BRILL

The Targums within a New Description of Jewish Text Structures in Antiquity

Alexander Samely
Manchester University

1. The Project 'Typology of Anonymous and Pseudepigraphic Jewish Literature of Antiquity' and its Framework

In 2007, the four contributors to this volume started collaborating on a major research project to investigate the literary features of all ancient Jewish texts outside the Hebrew Bible, insofar as they are anonymous or pseudepigraphic.[1] The corpus thus described contains basically every complete text from the earliest extra-canonical Jewish works to the end of the Talmud without a conventional 'author'. The Project corpus thus encompasses many texts counted among the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha of the Old Testament, the most substantial Dead Sea Scrolls (despite none of them being complete) and the whole of rabbinic literature. We felt that three things were missing from much of the current discussion of these texts: (a) a methodology for giving due attention to the literary features of the works, in the finally redacted shape they have in the best manuscripts; (b) a systematic conceptual framework and terminology for defining their concrete literary features; (c) and a unifying perspective that looks at them all together as literary phenomena,

without allowing the obvious historical differences to limit the scope for structural and synchronic comparisons.[2]

Our procedure has had a number of components. We started by reading afresh some 40 of the works in the Project corpus as defined above. We did so with a view to making as few assumptions on genre or historical function as possible. We noted down every structurally important literary feature that occurred in any one of them. This initial group of texts was selected for maximal diversity of their *prima facie* literary genres, based on our earlier experience with them. We then brought a systematic order to this initial list of literary features, while continuing to refine and supplement the features by examining more and more works in the corpus. Speaking at the beginning of 2011, this process is still ongoing, but only produces marginal changes now. I will refer to the whole system of features as the 'Inventory', short for 'Inventory of Structurally Important Literary Features'. At the end of the first year of the Project (2007–2008), we also began work which goes in the other direction by applying the Inventory to specific texts so as to create Profiles of their literary surface. We compare a text against every point in the Inventory and decide whether that particular point applies to the text or not; if yes, we adopt the generic Inventory definition of that point and add further details as required. We thereby determine which features a text actually possesses from a maximal set of theoretically possible features. The result is a schematic Profile of the text's literary surface. All Profiles share the same basic structure, because each is a selection from the same system of possible features, the Inventory.

The outcomes of our Project are two in particular: (1) Literary Profiles of several hundred texts which will be published in an online Database. This Database will contain analytical distinctions expressed in scholarly prose, but also coded as electronic information, allowing automated online searches and comparisons. The current volume contains several examples of what such

---

[2] A first report on this Project was delivered at the 2008 British Association of Jewish Studies annual conference, which was part of the Manchester 'JudaicaFest 2008'; this paper is available from the Project website mentioned in the preceding note. Other presentations concerning the Project were given by various members of the team at international and national conferences, including the Society of Biblical Literature 2009 and 2010, the World Union of Jewish Studies 2009, and the 2010 International Organization for Targumic Studies.

Profiles look like. (2) The Inventory of Structurally Important Literary Features itself is presented in print for the first time as the Appendix of this volume. It consists of hundreds of individually defined literary features, brought into a systematic order under twelve main headings.

The MAIN SECTIONS of the Inventory are as follows:

 1. The self-presentation of the text as a verbal entity
 2. The perspective of the governing voice
 3. Poetic or communicative-rhetorical formation
 4. Narrative coherence or narrative aggregation
 5. Thematic coherence or thematic aggregation
 6. Lemmatic coherence or lemmatic aggregation
 7. Correspondences and wording overlap between texts
 8. Characteristic small forms
 9. Characteristic small-scale coherence or aggregation for thematic discourse
10. Compounds of juxtaposed part-texts
11. Dominant subject matter or contents
12. Sampling of scholarly genre labels

I am preparing a monograph devoted to explaining and illustrating the Inventory in detail. A link to the *Database of Anonymous and Pseudepigraphic Jewish Literature of Antiquity* should become available from the Project website in the course of 2012.

Uses of the Project in future scholarship. In what way does this Project advance the existing scholarship and serve other scholars in the various fields that rely on these ancient Jewish sources? How do we anticipate our results, once they are fully available, being used?

