch, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had actually sinned in this manner. But why did he disturb his couch? When Rachel died Jacob removed his bed, which was always in Rachel's tent and put it in Bilhah's tent. Reuben came and protested against the slight this inflicted on his mother (Leah). He said: if my mother's sister was her rival is that any reason why the handmaid of my mother's sister (Bilhah) should become a rival to her? On this account, therefore, he disturbed the couch".
On the other hand, it is interesting to note that while the Targumim follow the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis, Onkelos renders literally: "And Reuben went and slept with Bilhah."

4. GEN.39:11 - "One day he came into the house as usual to do his work etc."
Rab and Shemuel in Bab. Tal. Sot.37 differ as to what - "to do his work" - means. Rab holds: - his actual housework; the other says that it means to associate with her, but a vision of his father’s face appeared to him and Joseph resisted temptation and did not sin. Onkelos, faithful to his principle of saving the reputation of the Patriarchs and their sons, chose the opinion of the one who says that Joseph came to do his actual "housework". Thus he interprets - "And it was on this day that he came into the house to examine the records of his accounts, etc". Rashi, however, although he quoted the two different opinions of Rab and Shemuel, nevertheless, unlike Onkelos, he did not see the purpose of deciding on which view
to accept, as, at any rate, Joseph's honour is saved, for both Rabbis agree that as Scripture made clear, he did not sin.

5. GEN. 42:7 - וַיַּכְנסוּ אֶת אָנָּיו... "And when [Joseph] saw his brothers, he recognised them but pretended not to know them etc."
Rashi explains - "He made himself like a stranger to them in his conversation, speaking harshly. Onkelos, on the other hand, refused to say that Joseph behaved like a stranger to his brethren, and he therefore translates - "And considered what he should say to them".

6. Similarly, GEN. 37:18 - וַיַּכְנסוּ אֵלָיו... "They plotted to kill him".
Rashi whose main concern is the etymology of words explains: - "They (the brothers) were filled with plots and craft". Onkelos on the other hand, who is not so particular about the etymology of the textual words, but keeps rather to the subject matter, translates in both places - "And considered" - and - "they considered" - respectively. The reader can see that Onkelos refuses to accept that Joseph was like "a stranger" to his
brothers, nor for that matter that the brothers who were righteous people, conspired to kill him. Onkelos, therefore, comes to their defence, and saves their reputation by toning down the Hebrew text which seems to reflect on their character.

On the other hand, when the text speaks about the Heathen, Onkelos does not come to their defence and translates the text as it stands, e.g. NUM.25

"For they distress you with their guiles, wherewith they have beguiled you etc", 15 - Onkelos translates as follows:

And Joseph said.....you might have known that a man like myself would practise divination".

Once again, out of consideration for Joseph, Onkelos suppressed the literal meaning of "divination". It is impossible for Joseph to use divination, an act forbidden by the Torah. 17 (LEV.1926; DEUT.1810). Consequently, Onkelos plays it down and interprets as follows:

"Did you not know that a man like me is capable of inspection......"
Rashi, although he was not meticulous in his choice of words since he is prepared to use the word - הָנִית - in his interpretation, nevertheless comes to the defence of Joseph. And explains this "Are you not aware that so distinguished a person as I, knows how to divine, to discover by my own intelligence and commonsense, or by logical deduction that it was you who stole the goblet". The latter part of Rashi is merely an explanation as to the meaning of divination in this context. In other words Joseph's divination consisted merely of the application of commonsense and intelligence, but an act of divination proper was not committed by Joseph.

9. GEN. 49.6 - שֵׁם-עֶזרוֹן, וַילָי, אָחֵי בֶּן-יִשְׂרָאֵל, כֵּלִים מִכְּרַחְיָם - "Simon and Levi are brothers, their spades became weapons of violence".

Out of consideration for the image of Simeon and Levi, Onkelos refuses to accept that the Patriarch's sons dealt in violence, he therefore - followed by Rashi in his second interpretation - explains that - and - מִכְּרַחְיָהוֹן - interchanging ) - their sojournings. Onkelos' translation reads as follows: - בְּאֵמוֹת הָאָבוֹת מָיִם - "In their land of their sojournings,
they acted mightily". 21

10. GEN.497 - אֱלֹהַ נַכְשֵׁנָם תִּשְׁכַּה יִ֖עָל שָֽׁמַעְתָּן לֹֽאִלְּאָוִ֖י לֵמֶרֶבֶת יְתַחְדָּסָו - "A curse be on their anger because it was fierce". To save the honour of Simeon and Levi, Ps. Jonathan, the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti believe that the Patriarch cursed the city of Shechem and not his children's anger:

לֹֽאִלְּאָוִי לֵמֶרֶבֶת יְתַחְדָּסָו - "Accursed was the town of Shechem when Simeon and Levi entered to destroy it in their wrath". Perhaps, Onkelos should also be understood in their wrath". Perhaps, Onkelos should also be understood in the light of the Palestinian Targumim:

לֹֽאִלְּאָוִי לֵמֶרֶבֶת יְתַחְדָּסָו - that the city of Shechem was cursed and that is why the brothers venged their anger. In this particular instance Rashi does not follow the Targumim and believes that the text is self-explanatory, namely that the Patriarch did not curse his children but rather their anger:

אָמָּרוֹ הַשֶּׁנֶּרֶךְ - "יהוה חזק אלהים" - וְיֵשֵׁב נָא עָלָם -
Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses

1. NUM.12 1

"And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite woman etc".

It appears that in those days marrying an "Ethiopian" i.e. negroid woman was regarded, somehow, as not done. Consequently out of respect to Moses, Onkelos translates - ימיה אשת חשביה - by - התחתת חשביה - "a beautiful woman". Rashi, too, follows his translation and thus he says: "This tells us that all agree as to her beauty just as all agree as to the blackness of an Ethiopian". Rashi goes on to explain that the numerical value of the word - כשיה - is the same (736) as that of - יפה כליה - a woman of beautiful appearance. And so Onkelos and Rashi out of respect for Moses take - כشعار - to mean beautiful.

2. NUM.11 17 - Rashi says understand - רבייה - as the Targum does: - 'זוכר - "And I shall induct into a position of authority." The verb למד - seems in the context to mean "to withdraw", and perhaps it is more appropriate to take it in the sense of - בטלי - "to set apart". In fact in GEN.31 9 Onkelos translates - אביו (דלי) - by - אביו (דרי) - (cf. Rashi GEN.27 36 - הנל אדליה (דלי) לשל הפצה כמיוויא). Perhaps, however, out of respect for Moses, Onkelos and Rashi refused to take it in the sense "to withdraw"
for otherwise it would appear that Moses' spirit would be diminished once God would place it upon the Elders of Israel, hence — שמודי, ויליה יתא. In other words as Rashi explains in the name of the Siphre:

"What was Moses like to at that moment? He was like to a light that is placed in a candlestick at which everybody lights his candle (or lamp) and yet its illuminating power is not at all diminished: 5"

3. Again NUM.11:25 — "...as the spirit alighted on them, they fell into a prophetic ecstasy, for the first and only time". Rashi quotes two explanations to the words — "They prophesied only on that day alone". 6

Onkelos, however, rendered — and they did not cease, meaning that the gift of prophecy never again departed from them. 7

Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti interpret likewise:— Perhaps Onkelos refused to take it in the former sense since in this particular instance the gift of prophecy was bestowed by Moses upon Eldad and Medad and
therefore in his honour the spirit never departed from them.

4. **NUM.11**

"Am I their mother?"
Onkelos declined to interpret - in its literal sense and making Moses as a mother he therefore translates - 

"Am I father to all this people". This change can be either out of respect to Moses or might be linguistic commonsense. Rashi does not comment on the text. Most probably he took it as a common expression used in biblical times.

5. **EX.4**

"Then the Lord said....and when he drew it out the skin was diseased, white as snow".
Onkelos translates the words by - by - - - - - and the word - is usually translated by . (See LEV.13:1-28).

However, in the verse in question, Onkelos has omitted the word . Perhaps here too, out of respect for Moses, Onkelos has deleted this word.
from his Targum, so as not to make Moses even temporarily a leper. Since the biblical treatment of מַעֲנֵי - "leprosy" - apparently implies some moral as well as physical taint, necessitating the bringing of a sin-offering on recovery. Rashi, somehow does not seem to be concerned with Onkelos' remarks.
GROUP D

Veneration of Aaron, The Priests and the People of Israel.

1. EX. 32 - "And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it".  
Some Rabbis in the Midrash are of the opinion that Aaron built the Altar to the golden calf, and not to God. 
Onkelos who translates - קַבּוּל - by - נָדַב וְעָתָנָא - seems to reject the above mentioned opinion for otherwise he would have translated - קַבּוּל - by - מָזַח - which is the usual translation given by Onkelos when sacrifices are offered to idols.
Rashi, too, who has much in common with Onkelos, in his own way endeavours to defend Aaron and thus minimises his sin. Rashi points out that Aaron undertook to build the Altar single-handed because he was confident that during the long time that it would take him to build it, Moses would return and that they would revert to the worship of the omnipresent.

2. EX. 24 - "But the Lord did not stretch out his hands towards the leaders of Israel. They saw God; and they ate and they drank".
Rashi interprets - "they gazed at him uninhibitedly (אִתְכּוּנַיָּרִים) 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. In other words Onkelos does not take it in a depreciative sense as implying that Nadab and Abihu and the Elders 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. Although perhaps, Rashi does not seem to favour Onkelos' interpretation, yet it is clear that Onkelos interpreted so only out of respect for Nadab, Abihu and the Elders and thus covered up for their sins which Rashi had pointed out.

3. In all instances where the Torah refers to "priests", whether priests ministering to God or other duties the Torah describes them as "Cohanim". Onkelos, however, out of respect for the priests of God, differentiates between those who minister to God for whom he uses the term - קָנָן "Cohanim" and those of other Deities, for whom he uses the term - קָנָן. Furthermore, in GEN.41.45 - (כָּנָן) EX.2.16 - (כָּנָן), and EX.3.1 - (כָּנָן). Onkelos points out that in these instances the term "Cohen" does not denote "minister", but rather - קָנָן - one of high rank.
In all these cases, Rashi follows the distinction made by Onkelos, and thus he says in GEN. 47 - without quoting Onkelos: "The term "Cohen" always means one who ministers to a Deity except in those cases where it denotes one of high rank, e.g. EX. 2 - Jethro the chief of Midian", and GEN. 41 - the Chief of On".

4. Furthermore, Onkelos displays great respect to the Israelites e.g. EX. 1 - "Now the Israelites were fruitful and prolific etc." The word - is literally "they swarmed" - a word used of the profusion of reptiles. Consequently out of respect to the children of Israel, Onkelos substitutes - "they propagated".

5. Again DEUT. 32 - "debased people". Onkelos seems to paraphrase the verse without translating the word - , and thus he says: - "these are the people who received the Torah but are unwise". Perhaps this omission is out of
consideration for the honour of Israel.

6. Again GEN.27\textsuperscript{46} - "יְהוָה יִבְנֵי בֵית", EX.1\textsuperscript{12} - "יְהוָה יְבֵית", EX.1\textsuperscript{12} - יְהוָה יִבְנֵי בֵית - NUM.21\textsuperscript{5} - יְהוָה יְבֵית - NUM.22\textsuperscript{3} - יְהוָה יִבְנֵי בֵית - בְּנֵי יְהוָה יְבֵית - יְהוָה יְבֵית. In all these places, out of consideration for the Israelites Onkelos substituted the verb - יִבְנֵי בֵית - [which means - יִבְנֵי בֵית - "despised" - ] by the Aramaic verb - יִבְנֵי בֵית (or יִבְנֵי בֵית) to harass, to press, trouble.\textsuperscript{13}
Two of the earliest Palestinian Targumim on the Torah are the Jerusalem Targum I, also known as Ps. Jonathan, and the Jerusalem Targum II, also known as the Fragment Targum. The Jerusalem I had the letters - 'ר' as an abbreviation for - יונתן - and in the 14th century A.D. this was erroneously taken for "Targum Jonathan", hence the appellative - Pseudo-Jonathan ¹. This Targum is practically complete and it consists of Peshat, Halacha and Haggadah. On the whole the Haggadah and Halacha of this Targum is in harmony with that of the Mishna, Talmudim and other Rabbinic works such as the Mechilta, Siphre, and Siphra. The legends which are attached to biblical events, as well as reward and punishment and other ethical elements mentioned in this Targum are in accordance with Rabbinic views. Messianic hopes as well as a brighter future for the people of Israel are vividly portrayed in this Targum. This Targum has also a highly developed angelology and in a dramatic way it describes how millions of Angels descended with God to Egypt for the killing of the firstborn. ² In short most likely the author's attempt was not merely to provide a translation ³ to the biblical text but also an elaborate exposition with full midrashic interpretations which were current in his lifetime.
Having made this short introduction let us now analyse whether Rashi, who is our main subject, has used Ps. Jonathan's Targum or not? According to A. Berliner, Rashi has not seen Ps. Jonathan's Targum and this is why he has never quoted him. In the Babylonian Talmud, Git.p.8a Rashi, however, mentions the Jerusalem Targum -כ"ו תור (תאמרין ל不尽) ותיכנן 提 ירושליםаницה -

Berliner, however, believes that originally in Rashi's text the abbreviation -כ"ו - which stands for "Talmud Jerusalem" was mentioned, and at a later time the printers erroneously took it for "Targum Jerusalem". This is not convincing as other commentators quoted the same translation in the name5 of Jerusalem Targum. Furthermore the Jerusalem Talmud does not speak about the "Mount Hor" in question.

There is, however, every reason to believe that Rashi's text is correct and that he had in mind Ps. Jonathan for the latter translates -כ"ו (NUM.34) - byםיinations - which is the equivalent of - which is the equivalent of - - quoted by Rashi. Most probably, Rashi was not careful in quoting the exact words of the Jerusalem Targum and quoted - as the talmudical text.
has it.

In Babylonian Talmud, Baba Metsia, p. 21, Rashi explains the mishnaic word - כַּרְיָוָּהָ - "bundles" - as follows:

"The word - כַּרְיָוָּהָ - means small bundles as the Jerusalem Targum translates on GEN.ch.37.

--Behold we were binding sheaves etc". Here, too, Berliner believes that this comment is not from Rashi but an interpolation from a later writer since Ps. Jonathan's Targum translates

- מַפְכַּרְיָוָּהָ פִּירָוָּ - by - כַּרְיָוָּהָ אָמַלְמִים (כֵּרֶךְ) - to tie dry ears - hence to bind sheaves.

This is not conclusive as most probably Rashi had a different reading in Ps. Jonathan. Indeed I am inclined to believe that Rashi had before him the Neofiti version (or part of it) which is also a Palestinian Targum and there the reading is - כַּרְיָוָּה - as Rashi has it.

In addition in his commentary on GEN.Rabbah, Rashi quotes the Jerusalem Targum. It reads as follows:

And the sons of Dedan were Asurim and Leumim and Leumim.

בְּטֶרֶזֶים יִוְעַלָּם מֵסֶרֶף בְּעַל הַיּוֹ אָשַׁרְיָה - מִלְאוֹעֶשֶׁי - לַחָּטָם - לִפְרוֹע - לַחָּטָם - לִפְרוֹע - לִפְרוֹע - לִפְרוֹע
The Jerusalem Targum interprets — לְעַנְיָהּ — by successful business men, and — לְשָׁם — by those who sharpen (or polish) the metal. This interpretation is found once again in Neofiti who translate the text by — נַעֲרֵי יָדֵי וְלֹא נַעֲרִי — business men, spear bearer (or guardsmen) and heads of tribes.

We may, therefore, say that Rashi did not possess Ps. Jonathan while he wrote his commentary on the Torah, but that it came into his hands at a later time when he revised his commentary and entered into it many interpretations of Ps. Jonathan without mentioning his name or just by saying "Understand the verse as the Targum does": The fact that he does not mention him by name is not at all surprising when we bear in mind that Rashi did not quote his sources. Furthermore, Rashi on the Torah, rarely quotes even Jonathan on the prophets by name, although the Talmud knows him as the author of the Targum on the prophets. He simply quotes his translation and says — מֵעֲרֵי לָא — or — מֵעֲרֵי לָא —.

Whether Rashi possessed the whole commentary of Ps. Jonathan as we have it in its present form is certainly open to question. But there is reason to assume that he had parts of it, and especially when
we see that some of Rashi's interpretations correspond to those of Ps. Jonathan and not the Midrashim available to us.
Here are a few examples to illustrate that Rashi had before him some texts of Ps. Jonathan and used the latter interpretations without saying - כותרת

1. GEN.3:22 - "The man has become like one of us etc...."
Rashi interprets - "דָּא תְּאוֹרֵךְ כְּאֶחָד מִכֹּל מָשָּׁרִים - כִּמָּה שָׁאָמְרָה יְיָ בָּעֲלוֹת מִדְּרוּשָׁתָה - ..."
This phraseology of Rashi is identical with that of Ps. Jonathan: - "וְזֶה אַלְפְּבֵי נוֹעֲרֵי בְּאֶרֶץ - הָיבָּסָמֶא נְאֶסְפָא יִמְּדֵי בּוֹשֶׁה דְּרָכָם - "Behold man is unique among the terrestrial ones, even as I am unique among the celestial ones".

2. GEN.4:15 - "So the Lord put a mark on Cain, in order that anyone meeting him should not kill him".
Rashi explains - "וְזֶה - מִסְתַּוּ רָק לָא גֵּדָה מְצָמֵיו בְּמִרְבָּא - He (God) inscribed on his forehead a letter of the Divine Name. It is the same in Ps. Jonathan: - "וְרָשַׁמֶה כַּלְכָּל אֲפֵי לְכַלְכָּל אֲתָמָא מָלְשֵׁא בָּבַּא - ..."
3. GEN.16:12 - ויהי הע资产管理 על ארץ ירדן: "He shall be a man like the wild ass....and every man's band against him".
Rashi explains - לכוצל על ענקים, עמהו אויבים: Everyone will hate him and attack him.
Ps. Jonathan - כי, יהיה, הובא יושב עשקה לאבנו זה -

4. GEN.19:4 - 'ויפרכו של מקרן - ושיה: "Before they lay down to sleep, the men [of the city] of Sodom"
Rashi says: - והשכו של מקרן: The real sense of the text is: the men of the city, wicked men...
Ps. Jonathan - והשכו של מקרן - רבקרה

5. GEN.24:22 - היה הגדול ניאו וחבר בתשע - "...the man took a gold nose-ring weighing half a shekel..."
Rashi explains: - ובקר_likeו שהקרן, שבחלם: Beka - a symbol of the shekels of the Israelites of...
which it is said (EX. 38) "Beka (half a shekel) a head".
Two bracelets - a symbol of the two tablets of stone, joined one to another.

Whilst the Derash regarding the "two bracelets" is mentioned in GEN. Rabbah, 60.6, the symbol regarding the "Beka" is found in none of the older sources except in Ps. Jonathan. 25

6. GEN. 3011 - "Leah said, good fortune has come".
Rashi explains: - הבאה - הבא מואר שבת...
Ps. Jonathan 26 - ואמרת להאה אתאה מואר שבת -

7. GEN. 3127 - "Why did you slip away secretly (lit. steal away from me) without telling me".
Rashi - תעלע לך: - "you did steal away my mind".
Ps. Jonathan is exactly the same - למא א-Barך - "you did steal away my mind".
Neofiti gives also the same interpretation in verse 26:-
8. GEN. 31:39 - "You claimed compensation from me for anything stolen by day or by night".
Rashi explains: - whether stolen by day or stolen by night - everything I paid back.
Ps. Jonathan 27 - He repented, so mercy must be shown upon you, - you brought me and all my servants to hara, where I have been.

9. GEN. 31:54 - And summoned his kinsmen to the feast (lit. to eat bread).
Rashi - His brethren - those of his friends who were with Laban.
Ps. Jonathan 28 - And the brethren of Joseph asked him.

10. GEN. 37:30 - "The boy is not there. Where can I go?"
Rashi explains: - Whither can I flee from my father's grief?"
Ps. Jonathan 29 -
11. GEN. 49 —
"For in their anger they killed men, wantonly they hamstrung oxen".
Rashi explains:-
They desired to exterminate Joseph who is called "ox" etc....
The Palestinian Targum reads:-
And in their desire they sold their brother Joseph who is compared to an ox.

12. EX. 2 —
"...and seeing there was no one about he struck the Egyptian down...."
Rashi -
When he saw that there was no man destined to issue from him, who would become a convert to Judaism....
Ps. Jonathan -

13. EX. 29 —
".....and put it on the lobes of the right ears of Aaron and his sons...."
Rashi explains - 

This is the inner cartilage which is within the ear...

While Onkelos and Neofiti take it to mean - the high part of the ear - Ps. Jonathan is exactly like Rashi -

14. NUM.14 10 - "...the glory of the Lord appeared to them all in the tent of the Presence".

Rashi -

The Glory of the Lord - i.e. the cloud descended there. Ps. Jonathan 33 - בכרח, קדמתו שונים ממנה -

15. NUM.21 18 - "The spring unearthed by the princes...."

Rashi -

This is the well which the princes, Moses and Aaron dug.

Ps. Jonathan 34 - הסורים ירח שלא הורו -
16. NUM. 27: *He must appear before Elazar the priest, who will obtain a decision for him by consulting.*

Rashi - "And ask of him - whenever he finds it necessary to go forth to war."

Ps. Jonathan - "and do not make yourselves a carved figure of everything which the Lord your God has commanded you."

17. DEUT. 4:35 - "...and do not make yourselves a carved figure of everything which the Lord your God has commanded you."

Rashi - i.e. which He commanded thee not to make.

Ps. Jonathan - "And do not make yourselves a carved figure of everything which the Lord your God has commanded you."

18. DEUT. 33:20 - "...tearing an arm or a scalp".

Rashi - Those whom they slew could easily be recognised, because they used to cut off the head together with the arm at one blow.
Furthermore in some instances Rashi says - כותרות - "Understand this as the Targum does" - and his interpretation corresponds to that of Ps. Jonathan and not to Onkelos. But sometimes by the expression - כותרות - Rashi means both Ps. Jonathan and Onkelos, for he has fused the two interpretations in order to elucidate the verse.

Here are a few examples to illustrate these points:

19. EX.16:33 - "So Moses said to Aaron, take a jar and fill it...." Rashi - אמיסתآ - לזרות על חרוב כלראגומן
It is an earthen flask, as it is translated in the Targum.
Onkelos translates without elaboration as to the material אמא르 מסת אולקפס ובזרות חרובמה.
By the expression - כותרות - Rashi must have meant Ps. Jonathan where this interpretation occurs:
"a flask of earthenware." 39

20. NUM.14:4 - "And they began to talk of choosing someone to lead them back".
Rashi explains:

Understand this as the Targum does: let us appoint a chief - let us set a king over us.

Whilst the first part of Rashi is from Onkelos, the second part is from Ps. Jonathan - and Rashi has fused the two interpretations.

And shall cheer up his wife whom he hath taken.

The verb - in the piel is causative and means - he shall gladden his wife, its correct Targum rendering is - which expresses this: he, however, who translates in the Targum - - (pe'al) - "he shall rejoice with his wife" - is in error, for this is not the Targum equivalent of - (piel) but of - (pe'al).

In all the books of the Targum Onkelos available to us, the reading is - corresponding to the piel. Rashi, therefore, most probably refutes.
Ps. Jonathan⁴² where the reading⁴³ is —

"And there you will worship other gods etc..."

Understand this as the Targum does —

- you will serve the people⁴⁴ that worship idols

not actually that they serve idols, but they will have to pay tribute and poll-taxes to the priests of the idols.

A. Bromberg⁴⁵ believes that Rashi is referring to Ps. Jonathan who explains exactly like Rashi:

This is not convincing as Onkelos himself can be interpreted in this way.⁴⁶ At any rate Rashi's idea that the Israelites "will pay tribute and poll-taxes to the priests of the idols" is not specifically mentioned⁴⁷ in Ps. Jonathan.⁴⁸
Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets.

As said throughout our thesis Rashi made use of Onkelos' Targum as well as of the Jerusalem Targumim. Another Targum which Rashi used on the Torah is Jonathan on the prophets. However, whilst on the Torah Rashi seeks his support occasionally, on the prophets he uses him extensively. According to the Talmud Jonathan ben Uzziel, a disciple of Hillel the Elder, wrote the Targum on the prophets. Quite often Rashi relies on Jonathan's Targum and follows his modes of interpretations. Perhaps the following two factors caused Rashi to favour Jonathan's Targum. Firstly, because his translation fits with the plain meaning of the text and secondly unlike Onkelos' Targum, there are very few Halachot to be derived from the books of the prophets, nor in Jonathan's translation, which otherwise would necessitate a thorough investigation as to whether his interpretations correspond with the current Halacha.

Rashi was greatly influenced by Jonathan to the extent that after interpreting the text according to him he believed that "no other interpretation could be made on the text and no addition could be added on Jonathan's Targum." The midrashic interpretations of Jonathan are fully incorporated in Rashi's commentary. And sometimes he even
rejects the midrashic interpretations of the Rabbis and accepts those of Jonathan because they accord better with the biblical text. He even supports Onkelos' interpretations on the Torah from Jonathan's Targum on the prophets. If a vision of a prophet is difficult and unintelligible to comprehend, Rashi, once again, turns to Jonathan for clarification.

Finally it appears that while Rashi has seen the "Targum Sheni" on the book of Esther, he was, however, unaware of the existence of any Targum on the rest of Hagiographia.
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3. See ibid *Encyclopedia Judaica*.


5. See *Rashi* - by M. Liber, p.95.

6. cf. Rashi GEN.49:21 - אַלּוּ שָׁוָהּ - וְכִסּוֹתָהּ וְכִשָּׁוָהּ אֵלֹהִים. Despite his occasional inclusion of succinct summaries of aggadic material, it is difficult to assume that Rashi intended his commentary for the masses alone, since he often incorporates therein complicated halachic material which would be beyond the grasp of many a general reader.
7. The nickname "Tam" was given him because his name was Jacob and it is written - GEN.25:29 - דָּמָן וַיַּחֲמַד. The term signifies perfection both in knowledge and in character.

8. H. Waxman, Rashi his Teachings and Personality - ed. by S. Federbush, Rashi as commentator of the Bible, p.20. The attribution of this statement to Rabben Tam is doubtful since Rashbam, records Rashi's own self-criticism with regard to his commentary on the Torah. See Rashbam, beginning of Parashat - זְמוֹן

9. See Rashi by M. Liber, p.104. The Persian word Parshandata, name of the sons of Haman, was divided into "Parshan" and "data" - expounder of the law. This epithet was attributed to him by Ibn Ezra in his poem. See, ibid, ch.11, p.207 and note 59 in p.249.

10. See Halachic Section.

11. See Midrashic Section.

12. See Section, Rashi as Philologist.

13. See Introduction, Rashi as Philologist; also ch.6, Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.
14. cf. GEN.14; GEN.41; NUM.27. See Introduction, Rashi as Philologist.

15. cf. GEN.1; GEN.6 with GEN. Rabbah. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Correlation to Peshat and Derash, Group E.(F).

16. cf. GEN.3; cf. "GEN.3 - שמן א <$1> אגדת רב Priest סדר אחדו רבדינו, 1, - מ/ג נב$ג וешארות,/logo לא $, אול$ $ה-founded! וה小时前 $ macht, See Midrashic Section, Rashi and Peshat, Group E.(C).

17. For the sake of clarity we shall term in this thesis Rashi's own halachic interpretations as "Peshat Halacha", in contradistinction to "Derash Halacha", i.e. wider halachic implications discussed in the Talmud: not that the two need be in conflict. See Halachic Section, Group G. note 3.

18. cf. Rashi EX.22; EX.23.

19. cf. Rashi EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.12; EX.20. See EX. ch.21 to ch.23 where in most cases Rashi follows the Halacha. The reader will find many more examples throughout his commentary. See Halachic Section.
20. cf. Rashi LEV.13 - "Consequently, if it remains in its true colour or if it has spread he is unclean". See Nahmanides, who states that Rashi's conclusion is correct according to the literal sense of the text, but contrary to the Mishna in Negaim 1.3 - לשון איט בחום שבעת ושנים אחרון לפי עתי כלום בחום שבעת ושנים אחרון See E. Mizrahi who admits that Rashi is against the Halacha. See Halachic Section, Group G.

21. cf. Rashi EX.22 - "Let him bring witnesses (plural) that the animal was torn in pieces involuntarily and he shall be freed from liability". See the various opinions in the Mechilta, M. Friedmann, Vienna 1870, p.93. See Halachic Section Group G.

22. cf. EX.21 s.v - רashi interprets according to Rabbi Ishmael and not according to the accepted opinion of Rabbi Akiva. See Bab. Tal. Baba Kam.50; for further references, see Halachic Section, Group G.

23. cf. Rashi EX.12 - cf.also Rashi,EX.12;EX.22;EX.29. See Halachic Section, Group G.
24. cf. Rashi GEN.1; GEN.14; GEN.50.

25. See Midrashic Section, Rashi and Derash, Group E.(E).

26. See Midrashic Section, Peshat in the Talmud, Group E.(b).

27. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept. Group E.(D).

28. See Midrashic Section, Rashi's Correlation to the Peshat and Derash, Group E.(F).

29. See Introduction, Rashi as Philologist.

30. cf. Rashi, IS.96 - סעך ויעהnants -ולא בטWake ככ negocio, כי לא מקים ישנא hot ישלים מהמתים orbs. See ibid s.v.; Rashi PS.21; PS.21; Rashbam, his grandson challenged also the Christian's interpretation, EX.20.


32. Rashi LEV.23; MEN.66a; cf. Rashi, PROV.97 - מעשיך לרשע - The phraseology - ליודיסיס ילך הבט - can only refer to the Karaites and not to the Christians. See Midrashic Section, Group E.(F), note D.
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33. See Rashbam Ex. 139 -

Rabbi Joseph Becher Shor complains about the laxity of the French Jewry:

"גמ" מברע אמונהشفה יעיבהוין יהי ור" - I בל וני - מברע אמנה שיבח ור"ב ויבב שאריוו "��בב ור"ב -

See E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.168, infra 31. The evidence of the total neglect of the Tephillin can further be seen from the statement of Rabbenu Tam who refers to those who scorned to wear them, saying, "what is the use of these straps". See L. Rabinowitz, The Social Life of the Jews of the Northern France in the XII-XIV centuries, p.176 ff.

34. Perhaps its popularity was due to the following statements:

a) it was assumed that the "argum was given from Sinai". (See Bab. Tal.Kid.48a).

b) see BER.8a - ש"וצר סחרא אינכ פוע𣲼ת ש.Router מהרי הכרזות.

c) see Siphre, DEUT.179 - לא יז קרא פקריה נביא זי יברוא אתי.

d) Rab. Shalom Gaon has this to say:

See A.Berliner, Targum Onkelo:, p.172, Introduction, Rashi as Philologist; Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, ch.10.
34. (cont'd).
infra. Its popularity may also have been due to the fact that on the whole Onkelos' Targum is closer to the text than the other Palestinian Targumim and this is why it was accepted by Rabbi Akiva and his school. See B.J. Roberts, The Old Testament text and Versions, Cardiff, 1951, p. 204 ff; Rabbi Moses de Leon, "Megillat Esther" (commentary on Maimonides "Sepher Hamitzvoth"). p. 92 - who believes that Onkelos' view should over- ride the opinions found in a "Beraitha". cf. Rabbi Malachi Ben Jacob, Yad Malachi, New York 1905, para. 659; Rabbi David Pardo, Shoshanim Le- David (commentary on the Mishna) Kerit. ch. 2. Mishna 1 - who believes that there is no need to support Onkelos from the Talmud:

35. cf. Bab. Tal. MEG. 3a; Palestinian Talmud, Meg. 3.
Halacha 1.

36. As can be seen from "Table Two" and "Table Three".

37. See Mishna, Meg. 4. 4. See also Halachic Section, Summary, note 6. That the Targum was still actually read aloud in Synagogue in Rashi's time is indicated by the fact that his contemporary Meir Ben Isaac Nehoral composed an Aramaic - מיר - to insert
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Note 37. (cont'd).

into the beginning of the Targum on - שְׁבוּעָה. According to the original arrangement this was read after the first verse of the Parasha - וַחֲשָׂע הַשֵּׁלֵי שָׁם. Later when the reading of the Targum had been given up, the significance of this position was misunderstood and the reading of - שְׁבוּעָה - was brought forward (by Jacob Emden) so that it precedes - שְׁבוּעָה. Most probably the reading of the Aramaic Targum was beginning to be abandoned during the period of the Geonim. Rab. Natronai Gaon, the head of the academy of Sura (853-858) complained about the fact that - קְרִי יָד - was no longer translated into Aramaic but rather into Arabic. He even excommunicated those who deliberately ignored the reading of the Targum (and followed the custom of the Karaites, see, Weiss, Dor-Dor-Vedorshav, v.4.p.117). Rabbi Judah Ben Koresh, in his letter - קְרִי יָד - complained also that the community of Fez (Morocco) had ignored the reading of the Targum: - "לִאָמְנוּ וְיֵשׁ עַל מִלְּדָּתָם בַּרְכָּתָם, וְלִאָמְנוּ בַּמַּרְדֶּקֶף נְקַוִּים, וְלִאָמְנוּ בְּעַל מִלְּדָּתָם מַעְבּוֹדַת, וְלִאָמְנוּ בְּעַל מִלְּדָּתָם אֶלֶף שְׁכָרָה לָכִים בַּבָּלָב, מַעְבּוֹדַת, וְלִאָמְנוּ בְּעַל מִלְּדָּתָם אֶלֶף שְׁכָרָה לָכִים בַּבָּלָב (סֵפֶר)." - (ארֵכֶּה כֵּן, הָוֲדָה בַּר קְוִי יָד - כְּרָאָלי, קְוִי יָד - כְּרָאָלי).
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38. See Bab. Tal. Meg. p.3a.

39. cf. Rashi EX.14$^{24}$ and Bab. Tal. BER.3$^b$.

40. See Bab. Tal. Abod. Zar.9$^a$ with regard to GEN.31$^{12}$; Bab. Tal. Sanh. 97$^a$. In some instances Rashi has in mind Onkelos' Targum even without identifying it. cf. Bab. Tal. Ber. 17$^a$ with regard to EX.24$^{11}$.

41. cf. Bab. Tal. Kid. 69$^a$ - DEUT.23$^{18}$.

42. See Midrashic Section, Groups A,B,C,D and E.

43. See Halachic Section, Groups, A,B,C,D,E and F.

44. See Section - Rashi as Philologist, chs. 1-10.

45. cf. also Rashi, GEN.37$^{27}$ on the verb - וישימם - See Section - Rashi as Philologist, ch.4 - Translation of Biblical Idioms Into Aramaic, notes 10 and 11.

46. cf. GEN.49$^{24}$ - והם לועדו על חרבם; GEN.18$^{23}$; EX.23$^{2}$ - לועדו חרבם, על חרבם.
47. Rashi does not apparently focus clearly on the difference in meaning between the Kal - מָלֵא - and the Piel - מָלֵא.

48. On the subject of grammar, see Section Rashi as Philologist - ch.9. Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.

49. cf. also Rashi, GEN.29; GEN.43; EX.1; EX.18; EX.26. The question of Onkelos rendering of the tenses in Hebrew according to their syntactical setting (vav conservative, i.e. consecutive, etc.) is a complex one which lies outside the scope of this thesis.

50. cf. GEN.11; GEN.22; GEN.49; GEN.43; EX.21; EX.22; EX.7; EX.11; EX.19; EX.21; EX.3; EX.22; EX.7; EX.7; EX.9; EX.16; LEV.19; LEV.21; LEV.22; LEV.25; LEV.31; NUM.15; DEUT.1; DEUT.14; DEUT.28; DEUT.32.

51. cf. GEN.40; EX.16; NUM.6. Sometimes without identifying Onkelos by name Rashi supports his translation from the Mishna, e.g. GEN.45.
52. cf. Rashi GEN.30 38 - לַאֵּתֲוַיְמָאַיִּם לֹאָמְאַיִּם תַּחְבָּאַיִּם וְּאֵלְאַיִּם בְּלֶשֶׁנִּים - מַרְמִי. וְרָכַבְּהַיִם שָׁבְחַלְוַיִּים
cf. Rashi GEN.3 24 s.v - רָכַבְּהַיִם; GEN.31 34 s.v - בּוּרַיִם;
genephēn; GEN.43 16 s.v - אֵרוּתִי; GEN.43 20 s.v - בּוּרַיִם;
genephēn; GEN.44 7 s.v - עֵלֶּתִי; GEN.48 7 s.v - בּוּרַיִם; GEN.49 11 s.v - לֶעֲרֹתִי; (ונִיְיִי) - הבּוּרַיִם;
genephēn; GEN.49 12 s.v - עֵלֶּתִי; EX.2 10 s.v - מְשִׁיְתִי; EX.34 33 s.v - מְשִׁיְתִי; LEV.19 16 s.v - רָכַבְּהַיִם - LEV.22 24 s.v - רָכַבְּהַיִם.

53. cf. Rashi EX.14 27 - וִינֶּרֶךְ וְשֵׁנַיְּנַיְּנֶּרֶךְ שֵׁנַיְּנַיְּנֶּרֶךְ - וְּנַחֲבוּבָּהַיִם בְּשָׁבְחַלְוַיִּים
cf. NUM.5 2 s.v - זָמִיתַיִם.

54. cf. Rashi GEN.31 39 s.v - אַחֲמוּרַיִם; GEN.43 18 s.v - הָאָחֲמוּרַיִם,
exephēn; EX.12 7; EX.13 18; EX.14 24; EX.15 3; EX.15 4; EX.21 25;
exephēn; EX.27 9; EX.28 4; LEV.26 36; NUM.31 49; DEUT.5 18; DEUT.11 14.

55. cf. Rashi GEN.45 26; EX.28 4; EX.27 10; EX.30 13; NUM.31 10;

56. See Rashi who quotes the Targum on FSALMS GEN.31 40.

57. It also appears that Rashi has seen some texts of Ps. Jonathan and possibly of Neofiti. See ch. "Rashi and Ps. Jonathan Targum."
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58. cf. Rashi GEN.38\(^2\); GEN.43\(^{20}\); GEN.49\(^{25}\); EX.2\(^{10}\); EX.3\(^{19}\); EX.7\(^{11}\); EX.13\(^{19}\); EX.14\(^{27}\); EX.15\(^{4}\); EX.18\(^{26}\); LEV.19\(^{16}\); NUM.5\(^2\); DEUT.5\(^{18}\).

59. cf. Rashi GEN.43\(^{18}\); EX.3\(^{19}\); DEUT.3\(^{4}\); DEUT.5\(^{19}\).

Rashi and Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra present the most vivid contrast between the French schools and their Spanish counterpart.

61. See chs. Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs - where this subject is dealt at length.


63. Rashi GEN.49\(^{24}\) - "הוהי יְהֹוָה... תָּנֹסֶת כְּנַב חָיָה מָתָּר וְיָשְׁבַּנְתָּ..."

64. Rashi EX.16\(^{14}\) - "עַבְדֵי שְׁכַנְתּוּ אָוריָו... תָּנֹסֶת כְּנַב חָיָה מָתָּר וְיָשְׁבַּנְתָּ..."

65. cf. Rashi GEN.49\(^{11}\) - "אֱלֹהִים יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּעַבְדֵי... הָעֵד... וְיָשְׁבַּנְתָּ..."

Commentators on the Targum have indeed shown that in many places Onkelos contains two or three interpretations in one single verse.
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66. cf. Rashi NUM. 24:14 — מַעְרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מְכוֹרֶת כֶּדֶר חַוָּה. Sometimes without saying that the verse is elliptical, Rashi implies as much by quoting Onkelos' Targum, e.g. GEN. 41:56 — יִתְנָה אָזֶן אֵל שָׁעַר בְּשֵׁם כָּכַבְוָת לָבֹא יְבוּרָא. "Understand it as the Targum renders it: Joseph opened all the storehouses in which there was corn". Onkelos and Rashi are concerned to account for the fact that — בּוֹדֶּה (masc) has no antecedent — it cannot refer to — יִשְׂרָאֵל (feminine). This has prompted one modern suggestion that — בּוֹדֶּה — is a verb and could be read — בּוֹדֶּה — with the suggested meaning "tied up" (cf. Hebrew אֲבָדֵת — Arabic — ابوغلاب). See Mandelkern Concordance (שהכיirmed) Leipsig, 1896, p.166.

67. Rashi — הַשָּׁבָעָה בּוֹדֶּה תֵּכֵר אֵוֹרָה מַכְּהָר כֶּרֶד לָשָׁשִׁים אֲלָבָא בּוֹדֶּה. מֵעַשְׂבָא לֶפִּי עֲשַׁיָּן בּוֹדֶּה לָפְתִּיר מֵעַשְׂבָא מִשְׁבִּי לַעֲשִׂבָא לְוָא. — R. Loewe suggests that Rashi may be also obliquely contradicting an attempt to refer — בּוֹדֶּה — to Joseph, in the sense of "he represented me as being restored" which makes good sense — לֵאמָע בּוֹדֶּה (כּוּלְרָא יְוָה) — (כּוּלְרָא יְוָה) — אָבָאוֹת אֲלָבָא. He — (Joseph) represented in his interpretation as due to be hanged. This interpretation is not far-fetched...
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67. (cont'd).

and in fact Ps. Jonathan appears to support it :-

והיה חכמה השיער לברא חוכם, כי אחות ובחיות של常に

The word -ם (ם) means that by his interpretation of the dream he (Joseph) restored the Butler. (cf. -וּהַשָּׁנָה בְּנִי).

68. See Nahmanides who suggests that Onkelos is alluding to the midrashic interpretation, namely that Moses taught the Israelites the relevant laws of each festival.

69. For further references with regard to elliptical verses, cf. Rashi GEN.4 15 ; GEN.13 6 ; GEN.29 2 ; GEN.39 14 ; GEN.41 49 ;
GEN.48 1 ; GEN.48 2 ; EX.10 5 ; EX.10 11 ; EX.22 22 ; EX.32 32 ;
NUM.8 4 ; NUM.14 24 ; NUM.24 14 ; NUM.35 25 . See also Rashi in
JOS.7 15 ; JUDG.5 5 ; I SAM.13 8 ; II SAM.5 8 ; JER.29 12 ; ZECH.9 13 ;
ESTHER 1 18 .

70. See N. Adler, Netinah Lager and A. Sperber. Perhaps, however, the text of Onkelos is correct, and he had a non-massoretic tradition which read:-
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71. cf. Onkelos, NUM.5\textsuperscript{19} s.v - יִשְׁרֵי נֶעְךָ. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3 - Free Translation.