(1) Scholars can use the Inventory's conceptual and generic framework as a prompt for their own analysis of a text from Jewish antiquity. This can happen entirely independently of the same text's specific Profile in the Database, which is merely *one* interpretation of how the Inventory applies to the text. Also, scholars may want to apply the Inventory to texts that do not have a Database Profile, but have features that *prima facie* link them to texts in the Database. This could include texts from the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament and early Christian literature, or the works of Philo and Josephus. It could also be used to profile other texts from the same larger cultural-historical context, such as early Islamic texts, post-Talmudic literature, ancient Near Eastern, or Graeco-Roman works; or texts entirely from outside the realm of Mediterranean

cultures. Scholars can thereby develop alternatives (or corrections) to the Inventory itself, by defining new features not present in the current Inventory or in the text corpus of the current Project.

(2) Scholars can use a Database Profile for gaining an overview of a text's literary constitution while working on some of its other aspects. Thus they may examine its history, the information it yields for historical or religious questions, and its original context, use or audience, while taking the Profile as a summary of its surface features. Or they can turn to a Profile as the starting point for studying a text's literary constitution in greater detail than the Inventory categories can provide for.

(3) Scholars can use a Database Profile as a quick first orientation in the literary constitution of a text when studying another, comparable text, whether that other text also has a Profile in the Database or not.

(4) Scholarly work on the history of the text, for example the separation of sources from their redactional framework, can check a Database Profile for literary features coinciding with hypothetical sources or pre-existing parts.

(5) Scholars can consult Database Profiles of whole groups of works to be studied together under any scholarly perspective. The Database can be used to make experiments in how to group works together.

(6) Scholars can use the Profiles specifically for comparative literary studies, with the Database functionality providing detailed data on structural similarities or dissimilarities and statistical information at the click of a button.

(7) The conceptual framework of the Inventory together with historically grouped Database Profiles make available new evidence for the study of the general history and culture of ancient Judaisms. They provide an overview of literary practices that has not been available before, alongside a wealth of text-specific information. They also constitute fresh material for the investigation of the interface between the written and the oral, or mechanisms in the transmission of tradition. The reconstruction of the intellectual history of ancient Judaism consists to a considerable extent in tracing out its modes of expression and textual genres, be it along a time line or across social groups. The Inventory and the Profiles create new data and a new horizon for such comparisons and contrasts. The Profiles on their own are like a laboratory for experiments in the study of literary and cultural features of ancient Judaism.

In this context it is important to stress that the formulations of the Inventory make no reference to specific genres of ancient Jewish literature, such as 'rewritten Bible', 'wisdom', 'Midrash', 'Targum', etc. Each literary feature is defined on its own terms (see below). That makes the definitions generic and renders them neutral, thus versatile, in historical terms. In other words, there are no inbuilt limits to the applicability of the literary features: they could conceivably be applied to any text that has them, whether from 3rd century BCE Egypt, 5th century CE India or 19th century Russia. They are constructed out of the evidence of ancient Jewish literature, but formulated without reference to it.

Methodological Principles. At this point it may be useful to sketch out the background assumptions which have underpinned the Project as a whole. I will not present a full justification of these positions within the confines of the present paper, but I will point out the main arguments:

– It is necessary and legitimate to analyse the simultaneous presence of parts in a text (synchronic analysis), in addition to analysing the potentially different history of parts within a text (diachronic analysis). Identifying what are the constitutive parts of a text, and how they constitute the text as a whole, is a job that scholarship has to do before or while it starts to use the text as a historical source for whatever purpose. In other words, synchronic analysis is a necessary component of all scholarly work with sources. It is therefore always present in some form, although often unacknowledged, and thus performed in a potentially flawed manner.

– This synchronic analysis does not amount to justifying the unity of a text, for example by only looking for literary features that make the text hang together. On the contrary, synchronic analysis must also bring to light features that weaken coherence in our eyes. For instance, where a text is an aggregate of semi-independent parts, synchronic analysis must bring to light just this. This manner of literary constitution is important in particular for rabbinic texts, including some Targums, for example Targum Canticles. Synchronic analysis in the sense here pursued has nothing to do with justifying the text as coherent as an act of faith.[3]

---

[3] I am grateful to Bernard Levinson for drawing my attention to the possible misunderstanding, here averted, of the word 'synchronic'.

The analysis must allow describing a text as weakly coherent or incoherent; otherwise the methodology is flawed.

– The synchronic analysis must give priority to the *de facto* final text shape, and where necessary acknowledge the existence of a plurality of final text shapes, in the light of the best transmission evidence. Hypothetical text shapes cannot constitute the primary evidence, for these are already invested with modern scholarly ideals of coherence. Indeed reconstructed sources are often the outcome of the division of the text in such a way that the parts have an *improved* coherence compared with the overall text as actually transmitted. The identification of pre-existing sources often makes internal coherence a defining criterion of diachronic differentiation. For this reason, hypothetical sources cannot provide a starting point for analysing what were the practices of text coherence in ancient Judaism in the first place. These practices may well turn out to have followed culturally different rules from those that govern our own coherence expectations, in particular insofar as they are shaped by modern academic training.

– The modern scholar's expectations of textual coherence are nevertheless crucial in this analysis. They should be neither ignored nor circumvented. Instead they need to be reflected upon, explicated and addressed, in particular where the text 'disappoints' them.

– From this follows that a structural feature *weakening* a text's coherence (in our eyes, to be sure) is equally important as features strengthening coherence. In particular, a feature that weakens coherence is to be contextualized neither as a value judgment on the quality of the text, nor as a historical hypothesis about its genesis, but as a 'literary' feature, that is, as an observation about some aspect of the text's structure similar to all other observations on the text's structure. The Inventory attempts to create precisely this equality of description between features that weaken and features that strengthen coherence.

These are the theoretical positions of the Project as they apply to the vexed questions posed by the nature of ancient Jewish sources. Topics like problematic final text shapes and the role of secondary text change are particularly acute for the corpus as defined by the Project: anonymous and pseudepigraphic Jewish literature. Unlike the works of Philo and Josephus and the books that came to be treated as canonical, the Project texts had no clear publicly known author or 'proprietor' and were potentially considered to be open to substantial development subsequent to their initial composition. Thus the Project concentrates on precisely those texts of ancient Jewish literature which have the greatest poten-

tial for exhibiting complex or messy literary structures, by excluding the canon-ical and authored texts. And it does so without postulating neater text shapes.

The conceptual foundations underpinning these concrete assumptions are to be found in structuralist procedures and the perspectives of text linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics. The Project has also benefited from adopting a number of close reading strategies used in various branches of literary studies, narratology and, in a limited way, in deconstruction or post-structuralism.[4] Where procedures or topics from these approaches have their own technical terminologies, the Inventory tends to avoid using them. Rather, it formulates afresh each idea it uses as a descriptive category, without relying on presupposed definitions. It renders the Inventory's own descriptive language (largely) free of jargon and self-sufficient, with certain necessary exceptions clearly highlighted. This also means, however, that Inventory points are formulated with conceptual precision uppermost in mind, and thus are in themselves technical. The avoidance of established technical vocabulary of diverse origins also fulfils another function. It indirectly demonstrates that in combining insights from a variety of approaches and disciplines, the Inventory is capable of being consistent and unified, rather than a ragbag of concepts and methods.

The Targums in the Inventory of Structurally Important Literary Features. Let me turn to the Inventory itself. I will explain some of the general categories of

---

[4] Syntheses of the various branches of scholarship mentioned include, K. Adamzik, *Textlin-guistik: Eine einführende Darstellung* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2004); R.-A. Beaugrande and W.U. Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (London: Longman, 1981); M.A.K. Halli-day and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (London: Longman, 1976); E. Coseriu, *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung* (ed. Jörn Albrecht; Tübingen: Francke, 1994); G. Brown and G. Yule, *Dis-course Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); S.C. Levinson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); E. Gülich and W. Raible, 'Überlegungen zu einer makrostrukturellen Textanalyse', in G. Gülich, K. Heger, and W. Raible (eds.), *Linguistische Textanalyse: Überlegungen zur Gliederung von Texten* (Hamburg: Buske, 1974), pp. 73–126; G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (trans. J.E. Lewin; Ithaca, N.Y. and Oxford: Cornell University Press and Blackwell, 1980) and *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (trans. J.E. Lewin; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988); R. Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in D. Lodge (ed.), *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (London and New York: Longman, 1988), pp. 167–175; M. Foucault, 'What is an Author', in Lodge (ed.), *Modern Criticism and Theory*, pp. 197–210. Ultimately, the Project's idea of a text is grounded in a phenomenology of reading and temporal experience; for a sketch of some of the positions and questions, see A. Samely, 'Observations on the Activity of Reading', in G. Banham (ed.), *Husserl and the Logic of Experience* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 131–159.