72. cf. ibid, ch.5 - Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum.

73. cf. ibid, ch.4. Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.

74. cf. ibid, ch. 6. The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.


76. See ibid, ch. 10. Rashi and the text of Onkelos.

77. ibid, ch.10, footnote 4.

78. See - יִשְׁרֵי נֶעְךָ - LEV. Vilna (םְקִירָת עֶזֶּרְוִים), 1886, where several rules have been postulated with regard to Rashi's method in quoting Onkelos' Targum.
79. With the exception of the Book of Zechariah or to the "Song of Songs"—where he prefaced his comments with the principles underlying his exegesis.

80. See Midrashic Section, Rashi’s Correlation to Peshat and Derash, Group E (f).


82. cf. GEN.22:2; GEN.49:27 sometimes/gives three interpretations and the middle one is from Onkelos’ Targum, e.g. DEUT.32:25.

83. L. Zunz — "Toledoth Rashi", p.3 — has rightly remarked that these rules are incorrect and no attention should be paid to them. See footnote 78.

84. cf. Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.9. Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.

85. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section.

86. See Midrashic Section, Groups A.B.C.D.E.
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87. cf. Midrashic Section, Group A.

88. Midrashic Section, Group B.

89. cf. EX.23\(^3\) - לְשׁוֹן הַעֲבָרָה, לֹא הָכַרְבָּהָה כְּרָכָּה. . . .
EX.22\(^2\) - לֶא לְשׁוֹן שְׁמֵעָה - אוּנֵקְלוֹ וְכוּרֵסֵה - לֹא לְשׁוֹן שְׁמֵעָה . . .
See Halachic Section, Group C. note 6.

90. cf. Rashi EX.25\(^{29}\) - אָמַר הַכֹּל הָאֹנֵקְלוֹ שְׁכֵכָה אֶלֶף לֶא תַּכְּבִּי רַבִּיתֵי -
However, Rashi does not always point to this fact.
See Halachic Section, Group F. infra 1.

91. See Midrashic Section, Group D.

92. IS.\(^4\) - רָמִים - is in fact not from - לְרָמִים - but is Niphal of - רָמִים. cf. B.D.B. p.266.

See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 14.
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94. cf. EX. Rabbah 1, 10; Midrash Hagadol EX, p. 13.
Preference for the Targum over the Midrash can further be seen in Rashi on GEN. 19\(^\text{15}\); GEN. 49\(^\text{22}\) and Midrashic Section, Group A. cf. also Section, Rashi as Philologist, chs. 1 and 2.

95. cf. Rashi EX. 9\(^\text{33}\) - סֵפֶר וּהֲכַנְתָּם בִּפְרוֹחֵי בַּתְּלֵי חָצֵרֶק
הֵפַע (וְגַם) - אֵלַקְתֶּן נַעֲכְתוּ בַּשָּׁמֶשׁ יִהְיֶה אָתָּה אָבְרַכְו מַעֲרַכִּי
יִשְׂרָאֵל - אֶשְׁתָּךְ, אֶדְעֵת - לָאָתֶךְ ...
See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 8. Rashi and Menachem.

96. cf. Rashi EX. 14\(^\text{24}\) - יֵאשׁוֹמְרוּ רָשֵׁי רַשֵּׁי. Rashi here rejects Menachem Ben Seruk's explanation. cf. also Rashi EX. 3\(^\text{22}\).

97. cf. Rashi EX. 3\(^\text{22}\); EX. 2\(^\text{10}\).

98. cf. GEN. 25\(^\text{3}\) - וְהַרְבָּהָ בְּעָדָהָ אֵין לְעַשְׁבוּ עַל לְשַׁן הָעֲקָרָה
cf. also GEN. 18\(^\text{19}\); GEN. 43\(^\text{18}\); GEN. 20\(^\text{13}\).

99. cf. EX. 10\(^\text{21}\) - וַיַּעֲמֹד וַיָּמֶשׁ וְלֹא מָכָרָה אֹּבֵד מִי מֵעַד - מְסַבֶּה עַל אֶלְקְתֶּן אֶרֶץ.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

100. cf. EX.15\(^{13}\) - סלקות - לַעֲנוֹד ולְעַנָּד שָׁם נַעֲנוֹד יָעִינוֹד לַעֲנוֹד לְעַנָּד - cf. Rashi EX.6\(^{9}\).

101. cf. EX.15\(^{8}\) - דֵּרְתָּי - לְעַרְבָּי וְלַעֲרָבָי שָׁם הַרְבָּי, יָאָרְבָּי וְלַעֲרָבָי - cf. also NUM.20\(^{29}\) s.v - כ"ג ח"ז; DEUT.3\(^{26}\).

102. cf. EX.23\(^{27}\) - וְאָמַרְתֶּם אֵלֵיהֶם וְהַמַּכְרָא שָׁוָאָה וְאֵלֵיהֶם cf. also cf. also NUM.20\(^{29}\) s.v - כ"ג ח"ז; DEUT.3\(^{26}\).

103. cf. GEN.15\(^{11}\) - נְפָרָי - פְּרָי - לְפָרָי לְפָרָי - cf. also cf. also cf. also cf. NUM.20\(^{29}\) s.v - כ"ג ח"ז; DEUT.3\(^{26}\).

Rashi may be crediting Onkelos here with an error due to textual transmission of the Targum, but although - פְּרָי occurs in Targum Jonathan EZ.6,13; I SAM. 17,46 it is not recorded from Onkelos in Kasowsky's concordance.

104. cf. DEUT.32\(^{26}\) - אַפְּרָיאָת - אַפְּרָיאָת פָּרָי - cf. also cf. also cf. also cf. NUM.20\(^{29}\) s.v - כ"ג ח"ז; DEUT.3\(^{26}\).

See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.9. Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar.

105. Lived in Toulouse (France) about the first half of the eleventh century. His book is often cited by Rashi under the title of "Yesod" (Foundation) a haggadic and mystical commentary.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION


107. See Midrashic Section, Group B, note 11; also Veneration of Aaron and Priests, Group D. For further references where Rashi favours the midrashic interpretations to that of Onkeles, see Midrashic Section, Group B, notes 5 and 6. cf. also Rashi DEUT.33.3 s.v - הֵרְבִּךְ; GEN.20.13 - וְיָגוֹלֵל יָדֵנִי שְׁתַּרְגֵד - Rashi NUM.23.23 - לֹא נַעֲרִנִי לָיְתֵנָא שֵׂרֶג -

108. See Midrashic Section, Group E (e). Rashi and Derash.

109. Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra also take it in this sense.

110. It appears that Onkelos takes it from the root - אֵרֵב - "to despise". - See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti read: - כְּרָבְשָׁנָא מַעֲלֵם נ* - i.e. taskmasters.

111. cf. Onkelos, EX.27.19.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

112. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti are in line with Rashi:—

113. cf. EX.32 29 — where Rashi explains the text differently from Onkelos. Again, Rashi GEN.13 13; GEN.37 36 — s.v — (see Nahmanides who supports Onkelos) GEN.36 24 — s.v — רָּאִים מְכוֹרָה. See Nahmanides; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

114. cf. EX.6 9 —ioxid המוכר מתשובה אתר הָּרוּקָה — לֵךְアン אֵנֶךְ יֵאֵמָר. See Nahmanides who supports Onkelos) GEN.36 24 — s.v — רָּאִים מְכוֹרָה. See Nahmanides; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

115. cf. Rashi EX.2 5 —سفגת — אָרְבְּאֵת יָדָא לְעַל יִכְּרָה לְפֵי מְכוֹרָה.

It is Rabbi Judah’s exegesis that — (literally cubit) means "her hand" but Rabbi Nehemiah understood it as Rashi does (i.e. אֵמָרָא). See Bab.Tal. Sot.12 b. The Targum follows Rabbi Judah.
115. (cond'd).

cf. Saadia Gaon in his commentary in Arabic - יומית דריירס - quoted by Rabbi D. Kimhi, on the Torah;

cf. Ps. Jonathan. Ibn Ezra points out, however, that the word - אומת - is only found as the name of a measure i.e. cubit never as referring to the arm itself.

116. cf. Rashi DEUT.32\textsuperscript{12} - לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו ואורחיינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתינו, לאו יומת אומתינו וראיתино.

117. See Weiss Dor Dor Vedorshav, IV, pp.324 and 327; ibid,II - ויהיו ירחא רב שמלת בר' יוחק ביבי הבולפלי - Vienna 1882, pp. 165 ff.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION TO HALACHIC SECTION

1. Regarding the conventional distinction between "Peshat and "Derash" see Midrashic Section, Group E (a,b,c,d,e); R. Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp. 155-167 and 167 f.

2. See Midrashic Groups.

3. See chs. Rashi as Philologist.

4. Whilst Rashi almost ignored Onkelos in halachic matters, the Spanish commentators such as Nahmanides quote him quite frequently and derive many "halachic points" from his interpretations, e.g. EX.22^{2}; LEV.6^{3}; LEV.11^{9}; LEV.19^{32}; LEV.20^{3}; LEV.23^{40}; LEV.23^{44}; NUM.31^{23}; DEUT.21^{16}; DEUT.21^{14}. The famous Spanish commentator on Alfasi, Rabbenu Nissim, also quotes Onkelos in Bab.Tal.Kid.32^{b} with regard to LEV.19^{32} and endeavours to reconcile his view with that of the Talmud. Again in Bab.Kid.9^{a} Rabbenu Nissim quotes Onkelos on DEUT.23^{18} (on : LEV 19^{32} — Rashi does not comment on Onkelos). The famous Rab. Hai Gaon quotes Onkelos and derives laws from his expositions, e.g.NUM.6^{3}. The Gaon holds that "scissors" fall under the same prohibition as — razor (therefore, it should not be used for cutting the hair) since Onkelos translates it by — "scissors". (See, however, Nahmanides "Torat Haadam", Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1968 who argues
4. (cont'd).

with the Gaon). Maimonides also deduced several halachic matters from Onkelos' expositions, e.g. מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים - מִדָּה הָעֲקָדִים on DEUT.23\(^1\); again in - מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים - מִדָּה הָעֲקָדִים (Rabbi Abraham Ben David - מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים) - and Maggid Mishne state that Maimonides' source is Onkelos' Targum, EX.22\(^2\). cf. Maimonides - מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים - מִדָּה הָעֲקָדִים where he quotes Onkelos, EX.12\(^4\) - before the Mechilta's interpretation. The famous commentator on the Talmud Rabbenu Yom-Tov (רַבּוּן יוֹמְטוֹ) in Moed Katan 24\(^a\) deduces from Onkelos' interpretation, LEV.13\(^4\) - מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים - מִדָּה הָעֲקָדִים - that the "covering of the head" is biblical (영상ון העיר) (see Shulhan Aruch, V. Yore Dea, ch.386). Again, Rabbenu S. Ben Adereth (רַבּוּן יָתוֹר) quotes in his Responsium 164 Onkelos, GEN.25\(^\text{27}\). The Tosafoth likewise deduce laws from Onkelos' Targum, e.g. NUM.6\(^3\) - MEN.44\(^a\). The Talmud itself quotes Onkelos' expositions e.g. EX.25\(^5\) - SHAB.28\(^a\). It is difficult, however, to know whether - גָּמְרוּ מִדָּה הָעֲקָדִים - is a reference to Onkelos as the same interpretation is given in Ps. Jonathan. Again, NUM.6\(^4\) - NAZ.39\(^a\) - מְלֹא כְּלָא הָעֲקָדִים, חֲמִית וְהָעֲקָדִים. Here Rab. Joseph definitely had in mind Onkelos and not Ps. Jonathan for the latter translates differently. On this subject, see P.Churgin - Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, in his introduction "The Historical Background", pp.9-20 with special attention to p.14. See Halachic Section group E. note 25.
1. See this Section, Group C.

2. cf. Ps. Jonathan: "...IRRORIM הערבי לוי, כדי שמייד ייגמר כל קשון -
Neofiti, however, translates: "... kd' shorטה אומרים זכר ויאמר לי בום -
לפי "שנהרף" יחוית יאורות בך בת הברה ולboro יכדרש.
Neofiti is in line with current Halacha for the words -
לפי יבך שן - mean: by a single witness.

3. ההמקה ליב יייךבר ערב חמא והיו חכמים תפסו עבדיה דיב לב
shed נגרג עבר"achen יברך Legislature. -
cf. Maimonides - הלוקס סלונים פותיר ∞. -
cf. also GEN. Rabbah 34,14 - שמך - אחיך בניandi

4. ed. Weiss, Vienna 1865, Parasha 11. It may, however, be
that Onkelos is excluding "gentiles" and not "proselyte victims". See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.97.
N. Adler, Netinah-Lager believes that the word - הערבי -
is an interpolation in Onkelos' Targum by a later writer.
This is unlikely since Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti in-
corporate this word in their Targumim.
The fact that the Meholata felt compelled to include
"proselyte victims" - shows that at one time there was
a school of thought which believed that the proselytes should be excluded. This school of thought is portrayed by the Targumim.

5. cf. this Section, Group A (11). Also this Section, Group C. note 7.

6. Onkelos is supported by the division of — אַנְּקֶלּוֹס — in the word — הָאֹף —.


10. cf. Mechilta (ed. M. Friedmann), Parasha 20; Maimonides — מַעֲלֵא אָבְרָהָם —.

11. See Rabbi H. Di-Silva in his commentary "Peri Chadash", V. Yore-Dea, ch. 87, who remarks that Onkelos is against the traditional interpretation.
12. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. does not translate according to the sequence of the text.


14. cf. also Bab. Kam. 65b.

15. However, A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic has - • - אָמַשֵׇּיתוּ - also, Oheb. Ger. p.58 - • - אָמַשֵׇּיתוּ. This of course would correspond with tradition. Kittel 'Biblia Hebraica', notes 53 Manuscripts reading - • - אָמַשֵׇּיתוּ - (singular). See, Pesherim, Heb. Commentary 911.

16. This is the version in A. Sperber.

17. Mishnayoth 6:2 שִׁיחֲמִי הַכֹּהֵן הַכָּלֻּמִים נַעֲשָׂה לְךָ. According to - • - אָמַשֵׇּיתוּ - one of each is enough, and Rabbi Judah's accepted opinion is that two scales and one fin are needed. The accepted opinion is that of - • - אָמַשֵׇּיתוּ - cf. Maimonides(昀הוֹת מֶאֱמֶה), cf. Shulchan Aruch and Tur. V. Yore-Dea, ch.83; Siphra 78; Tossefta Hul. ch.3. See, too, Maggid Mishneh. It is worth noting that Onkelos is not in accordance with Rabbi Judah either, since the latter holds that one fin is enough.
18. This is the N.E.B. translation and it appears they take -רָּעַד - and -רְאוּד - as one kind. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary translates the text in Deut. 14:13 as follows: "The glede and the kite and the vulture after its kind".


20. N.E.B. translation and the Heb. means "husband".

21. Siphra Parasha 1,10 -וְיַעֲבֹר גֶּלֶד עַד גֶּלֶד שָׁוַעַד - וְיַעֲבֹר תְּנִינָא עַד תְּנִינָא - שָׁוַעַד

shov'ah, sh berah, sh melah

cf. too Ps. Jonathan; Bab.Yeb.22b; Maimonides -

22. See Nahmanides on verse 1, who explains Onkelos.

23. Neofiti reads - לֹא סֵמַּכְיָר בְּרֵכַח לָכֶם - On the margin of Neofiti - כֵּחַה לָכֶם - is inserted.

24. See Bab.Yeb.p.70a; Siphra Parasha 6,3: -"הָּבְּרֵכַח לָכֶם בְּרֵכַח לָכֶם בְּרֵכַח לָכֶם" - שָׁמַּכְיָר "מִלְּאָה מִלְּאָה מִלְּאָה" - Maimonides - מִלְּאָה מִלְּאָה מִלְּאָה; Maimonides, Commentary on the Mishna, Yeb.ch.7, Mishna 7.
NOTES

GROUP A (1)

25. Siphra; Bab.Tal.Sanh.84 b, 85 b.

26. cf. N.E.B. "Whoever strikes a beast and kills it shall make restitution, but whoever strikes a man and kills him shall be put to death".


28. Neofiti does not follow the traditional view: See further Group A (II) The Targumim Contain Pre-tannaitic tradition.

29. cf. also Bab.Ket.46 a: - מうちに שלח רוכ ב (ונמיב, נב)."וכם ריכ אביהו לְמִרְסָה יִסְקוּרֶם שֵׁלוֹ שֶׁלָּוָה

30. Siphra 291; Bab.Yeb.101 b and 106 b; Maimonides: - מדרש תנהים, p.167; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.p.566. see Halachic Section Group E. note 39.

31. See Rashi, GEN.3221.
NOTES

GROUP A (II)


3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.

4. Neofiti reads: כ יברך יברך שב צד כורש ישוע - המזדיק את בית שבר צד שבר כורש ישוע

5. Bab.Kam.p.2b; Rashi EX. 22. The word - אשתה - comes under the category of - בני - the second - בני - under that of - ניצחון


7. op. cit. p. 117.
NOTES

GROUP A (II)

8. *cf. Palest. Tal. Meg.ch.4, Halacha 10, p.65* -

9. *cf. Maimonides, Yad:* - and


11. *See Maimonides, Yad:* -

12. *ch.4, 9.*

13. "הansen מוער עלא מטוען הלהביר למחן, ומיישר לא מתן

14. *See Bab. Meg.25* where the Meturgeman was always guided

15. *For a digest of the basic rules, see Maimonides, Yad:* -

NOTES

GROUP A (II)

16. See Bab. Shab. 115a with regard to the Targum to the Book of Job.

17. See this Section, Group A.I. Also Group C, note 7.

18. See this Section, Group B.

19. cf. N.E.B. who takes it also as Neofiti: "When a man burns a field or a vineyard and lets the fire spread so that it burns another man's field, he shall make restitution from his own field according to the yield expected; and if the whole field is laid waste, he shall make restitution from the best part of his own field or vineyard".


21. If the author meant that they used to hang the body after the strangulation, this too, is against the Halacha since only the - נמי - used to be hanged. See Mishna, Sanh. 7,4.

22. See Jerusalem, 1963, pp.190-194. Rab Hai Gaon's statement (see Genizah studies in memory of S. Shechter II New York, 1929, p.86) that the Targum of the Hagiographa is "a Targum of Laymen" (當כעיס וינמיכי פ''ע"א) or better "unauthorised" Targum) is further support to this theory.

24. Most interesting to note that Rabbi M. Sopher (the famous Talmudist known as - מפער) believed that the author of this Targum was a Sadducee. See - מפער. cf. also Melamed, op. cit. p. 191.
1. cf. Mechilta, Parasha 17; Bab.Pes.5; Ps. Jonathan interprets - שבעת ימים ושבהו תבנולו ברש מפרסות -צמחים חלצנים אלה ובשנים חמשה -

2. On verse 16, Onkelos takes - למשוער - to mean Tefillin - אלתקולulfill עניין

3. cf. Rabbi S. Ben Meir.


5. Onkelos is obscure and it is difficult to assess whether he is like Rabbi Akiva or Rabbi Jose Hagalili. See Adler- Netinah-Lager. Ps. Jonathan follows Rabbi Jose Hagalili - לאונסוה יד שמחה כן רכשה - ולימנה להחי ולחיים ויהיה לה ישבעה וברחויה' נוכמו ולא כתבו -

Neofiti reads - ויתנשו יד שמחה כן רכשה היהיה - שובנה עליה של פין דעם דעם

6. Mechilta Bab.Tal.Kid.15. See Midrashic Section, Group E (a) Origin and Development of Halacha(footnote 3); Also Midrashic Section, Group E (f) footnote 5.
7. Ps. Jonathan translates in accordance with tradition: -

Neofiti translates literally:


11. Neofiti EX.2115-16 translates literally. There is, however, no translation for verse 17.

12. Mechilta, Bab. Tal.Sanh.52b, Baba Batra 50a. cf. Ps. Jonathan: ירוי חכמים ומכ תמריה...יםוות בכמה ימים עם -

13. See Bab.Tal.Baba Kama 83b; 84a; Mechilta, Parasha 8; Ibn Ezra; Nahmanides; Maimonides: - לזכות חכמים ומכ תמריה

See P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, p.17 - who remarks that Onkelos is against the Halacha.
13. (cont'd)

In Bab.Tal.Baba Kam. 84a, Rabbi Eliezer states that "eye for eye" - "ארensa מכסה אשת איש, אשת איש מכסה" (i.e. literally) and from the Talmud Meg. 3a we learn that Onkelos was Rabbi Eliezer's disciple.


15. Bab. Sanh. 15b - אֱלֹהֵי סֹחֶר, צַעְדָה לַבָּכָה, חָוָה לְוֹזֵה

16. Onkelos: — יְסָרְגִים יִכְרַף כְּרַף

17. — לְזָה בַּעַרְגִים, צַעְדָּת לַבָּכָה, חָוָה לְוֹזֵה

18. Mechilta Parasha 10: — בְּעַד פָּרָן כֶּפֶן, ונָרַב עָבָד, רָב
   "סְמֵרָא" נָרַב עָבָד, אָמַר כְּפֶן, "סְמֵרָא"

19. However, in Bab.Tal.Baba Kam. 27a, 40a, there is a different version. The same argument is between the Rabbis and Rabbi Ishmael Ben Beroka.


22. Mechilta Parasha 17; Bab.Tal.Sanh.54b; Siphra LEV.2016; Bab. Yeb. 4a.

23. Ps. Jonathan reads:- כָּל יְשׁוּבָה דְּרֵי בְּעָרָה בַּעַל חַמָּן כְּכָל יְשׁוּבָה דְּרֵי בְּעָרָה בַּעַל חַמָּן

24. Ps. Jonathan, however, explains that he will be killed by the "sword" - נְפָל. This corresponds with the Bab.Tal.Sanh. 60a.

25. See Siphre NUM.1912-13 (Malbim 41, 45); עַשָּׁם עַשָּׁם מְחֹזֵר אֵרֶב. This corresponds with the Bab.Tal.Sanh. 60a.


27. See Adler Netinah-Lager. In Siphra, ch.9, however, we read: - ואתו מְשָׁמְשָׁמָשׂים - כֵּן דָּרִי - without definition of the penalty.


30. cf. Onkelos, Ex. 13:10 who translates - יִמְשָׁא מְשָׁא - by - יִמְשָׁא. See further the following note 17.


32. With regard to a stranger who enters the Temple whilst he is unclean, see this Group, note 15:

33. Although there is a rule that wherever the death penalty is mentioned in Scripture without being precisely defined, "strangulation" is intended (cf. Rashi Ex. 21:16) nevertheless, Nahmanides' argument that Onkelos holds like Rabbi Akiva, is not convincing for two reasons: a) because there is an argument (Bab. Tal. Sanh. 84a) between two Tannaim whether Rabbi Akiva holds "Hanek" - "strangulation" - or - "Sekilah" - stoning - to be applicable to this case.
GROUP B

33. (cont'd).

b) in EX.21\textsuperscript{17} - "And he that curseth his father or his mother shall surely be put to death" - the Rabbis interpret (see this Group, note 7) that sentence of death here means - "Sekila" - stoning - and/or "Hanek" - "strangulation". But here, too, Onkelos translates literally - despite the fact that the whole talmudic tradition agree that "Sekila" is meant.

34. Siphre, 179 (Malbim ed). cf. Ber. 9\textsuperscript{a}.

35. - אֲבָשֵׁלִית וְאֵלֶּה אֵלֶּה שָׁפָּךְ הָאָרֶץ שָׁאוֹר -

36. cf. EX.12\textsuperscript{9}; Bab.Tal. Pes. 74\textsuperscript{a}.

37. Mechilta Parasha 17; Pes.120\textsuperscript{a}; cf. also Rashi on EX.12\textsuperscript{15}; Bab. Men. 66\textsuperscript{a}.

Siphre
38. cf./Piska 156 - קְרֵי עַלְתָּם אֵלֶּה - לֹעַּמֵּר

כָּאָשׁ עֵמֵר אֵשׁ אָמְרָה לְעַמֵּר לֹעַּמֵּר אָמְרָה" יַרְכֵּא בְּנָתָיָר (בְּכָא אֲשֶׁר אֵשׁ אָמְרָה לְעַמֵּר לֹעַּמֵּר)

כָּאָשׁ לֹעַּמֵּר.

cf. too, Bab.Tal.Yeb.24\textsuperscript{a}; Maimonides - מְאֹד נַעֲלוּ תַּלְוָה וְאַנִּי מְאֹד נַעֲלוּ תַּלְוָה וְאַנִּי מְאֹד נַעֲלוּ

Midrash Aggadah, DEUT. p. 563.
39. Ps. Jonathan, however, follows the tradition.
   In verses 5 and 6 he adds the word - מַאֲמַר -
   Neofiti translates literally.

40. cf. Bab.Tal.Baba Kama 28a - בְּכֶסֶף אַתִּים - מָשִׁים

41. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate also literally.
   Perhaps the Targumim follow the first tannaitic
   opinion in Siphra Piska 161 - בְּכֶסֶף אַתִּים - מָשִׁים
   cf. too, Maimonides - מַהְנוּת לוּכָּה פַּזָּה -
   and Rabbi Abraham Ben David.
NOTES
HALACHA - GROUP C

1. Bech.ch.6, Mishna 2; Bab.Bech.38; Maimonides - ביצת מצה פ' ה.ז.

2. ibid, ch.6, Mishna 2.

3. Maimonides in his commentary on this Mishna explains that מין - is a piece of flesh which intersects the pupil of the eye - והוא שארומם בעין עושה מענה ימשך - יר שומוב קעדא מעשה ייח.

4. See Rabbi Abraham Ben David who explains in his commentary to the Siphra that Onkelos is contrary to the interpretation of the Rabbis.

5. See Bab.Git.45a where this interpretation is given in the name of Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah. See Maimonides - עלון ערביס פ'.

6. Nahmanides follows Onkelos (without quoting him) that the text speaks about a gentile slave whose master is a heathen and then he quotes the interpretation of Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah in Git. 45a. See also Ibn Ezra. Mizrachi explains the wording of the Targum - ערב יאמל - to mean - ערב ישראל הacağını ליזכזר - "an Israelite slave whose master is a heathen". This is a forced
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GROUP C

6. (cont'd).

interpretation. See Maimonides - Met. 11.6; Halachic Section, Group D, note 11.

7. Keri.9; Yeb.46b; see Rabbi Abraham Ben Maimon (ed. Wiesenber, London 1959) that Moses sprinkled the blood on the head of - ראתך הקומ - LXX renders "Moses took the blood and scattered it towards the people".

8. - ויביאו הוא ובירך אותו armaו וזרע באה ובאה - ובירך אותו armaו וזרע באה ובאה - ובירך אותו armaו וזרע באה ובאה.

9. ibid.

10. The Talmud, however, does not explain the text in question according to Rabbi Eliezer, but perhaps Rabbi Eliezer would have explained it like Onkelos, viz. that the sprinkling was done on to the altar. See Tosefoth Yeshamim, Zeb. 46b which interprets it likewise; cf. Adler in Netinah-Lager.

12. Rashi - אָנָּכּוּ בְּהֵיטְבַּסְתָּם אָחֳרֵיָּם מַפְלָכָה בַּיּוֹתֶר קִנֵּי יִשָּׂרָאֵל

13. On this particular text Rashi, dissatisfied with the interpretation of the Rabbis as well as that of Onkelos, adds his own interpretation which he considers fitted well with the plain meaning of the text:

- See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the text of Onkelos, note 25.

14. cf. Bab.Sanh. 54b; Siphre Piska 126.

15. P. Churgin - Targum Jonathan to the Prophets - p.17 - remarked that Onkelos on DEUT.23 is against the accepted Halacha.

16. Nahmanides has this to say:

- Maimonides also quotes Onkelos' interpretation - הקבץ 18 וּלְזִכַּה קַרְאוּ אתּוֹת בָּאָרָה פֶּה. ג. Who explains the discussion of the Talmud according to Onkelos; Mine Targuma by I. Berlin.

17. Rashi - אָנָּכּוּ בְּהֵיטְבַּסְתָּם אָחֳרֵיָּם מַפְלָכָה בַּיּוֹתֶר קִנֵּי יִשָּׂרָאֵל
GROUP C

18. See Mechilta Parasha 13; Rashi -
כַּל הָבָרָה שָׁוֵא לָהוּ חוֹלָה בְּשָׁמֶשׁ... כִּי גְּשָׁמוּ עֲלֵיהּ
כְּלֵי הַגְּרוֹג הַיְּוֵרָה... כִּי אֵלּוּ הַגְּרוֹגֵי הַגּוֹרָבָּה וּנְּבָיו
cf. Bab. Sanh. 73.

19. - לא יָצְאֵה לְהָרָּכָהּ נַפְלָת לוֹ תַּחְתָּיו... כִּי אֵלּוּ הָיוּ נָאוֹקֵליִּיָּהוּ לְךָ -
The Mechilta offers the same interpretation as that of the Targum.

כַּל לְיַדָּן (יִנָּהַיָּהוּ בֵּיטָא) כָּל לִי מַעַשְׂיָיו יִנָּהַיָּהוּ יִנָּהַי יִנָּהַי
The word - מַעַשְׂיָיִן (deliverers) might in this context be understood to mean "witnesses". See Nahmanides: מַעַשְׂיָיִן - see section. Rashi on Philologist ch. 4 note 5.

20. See Maimonides: הלּוֹדוֹת אוֹ בָּכִי תֵּפְלָה... who incorporated Onkelos' opinion into his Halachot. Rabbi A. Ben David suggests that Maimonides' source is the Targum in question.

21. Rashi - אֶשֶר שִׁוְרִים - נַמקְרִים מִלְּשָׂרַק לִחְטֵר בִּירָם
הִכְּלָי צֶדֶק... שָׂם שָׂמְנוּ אֶלֶּה שִׁוְרִים כִּי שִׁוְרִים שִׁוְרוּ בִּי-

22. Siphre Piska 149; Bab. Tal. Ket. 45b.
23. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos:

骨折, viz. הבארה המאה א' ועיית.

It appears that Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan had a different traditional Halacha than that of the Babylonian Talmud. At any rate Onkelos is not in error since the "Sages" in Palest. Tal. Sanh. (ch. 6 Halacha 1) interpret like him:

כאמד כל ימי המאה תחלו, ומים אחר ימי המאה שולח.

Note also Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 383:

בפ. ד'ית י' - שאיריש

Neofiti, however, does not follow the other Targumim:

EFRCHI תחא העברא הנון לא תחא העברא הנון ירוחמים.

See this Section, Group A (II). Also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 10 - Rashi and the text of Onkelos, note 34.

24. This is in fact the interpretation of Rabbi Ishmael, as Rashi mentions immediately afterwards:

כאמד כל ימי המאה תחלו, ומים אחר ימי המאה שולח.

25. See Nahmanides.

26. While Rashi, here, rejects Onkelos in Bab. Sanh. 90b, he interprets the statement of Rabbi Eliezer Ben Jacob according to Onkelos' interpretation: — חֵם חֵם יַחַי מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָา וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא בְּשָׁמִי הַגְּזָרָא וְאֵין גְּזָרָא מִי הַגְּזָרָא ב
NOTES
HALACHA - GROUP D

1. "לא יִהְיֶה לְתוֹבּוֹת שֵׁם לֹא יְהֹוָה שַׁמֶּשׁ עַל בְּכוֹרֵי אוֹרָה..."

2. Baba Kamma 85a - "אַשֶּׁר מִאֵר לָתֵית חֵי אֵל לָהֶם וָאֵלֶּה מַכָּא שְׁעַר. פַּעַת אֵל בֶּן הַשְּׁכָלֶת הַקְּדָשִׁים מִלְּכוֹ, הַגָּמָר."
See too Maimonides: - "כלדוע וְגֵשִׁים וּמִשְׁקָל לְרוּחַ פָּעַת..."

3. i.e. - "בשע משך היום - See Bab.Tal.Hul.102b."

4. Hulin 102b - "אמר להם בֵּיתוֹנִים בְּשֵׁם אֲחַיָּהוּ - וַיִּבָּשֵׁם מֶלֶךְ הָיָה..."
cf. Maimonides: - "שלדנ/year halelochim אַלּוֹכֵי פַּעַת..."
See Luzzatto - Oheb Ger, p.53 with regard to the different versions in Onkelos' Targum. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.


6. cf. Pes. 118a; Makoth 23a; Shebuoth 31b: - "םַיִּקְּנֶה בֵּיתוֹ לְשׁוֹן..." מה כָּה לִבְּשֵׁם בֵּיתוֹ לְשׁוֹן, שֵׁמוֹר בֵּיתוֹ לְשׁוֹן נָשָׁל אוֹדֵיה..." וְסֵפִּיק לָהֶם לֵבָע שָׁם שֵׁנִי.

7. The Pentateuch/Rashi's commentary, N.E.B. does not translate the text literally.
8. 87\textsuperscript{b}, cf. Rashi on EX.23\textsuperscript{18}, Mechilta on EX.23\textsuperscript{18}, Parasha 20; Meg. 20\textsuperscript{b}; Siphra on LEV.6\textsuperscript{2}. It is interesting to note that on EX.23\textsuperscript{18} Rashi does not quote the Targum; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.544 and p. 714; Maimonides:-

9. Rashi:

It is interesting to note that on EX.23\textsuperscript{18} Rashi does not quote the Targum; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.544 and p. 714; Maimonides:-

10. cf. Siphra, ch.11, 7; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 582.

11. Bab.Tal.Bech. 44\textsuperscript{b}:  

This is another case of discrepancy between the Targum and Rabbi Akiva, Onkelos' own reputed teacher. cf. Siphra (Pardess Jerusalem 1957) Piska 53; Maimonides:-

---
GROUP D

12. cf. Siphra, 12, 1; Bab. Men. 68; Midrash Hagadot, LEV. p. 541 ff; Lekah-Tov, v. 2. p. 64 ff.

13. See also DEUT. 17 where Rashi quotes Onkelos:— כֵּן וְחָפְצָה יָדָו יִזְכָּר לְךָ בְּצִיוֹן. וְיִשָּׁרֵי אָדָם בְּיֵשָׁרֵי אֱלֹהֵי צִיּוֹן—

But here also the same interpretation occurs in Siphra Piska 17; Midrash Tannaim, p. 9; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadot, DEUT. p. 28; Rashi LEV. 19; Siphra, ch. 4, Piska 37, 38, Midrash Hagadot, LEV. p. 547 ff; Maimonides — סדר החמשת אל תשעיה, דעה. See also Midrashic Section, Group D, note 4.

14. Siphre Piska 86 — כָּל מַעֲרָר חֲרֵף יִזְכָּר לְךָ בְּצִיוֹן. וְיִשָּׁרֵי אָדָם בְּיֵשָׁרֵי אֱלֹהֵי צִיּוֹן —

 cf. Ps. Jonathan, Palest. Targum and Neofiti:—

15. Sanh. 76 b — אֵין שְׁמוּאֵל מֵאָבָה מָאָבָה לְבַכְּיוֹל שְׁמוּאֵל —

 cf. Siphre Piska 10.
16. See N. Adler, who believes that Onkelos holds like "Tanna Kamma". cf. Bab. Git. 54a; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 524; Halachic Section, Group C, note 2. Perhaps, however, Rashi's motive is to make us aware that Onkelos is in line with one tannaitic opinion, thus giving further support to this view.


cf. Bab. Yeb. 101a; Midrash Tannaim, p. 166; Palest. Yeb. ch. 12, Halacha 1; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 564.

2. Onkelos: - אֶנְ' חָמָא חָמָא בַּעַר שֶׁרְבָּא  

3. i.e. Rabbi Judah the Prince (b.135 C.E) the author of the Mishna.

4. In Bab.Ket.47b this argument is between the Rabbis and Rabbi Elazar.


6. Mechilta Parasha 8 - אָנָּהוּ בְּאֶתָּר יָדוֹ אֵיבֵי קָנָא אֵלֶּה מַעְדִּים  

7. Onkelos: - אַלּוֹ יַעֲשֹׁב בְּאֶתָּר יָדוֹ אֵלֶּה מַעְדִּים אַלּוֹ יַעֲשֹׁב בְּאֶתָּר יָדוֹ אֵלֶּה מַעְדִּים  
In other words money should be exacted from the offender and the amount is paid according to the estimation of the Judges. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Neofiti reads: - אָנָּהוּ בְּאֶתָּר ... מֵאֲרָפֹנָא מְכָרְוַא ... יָדַי לְאָמֵן לָדָא ...

9. See Adler, Netinah-Lager.


12. Onkelos - קב"ל כי נרה רבותא | יף שיו | - cf. the Syriac version - Hamikra Ve-Targumav by A. Geiger, p. 123; Ps. Jonathan also follows the tradition - חילבטא | ד | ' - נ"ה | ב | שמעא; -

13. Mechilta Parasha 16 - כב, יותל | ב | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א | א |א


16. "בכורות וטמעה לא טעםיה". Ps. Jonathan interprets in both cases in accordance with tradition. Neofiti, however, reads:

17. Nahmanides, on the other hand, does quote him. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 5 - Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 5.

18. Mechila Parasha 20; Bab.Tal.Sanh.27a; Baba Kamma 72b; Maimonides - .ב.נ.א.ל -

19. Onkelos: - "א ילש עיר עיר עצים יקטה ליחי סחייה ושתיך - "set not your hand with the wicked to be to him a false witness". cf. Ps. Jonathan who interprets similarly.

GROUP E

21. Onkelos - (see A. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53 on the word - ...). Onkelos is very concise and his interpretation is a short version of Ps. Jonathan who takes the same view as that of the Rabbis:

Onkelos usually modifies the Palestinian Targumim and consequently his Targum should be studied in the light of the Palestinian tradition. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section. Also ibid, Group A, note 1 (on GEN.47).

22. Mechilta Parasha 20. cf. Pes. ch.5 Mishna 4; Palest. Tal. ch.5, Halacha 4; Ps. Jonathan translates in accordance with tradition:

Neofiti, however, reads:

23. By translating - הבן - by - נסיך - Onkelos learns like Rabbi Ishmael that the Paschal lamb is meant here and not - הקרב - the "daily sacrifice" as Rabbi Judah holds. See Section Rashi as Philologist, ch.5, note 6.

25. Whilst here Rashi does not quote Onkelos on EX.34\(^25\) - Rashi says - ""בְּרֵי מַגְּדִיל"" - "Render it like the
Targum - מֵאֵל יִבְרָא וְכָל מִטַּבְּהָרָת -See Halachic
Section, Group D, note 4.

26. Bab.Tal. Zeb.112\(^{b}\) - עֲרָבָים קֹל הָעָם כָּל מִטַּבְּהָרָה
Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 553.

27. Onkelos - יָעָלְתָה יִתְבָּרָא בּוּנְהַל שְׁרוֹן לָּהּ - "And he sent the
first-born of the children of Israel". cf. Ps. Jonathan,
Neofiti, however, translates literally:

28. However, Rashi, who agrees here with Onkelos, seems to
ignore his own interpretation in Zeb. 115\(^{b}\) - יָעָלְתָה יִתְבָּרָא
that the - נְרִי - lads brought only the animals, but the
actual sacrifices were made by the Cohanim and not by the
first-born. See Rabbi I. Berlin, Mine-Targuma,p.10. It
appears that Onkelos and Rashi take the view of R.J.Ben
Korha, who holds that - וְלָּא הַכַּהֵנִים הָעָם לָּהּ - (EX.19\(^{22}\))
is referring to the first-born sons. cf. Zeb.115\(^{b}\) and Rashi
EX.19\(^{22}\).
29. This is the translation of "The Soncino Chumash".

רבע שניים ומפרים ... שורין דבריו דבר שפיקח פוקאוי.

31. The famous commentator on the Talmud, "Ritba" (Moed Katan 24a) deduces from Onkelos that the "wrapping" of a mourner is a biblical law. (ים התורה). Onkelos here follows the tradition, but on - ראהו ימים הפר - he reproduces literally - ראהו ימים הפר - perhaps in order to leave the way open for the view of Rabbi Akiva who holds that - פורה - signifies uncovering of the head. cf. NUM. 5: - ולש מטרה לשל פורה - where the Siphre, 56 states in the name of Rabbi Ishmael that it means to uncover her head. cf. Bab.Tal.Ket. 72a; Rashi EX. 32. However, Ps. Jonathan represents the view of Rabbi Eliezer that he should let his hair grow wild: - נישית ימי זכרון הפר - Neofiti, however, reads: - אפרים הגרנדה ביד לוושי ימים לווך יקר הAjax לא אוקלים "I will not work..."
32. Rashi -

33. Yoma 66a; Siphra Piska 57a.

34. Onkelos -

Onkelos should be understood in the light of Ps. Jonathan:

"A man who was ready from the previous day"

Neofiti, however, reads:

35. Onkelos -

36. Rashi -

37. The word - is redundant and it would have sufficed to say - - The meaning, therefore, is to include any human being. cf. Rabbenu Nissim on Sanh. 66a who explains that - - and - are merely given as examples because they represent men at the two extremities of the social scale, but as a matter of fact cursing any human being is forbidden.
38. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh. 66a; Sheb. 36a; Maimonides:
   נַיִּ֑וּזֵ,ִ֔י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.

39. cf. Ps. Jonathan: -
   נַיִּ֑וּזֵ,ִ֔י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.
   Neofiti reads: -
   נַיִּ֑וּזֵ,ִ֔י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.

40. Rashi: -
   זֻרְפַּ֖ה לָֽא נַפְרְעָ֖ה וְיצִ֖כָּה וּלְאָֽוֶּתִיַ֖וְּלַ֖י וּלְאָֽוֶּתִיַ֖י.
   בֵּכְשָׂ֑ה. אֵֽאַ֥וְּוִתָ֖ה - בּוֹשָׂ֑ה.

41. Siphra 53: -
   נַיִּ֑וּזֵ,ִ֔י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י. בֵּכְשָׂ֑ה.
   הבשера מַרְנָא -
   בֵּכְשָׂ֑ה. אֵֽאַ֥וְּוִתָ֖ה - בּוֹשָׂ֑ה.
   מַה לָֽא נַפְרְעָ֖ה וְיצִ֖כָּה וּלְאָֽוֶּתִיַ֖וְּלַ֖י וּלְאָֽוֶּתִיַ֖י.
   cf. Bab. Keri. 11a; Maimonides: - .