the Inventory first, before illustrating Inventory sections which are particularly important for Targums. I will use Targum Onqelos as illustration. A full Database Profile of Onqelos Genesis may be found at the end of this article. Eventually, the Database will contain entries for each of the books of the Pentateuch in Onqelos' version, as well as for the whole of Onqelos.[5] The Inventory makes the following synchronic distinctions between basic text types. First, it distinguishes three different ways in which a subject matter can be used as the basis for arranging the parts of the text: (i) the narrative, which presents emplotted events and presupposes temporal differences between them; (ii) the thematic treatment, which collects together what belongs to the same topic without using relationships of emplotment or temporal difference; (iii) the meta-textual treatment which takes another text as its topic, and comments on parts of that text (as 'lemmas') in their original sequence. In addition, there are two text types distinguishable by form: a poetic or communicative-rhetorical form, which creates a certain sequence of parts and goes hand in hand with a certain subject matter; and the juxtaposition of formally independent part-texts that produces a higher-order compilation of texts. These distinctions yield the following most basic text categories used in the Inventory, with examples presented in brackets:

A. types of treatment of a subject matter:
    i. narrative (= Inventory section 4, e.g. Onqelos, Jubilees, the part-texts of Genesis Apocryphon, Tobit, 1 Maccabees)
    ii. thematic discourse or description (= Inventory section 5, e.g. most Mishnah and Tosefta Tractates, Sefer Yetsirah)
    iii. meta-textual lemmatic treatment of another text (= Inventory section 6, e.g. Habakkuk Pesher, Bereshit Rabbah, Sifra, Gemara)
B. poetic and communicative-rhetorical formats (= Inventory Section 3, e.g. Prayer of Manasseh, rabbinic homilies, individual pieces from the Psalms of Solomon)
C. higher-level aggregates (= Inventory Section 10, e.g. the Mishnah as a whole, the Babylonian Talmud as a whole, Lamentations Rabbah, the Psalms of Solomon, Genesis Apocryphon as a whole)

---

[5] This will allow users to check, on the one hand, whether the five books of Onqelos have the same features or not; and on the other, whether the manner the five books of Onqelos constitute a larger text is structurally different from the Pentateuch in MT.

These distinctions account for five of the twelve sections into which the Inventory is divided. The remaining sections of the Inventory deal with other structural aspects, for example the point of view or perspective from which a text speaks to the reader (section 2), a text's relationship to the Bible (section 7.1), its small literary forms (section 8), and a number of other topics. I will now introduce those parts of the Inventory which are of particular interest for describing the literary surface of Targums.

2. The Targums as Engaged with the Biblical Wording and with the World (Objects)

The Inventory deals with structures that are usually considered to be typical of Targums in point 6.13. Inventory section 6 as a whole deals with exegetical texts that mirror the sequence of parts in another text, either as a running commentary (Midrash, Gemara) or in the 'Targumic' way. Most other points in section 6 only apply to explicit commentary texts. The defining characteristic of a commentary text is formulated by Inventory point 6.1:

6.1. The text's most basic thematic progression consists of alternations of (a) quotations from a base text in their original sequence, and (b) statements which comment on or add to the meaning of these quotations.

This definition does not apply to Targums; it is mutually exclusive with point 6.13. It defines explicit commentary arrangements as found in the Habakkuk Pesher from Qumran and works of Midrash such as Bereshit Rabbah and Sifre Deteronomy or the Gemaras of the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds. Almost all points under 6, except 6.13 itself, presuppose 6.1 and are concerned with issues such as the nature and size of quotations from the base text, which parts of the base text are covered, whether the commentary has a unifying focus or is an aggregate of interpretations (as usually in works of exegetical Midrash), the occurrence of any quoted speakers as interpreters of the base text (such as Rabbis) and the occurrence of any units that stand in a supplementary relation to quotations from the base text, rather than in an interpretative relation (as often happens in the Gemaras to the Mishnah). None of these features arises with a text that ticks the box number 6.13. The definition of 6.13 reads:

6.13. The text constitutes a complete and sequential representation, in another language and in object-oriented perspective, of the perceived meaning of all or almost all verbal matter of a complete set of base text segments. Thus, the resulting sentences do not thematize the base text in a meta-linguistic perspective, but recreate the thematic or narrative progression of the original.