42. In Palest. Tal.Kid. ch. 1 Halacha 1, Onkelos is quoted.
   See Halachic Section, Group F, note 6.

43. cf. Siphra (Pardess ed. Israel 1957) -
   יֶֽהָ֑וִּתְּלֹא שָׁמָ֑י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.
   בֵּכְשָׂ֑ה. שָׁמָ֑י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.
   cf. Bab.Tal. Macc. 20a: -
   יֶֽהָ֑וִּתְּלֹא שָׁמָ֑י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.
   בֵּכְשָׂ֑ה. שָׁמָ֑י וּלְּפַ֖רְעֹה וּלְאָֽוֶּתַ֖י.

44. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Ibn Ezra quotes Onkelos.

46. Rashi follows the Sages and not Rabbi Hananiah who holds that - 

47. "הוֹרֵסָה אֲנִי שָׁאָלָא דָּבָרָה זוֹ לְהַכְּלָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה הַלְּכָה 

48. 79a s.v. יָּ֔שָׁה

49. Maimonides: - הָֽיְּ֥יָאָהָה שְׁעִיּוֹת בֵּ֖ית בֵּי ויָאָהָה - writes that this matter is in doubt, whether the Halacha is like Hanania or the Rabbis (see Kesef Mishne).

50. Siphra; Parasha 10, Piska 5; Men. 66a.

51. See Bab. Men. 65a with regard to the interpretation of the Sadducees that - המשכין שבת - means on a Sunday.
51. (cont'd)
See Nahmanides; Mizrahi; Adler, Netinah-Lager. This subject is treated fully in Hoffman, LEV. II pp. 159-215, where the literature bearing upon this question is given. See also A. Geiger Hamikra Ve-Targumav, pp. 110-127.

52. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti also reads:-

53. Bab. Tal. Succ. 35a; Siphra, ch.16,3. Ps. Jonathan;
Palest. Targum. cf. also Neofiti:

54. See Hoffman, LEV. v.2. p. 198 ff.

55. Nahmanides, however, quotes Onkelos.

56. - לא ניבי לברוח כלשהי את הקדר - אחר כ' היסודותاصر -

57. Onkelos translates:
Nahmanides states after quoting Rashi's interpretation -
58. cf. Mishna Sot. 2,2; Siphre Piska 52:—

59. Onkelos —

60. cf. Mishna Nazir 6,2; Maimonides:

61. The Bab. Nazir 39a makes it clear that Onkelos is in line with Rabbi Josi:—

62. cf. Siphre Piska 101 — in the name of Rabbi Josiah;

Rabbi Jonathan, however, holds the opposite that — is unintentionally (אָדָם) and — is unavoidably (אָנִי). The same argument occurs in Bab.Tal. Keri. 9a. However, Rashi contradict himself, for in Pes. 80b (דַּעֵי) interprets like Rabbi Jonathan that — is inadvertently and — is unavoidably. Isaiah Berlin in his book — suggests that Rashi here does not state his own view or that of the Talmud, but only that of Onkelos who takes it as Rabbi Josiah.
63. Onkelos: Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos:

(Onkelos reads: — by — e.g. Mib. 142.)

64. The Mishna Nazir 6, 8 states:


65. Onkelos' translation:

By adding the word — Onkelos incorporated the traditional view. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, reads:

66. cf. Siphre, Piska 21; Bab.Tal.Zeb. 42b; Men. 73a.

67. Onkelos adds:

i.e. what is left from the fire after the fat has been sacrificed. cf. Ps. Jonathan:

68. cf. Siphre Piska 50; all the Rabbis agree that Scripture is speaking of an "earthen vessel". cf. Maimonides —
GROUP E

69. Onkelos - יִנְבֹּךְ מִפְּסָחֵי תֵּיבָה יָלְיָה מְאוּבֵּטֶת שֵׂעֵר שֶּׁקָּחַת לִיוֹדוֹ -
cf. the Palest. Targum and Ps. Jonathan

70. Onkelos translates - יָרָם עַל פיּ - It appears he holds that the lid itself must be from -
(cf. GEN.11 where Onkelos takes - לְקֵמָר - as - לְשָׁי - mortar) - mortar and not metal. See, S.B. Schefftel,
Biure Onkelos, pp. 198-199.

71. Other references where Onkelos translates in accordance
with tradition are: NUM.25 s. v - לְקֵמָר - Sanh.35a.
Again NUM. 35 - with regard to - לְשָׁי - is in line
with Bab. Macc. 12a.

72. cf. Siphre, Piska 8; Men. 34b; Zeb. 37b; Sanh. 4b;
Rashi EX.1316.

73. Onkelos - יִכְֵּמֶרֶגֶם לָאֵשׁ בַּיָּדָא מִפְּסָחֵי תֵּיבָה יָרוֹם -
It is, however, difficult to understand Onkelos' reason
for translating - יָרוֹם - literally and not like the traditional view that it means the "Tephillin
Shelyad". In 139 Onkelos translates the whole verse
literally, but Ps. Jonathan follows the tradition of
the Rabbis. See Halachic Section, Group B, note 2.
74. cf. Siphre Piska 18.

75. Onkelos: 

It is significant that Onkelos does not translate - by - (his usual equivalent) but by - This shows that it is a matter for the court. Nahmanides after quoting Rashi's interpretation says: - Ps. Jonathan translates - by - and - by - Onkelos should therefore be understood in the same way. Neofiti reads: -

76. cf. Siphre Piska 52-53. 

From his additions to the biblical text one can see how faithful he is to the traditional interpretation. Ps. Jonathan translates almost literally and takes - as Elazar and Itamar. See Adler, Netinah-Lager.

79. Onkelos explains - הַנְּחַלָּן הַשִּׁבָּה - "desolate valley".
   cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; cf. GEN. 4719 where Onkelos translates - נַחֲלָה - by - (desolate, dry ground becomes hard; hence Rash. 17a).

80. However, Maimonides - הבוחבב בָּעֵם - does not follow Onkelos and takes - נַחֲלָה אָירָּנ - to mean a "fast flowing river" - נַחֲלָה שִׁיחַות בְּחוֹדֶשׁ, זָהָה - cf. the translation of our text by N.E.B.

81. Mishna Sot. 46a; Siphre Piska 147; Maimonides - הבוחבב בָּעֵם - cf. the translation of our text by N.E.B.

82. See Rabbi J. Caro, Kesef Mishne (commentary on Maimonides) who quotes Onkelos as Maimonides' source. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Also Neofiti - הבוחבב בָּעֵם - cf. the translation of our text by N.E.B.

83. Rashi - כְּמוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל - cf. the translation of our text by N.E.B.
84. cf. Bab. Yeb. 48a; Maimonides:—. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 468.

85. cf. Sanh. ch.8, Mishna 2; Siphre Piska 34:—
86. Onkelos —
87. cf. Siphre Piska 82:—
88. The Talmud deduces by means of analogy that
89. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, translates literally:—

See Group A note 12

90. See Maimonides — and Kesef Mishne:—

91. cf. Maimonides — and Maggid Mishne.

92. Ps. Jonathan, however, in both places translates —

which is contrary to the accepted Halacha.

See Halachic Section, Group A. note 12.

93. cf. Cassuto, DEUT. p. 80:—

See, S. Luzzatto, his commentary on the Torah, p.545.

94. Mishna. Tem.29a —

and in the Mishna 30a —

cf. Maimonides —

95. Onkelos —
GROUP E

95 (cont'd)

The prostitution hire of a whore or the exchange of a
dog shall not be brought into the Temple. cf. Ps.
Jonathan and Palest. Targum. cf. also Neofiti —

Note that — is not rendered literally (sale).

96. In p. 87b, the Talmud quotes a Beraita whereby the
Rabbis have learnt by means of analogy (from —
tabuol אלי המשמש that Scripture is referring to a
labourer. (This is to exclude the opinion of Isi Ben
Judah who holds that Scripture is referring to every-
one who comes to the vineyard —
cf. Siphre Piska 132-133; Maimonides —
..מהjsonpויטות פ"ב.א.

97. Onkelos in both verses 25 and 26 interprets the words
- by — "when you are hired". cf.
Ps. Jonathan —
Neofiti in both verses, reads —

98. Beraita —
See Mishna Baba Metsia. 115a —
cf. Maimonides —
GROUP E

99. Onkelos - לא soothing chest, butancheare, bear the protests, now, now, Rashi -
Neofiti reads - אוכז ד"ל תברך כה בחק,財ש או חיל

100. Rashi - והישמעה דא - אנה מיב ז"ל שישמעו בה

101. Siphre Pisma 139 - מייער שמענו מיב אה שיכננה לרשעיו. ליב, יהודית ותמר ע"ר שיכננה לרשעיו וישמעו השרעין בו שלנא' העשים בואוכלו.
cf. Mishna, Sanh. 11, 1.
cf. Maimonides - מ"ה קובץ ובך פן -


103. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ותעייב בא"ב פרקמטיא ואבי נער -
Neofiti reads - ותעייב בא"ב פרקמטיא ואבי נער-

104. Rashi - ח"ש השכאר חוח חוח נתנה אתنفسו לcoma עלה בכמתה -
ךלהי בחות.

105. - כותא אתי נשטי - ותומי עוה או לcoma והכמתות אשר תחת הנשה -
לכם שעון י"א ש-calendar בוט.
105. (cont'd).


106. Rashi:

107. Siphre:

108. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Targum Jonathan II Kings, 14;
Rabbi D. Kimhi; Zunz Haderashot Be-Israel, ch.5,p.35.
and note 10 in p. 252. Neofiti, however, does not incorporate the Halacha -

109. Siphre Piska 13 - cf. Maas. Shenii, v.10; cf. Maimonides. Onkelos can not, here be referring to - or - כ.scrollTo.js - מירשין - או - מ"שין -

111. Rashi -绳לדועט STREET - חכשא שארו - כותב

112. For details see Maimonides - חלדועט זכרות שוג פ"ש

Bab. Pes. 36a. Yeb. 73a.


NOTES

HALACHA - GROUP F

1. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 1, note 18. In all fairness to Rashi in LEV. 1.6 he remarks that Onkelos' interpretation is in line with that of Abba Jose Ben Hanan who argues with the Rabbis:

- ברע"מ - הע הכנף מ何度も - וננה שכתב רכובו ומאחוריו, ונה
- אברותיו של אחיו של בן מיזים כמאבר גוזל את מיכראこそ כמע
- וברע"מ "וילא"ו א"ד

- סניבורפ - means together with its entrails etc.

This is what Onkelos means when he translates - סניבורפ - This is also the interpretation given by Abba Jose Ben Hanan who states he removes the stomach (the organ which contains digested food) together with the crop. cf. Bab. Zeb. 65b; Siphra Parasha 7; Lekah-Tov; this Section, Group D, note 5. This is one of the few places in the Torah where Rashi points to Onkelos' support of a particular "tanna". cf. Rashi EX. 2529. It is true, however, that in non-halachic aspects Rashi remarks that Onkelos' interpretation corresponds to one tannaitic opinion, e.g. DEUT. 3226, see General Introduction, p. 34.

3. Rabbi Judah the Prince holds - He who intends to kill a certain person and inadvertently kills another instead (as in the case here) is exempt from the death penalty and has only to pay his heirs - ממה - "money".


5. Rashi - cf. Maimonides - who derives from this verse these two prohibitions.


8. This is another discrepancy between the Targum and Rabbi Akiva Onkelos' own reputed teacher. See Halachic Section, Group D, note 7.
9. The four garments are: (belt) - יְתַעֲמִית - (mitre) - כּוֹפֶרֶת - and - בָּטַנְתָּא - The Samaritan text reads - מֶלֶךְ - in plural.

10. For this reason itself Onkelos is not consistent with Resh Lakish for otherwise there was no reason for him to translate - מֶלֶךְ - in plural as in any case the text mentions two garments, the shirt and the trousers.

11. The Bab. Keri. 13\textsuperscript{b} explains the argument as follows: The Rabbis through the rule of analogy - שֶׁכֶר שֶׁכֶר מַרְגּוּר - (cf. NUM. 6\textsuperscript{3}) compare the "Cohen to the Nazarite" and as the Nazarite should not drink wine - מִשְׁמַר, but he can have other drinks, so too the Cohen (cf. Onkelos NUM. 6\textsuperscript{3}). But Rabbi Judah holds that we do not deduce the laws of the Cohen from those of a Nazarite and - ושֶׁכֶר - (mentioned with regard to the Cohen) is intended to include all drinks. cf. Maimonides:

12. cf. Keri. 13\textsuperscript{b} - רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר אַל מִשְׁמַר שִׁיטְרָא מֵעֲלֹי, מַסּוֹן - מַשְׁמַר וּשְׁכָר.

13. While in NUM. 6\textsuperscript{3} Rashi quotes Onkelos, here he does not quote him.

15. Onkelos:

16. Siphra:


18. cf. Siphra 53:

19. In several cases Onkelos follows Rabbi Ishmael and not as A. Berliner holds that Onkelos translates according to Rabbi Akiva. On this subject, see J. Komlosh, pp. 159-160. See also this Group, note 2, footnote 8; also Halachic Section, Group E, note 18.
20. In Bab. Kid.32b - the Talmud states that many Rabbis are of the opinion that only an old man who is also a "wise" is referred to. Rabbi Jose holds that even if he is young, providing he acquired wisdom, he is entitled to such courtesy. Isi Ben Judah holds - that what is intended is any old man; cf. too, Siphra Piska 80.

21. cf. ibid.

22. While the French school (Rashi and Tosafoth in Kid.32b) failed to remark on Onkelos' interpretation, Nahmanides on this verse (as well as in - on Tractate Kid.32b) quotes him and tries to reconcile his view with that of the Talmud. Rabbenu Nissim ( too, quotes him in his commentary on Alfasi: See Introduction to Halacha, footnote 4.


24. ibid: - However, in Ber.31a, this is given as the opinion of Rabbi Ishmael and not of Rabbi Akiva.

26. cf. Bab. Nazir 19a and 22a; Baba Kamma 91b; Ned.10a; Taan. 11a; Sheb. 8a; Sot. 15a; Keri. 26a.

27. This is the version in many texts of the Targum Onkelos, including that of A. Sperber. cf. Ps. Jonathan. There are, however, some versions which read in Onkelos - יבש עצב מצויה אלו ובשה - which is a literal translation. Rashi, however, had in Onkelos - היבשה לעב מזרע אלו ובשה - for in Taan. 11a (לעב מצויה) Rashi says - Understand it as the Targum that the Nazarite's sin was because he defiled himself by a corpse. Texts of Onkelos may have been brought into line with the Talmud.
NOTES
HALACHA - GROUP G

1. -ויהו באהת משמשות המדות ומכרו פירות הבוות איננו כ...

שתכינו שמעון להדליר את המודר במוד שבוע בששה לאשהواقף אבר.

See E. Mizrahi who admits that Rashi is against the Halacha.

2. Rashi....


4. cf. Ps. Jonathan:

Palest. Targum: -

Neofiti -

5. See Rashi EX.23:

See General Introduction, p. 17.

6. ibid EX.23:

7. For the sake of clarity we shall term his Halachic deduction as "Peshat Halacha" in contradiction to "Derash Halacha".
GROUP G

8. A technical term for that portion of the sacrifice which is not eaten within the prescribed period.

9. cf. Rashi EX.16²⁹; EX.22⁸; EX.33².


11. And sometimes without even saying - יִשְׁמִיט - he is implying the "Peshat Halacha" of the text. cf. LEV. 6⁵; LEV. 8³⁴; NUM. 5⁸. In other instances he makes it clear that their "Derash Halacha" fits well with the Peshat of the text. cf. EX. 21¹⁹; EX. 22⁲⁹.

12. See Maimonides:- תְּמוּנָה קְרֵבָה סְמָךְ פָּנָיוֹ.


14. See Maimonides:- הַלּוֹכָה אֵדִיסֶה פָּנָיוֹ.בַּא יְמֵי מָיָה אֵשֶׁת לְפָרְנָסָה יְמֵי לְפָרְנָסָה יְמֵי לְפָרְנָסָה יְמֵי לְפָרְנָסָה יְמֵי לְפָרְנָסָה יְמֵי לְפָרְנָסָה.

15. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. does not translate literally.
16. See Bab. Baba Kamma 50a  

17. cf. Maimonides:  


Rabbi Eliezer holds that the "journey" need not be a  
distant one, but even - -ת 'הירוח ירא-- through he  
was merely outside the threshold of the forecourt of the  
Temple.  

22. cf. Maimonides: - - -ל"כ קדש סה ב"ה ב.  

23. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.45b. Rabbi Eliezer applies the herme-
neutical principle of - - -ם ויהי - and - -כ יוו .  

24. cf. also DEUT. 2319 - where Rashi (s.v - - -ם ינש א"ו)  
follows the opinion of "Beth Shammai" and not that of  
"Beth Hillel". See Bab.Tem.30b. Again DEUT.2316 where
24. (cont'd).
Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation, although it is rejected in Bab. Git. 54a by Rabbi Ahi Ben Josiah. See Halachic Section, Group D, note 11 and General Introduction, p. 17.

25. cf. Rashi LEV.1355 - where he says clearly that their "Derash Halacha" should not be detached from the setting of the text. In EX.122 - Rashi rejects the Derash Halacha, simply because - no Scriptural text can lose its literal meaning.

26. Parasha 16; cf. Mechilta Rabbi Simeon Ben Yohai; Bab. Baba Kamma 11a; Midrash Hagadol, EX. pp.514-515; Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben-Meir; Halachic Section, Group E, note 6.
NOTES
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1. Divrei-Shalom-Ve-Emeth. In note 7 after quoting EX. 21:24 "eye for an eye" - he writes the following - אָרְבָּא שֶׁשַׁאֲמַרְשֵׁם לְאֵין גִּפְעַת מִילָה בֹּזָה, אֶנֶּני הַמַּיִם שְׁאָמַר מִילָה מִילָה: אָרְבָּא שֶׁשַׁאֲמַרְשֵׁם לְאֵין גִּפְעַת מִילָה בֹּזָה, אֶנֶּני הַמַּיִם שְׁאָמַר מִילָה מִילָה. In note 8 he writes again - אָרוּבָא שֶׁשַׁאֲמַרְשֵׁם לְאֵין גִּפְעַת (שֶׁשַׁאֲמַרְשֵׁם), אֶנֶּני הַמַּיִם שְׁאָמַר מִילָה מִילָה. cf. A. Berliner - Targum Onkelos, p. 224.

2. Ibid, A. Berliner.

3. In his Introduction to his commentary on Targum Onkelos:

כִּי נְאַתּוּ הַשָּׁאוּרִים שַאֲמַרְשֵׁם שָׁנְאֵּר לִבְּרוֹם הָעַלֶּה בֶּלֶת הַבַּשִּׁילָתָה שלַקְנִיִּים חַשִּׁים. ובַּשָּׁלוֹם אֶלָּחֶד בְּשַׁמַּיִם שַחֲדֵבְךָ מְאַוַּלְךָ לֹא. вал חלך.

כִּי נְאַתּוּ הַשָּׁאוּרִים שַאֲמַרְשֵׁם שָׁנְאֵּר לִבְּרוֹם הָעַלֶּה בֶּלֶת הַבַּשִּׁילָתָה שלַקְנִיִּים חַשִּׁים. ובַּשָּׁלוֹם אֶלָּחֶד בְּשַׁמַּיִם שַחֲדֵבְךָ מְאַוַּלְךָ לֹא. вал חלך.

כִּי נְאַתּוּ הַשָּׁאוּרִים שַאֲמַרְשֵׁם שָׁנְאֵּר לִבְּרוֹם הָעַלֶּה בֶּלֶת הַבַּשִּׁילָתָה שלַקְנִיִּים חַשִּׁים. ובַּשָּׁלוֹם אֶלָּחֶד בְּשַׁמַּיִם שַחֲדֵבְךָ מְאַוַּלְךָ לֹא. вал חלך.
4. P. Churgin refuted also Adler's theory - see Horev IX 1946 - p. 83 - "Halacha be-Targum Onkelos":-

"..." ( Exodus) מיריה שארווקלוזו רוחת תארגומיו למסור הקדיש,parator
יאור מודרה למסור את המסורה לפי ההלכה בכזל עותק שמחתיה
ב יודוקvais: ויוזמיות בולבוב א"ו הקצבה. רעה★ ו★ יהודה מברוקסmodation כל
 TRECE 샤רי ייחו מימי בת אומת לאמור במקלדת של מניי
וזיון. שביהים שיכו שמיונא בולבוב★ יאמ והיו כרכוב קולוש
ף ספוקם★ אחרי. לא שמעו שמיי הלוכד שמי אחר שדואל הישאר
על המגלים שיש רוחת אכיריי בורדייט ( Targum Onkelo קובץ על
האגיד ו.nlm תארגומי של שמיי דר מיומד★) וי אמרו אדם★ בשלעיו
שראת בשאר (שבים מיריה שארווקלוזו תארגומי☆ מיired לא רפייך צאהו
שפתת מותרת). א"ו לא טוב עד ספוקם" שם ישארו תארגומי
למסור בין ווהל המסכרים והביס מה תארגומי הלוכד.ויהו.
See J. Komlosh, p. 158.

5. Mishna: - "closest בApiClientיأخذ את שידר גנ perchè נשת רסה
אמרה" התב ע︶בש מיל" ע"ב מקר מערכן וער יש לה
ספוק ושתל עוזר אחד ק'פ. זה. cf. Rashi - DEUT.19^9 -
כammers ע"ב - לא מסוף ע"ה - See the story of Shimon Ben Shetah, his son and Susanna
in the Apocrypha (Jerus Sanhed VI 3 ) v.48 ff., with regard
to the validity of the Halacha of -"אריך ע"ה -
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Midrash Hagadol, Lev. p. 480.


9. Mishna Baba Bathra, ch. 8, 2, and Bab. Talmud, 122b; Ket. 90a; Palest. Talmud, Baba Bath, 8, 1; Meg. - Taanith, ch. 5.

10. Mishna, ibid - 'בּכָּל מצוות השם בּכָּל בּכָּل בּכָּל בּכָּل בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל בּכָּל ה

11. cf. Bab. Talmud, Baba Bath, p. 122b - "טילאי איה א"ה" - בפואר יא ע"ש ו"ש בהעמ" - בפואר יא ע"ש ו"ש בהעמ" - בפואר יא ע"ש ו"ש בהעמ" - בפואר יא ע"ש ו"ש בהעמ" - בפוא

12. See A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, pp. 69-102 on the "halachic differences" between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The reader will see that there are several "halachic texts" of which there are arguments between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, with regard to their interpretations and Onkelos did not interpret them.
12. (cont'd).

in accordance with the Pharisees' view (see especially pp. 89-93).

13. His Introduction:

14. Many more cases of this nature will be found in Halachic Section, Group E.

15. See further this ch. (suggestion 6).

16. See Halachic Section, Group A.II.

17. I say on the whole because we cannot say he avoided him completely since in a few instances he did quote him (see Groups C and D).

18. In several instances Onkelos' interpretations correspond with the Mishna, cf. NUM.517 - Mishna Sot.15b; NUM.68 - Mishna Nazir 45b; DEUT.2120 - Mishna Sanh.70a; DEUT.218 - Mishna Sot.46a. Regarding the latter quotation see N.Adler, Netinah-Lager who says that Onkelos knew the Mishna. Many more examples can be found in Halachic Section, Group E.
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19. See Halachic Section, Group F, note 5.

20. See Halachic Section, Group E, note 18; Halachic Section, Group F, notes 2 and 6. In several instances Onkelos follows Rabbi Ishmael's view. See J. Komlosh, pp.159-160.


23. In Palest. Tal. Meg., however, a different version is given:

24. Halachic Section, Group E, notes 2 and 36.


26. Rashi has used the same terms even in non "halachic expositions", e.g. GEN.15:11; GEN.43:2; EX.23:27. Although Rashi on several occasions has refuted also the Midrash of the Rabbis, nevertheless he never expressed himself so forcibly. See Section - Rashi as Philologist, ch.7. Rejection of Onkelos' translation.
27. Rabbi Eliezer was called - cf. Palest. Shebi. ch.9; Palest. Bets. ch.4. cf. Maimonides' commentary on the Mishna Sheb. ch.9 - cf. Rabbi Shelomo Adani - Melecheth Shelomo Mishna Sheb. ch.9, who explains that Rabbi Eliezer belonged to the "School of Shammai".

28. At first there was opposition to the use of written Targumim. See Mishna Meg. 4.4, that the "Translator" had to translate orally, cf. B.J. Roberts - The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 197 ff. We know, however, of earlier Targumim on the Hagiographia, cf. Bab. Shab. 115a that Gamliel I authorised the destruction of a Targum to the Book of Job, possibly the one now known from the Dead Sea Scroll. See Michael Sokoloff, "The Targum to Job", Bar Ilan University, 1974, p. 4 ff.

29. A salary was even attached to this office. See Bab. Pes. 50b.

30. For details see Mishna, Meg. 3.2.
31. See General Introduction, p. 22.

32. The identification of Onkelos with Aquila, the author of the literal translation of the Old Testament into Greek, is a subject of discussion in many works of scholarship. cf. Silverstone Aquila and Onkelos, 1931. Also B.J. Roberts, op. cit. pp. 204 ff; cf. P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, p. 117.

33. See Introduction to Midrashic Section with regard to Midrashic and Halachic insertions as well as to Free Translation in Onkelos' Targum. See also Section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 3.

34. P. Kahle, op.cit. p. 119 (quoted also by B.J. Roberts, op. cit. p. 205) believes that the "halachic material which occurs from time to time in the Targum is the remains of what at one time characterized the work as a whole, but was expunged as a result of Aquila's work on the strict definition of the text". His argument is not convincing, for, if this is the case, one would not expect to find so great a remnant of "halachic" expositions in this Targum, and certainly not expositions which are contrary to the views of Rabbi Akiva himself (see Group F, notes 2 and 6) or for that matter Halachot which are not in
34. (cont'd).

conformity with tradition (e.g. Group A). I, therefore, believe that Onkelos' Targum was, primarily a translation, strictly literal, and this is why it was accepted by Rabbi Akiva who was, somehow, dissatisfied with the LXX and other versions. Furthermore, being strictly literal, it enabled the unlearned to concentrate on the text without being confused by the Halachot which are of no consequence to him. It was only after Rabbi Akiva died that somehow, every time this Targum was revised, the various halachic expositions of the Meturgemanim were inserted in the Targum itself. See Introduction to Section Anthropomorphism, footnote 31.

35. A similar idea was expressed by P. Churgin (Horev IX 1946, pp. 79-83). On p. 83, he writes:

36. cf. P. Churgin (ibid):
בזכך עודיו והכחות של הסרגון. Haupt
הסרגון לא ידע לעזרת עם מתייה בחיה
והכית במקרא או על קצב של הסרגון בצלאו
הסרגון עתים ועתים ושם שביני הסרגון
נפרו לברית ולפיו גורשו מתושבי אוזה משאוד
ולפי זכויותיהם והוועדות בשתי הקומות.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION TO THE MIDRASHIC SECTION


4. Targum Onkelos, II, Berlin 1884, pp. 224-45. L. Zunz's statement that only occasionally had Onkelos used the "Derash" is also incorrect when one takes into account the very large number of midrashic interpretations which exist in Onkelos' Targum:

See Hadera'hok - Be-Isra'el, p. 38.
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6. Scholars differ as to the origin of Onkelos' Targum.

A. Geiger, *Hamikra-Ve-Targumim*, p. 290, believes that Onkelos is of Babylonian origin. This is also the view of Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, p. 117. I am, however, inclined to share the view of Leopold Zunz - *Die Vorträge der Juden Historisch Entwickelt 1832*, p. 62 - supported by G. Vermes, ibid, p. 169, who both believe that Onkelos is a Babylonian revision of Palestinian Targumic tradition. On this subject see also B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, op. cit. p. 205-206. It is true, however, that in several cases (see Group B) Onkelos takes an independent line from that of the Palestinian Targumim available to us. And consequently, the theory that Onkelos is a shortened version of Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 1. We may also say that Jonathan on the Prophets has seen Onkelos' Targum for Jonathan's interpretation on *Judges*, ch. 5:26 is identical with that of Onkelos in *Deut.* ch. 22:5. Similarly, Jonathan on *Kings*, ch. 14:6 is exactly like that of Onkelos: *Deut.* ch. 26:16. Again Jonathan, *Jer.* ch. 48:45-46 - is similar to that of Onkelos, *Num.* ch. 21:28-29. See L. Zunz, *Haddarashot Be-Israel*, ch. 5, pp. 35-41 with special attention to note 10 on p. 252. This
6. (cont'd).

assertion is correct only if we accept the theory that the author of the Targum on the Prophets is Rab. Joseph and not Jonathan, Hillel's disciple. (See Bab.Tal.Meg.3a; Rashi and Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets). In support of this theory many interpretations of Jonathan's Targum are quoted in the Talmud in the name of Rab. Joseph. See JER. ch.46^20 - and quoted in Yoma, p.32^b; AMOS, ch.6^7 - quoted Ned.p.38^a; ZECH. ch.9^6 - quoted Kid.p.72^b; ISAIAH, ch.5^17 - quoted Pes. p.68^a; ISAIAH, ch.19^18 - quoted Men.110^a; EX.25^5 - quoted Shab.28^a; NUM.6^4 - quoted Naz.39^a. See the following note.

7. This would explain the assertion of the Babylonian Talmud, Kid.49^a, in referring to Onkelos as - רָכַּב לְשׁוֹנָהוּ מִיֵּלֶדֶן - "Our Targum". Sometimes Onkelos is quoted in the Talmud just by - רָכַּב לְשׁוֹנָהוּ מִיֵּלֶדֶן - cf. Bab.Tal.Rosh Hashana, p.33^b; Meg. p.10^b; Git.p.68^b; Sanh. p.106^b; Hul.p.80^a; Bech. p.50^a. And sometimes it is Rab. Joseph who quotes Onkelos' Targum, e.g. Shab. p.28^a; Shab.p.64^a.

8. See Halachic Section, Group E and Midrashic Section, Group C.

9. See J.W. Bowker, Haggadah in the Targum Onkelos. J.S.S. v.12,p.52 - who remarked that Rashi was fully aware of the midrashic elements found in Onkelos. (However some of his examples, such as GEN.ch.3^24;GEN.ch.11^6 - are merely obscure textual words where Rashi turns to Onkelos for guidance).
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP A

1. The word - נשמ - can be read with the preceding and the following clause. If it is taken with the first part of the verse then - נשמ - is interpreted in the sense of - נשמ - to bear with, hence to forgive.

2. Here - נשמ - is read with the clause that follows it and consequently it is derived from - נשמ - "measure" - the sin overflows the measure. cf. Bab.Tal.Yoma, p.52; Bab.Tal.Kid.p.30; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.114.


4. The same interpretation is given by the Palestinian Targum and Neofiti. We may, therefore, suggest that Onkelos is dependent on Palestinian Targumic tradition, and not vice versa. On the whole, Onkelos modifies and condenses the more diffuse and elaborate midrashic interpretations found in the Palestinian Targumic versions. Undoubtedly, these Targumim were current in his lifetime, and he therefore, incorporated them in his own Targum. If, however, his brevity and conciseness make his Targum obscure and unintelligible, then we must turn to the other Palestinian Targumim for guidance. However, in some cases (as can be seen from these chapters), Onkelos takes an independent line from
4. (cont'd).
that of the Targumim available to us. Although we
cannot decipher his sources, yet we may safely assume
that he had some other Palestinian Targumic tradition
before him. On this subject see G. Verme, J.S.S. v.8,
op-cit. p. 169 who expresses the same view that Onkelos
is dependent on Palestinian tradition, and not as some
scholars such as G. Dalman-Grammatik der judisch-paläst-
ineschen Aramaisch, second ed. (Leipzig 1905), p.31 and
G.F. Moore, Judaism, 1, 174 - who hold that it is the
Palestinian Targumim who embroider and elaborate on the
bare and literal translation of Onkelos. See supra p.

5. Ps. Jonathan reads –
And they shall dwell in the "school" of Shem.
Onkelos is taking an independent line, see above footnote
4.


7. Ps. Jonathan translates –
"The well at which the living God had appeared to her".
cf. GEN. Rabbah, ch.45, 10 in the name Rabbi Judah Ben
Simon.
8. See Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p. 268, that it was "a prophetic vision".


10. It appears that whilst Onkelos and Rashi take as - a prophetical vision - Ps. Jonathan takes it as - for he translates: -

11. The expression - denotes a rejection of Onkelos' interpretation. See Section Anthropomorphisms, Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 4. Also, ch. Reverence to God, note 5.

12. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not translate that Abimelech gave "a garment of honour" to Abraham.


14. (cont'd).

See Midrash Hagadot GEN. op.cit. p.331; Rab. Saadia Gaon on the Torah, Rabbi David Kimhi, p. 116.

15. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb Ger, p.36 who quotes another version in Onkelos. See, S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.36; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager, op. cit. p. 69; N. Adler, Natinah-Lager.

16. See Nahmanides who interprets Onkelos differently. It is quite common for Onkelos to translate geographical place-names midrashically, e.g. GEN.4 - DEUT. ch.1. See S.B. Schefftel Biure Onkelos, op. cit.p.221. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.5. Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 12 ff.

17. See GEN. Rabbah, ch.55, 7 - נב' יהיהֹ חוכמ, כיון, יאשアメリカ - בהוגים שעומדיםantwort לזוגים. אמבר, זמנה שיכרין א mesa קראת. ביבט לד. redis ביבט לד. redis. The first two interpretations occur also in the Bab.Tal. Taa. 16a; cf. the Palest. Tal.Ber.ch.4, Halacha 5; Tanhuma,Parashat Vayera, ch.22;Yalk.Shimon1,247,96; Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p.349.
18. In this case as well as in GEN.4 (חלקאוסות בּלֵו), or GEN.28 (חלקאוסות) the reader would expect Rashi to say - "And its midrashic interpretation is like that of the Targum". Rashi, however, is not so particular in his stylistic expressions, and we may assume that if the "Derash" does no violence to the text then to Rashi it is in order to call it Peshat. cf. Rashi NUM.24 - (פּוֹשַׁט חכָּרָאשָׁם) and NUM.24. See also this Section, Group B, note 14 (infra) and 29 (infra).
Regarding the conventional distinction between "Peshat" and "Derash", see Raphael Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp. 155-167 and 176 ff. See also Midrashic Section, Group E. (b, c and d).

19. Rashi, here, quotes first the midrashic interpretation of Onkelos and then that of the Midrash, cf. GEN.9 (part. 1); GEN.6. Sometimes, however, the order is vice versa, firstly the Midrash and then Onkelos' interpretation, e.g. GEN.22; GEN.4927. We may, therefore, conclude that no significance can be attached to the above for Rashi did not write prefaces to his work nor indicate the premises upon which his interpretation rested. See General Introduction, p.32. Section Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, footnote 4; Midrashic Section, Group B, notes 7, 12.
20. See GEN. Rabbah, ch.56,10:

"Rabbi Johanan said: May it be thy will....that when Isaac's children are in trouble, Thou wilt remember that binding in their favour and be filled with compassion for them....Rabbi Helbo said: While it was yet Salem (Jerusalem) the Holy One blessed be He, made Himself a tabernacle and prayed in it, as it says. In Salem also is set His Tabernacle, and His dwelling place in Zion. (Ps. 76:3). And what did He say: O that I may see the building of the Temple".


21. LXX reads: accompanied by Ahazath his Chamberlain.

23. Perhaps Rashi did not see the purpose of quoting the Midrash, since Rabbi Nehemiah himself quoted Onkelos' interpretation.

24. This is also the interpretation of Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Onkelos and Rashi seem to take - רְשֵׁי - not only in the sense of King Messiah but also in the sense of - כֶּבֶר - his - cf. GEN. Rabbah 99, 8 - הַכֶּבֶר שֻׁלַּחְנָהוּ שְׁכִּי. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.47; Rabbi D. Kamhi, op. cit. p.205; Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra. The Samaritan text reads - רְשֵׁי - The Vulgate reads: "donec veniat qui mittendus est". It appears that the Vulgate takes - שֻׁלַּחְנָהוּ - in the sense of - כֶּבֶר - See J. Komlosh, p.184. See Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir who rejects these interpretations: -"כֶּבֶר כִּבְרֵי אֶחָדָם וּלְאָם שֻׁלַּחְנָהוּ כִּבְרֵי אֶחָדָם". See D. Rosin, Interpretations on Rashbam's Commentary Breslau 1881, p.72. Also in Jahresbericht, Breslau 1880, p. 98.

25. (cont' d)

Poznański, Schiloh, Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte der Messias Lehre; S. D. Luzzatto, On the Torah, pp. 194-196; J. Komlosh, op. cit, p. 183 - who quotes - that Shiloh refers to King Messiah: - that Shiloh refers to King Messiah: -

On the word "Shiloh", see further Nahmanides; Ibn Ezra; Rabenu Bachai, v. l, pp. 383-384; Rabbi I. Arama; Rabbi O. Sforno.

26. cf. Bab. Tal. Irub. 54b where this is referred to the scholars who ride from city to city and from district to district to learn Torah. Thus making the laws of the Torah shine - white as is the light at noonday.

27. Parashat Vayehi 10; cf. GEN. Rabbah, ch. 98, 9; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp. 844-845; Midrash Aggadah. Buber, p. 111.

28. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum take an independent line although both agree that the text refers to King Messiah.
29. One can see from this verse as well as from verse 49\textsuperscript{12} that Rashi was aware that Onkelos contains several interpretations in one verse without of course differentiating them by the formula - רבס נרמ - "another interpretation". See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 28.

30. For further analyses of this subject, see Halachic Section and ch. "Summary."


32. See Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 856; GEN. Rabbah 98,18; Bab.Tal.Zeb.p.118\textsuperscript{b};

ף"יר ר"ן - רבעו עלא רצקה שלנ יתגרות מברך שאנה ש"ת

תקיב אתמקץ קספרו עינה.


33. op. cit. p. 857: יבש ווא"ץ ייו - שיעוח ליבש פן י"ע דriousס


cf. Midrash Aggadah; Lekah-Tov.

34. N.E.B. takes - הירש - in the sense of - הררי - mountains.
35. Onkelos: Ps. Jonathan identifies "the great ones" - specifically "אמרון לא יהוה רברש התורה" - cf. Neofiti. The Palest. Targum takes - in the sense of - כרים - "mountains". The Patriarchs are compared to "mountains" and the Matriarchs to the valleys: cf. Neofiti. The Palest. Targum takes - in the sense of - כרים - "mountains". The Patriarchs are compared to "mountains" and the Matriarchs to the valleys: cf. Neofiti. The Palest. Targum takes - in the sense of - כרים - "mountains". The Patriarchs are compared to "mountains" and the Matriarchs to the valleys:

The basic text for the identification of - כרים - to קואר (ch.6) is Micah, (ch.6):

"Up, state your case to the mountains; let the hills hear your plea". Rabbi D. Kimbi in the name of Jonathan's Targum (cf. Rashi) explains that the "mountains" are the Patriarchs and the "hills" are the Matriarchs. See further this amp A note 28.

37. See GEN. Rabbah 98,20; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. pp. 858-859; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 115:

"Let all these blessings come (lit. - קש - to gather) and make a diadem of majesty upon the head of Joseph".
cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. See also Ibn Ezra and Samuel Ben Meir's commentary.

Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.859; Siphre, DEUT.
Piska 353; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT.3316, p. 858.

40. cf. Midrash Tanhumah, Parashat Vayehi 14; cf. also GEN. Rabbah, Parasha 99, 3.

41. cf. Tanhumah, ibid: "מרבר אחר כל ת븐י ואש סופ - מרבר ברברנסת -
ובבר אחר אנחל ורב אחר מנשה וחברת הברך והברך והברך והברך..."
"AFTER ANGEL AND ANGEL AND ANGEL AND ANGEL
AND ANGEL AND ANGEL AND ANGEL AND ANGEL..."
cf. GEN. Rabbah ibid; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p. 864;
Midrash Sechel Tov, p. 326; Midrash Aggadah, p. 115;
Lekah-Tov; Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. To Onkelos the
41. (cont'd).

word - בונה - is taken in the sense of - מניח - "altar".
cf. GEN. Rabbah 93, para. 3 - ובחב 느נה בריך קריא - במעטב, ים תואם כי הוא מוטב

See B. Becher - כחר מ특별 - v.3, p.323. See also Bab. Tal.Suc. p. 56b - מערעת בכריים בית ביליהל עוד..._records.

יושב יהודיה יתב עשרות בכריעת הוא, הטמא, האור הכתVirgin לוחות זרעים (80b) וו הנח את המלקה.ormשSeverity עם השעון

Onkelos' view that in the land of Benjamin the Sanctuary will be built - אבאוותיה יבנת מקדש - is also found in Siphre, DEUT. Piska 352: - שלמר שבית מקדש - כי buen belokh שוק בקימא.

cf. also GEN. Rabbah, 93, 12; ibid, 99,1; Bab.Tal. Yoma, p.12a; Zeb. p.118b; Meg.26a; Encyclopaedia-Ha-Ivrit, v.9, p.137 ff. Mechilta - ממקראות יתי בלעה; See also Benjamin's will - 9,2 -ESS מקרך ח' כהליק וי - in A. Kahana - הסוכרים החכמוניים - v.1, p.214.

42. There are, however, different versions in Onkelos. See Nahmanides, who quotes some of them. See A. Sperber; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. pp.49-50; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.
NOTES

GROUP A

43. cf. N.E.B. "But beware there is trouble in store for you". cf. Ps. Jonathan: — חמשתונות לבהלוב ושבה תוקן
— cf. Neofiti and A. Ibn Ezra. Rabbi Samuel-Ben-Meir seems to interpret differently —"אמשתوحすれば רעה בלבך" — "You devise evil in your heart".

44. Ex. Rabbah, 13,5.

45. The Palestinian Targum and Neofiti translate — "נוה - "armed". See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 5 note 3.


48. cf. Midrash Tanhuma; Yalk.Shimoni, 242; Midrash Hagadot, Ex. pp.287-288; Mechilta, Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon; Bab. Tal.Chag.13b:—"חמשתונות לבהלוב ושבה תוקן
— "You devise evil in your heart".

She follows the Palestinian Targum and says the verse means "a wolf among shepherds."

לע גוני והו של מחוז כופי.
49. (Vienna 1870) Beshalach, Parasha 3 -

'וכְּבֵי עוֹלָם' אֶלֹהָי - בְּמַעֲשֵׂה אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים שֶׁהִיא מִדָּרְשָׁתָם

This is also the interpretation of the Vulgate -
"Glorificabo eum".

cf. also Yalk. Shimoni, 244; Mechilta Rabbi Shimon;
Midrash Hagadol, EX. p.292; Ps. Jonathan, the
Palestinian Targum, LXX and Neofiti follow Rabbi Akiva.

50. Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach -

op. cit. p. 40. cf. Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon; Midrash
Hagadol, EX. op. cit. p. 300. See Section, Rashi as
Philologist ch. 5 note 4.

51. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti, however, translate -
אַוְּיִקְוּבָּה אֶלְּשֶׁהַתִּתְּנָה - "The waters were made into manifold heaps". cf. the Vulgate "Congregatae sunt aquae".
See J. Komlosh, p.195; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v.6, p. 110.

52. The exact words of Onkelos are: -

рокט פְּנֵי יְהוָה לְבָנָי רְאוּ וְרָאֵהוּ -

Rashi, having in mind the Mechilta's comment translated -
-"b'nei yisrael beyt nebali".
53. cf. Mechilta Yithro, Parasha 2

See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15a) where the punishment of water is clearly specified:

See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15a) where the punishment of water is clearly specified:

See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15a) where the punishment of water is clearly specified:

54. cf. Rashi, EX.34.


pp. 406-407; Bab.Tal. Ber. p.7a; Jonathan's Targum,

Jer. ch.32. cf. Rashi, Onkelos, Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti on LEV.26; Siphra Behukotai, 8; Midrashic Section, Group C; notes 40 and 50; Midrashic Section, Group D, note 3.

57. See NUM. Rabbah 9, 14: - לִפְנֵי שְׁעֵה אֵלֵּךְ וְלֹא תִמְרֹע הַדָּמָא תֹּא רָחַם אֵלֵּךְ וְלֹא תִמְרֹע הַדָּמָא תֹּא רָחַם. See Midrash Hagadol, EX. op. cit. pp. 757-758.

58. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti who both interpret that the righteous women used to pray at the Temple. In other words they had given up all earthly matters and came to the Temple for prayers and instruction. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra: - וִיהֵם מִי בִּשְׁכָרָאֲנַה יְטַבְּרַת תּוֹשָׁהָשׁ שְׁסֵרַת מַתָּאָוהַת - וַיִּזְרָא לָעַד וְלֹא יִזְרָא לָעַד וְלֹא יִזְרָא לָעַד וְלֹא יִזְרָא לָעַד וְלֹא יִזְרָא לָעַד. The Palest. Targum however merely reads - הבורא נטע'א. - see M. Cassuto, EX. p. 326; Nahmanides; Rabbenu Bachai; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos.

59. N.E.B. takes - הֲוָה לֵךְ לְרֹאיִי - figuratively, hence, "And you will be our guide".
NOTES

GROUP A

60. Siphre (M. Friedman) Vienna, 1864; Piska 80; p. 21a-
   "אמר לי השם אלהים: אם תרבו בני ישראל במדבר...".
   cf. Yalk. Shimoni, Behaalotcha, 726; Midrash Hagadol,
   NUM. p. 152.

61. Parashat Behaalotecha, Piska 95; cf. Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p. 180; Siphre Zuta,
   Behaalotecha, Piska 25 (ed. Horovitz) p. 272; Tanhuma,
   Buber, v. 2. p. 57.

62. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti - see further this Group, note 31 on DEUT. 19.

63. cf. Tanhuma, Buber, v. 2. p. 57; Rashi DEUT. ch. 5; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v. 6. p. 88, note 481. See
   Section Veneration, Group C, note 3.

64. This is the translation of the Soncino Chumash edited by A. Cohen, Eleventh Impression, London 1974. N.E.B.
   however translates as follows: "The spring unearthed by the princes... a gift from the wilderness. (v. 19). And
   they proceeded from Beer (Heb. from gift) to Nahaliel...."
NOTES

GROUP A

65. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti explain the "princes" to mean the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and - by - נריב י疲れ - who are Moses and Aaron. Onkelos also can be explained in the light of the Palestinian Targumim. See J. Komlosh, p. 201.


NOTES

GROUP A

67. (cont'd).
Tem. 28^b; Meg. 6^a; Tosefta Ab. Zar. ch.7. On this word - רַפַּיָּה - See M. Jastrow, v.1.p.248.


69. Perhaps, however, Rashi felt that the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis is more appropriate on the words - " לֵאמֶר מְנַחֵלָן" - as the Targum has it, and this is why Rashi quotes Onkelos.

70. See Rashi - NUM.23^9 - who alludes to this Midrash.
See this group footnote (supra) 35.


72. This is the translation of the "Soncino Chumash" edited by A. Cohen, London 1974. The N.E.B. translates as follows: "He uttered his oracle: Ah, who are these assembling in the north...". This translation presupposes נַפְעַל - For - מִקְוָא
73. See Bab. Tal. Sanh. p. 106; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. op. cit. pp. 432-433; Rabbi Ibn Ezra believes that - לאמ - is not referring to God, but to the King of Assyria who made himself as God - לאמ. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir translates - לאמ - as אבריר. Ps. Jonathan takes it as Onkelos: - לאמ - as אבריר. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. (This note 30 is misplaced and it should be in Group C.)

74. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; Nahmanides and Rabbi S. Ben Meir. See also this ch. note 25 (on NUM. 11). From this verse Rabbi Johanan deduces that in the time to come all the books of the prophets will be abolished except the five Books of Moses: לאמ - as אבריר. See the Palest. Tal. Meg. ch. 1, Halacha 1; Ephraim E. Urbach, The Sages, p. 274.

75. Onkelos: - ספוק metastebאברירא ספוקב אברירא אברירא לוא(frames, note 76) - as if it were - הפיס_Run. Onkelos treats - הפיס - as if it were - הפיס.Run. Onkelos, here moderated the apparent
76. (cont'd).

anthropomorphism and translated - עיניו - and
guarded them as the pupil of their eye and not as the
pupil of His (God's)eye. See Section on Anthropomorphism,
Group B. References on Human Form and Organ, note 7.

77. DEUT. pp. 705-706. cf. also Yalk. Shimoni, p. 943;
Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.3. Ps. Jonathan, the
Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate differently from
Onkelos.

78. See Siphre, Hazinu, Piska 315; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Tannaim,
p. 192; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 707.

79. The wording is ambiguous and it is hard to tell whether
Onkelos meant - עֲבוֹדָה עַיְנֵי - "the Hereafter" - or - עַיְנֵי -
המשיח - the Messianic times. Most likely the latter
as can be seen from the continuation of his interpretation,
i.e. the eradication of the worship of idols. See Maimonides
Mishne-Torah;

The other Targumim, Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and
Neofiti do not follow Onkelos. They simply state that
God will make them dwell alone in their own land. Ps.
Jonathan reads:

It is interesting to note that whilst Onkelos takes
79. (cont'd).
- דמל as referring to God (דמלה) - the other Targumim take - דמל as referring to the suffix of דמלה; the parallelism - דמל רמ - as well as the - ה GridView - support the Targumim. However, some read in Onkelos - דמל - and not - דמל. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

80. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.713.

81. It is true, however, that Onkelos' interpretation is inadequate to convey the full meaning of the text. Rashi therefore takes the opportunity of quoting and explaining him. See this Section, Group D, note 6. See Section Anthropomorphism Group I note 8

82. See Rashi DEUT.32 43 - who quotes the two opinions.

83. See Siphre, Ha'azinu, Piska 323; Midrash Tannaim. p.199; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 723.

84. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. From the verse DEUT.32 35 one can further deduce that Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Judah: - דמל שיב אד - "Their foot shall totter in due time".
84. (cont'd)

Onkelos interprets: - קָדָם מִרְעוֹנָתָהּ וַאֲנוּנָא, וַעֲשֵׂלוֹת לְעֹד
- יָרַע

"The punishment is before Me, and I will repay in the time of their dispersion (exile) from their land". The exile from their land can only refer to Israel. Rashi follows Onkelos' interpretation and in verse 34 he says clearly -lsa -

85. See Nahmanides who remarks that Onkelos did not suppress the naive conception - God's right hand. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. See section The Anti-Anthropomorphisms, Group B. References to Human Form and Organs, note 12.

86. It appears that the Targumim and other classical commentators have taken - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי as two words. However, Abu Omar Ibn Jakwa, the Spanish commentator of the 10th century takes it as one word - (cf. DEUT.3:17 - אָשֵׂרַת חַטָּבֹת) and signifies a "place". See W. Bacher, Die Judaifche Biblexegese, Trier 1892, p.21 - quoted by J. Komlosh, The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations, p.206. Grammatically speaking, if the word - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי - means the Torah, then one would expect - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי - and not - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי. The - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי - in fact, refers to the place - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי - parallel to - יָשָׁרַע - and - שִׁירָשְׁנֵי - . The only
86. (cont'd).

place where the word ידוע - is found in the Bible is in the Book of Esther, (ch. 15 and ch. 18) - which is quite late. The English translation of the text in question is taken from The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. The N.E.B. however, does not take - as referring to the Torah: "He showed himself from Mount Paran, and with him were myriads of holy ones streaming along at his right hand".

87. Parashat Vezot-Haberacha, Piska 343. cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 754; - אמר רבי שמואל ב' לרב, התורה של ש"ו וסמוס את חת חsoldorنسו נשבו ענה, ויאמפרות אנוה (שמעון ל"ו) ומקליאס שיאריו עמו אשה, מצהיגהו אש לוית (ח' כ, כ)."והכיר בנוו ברות, וניענן הפרוש... See DEUT. Rabbah, ch. 3, 12; Palest. Tal. Shekalim, ch. 6, Halacha 1; Palest. Tal. Sot. ch. 8, Halacha 3; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch. 43 - ב"ו.

88. cf. EX. 19 18; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. These Targumim elaborate on the fact that the Almighty offered the Torah to the sons of Esau and Ishmael, but they refused to accept it.
1. See Introduction to the Midrashic Section.


3. See Rabbi D. Kimhi on the Torah, p.151.

4. cf. Ps. Jonathan; Rashi and Onkelos, GEN.46:34. Neofiti, however, translates literally.


6. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum translate differently. GEN. Rabbah, Tanhuma and other Midrashim also make different comments on the text. GEN. Rabbah - 97 refers the text to "King Messiah". cf. Lekah-Tov, p. 235. See Midrash Aggadah, Buber, p. 110:- ἤταν ἡ μορφὴ περὶ τῆς αἰωνίως. Perhaps, therefore, Rashi's source is the Midrash Aggadah and Rashi merely states that Onkelos is in line with the Midrash's interpretation. However, the Midrash Aggadah does not identify either the whelp or the lion, with King David. In GEN. Rabbah (שמוע חמשה) 97, we
6. (cont'd).

Rabbi Hama said this is the Messiah, the son of David". cf. Midrash Lekah-Tov, p.235. Onkelos, most likely, had in mind King David and the King Messiah, as indeed Rashi interprets.

7. Tanhuma; GEN. Rabbah and other Midrashim offer a different interpretation than that of Onkelos.

8. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targumim interpret the text as having reference to King Messiah. On the words - however, they seem to agree with Onkelos' interpretation. cf. Neofiti. See Midrashic Section, Group E (b), note 1.

9. One can see from this verse as well as from GEN.49 that Rashi was aware that Onkelos' Targum contain several interpretations in one single verse. See General Introduction, p. 27. Also Midrashic Section, Group A, note 10.

10. cf. I. SAM. 14 and Rashi on - EX.14 - where the reference there is to the valley between the rocks.
11. See GEN. Rabbah, 99, 9; ibid 72, 5; ibid 98, 12; 
LEV. Rabbah, 25, 2; NUM. Rabbah 13, 17; Tanh. Vayehi 11.

12. Rashi DEUT. ch. 3318.


14. It is quite common for Onkelos' Targum to offer two 
interpretations in one verse. cf. Rashi, GEN. ch. 4911-12. 
See this Group, note 4 and infra 9.

15. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98 12; ibid 99, 10; Bab. Tal. Ber. 5a; 
Midrash Aggadah, v. 1, p. 112; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 848; 
Ps. Jonathan; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v. 5, p. 368; Tanhuma 
Vayehi 11; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 30.

16. S.B. Schefftel Biure Onkelos, p. 74 - believes that 
Onkelos does not take יָרֹד - in its literal sense but 
rather in the sense of EX. ch. 810 - יָרֹד וְיִשָּׁרֵי - "And they יָרֹד - piled them up in heaps". 
(cf. JUDG. 1516). Perhaps out of consideration to 
Isaachar's honour, Onkelos takes it in the sense of 
"wealth". See Section Veneration and Idealization of 
the Patriarch's sons, Group B, note 9, footnote 50.
17. A. Geiger Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, op.cit. p.232 - suggests that Ps. Jonathan's version in the biblical text was - אנהור(he loves to learn, - אנהור is the Aramaic verb for - אנהור) and not - אנהור. Geiger, however, brings no support to his suggestion, which is far fetched.


19. See also NUM.21:28 where Onkelos interprets midrashically, but Rashi makes no comment on his interpretation. cf. GEN.49; DEUT.32; DEUT.32:36; DEUT.33:7; DEUT.33:9; DEUT.33:12; DEUT.33:14; DEUT.33:18; DEUT.33:20; DEUT.33:21.


21. (cont'd).

Rashi quotes the interpretation of the Midrash before that of Onkelos. But no rules or conclusions can be derived from this as in other instances Rashi quotes Onkelos before that of the Midrash (e.g. GEN.49). Rashi works unsystematically and his main objective is to make the Hebrew text intelligible to the student of the Torah. On this subject, see General Introduction, p.32. See further this Group, note 12, infra 38.

22. Onkelos takes an independent line, as nowhere in the Midrashim or the Targumim available to us is his interpretation found. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti interpret like the midrashic interpretation of the Rabbis in treatise Sot. cf. Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, ch.39; Yalk. Shimon, Parashat Vayehi, 247; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p.113; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.853. Tanhuma, Vayehi, 13; Bab.Tal.Pes.p.8, Ber.44. Perhaps Ps. Jonathan had in mind Onkelos' interpretation: -

"And when he opened his mouth in the congregation of Israel to give praise, he was the chosen above all tongues". Similarly, in GEN. Rabbah, 97

... cf. the Palest. Targum. Similarly Neofiti: -

On this subject, see, Ginsberg, Legends, v.5, p.369,
22. (cont'd).

note 396. See Midrash Tehillim, Ps. 81, Buber, p. 366:

"אמר בְּבִישָׁה בֵּית אָנָי בֵּית אֱלֹהִים נֵבָלָי
אִלָּה שֵׁלָה שֵׁלָה כִּלָּה כִּלָּה שֶׁמֶלָּה שֶׁמֶלָּה",

Rabbi Josi takes - מַלָּא - in the sense of "hind"
and not as the N.E.B. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 48. On the
alertness of Naphtali, see A. Kahana:

23. Rashi, after saying - כָּכְלֵךְ כֵּLeague - and quoting the Derash
of the Rabbis, goes on to say - כָּכְלֵךְ כֵּLeague
"The words in the Targum mean his lot shall fall [so
that the second half of the verse would mean], he will
give thanks for his fortune with pleasing words and with
praise". The order of Rashi is strange for one would
expect Rashi to translate the Targum right at the
beginning where he quoted it. See this Group, note 21.

24. This translation is taken from "The Pentateuch with
Rashi's Commentary". N.E.B. however, translates as
follows: - "But their bow was splintered by the Eternal
and the sinews of their arms were torn apart (or the arms
of his hands were active) by the power of the strong one
of Jacob by the name of the shepherd of Israel". The verse,
however, is in the singular and refers to Joseph.
25. Onkelos - יַעֲקה - implies - בָּשָׂר (from בָּשׁ) and not - בָּשׂ - from - בָּשָׂ - בָּשָׂ; the Aramaic for which would be - בָּשָׂר.

26. Rashi deliberately points out that there are "additional comments" on the part of Onkelos which do not form part of the text, thus dispelling any conjecture that Onkelos might have had a different version in the biblical text. cf. Rashi EX.16. See General Introduction, pp.27-28. A similar concept is mentioned in Bab.Tal.Sot.10 - アンין יתבשך ויהי עץ שקרש שמשה. שמש יתבשך ויהי עץ והכין שמשה הקב"ה. See also Zeb. p.118.

27. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 12.


30. Rashi quotes Onkelos without acknowledgment.

31. Rashi's own elaboration of what Onkelos meant is of course entirely arbitrary. We have nothing in Onkelos himself to suggest this.

32. Rashi has in mind the idiomatic meaning of: "ברך את הרך את זקן מחמתו וברך את אברת חלבך ואת נקבת חלבך..."

33. Ps. Jonathan translates - "ברך את הרך את זקן מחמתו וברך את אברת חלבך ואת נקבת חלבך...

Blessed are the breasts that suckled thee and the womb in which thou didst lie. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti who take these words literally. cf. GEN.Rabbah, ch.98,20 - "ברך את הרך את זקן מחמתו וברך את אברת חלבך ואת נקבת חלבך...

Rabbi Abba Ben Zutra said: Go forth and see how much Jacob loved Rachel. Even when he came to bless her son, he treated him merely as an accessory saying: "Blessings of the breasts and of the womb, which means, blessed be the breasts that suckled such and the womb whence issued such". cf. GEN. Midrash Hagadol, op.cit. p.858.

According to P. Churgin, American Journal of Semitics Languages and Literature,50 (1933-34) p.60 - Onkelos
33. (cont'd) 

 takes - in the sense of "father" because most probably the end of this verse was fused with the beginning of the following verse - 

34. - וייתכן כשנמצא בו Bölge 50 מחודש ושתייה ככ חרות - רב翅 וה LENG י anál 50 מחודש ככ.

35. cf. LEV. Rabbah 20,10 - מלך שון ענייה של מדינה -isz foi 16 מחודש המבוסס על מחודשownik. Perhaps Rashi is not careful here and means to endorse the simile in LEV. Rabbah - בסיים månvis. This is why I have translated "as though their association etc." It is interesting to note that Rashi's explanation in the name of Rabbi Tanhuma is nowhere found in Tanhuma Lewin Epstein (Jerusalem 1969) nor in Tanhuma Buber (Vilna 1913). In LEV. Rabbah, however, Rabbi Tanhuma gives a different explanation altogether: - נזון. בסיים månvis. cf. also NUM.Rabbah 2, 25: זכר ביך צעמהملעםشعار - זכר ביך צעמהמלעםشعار. See Babtal.Ber.17a. See General Introduction, p.36 ff.
36. The same interpretation is given by Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.

37. cf. Section, Veneration of Aaron and the Priests, Group D, note 2.

38. Some commentators on Rashi would like us to believe that if Rashi quotes Onkelos' interpretation first and then that of the Midrash, it is a sign that Rashi favours Onkelos' interpretation, and if vice versa then Rashi favours the Midrash. On this subject see this Group, note 7, footnote 21; General Introduction, p.32; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7, footnote 19.


40. cf. Neofiti.

41. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. reads: or number the hordes of Israel. The N.E.B. amends - כמותם - in phrase of - כמותם - in parallel to - כמותם.
42. cf. Palest. Targum:—

כינסא לוממות ולוממות ביכת יקסב


43. cf. Midrash Tanhuma, Balak,12; Tanhuma Buber Balak 20; NUM. Rabbah 20,19; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.417; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, p.139.

44. cf. Ps. Jonathan. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti offer Onkelos' interpretation on the second part of the verse—"Neither hath he seen trouble in Israel". The Midrash Hagadol NUM. p.419, alludes to Onkelos' Derash, but Z.M. Rabinowitz' comments (in his glosses) that—מוית נעלם— "the source of the Midrash is unknown".

45. In other words, the Peshat here for Rashi seems to consist of the possibility of translating—_scripture notation_— as meaning: "God has not concerned himself to see with
exactitude". It is interesting to note that when the
Midrashic interpretation does no violence to the text,
Rashi is inclined, as in this instance, to call it
"Peshat". See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7. And
this Group, note 18. Also Midrashic Section, Group E.(d)
"Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept".

46. The word - מ"ס - is treated as if it were - מ"אטינ-.  
cf. Tanhuma Balak 14; NUM. Rabbah 20,20; Yalk. Shimoni, 768.

47. There is, however, no conclusive evidence that Onkelos
derives - כא"היג - from - כא"י - (companion) as Rashi
makes us believe for Onkelos' tendency in inserting -ל"נינש-
is purely to avoid the anthropomorphism.

48. NUM. Rabbah 20, 20; cf. Tanhuma, Balak 14; Yalk. Shimoni,
Balak 768; Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti;
Ibn Ezra; Sforno. Onkelos here takes an independent line,
followed by Rashi and his grandson, Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.

49. cf. Tanhuma Balak 14; NUM. Rabbah 20, 20.
50. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Also the Palest. Targum and Neofiti with slight variations. Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.140 however, follows Onkelos:


In the light of the Midrash Aggadah this note should be in Group A.


52. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum; Neofiti; Zohar, Vilna 1882, Parashat Balak. Nahmanides, however, claims that Rashi's reading in the Targum Onkelos is incorrect, and that it has been taken from the Palestinian Targum:

"וְזֶה עַל בַּמֵּאוֹן כֵּּבָּר וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר שָׁבָּת וְכֵּּבָּר אֵּלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָл כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר אֵלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת ו�ְזֶה עַל בַּמֵּאוֹן כֵּּבָּר וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר שָׁבָּת וְכֵּּבָּר אֵּלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת ו�ְזֶה עַל בַּמֵּאוֹן כֵּּבָּר וּכְּעָל כֵּּבָּר שָׁבָּת וְכֵּּבָּר אֵּלְכַּבָּר בֵּשַׁבָּת Woo. See Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p.423; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, p.140. In other editions, however, the reading in Onkelos is as follows - ישו סקרבעפ נטוי -
52. (cont'd).
"And he set his face towards the desert". Whilst scholars are in dispute as to whether Rashi had seen the Jerusalem Targum (see ch. Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum) Nahmanides had definitely seen it as can be seen from here. cf. also Nahmanides, GEN.30:20; NUM.11:28.

53. When the midrashic interpretation of Onkelos or of the Rabbis does no violence to the biblical text Rashi calls it "Peshat" as in this instance. cf. Rashi, GEN.22:14; NUM.24:7. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7. See also this Group, note 14, footnote 45; Midrashic Section, Group E. (d). Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept.

54. cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch.29; Rashi GEN.17:3; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, p. 142.

55. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti take - למשתח - in the sense of - לע desea "fell on his face". cf. Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.2, pp.141-142:-
- נפל - נמשחתו ועה זרבאר עמי חבקה, כי (בָּלָה)...
- נמשחתו זרבאר עמי חבקה, כי (בָּלָה)
56. Rashi calls Onkelos' midrashic interpretation - although it is purely midrashic. See Midrashic Section, Group E.(d) Rashi's Occasional Reversion to the Talmudic Concept. See Raphael Loewe, The Plain Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, p.176 ff.

57. The Bab.Tal.Ned.81a gives a different interpretation. See Midrash Tannaim, DEUT.33, p.213; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.p.428; Rabenu Bachai in his commentary on the Torah.

58. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti (with slight variations).

59. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti. Perhaps this is also the meaning of the Midrash, GEN.Rabbah, Parasha 98,7:- i.e. from King David to King Zedekiah, the Israelites settled in their land in strength and might. See Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.842; Midrash Hagadol, NUM.p.428.

60. cf. Siphre, HAzinu,Piska 13; Midrash Tannaim, p.192 ff; Lekah-Tov; Bab.Tal.Ket.p.112a; Palest.Tal'.Peah.ch.7, Halacha 3.
61. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti are closer to the "Derash" of the Rabbis.

62. The fact that Rashi had to repeat himself by stating that these two verses can be explained according to Onkelos, when he has stated right at the beginning that "the whole text is to be understood like the Targum", leads to the assertion that one of these statements must be deleted. It appears, however, that there is a misprint and it is preferable to delete the first statement (in v.13) as what follows is nowhere in agreement with the interpretation of Onkelos, but rather with the Siphre. See the Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, p.232, note 4, where A.M. Silberman quotes Dessauer who believes that the first statement of Rashi in verse 13 refers to Ps. Jonathan. A similar idea was put forward by A. Bromberg Sinai, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1966, v.57, p.91. This is highly unlikely as Rashi follows to the letter the interpretation of the Siphre and not that of Ps. Jonathan. Silberman follows the theory of A. Berliner (see Berliner's Rashi second edition, p.433, and his Beitragé Zur Geschichte der Rashi, Commentary, pp.28-29) who holds that Rashi did not see Ps. Jonathan's Targum on the Pentateuch. On this subject, see ch. "Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum." See also Bromberg, who claims that the expression - כַּפְרוֹאֵהּ לְכָּלַת סִיפְרֵהּ.
62. (cont'd).

does not appear in the Vatican manuscript of Rashi.

63. DEUT. Hazinu, Piska 330; cf. also Midrash Tannaim, p. 202 f; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 732; Onkelos and Rashi EX. 17.

64. See Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 13.

2. This is also the interpretation of the Rabbis in GEN. Rabbah, Parasha 8,11 that man is like an Angel in the sense of understanding and speech. See Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.4; Nahmanides, who explains that Onkelos is in line with Rabbinic interpretation; Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p.80; Yalk. Shimoni,20 — נַעַמָּה - לְצֵא לְפָעַם - i.e. the understanding and the knowledge, the nature and disposition of man. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.1; Rabbi T. Arama - יְסוֹדָה , שֵׁיַר שָׁשֶׁנַּו B. Berkovitz - הַנִּתְנָה לְעֵבֶד לְךָ - p. 22. All this ascends ultimately to the Aristotelian notion of the tripartite soul; that element therein which is the human prerogative, i.e. the soul (or mind) capable of intelligence (noetikos) was sometimes described in mediaeval Hebrew as - נֶפֶשׁ הָאִסְפֶּרֶךְ - and to this the midrashic references to - וַיְהִי - point forward.

4. See GEN Rabhah, 20; Menoteth Kehunah in the name of Maimonides who interprets that before Adam had sinned, his garments were made of - רוח - but after his transgression, they became - חバラ; Midrash Tanhuma, Buber, pp. 17-18 - cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 14. See also Yalk. Shimoni, Bereshit, 34, p. 19; M. Guttmann, Enc. Jud. 1, 765; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v. 5, p. 97, no. 69; idem, Die Haggada bei den Kirchewätern, Berlin 1900, p. 49, quoted J. Komlosh, p. 171, note 8; A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, 1884, p. 128.

5. See the argument between Rab. and Shemuel; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager.

6. Perhaps Rashi avoided quoting Rabbi Meir's version in order not to confuse the student of the Torah in thinking that the Torah as we have it contains different versions.

7. See M. D. Cassuto - עָהִבָּה אֱלֹהִים עָלָיו - p. 115. See also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group 1, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 1. See Moshe Zucker - Pentateuchal Exegeses of Saadia Gaon and Samuel Ben Chofni Incorporated into the Midrash Hagadol (Abraham Weiss, Jubilee Volume), p. 463 ff.
NOTES

GROUP C

8. cf. Mechilta, Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach, Masaehta 2, Parasha 6; Mechilta Rabbi Shimon 14, 29; Yalk. Shimoni, Bereshit, ch.34, p.20.


11. cf. S.D. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p. 18 — witham אקבו תשבות and ותנשא בו העם וטבעו ותפש את נוסך שניהם ובראש הנעדרים בנו ענני. cf. also Maimonides in — ch.8 — who quotes this Targum in — הק"ס— ממקס ממקס ובו ממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו העם וטבעו ותפש את הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו העם וטבעו ותפש את הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה במרות השם ובראש הנעדרים בבו וממנה hare חשב חשב ממה נמה נמה בмар

The Palestinian Targumim, in this respect, not only exclude the possibility of any polytheistic implication in — but also convey the idea of autonomy and freewill of man in choosing between good and evil. See Ephraim E. Urbach, The Sages, their Concepts and Beliefs, pp.283-284, who quotes Onkelos' Targum; M.D. Cassuto — Jerusal, Jerusalem, 1953, p.73; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op. cit. p.8.


15. Onkelos: יומך זומח מת לשון: כי אתה שמרת קהל,_CELL_ כי, כל קהל - עליך. כי ברך לך קעליך, BüyükآמהRANDOM Cơ hội. הבולע ביוון, שמח ו azi. It is also possible that the Targum is to be read as a question expecting the answer "yes". (Is it not the case that I have killed a man etc.)


18. Perhaps Rashi, in this instance, quotes only the Midrash because it has greater clarity than Onkelos.


22. This is the N.E.B. translation, but in some texts the English reads - "Then it was begun to call idols by the name of the Eternal". This translation corresponds to GEN. Rabbah, 23,7, quoted by Rashi: מַכִּירוּ אֶל שְׁמוֹאֵל הָאָבִּי כָּל עִירֵי אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרָם שֶׁבַּעַת עֵצֵי. cf. Yalk. Shimoni 39; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.128.

cf. also Neofiti. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.13. His argument that Onkelos differs from Ps. Jonathan is not convincing.

24. In most texts this is the version in Onkelos; however, some read וְרֵאשָׁו לֶחֶם and not וְהִוא לוֹ לִעֵמָה.

See A. Sperber. According to this version וְהִוא לוֹ לִעֵמָה is from וְרֵאשָׁו לֶחֶם (הַלָּה) to begin. cf. Ibn Ezra; See J. Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature, p.141; Ps. Philo II. 8. (Appendix I). However, וְרֵאשָׁו לֶחֶם seems the better reading, since it is difficult to assign a negative meaning to וְהִוא לוֹ לִעֵמָה whatever the root to which it is assigned. If the negative meaning "acted profanely" is postulated, this would demand a Pael form וְרֵאשָׁו לֶחֶם.

25. cf. GEN. Rabbah 25, 1: וְלִכְבֶּשׁ אֶלֶךָ הַנִּפְתִּח הַיָּה פְּסָמִים וְזֶרֶךְ פְּסָמִים לְשׁוּשַׁנְתּוֹ פַּחְצָיו אֶלֶךָ הַנִּפְתִּח הַיָּה.

cf. Yalk. Shimoni, 42.

26. While the above cited Midrash (see the above note) takes Enoch as a "wicked man". Ps. Jonathan Targum believes that he went up to heaven and became "Metatron" the great
26. (cont'd).

scribe: - אֶרֶץָ נְתֶנַּרְתָּ לְרֵיקַּי - מִוליָ שְׁמֵיהָ כְּמוֹשַׁמְלֵן - סֵפִּירָ קְבֵּיי.

cf. Tosafoth ( - - מִיָּה ) Bab. Tal. Hul. p. 60, that Enoch is "Metatron", "prince of the world"; see Ecclus. 44:16; Wisdom 4:10 - where Enoch is highly praised; also Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p. 132 - אֶרֶץָ נְתֶנַּרְתָּ לְרֵיקַּי - מִוליָ שְׁמֵיהָ כְּמוֹשַׁמְלֵן - סֵפִּירָ קְבֵּיי.

cf. Midrash Aggadot, v. 1, p. 15; Sepher Enoch; Beth Hamidrash, v. 5, p. 171; LXX holds that Enoch was translated. On this subject, see E. E. Urbach, Enc. Haivrit, v. 17, pp. 694-695; J. Bowker, op. cit. p. 143-150.

27. Perhaps Onkelos deliberately interpreted that Enoch died an unnatural death, although the verse could be interpreted otherwise, in order to exclude any support for the Christian contention that Jesus also did not die. The fact that the Rabbis (GEN. Rabbah 25) depreciated Enoch and called him a "wicked man", supports this theory. It appears that the Rabbis were confronted by the Christians to explain the difficulty of this verse which gives rise to the Christian's contention - see GEN. Rabbah, ibid - מְשֹׁרֵעַ שְׁעֵלָלָה אֵל רֹב, אֵאָרֶךְ 4' אַלְמַן - מִלָּאֵס אֵלֶּהֶן בָּשַׁלָכְן -
27. (cont'd). - ופתורם ישאלו לרוב, איך, אויכו, כיון שה Cin, יא ויתור
מרואים מפיוה להוות את לרוב, להי זמנים, כי
נאמנים כל לקתיי יאמריה להלוד (מל'.ב).
כ' ויתור ויתור, להוות את יותר
麸טיה — יא 

See A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav, pp. 126-127.

28. This version is mentioned by Rabbenu Bachya, p.96;
cf. Oheb-Ger., p.30; A. Geiger, Hamikra-Ve-Targumav,
p.127, who believes that this is a late version.
However, the Tosafoth Bab.Tal.Yeb.16b reads in Onkelos:

"כבר מת רכמים בע"כ לקמ' אזור
יכו רכמים ימיעך יכואית."

See J. Komlosh, op.cit. p.167; A. Sperber quotes the
two versions, p.8. The other Palest. Targumim, Ps.
Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti do not mention
"death" in connection with Enoch.
29. Perhaps in cases where there is doubt about Onkelos' rendering, as in this instance, Rashi prefers not to quote him. This perhaps would explain also the reason for not quoting him in GEN.4.26.


31. And the Lord said, this evil generation shall not stand before me for ever, etc. An extension will I give them and 120 years if they repent. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neofiti.

32. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

NOTES

GROUP C

34. cf. Bab. Tal. Sanh. 99b; Abod. Zara. 9a, and Rashi who quotes Onkelos; GEN. Rabbah, 39, 14:
ככ חלה אברכים חיה מאיצר את הכovenant
sheheh sa"varak atzeh heshu"st.
Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, S. Schechter. (ז"מה), ch. 12, p. 27.

35. - אמי ריבה לעון יבשא עימה בכים -


37. cf. Ps. Jonathan - בשם숙ון כי לכין לא"י בצתו בגילויה
ær. tứcא ושםוות אדיש אטו.
Neofiti reads: - ... בך_trigger לא"י אויביו בצתו עימה ובשכיפהות
- ע"י אולא סראים,カラים בשכיפהות עיינו.
cf. GEN. Rabbah 41, 7:
- ו"ע"י בא"י בסראים,カラים בשכיפהות עיינו.
They were "wicked" to each other; "sinners" in inchaestity; "against the Lord" - in idolatry; "exceedingly" refers to bloodshed. In Sanh. 109a the word against - "the Lord" - refers to - 'בעכלית לא"י - blasphemy; cf. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 230; See Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, op. cit. (ז"מה), ch. 12, p. 52 - where the same interpretation occurs with slight variations.
38. See Bab.Tal.Kid.32b - מָעְשֶׁה בֶּלַּתא אָסִיָּרָא אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶׁךְ - זָעוֹן שִׁמְעֵנִים בַּבִּיט אֵשֶׁת בָּרֹאשׁ לִבְנֵי נְדָעִים הָיוּ זָעַיִים לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶׁךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ לְשֵׁם נַחֲלַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׁשֶךְ Luzzatto has already remarked that the difficulty in

39. cf. Ps. Jonathan - וַתָּבֹרֶה - See GEN.18 - יָבֹרֵה - where Onkelos interprets - יָבֹרַה עָלָיו הָאֵשׁ See also GEN.19 - יָבֹרֵה הָעָרָיִים בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶ� - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ בְּבֵית אָבִּי יִשָּׁשֶךְ - אַף עַל פֶּן יִשָּׁשֶךְ Beshalach, 229; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 296.

40. Rashi: - אַף עַל פֶּן יְעַרֵּה בְּקֶרֶב הָאַלֶלָה הָיָה שְׁעָרֶה בְּהַאֲלָה הָיָה שְׁעָרֶה בְּהַאֲלָה הָיָה שְׁעָרֶה בְּהַאֲלָה Huzzatto bas already remarked that the difficulty in

41. This is the version in most books of the Targum. However, Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 35 and A. Sperber, quote a different version in Onkelos: - כְּכֶלֶל תְּמִינָתָה לִכְלֵיָה טַעַנְיָה - כְּכֶלֶל תְּמִינָתָה לִכְלֵיָה טַעַנְיָה - כְּכֶלֶל תְּמִינָתָה Luzzatto has already remarked that the difficulty in
41. (cont'd)
this version is obvious, for it implies that God will exterminate them, even though they repent. However, Luzzatto quotes some commentators who take the word - not in the sense of extermination, but rather in the sense of "forgiveness". This translation is far fetched. On this word see I. Levy's dictionary, v.l. p. 146. On the difficulty of this version, see also N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos; Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides.

42. cf. Yalk. Shimon 83; Midrash HAgadot, GEN. p.312; Mechilta, Beshalach, Masssechta Deshira, Parasha 5; Tanhum, Beshalach, p. 89, 15; Midrash Aggadah, v.l. p. 42; Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum; Neefiti.

43. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. translate: "One evening when he had gone out into the open country hoping to meet them (or to relieve himself) he looked up and saw camels approaching. (Incidentally to translate - "תיתל" - "to relieve himself" is certainly odd).

44. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 60, 14; Midrash HAgadot, GEN, op.cit. p. 410; ibid. p. 323; Bab. Tal. Ber. 26b; Palest. Tal. Ber. ch.4, Halacha 1; Palest. Tal. Pes. ch.5. Halacha 1; Tanhum, Chaye-Sarah, p. 33, ch.5; Tanhum, ibid, p.51, ch.9; NUM. Rabbah, Parasha 2,1. See also Section, Veneration, Group A, note 14.
45. See GEN. Rabbah 60:16; Yalk. Shimoni 109; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 60; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.412; Section, Veneration, Group A, note 11.

46. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti translates literally. See also Nahmanides, who quotes Onkelos; M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager, p.82. It is true that Onkelos represents the less developed and less circumstantial stage of the Derash quoted by Rashi, nonetheless, it appears that Onkelos had this Derash in mind.

47. J.W. Etheridge, The Targums, London 1862, translates Onkelos as follows: "And Jacob was a man of peace, a minister of the house of instruction". This is incorrect for - נְגוֹן - is not from - נְגוֹ - peace, but from - נְבָל - complete, perfect. (נלה - unimpaired), i.e. of unimpaired integrity, but in Rabbinic Hebrew, it means simple, unintellectual).

48. See GEN. Rabbah 63:10; Yalk. Shimoni 110; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.441, adds also the school of Abraham.

50. See G. Vermes, J.S.S. v.8, p. 167. See also, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs and their Wives, Group A, note 5.

51. Perhaps Rashi relies on the reader of his commentary to read Onkelos' Targum from which it is clear that by "tents", schools are meant. Rashi, therefore, merely adds that these "tents" are of Shem and Eber who knew the Torah before it was given. Whenever Onkelos' interpretation is inadequate, Rashi augments Onkelos' interpretation. cf. Rashi, GEN. 37. See our Midrashic Section, Group D, note 1, footnote 2. It may even be said that the commentaries of Rashi and Onkelos are almost inseparable and the student is advised to read them in conjunction in order to fully comprehend the biblical text.

52. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti translate literally.

53. cf. GEN. Rabbah 64, 10; Yalk. Shimoni 111; Midrash Hagadol - GEN. p. 456; cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 36.
54. The root - רד or רד - is generally assumed to mean to be restless and is thought to be connected with the Arabic - ד"ע

55. cf. GEN. Rabbah 67, 7, אָמַר רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב בֶּן מַחֲסֶה אָבַס רַבִּי יְחִיָּה חַנים: -

ףְּעֵֽלָּ֔ךְ אוֹלָ֖הּ שַׁאֲרָתָ֑הוּ בֵּֽאָרָ֖ה וּלְאַבֵּֽזָּהוּ שַׁאֲרָ֖ה שֵֽׁפֶלְגָּֽהוּ בֵּֽאָרָ֖ה

cf. Yalk. Shimoni 115; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp. 484-495; Lekah-Tov; Bab. Tal. Shab. 89b.

Rashi interprets as follows:

לֹא מֶתַכֶּה יִיָּהַלְקַם בֵּן חָלָ֑ה וּלְכֹלְבֵּֽן בֵּן נַבְּלַכָּ֖ה וּלְבַכֹּֽהַת שְּגַֽקְרָֽה וּלְבַכֹּֽהַת שְּגַֽקְרָֽה

56. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos.

The word - רד - in the Targum means yoke, servitude.

cf. Bab. Tal. Shab. p. 54b:

אָמַר רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב בֶּן מַחֲסֶה אָבַס:

Rashi interprets as follows:

בְּכַֽר נָעְֽהָה - זֶה שֵׁמְתַּעֲדָה:

גֵּרָֽנָה בָּאֲרָֽאֵרָה מָעֵֽה לָמַֽעְּץ לָמַֽעְּץ

See too, M. Jastrow, v.2.p.909.

57. See GEN. Rabbah, 84, 14; Yalk. Shimoni 141; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op. cit. p. 634; Tanhuma (Buber) Vayeshev, 13. See also M. Levenstein, Nefesh Hager; S.B. Scheffitel, Biure Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan reads:

לֹא מֶתַכֶּה יִיָּהַלְקַם בֵּן חָלָ֑ה וּלְכֹלְבֵּֽן בֵּן נַבְּלַכָּ֖ה וּלְבַכֹּֽהַת שְּגַֽקְרָֽה וּלְבַכֹּֽהַת שְּגַֽקְרָֽה

-cf. Neofiti. See Midrashic Section, Group E(e) Rashi and Derash, note 5.
58. Perhaps as Onkelos' interpretation is ambiguous, Rashi prefers to quote the Midrash and at the same time, through the Midrash, Rashi hopes that Onkelos' Targum will also be clearer. It may even be said that, on the whole, so long as Rashi does not say Onkelos translated the text in a different manner, we may assume that Rashi believes that Onkelos' text can be interpreted in the light of the same Derash quoted by him.

59. See Bab.Tal.Sot. 36b; GEN. Rabbah 87,7; (but the argument is not between Rab and Shemuel). Yalk. Shimoni, 146; Mechilta, Rabbi Shimon Ben Yoḥai, EX.35; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 668.

60. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.

61. One might expect Rashi to say that Onkelos translates the text according to the opinion of Rab. cf. Rashi EX.25; DEUT.32. See Halachic Section, Group F.

63. Perhaps the Targumim follow Rab's opinion, out of respect to Joseph. See Luzzatto Oheb.Ger. p. 20. See also, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarch's Sons, Group B, note 4.

64. cf. GEN. Rabbah 90,4:­
Rabbi Johanan said: The name connotes: He reveals things that are hidden and finds it easy to declare them. Rabbi Hezekiah says: With his knowledge he reveals things that are hidden and sets the minds of people at ease. cf. Yalk. Shimoni 148; Midrash Sechel Tov, p. 257. Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.714.

65. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti. See Samuel Ben Meir and Ibn Ezra, who believe that Zaphenath-paneah is an Egyptian name; The Vulgate translates "Salvatorem Mundi". The "Saviour of the World". See Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (translated by William Whiston, London, George Routledge and Sons) Book II.ch.6. "The king called him Psothom Phanech, out of regard to his prodigious degree of wisdom; for that name denotes the revealer of secrets". According to Mahlev,
65. (cont'd).

66. cf. GEN. Rabbah,93,10; LEV. Rabbah,32,5; Yalk. Shimon 152; Mechilta Bo, Parasha 5: שאמור כ ב הנעברית אל יizzy
... cf. Tanhuma, Vayigash, 5; ibid. Balak,16; Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p. 765 and footnote 5.

67. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti; Ibn Ezra; Samuel Ben Meir; David Kamhi, p. 197. Nahmanides believes that the commentators followed Onkelos' Targum. In Bab.Tal. Meg. p. 16b we read the following: ... נאמר ברש עטימן
... אל יるもの כ ב הנעברית אל יizzy

68. The Rabbis tell us that the Divine Presence departed from Jacob, because it does not rest upon men in
68. (cont'd).

times of sorrow. cf. Bab.Tal.Shab.30; Pes.117a;
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 766; Tanhuma, Vayeshev, ch.2.
p. 45: אֱכָלֶת חֵקֶק יְרוּם מִיָּחֵד אֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת מַלְכֶּה

cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch.38 - who quotes Tanhuma
and Onkelos: Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, ch.20. (אַחַת לְאַמְּנָה);
Rabbi David Kimhi on the Torah. See also II Kings,
ch.3, v. 15., (about Elisha the prophet). See Rabbi
Samuel Ben Nissim, Bereshith-Zuta, p. 304.

69. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti, however, translates:

60. cf. Bab. Tal. Baba Bathra 123a - אֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת מַלְכֶּה

70. cf. Yalk. Shimoni 157; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. pp.831-832.
The Midrashim and Onkelos' Targum take - as if it were - בַּחוֹר יָדָיו מָשָׁאֵר

- "with the practice of Mitzvot and
good deeds". cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.
NOTES

GROUP C


72. Whilst the Palest. Targum and Neofiti interpret similarly to Onkelos:

Ps. Jonathan translates literally - Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Introduction to Midrashic Section; Group A, note 1, footnote 6.

73. See GEN. Rabbah, 98,4:
NOTES

GROUP C

74. The same interpretation is given by Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti and only the following is added:

See GEN. 35:22 where Reuben's sin is mentioned. See Rabbi David Kimhi, p. 204 and Rabbi Bachya, v.1, p.379, who takes Onkelos' interpretation as the Peshat of the text.

75. See I. Chron. ch.5, 1. See, however, Bab.Tal.Shab.p.55b and Rashi. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98:4, where Rabbi Simon Ben Yohai believes that Reuben did not sin but he simply vindicated his mother's humiliation;

The truth, however, is that he vindicated his mother's humiliation. For as long as Rachel lived, her bed stood near that of the Patriarch Jacob: when Rachel died, Jacob took Bilhah's bed and placed it at the side of his. Reuben said, was it not enough for my mother to be the victim of jealousy during her sister's lifetime, but must she also be so after her death? Thereupon he went up and disarranged the beds, (i.e. putting Leah's bed in the place of Bilhah's.)
75. (cont'd)
This alone was his sin). cf. Ps. Jonathan, GEN.35.22; Rashi GEN.35.22.

76. See M. Adler, Netinah-Lager, who translates - אֱלֹהִים in the sense of "anger." M. Levenstein, Nephesh-Hager, p. 157 follows Adler. This is incorrect for one would expect Onkelos to say - אֱלֹהִים - and not - גֵּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 71, who argues with Adler and takes it in the sense of - גֵּשֵׁם - towards your own thoughts; in other words, pleasing himself.

77. Neofiti makes the idea of repentance even clearer - רָאָה בַּן אֲרוּם וְלֹא לֵעָשׂהוּ מַעְשָׂה וְשַׁחַבֵּךְ. Onkelos, therefore, must be understood in the light of the Palest. Targumim. Onkelos does not connect the word - אֵל - with the sentence that precedes it, as Rashi does - אֵל - but rather by itself and it means my son, through your repentance, God had accepted you, (lit. he has risen - back into God's favour).

Both teachers believe that Reuben sinned and in GEN. Rabbah, 98,4, Rabbi Eliezer translates the word -אֹיֵב in the following way: -"thou didst hasten, thou hast sinned, thou didst commit adultery". Rabbi Joshua explains: -ךְִּלְתַּחְיִיתַת הִלְלִית שָׁלֵךְ, וּכְּרָצָה. thou didst throw off the yoke, thou didst defile my bed, thy passion did stir within thee. cf. Bab. Tal. Shab. 55a; Tanhuma Buber, Vayehi, p.218; Tanh. 9; Midrash Chadash, p.202; Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, (בְּשֵׁם), ch.44; Midrash Aggadah, Vayehi, v.1, p. 109; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op. cit. p.837; Shitah Chadashah, Parasha 2. Onkelos in GEN.3522 follows his teachers and takes - He slept" literally -וַאֲסָק וַאֲשָׁב. 81. See the commentaries -MALCOLM COMBE, 716: A NO. 18, 1916.

82. See GEN. ch.38.

83. The Palest. Targum does not mention the story of Tamar, but it also mentions that after the name of Judah shall all the Jews be called. cf. Neofiti; GEN. Rabbah,98,6; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.841;
83. (cont'd).


84. GEN. Rabbah, 99, 8; cf. Tanh. Vayehi 10; Tanh. Buber, 12, p. 209.


86. Netinah-Lager. In several instances, Onkelos gives two or three interpretations in one text. Rashi was fully aware of this method, cf. Rashi GEN.49 11. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 10, infra 39. In other versions of Onkelos, however, the reading is - ובֵּי- broken - instead of - יִבְּרָהַ - dispersed. See Oheb-Ger. op. cit. p. 46.

87. See GEN. Rabbah 98,6 and 99,8. Rashi explains:

88. According to the Bab. Tal. She 16b - וַיְשָׁמַע - cf. also EX.11 8 - cf. also "And all these thy servants shall come down unto me and prostrate themselves unto me". Onkelos, once
88. (cont'd).

again, does not translate - הָעַלְּיהַ - literally, but rather - מַעַ'י - and request of me. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, op.cit. p.73; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Rashi, on the other hand, does not seem to be concerned with the sensitivity of Onkelos, for he does not comment on this particular word - הָעַלְּיהַ - either in GEN.49\(^8\) nor in EX.11\(^8\).

89. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

90. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98,7 - אֵלְיָהוּ וְיֹדַעְתָּו וָאִדְּרָעָתָו וָאֵלְיָהוּ וָאִדְּרָעָתָו מָעָרָה וָאִדְּרָעָתָו Thou (Judah) didst go up from the tearing of Joseph and wast thereby exalted; thou didst go up from the destruction of Tamar and wast thereby exalted. cf. ibid, 99,8; Yalk. Shimonı 106; Midrash Chadash, p.203; Tanhuma, Vayehi, 10; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.p.842; L. Ginsberg, Legends, v.5, p.329, note 46 and p.335, note 90.

91. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

92. See Our Introduction to the Midrashic Section.
93. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti: Ps. Jonathan translates - מַעֲנִי - literally and - מַעֲנִי - rest - in the world to come. As for the rest of the text Ps. Jonathan is in line with the Midrash that it speaks about the acceptance of Torah and its obligation by Issachar. Onkelos' rendering of - מַעֲנִי - by - מַעֲנִי - may have been influenced by the phrase- מַעֲנִי חֲנַמְיָה שָׁלֵל שָׁלֵל-.

94. Other Rabbis believe that the text speaks about the acceptance of Torah and its obligations by Issachar. cf. GEN. Rabbah 72, 5; ibid., 99, 10; Bab. Tal. Ber. p. 5a; Midrash Aggadah, v. 2, p. 112; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op. cit. p. 848; Ps. Jonathan; L. Ginzberg, Legends, v. 5, p. 368. See also Midrashic Section, Group B, note 7.

95. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. however, translates as follows: "Dan - how insignificant his people, lonely as any tribe in Israel". (This translation is odd and not in line with the wording of the text).

96. cf. GEN. Rabbah 98, 13 and 14; ibid, 99, 11; Midrash Aggadah, v. 1, p. 112; Lekah-Tov, p. 237. Sechel Tov, p. 316; Tanhuma, Vayehi 12; Bab. Tal. Sot. p. 10a; NUM. Rabbah, 10, 5; ibid., 14, 9; LEV. Rabbah 8, 2; Yalk. Shimoni,
NOTES

GROUP C

96. (cont'd).
Shofetim, 247,69; Palest.Tal.Sot.ch.1, Halacha 8.
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. op.cit. p.849.

97. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98, 15; Yalk.Shimoni 161; Lekah-Tov, p. 238; Sechel Tov, p.317.

98. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti follow Onkelos. The Palest. Targum has this to say:
"And afterwards they shall return to their dwellings in peace". See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra.

99. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary.

100. cf. Ps. Jonathan:
"— לא י shalt ה כי י yat" —

101. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 98,16; Midrash Tannaim, p.220;
Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 852; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 113.

102. However, modern biblical scholarship follows the septuagint, etc., in dividing the verses not as
102. (cont'd).

the Massorah does (i.e. – יָהֹּֽוֹּתָדָּתֶּוֹ – and then – שָׁפָּרְוַּשָּׁרְוַ – but instead – שָׁפָּרְוַּשָּׁרְוַ – and the next verse – שָׁפָּרְוַּשָּׁרְוַ – connecting the – 'ר – in – שָׁפָּרְוַּשָּׁרְוַ – with the ending of the previous verse – בְּרַק. The N.E.B. also ignores the – 'ר – "Asher shall have rich food as daily fare, and provide dishes fit for a king". Onkelos also ignores the problematic – 'ר – שָׁפָּרְוַּשָּׁרְוַ –.

103. Neofiti, however, translates: – יָהֹּֽוֹּתָדָּתֶּוֹ.


109. See Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Beshalach - מركة עריפא - Parasha 2, p. 56; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. p.345; Pesikta, Buber 28; Pesikta Rabati, M. Ish. Shalom, p.51; Ibn Ezra; Rashbam; Nahmanides.


111. The Midrashim and the Targumim take אָדָם - in the sense of אֵל - throne. The LXX takes it in the sense of אָמֶר - "cover" - i.e. with covered hands God fought with Amalek. The Pesikta Rabati (p.51) takes it also in this sense - אֵל וְהוֹא אֵל - אֵל וְהוֹא אֵל - אֵל וְהוֹא אֵל - אֵל וְהוֹא אֵל. See J. Komlish, op. cit. p. 196, footnote 11.

112. For other interpretations on this word - עָם - see M. Cassuto, EX. p.64.

113. Modern scholarship tends to assume that עָם - is a textual corruption for יֶּהָא to correspond with the foregoing יֵהָא.
114. See Bab.Tal.Sanh.p.20

115. See EX. Rabbah 42,9; Bab.Tal.Ber.32 where a similar explanation is given on DEUT.9 - "Let Me alone that I may destroy them". Tanhuma, Ki Tissa, p.123. See also Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan in DEUT.9


117. cf. also Bab.Tal.Sheb.39; Mešilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Yithro, Parasha 7, p.68; Tosephta Yoma, ch.4; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.186; Pesikta de Rab. Kahana, p.167; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit.p.710. See also this Group, note 48; Group D, note 3.

118. cf. Ps. Jonathan; the Palest. Targum and Neofiti, however, translate literally - (בגשנ ימי וסבל)

119. See Siphra, Achare-Mot, Parasha 9,10: - (ויתבש-לולימש המב) - (ומנמאב כרשו מוח יולימ ומד מת מלח מתקמק) - (ומבכיננ לולימש המב).

Yalk. Shimoni, 596; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p.519.
NOTES
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121. cf. Sifra Parashat Emor, ch.17; Mechilta on EX.12.27; Bab. Tal. Succ. p.11b; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon on EX.12.27, p.26; Tanhuma, Parashat Bo, 9; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. op.cit. p. 214.

122. Onkelos follows the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, but Rabbi Eliezer holds that the word - רכיבת - must be taken literally in the sense of "booths". There are, however, different versions with regard to the argument of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva. In Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon, (EX.12.27) רכיבת איבהו למקרא. See also Midrash Hagadol, p.214. See D. Hoffmann, v.2, p. 207; Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir take the word "Booths" literally.

123. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos: יראות בחדש חנין - cf. Neofiti: To the Targumim, Rabbi Akiva's view is more plausible, for from their departure from Egypt the
NOTES
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123. (cont'd).
Israelites were sheltered by the cloud of Glory
by day and by the pillar of fire by night. cf.EX.13

124. See Siphra Behukotai 3; Midrash Hagadol, LEV.op.cit.
pp.742-743.

125. See Neofiti who translates the first part of the verse
like Ps. Jonathan:-

126. Rashi's source is Siphra Behukotai, ch.8,1:-

127. cf. Ps. Jonathan, Neofiti, however, translates
literally:-

128. See The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary by
Silbermann, LEV. p.130, Appendix 1. See also Rabbi M.
Malbim's commentary on the Siphra, LEV.26, ch.8,9.
129. The expression - י"ע י"ע - is also found in EZ. ch.13; ibid. ch.36. See D. Hoffmann, LEV. op.cit. p. 257; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 168; J. Komlosh, p. 199.


131. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra who follows the Siphra.

132. cf. The Palest. Targum: - מָכְסָנָה מַהְפַּכֶּלָה מַחְיָלָה מַחְיָלָה.


It is difficult to perceive why Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan did not translate - מַחְיָלָה - literally. In DEUT.12 - ולַעֲנֵיהֶם - Onkelos translated - בְּכֵלָה לָעַה - cf. DEUT.12 - לְעַה בְּכֵלָה. Onkelos, once again, translated - לְעַה מַחְיָלָה.

Perhaps, however, to avoid the merest hint that Israel could have been contaminated by the lust of the mixed multitude, the Targum apparently softens the meaning from lust [desire] to ask [questions].
133. (cont'd).
Neofiti, translates literally: נְאוֹפִיתִי. See Section, Veneration, Groups, A, B, C and D.


137. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra who takes "Cushite" to mean "black" - כֵּשֶׁר שְׁמוֹן חַלְּכָה לְמִי לְעָשֵׂי -
138. cf. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti:

Ps. Jonathan believes that the text is not referring to Zipporah but to another Cushite woman whom Moses married when he became King in Ethiopia, and ultimately divorced her. cf. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.

139. The notion of divorce is probably not due so much to

- the principle of

- because of its occurrence also in Jer. 3.


141. cf. Siphre Piska, 105; Bab.Tal.Ned.64 b; Sanh.102 b; Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p.104.

142. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti. Onkelos should be understood in the light of Palest. Targumim.
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143. The words, "Pray now" are an addition on the part of Onkelos, having no words in the Hebrew text to correspond to it. This method is quite common in Onkelos. cf. Rashi, GEN.49 \( ^{24} \). See General Introduction, p.27.

Perhaps, however, Onkelos takes - \( \text{י' נ ש א י} \) - in the sense of Prayer. - as the Rabbis state - \( \text{י' נ ש א י} \) - cf. Rashi, GEN.22 \( ^{2} \). See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 188.

144. See Bab.Tal. Sot.34 \( ^{b} \); Yalk. Shimoni, 743; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. op.cit. pp.205-206.

145. cf. Onkelos, GEN.32 \( ^{5} \): - \( \text{י' נ ש א י} \) - cf. Rashi, GEN.22 \( ^{2} \).

146. Ps. Jonathan takes - \( \text{י' נ ש א י} \) - in the plural:

Neofiti makes it clear that the reference is to Caleb:

See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra.

147. See Bab.Tal.Yoma 86 \( ^{a} \); Rashi, EX.34 \( ^{7} \); Tosephṭa Yoma, ch.4, Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p.186; Onkelos, EX.34 \( ^{7} \).
148. See also this Group (supra), note 38. Also Halachic Section, Group D, note 3.

149. In GEN. 25:16 Onkelos translates - שְׁכִינָה - by קֶרֶךְ, which means - "walled towns", in contrast to הַרְכָּבָה - "unwalled towns", i.e. "open". See Onkelos and Rashi. cf. also Psalms 69:26 and Targum Jonathan. Perhaps Onkelos' rendering of שְׁכִינָה - and Rashi's likewise, has been partly helped by the circumstance that in Hebrew - רֵיהַ - can mean both palace and Temple: the same being apparently assumed regarding שְׁכִינָה.


152. See Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra; Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir; Nahmanides; Siphre in the name of Rabbi Josi-Ben Dormaskit.

154. This is most difficult to comprehend for the story of the quails occurred in "Kibroth-Hattaavah" (see NUM.11:34) and not in Hazeroth. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate also like Onkelos. Perhaps because "Kibroth-Hattaavah" was very near to Hazeroth (see NUM.11:35) that the whole area was termed Hazeroth. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221.


156. Piska 32. See also Bab.Tal.Ber.54a; Midrash Aggadah, v.2, p. 185; Yalk. Shmoni 247; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 130.

157. cf. Ps. Jonathan: יְהֵמוּא חַבּוֹן - Neofiti interprets that "the love" refers to the Torah of God.

158. For the literal meaning of the text, see Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and other classical commentators.
159. cf. Nahmanides who quotes Eccl. Rabbah, ch.7, 32:
ןָהַאֵר-ב בְּאֶרֶב בְּיִשְׁגִּית הַגָּוֶלֶת הָּרַבִּים אֲנָכיִּי אֵין לְשׁוֹנָּה
but צְתִי בְּהָרָגָה שָׁמְאֵי הַשָּׁמְאִים וְצְחָקִית בְּלֵבָּבִי הֶלְבָּבִים שָׁלוּם שָּלוּם.

cf. Bab.Tal.Ber. 7a. On Psalm 36 Rabbi Akiva has this to say:
"אִלְּךָ בְּעֶשֶׁר עַל-כָּל-הָּרָעָה הַיַּעַר הָּרַבִּים שָׁלוּם שָׁלוּם וְיָנוּדֶנְּהוּ
See Yalk. Shimoni, Psalms 726; J. Komlosh, p.204. See Bab.Tal. Irubin, p.22a:
לִשְׁבַּח אֵלָה אַנְאָנִי שָׁרוֹאִין נַהֲרוֹ
The
בְּרַמְחַ לָאָרֶץ אֶלָּה שְׁלַשְׁשֵׁי גְּדוֹלָוִים וְיָנוּדֶנְּהוּ וּלְאַגְּדֶנְּהוּ
Secondly, Israel God has this sense.

160. Ps. Jonathan, Palest, Targum and Neofiti take it also in this sense.

161. cf. Siphre, Parashat Reeh, Piska, 128; Bab.Tal.Ber. 9a:
אמר Мне אָבָהָ טַמִּירָה בֵּין הָעֵבִיד שָׁמְאֵי מֵאֶזְרִי
Midrash Tannaim, p.90; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.352:

- בּוֹזָה-וּלְכָּ דַה פָּרָה מָשָּׁב מִלּוּא פּוּך

162. Ps. Jonathan explains that - מִלּוּא פּוּך - refers to the Paschal lamb which is eaten by night-
Neofiti appears to follow the Siphre:
וְאָמַר-אַל יַעֲקֹב אֵלָה אָלֵילָה עֲקִיבָא עֲקִיבָה
163. cf. The Haggadah for Passover; Siphre, Ki-Tabo. Piska, 301; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op.cit. p. 587.

164. It may well be explained that the interpretation rests on the treatment of - הָעַזָּא - not as Kal participle, but as a Poel perfect, - "attempted to destroy". For this meaning of the Po'el cf. - הַעֵשֶׁב - Ps. 1015; - הָעַז - 1 Sam. 189. See Gesenius Hebrew Grammar 55, b, c, p. 151.


166. N.E.B. translates: "For the enemy have no rock like Ours in themselves, they are mere fools". It is difficult to see what etymology underlies this rendering for - הַעֵשֶׁב - is always taken in the sense of intervention, argument, plea, judgment, cf. Ps. 106 30 - הַעֵשֶׁב - see Bab.Tal.Sanh.p. 44a - מְלַאכָּה יָשֻׁשֵׁה פְּנֵיהֶם עָלָיוֹ - see Bab.Tal.Sanh.p. 44b - מְלַאכָּה יָשְּשָׁה פְּנֵיהֶם עָלָיוֹ - see Bab.Tal.Sanh.p. 44b - מְלַאכָּה יָשְּשָׁה פְּנֵיהֶם עָלָיוֹ. He pleaded with his Maker. cf. Ibn Ezra on Psalms; Bab.Sanh. p. 111b - הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל - Meg. 15b - הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל הַשָּׁיִל - see Bab.Tal.Sanh.p. 44b - מְלַאכָּה יָשְּשָׁה פְּנֵיהֶם עָלָיוֹ. The translation of our verse is from the "Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary".
167. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska 323; Midrash Tannaim, p.199; Yalk. Shimon,946; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.723; Mechilta Mishpatim,EX.21. Parasha 8; -

168. cf. Onkelos, EX.21 and the other Targumim. With regard to our text cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest.Targum and Neofiti who take -ם'压抑-in the sense of judges.

169. Siphre, Piska 347: -

170. cf. Ps. Jonathan: -

171. This implies that Reuben will not be judged after his death like all the wicked people. cf. Ps. Jonathan and other Targumim. It may also mean that Reuben will not die a second death once he is resurrected. cf. Jer.ch.51:39 -

Jonathan translates -

172. See Rashi EX.32^26-27; Bab. Tal. Yoma p.66^b; Siphre Piska 350; Midrash Tannaim, p.216; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 764.

173. See Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti who elaborate on the faithfulness of the tribe of Levi.

174. See Bab. Tal. Zeb. p. 54^b; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 765; Siphre Piska 352.

175. Some Rabbis in Siphre (ibid) believe that the text refers to the Messianic era or the world to come.


177. GEN. Rabbah 99, 9; יבשותי השכטני חומך בשמים - cf. also Siphre DEUT. Piska 354; Nahmanides.

178. The Targumim Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti, however, take it like Rashi:

179. cf. Ibn Ezra; I. Chron. ch.12^33: ידיבנו וירכע יבשותי חומך בשמים -
180. Midrash Tannaim, p.218 takes it as Onkelos. cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.770; Zohar Parashat Behaalotecha, Vilna 1882, p.150:


182. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos. However, Ps. Jonathan takes it as the Siphre (ibid):

183. By the lawgiver, Moses is meant, see Siphre, DEUT. Piska 355; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op.cit. p.772. See, however, Ibn Ezra, who does not take "lawgiver" to mean Moses. See S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah, p.568; M.D. Cassuto, p.122.

184. cf. Ps. Jonathan, the Palest. Targum and Neofiti; Sforno; Abarbanel; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

In some instances Onkelos interprets the text in accordance with the "Derash" of the Rabbis but there is nothing parallel to it in Rashi. E.g. GEN.49.27 - Onkelos' interpretation is in line with Bab.Zeb.p.54a; Siphre, DEUT. Piska 352; GEN. Rabbah 93, 12; ibid. 99, 1; Bab.Yoma p.12a; Zeb.p. 118b; Meg.26a. Again, EX.151 Onkelos' interpretation is in line with Rabbi Akiva's view in Bab. Sot. p.27b; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 284. Again, NUM.1727 - Onkelos is in line with Midrash Aggadah, Buber, Korah, v.2, p.119; Lekah-Tov, v.2. p. 232; The other Palest. Targumim. Again, DEUT.3311 Onkelos is in line with Rabbinic interpretation in Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p. 765; Siphre Piska 352; Midrash Tannaim, p. 215.
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP D

1. The Talmud often treats - מ"ע - as an abbreviation in the sense of - מ"ע השכלת הנבון - one who has acquired wisdom. See Bab.Tal.Kid.p.32ב - מי שלח הלל יאמר ויהי麻醉 מהנביא הקדיש.

2. See GEN. Rabbah 84,8:sehen - יתאמר עשה חטא amacıyla - והראת השם על מקום השם שנגזר מהשם. Rashi quoted Onkelos for no apparent reason, since the same interpretation is mentioned in the Midrash in the name of Rabbi Nehemiah. See Midrashic Section, Group A. We may, however, say that although the same interpretation occurs in the Midrash, nevertheless, Rashi takes the opportunity of elucidating the Targum for the benefit of its student. It may even be said that the commentaries of Onkelos and Rashi are almost inseparable and the student is advised to read them in conjunction in order to fully comprehend the biblical text. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 17 infra 51.

3. The Rabbis, however, explain - בקורי - in the sense of - בקורי - pottage - בקורי - pottage - "in the pot wherein they had cooked, therein were they themselves cooked". See Bab.Tal.Sot.p.11א.
NOTES

GROUP D

4. See Mechilta, Beshalach, Parasha 6 (with regard to EX.15): ""... לַעֲרָתָה לְעַרְתָּה יָדִי לָכֶם לְעַרְתָּה יָדִי לָכֶם ..."

- cf. Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.cit. p. 300; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 21.

5. Onkelos: ""םַלְמָה לְסַלְמָה יָדִי לְסַלְמָה יָדִי לָכֶם ..."
- cf. Rashi. EX.34

6. cf. Bab.Tal.Sanh.27; Ber. 7; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 22; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 42.

7. Piska 17. cf. Midrash Tannaim, p.9; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.28; Rashi LEV.19; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 547 ff; Siphra ch.4, Piska 37 and 38; Halachic Section, Group D, note 8, footnote 13.

8. See Bab.Tal.Sanh. 8; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.665.

9. Onkelos: ""... לַעֲרָתָה לְעַרְתָּה יָדִי לָכֶם לְעַרְתָּה יָדִי לָכֶם ..."
10. See Siphre Piska 318; [Hebrew text follows]... cf. Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. op. cit. p. 713; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 34.


12. cf. DEUT. 32:40; [Hebrew text follows] - where Rashi quotes Onkelos' translation and completes it by a midrashic interpretation.
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (a)

1. "The Persian word Parsbandata, name of one of the sons of Haman, was divided into Parsban and Data - "expounder of the Law". This epithet is already mentioned in the poem attributed to Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra (died 1167). See M. Liber, "Rashi" translated from the French by Adela Szold, ch.6, p. 104; and ibid ch.9, p.207.

2. See chs. The Anthropomorphisms and Reverence to God.

3. For instance EX.21:6 - יִתְנָה יִתְנָה יִתְנָה - If we are to take יִתְנָה in its literal sense - "For ever" - then this is in conflict with the current Halacha which states clearly that it only means (Bab.Tal.Kid.15a) the Jubilee. Halacha insists that it must be so understood as to be in agreement with the current form which the institution took, i.e. that service terminates with the Jubilee. On this text see Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben Meir's commentary; Halachic Section, Group B, note 4; Midrashic Section, Group E. (f) footnote 6.

4. See Judah Halevi - Cuzari, Zamose, 1796,3, p.73.

5. See A. Ibn Ezra, Yesod Mora, quoted by J.A. Moscato in Kol Yehudah (commentary on Cusari) 3, p. 73. On this subject see H. Albeck - יִתְנָה יִתְנָה - p.41; Abraham Weiss - יִתְנָה יִתְנָה - p.12 ff.
6. Maimonides, Sefer Hamitzvoth - נְאֹרָנָא. Also in his Introduction to the Mishna.

7. Z.H. Chajes, Introduction to the Talmud, Zolkiev, 1845, ch.17 - follows the former conservative view.

8. I.H. Weiss, Dor Dor Ve-doreshay, v.1. ch.18 and v.2. ch.11.


10. S. Rosenblatt, Bible Interpretation in the Mishna, Baltimore, 1935, p.5; Malbim in his Introduction to the Siphra.

11. e.g. in the case of the law - כְּהַמַּשְׁבֵּט (two thousand cubits in every direction). The Bab. Talmud (Irub. p.51a) asks: - וְהַאֲמַרְשָׁפִי אָמַת כָּבָּד? - Where is it written in the Torah the limits of two thousand cubits? Consequently, although this law is a Rabbinic enactment, yet the Talmud was groping around in search of a biblical text. See Rashi, Bab. Tal. Shab. p.34a:

See Magid Mishne, Maimonides.
The Palest. Tal.ch.6, Halacha 1, p. 39 states as follows:

This statement can only mean that the Halacha did not arise from the midrashic exegesis but on the contrary the midrashic exegesis was made in order to support the traditional Halacha. Furthermore, in this vein Rab Sherera Gaon's letter (p.39) should be understood:


13. See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.69-102, with special attention to p.96. With regard to the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, see ibid. Geiger, pp.110-127.
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (b)

1. See Bab.Tal.Shab.63a; Yeb. 11b; ibid 24a; Kat. 38b.


3. This is deduced from - מנה לבר - treated as - מנה לבר.

4. The Hebrew word - עשה חסר בכסא חמשה - is doubtful and some translate the text - "As one that taketh off a garment". See Jonathan's Targum; Ibn Ezra; Jastrow, v.2, p.1043, takes it from - זרש "to strip". Metsudath David explains as follows: - a man who does dress in a thin garment on a cold day because it looks smart, acts foolishly. See N.E.B.

7. ס中式 תורא דל מונד לע יהודיה עשה ניסי הזרעךMBOL
לUIImagePickerController שעמא הזרעך את ענני הכרמל מברק לפשית חלול.

8. Referring to a site of idolatrous worship.

ליהורך כה חומש יכוסי ברוך אבינו עלי ישראל. והזב, כרשו
לע מתחכם אם ראה ליהודיה עשה ניסי הזרעך ענני הכרמלtex1a תמך.

10. cf. Bab.Tal. Irub.23b; Arachim 8b; R. Loewe, The Plain
Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis, pp.160-161.


12. NUM. Rabbah, 18, 22.

13. GEN. Rabbah 10, 71-
רבד על דברים ואתה בקטנה עד כי נעש -
See too ibid, ed. Theodor Albeck, p. 81.

14. Textual variant-ibid. See also GEN.Rabbah 47,8:-
- כרשים היה ישיב לשוונך.

15. LEV. Rabbah 16,2, as quoted by Theodor Albeck: In
edition New York, 1952, the reading is - לאש.
NOTES
GROUP E (b)

15. (cont’d).

16. See DEUT.137 and Kid.80b.


18. Parashat Yitro, 15.

19. In EX. Rabbah 40, 1, the reading is Rabbi Johanan Ben Turta.

20. ibid: שֵׁם הַקָּדוֹשׁ בִּלְשָׁנָה לְאַלְמָנָה וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל - מְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָט וּמְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָט וּמְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָט וּמְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָט.

See Bab. Kid. 25a – מְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָּט וּמְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָּט וּמְבַעֵה הוּא עַל מִשְׁפָּט.
21. See Bab. Tal. Yeb. p. 24. Another piece of conclusive evidence can be seen from a passage in Palest. Tal. Horayot, ch.3, Halacha 4, p.18 where the two terminologies - מִצְוִית and כִּשָּׁה - are used interchangeably in one sentence:

בְּעֵמִית חֵם כָּל הַמַּחֲבֵּר בָּהּ - אָכְלוּ בָּהּ לָהֶם כֹּל חָמַר פּוֹרָה.

Amero לַהֶם כָּל חֶמֶשׁ עַל גְּדוּ וְדִשְׁוּ בֵּינוֹ ובֵנֵיהֶם וְכָל בְּכָל הַמַּחֲבֵּר לָהֶם כָּל חָמַר פּוֹרָה.

Rabbi Hanania saw the people of Sepphoris running to the school. Inquiring about the reason, he was told that his disciple Rabbi Johanan - הַדָּאָבָר - whereupon Rabbi Hanania gave thanks to God for seeing the fruits of his labour in his lifetime, for it was him who - לִרְבּוּ נַפְשׁוֹ - taught Rabbi Johanan the Aggadah. See too Palest. Tal. Baba Metsia, ch.2, Halacha 11, p.10.

22. See Bab. Sanh. p. 100.


25. Some scholars believe that the Amoraim were fully aware of the distinction between Peshat and Derash. Others wish to accord this recognition also to the Tannaim (see S. Rosenblatt, The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishna, Baltimore, 1935, p. 5f). But all this cannot be substantiated as can be seen from this chapter.

26. S. Rosenblatt, ibid, p.5 ff. believes that in the Mishna -משה- may be identified with the simple or literal meaning of the text. See R. Loewe, p.159, note 78. What proof is there to assume that this is so when in fact the Mishna never used the verb -משה- in this sense?

27. Dor Dor-ve-doreshav, v.1, ch.18, ed.Vilna, 1911, p.158.


29. See Kid. p.49a; הביא שדה אחר וysics הפסוק קצוב - והר, הצבי אל קמותך עד אמת.

30. R.Loewe,op.cit.p.180. See(in Loc) and also other terminologies such as -משה- and -דארך-. See also D.Hoffmann, LEV.in his Introduction,pp.3-8. But he dealt with this matter summarily.
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (c)

1. GEN. 3:8 - שָׁמַּלְתָּשׁ אֶלֹהִים שֵׁלֵשׁ, וּבָכָא סְיַרְוֹתָם הָבִיתָנָה - מִמָּזְוֵנָה בֵּית בֵּית וְשֵׁרְוֹתָם מִזְכַּרְוֹת, וּאֹי לָא בָּאֲךָ אָדוֹן, פּוֹתְשַׁם שֵׁלָה מָכָּה לָא וְאַרְגְּאָה מָעִישַׁבָּת הָבִית, חֲסֵרֵהוּ הָבִית

2. In other words - נְאֻם דְּוָאָה - does not mean: let me die now, but if I were to die now, I should die with the comforting knowledge that you (Joseph) are still alive.

3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, N.E.B. translates: "Judah was sent ahead that he might appear before Joseph in Goshen".

4. GEN. 8; EX. 12; LEV. 25; NUM. 4; NUM. 14; DEUT. 1; DEUT. 4; DEUT. 26.

5. See Table One, see E.M. Lifshits, "Rashi", p.167 ff.

6. See Rashbam Parashat Vayeshev: יָּאוֹק אֵלֶּה נַשְׁמָה לְךָ מִסְכָּנָה - זָמַּת נְתוֹנוּת אֵלֶּה לְךָ כְּנֶסָּה לְךָ לְפָנָיו, חֲסֵרֵהוּ לְךָ נָגְנָב יְבָאָה. פָּרָשֵׁת בְּרֵרוֹת אֵלֶּה לְךָ בְּתִיםָם הָדְשִׁיטֵהוּ בְּבָלִילֵי.

7. See General Introduction, p. 16 ff. Introduction to Section, Rashi as Philologist; ibid, ch.8. Rashi and Menachem-Ben-Seruk.
NOTES

MIDRASH - GROUP E (d)

1. See the above Section, Group E (b), and (c).

2. Perhaps the present meaning of Pesbat is probably due to the earlier Spanish Lexicographers who sharply differentiate between the interpretation of the Rabbis which they called "Derash" and the "literal" meaning to which they gave the name "Pesbat". We may even say that the present meaning of Pesbat is due to Rab. Saadia Gaon as can be seen from his commentary on the Torah.

3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary. N.E.B. translates....."who with staring eyes sees in a trance".

4. cf. Rashi NUM. 2321 - אֲמֹרִים אָמָר אֶת אָדָר, מָשָׁה קָנָה... נֹכַח שֶׁלֵּש מִלָּה לָאָלָה

5. See GEN.47; NUM.24.7. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7.

6. It must be made clear, however, that when Rashi says - כְּסָפַט מִי - he then has in mind the literal meaning of the text. See DEUT.2226; cf. Table One; I. Sam.1527.
NOTES

GROUP E (d)

7. Rashi GEN.3:22 - יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁנֵי נָצִירֵי אֱלֹהִים מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל. See Table One.

8. See M. Jastrow, v.1, p. 599. This verb -בָּשְׂרוּ- is widely used by Rashi in his commentary on the Bab. Tal. and through it he seems to harmonise and settle all sorts of conflicting claims made by the Rabbis of the Talmud. - e.g. Ber.38b; ibid 63b s.v - בָּשְׂרוּ-. Yom. 29b; s.v - בָּשְׂרוּ-. Ket.66b s.v - בָּשְׂרוּ-. Git.67a s.v - בָּשְׂרוּ-. See also Rashi's Introduction to Zech.1:1 - בָּשְׂרוּ-.

9. See, however, Halachic Section, Group G - where Rashi rejects the "Halachic deductions" of the Rabbis as they do not conform with the natural meaning of the text.
NOTES  
MIDRASH - GROUP E (e)  

1. See GEN.1:27; GEN.7:16; GEN.8:7; GEN.8:11; GEN.9:7; GEN.12:3; 
   GEN.12:5; GEN.12:11; GEN.14:15; GEN.32:31; EX.2:6; EX.4:2; 
   EX.8:2; EX.9:32; EX.25:28. For more references see Table One. Sometimes, without saying - הָקִּישׁ - but 
   implying it: GEN.14:16; GEN.38:15; EX.15:14. See this 
   Midrashic Section, Group E (f) Rashi's Correlation of 
   Peshat and Derash.  


3. See M. Liber, Rashi, ch.6, p. 111.  

4. See the above Section, Group E (d) Rashi's Occasional 
   Reversion to the Talmudic Concept.  

5. See GEN.50:5. See M. Liber, Rashi, ch.6, p. 111.  
   For more references see Table One.  

6. See GEN.1:1 - "This verse calls for a Midrashic 
   explanation". In several places, Rashi interprets 
   midrashically without even offering the Pesbat. See 
   GEN.21:17; GEN.25:1; GEN.28:11; GEN.28:13; GEN.29:11; 
   GEN.37:17; GEN.37:22; GEN.37:33; GEN.38:1. The student of 
   Rashi will find many more examples of this nature.

8. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti follow Rashi's Derash. According to Neofiti the Angel's name was - שְׁנַרְיָא. LXX follows Onkelos.


11. See Nahmanides who states that this is: יְחִי אֲשֶׁר לַעֲבָד. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 19; Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.4. - Translations of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.

12. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 19.

13. See GEN.33:10 - where Rashi for no purpose takes אָנָגְרָא - to mean - אָנָגְרָא - "Angel". Onkelos, however, takes this expression to mean - אָנָגְרָא - "important people". cf. Onkelos and Rashi GEN.6:2 - בֶּן נַחֲוָיָא. See Section on Anthropomorphisms, Group G, "Intermediary Elements", note 1. Also ibid, Group H, note 9.

15. See Section on Anthropomorphisms, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 2.

16. Onkelos: - Although the text is in singular it is quite common for Onkelos to translate collective singulars as plural, e.g. GEN.32'; EX.1246; EX.2220; LEV.1441; NUM.2240; NUM.3013; cf. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti.

17. See Bab.Tal.Bab Bath.15a - where the word "tree" is taken in a metaphorical sense. Perhaps the Rabbis were influenced by the verse: - לְיָם מָעָה לְאֹלֶל בַּמֹּאָר -


19. See Bab.Tal.Sot.35a; Arach.15a.

20. The reader will find in Rashi many more examples of this nature.
21. See Table One. See NUM.22 - where Rashi discards Onkelos and interprets midrashically.

22. In other words one who reiterates his claim without adducing any evidence.


24. See Bab.Yeb.47 - We may, however, say that Onkelos, being himself a proselyte, nearly always renders the biblical - by - "proselyte" - because of his personal involvement. Rashi sees that the context excludes this meaning and provides a purported etymology for - (from-) to substantiate the normal biblical meaning of resident stranger. At any rate the literal meaning is (always) stranger (i.e. resident alien) in biblical Hebrew, and it is only in post-biblical Hebrew that it acquires the meaning of convert to Judaism.
1. See Midrashic Section, Group E (c) Rashi and Peshat and Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, General Introduction, p.16 ff.

2. See M. Liber, op.cit. ch.6, p.124.

3. Rabbi Joseph Kara, contemporary of Rashi, who believed that the Peshat should not be deprived from its rights has this to say on the Derash of the Rabbis: I Sam.17:

17: "וְיֻם וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה אֵלָיו... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ بְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה... כִּי בָּאָדָם בְּשָׁם יְהוָה בְּשָׁם יְשׁוּעַ בְּשָׁם בִּקְרָא שָׁם יְשׁוּעַ כִּי בָּאָדָמ..."  

See also, ibid. 2 Sam.12. See also, ibid. 2 Sam.12.

1972.
4. cf. Rashi GEN.1\(^5\); GEN.6\(^7\) with GEN. Rabbah.

5. See Rashbam Parashat Vayeshev.

6. See Rashbam EX.21\(^6\): - וַיֵּעֲבֹר לָפָרָעָה - And he (the slave) shall serve him (the master) for ever. While according to the current Halacha this means until the "Jubilee", Rashbam takes it to mean - "for ever" - לְחיָיו לְרֵאשֵׁי־בֵית הַיָּמִים - See Ibn Ezra; Halachic Section, Group B, note 4; Also this Section, Group E. (a), Origin and Development of Halacha, footnote 3.

7. See E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.176; M. Liber, Rashi, p.109. Rashi LEV.23\(^\text{11}\), Men.66\(^a\). Rashi Prov.9\(^\text{7}\):- אָמַרְתֶּנָה לְרָישֵׁי־בֵית אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לָנוּ חַוָּה שֶׁחָוָה לְרֵאשֵׁי־בֵית יָמִים - לא יאֶחֱנוּ לְרָישֵׁי־בֵית עִם שִׁטֵּינָן מַעֲלֵי שָׁמָּוֹן אֲשֶׁר לְרֵאשֵׁי־בֵית לִקְרָבָן

By the phraseology - כִּי־קָרָבָן - Rashi dearly had in mind the Karaites and not the Christians. See General Introduction,p.20; Moshe Max Ahrend, Le Commentaire sur Job de Rabbi Yoséph Qara, Hildesheim, 1978, p.9, note 76. cf. also p.2 ff.

8. As a result, for example, the Feast of Weeks (Shavuot) falls on the 50th day following the Saturday of the
8. (cont'd)
Passover week in accordance with the literal meaning of the text LEV.23 \(^{11}\) and is therefore always on a Sunday. The Rabbanites, of course, follow the Talmud and interpret the above text in a different manner. See Rashi LEV.23 \(^{11}\) and Bab. Tal. Men. 66 \(^{b}\).

9. EX.16 \(^{29}\); EX.22 \(^{8}\); EX.33 \(^{2}\).

10. cf. LEV.13 \(^{6}\). See Halachic Section, Group G; General Introduction, p.17.

11. Published in some Prayer Books of the Sephardi rite. See Kerem Ḥemed 4; E.M. Lifshits, Rashi, p.168. It was written 7th December, 1158, when Ibn Ezra visited England. See N. Golb, History and Culture of the Jews of Rouen in the Middle Ages, Tel Aviv, 1976, p.54 and p.60. See also E. Margalioth - לֶבָנָּהֳו הָאֶבָנָּתִים אֵלֶּה הָעֹרֶה (בֻּשֶּׁר אֲשֶׁר אָבָד לְעֹרֶה שְׁאָמָה אָשֶׁר חוֹצֶה כֹּהֵן 'וַעֲלוֹת שְׁמָהאֵי יְרוּשָׁלָיִם) 366 .