This definition, while meant to capture one key feature of most of the works usually called Targum, also captures other works, and the word 'Targum' does not appear in it; nor is Aramaic mentioned.[6] To paraphrase this definition somewhat, one might say that a Targum's basic constitution involves a constant engagement with the wording of the biblical text, even when there is a visible distance between the biblical meaning and the Targumic meaning. This means that, in some sense, the Targums must be the result of a meta-linguistic attitude assumed towards Scripture's verbal matter *as* verbal matter.[7] The Targumic wording thus depends on the biblical wording by way of an appreciation of the latter as linguistic data. This dependence is trans-linguistic, transposing into another language the perceived meaning of the biblical wording. Furthermore, it produces not sentences that speak about the biblical *wording* (or text), but sentences that speak about the biblical *objects*, in basically the same manner in which the biblical text itself speaks about those objects. Thus Targum Onqelos of Genesis 1 speaks about God, the beginning of the world, acts of creating, heaven, earth, plants, animals and man. It does not, as Midrashic texts usually do, speak about the *words* 'God', 'beginning', 'creating', 'heaven', etc., while also speaking about the objects. Targum is thus characterized by use of the object language, but motivated (at least partly) by a *meta-linguistic* reflection on the meaning of words, namely those of the biblical text. There could be no dimension to the Targums which is 'translation' without such a meta-linguistic reflection. And in fact Targums have the option of other kinds of meta-linguistic reflection in addition to this trans-linguistic analysis, namely the search for implied meaning, with which I will deal in the final section of this paper.

---

[6] This goes for the Inventory more generally. As mentioned above, the Inventory presupposes no conventionally used terms for specific historic genres, but seeks to define all its categories in a terminology drawn from linguistics, philology, literary studies and allied disciplines.

[7] This orientation towards the linguistic signs of Scripture is, if anything, made even more prominent by any traces of a particularly 'literal' rendering into Aramaic. When imitating linguistic features that are not natural to Aramaic, the meta-linguistic orientation of a Targumist gains an added dimension of deliberateness; the orientation could even be said to be subliminally *displayed* by literal rendering, although that is not a feature the Inventory picks up on, concentrating as it does on basic structures.

One may ask: Why assume 6.13 applies to Targumic texts at all, since their translational dependency on the biblical text is not visible as part of its fabric and surface? After all, the Targums do not declare themselves in so many words to be translations of the biblical text. The answer is that in determining that a text falls under 6.13, a comparison with the original text is presupposed. Moreover, the result of that comparison, namely the observation of a near-total overlap in wording in a second language, needs then to be contextualized by two historical assumptions: first, that this amount of overlap in wording cannot come about by accident, as the result of a free composition; second, that the direction of dependency goes from Scripture to Targum, not the other way round. Amply justified as these background assumptions may be on the basis of other kinds of evidence, they mean that in formulating point 6.13 the Inventory explicitly relies on substantial specific historical relationships between texts in a manner that applies to no other Inventory point. The reason for this lies in the very nature of the basic genre of 'translation': its production mode (translating another text) is part of its literary constitution, yet *not expressing* that production mode is also part of its literary constitution.

Inventory point 6.13 then seeks to capture these various aspects: (a) engagement with the signs of language ('verbal matter'), (b) trans-lingual reproduction ('in another language'),[8] and (c) object-oriented expression, or object orientation for short ('object-oriented perspective'). Taken together these three components yield a working definition of what many modern scholars mean when they use the word 'translation'. Where the biblical text is the description of an object, the chances are its Targum will be the description of an object in partly the same words, in another language; where the biblical text tells a story, the chances are its Targum will also constitute story telling; where the biblical text prays, the chances are its Targum will do the same.[9] But in all these cases, we have to add the words 'the chances are'. That means Targum does not fit certain normative or intuitive modern ideas of translation. It does, however, arguably fit a translation theory concept of translation, which is more flexible.[10] In any case, all the Targums manifestly exceed a merely

---

[8] Both (a) and (b) separately evince a meta-linguistic attitude; they presuppose that the signs of a text are the object of analysis or reflection.

[9] The three text shapes just mentioned correspond to three text types distinguished above for the Inventory: narrative and thematic discourse correspond to sections 4 and 5, and prayer belongs under section 3, if it is a rhetorical-communicative or poetic form.