The Karaites, themselves, agree with Ibn Ezra's interpretation on GEN.1 \(^{5}\). See - בְּרֵיחַ בְּבֵית אָבִית אֲרוּם - אֲגוֹרַת אָבִית אֲרוּם. See - The Jews of Israel, 1966, ch.3.

12. See Ibn Ezra, EX.13 \(^{9}\), who accused Rashbam for interpreting the text against the tradition of the Rabbis - וְהִי וְבָשָׁם אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם שָׁמָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁם Shmży.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION - RASHI AS PHILOLOGIST

1. cf. this Section, ch.9. Onkelos and the Hebrew Grammar.

2. See Midrashic Section, Group E (f) Rashi's Correlation of Peshat and Derash.


4. cf. ibid General Introduction, p. 27.

5. See this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk. See also Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.11, p.1305.

6. ibid. ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk.

7. Menachem's Maḥberet is arranged under headings in alphabetical sequence of biliteral units. Each one of these headings had its subdivisions in which specific words are put together under a suitable general heading.

8. The distinction could easily be seen from comparing the commentaries of Radak and Ibn Ezra with that of Rashi.

9. See Rashi EX.27 with regard to the privative use of the Piel.
10. cf. GEN.326.

11. cf. Rashi GEN.2\(^{19} \) - בְּכֵלָה אַחֲרֵי הָעָרָה יַעֲבֹרָה יַרְחָא אַלּוֹ בְּעָרָה עָשֶׂה אָדָם... 

12. cf. Rashi GEN.11\(^{11} \) - התשׂא מַחַר לָשׂא וְעָשָׂה - בַּשָּׂא וְעָשָׂה... 

13. cf. Rashi GEN.41\(^{35}\) s.v - בַּשָּׂא וְעָשָׂה. In his commentary on Ez.\(^{11} \) Rashi has this to say: שֵׁשׁ רוּחַ גָּדוֹל כֶּלֶד אַלִּים שֶׁהוֹדַע שְׁכָנָה אַבַּל מַעָּל לְהוֹדֵעַ לְמָבוֹד לוֹמֵר לְהוֹדֵעַ לְאוֹמָר לְזֶהוּshade... 


15. See this Section, ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum.

16. See this Section, ch. 2, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with Identifying Him.

17. See this Section, ch. 3 - Free Translation.
18. cf. this Section, ch. 4, Translations of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic.

19. cf. this Section, ch. 5, Injection of "Berash" and "Halacha" in Onkelos' Targum.

20. cf. this Section, ch. 6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.

21. Perhaps its popularity was due to the following statements: Bab.Tal.Kid.48a - "Targum was given from Sinai". cf. also Ber.8a: - מִכָּהָם הָאָם יָכוֹנָהוּ שָׁעִים - לְעָלוֹת הָעָם יָכוֹנָהוּ שָׁעִים.

   cf. too, Siphre, DEUT.179: - לְמִרְבָּה לְמִרְבָּה מִלֵּמָה - מִלֵּמָה מִרְבָּה לְמִרְבָּה מִלֵּמָה.


23. See Mishna Meg.3,2 with regard to the translation of the Meturgeman in the Synagogue. cf. Halachic Section, Summary; this Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos; General Introduction, p. 21 ff.

24. cf. Rashi GEN.2736; EX.2327.

25. cf. ibid, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos.
CHAPTER 1 - RASHI'S USE OF ONKELOS' TARGUM WITH REGARD TO NOUNS AND VERBS

1. The word - מָרַל - means to glow, to heat, hence sharp as a blade. See Rashi EX.711.


4. From the verb - יָדָא - to cut off, to make something inaccessible to the person concerned. Rashi supports him from Psalms 7613. cf. DEUT.128; Neh.925.

5. cf. Is.224; EX.513.

6. cf. Jer.93. See also B.D.B. ibid, p. 784.

7. cf. this Section, ch.6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew.

8. See Rashi who brings other references from the Bible, as well as from the Mishna.

10. A. Ibn Ezra interprets מַשְׂרָה - מַשְׂרָה בַּז - by מַשְׂרָה בַּז - מַשְׂרָה בַּז - "to exalt oneself".

11. See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra who take it as מַשְׂרָה בַּז - "that the incense should contain salt. Rabbi D. Kimhi, ibid, p. 233 agrees with Rashi.

12. See Halachic Section, Group F, footnote 1.


14. cf. DEUT. 19 - וַיַּשָּׁבוּ בִּיוֹנָה וַיַּשְׁבִּיעֵהוּ בַּיָּם - See Nahmanides.

15. See this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 8.

16. cf. NUM.3 10.

17. cf. Jud. 20 15.
18. Onkelos translates the text in plural – יִנְיָרָם רְעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. Although the text is in singular, it is quite common for Onkelos to take it in plural. cf. EX.12; LEV.14; NUM.30. Ps. Jonathan, however, takes it in singular – יִנְיָרָם רְעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.


20. Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti read like Onkelos – לְיַרְדָּן. N.E.B. reads: "I will take back part of that same spirit which has been conferred on you and confer it on them". See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Prophet Moses, Group C, note 2.


24. cf. Ex. 10\(^2\) - לְעַלְּבֶּל יַעַלְּבֶּל וְלֹאנָה - Jud. 19\(^25\); Jer. 38\(^19\)  
The other root - לְעַלְּבֶּל - whence - לְעַלְּבֶּל - tremendous acts,  
(cf. Lam. 1\(^22\), Lam. 3\(^51\)) should be kept separate.

25. See Ibn Ezra and N.E.B.

26. However, Job. 22\(^21\) shows that the root can be used to express familiarity, and hence "learning about a person.

27. cf. Jer. 3\(^21\); Nahmanides. Ps. Jonathan reads - לְעַלְּבֶּל - נֶעָלֵי הָנָה. It appears he holds like the Midrash that Balaam was a lame person (from - לְעַלְּבֶּל - GEN. 49\(^17\)): - נֶעָלֵי הָנָה - שָׁמַעְךְ לֵלְבֶּל עֲפֵר.  
See Bab. Tal. Sanh. 105\(^a\); Yalk. Shimoni, Balak, 765;  
Midrash Hagadot, NUM. p. 411.

28. See Bab. Tal. Sanh. 105\(^a\).

29. See A. Ibn Ezra. The Vulgate takes it also in the sense of blind. "Obturatus - See J. Komlós, ibid.  
p. 135. N.E.B. however, reads: - "The man whose sight is clear".
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NOTES  
CHAPTER I
30. Ibn Ezra explains - קרשת רע בסתה - by - חתנים - This is because the hypocrite (ָּנִה) does everything on the quiet.


32. The word - יִשָּׁרֵר - may have some connotation with the goddess of Canaan - Ishtar, "Astarte". See B.D.B. p.800. See also this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 3.

33. cf. LEV.1144; LEV.207. In the sense of prostitution, see DEUT.2318; Hosea 414; I Kings 1924; I Kings 2247; II Kings 237.

34. See this Section, ch.3, Free Translation.

35. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads - נַשָּׁןֵי לֶחַט -

36. Rab. Saadiah Gaon and Rabbi David Kamhi follow Onkelos. It should not be confused with the word - שִׁרְיָי - in LEV.177 or Is.1321 - meaning "demons", "satyrs".
NOTES
CHAPTER 1

37. S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah, p. 560. Since the speaker of the section in question is Moses, Luzzatto's interpretation needs no refutation and at any rate is far fetched.

38. cf. Esther 2⁷ "And he brought Hadassah up". cf. Lam.4⁵; Ruth 4¹⁶.

39. cf. GEN.15⁶; EX.4⁵; EX.14³¹; EX.17¹²; NUM.14¹¹; DEUT.1³²; DEUT.28⁶⁶; HAB.2⁴.

40. cf. this Section, ch.6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 14; Also ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 14.

41. Piska 343.cf. Midrash Hagadol,DEUT.p.754;Palest.Tal. Shekalim, ch.6,Halacha 1; Palest.Tal.Sot.ch.8, Halacha 3.

42. cf. Ps. Jonathan and Meofiti.

43. See W.Bacher, Die Judische Bibelahexegese, Trier, 1892, p.21 - quoted by J. Komlosb, p.206.

44. See Midrashic Section,Group A, note 36.

2. In EX.13 Onkelos does not translate "shaken", "afraid". This is because, as said in ch.1, note 36 (see this Section, ch.3, Free Translation) Onkelos translates according to the context of the subject and not according to the literal meaning of the text. In GEN.6 Onkelos translates by "punishment, vengeance". In DEUT.32 instead of the usual translation "punishment" Onkelos translates "regret, repentance". On the latter Ps. Jonathan reads "from" instead of the usual translation. Jonathan translates the Niphal "punishment". Jonathan, however, is not consistent for in Jer.42 translates "punishment". On the whole, the tendency of Onkelos, as well as other Palest. Targumim, when confronted by anthropomorphisms is familiar, and led them to various periphrases. See Section, Anthropomorphisms. The verb can also mean to console, to comfort, as e.g. Is.51; Is.52 - or in the sense to have compassion e.g. DEUT.32. In this verse N.E.B.explains by "Esau your brother is threatening to kill you".Rabbi D.Kimhi takes
2. cont'd.

it in the sense of consolation - הביע קבר הרגшение - לכי מיתכן ב חשב יהודוּר - See Ibn Ezra, S.D. Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.115 - takes it in the sense of - ובשנ - "to consider". Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.37 takes it as Onkelos: - לאוימ יד הוחזר.

3. With regard to the large number of words to render - see Raphael Loewe, "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism" Vetus Testamentum - Leiden, 1952, pp.261-272. See also Section, Anthropomorphism, Group C, References to Human Emotions, note 1. See this section, ch. 3 note 12. Also ch. 7 note 15.

4. The nearest word to - כּ רֶ יֶ יֶ - is - קִ בּ קוֹ נִ הָ - in NUM.11 - which Onkelos translates by - כּ רֶ יֶ יֶ -


8. His Commentary on the Torah, p.75.
CHAPTER 2.

9. See also Cassuto in his commentary on EX. p. 280 and S. Luzzatto, p. 379 who follow Onkelos.

10. See Bab. Tal. Shab. 105a; Men. 66b; Siphra Vayikra, Parasha 13; Midrash Hagadol, LEV. p. 69. Perhaps the word - כ - is an inversion of - כ - "soft".


15. See S. Luzzatto (on the Torah), p. 456; - see supra, Table Three p. 306. See also Cassuto in his commentary on EX. p. 280 and S. Luzzatto, p. 379 who follow Onkelos.

17. See S. Luzzatto who explains the text according to Onkelos.

18. cf. Hosea 10\(^{12}\); Jer.4\(^{3}\).

19. cf. I Kings 15\(^{4}\); II Kings 8\(^{19}\); II Chron.21\(^{7}\) - cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.125; Ps. Jonathan and Neofiti take it as Onkelos. Rabbi David Kimhi, p.267, however is in line with Ibn Ezra.

20. See Bab.Tal.Shab.125\(^{a}\); Men.66\(^{b}\); Tanhuma, Balak 9; NUM. Rabbah, 20,16; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. p. 408.


- רצון = "wring out" ; רצון = "wring out"  See also Rabbi M. Ben Eliyahou's Commentary on NUM. p.151 - who explains:

- רצון לשו עמעי יעדBV
23. Neofiti translates - שֵׁם סְמַע אָוֹרָה לַכֶּבֶל -

24. Literally, according to Rashi - קֵמָט - is "to cut".
This is because Rashi equates - קֵמָט - with - קָצֵב - "to cut". cf. Rashi, Hosea 13:14.

25. Piska 321 - קֵמָט מִכְרִי - שָׁם וְכָלְּכְלָנָה יְתַתֶּנָה לַמַּכֶּב

In Malbim ed. Pardes, Jerusalem 1957, the reading is -
שָׁם מִכְרִי בֶּן מַכֶּב -

26. See Midrash Tannaim (ed. Hoffman) p.197; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. p.718 - reads - מִכָּלְכָּל הָלָותָה בֶּן מַכֶּב -


31. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.280.

32. cf. The Vulgate "cum EO". Also N.E.B. "and with Him were myriads of holy ones".


34. See S. Luzzatto (on the Torah), p.567 - who explains: -

Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra's comment: - is not convincing, as Luzzatto rightly remarked.

36. J. Komlosh, p.139 suggests that Onkelos is not like the other Targumim. He offers, however, no proof to support his argument and as said Onkelos should be studied in the light of other Targumim.


38. p.179. See also S. Luzzatto on the Torah, p. 568.
NOTES

CHAPTER 3 - FREE TRANSLATION

1. cf. also this Section, ch.1, note 36.


3. It could, however, be argued that Rashi, following the Midrash and starting from - מָרָא - direction, is independent of Onkelos who paraphrases by rest, but that the two converge - rest - evening west.

4. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.15 translates בְּשַׁעַת הַבָּשָׂם See Nahmanides, who takes - בְּשַׁעַת - in its literal sense and that God made it like any other day so that Adam and Eve should not be frightened. See Palest.Tal. Ber.ch.4, Halacha 1; S.Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.29.

5. Targum Onkelos, p.201.

6. The N.E.B. seem to be undecided about the correct translation of this difficult word - "at the time of the evening breeze".


12. See GEN. Rabbah 84,9; Yalk. Shimon 247,141; Lekah-Tov; Sechel Tov; Midrash Hagadot, GEN. pp.627-628.

13. cf. EX.3012

14. cf. Onkelos GEN.4020 - יִשְׂאוּ [ות נָצַּחְתָּו] - by - זְאֵב - Ps. Jonathan in verses 13 and 19 follows Onkelos, but in verse 20 he translates - נָשִּׁית - by - זְאֵב. In verse 19 Onkelos renders - נָשִּׁית - by - זְאֵב - because the text has - זְאֵב חַרְבָּל -

15. See further this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.

16. See Sforno; Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir; S. Luzzatto, p.169.

17. Nahmanides explains that - קָעַם - should be taken in the sense of - בָּאָר - (The - מָזְרַע and - מָזְרַע interchanging) -"hole" in the ground, (הָעַרְבּ) hence, "storehouses". Rab. Saadiah Gaon, p. 44 - translates - לְמָזְרַע - מָזְרַע - מָזְרַע.

18. Neofiti follows Onkelos.

20. - קְשֶׁהַבָּנָה - Ithp - to be chief, to lead, hence to assume superiority. See M. Jastrow, p.1446. See Nahmanides and Ibn Ezra.

21. cf. Neofiti. Ps. Jonathan reads - מַחַלִּיקוֹד הַיָּה -

22. See Nahmanides. The Aramic word - עָמִּיקוֹד - is from the root - עָמֵל - perhaps to make go around, hence to turn against, seek occasion. cf. Lam.1_22 לֵוֶה יַֽעֲשֵׂה - מִמְּסֹכַר עָמִיקוֹד יִלֶּשׁ. The Targum translates - וַתְּשַׁלְּחַנְּפֵּשׁ צֵל - see supra, this section, ch. 3 note 6.

23. (Is.51_18) - יִרְדָּכָה הָמֶה יֹכַגְּדֵנִי הָלֵֽהוּ - It is similar to Ex.15_13 - דַּעְלוֹת בִּטְרֵי - "thou hast conducted them". With regard to the difficulty of this word - רֶהֶד - See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.302. The Samaritan text reads - בֵּית לֶפֶד - with - 'ה - Perhaps this is also the reading of Ps. Jonathan.
24. cf. LXX; The Vulgate. The N.E.B. is doubtful about its exact meaning and offers two meanings, a) "Bury me in the grave that I bought", b) Or that "I dug". Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.48 takes it as Rashi. Perhaps Onkelos was influenced by ?1.40 where יכין might be better translated "prepared" than "dug".


26. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs, Group 1.

27. cf. Rashi GEN.66; Rashi EX.1317. See this Section, ch.2, note 2, on the various explanations on the verb - יתכן. The N.E.B. reads: "The people may change their minds".

28. Neofiti also translates freely - דצבו יבּך לָבֹא. In EX.4 - Onkelos translates - מְנַרְבָּעַ השוֹלָע. "his (Moses) hand was leprous" - by יבּך דִּבְרָא לאָל. his hand was as white as snow. Onkelos was not exact for he omitted to translate the word "leprous".


31. cf. Ps. Jonathan. Neofiti reads - מַעַרְבּוּ -


33. Rashi's source is the Siphre. cf. also The Palest. Tal. Shek. 6,1; Midrash Hagadol, NUM. pp.153-154. See this Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.4, note 12.

34. Rashi quotes this midrashic interpretation in the name of the Siphre.

35. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the People of Israel, Group D. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, Munich, 1888, p.213 - שָׁמָּי שֵׁי מִסְחַרְתָּן תַּעַנְּעָה - Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.130 explains - יִיּוּנָה - רַבּוּרִיהָ תַּעַנְּעָה -

36. Neofiti translates - מְסָרָה - by - מְסָרָה
37. B.Z. Berkovitz - p.122-explains Onkelos differently. J. Komlosh, p.146 explains as follows: -כראהש ואחרות המתים נהוגותו וענש - собственно או אחרון הקטנים, ישですよ, חורש - because, in addition, the "bent" or "fetal" position is afterwards accompanied by -כדש לעון והמשים כי מתים וענש בפועלו - because, on the one hand, the fetuses, when they are delivered, become -גס גס גס גס. 

38. Ps. Jonathan reads - וייתו מוכן


40. See chapters, Anthropomorphisms; this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 13.

41. -כטיכומכם כטיכוים כות שער הדין - והם שומרי תבנית - כות See Rabbi M. Ben Eliyahu's Commentary on DEUT. p.188; Ibn Ezra.

42. Quite often Nahmanides remarked that Onkelos translates freely. See M. Levenstein, Nephesh Hager. Introduction, p.22, para. 3.
CHAPTER 4 - TRANSLATION OF BIBLICAL IDIOMS INTO ARAMAIC

1. It is also possible to say that Onkelos did not translate literally in order to avoid the anthropomorphism. See Section, Anthropomorphism, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 5.


5. cf. Onkelos EX.14:8 - יִבְרֶה רָה - NUM.14:24 - יִנְבַּל אֵיךְ -


7. See the full text of Rashi.

8. The verb - גָּאַה - "to gird" - sometimes is translated by - לִכְּשָׁמֶנָה - as in DEUT.1:41; EX.29:9; LEV.8:7; LEV.8:13 - and sometimes by - לִכְּשָׁמֶנָה - "to tie", "to chain", as in LEV.16:4;
8. (cont'd)

EX.12. In other words it all depended on the context of the text and subject matter. In battle, the verb -יִּשָּׁהוּ is more appropriate, whilst in the wearing of garments the verb -יִּשָּׁהוּ is more appropriate. cf. Jonathan, Is.15:3; Is.22:12; Is.32:11, Ez.7:18; Ez.27:31. In the Hagiographa, Lam.2:10 - יִשָּׁהוּ is translated by - יִּשָּׁהוּ.

9. See Onkelos DEUT.1:24 where he translates also - יִּשָּׁהוּ by - יִּשָּׁהוּ - see this Section, ch.3, Free Translation, note 15, General Introduction, p. 30 f.
NOTES

CHAPTER 5 - INJECTION OF "DERASH" AND "HALACHA"
IN ONKELOS' TARGUM


2. מקדש חזרות ביכר ביכר ביכר - cf. Yalk. Shimoni, 247,77; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, pp.32-33; Bab.Tal. Taan.27b; Meg.31b.


4. Rabbi David Kimhi in his Commentary on the Torah, p.91 - rejects Ibn Ezra's interpretation, and accepts that of Onkelos and Rashi. In his book - שרשינ - שרשין - however, he takes it to mean - שרשין בידני - the third child to his mother, (which is usually soft and tender). See S. Luzzatto, p.70.
5. See Mechilta, Beshalach; (mètre יב אמשור). See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 17.

6. The Palest. Targum and Neofiti follow Onkelos. Ps. Jonathan, however, reads -שֹ לְנָו יִדְיוֹן שֵׁנֶה לְנָו הַלְּנוֹן -

7. Beshalach, Parasha 6 (on EX.15:8). See Bab.Tal.Sot, p.11a. See Midrashic Section, Group A, notes 20 and 21; this Section, ch.8, Rashi and Menachem Ben Seruk, note 4; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p. 301.

8. cf. the second interpretation of the Mechilta, ibid. See Ginzberg, Legends, v.6, p.10.

9. See Mechilta, Mishpatim, Parasha 19; Bab.Tal.Tem.4a; Rashi and Nahmanides.

10. See Halachic Section, Group E, note 7; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, op.cit. p. 303.

11. See Mechilta Parasha 20; Mishna Pes.63a; Palest.Tal. ch.5, Halacha 4. Ps. Jonathan also translates in accordance with tradition.
12. See our Halachic Section, Group E, note 10.

13. - is revenue farmer, publican, see M. Jastrow, p. 741.


15. Neofiti translates - בזילישמה - by - בזילישמה - בזילישמה


17. See Bab. Tal. Hul. 78b (the argument between the Sages and Rabbi Hananiah); Halachic Section, Group E, note 20.

18. cf. Ps. Jonathan - בֵּית קִבֵּרָה


20. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska 306; Midrash Tannaim.
21. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.272 - who suggests that Onkelos understood - יַעַרְגָּה (יהוּדִית) "pleasant". This would mean that Onkelos is independent of the exegesis in the Siphre, but it seems unlikely.

22. See Siphre Piska 306; Midrash Hagadol, DEUT. pp.690-691.

23. See further this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translations.


25. See Siphre, Haazinu, Piska, 322.

26. See this Section, ch.9, Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 2.


29. See GEN. 4:16 where Onkelos translates — יִֽשְׂרָאֵל. Midrashically; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221; Onkelos and Rashi, GEN. 14:3 s.v — נִזְרָא יִשְׂרָאֵל; GEN. 16:14 s.v — יִֽשְׂרָאֵל נִזְרָא.

30. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 58,8.


33. The incident of the quails occurred in Kibroth Hattaavah, and not in Ḥazeroth as Onkelos interprets. Perhaps the connection is because the two places were very near each other, as can be seen from verse 35, and most likely the incident occurred on the border of both places. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.221; Midrashic Section, Group C, note 50.
34. See Siphre, Bemidbar, Piska, 134, Siphre Debarim, Piska, 6: כדי לחנוך אלה בית המקדש. למדתי כריך
שהלהי מקדש סונה בשמחה עד שראתי את כל
cf. Siphre ibid. Piska, 28; Bab. Tal. Yoma 39a; Bab. Tal. Git. 56b: אברע ספרה זה כל מה שראתי את זה
Precioza נישואים בין הדתות של בני בבן בין
בכדי 신免費 נשיא בית המקדש שנאמר בהם המוב
כדאי המבנה.

35. See M.D. Cassuto: עץ ארץ מהקודש ענני קפלני מצאתי-


38. See (supra) this Group, note 14.

39. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; cf. also Ps. Jonathan and LXX.

41. Rashi NUM.21^28 follows Onkelos.

42. In NUM.32^3 Onkelos identifies - יְָמֹר וְיִזָּכָה by - מַקְּלִים לְהִדַּעְתִּי. Most likely this is an interpolation by a later writer taken from Ps. Jonathan's Targum for in Bab.Tal.Ber.8b Rashi says clearly that there is no Targum to - יְָמֹר וְיִזָּכָה In fact, in verses 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 Onkelos offers no Targum to these two places. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Cer. p.71.

43. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

44. cf. Onkelos, GEN.9^9; NUM.14^25. See G. Vermes Haggadah in Onkelos' Targum, J.S.S. v.8, p.160.

1. The Torah itself contains one Aramaic phrase. See GEN. 31\(^{47}\) v.1, 1965, p. 593; Isaac Avinery - this Section, ch.1, Rashi’s Use of Onkelos’ Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, notes 11 and 12.

2. For Rashi, Aramaic - נקב - corresponds to Hebrew - קב. On the verb - קב - see B.D.B. p. 7, cf. Ethics of the Fathers, 1, 4 - קב that disappears in Heb. Onkelos, however, may have taken - קב - from - קב - "dust". (See Menachem, quoted by Rashi) - become dusty [in - wrestling] - which is paraphrased by Onkelos - קב - See this Section, ch.3, Free Translation.


4. Some editions read in Rashi - קר - i.e. in Latin - Rex - means "Rex" - King.
5. See Siphre, Devarim, Piska 1; GEN. Rabbah 90,3; Midrash Aggadah, Buber, v.1, p. 97; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN, p. 713.


7. A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.300 — suggests that Onkelos accepted the interpretation of Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum, but he merely avoids the usual elaboration of the other Targumim and retains only the beginning of their interpretation: ידוע ומזהר לברך בתימתיו הערץ בשפר והכיתב בשעה


8. The word — הולך — is an obscure word and probably a Greek word "phoreion" — litter, carrying chair. cf. Song.39 — cf. Bab.Sot.12a

It may, however, be a semitic word and it means a "headscarf". See M.D. Cassuto,Song,p.20.
9. With regard to the explanation of these words - רוש - שנייה - See S. Luzzatto in his commentary on the Torah, p.203; Midrashic Section, Group B, note 10.

10. Rashi - בְּבֵדַר אֲדוֹן אֲבֵד בּוּד שֶׁמש וּמִתְבַּנֶּה עַרְמֵה -

11. Rashi DEUT.11:14 believes that the Hebrew word - שִׁיטָן - has its origin in Aramaic.

12. The word - יִש - here is a good case where Hebrew - יֵש - is a genuinely Hebrew heritage parallel to Aramaic - יֵשָׁנָה. Rashi may have wanted to make it an Aramaism in Hebrew because of the existence of the other Hebrew - יֵש - "until".


14. cf. this Section, ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 39; this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 14; General Introduction, p.36, footnote 106.
CHAPTER 7 - REJECTION OF ONKELOS' TRANSLATION

1. See General Introduction, p.21 this Section, ch.3, Free Translation, notes 6, 7, 8, 18. Also, ch.5, Injection of Halachic and Midrashic Interpretations, notes, 1, 4, 10 and 11.

2. cf. GEN.50 - מוגזים


4. cf. the Palest. Targum and Neofiti.

5. See Bab. Tal. Hul. 7b; GEN. Rabbah Parasha 82,15; Ps. Jonathan.

6. cf. DEUT.2 - Onkelos takes - מוגזים - in the sense of - עַלְפָּה -

7. See S. Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.145, who quotes some scholars who read - הַיָּדָע אוֹרָה שָׁמָּיִם - מִקְּרוֹת אוֹרָה שָׁמָּיִם - In other words Anah found "springs of" "hot water". cf. the Vulgate "aquas calidas".
8. cf. Rashi GEN.433 s.v - נַחַלָה עַנְיוֹן

9. Rashi's criticism of Onkelos is not justified for in actual fact - כַּסְפָּרִים could mean [point of potential] breach, i.e. entry into the land. By translating freely Onkelos is eliminating the Hebrew idiom. cf. ch. 3, Free Translation.

10. See Luzzatto Oheb-Ger. p. 45 - יָשָׁב - is frequently used for - הָלָּךְ - plus infinitive e.g. GEN.1722, see Levy's Targum Lexicon, p. 476. See this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 16.

11. cf. Rab. Saadia Gaon, p.47; Rabbi D. Kimhi, p.204 offers a few interpretations to this particular word. See GEN. Rabbah, 98, 5 - עֲקָרֶתִי חָרוֹן וּמֶּה - Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p.839, however, reads " מיִּיה שֵׁנִי". See Midrashic Section, Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, note 6. Also, ch. Rashi and Dr. Jonathan Targum note 11.

12. The Palest. Targum reads: יָשָׁב - "wall" is perhaps due to the fact that - עֲקָרֶתִי - means literally "uproot" a metaphor more appropriate to a wall than to animal's legs.

14. See S. Luzzatto in his Commentary on the Torah, p.212.

15. Rashi does not accept that the stem of - שָׁוֶּה - is a triliteral basis - שָׁוֶּה - but rather - שָׁוֶּה - "poor" - regarding as its basic stem. However, the verb "to inherit" he accepts that it is from - שָׁוֶּה. One fails, however, to understand why he does not accept the verb - שָׁוֶּה - as meaning - "poor" - since in GEN.45 he translates the Niphal form - שֹׁמֵר - according to Onkelos - שֹׁמֵר - "impoverished". With regard to the treatment of weak verbs by Rashi, see J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, pp. 26-32.

16. In the last two references Rashi quotes Onkelos as a support that the verb denotes "driving out". However, in NUM.14 other editions of the Targum read - לְנָשַׁב - See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Also in NUM.14 other editions of the Targum read - בָּרֵית - (not like Rashi). See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.67; Also this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 33.
17. Onkelos is obviously influenced by EX.5 for he translates...... by - 


19. In EX.8 Ps. Jonathan translates - - He takes it in the sense of - . Onkelos, however, translates - . See Rabbi D. Kimhi, p. 215. With regard to our text, EX.33, see S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.119; this Section, ch. 1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 4.

20. cf. Ibn Ezra; Rabbi S. Ben Meir; Sforno; Rab. Saadia Gaon, p. 128.


23. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, pp.80-81; Onkelos and Ps. Jonathan, DEUT.24
24. See Nahmanides who elaborates on these two interpretations; Rabbi Isaiah Berlin, Mine-Targuma, pp.32-33 quotes Maimonides and the Mishna Sanh. p. 85a.

25. See this Section, ch. 3, Free Translation, note 19. See chapters, Anthropomorphisms.

26. Rashi - מֵעַדְּלָה תַּרְגֻּמָה דְּפֶעַס כֶּלָּא ִּיְלִיֵּי ַּיִּי מְדִינֵי

27. See this Section, ch. 6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 14. Also ch.1, Rashi's Use of Onkelos' Targum with regard to Nouns and Verbs, note 39.

28. With regard to the large number of words to render -רפס- see Raphael Loewe, "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism" Vetus Testamentum, pp.261-272. See this Section, ch.2, Rashi's Use of the Targum without Identifying Onkelos, note 2. Also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group C, References to Human Emotions, note 1.

30. See Rashi GEN.25:3; GEN.18:19; GEN.20:13; GEN.43:18.

1. Menachem Ben Jacob, the Spaniard, of the family Seruk, born in Tortosa and lived in Cordova about 960 A.D. with the celebrated Minister, Hasdai Ibn Shaprut. He was the author of the Maḥberet one of the first complete lexicons of the biblical language. He arranged all the biblical Hebrew words into a lexicographical order, and thereby compiled the first Hebrew dictionary. Menachem’s lexicon is based on biliteral units expanding where appropriate into 3-letter stems, rather than on the triliteral root recognised by subsequent Hebrew Grammarians. Generally, his style is brief but endeavours to analyse difficult and obscure words with the result that quite often he displays new ideas. One of his severe critics was Dunash-Ben-Labrat (quoted also by Rashi) of Fez, a contemporary of Menachem, who made severe comments on Menachem’s Maḥberet. See S.D. Luzzatto in Kerem Chemed, p.48; Herschell Filipowski, The First Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon by Menachem Ben Seruk, London, 1854.

2. Rashi: -וּבֶן-"עֵשֶׂה - לְשׁוֹן אָוֹר מֵטַרְגָּמָת, בֶּתַיּוֹרֶשׁ. וּרְפֵעָהּ -מִבְּנֵי עִשְׂרֵהָ תֹּאֵפְשָׂת. לְשָׁן עִטְּבָּתָה פְּלַטְּלָתוֹן וּמִטַּרְגָּמָת הַשַּׁעֲרְוָה. מִלְּאָמְרָתַת מַטַּרְגָּמָת בְּשַׁעֲרָה. הָעֲבָרָתָה, אֲנָה מְטַרְגָּמָת בְּשַׁעֲרָה וּבְשַׁעֲרָה יַעֲבָרָתָה. הָשָׁמְעָתָה, עַל כָּל הַכָּלְמָיִם.
3. cf. (DEUT. 11:14) - מְלֵךְ - the "latter" rain. Also Amos 7:1 - מַלֶּךָ.

4. cf. EX. 9:33 - where Rashi favours Menachem's interpretation:

5. cf. - עֲרַיָּס - GEN. 3:1; Midrashic Section, Group A, note 20.

6. Rashi - "עַעֲרֵיָה/אֱנַקֵלוֹת וְכַפְּרַשׁ לִשְׁלֹשׁ עַרְיָים" - לשון עַרְיָים. לְשׁוֹן עַרְיָם.


7. See this Section, ch. 5, Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum, note 4. See DEUT. 7:13 - לָשֵׁם עַד - where Rashi follows Menachem. See this Section, ch. 1, note 33.

8. See Rashi, LEV. 11:3 s.v. - מִּי - See J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, p. 65.
9. Rashi - "洞察 - לְשׁוֹן כָּלָה כַּמִּי לְעֵדֶן, כֹּל
שֶׁאָמְרוּ הָקָרֵיִים שֶׁאֵינָם אֵבוֹת.

This also is taken from Menachem's Mahberet, p.173.

Rashi is incorrect as the form - מַכְשֶׁר - shows
(impossible from a root - שָׁכַר). It is from - שָׁכַר -
to look at, gaze in admiration. cf. Is. 2:16

In Aramaic - מַכְשֶׁר (or מַכְשֶׁר) cf.

Onkelos, GEN. 15:5 (by - חָצָה - חָצָה; Bab.Meg. 14a-

וַיָּשֶׂה רֵאֵם גֵּט בֶּן שֶׁבֶט ... וַיוֹסֵף נִקְרָא שָׁבֵט ... "in a year"

שהָיָה בַּהֲיוֹמָה הַקָּדוֹשָׁה ... וַיִּכְנֵס - שִׁלֹחַ - שִׁלֹחַ


10. cf. GEN. 18:10 where Rashi translates - שָׁכַר - "next year". Again Menachem

originated this explanation, see Mahberet, p.87. cf.

GEN. 41:43 - Rashi, in the name of Rabbi Jose-Ben-Durmaskit
(the son of a woman of Damascus) explains the unusual word
- הַכָּפָר - with - הָבִיס - "knees". Menachem likewise
connects the two and takes the - הַכָּפָר -
as prophetic, as in - הָבִיס - see Mahberet, p.14;
see GESENIUS, ch.II,19, M. p.70.

11. These terms are obscure and generally speaking Africa is
taken as a district in North Africa, and Kapti as the
coptic language. For further information, see Kohut's
Aruch, s.v - מַכְשֶׁר -
12. Similarly, Rashi rejects the Rabbi’s interpretation and accepts that of Dunash-Ben-Labrat, e.g. NUM.11:8 s.v - לָשׁוֹן הַשֵּׁם.

13. It may be worth mentioning that although Rashi challenges Menachem’s derivations yet, throughout his commentary, he has never shared Dunash-Ben-Labrat’s claim that certain definitions of Menachem were likely to lead the reader to erroneous interpretations of Halacha and belief. As a matter of fact Rashi’s grandson, the famous Tosafist, Rabbi Jacob Ben Meir, (known as Rabbenu Tam) in his book of decisions (appended to the Filipowski’s edition of the Maḥberet) defended Menachem from Dunash’s criticisms and proved that his decisions were valid. See Joshua Blau, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, 1974, v.11, p.1305; H. Filipowski, ibid. in his Introduction, p.14.


15. See Rashi GEN.41:34 s.v - שְׁנַי. See J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, p. 66.
16. See Mahberet, op.cit. p. 95 - לא יהכס לֹאב לַשּׁוֹעַר - פָּסַחְנוּ לֵאמֹן לַעֲנוֹת שָׁמֶל, לֵאמֹן כְּלָל לַשּׁוֹעַר.

17. See EX.3:22 - נְעֹרֵי הָעָם - where Rashi rejects Menachem's derivation.

18. It is, of course, an "ex-post facto" etymology for - מֶשֶׁךְ; if it were the real etymology the name would have to be - מֶשֶׁךְ. (cf. Ibn Ezra). In fact it is Egyptian for "son" (mesu) - she called him (her) son. (cf. Rameses - son of Ra, Totmes etc, borne by Kings of Egypt).
NOTES

CHAPTER 9 - ONKELOS AND HEBREW GRAMMAR

Known as Abu-al Walid. See the Introduction of this Section, Rashi as Philologist.

2. Naturally Rashi assumed (as we today would not invariably assume) that Onkelos had before him the Massoretically vocalised text, i.e. - יִשְׁמַר - vocalised - יִשְׁמַר - and thus excluding the possibility of reading it - יִשְׁמַר -.

3. cf. EX.1424; Jud. 415. See this Section, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 27.

4. Rashi compares it to - יִשְׁמַר - the second - יִשְׁמַר - receives a dagesh because it comes in place of two - יִשְׁמַר - since the word requires three - יִשְׁמַר - two for the root (יִשְׁמַר) and the third as a servile letter. Rashi, here, follows Menachem-Ben-Seruk who recognises the stem of - יִשְׁמַר - as biliteral (יִשְׁמַר) basis. cf. Rashi EX.291.
   See J.P. Mendoza, Rashi as Philologist, p.18.

5. cf. also NUM.2029 s.v - יִשְׁמַר - ; DEUT.1230 s.v - יִשְׁמַר - where Rashi rejects Onkelos' Targum as his explanations are not in accordance with the rules of Hebrew Grammar. cf. Rashi and Onkelos,NUM.3532 s.v - יִשְׁמַר - . See S.B. Schefftel,Biure Onkelos,pp.219-220. See this Section, ch.5, Injection of Derash and Halacha in Onkelos' Targum,note 11.
6. See A.S. Silberman, The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary EX. p. 219, Appendix 3. Rashi sees that יְהוָה— cannot be treated as יְהוָה— in the way that the Targum does without leaving the following שִׁישו— without a subject other than the Deity (mentioned at the beginning of the verse, but desiderated again if יְהוָה— had intervened).

7. Rashi obviously assumes — rightly — that יְהוָה— is an ettaphal form, corresponding to "Hophal", which must be vocalised יְהוָה—, as opposed to יְהוָה— etc., of the popular editions (ethpe'el).

8. cf. Rashi, EX. 33 — With the aid of the Targum in GEN. 29 s.v — יָשָׁב — he ascertains the function of the respective tense. With regard to the tenses, see J.P. Mendoza, op. cit. p. 41.

9. Other editions in the Targum read שַׁעֲלוֹ. See Rabbi E. Mizrahi. It is interesting to note that in DEUT. 4 Rashi does not comment on Onkelos who translates יָשָׁב— by יָשָׁבִי — and not by שָׁשָׁב. Perhaps here, too, Rashi would read in the Targum שָׁשָׁב. See this Section, ch. 10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 30.
10. With the aid of Onkelos who translates GEN.49:23 - בְּזַּבִּיתָם - by רֹאשָׁנָה - Rashi explains the passive force of the Niphal.

11. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p. 199 - who suggests that Onkelos is in agreement with Rashi, Ps. Jonathan does not take it as a noun:

12. - יִשְׁתָּחֵץ אֶת הַרְחוֹבִים - מְסַפְּרוּ לוֹשָׁנִי הָיָה מָנוּ תִּכְדָּא

13. Rashi - לְצִיַּשׁ הָעִבְרָא, וּמְאֹד אָמְרָה לִזְלֹל הָרֹאשׁ לְעִבֵּרָה - See GEN. Rabbah, 60, 6.

NOTES

CHAPTER 10 - RASHI AND THE TEXT OF ONKELOS

1. The popularity of the Targum can be seen from the following statement of Rab. Shalom Gaon:

See A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, p. 172; J. Komlosh in his Introduction, pp. 33-35; Bab. Tal. Ber. 8 b; Siphre, Piska 161 with regard to DEUT. 17.

"It is laid down in the Shulhan Aruch, V. Orach-Chaim, ch. 285 of the obligatory reading of the pentateuchal weekly portion - twice in the original Hebrew and once in Onkelos’ Targum. See, - Introduction to this Section, Rashi as Philologist; General Introduction, p. 21.

2. Targum Onkelos, (Second ed. Amsterdam 1896). He also believes that the two different cantillations of Babylon and Tiberias were the cause of the various versions which exist in Onkelos’ Targum. See, J. Komlosh, ibid, p. 32.


4. A. Berliner - יי הרימר - 1905, p. 433. However, as Rashi did not write prefaces to his commentary or the method to be pursued, it will be futile to make any rules as to what exactly Rashi meant by the different stylistic methods he has used.
4. (cond'd)

In quoting Onkelos. In fact in GEN.41:38 s.v - נקמה כה - Rashi points to the correct rendering in the Targum without saying - יבושה רכבר - or - יבושה רכבר - or - יבושה יבושה - (See this chapter, note 14) cf. Rashi EX.8:20 and this chapter, note 20; Rashi EX.16:14 and this chapter, note 22; Rashi EX.23:5 and this chapter, note 26; Rashi NUM.5:2 and this chapter, note 32. In other instances Rashi points to the correct reading in the Targum and states - יבושה יבושה - and not - יבושה יבושה - e.g. GEN.26:22 and this chapter, note 5; cf. LEV.25:47 and this chapter, note 31. In EX.34:5 Rashi corrects the reading by saying - יבושה יבושה - and not - יבושה יבושה - (see this chapter, note 29).

Other Exegetes established certain rules about these terms of Rashi. See - ספיכא ויהי רכבר - LEV, Vilna (שנוי שופט רכבר) - 1886. Also LEV. ed. Levin-Epstein, Jerusalem (שנוי שופט רכבר) 1954 - But as L. Zunz (Toledoth Rashi, p.3) has rightly remarked that these rules are incorrect and no attention should be paid to them. On this subject, see General Introduction, p. 32, Midrashic Section, Group A, note 7.
5. See Rashi GEN. 49:24 - לִבְּרוֹד הָאָדָם בֵּשָׁכֵרָה מַעֲברֵיהֶם. See P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, p.42, who believes that Onkelos' additions are due to the variety of translations which were inserted in the Targum at a later time by different editors.

6. See this Section, ch.5, Injection of "Derash" and "Halacha" in Onkelos' Targum.

7. See E.M. Lifshitz, Rashi, p.179.

8. In many editions the reading is - יִתְנֶל לָהֶם.

9. See Nahmanides; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.34, note 44, who quotes the various versions of the Targum; Sepher - מַעֲברֵיהֶם (quoted by Luzzatto) reads as follows: - לַדַּעַת, כְּשֶׁבֶר אֵדָר, יְלַעַת אֵּת הָאֵין וְיִלּוֹת גְּדוֹלָה. See A. Sperber.

11. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi S. Ben Meir agree with Rashi. It is significant that the Neofiti Targum reads:


13. See Rabbi E. Mizrahi.


15. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ולכם מטחת - This is also the reading in Neofiti.

16. See A. Berliner and A. Sperber.

17. See A. Berliner.

18. The wording of Rashi - ויסדנה לש וחיק - shows clearly that Onkelos does not support him. On this subject see S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 41, note 78. If Rashi had in his Targum - שהי - one would expect him to say - כָּכָהוּשׁ.


22. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 45, note 102. S.B.Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.66; this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Translation, note 4.

23. N. Adler, Netinah-Lager suggests that Rashi had this reading in the Targum. Adler's reading in Rashi is incorrect for Rashi takes it from - מִבְּלָה - "half". In some editions, however, the word - מִבְּלָה - is not translated by the Targum. See A. Sperber and - מִבְּלָה - p.14.

25. This version is found in - אֹמֵר יְהוָה - EX. p.2. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p. 49, note 134.

26. כֱּבֵד - כָּפַר רָעַּו - שֵׁם רְבֵרָא וְזֶה - Rashi calls an adjective which is the usual term for a noun.

27. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger, p.49, note 135; N. Adler, Netinah-Lager. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra and Rabbi S. Ben Meir take it as a verb.


29. N.E.B. reads: "But beware, there is trouble in store for you."
30. See Nahmanides - Series: "בר מושל י inversión בין אמה - כינון היי". מבוא בהי שכנוע א"ם传导 וגרותMarkup מהתקומס

Nahmanides quotes three versions in connection with this Targum. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.49, note 139; A. Sperber.

31. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.89; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.52, note 155.

32. S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.52, note 159, reads - "לעבידך".
See Section; Anthropomorphisms, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, notes 24 and 25. -

33. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager.

34. See the different versions in S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53, note 168; Tosafot, Bab.Tal.Kid.p.49; Halachic Section, Group C, note 4.

35. cf. Ps. Jonathan - "어서ון יס עמרא"

36. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.53, note 171; A. Sperber; S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, p.103. This Section, ch.9, Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 1.
37. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.54, note 173.


39. cf. NUM.16 where Onkelos translates - לְיָמי - by - יָשָׁבַע. See this Section, ch.9, Onkelos and Hebrew Grammar, note 10.

40. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.56, note 189.

41. See also Rashi EX.40 s.v. - מַעֲשֶׁה

42. N.E.B's translation. J.H. Hertz' ed. (London Soncino Press, 1961) read - "And if a stranger who is a settler with thee etc".

43. The Siphra supports our editions: - זָרָךְ יָשָׁבַע לְךָ - התשובה והאר אוכל אוכל -

See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; A. Sperber.
44. See the different versions in S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.64, note 243; A. Sperber; this Section, ch. 6, The Influence of Aramaic Language on the Hebrew, note 4.

45. See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager; Rashi NUM.14 24; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.67, note 262. See this Section, ch.7, Rejection of Onkelos' Targum, note 7.

46. cf. Rashi NUM.16 18.

NOTES- INTRODUCTION

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHISMS OF ONKELOS AND RASHI'S ATTITUDE


3. cf. NUM.23 19 - אַזَا שָׁעָה לָא וֹדֵבֶּהוּ וִיתַנָּה - In GEN.3 8 - יְשֵׁמַעְתָּא כָּלִתַגרוּ - The Torah deliberately mentions that Adam and Eve heard "the sound" (לִיפַּל) of the Lord God walking in the garden - but God himself was not walking. See M.D. Cassuto - מַעַרְשָׁי בה - p. 100.

4. cf. EX.24 16 ; cf. EX.24 17 ; LEV.9 6 ; LEV.9 23 ; EX.33 18 ; EX.40 34 ; EX.40 35 ; EZ.10 18 ; EZ.1 28 ; EZ. 8 4. On the word "glory", see A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.205-207. It is not necessary in this context to consider the suggestion of whether the "Kebod" of God was assumed to manifest itself in an actually visible light, as has been argued to be the case regarding Ezekiel.


7. Theologie, II. pp. 5-18. - quoted by Ch. T. Fritsch, ibid, p. 5.

8. At this stage it is most important to note that the notion of intermediaries was highly developed by the Targumim, with their "Shechinah" (אשת-יוחנן) or "word" (אשת-יוחנן) or Glory (אשת-יוחנן). See further about these uses by Targum Onkelos. Also this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God. Also Group G, Intermediary Elements. Philo also developed his theory of the Logos.

9. cf. IS. 6:3; LEV. 11:45; LEV. 19:2. On this subject of "Purity and Holiness" of God, see A. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, pp. 208-217.

10. The transcendent view of God can be seen from the Book of Ezekiel, ch. 1, vv. 26-28. Also ch. 8:2.

11. cf. EZ. 1:26; EZ. 20:33-34; IS. 26:11; IS. 8:11; IS. 6:1; ZECH. 12:4.
INTRODUCTION

12. Regarding Tikune Sopherim, see Mechilta - נֶפֶלָהּ בְּשֵׁלָחָן, Parasha 6; GEN. Rabbah, 49,7; EX. Rabbah, 41,4; LEV. Rabbah, 11,5; Tanh. 16; Tanhuma, Buber, GEN. 4; Palest. Tal. Bik. ch. 3, Halacha 3; Rashi GEN. 18, Midrash Aggadah; Lekah- Tov; Siphre, Behaalotecha, Piska 84, Siphre, ibid, Piska, 105; Yalk. Shimoni, Beshalach 247; Yalk. Psalms 806; Rashi, NUM. 1212.

13. For a thorough study of Tikune Sopherim or Kinouye Sopherim, see A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp. 199-223 and especially pp. 199-204; See also Ginzberg in his Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, pp. 347-363; S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (1950) pp. 28 ff.

14. See supra note 12; cf. also Midrash Hagadot, GEN. p. 313.

15. cf. DEUT. 138; DEUT. 108.

16. See Rashi on this verse who states that the original reading was - מִשְׁרוּ ענֵי - And let me not see their evil. See, however, A. Berliner, Zechor le Abraham, who quotes Rashi in Job. 32, where he has the reading - מִשְׁרוּ ענֵי - מִשְׁרוּ ענֵי -
17. On the subject of Tikune Sopherim, see other suggestions by Luzzatto—quoted by A. Geiger, op. cit. p.218—who believes that the Sopherim have also altered the vowels of a text, when they saw that the pointed text, as it stands, is unbecoming of the Deity, e.g. the phrase—אריס (EX.34:26) was originally in the Kal—שם (as the inclusion of שם shows) but because the original reading raises the obvious objection—"seeing the face of God"—the vowels were altered from the Kal to the Niphal. The passages in question are as follows:—EX.23:15; EX.23:17; EX.34:20; EX.34:23; DEUT.16:16; DEUT.31:11. On this subject see also Dillman, EX. p. 276; Driver, DEUT. International Critical Commentary, p. 198; Ch.T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.7.


23. See GEN.32.30 - "For I have seen God face to face" - Onkelos translates - "For I have seen the Angel of the Lord". cf. Onkelos GEN.16.14.

24. EX.33.14; EX.34.9; NUM.11.20; NUM.35.34; EX.25.8; EX.20.21; NUM.16.3; NUM.5.3.


26. cf. this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, notes 10 and 11. On this word - see Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, ibid, v.1, ch.27 and ch. 48. See, however, Nahmanides on GEN.46.1 who interprets Onkelos differently.
27. See also EX.24\(^{11}\) - לְָתָם אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה - where Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism.

28. See this Section, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 13.

29. cf. DEUT.4\(^{34}\); DEUT.5\(^{15}\); DEUT.7\(^{19}\); DEUT.26\(^{8}\) - where the words - יָדָם - are translated by Onkelos literally - וּבָיְתֵהַם - "with a strong hand". The same applies to - בְּעָלֶיהָ - EX.6; DEUT.9\(^{29}\) - Onkelos translates literally - בְּרָם מִרְדִּים - "with an upraised arm". See this Section, Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 12.

S. Maybaum, Die Anthropomorphien, Breslaw, 1870, p.56, exaggerated in saying that Ps. Jonathan is more anti-anthropomorphic than Onkelos. This is not correct as in several instances Onkelos avoids the anthropomorphism of the text and Ps. Jonathan translates literally. See J. Komlosb, op. cit. p. 105, note 18.

30. LXX was also careful in translating - 'אֵל הַלַּוֵד - "before the Lord". See Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.12; Ps. Jonathan was also careful in translating in all these cases - קָנָא לָהּ -
31. See this Section, Group B, note 7. Nahmanides on GEN. 46; S.D. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. Hametiv ha-Shelishi, p.3.

32. cf. EX.3; EX.9; EX.431; EX.32; DEUT.32; DEUT.32.

33. cf. GEN.6; GEN.6; GEN.29; On the subtle distinction between the two translations of Onkelos - see Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.48. See also Maimonides, ibid, about the verb - יִשְׁמַע - to hear.


35. See Halachic Section, Summary, suggestion 6.

36. See Ch.T. Fritsch, op. cit. p.20, who expresses a similar view about the translation of the Septuagint.


38. Rashi: - כָּלְצָה בְּבַדָּה הָשָּׁם וַיִּגְנָב וַיִּכְבּ וַיְסַרְבּ לְאָלָם מִי - trespasser took a calf and gave it for one of the folds.

- עֲנַנְתִּי עַל הָאֹרֶבֶּה וַיִּשְׁכִּבְּוָנָה וַיִּכְבּ - I was angry with them and took their calf and covered it.

39. cf. Rashi, EX.15⁸; EX.19⁴; EX.19¹⁹; EX.31¹⁷ - where this important rule is re-emphasized.

40. The heading under which some instances are classified are subjective.

2. This is also the opinion of Maimonides that the term "Shechinah" is used as an intermediary. Nahmanides, GEN. 46:1, however, argues with him. It appears (as can be seen from this chapter) that Rashi holds like Maimonides. See M. Kadushin, Rabbinic Mind, p. 223 ff. and 325 ff; J. Komlosh, op. cit. p. 107; G. Scholem, Mysticism, p. 66 and p. 226 f. See footnote 6.


4. See Midrashic Section, Group E (e) Rashi and Derash, note 8.

5. cf. Onkelos, EX. 33:15.

6. (cont'd)

special reference to p.32. Rab. Saadia Gaon, in Book of Beliefs and Opinions, 2, 10 believes that the "Shechinah" is a created being which is separate from God. See S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, 1909, p.40, note 1. Encyclopaedia Judaica, Keter, v.14, pp.1349-1354.

7. However, in LEV.26:24 and LEV.26:28 - the word - ה딩למ - is translated by Onkelos literally, although applied to God.

8. cf. Rashi GEN.6:9 - who interprets that Noah needed God's support:

9. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.

10. cf. Onkelos, GEN.24:40 - "The Eternal before whom I walk - and God before whom I worship". cf. also GEN.48:15 - The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac worshipped. When the verb - הלך - is in the sense of - "The Eternal went before them" - (EX.13:21; DEUT.1:30; DEUT.1:33; DEUT.20:4; DEUT.31:6) then the Targum Onkelos takes it in the sense of - עלבר - to lead.
11. See this Section, Group G, note 7.

12. In the same verse Rashi further comments that it is the "Shechinah" that dwells in the Temple of Jerusalem. Perhaps in opposition to the idea of God Himself dwelling in the Temple as this is unbecoming of the Deity:

"...מְסַתְּרֵי חַתַּןְוֹ חַלָּה שֵׁלָה נֶאֶן רַשּׁוֹת לְחַסְּרוּתָם תָּשָׁר וַיִּשָּׁר לְבוֹאֵת מֵאֲדָם,"

13. The same applies when the verb - יָרַשׁ - refers to the Patriarchs e.g. GEN.18; GEN.26; GEN.35. See Section, Veneration and Idealization of the Patriarchs, Group A.

14. See Sforno, GEN.20 who says that this is why regarding Laban, Balaam and Abimelech the text does not read

"...וַיִּרְאוּוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהָם אֶלָּבָנָא אוֹבֵד מַעַרְכָּת בָּנָנָא אֱלֹהָם אֶלָּבָנָא אֱלֹהָם אֱלִיתוֹת...ולא חברו...כאמר לא נחר DataType error, op.cit. GEN.20 , p. 35.
15. On the subtle distinction between the prophecy of Moses and that of other prophets, see Maimonides - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו ch.7, Halacha 6; cf. Guide to the Perplexed v.2, ch.35; his commentary on the Mishna, Sanh.ch.10, Mishna 1; his Introduction to the Ethics of the Fathers, ch.7.

16. Rashi's source is the Mechilta, Yithro, Parasha 4. However, it is interesting to note that the phrase - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - in this context is an elaboration of Rashi's own. The Mechilta simply reads: - למשה ולא ירא י"ז ד' ח"ו ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - "ויהי כора לע_yellow color_ י"ז ד' ח"ו זה אהבה והנה שאמה البعד למשה - his interpretation of his own. The Mechilta simply reads: - למשה ולא ירא י"ז ד' ח"ו ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - "ויהי כора לע_yellow color_ י"ז ד' ח"ו זה אהבה והנה שאמה البعד למשה - his interpretation of his own.

17. On GEN.1 - י"ז ד' ח"ו - The spirit of God was hovering. Rashi explains - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - "The throne of Divine Glory was standing in space hovering over the face of the waters". In other words it was not - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - but rather His throne of Glory. However, Rashi's source for this interpretation is Bab. Tal. Hagg.15* - but there, too, the phraseology - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - is not mentioned. Onkelos translates - ח"ה י"ז ד' ח"ו - "And a wind from before the Lord was blowing. cf. N.E.B. "And a mighty wind that swept over the surface of the waters".
18. Rashi - יְהִיционֶךָךָךָּ לָאֵלֶּה בָּאֵלֶּה לִבְנֵי שׁוֹלֵם

19. While here and EX.12²³ - Onkelos avoids the ascription of motion by translating - אִישָׂיִים - in EX.32²² - אִישָׂיִים - Onkelos translates literally - נִמָּא אִישָׂיִים. In DEUT.31³ - "He will pass before you". Onkelos does not translate - אִישָׂיִים - but - לִבְנֵי אִישָׂיִים - "His Memra will pass before you". Perhaps in EX.33²² - Onkelos translates literally because it is not referring directly to God, but to His Glory as the beginning of the verse shows - לִבְנֵי אִישָׂיִים -


21. cf. Onkelos EX.12,vv.23,27. See Mechilta, Bo, Parasha 7 - עַל אִשָּׂיִים אָמְרוּ אֵלֶּה. Presumably - עַל אִשָּׂיִים - ought to be taken in the sense of "sparing" and not in the sense of "pity" - for this is in itself a human emotion which ought to be avoided when referring to the Deity. But conceivably the Rabbis, in their eagerness to get rid of the obvious problem, did not realise (or were not for the moment concerned) that in crediting God with pity they had involved themselves in another.

23. cf. Onkelos NUM.23 - cf. also NUM. vv.4,16. There are, however, inconsistencies in Onkelos for in EX.3 - he translates - And in EX.5 - In NUM.23 the Samaritan text reads - and in verse 3 the reading is - (rather than the verb - to meet). In NUM.23 - the Samaritan text reads - LXX in EX.3 - reads - . He has commanded us. Most probably all this was done to soften the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew text. On this verb - to meet, see Ch. T. Fritsch, op.cit. pp.31-32.


27. cf. Onkelos EX.25\(^{22}\); EX.30\(^{6}\); NUM.17\(^{19}\). LXX also avoids the anthropomorphism - \(\gamma\nu\mu\omega\sigma\eta\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\) - as if it were - 'רֶשֶׁת (from - רֶשֶׁת) I shall be known.
See Ch.T. Fritsch, op.cit. p.30. But the possibility must be admitted that the Hebrew text in front of the LXX actually read - 'רֶשֶׁת - instead of - 'רֶשֶׁת - See this Section, Group G, Intermediary Elements, note 4.

28. Rashi EX.33\(^{21}\) explains that the Holy One blessed be He is the "place" (\(דָּוִד\)) of the Universe (comprises the Universe) but His universe is not His place. (Does not encompass Him) cf. also Tanh. EX. Parashat Ki Tissa. See Montgomery J.A. The "Place" as an Appellation of Deity, Journal of Biblical Literature XXIV, pp.17-26.

29. Onkelos - 'לֹא יִשְׁמַעְתָּם הָעֹלָּם יִשְׁמַעְתָּם שֶֽׁרְאֶה בְּעָיוֹן -

30. cf. NUM.16\(^{3}\) - אֲנַהֲרֶהְךָ - "And the Lord among them" - 'Onkelos translates - 'לְעֹלָם שֶֽׁרְאֶה אֲנַהֲרֶהְךָ. cf. also Onkelos DEUT. 12\(^{11}\); DEUT.12\(^{5}\); Onkelos and Rashi DEUT.33\(^{12}\).
31. Rashi - א arose בכרות - לא ב שמעתי שמעתי ינכש לא גבש לובכש לוכס ילב המרבדים המלך

\text{cf. Rashi EX.33}^{10}; \text{EX.33}^{7}.

32. \text{cf. Onkelos on - יסוי - EX.15}^{22}. \text{See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10. Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, note 23.}

33. Rashi - וקרן 150 תכשיס עם זמי החמץ את חמשה, ומשה לולעדה.

\text{cf. Onkelos and Rashi EX.6}^{8}; \text{NUM.14}^{30}; \text{See A. Ibn Ezra on EX.6}^{8} \text{who states that - נסובץ את יי - is merely a metaphor: - לושם את יי -铬כ משך דרכם משם, יי ל"ז מקים ושיבת.}
NOTES

GROUP B - REFERENCES TO HUMAN FORM AND ORGANS

1. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v. 2, ch. 1 and 2; Maimonides, "ע"פ"ת ה'ד א'ג'ג - NUM. 23:19; I Sam. ch. 15:29; LXX. likewise avoids the word "man". See Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p. 9.

2. cf. LXX. - "And the Glory of the Lord he saw". See Ch. T. Fritsch, p. 9.

3. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p. 28; N. Adler, Netinah-Lageb. Ps. Jonathan, however, translates - 'ב'ה'ו'ת מִן קֻמָּה -

4. cf. Nahmanides. See this Section, Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 2.

5. cf. Onkelos LEV. 26:17; LEV. 20:3; LEV. 20:5,6. On the other hand in EX. 33:14 - שְׁכֵנִים - is substituted by - "Shechinah". Similarly - EX. 33:15 - שֶׁכֶּנֶּר - EX. 33:37 - מְשָׁרֵים - DEUT. 4:37 is translated - With His "Word". But - GEN. 19:13; EX. 32:11 - קֶם הָא ד - Onkelos translates it by -"ךָקָם ד" - Similarly, the expression on - EX. 23:15; DEUT. 16 - Onkelos translates it by - קֶמֶּר קָנָל.

7. See Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 7. Also ch. Reverence to God, note 2.

8. cf. Rashi, GEN. 11:28 - על פי תורתו עַיִן

9. cf. Onkelos NUM. 12:8 who translates - אֲנִי אוֹת בְּלַדְמַע - וֹמַשׁ וּמְפַסֵּד - "word with word". cf. Onkelos EX. 33:11 - מָמְלֹא קַשָּׁה נִכְּסָה - וֹמַשׁ וּמְפַסֵּד - "word with word".

10. In GEN. 32:31 - כִּי נַצְיֵה אַלְמָא וָלַעֲבָה - "For I have seen the Lord face to face" - Onkelos translates - אֶל עֲלָה עַל הַנַּשָּׁה - "For I have seen the Angel of the Lord face to face". cf. Ps. Jonathan. On the other hand in DEUT. 34:10 while Onkelos translates literally, Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum avoided the anthropomorphism: - לְאָלֶלְכָּה עַל כָּל הַנַּשָּׁה - "For I have seen the Lord face to face". 

See N. Adler, Netinah-Lager, DEUT. 34:10; S.B. Schefftel, Biura Onkelos, DEUT. 34:10.
11. I say in most cases because in DEUT.11:12 - א"ת י"א - תי א - "The eyes of the Lord your God are always upon it". Onkelos translates literally.


13. LXX also avoids this anthropomorphism, see Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p. 12.

14. Rashi's source is Siphre in the name of Rabbi Akiva, Parashat Re'eh, Piska 79.


17. The Aramaic root - ِعَرَ - corresponds to the Hebrew root - ِعَرَ - and this is why Rashi translates - ِعَرَ - by - ِعَرَ - guidance. See section Rashi as Philologist, ch. 4 - Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic, note 21.

18. In several cases the word - ِعَرَ - (hand) when used in connection with God, is translated in the sense of - ِعَرَ - power and might. cf. Onkelos and Rashi EX.14:31. In EX.13:3; DEUT.4:34; DEUT.5:15; DEUT.7:19; DEUT.11:2 DEUT.26:8 however, Onkelos takes - ِعَرَ - literally. It may be because nothing in the context determines that the - ِعَرَ - is that of the Deity. It simply means - ِعَرَ - "might". Rashi in Isaiah, ch.8:11 takes - ِعَرَ - in the sense of - ِعَرَ - "prophecy".


21 See Nahmanides, GEN.46:1. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 36.

22 See this section (supra) Group A note 25
GROUP C - REFERENCES TO HUMAN EMOTIONS

ANTHROPOPATHISMS

1. cf. Onkelos GEN.6. But again there is no consistency for in EX.32\(^1^2\); EX.32\(^1^4\) Onkelos translates literally. See Onkelos DEUT.32\(^3^6\); NUM.23\(^1^9\).

2. R. Loewe has examined this and all other passages where -וה- is used of God in Vetus Testamentum, pp.261-272. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.2, note 2.

3. רְצָחֵב - הַעֲשֵׂה אֶלָּבֶּל שֶׁל מִקְוָה מִקְוָה - לוֹקֶנֶּהוּ וַהֲסֵרוּמִי של עַמּוּךָ.
See Ps. Jonathan - אֵלָיוֹ מִי יָשִׂים בָּרוּם מְרוֹם - Neofiti reads - יָחָדָנוֹ וּלְּבֹרֵךְ

4. cf. Onkelos DEUT.28\(^3^9\) - לֹא-יִתְנַאֵּר by - לֹא-בּוּבֶּשׁ. See Prov.6\(^8\); Prov.10\(^5\); cf. Siphre Haazinu, Piska 322 - "וְזֶה נַעֲלוּ נַעֲלוּ שְׁנֵי עַמּוֹת בְּלֹא קָוֹרֵי יִתְנַאֵּר - Prov.30\(^1\).

5. cf. Onkelos LEV.26\(^1^1\); LEV.26\(^4^4\).

6. On the expression DEUT.1\(^3^7\) - רָאָה ג' הַצְּנַחְק - "Also the Eternal was wrath with me". - Onkelos weakens the anthropomorphism - כִּי עִם לָאֵ רַע - the wrath from before the Lord. But in DEUT.1\(^3^4\) Onkelos translates - רָאָה ג' הַצְּנַחְק - literally - רָאָה ג' הַצְּנַחְק.
7. Jonathan's Targum on the Prophets does not follow a consistent policy in this area, either. In several human emotions attributed to the Deity, Jonathan translates them literally. (e.g. Mal.1:1; Hosea 11:1; Joel 2:18; Amos 5:21; Amos 7:3, 6). On the other hand, the expression, Is.1:14 - שְׁנַאָה דָעַשׁ - "My soul hates" - Jonathan has toned down the anthropomorphism, and substitutes it by - .
NOTES

GROUP D - REFERENCES TO PHYSICAL REACTIONS

1. N.E.B. reads - But Moses set himself to "placate" the Lord his God. Some suggest that the original meaning was to stroke the face of someone, and thus to placate in that way, from the idea of stroking the idol in prayer. See Ch. T. Fritsch, op.cit. p.10, note 5, see Mal. 1.

2. N.E.B. reads - He ceased work and refreshed himself, literally "took a [deep] breath" (בשם). cf. Rashi, EX.20 sul s.v רינת
ONELLOS' translation is simply inadequate for while
he was careful with the textual word - רוח - he,
however, substituted - נשימה - "nose" by - שפה - "mouth" - which is in itself a gross anthropomorphism.

2. See Maimonides - רוחו של הרוח - See Rashi
I. Sam. 16:13 - where in a remarkable way he explains
- רוח בבראשית - "the breath of the Lord" - by - שפה - the spirit of power (strength); cf. Onkelos and Rashi
GEN.1:11 on the expression - שפחתה מרחבת

3. Rashi's statement - סמך את בשמה רוח - is not
mentioned in Bab. Tal. Zeb. 46b or in Siphra, Piska 58 -
where the text is discussed. It simply says - רוח - שפחתה רוח
- cf. also Rashi EX.29:25:
-ålד את רוח - רוחת כך מיום שחרר ורשות לאזכרה

4. See Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. Netiv ha-Shelishi, p. 3.

5. cf. Mechilta Bo, Parasha 7; Midrash Hagadol, EX. op.
cit. p. 190.

6. Also wherever the verb - שמע - means agreeing with a
person's statement, Onkelos translates it by - עָנַי -
e.g. GEN.37:27. See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.4.
Translation of Biblical Idioms into Aramaic, note 10.
7. cf. also Jonathan on the Prophets, Is."15; Jer.716.

8. Guide to the Perplexed, v.1, ch.45 and ch.48. However, even here there is no consistent policy, for according to his distinction, one would expect Jonathan to translate II Kings, 1916 - הוהי י taco הלל - the verb - הביר - but in fact our version reads - יהושע Kendrick. Again GEN.2117 - כיוון שמעי - אַלּוֹנֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל - "For God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is" - Onkelos translates - ובין שמי וילכו אשר התים קבש - when in fact (according to Maimonides) one would expect - קבש ל חנוריה - "And the Lord accepted his prayer". Perhaps, however, in these two cases, Maimonides had a different version.

9. cf. Rashi DEUT.145 - לָא שִׁמְךָ בֵּ֣ית נָבִי - "The Eternal would not hear your voice". - Rashi explains - לָא שִׁמְךָ - הביאוּל עַשֵּׂיתָם מִשָּׁמָיו רָבִיתָם וַאֲשֶׂר חָסִיתךְ - "If it is at all possible to say so of God, you caused his attribute of mercy [to act] as though it were cruel." In his usual sensitivity Rashi avoids the anthropomorphism by explaining the verb - שמע - not in its literal sense, but rather - חסית רחמי - His attribute of mercy.
10. Rashi on EX.33 11; Ps. Jonathan EX.33 9,11.

11. cf. Rashi DEUT.33 3 - סעכ וniche thy decisions.

12. See Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, v.2, ch.33, who explains that although Moses and Israel heard the voice of God at Mount Sinai, yet there was a definite distinction between the ability of Moses in comprehending the "voice" and that of Israel. This is illustrated by the Targum Onkelos. In every case where the Torah says

- "And God spoke to Moses" - Onkelos translates

Similarly EX.20 1

"And God spoke all these words" - Onkelos translates

- "עגאל נ" - אע"ש מהשלום... - ריבר את נהיה את נביה

"But let not God speak with us" - Onkelos translates

- (Onkelos uses the Hithpael). "But let it not be spoken in our presence from before the Lord": - "איש宁静 את הקים לא - המית הכרותש בז" שלבר עשו דין, לאמ" אתירך את הורו ויהו

אודה מהת מוקש שלימים ובו יברך ה', כי מעשה לאמך.
In other words there was no direct speech with Israel, but they simply heard a "voice from before the Lord". Maimonides' theory is not convincing for even with regard to Moses, Onkelos EX.33⁹ had used the Hithpael "בַּשָּׁם מִצְרָים יָרָכָה יִרְכָּה". Perhaps, however, Maimonides' distinction lies in the fact that with regard to Moses the words - "זְבָא יָרָכָה - "From before the Lord" - are not mentioned. This subtle distinction can be supported by the fact that while in NUM.7⁸⁹ - "וְזָכַרְתָּ בַּשָּׁם יִרְכָּה - "And He (God) spoke to him" (Moses) - Onkelos translates - "וְזָכַרְתָּ בַּשָּׁם יִרְכָּה" (referring to the voice), in DEUT.5²¹ - (with regard to the Israelites) - "כִּי בָא עֵתֶם אֶלָּא וְאִם אֶלָּא" - "We have seen this day that God doth speak with man, and he liveth" - Onkelos translates - "כִּי בָא עֵתֶם אֶלָּא וְאִם אֶלָּא". One can see that the expression - "זְבָא יָרָכָה - is used only with regard to the Israelites. This is, however, according to N. Adler (in his Introduction, note 10, footnote 1) who quotes this version. But in all other books of Targum Onkelos, including that of A. Sperber, the reading in DEUT.5²¹ is literal - "זְבָא יָרָכָה -
NOTES

GROUP F - PREPOSITIONS IMPLYING MOTION OR OTHER CORPOREALITY

1. See Nahmanides:


3. cf. Rashi, EX.20 - s.v. - "And God rested".
See this Section, Group D, note 2.

4. There is, however, no consistency in Onkelos, for in the following verse (v.13) - "Because all the firstborn are mine" - Onkelos translates literally.

   Similarly (in the same verse) the expression - "Mine shall they be" - Onkelos translates literally. On the other hand, the phrase - "I sanctified to me" - Onkelos reads - "I sanctified before Me".


6. See this Section, Group E, References to Human Senses, note 5 (EX.33).
7. See GEN.2815 where Rashi explains - אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר רָכַבְתִּי לָךְ - Until I have done that which I have spoken to thee - by - לְשׁוֹנִי וּרְאָתִי - that which "I have spoken in thy interest and concerning thee." Rashi, once again, explains that - "in the same way whenever - יִסְדְו - or - לָא - or - לְהָעִיס - or - לְרָבָר - are used after a verbal form of - לְשׁוֹנִי - they are used in the sense of - עַל - concerning (תִּכְנָשֵׁה עַל עַכְּבֹּד לִבְּךָ מֵעַרְכֵּךָ לְאָדָם). This verse proves that this is so, since it cannot mean - "I have spoken to thee" - as God had never spoken to Jacob before this occasion". See Nahmanides, who argues with Rashi for in EX.3234 - the text reads - וְאַנֲחָא אֲנִי הָאָדָם - "Now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee" - (and it is impossible to explain: - רִאָשִׁי - "concerning you" for God had spoken before to Moses). See C.B. Chavel in his glosses on Nahmanides, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem 1969, v.1, pp. 135-136; Rabbi E. Mizrahi.
1. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 1, footnote 2.

2. cf. Rashi GEN.32 "Our Rabbis of blessed memory explained that he was Esau's guardian Angel". cf. GEN. Rabbah 78,3; Yalk. Shimoni 247,133; Midrash Hagadol, GEN.p.574. There is inconsistency in Onkelos for whilst in GEN.32 Onkelos takes - as - "Angel", in GEN.33, 10 he translates - "great people". Ps. Jonathan is consistent and in both places he translates -.


4. On this verb - See this Section, Group A, note 19.

5. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 3.

6. cf. Rashi EX.34, 10; this Section, Group A, note 1.
7. See this Section, Group A, note 8.

8. Rashi - אומס על ניעה,... היי הכף... רם בכף נפש ... (לכן, כף)... See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 18.

9. Rashi... בכלו - נוחו המקרא בהו לון שלמה... cf. Rashi EX.1419.
NOTES

GROUP H - DIRECT AND INDIRECT SOFTENING

(OR FREE SUBSTITUTION)

1. cf. Rashi EX.17 \textsuperscript{15}; Jud. 6 \textsuperscript{24}.

2. The LXX translates "the Lord is my refuge". It appears that the LXX has connected the word - 'Əḇ - with the root - Əḇ - to flee, to escape. See Ch. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p. 37. It is not necessary here to enter into the question of the textual originality of - 'Əḇ - and its relationship to the following explanation - ...םב יב.

3. cf. DEUT.33 \textsuperscript{29} - יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְבָּרֵךְ - "The Shield of thy help". Although it is used in a metaphorical sense yet, comparing God to a shield is, somehow, disrespectful to the Deity. Onkelos, therefore, translates - הִינָךְ יָדוֹ - "the Mighty is thy help". Thus softening the idea considerably. See also in the same verse how Onkelos gets around the metaphor of calling God a "sword". Similarly the LXX avoids literal translation where - חֵפֶס - is used metaphorically of God in Psalms 84 \textsuperscript{12} - ...כ שְׁמֵישׁ יָמִלְךָ.

4. See Rashi EX.19 \textsuperscript{18}; EX.15 \textsuperscript{8}; EX.19 \textsuperscript{4}; EX.19 \textsuperscript{19}; EX.31 \textsuperscript{17}. On the verse in question cf. Ps. Jonathan and the Palest. Targum...

6. cf. Ibn Ezra on verse 34 - הניה פרושת ליעם ה', והם
メール שלדיהם לאמר

- cf. Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir.

7. See this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 19 on the verb - רָאָה.

8. cf. GEN. Rabbah, 68,9; EX. Rabbah, 45, 6; Tanhuma, Ki Tissa, 27; Tanhuma Buber, v.1, 16; Midrash Tannaim, p.222; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 498; ibid, EX. p.705.

9. See Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation.

10. See Ibn Ezra and Nahmanides.

11. cf. EX.22 where Onkelos and Rashi take - דַּרְכֵּי הַגֵּזָה- to mean "Judges".


2. It is said that to avoid exposure to the concept of Polytheistic construction the 70 Elders who translated the Torah into Greek for Ptolemy have inserted in this chapter of Gen: פֶּה בַּעֲרֵבָה יָהֲעָזִיתָהוּ. On this subject, see Mechilta Parashat Bo; Palest. Tal. Meg. ch.1, Halacha 9; Bab.Tal.Meg. p.9a; Sopherim, ch.1, Halacha 8; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, pp.281-287; this Section, Group B, Reference to Human Form and Organs, note 3. Great emphasis was also placed on this text by the Church as an argument for the trinity.

3. Here also the 70 Elders rendered it for Ptolemy פֶּה בַּעֲרֵבָה יָהֲעָזִיתָהוּ - cf. Mechilta, Parashat Bo; see the above note; A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.282.

4. By translating פֶּה בַּעֲרֵבָה - Onkelos avoided the idea of motion; cf. this Section, Group A, Motion and Place Denied God, note 11. However, it is surprising to see that Onkelos has left the text in the plural form.
5. Onkelos has changed the verb - וָָנָָיַּיבַּ - from the Hiphil to the Kal - וָָנָָיַּיבָּ - See H. Levenstein, Nephesh Hager, op. cit. p. 68. In GEN. Rabbah 52, 11 seems to explain Onkelos' interpretation: - הבשעים שבעים רבים לַחָטָעַבּ - וָָנָָיַּיבַּ. "And when the idol worshippers tried to mislead me, the Holy One blessed be He was revealed to me and said go out from your land". The onus of responsibility is thus removed from God. cf. Midrashic Section, Group A, note 4. See ch., Reverence to God, note 5. In addition, there is also an argument among the Rabbis as to whether אָשָָיַּל - אָשָָיַּל in this verse is - אָשָָיַּל - or - אָשָָיַּל. See Sopherim 4,6; Palest. Tal. Meg. ch.1, Halacha 9.

6. cf. DEUT.4 - אָשָָיַּל - אָשָָיַּל - Onkelos, however, takes it in singular - אָשָָיַּל.

7. cf. Rashi EX.22. See this Section,Group B, References to Human Form and Organs, note 5; ch., Reverence to God,note 2, footnote 4.

1. See S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Ger. p.35, N. Adler, Netinah- Lager, holds that this is the correct reading in Onkelos. Furthermore, whenever the terms - 'הנ' - or - ה' - are mentioned in the Torah, with regard to idols, Onkelos translates them by - 'חרפ' - "Fear". This was done out of reverence to God, in order to distinguish between the true God and other gods e.g. GEN.31\(^{30}\); EX.32\(^{1}\).

2. Or it can be translated "among the mighty" (see Rashi). The N.E.B. reads: "Among the gods".

3. cf. Onkelos DEUT.4\(^{7}\) where Onkelos translates -ש"ק - in singular.

4. cf. Rashi EX.20\(^{3}\) s.v - ה' - See Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group B, note 5 and Group I, note 7.

5. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. however, is closer to the Targum Onkelos.

6. See also GEN.30\(^{2}\) and GEN.50\(^{19}\) where Onkelos substituted a positive statement in the place of a rhetorical question.
7. cf. GEN.18\textsuperscript{25}; GEN.30\textsuperscript{2}; GEN.50\textsuperscript{19}; NUM.23\textsuperscript{19}.

8. See Midrashic Section, Group A, note 4. Also Section, Anthropomorphisms, Group I, References Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 4. On the text in question Rashi offers a different interpretation and one can see from it how he has indeed removed any degradation of God's character.

9. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary.


11. cf. Ps. Jonathan - ויהי צדוקו להו ויהי קוז ליה איה - עקיסית ליהו...

12. The words "descending it" must be added in Rashi because the Mishna, Mac.II. 1, expressly states that only if the accident happens when he is descending. This is derived from the text (NUM.35\textsuperscript{23}) - אשר עליה עמק - which is taken to mean - אשר עליה רוח - But one who falls when ascending a ladder and thus kills another is not banished to the city of refuge. See Bab.Tal.Mac.7\textsuperscript{b}; Rashi NUM.35\textsuperscript{23}. 
13. Rashi - 

See Mechilta, Mishpatim, Parasha 4, p.80; Bab.Tal.Mac. 10b; Yalk. Shimoni 323.

14. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 35.

15. cf. Onkelos' translation LEV.24 14, 15, 23.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION - VENERATION OF THE PATRIARCHS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS

1. The Aramaic word - מָאָסֹר - is equivalent to the word - מָאָס - See Onkelos GEN.31:34 - מָאָס - is translated by - מָאָס -

2. The N.E.B. paraphrases these phrases in v.26 - פָּּלִפְּדֹּס - "You have deceived me", and in v. 27 - פָּּלִפְּדֹּס - "Why did you slip away secretly without telling me".


4. cf. GEN. 27:43 where Onkelos translates - יֹּרֵם - by - יֹּרֵם - cf. also EX.14:5 - יֹּרֵם - by - יֹּרֵם - that the people went, instead of "fled".

5. It appears also that Onkelos saves even the honour of heathen prophets for in NUM.24:11 - יֹּרֵם - "And now flee thou to thy place" - Onkelos translates - יֹּרֵם - - יֹּרֵם - - יֹּרֵם - and not as Ps. Jonathan who translates - יֹּרֵם - which is indeed the correct translation of the Hebrew word - יֹּרֵם. There are, however, inconsistencies in Onkelos' Targum for in GEN.35:1 - he translates - יֹּרֵם - See, also EX.2:15 - יֹּרֵם - "And Moses fled" - Onkelos translates - יֹּרֵם -
5. (cont'd).

In honour of Moses one would expect - מִצָּא - and "he went". See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, GEN.31 who endeavours to give a different explanation on the inconsistencies of Onkelos.
NOTES
VENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PATRIARCHS AND THEIR WIVES

GROUP A

1. Rashi: יברגכן חכם את הרביעי - וה الجمع את הנעימים וה хорошות הוא נמנהון.
cf. GEN. Rabbah 74.5.

2. Ps. Jonathan explains as Rashi: "lest the king who is singled out from the people". The question, therefore, arises has Rashi seen Ps. Jonathan? On this subject see Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum. The Palest. Targum, however, translates literally - "if someone (i.e. any Tom, Dick or Harry) had slept with your wife".

3. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. translates: "Rachel said, I have played a fine trick on my sister, and it has succeeded, so she named him Naphtali".

4. Rashi: התברר בותך לפני נוחברלבך והרב מצה אי גבורה: Onkelos translated it in the sense of prayer, in this way - means prayers that were pleasing to God. I prayed and I was accepted, and was answered like my sister. - treated as - רכובלוות - מטפסלוות.

6. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 16. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, note 11.

8. LXX takes it in this sense: "Thy brother hath come deceitfully and taken thy blessing"; cf. also Ibn Ezra - "He did not speak the truth".

9. See also Onkelos and Rashi on GEN.27\textsuperscript{36} - s.v - שָׁוֹאֵל. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, Free Translation, note 11.

10. Ibn Ezra, too, takes - שָׁוֹאֵל - in its literal sense.


To one Rabbi who translated - רַכַּחְוָה - by - רַכַּחְוָה - tender (weak). Rabbi Johanan replied - "your mother's eyes were weak"; cf. also ibid 71,2;

Tanhuma Vayetse,4; Tanhuma Buber, Vayetse, ch.20 and 21; Midrash Aggadah; Sechel Tov; Lekah-Tov; Ps. Jonathan; Palest.Targum; Midrash Hagadol. GEN.p.515:-
11. (cont'd) It appears out of respect to Leah all the Midrashim and Targumim strained to avoid taking the word - ידוע - in its literal sense.

12. Rashi - והנה, והנה עבדך - אנכי, ומיבשא这是我 והנה עבדך

13. - אומר והנה לאбудו, ואהיל והנה עבדך

Ibn Ezra, too, takes the text literally and proves that King David and others told "white lies" to achieve their purpose.


15. Ps. Jonathan translates literally - וְאִם לְעַל אָדָם יִפְעַרֵךְ - "And if he shall curse you with any curses they shall be upon me". One can see, therefore, that the theory that Onkelos is a short version of Ps. Jonathan is open to question. See Midrashic Section, Group C.GEN.48, note 24.

17. Rabbi Saadia Gaon takes - אַהֲרִיךְ אֵל - in the sense of - "I toiled". It appears that Saadie Gaon read in the text - לֹא אַהֲרִיךְ אֵל (or - לֹא אַהֲרִיךְ אֵל) and also Onkelos takes it in this sense. Menachem Ben Seruk writes that - וַיַּגְּדֵל שָׁלוֹם ג' רוּחַ אֵל מִתוֹם שָׁלוֹם ג' רוּחַ אֵל - the ancient commentators have explained - אַהֲרִיךְ אֵל - in the sense of - שָׁלוֹם - "keeping". Dunash Ben Labrat refutes Saadie Gaon and explains - אַהֲרִיךְ אֵל - in the sense of - "keeping".
that the "Yod" is redundant and not the suffix of the personal pronoun as in Is. 121 - אֱלֹהִים, וָשִּׁמְשָׁנוּ - See A. Geiger, Hamikra ve-Targumav, p.298 who quotes the argument between Rab. Saadia, on one side and Menachem and Dunash on the other. See also Rab. Saadia Gaon on the Torah, by J. Kafih, Jerusalem, 1963, p.39. 

Rashi and Ibn Ezra follow Dunash Ben Labrat. The Samaritan text reads - לְעֵבָרָה - without the "Yod". The theory that - לְעֵבָרָה - can be taken in the sense of - לְעֵבָרָה - "keeping" has some support in the Bab. Tal. Bab. Metsia 93a - where the Talmud states that Jacob said to Laban that he would look after his sheep as a - לִשְׁמַעְתִּי לְשֵׁמוֹר עַד כָּל הַיָּה - אֶלֶף וָשִּׁמְשָׁנוּ - "a guard of the city": - שֵׁבַך חֵי יַעֲשֹׂר עַד כָּל הַיָּה בָּנוֹי אֶלֶף וְשֵׁמְשָׁנוּ - אָמַר לְיִרְבָּנֵי אַבְרָם אָפַלְּךָ אָפַל פְּלֵם הַיָּה - קֵצָר לֶיה - שֵׁבַך חֵי יַעֲשֹׂר עַד כָּל הַיָּה - מִישָׁךְ וְלִשְׁמוֹר כָּל הַיָּה. See S.B. Schefftel, Biure Onkelos, Munich, 1888, p.55. 

N.H. Tur-Sinai (pp.147-148, Jerusalem 1938) believes that the original version of Onkelos was as follows: - לִשְׁמַעְתִּי לְשֵׁמוֹר עַד כָּל הַיָּה אֶלֶף וָשִּׁמְשָׁנוּ - and only at a later time this version somehow was shortened. See J. Komlosch, pp.211-212; M. Levenstein Nephesh Hager, pp.109-110.
18. Rashi - cf. too, Ps. Jonathan and Palest. Targum - the latter translates as follows:

"And what thieves stole by day or wild beasts devoured by night I have paid it". Both Targumim take - in its literal sense, and not like Onkelos. The Targumim also support Rashi that anything stolen was paid by Jacob, and not like Dunash Ben Labrat (see the above note 17) that nothing was stolen from Jacob.


20. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 12; Bab. Tal. Kid. 32; Siphre, Piska 38; Mechilta, Yithro, Parasha 1; Rashi, GEN.18.
NOTES

GROUP A

21. *

[Text continues with footnotes and references]

22. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B.

However takes - ִּיָּשָּׁר - to mean - "to relieve himself"

See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 10.

23. Rashi - ִּיָּשָּׁר * NUM.

In this sense, too, the Midrashim take it; Rabbah 2, 1.

Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.410; GEN. Rabbah 60,14. See

the Midrashic Section, Group C, note 14; Mechilta - ִּיָּשָּׁר חַיָּבָא

Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon, Beshalach, 14,10;

Tanhumah, Chaye Sarah, 6; Pirke de Rabbi Eleiezer, 16;

Midrash, Prov. ch.22,28; Ps. Jonathan; Palest. Targum;

Neofiti.

24. cf. The Midrashic Section, Group C, note 24; Bab.Tal.

Baba Bathra 123a; Yalk. Shimoni 157; Mechilta de Rabbi

Ishmael, Beshalach, Parasha 2; Mechilta de Rabbi Shimon,

Beshalach, 14,10; GEN. Rabbah 96,6; Palest. Targum; Neofiti.
NOTES

VENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PATRIARCH’S SONS

GROUP B

1. N.E.B’s translation; cf. also LXX.

2. Literally “with wisdom”.

3. Rashi – cf. too, GEN. Rabbah 80, 8 – “כל חכמים חכמים, עזים עזים”.


5. See GEN. 24:3 – that Abraham instructed Eliezer, his servant, not to take a Canaanite woman for Isaac; see GEN. 28.8, cf. Bab. Tal. Pes. 50a; GEN. Rabbah 85, 4.

   However, Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p.643, is of the opinion that Judah married a Canaanite woman. See also Torah Shelemah, ch.20.

6. cf. LXX. Ibn Ezra points out that the Midrash of the Rabbis is merely in line with Prov. 12:16 – "But a prudent man concealeth shame".
7. Rashi — מִשְׁכַּבְּךָ מְבֹלָשׁוּ שְׁכָנְתוֹ בְּשָׁכַנְתָּךְ עַל אֲלֵךְ שְׁכָנָה diferen, שֶׁנֶּאֱכְלוּ קְרָבִי בָּאָרֶךְ שֶׁלָּךְ. Shmah teivat teiyer bava el re'eh halil ba'sheir elavot be'ulah 'av devei tefah echad b'alev. cf. Bab.Tal.Shab. 55b; GEN. Rabbah 88, 4; Siphre, Vezothha-Beracha, Piska 347; Midrash Aggadah; Lekah-Tov; Midrash Hagadol, GEN. p. 605.


9. It appears that Onkelos holds like his teachers, Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua who hold (שֶׁכִּם כְּצִימָנוֹ) that Reuben indeed sinned. See Bab. Tal. Shab. 55b. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 26.

10. cf. also GEN. Rabbah 87,7; Song of Songs, Rabbah, 1, 1; Yalk. Shimoni 146; Tanhuma Vayeshev, 9; Sechel Tov; Lekah-Tov; Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer, ch.20, p. 368; Mechilta, Rabbi Shimon Ben Yohai, EX.35; Midrash Aggadah, v.1, p. 87. See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 20.

12. **Rashi** - דְּנַעָלָיָה יָפְתַּעֲמָה יָפְתַּעֲמָה כְּבָרִים בַּרְבּוֹךְ קְשֻׁוֹז

13. **Rashi** - הָאָבְנָרָא נַטְפַּלְתָה נַטְפַּלְתָה יָרֵם מָמוּר

14. **See Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.3, Free Translation.**

15. **The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B.** paraphrases the text.

16. **cf. EX.21** - כי יִתְנָה אַשָּׁע לָעַה לֶהֶרֶזְבָּא בָּרֵבָּיִם - "But if a man has the presumption to kill another by treachery etc....."
Onkelos translates - בָּרֵבָּיִם - by - בָּרֵבָּיִם

17. **Perhaps Onkelos also had in mind the verse NUM.23** - כָּל הָנָּשׁ בַּעֲקִיב - "there is no divination in Jacob".

18. - כָּל הָנָּשׁ בַּעֲקִיב - מִשְׁמַעְתָּו מִשְׁמַעְתָּו לְעָרָי מק"י - לְוָרָיָא מִשְׁמַעְתָּו מִשְׁמַעְתָּו פַּרְבָּיִם - המֵבָּיִם.
19. While in LEV. 19:26 and DEUT. 18:10, Onkelos translates "לأمن - literally, with regard to GEN. 30:27 - "I have divined that the Eternal hath blessed me for thy sake" - Onkelos translates - "לأمن - "I have proved". The question is why did not he translate it literally? And especially since it was Laban who was a diviner. There was no point in Onkelos covering up for Laban as he did for the Patriarchs, for in the Midrashic literature Laban was known as "a wicked person". See Ginzberg, Legends, v.5, p. 302; v.6, p. 123 ff. In DEUT. 26:5 - "לאמן - "A straying Syrian was my father" - Onkelos interprets - "לאמן - "Laban the Syrian wanted to destroy my father". cf. also Ps. Jonathan and the Haggadah for Passover. A. Sperber and N. Adler, quote no other version to Onkelos' text on GEN. 30:27. Rashi, who most probably realised this difficulty in Onkelos interprets - "לagnostics - "I have tested, i.e. discovered by my act of divination that through you a blessing has come to me". It appears that Rashi understands that the Targum did not cover up for Laban. However, the question remains why did not he translate it literally, as he did in LEV. 19:26 and DEUT. 18:10. I believe, however, that Onkelos refused to translate it literally in connection with Laban, simply because of the
19. (cont'd)

continuation of the verse: — נטשותי יברסני ה' בגזרת "I divined and the Lord blessed me for your sake".
Out of reverence to God, Onkelos plays it down for how can a diviner be blessed by God? See M. Levenstein, Nephesh, Hager, op. cit. pp. 144-145.


VENERATION AND IDEALIZATION OF THE PROPHET MOSES

GROUP C

1. "כשאתי הכッシית - מ奥林匹 שחגלו מולייס ביבית פסח שמש חכמה "
   cf. Siphre, Piska 99; Yalk. Shioni, 738; Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 53; Midrash Aggadah; Yalk. Jer. 326;
   Aboth Derabi Nathan, ch.9. (חוג מצודא), Vienna 1887, S.Z. Schecheter, p.122; cf. Palest. Targum and
   Neophiti. However, Ps. Jonathan takes it literally.
   See Midrashic Section, Group C, note 47.

2. cf. Rashi - 'כתי -ビジים' יייצום מתורה שבעוה אור.

3. In Amos 9:7 - Jonathan translates - "בשיעי" - by - "יהיו בני רוחם" - "merciful sons".

4. N.E.B. in fact, takes it in this sense: "I will take back part of that same spirit which has been conferred
   on you and confer it on them...." cf. N.E.B. NUM.11:25

5. cf. Rabbi A. Ibn Ezra: "וזי מצוות קניית הדרכון והחיים - הנחית הימורים Lakes ויל תחתון גר-
   See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.1, note 24.

6. See Siphre Behaalotecha, Piska 95, cf. Tanhuma Buber,
   v.2, p. 57: - רכיבתא, Böl שעת אבסות -
NOTES
GROUP C

7. cf. Bab. Tal.Sanh.17a — בַּשְׁעָה שֶׁאָכָל 1/3 כָּכְבָּה... סְלֹא... סֶּרֶבֶץ שֶׁאָכָל כְּלֵי הַעֲשָׁבָה אַוָּלָה והוּא (קִנְיָן טוֹפָה) נַעֲרֵבָה אַוָּלָה וּפָרֵל. — L. Ginzberg, Legends, v.6, p.88, note 481. See also Midrashic Section, Group A, note 25.


10. cf. NUM.129 — וּוּנָהָה מִרְיָם וּרְאָה עֵדּוֹת שָׁלֵּא Here, too, Onkelos deletes the word — מִרְיָם וּרְאָה עֵדּוֹת and thus he says — וּוּנָהָה מִרְיָם וּרְאָה כַּלַּלַלָּה. "And Miriam is as white as snow".

11. Rashi explains — מִרְיָם וּרְאָה עֵדּוֹת שָׁלֵּא It is the nature of leprosy to be white. It appears from his statement that the word — כַּלַּלַלָּה — in the text is superfluous, for the comparison between a leprous hand and "snow" is self-evident.
NOTES

VENERATION OF AARON, THE PRIESTS AND THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

GROUP D

1. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. however, translates: "Then Aaron was afraid and built an altar in front of it and issued this proclamation".

2. See LEV. Rabbah 10, 3; Pesikta de Rabbi Kahana. S. Buber, p. 133b.

3. cf. DEUT.12 - "And you shall pull down their altars". Onkelos translates - יָשֶׁרֶךְ יִשָּׂף יָשֶׁרֶךְ וְיָשֶׁרֶךְ - cf. too, Ps. Jonathan; cf. also Onkelos, EX.34; DEUT.7.

4. See J. Komlosh - קִבֵּלָה אֲשֶׁר בַּלָּהַ אֲשֶׁר בַּלָּהַ - cf. also EX.4, where Rashi idealizes Aaron for not being jealous in seeing his brother Moses attaining a high position.

5. cf. LEV. Rabbah 10,3; Yalk. Shimoni 391,32; Midrash Hagadol, EX. p. 680.


8. Depending on the context, in some instances, Onkelos translates the word "Cohen" as - שומע - "minister", which is, in fact, apparently sometimes its meaning, e.g. Gen. 14:18 - "ויהי כהן לאלים" - "And he was a priest of the Most High God". Onkelos translates - ליהיה מאש שמה קדש כהן; cf. also Ex. 28:18.


10. - כהנים - מדברים, כל שבע כהן משות� לא清凉והו以上の - cf. Rashi on Ex. 2:16, where Rashi translates - הלך - by - the Chief amongst them;

   - cf. II. Sam. 8:18, where Rashi follows Jonathan: -
11. In all these cases, GEN.1418; GEN.4145; GEN.4722; GEN.4726; and EX.31. Ps. Jonathan follows Onkelos. However, the Palest. Targum on GEN.1418 reads:

"And serves in the High priesthood". cf. Neofiti.

12. Ps. Jonathan reads:

Out of respect for the people of Israel, Onkelos refused to use the term - as the other Targumim do.

13. For more examples of this/see, Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch. 3, Free Translation, notes 16 and 17.
NOTES

RASHI AND PS. JONATHAN'S TARGUM


2. cf. EX.12\textsuperscript{12} ; GEN.1\textsuperscript{26} ; GEN.11\textsuperscript{7}.

3. The theory of P. Churgin (Targum Ket. 1945, p.112; quoted also by B.J. Roberts, op.cit.p.202) that the Jerusalem Targumim did not attempt to provide a translation but simply an exposition is incorrect as frequently these Targumim merely provide a straight translation for the biblical texts. Almost in every chapter in the Torah part of it is a Derash exposition and the other part is simply a translation.

See, however, M. Liber, Rashi, p.249, note 60 - who argues that Rashi seems to have known about the Targum
4. (cont'd).

of Ps. Jonathan on the Pentateuch. See Berliner in Zechar Le-Abraham, Berlin, 1866, pp.373-374 - who believes that Rashi seems to have known about Ps. Jonathan. In fact in several places, Berliner points out that Rashi's interpretations are taken from Ps. Jonathan e.g. GEN.18, GEN.26, GEN.35, GEN.35, GEN.42.

At this stage it may be worth mentioning that many of Berliner's examples are not convincing as the same interpretations are found in Midrash Aggadah, GEN. Rabbah and Yalk. Shimon.


6. cf. Ps. Jonathan NUM.20, NUM.21, NUM.33, NUM.33, NUM.34, DEUT.32, NUM.33, Ps. Jonathan - reads: -םיִנְיָנָוּ אָלְאָלָו -

7. Neofiti, however, is inconsistent for whilst in NUM.20, he translates like Onkelos - - (cf. NUM.33, NUM.34, NUM.34, he translates - .

9. cf. Bab.Tal. Shab. p.155b - we may unite bundles of straw - מפריכי"עב -

10. A. Berliner, of course, has not seen the Neofiti Targum.


15. See Rashi, GEN.25:3 who rejects Onkelos' interpretation.

16. Some scholars, however, cast doubts as to whether Rashi has written this commentary on GEN. Rabbah. See E.M. Lifshitz, "Rashi", p.194. See, however, "Sepher Haorah of Rashi", v.2. ch.63, where the following statement is mentioned: -"ועדו עובד אלוהים בזבז לאשה ויאמר - הבארה - והאלו ל' בחכמה" - שברך אמר ה' א"ן לאשה בזבזלאשה ויאמר - והאלו ל' בחכמה.
16. (cont’d)
The same statement is found in “Machzor Vitry”, ch.103.
Most probably Rashi and his disciples had other texts
of Jerusalem Targum for this interpretation is not found
in Ps. Jonathan or in Neofiti. cf. also Rashi GEN.
Rabbah - (Parasha 33,3) - GEN.38\textsuperscript{27} - where Rashi quotes
once again the “Jerusalem Targum”:

\begin{quote}
Here, too, Rashi must have had a different text for Ps.
Jonathan and Neofiti translate differently.
\end{quote}

17. In EX.28 Rashi quotes Jonathan by name but on the whole
he just says - "Understand it as the Targum", e.g.
GEN.45\textsuperscript{26}; EX.27\textsuperscript{10}; EX.30\textsuperscript{13}; EX.38\textsuperscript{8}; NUM.31\textsuperscript{10}; DEUT.33\textsuperscript{19}.
See chapter, Rashi and Jonathan’s Targum on the Prophets.

18. See Bab.Tal.Meg. 3\textsuperscript{a}.

19. On this particular text, see Mechilta Parashat Beshalach,
Massechta 2, Parasha 6; Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed,
v.1. ch.2; section, Anthropomorphisms, Group 1. References
Exposed to Polytheistic Interpretation, note 1. A.
Berliner in Zechor Le-Abraham believes that Rashi’s
source is Ps. Jonathan.
20. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally.

21. It is true, however, that this interpretation is also found in Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, ch.21 and in Midrash Hagadol, GEN. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p.124. But since Rashi did not quote his sources, it may well be that the source of his interpretation is Ps. Jonathan. A. Berliner, Zehor Le-Abraham, quotes Ps. Jonathan as Rashi's source.

22. Onkelos translates — הָיְתָא אֶבֶן עֵדֶשֶׁא יַהֲנָא תְרֵיִם לֶה — Neofiti — הָיְתָא כֵּלַם שלטינו בַּרְכָּה —

23. Onkelos — מַעְמַךְ רַקְמֵךְ — Neofiti — מַעְמַךְ רַקְמֵךְ —

24. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally.


26. Onkelos translates — אֲדַעַה — Palest. Targum and Neofiti translate — אֲדַעַה —

28. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally - אלוּ לְאָתְחֵי.

29. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally. See also Section, Rashi as Philologist, ch.10, Rashi and the Text of Onkelos, notes 14 and 15 - where Rashi appears to follow Ps. Jonathan.


31. cf. Palest. Targum. Neofiti and Onkelos translate literally. Several commentators believe that Rashi’s source is either the Palest. Targum or Ps. Jonathan.

32. See Rashi, LEV.14 - הַשָּׁלֹם - וְיִדְרֶךְ אֶת עֵצֶר שְׁבֵא. It is the inner wall of the ear. cf. Ps. Jonathan - הָאָרָץ שָׁבֵע. Rashi’s translation once again, is identical with that of Ps. Jonathan. See Bab.Tal. Besh. p.37a and p.40b; Pes.84a. Perhaps, however, Rashi’s
32. (cont'd).

source is the Siphra, Parashat Metsora, Piska 50 -

The Pesikta Zutatini appears to follow Onkelos -

cf. Adler, Netinah-Lager on EX.2920.


34. Several Midrashim take "princes" to mean, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and only Ps. Jonathan (see Palest.Targum Neofiti) interprets it to mean Moses and Aaron. The Midrash Hagadol, NUM. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p.390 takes "princes" to mean Moses and the 70 Elders. According to Z.M. Rabinowitz Rashi's source is - ָנָוְּם - pp.384-385. Most likely Rashi has not seen this Midrash, and furthermore, this Midrash mentions Moses only and not Aaron as Rashi does.
35. Neofiti explains that Elazar will guide Joshua regarding the laws of the Torah - נֵּסַע הַלּוּ הַגִּבֹּרֶתַלּ קָרַת לָה - cf. Onkelos: - מַעַּל הַלּוּ הַגִּבֹּרֶתלּ קָרַת לָה - While the rest of Rashi's interpretation is found in Tanhuma and Bab. Tal.Sanh.16 - this particular interpretation is only found in Ps. Jonathan. This point was also noted by A. Bromberg who also believed that Rashi has seen Ps. Jonathan. (See Sinai, v.57,1965, p.91). Asa Kasher, (see Sinai, v.58, 1966, pp. 91-93) however, argues that there is no proof from here that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan as the phraseology - נְעֵרָה - is self-evident that the text speaks about "war". But it might be contended that despite the occurrence of the phrase, military guidance - which has already been referred to in v.17 - is not here referred to, since the text can be explained in the sense of Neofiti Targum: that is to say that Elazar, the priest will guide Joshua in "matters of law" which was in fact the function of a priest in those days.

36. Onkelos and Neofiti translate literally.

38. cf. Neofiti.

39. This is also the interpretation of the Rabbis in Mechilta, Beshalach, Masechta 4, Parasha 5; cf. Midrash Hagadol EX. Mossad Harav Kook, op.cit. p. 335. See M. Friedmann in his commentary on the Mechilta, who quotes Ps. Jonathan as Rashi's source.

40. cf. also the Palest. Targum and Neofiti: - רֵאֵשׁ עַל עַנֵּיוֹן סֶפֶךְ לַשֵּׁם -

41. The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. N.E.B. reads: - "and enjoy the wife he has taken".

42. See A. Bromberg, Sinai, v.57, op.cit. p.91; N. Adler Netinah-Lager; S. Luzzatto, Oheb-Car, p.82, however, bring another version in Onkelos where the reading is -וַי - and consequently, Rashi is refuting Onkelos. The reading in Neofiti - הַCHRדָ' הַCHRדָ' - supports Rashi. Perhaps Ps. Jonathan had in his biblical text - הָאֲבִי - the Pa'el and not - הָאֲבִי - the Piel. Hence he translates - וַי - cf. David Rider, Sinai, v.58, op.cit. p.94.
43. We need not here concern ourselves with whether Rashi was criticising an incorrectly vocalised targumic text, or an oral tradition of pronunciation associated with written targumic texts lacking vowel signs. See section, Rashi as Philologist ch. 9 note 6 p. 410.

44. cf. Jonathan on the Prophets, Jer. ch.5:19.

45. See Sinai v.57, op. cit. p. 91.

46. Neofiti translates literally - יָכְלָא יִתְנַהְלָא שֶׁלֶם אָהָרֹן: -

47. See further A. Bromberg, Sinai, v.57, op. cit. p. 91 - who quotes Rashi on NUM.5:10 - אִשָּׁה אַשְׁרָה יִצְרוּ הַדְּבָרִים לָצֶדֶק לְיִשְׂרָאֵל: - "whatever is given to the priest shall be his." Rashi interprets - שֶׁיְהֵם מָחוּר וְרָהֲבֵּר - He shall have great riches. Bromberg believes that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan:(decimal 1,verse 12)- "whatever is given to the priest shall be his." He shall have great riches. Bromberg believes that Rashi's source is Ps. Jonathan: decimal 1, verse 12.

In this particular instance Rashi's source is certainly not Ps. Jonathan, but rather Bab. Tal. Ber. 63a where the same notion is mentioned:

48. A. Bromberg believes that Rashi's source on DEUT.32:13-14 is Ps. Jonathan. On this particular text see Midrashic Section, Group B, note 21.
NOTES

RASHI AND JONATHAN'S TARGUM ON THE PROPHETS

1. cf. EX.28^ - If he will change the time of entrance (to the tabernacle).
Quite frequently, however, Rashi does not quote him by name e.g. GEN. 45:26; EX.27:10; EX.30:13; EX.38:8; NUM.31:10; DEUT.33:19. See chapter, Rashi and Ps. Jonathan's Targum, footnote 17.

2. See Bab.Tal.Meg.3^a. On this Talmudical statement see P. Churgin, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, New Haven, 1927 in his introduction, The Historical Background, pp. 9-20 (especially p.14). See also Introduction to the Halachic Section.

3. cf. Nahum 1:12 - יָשֶׁב תַּכְרִיגוּשׁ שְׁלֹשׁ מִשָּׁבוּ הָלֹךְ תְּפָקְדָּה - Malachi 1:15 - וַתִּרְגֹּמֶשׁ שְׁלֹשָׁה מִשָּׁבוֹת בָּלוּנִים -

4. cf. Ez.16:9 - נִשְׁתַּמְסָתְוַיָּאָה אֶלָּא כְּנֶאֶסֶתְוַיָּאָה יִתְּנוּ -

5. cf. Rashi, Jud.5:4 - בְּבֵאֲכַיְפַיָּאָה - ומָשְׁקוּת תָּוְהָרָה - רַבָּה הָעֵגֶל הָעֵגֶל

6. cf. Rashi, Nah.1:12 - אַעֲשֶׂה שָׁמְחִית שְׁלֹשָׁה מִשָּׁבוֹת - על המקרית וֵעֲבַרְוָהּ וַנֵּלְכַעְבִּים, וְנִשְׁתְּמַסְיָאָה עַל הָעֵגֶל

7. cf. also Malachi 2:15 - יֶשֶׁה וְיִשְׁתְּמִיתְוַיָּאָה - נֵאֲבַע הָאָלָם אֲלָלָם וְנַעֲבַר הָאָלָם עַל הָעֵגֶל וַנֵּלְכַעְבִּים...
NOTES

7. cf. DEUT. 19.

8. cf. Rashi, Zech. 1 - מֵאַלֶיהָ זָכַר כָּלָּתָה לֹא בָּא שֵׁם מַמְרַשְׁתָּן, וְנִמְנָעֵת אָתָא לֹא בֵּי הָשָׁם כָּלָּתָה וְאֶלָּ הַפְּלֵגֵתָה

9. cf. Rashi DEUT. 3 - מֵאַלֶיהָ עַדָּ מוֹעֵידָה הַבֵּית בַּפֶּלֶגֶי הַעֲצָבִים, וְאֶלָּ הַפְּלֵגָה -

See also Rashi Bab. Tal. Meg. 13 - וְכָלָּתָה - הבכורה של מוֹעֵידָה בַּפֶּלֶגֶי עַד הַבֵּית בַּפֶּלֶגֶי הַעֲצָבִים.

10. See Rashi Bab. Tal. Meg. 21 - וְכָלָּתָה מֵאַלֶיהָ קְרָבִים שֵׁם מַמְרַשְׁתָּן -

However, in Bab. Tal. Taa. p. 18, Rashi quotes the Targum on the Hagiographa - מֵאַלֶיהָ קְרָבִים שֵׁם מַמְרַשְׁתָּן -


11. Some scholars believe that Rab. Joseph is the author of the Targum on the Hagiographa. See Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir in his commentary on the Torah, EX. 15; LEV. 20. However, the Tosafot, Shab. 115 reject this opinion.
11. (cont'd)

cf. also Tosafoth Bab. Kam. p. 3b; Meg. p. 21b. See also Haderashot Be-Israel, ibid, p. 253, note 21. Rashi, however, possessed a "Palestinian Targum" on the Book of Micah the Prophet. (See Rashi Micah, ch. 7). Rabbi David Kambhi in his commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, ch. 5 quote also the Palestinian Targum. See Zunz, p. 39. The quotations of the Targum to Psalms, some of them taken from Rashi's commentary, by Herbert of Bosham (late 12th century) would indicate either very early interpolation or - more probably - that Rashi did know a Targum to Psalms even if not to the remainder of the Hagiographa. See R. Loewe, Biblica, 34, 1953, pp. 67-68.
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Earlier Rabbinic Sources

The rabbinic sources that are cited in this document include:


These sources are key to understanding the rabbinic perspective on various topics, including the history of the Jewish community and the development of rabbinic law.

The rabbinic sources mentioned in this document are also available in Hebrew:


These sources are key to understanding the rabbinic perspective on various topics, including the history of the Jewish community and the development of rabbinic law.
Earlier Rabbinic Sources

מדרש

מדרש רבה (ע"ש כל המפרשים), הוצאת מדרש י"ר-רודף תשע''ב, ב' הכרם.
מדרש אגדות, סלה ובה, הוצאת מדע י"ר-רודף תש''ג, ב' הכרם.
אגרת ברואסי, מהדורה של ע' באכר, תק"ף ter.
מדרש תבות, ברואסיה שמואל, מהדורה מרדכי מרבלי, הוצאת שמיים והרבח קוק, ירושלים תש''ח.
מדרש ירמיה, עדריא, מהדורת עדין סטיפנוביץ', הוצאת בוסר הרב קוק, ירושלים תש''ח.
מדרש ירמיה, עדריא, מהדורת ינא יברנברג, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תש''ח.
מלשן כאן - עלにして חומשי תורה, רבינגר שוביחו בא''ר אליעזר, ב' הכרם, ירושלים.
מדרש חנוכה, מהדורת לירן אמסטרדם וירושלים תש''ג.
מדרש חנוכה, מהדורת סלמה באכר, ידילגא מצוד, ב' הכרם.
מדרש ספוקתא רבינר, מהדורת מייר איסר שלום, תל אביב תש''ב.
ி-לוקס טשקנדה, מהדורה תצלאל לנדורי ירושלים תש''ג, ב' הכרם.
אוצר מדרשים, ה' הארבעה, א.אייוולנסקימל', הוצאת ידיעות, א' дерנדניאל.
גיר-גרית, טש''ה, ב' הכרם.
מדרש שלח汚, ברואסיה שמואל, מהדורה של ע' באכר, בריל''ר ח Buying.
מדרש רב ז"ר ז'הנה - ספ''ר ברואסיה, מהדורה אגרסיה יציחו כ', הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים תש''ח.
בחיה מרדורה, מרסת ח"ו"ל על פי בחינה יד מפגינה ירושלים ז"א מדרים.
"غارות ורציניות מה תימן את התר" ב" כריכים.
מרש ספוגה, מחרות ס. זבחר, קראקה"ב מים בראשת ורבה, חיבר רבי יספיאן ב"ר ונсим מענה ע"ן הגרות
מרך עץ חינה, מכסח הרב קוך, ירושלים ח"ב.
מרש תנגים, ברדר, מחרות רוד ז"א ורמאע, ולפי 1909.
אובר גרגדה הלמונית וחרותיה, מחרות ובח רוד ז"א, מכסח הרב
 IID, ירושלים ח"ז, ב" כריכים.
אובר מרסים, חטורה רוד א-רדרים, ודפני, "כובעה"اقנעש פריגניצים
 IID-רויד, חט"ז (ב" כריכים).
בננה ביב נחנך-בחף NFS, מחרות ס. ז"א שיקרא, ז"א ז"א ורמאע, ורמאע ז"א 5.
מכילהו דרבינ שפיעלי, מחרות מק"ר איס שולום, ורמאע ז"א 6.
מכילהו דרבינ שפיעלי, מחרות מק"ר איס שולום, ורמאע ז"א 7.
"ס"ז מלקד, ירושלים ח"ז.
ס"ז מלקד, ירושלים ח"ז.
פי שר עמותה ח"ה, להג"ז רבי 1872 מ"ל רב" מ"ה מחרות שולום ז"א 8.
ייז"ט נשיא, ירושלים ח"ז.
פי שריארה רבע - ס"ד אוליאורимер ורמאע - מחרות מי"ר איס שולום, ירושלים
 IID-רויד, חט"ז.
פי שריארה רבע - ס"ד אוליאורимер ורמאע - מחרות מי"ר איס שולום, ירושלים
 IID-רויד, חט"ז.
פי שריארה רבע - ס"ד אוליאורимер ורמאע - מחרות מי"ר איס שולום, ירושלים
 IID-רויד, חט"ז 1956.
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�"; על התורה, התורה את בלה, והarer של הר"ז מפרשים והסקר.

רב סעדיה תבורי על התורה, התורה את בר"ז שם מפרשים והסקר.

מפרשים המאוריצים רבי סעדיה תבורי שם מפרשים והסקר.

ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר, ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר.

וז"ז, רבי יונתן באנו עוזרו, ורב"ז, מפרשים והסקר.
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�"; על התורה, התורה את בלה, והarer של הר"ז מפרשים והסקר.

רב סעדיה תבורי על התורה, התורה את בר"ז שם מפרשים והסקר.

מפרשים המאוריצים רבי סעדיה תבורי שם מפרשים והסקר.

ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר, ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר.

וז"ז, רבי יונתן באנו עוזרו, ורב"ז, מפרשים והסקר.
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�"; על התורה, התורה את בלה, והarer של הר"ז מפרשים והסקר.

רב סעדיה תבורי על התורה, התורה את בר"ז שם מפרשים והסקר.

מפרשים המאוריצים רבי סעדיה תבורי שם מפרשים והסקר.

ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר, ובכרזא עד להבדל ורב"ז מפרשים והסקר.

וז"ז, רבי יונתן באנו עוזרו, ורב"ז, מפרשים והסקר.
רבי אברהם גלן עזר את סופר יشحن, מחוזר Moff. פְּרִיָּלוֹבָד לְגַרְדנִי
1873
להבָּנָא — בַּרְאָסִית סָמוֹת, מחוזר Moff. הרֹבֶה חִיּוֹם דָּב שְׁעֹרְעֵל, מְכַסֶּר הָרוּב קֹוּק
ירוטליימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.
— רכּוּ, בָּבָדֵר, בָּבָּר, מחוזר Moff. הרֹבֶה חִיּוֹם דָּב שְׁעֹרְעֵל, מְכַסֶּר
הָרוּב קֹוּק, יְרֶטְלִיימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.
רְמַבֵּם — מִחוֹצֶה הקְבּוֹכָאִים, מחוזר Moff. הרֹבֶה קֹוּק שֶׁקָּאָמ, מְכַסֶּר הָרוּב קֹוּק שֶׁקָּאָמ.
רְבֵּי גֵּוַי אֵבְרֶהְמָה בֶּן הָרֹמֶפָּא, עָלָּבְּרֵיָה רָםָּא, מחוזר Moff. טָראֵרָיָה שָׁה
רְבֵּי גֵּוַי שֶׁרְגַּב רָבִּי מַבֵּרָה, הָרוּצָא שֶׁלֶק, לְרָדוֹנְזֵר שֶׁשֶׁפֶּה.
— רְפֵּי הָרֹיחְוָה הָלוֹּויִים, כּוּנְרְדַי, הָרוּצָא יְרֶטְלִיימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.
רַשְׁבֵּם — פְּרִיָּלוֹבָד, מחוזר Moff. רֶזוּוֹ רַאִיִּין בְּרֶטֶסִילָא מְחַפִּרְבֵּה.
— הואַת הָפְסָסִי מְחַחְוָה, רֶזֶּה פְּפַלָנֵים, הָרוּצָא לוֹוֹיָא אָפְסָסִיִּין, וּרְוֶשְׁת
לְרָדוֹנְזֵר שֶׁשֶׁפֶּה.
— רְדַחְבֵּם — עִלָּה הָרוּצָא, מחוזר Moff. הָדוּשׁ קְמַלִּר, הָרוּצָא מְכַסֶּר הָרוּב קֹוּק
ירוטליימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.ך
פורְסָה וְתָלוֹת עַל הָחִילָיָאִים, מחוזר Moff. אֵבְרֶהְמָה דָּרוֹמ, הָרוּצָא מְכַסֶּר הָרֹב
— קֹוּק, יְרֶטְלִיימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.'ב
עָלָּבְּרֵיָה — הָרוּצָא פְּרֵדָה, דְּרוֹ—רָוְקִ שֶׁפֶּה.ג
— פְּרִיָּלוֹבָד — עָפְיָה טָרְפִּיס — עָפְיָה טָרְפִּיס מְפַרְבֶּךָא יִלֶטְרָיָה הָלוֹוֹיָא אָפְסָסִיִּין, וּרְדוֹנְזֵר שֶׁשֶׁפֶּה.ד
1847
— בֵּעֲלָה הָחִילָיָאִים, מְפַשׁ דְּרוֹבֵי עָלָּה הָרוּצָא, מחוזר Moff. לְפֵימָלְקָא דְּרוֹ שָׁלָל,
— לְרָדוֹנְזֵר שֶׁשֶׁפֶּה.ה
— עִלָּה הָרוּצָא, מחוזר Moff. אָפְסָסִיִּין דְּרוֹ שָׁלָל,
— קֹוּק, יְרֶטְלִיימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.ו
— רְבֵּי גֵּוַי — בְּרֶטֶסִילָא, מחוזר Moff. חִיּוֹם דָּב שְׁעֹרְעֵל, הָרוּצָא מְכַסֶּר
הָרוּב קֹוּק, יְרֶטְלִיימשׁ פֶּשֶׁת.ז
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פסוקי הלכה

רמב"ם - די הזדהוק, (משנה תורה), הוראתה פרדס, ירושלים תני"ס.

פיירוס התורה, המורדת הורה ווסף זמך, הוראתה מוסף הורה.

amics, ירושלים ת"ם - תס"יו.

רמב"ן - חכבי רבך ק, התורה והדון, המורדת הורא חדים ודב שערלע.

הוראת מוסף הורה ק, ירושלים, ב', כרכום ת"ב - תס"יו.

רבי צדק - בעל הדרשמ, הוראתה מאורות, ירושלים ת"ס.

רבי ברוך ביאר - הָלְטָן עַדּוּר, הוראתה מאור התורה, תס"יו.
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ואלהงו - קונגרס לברصر על תרבויות יוגניאל, ספר תודעה על מחקרים, 
תרמש רדינג נרות

אלברט ג'אמונד פשטי "הספירה בין בניןכס לשחיתות היחסים רודיו" (תסרוק),
ראית המפרץ "תניגון הקריה" (1940), הרצאות דיבר,
 nihil-אוכך שלט

ובأغلب יוונים - "האיכיל רד"?" - הול-אנצ'י, ד. בריס, (כרך ג', 1956,
כרך ד', 1960, כרך ד', 1949,)

אלה ש. - מבוא רצון אפסן תמר לשון דואט, השכליים השות"ה.

---

ה服役 התינו ורבונד - פעיל סדרה רחובות, 
מ. ג'ונס, קרשם ת"ש, 'מע. ז"ב-ק"ד.

---

שבעה מדרסים, מסדר יונולים, ירושלים - דבורי, הול-אנצ'י,
טסלו, א. מעול, "טל"ה, "טל"ה.

אף על "הקריאים" - חקוף ההיברבים וסרופרות, מסור הזר קוק,
טסלו, ק"ד - ק"ד.

ארוך ב. ג. - ח"ד - פיצי פיצי ריעות, היברלים בטיעים העבריים.

ברוסלב, "טסלו".

בכר ב. ג. - עקרון עוקב (היברלים ומרגrowned - א. ג. ריבונד), få-

ובatables תורם

בלקדים שמוסא - מקור זר𝖏 על מדרסיה ח"ד - מרבד ש"ז על בראשית

=DBHUL (1940)טסו בולדנגוצ'י, (בכר יונולימהם על היברלים, רדいただける

דיבוס שולו לטבע, "טסלו" קוק"ד, "טסלו" הרבול.
ברלין.
מפרס - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניבرسитет ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.

ברלין המערבי - עד 1926, הגרוסטט באוניברסיטת ברלין, גבעה ב-1850, רימן, סוריה.
הסקופיטן מ"א, לעי גורע הגרונגוך עובקדמות, הדרום, הובקה ל"כ.

גרודינגרט חאירת טע"א. עמ', 150-170.

הגרנדוםclassed生物科技י של רבי עקרוב, אזור המזרח.


גרודינגרט בחולות יערוב - תולדות התברוגים, לספריirisי אושח TRE ר"ז - ר"ח.

השראת מואבר בסומר תורודל לאבורדה לריס, גו-גרוד.

ההכליל הקטנים הקופרטיים, שמארגין את.

ל"מ"ו.

פייטסברג מחכר מיסט שחרול על התברוגים הקדומים -

ם, סריצי אס מ"ת-"ד.

ורשימים ס"א, האגר הגרונגום יורדשלים ורטר.

ורספיטר צבר ס"א - פילוגלי האולקנטרה - תולדות הפילוגריפית.

חרית יוהונט, מסדר הרוב קוק, ב"כ, מספרים תש"ל.

גרוד אברמא - תוקר התברוג, תלק א', גו-גרוד 1954.

1957 - מחקרם במע_reviews התברוג, גו-גרוד.

גרוד אוירברנדי יוהש - דอก רגר ורדש, הזואת פלאס ומיצקופס.

גרוד-פורטס / בריילן_VAR חמה.

חרובים צברים, ז"כ-גרוד וחמה.

ההכליל הבתרוגים עובקדמות, חורב ס"ות ו"ח.

עמ', 79-93.

iedad צ"ח, האגר בכר, מחורבת יעדן ירויול פרוטסבנברגר וריינר.

הטסות מאייר הפקוסבץ, רבוץ היגש חירר, מוסק.

גרוד קוק, ירסלים ט🚴‬ ב פוצר 15 כ"ח ו"ח.


(א.טוג) 224.


ypsum מ"ר, במן, 143-151.
לרגאמר ש. צ" (שי"ל) - אוחב בר, קראקא, שנח (במרחבים ויריע ל"ד 1895)

פורש על הפסחא והפסחא: ר"ה, ר"ה, ר"ה (ה печט הראפה)

בהארבה, הלילשת

לא פסחן אליגוט מאייר, "רמ"י", מוסד הורב קוק ירושלים 1966

מלבדו"ש מאייר לעברות - אוצר ה التعاون על "ח" קוק מקרוב וברודנה

суд"ט, פדרס, ירושלים תש"י.1

مالק ערוזה צ'ורן - התרבויות מכללה רות"ק, סמר חסן בני-יאלך 357-369

תרבויות ערוזה, ז' רביבש ירושלים, קשמית.

מרגריטה אליגוט - "ה xa זיイン פורוש מוייבש מהדרו השאר"ה על הורב, (בעור אפ ל'-צב ו'פור), קשמית

ע"ש, מוסד הורב קוק, ירושלים תש"י.1, ע"ש.
סגל מ.זב - פאורה המקרא א-ד, ירושלים תשס"ו.
עורך ועורך לספר - הורט ויצחק, ניירון-cycle 14, ירושליםbeck.14.
פרברטס ס. - ר"ס" - הורט ואבב, יערית "ר"ש" ורדר實際.
גיר-גאוזך תש"ח.

פרסון - על תרבויות אונקלודס, תקנת ביימה והיתוך מממלכה, (ע"פ פרויש
 vagy ליגוד), ורדרוגה שה"ד" (עד"ל מכונה.
سفر ז"א"ר).

פרברטס ס. - "הﺉווארה על תרבויות אונקלודס", תורבח, סדר ס',
ע"פ "כ"ז ע"פ "כ"ז".
פרברטס ז"א - "מכונה על תכסיס תרגום פאורה המקרא, ירושלים.
ע"פ "כ"ז".
ונגר וילфессט ז. - "ה너הראונא והשורושולוקה התיאטריה, ירושלים.
כאמור מ.ד.ז. - על "ט"כ (מפרשים על ד"ד א.ז.הסרות),
המאורע זיבנה, על אובדן של"ת".

פרובס על שמי ברשיטה. (סרד ברשיטה, סדר
נת, רוחק מטבר, ולך), הוראה מנסים, האוניברסיטה
העבירה ירושלים של"ת".

פרובס על שמי ברשיטה, הוראה מנסים, האוניברסיטה
העבירה ירושלים של"ת".

ספר מ.זב - ספר מ.זב - ספר מ.זב.
ספר מ.זב - "ספר תרבויות אונקלודס הברבריסית", מעמד המקרא.
يسرל 1972, "ע"פ" 374-374.

ספירה מ.זב - "ספירה מ.זב" - "ספירה מ.זב" - "ספירה מ.זב".
מדליית אוניברסיטה עבודה, גוארגוסיו, בר-אילן.
ספירה בסגלה ביבייצים הרדו, ואנקה שלפרם.
ורטס ז. - "ירושלים הכס"ב, דיר 81-105."
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קריסת 6. "קריסת הקהילה המודרנית - הרגשה ומוסד יהוד".

ירטסליום - לביר, "הלושכ הסל" (יתרונות החינוך), מפענוברו

תורב. 8. "המשרה" - "המשרה" הפוליטית Meghan קרן ד', חטש' 93-584

קרמלש יוהוז - "המשרה הברור וההרבות" הרגשה דבירה, חל איב

תשל"ג.

קריסת אופייניים בחרבון אורכליים, "דריפה מפורק".

שמת בור ע"ל, בור ר', חטש"ח. עמ', 190-181.

המגנה בחרבון בכרת עקיבא, פרש השגה בר-אילן.


רמ פורט שלמה סימאון, (ע"ב) - כותרים, מתנה neuen, פראג, ח"א.

עמ', 204-227.

דרי ע"ב שולג זמנה, פרנץ, 1861.

שמשל כנסת ברוך - ביאורן אגרנקלס, מיכל"ה חטש"ח.

שסירר ספואל - אנבי שבי, (על הרגשה החינוך), מתקופ החומ"ש.

שזרה ביביינין - האהבה החינוך (על הרגשה החינוך), ביגברוז, ח"א.