[10] See on this S.G.D.A. Lasair, 'Targum and Translation: A New Approach to a Classic Problem', *AJS Review* 34 (2010), pp. 265–287.

trans-lingual dependence on the biblical wording, and the subordinate points of the definition, namely 6.13.1–6, deal with this phenomenon. As it is, 6.13 could apply to translations without any particularly 'Targumic' features at all, and would include in particular the Septuagint which is not, however, part of the Project corpus.[11] The subordinate points of 6.13, on the other hand, do not apply to 'normal' translations at all, as we shall see below.

The Targums also often appear to have their own engagement with the *objects* which the biblical text speaks about. Viewed from the perspective of the biblical events, the Targum text speaks as if it had independent information on the happenings, objects and persons of those events. This is true even before any non-biblical information voiced by the Targumic narrator is taken into consideration. And where the Targum has different or more information compared with Scripture, this 'beyond' of object engagement is quite indistinguishable on the text surface[12] from passages where it sticks to the biblical information. Both kinds of passage are spoken as if from direct knowledge. The reason for this is that the trans-lingual object orientation characterizes the basic format of Targum, because it reproduces or 'doubles' the object orientation of the original biblical text.[13] This is why Targum is so complex a genre to explain, while intuitively so simple (more on this below). The definition at 6.13 captures this togetherness on the one hand of the object orientation, with its potential for 'new' object information, and on the other hand of the translational engagement with an existing wording, which requires a consideration of the signs of language *qua* signs, enacting the biblical object orientation.

The Targum of a biblical narrative usually has the basic sentence type, 'A happened'. The same sentence style occurs embedded in Midrash in a meta-linguistic container:

---

[11] The reasons for excluding the Septuagint from the Project are partly pragmatic. There is a sense that the differences which the books of the Septuagint offer in comparison with the Masoretic text are not mainly created on the back of a meta-textual process of translation, but are often due to a Hebrew Vorlage different from MT. This is of course no impediment to creating their literary Profiles using this or a modified Inventory. But it would be most fruitful to do so while also profiling the canonical biblical books.

[12] At least, not without a forensic analysis by historical-critical methods: indistinguishable by any signal that the text gives.

[13] And if any biblical text had an orientation towards *linguistic* objects (e.g., consisted of a commentary, or a treatise on grammar), then any translation (or 6.13 text) would reproduce *that*—but not by speaking about the biblical text.

'The biblical statement "X" means "A happened" '

By contrast, in Targum this sentence type, 'A happened', is not, or only very exceptionally,[14] presented in a meta-linguistic container, that is, framed as a statement *about quoted words* from Bible. Here are the subordinate points of 6.13 which explain further features of Targum-like texts.

Generic Definition of Inventory Point	Examples from the Project Corpus
6.13.1. The statements of the text are displayed in manuscripts as alternating in mere juxtaposition with segments of verbal matter from the base text (without linking quotation formulae).	Neofiti, Targum Esther Sheni, and most Targums
6.13.2. The text's governing voice almost always is identical with, or a consistent extension of, the persona projected by the governing voice of the base text. (This excludes 6.13.6.)	Targum Genesis Onqelos, Pentateuch Targum most of the time
6.13.3. The text tends to use the sentence structure of the base text to accommodate any additional or modified object information.	Targum Onqelos Genesis
6.13.4. The text creates new syntactic structures within which the words of the base text can be recognized.	Targum Canticles
6.13.5. The text places sentences that have no corresponding wording in the base text at all alongside sentences that do.	Palestinian Targums Gen. 4.8; Gen. 22.1, Targum Esther Sheni
6.13.6. The text also thematizes its base text (or some part of it) as a verbal entity, e.g. by quoting its wording as part of its own fabric of meaning. (This excludes 6.13.2.) The wording inside any quoted base text segments fulfils a proof function, while the narrative progression is basically constituted by the same sentence(s) being *rendered*.	Targum Esther Sheni
6.13.6.1. Such meta-linguistic components are verbally integrated into the text's narrative or thematic continuity. Thus no lemmatic structuring of the text's surface results, notwithstanding any transmission of the base text in physical proximity or interweaved with it (i.e., 6.13.1).	Targum Esther Sheni

---

6.13.6.2. The positioning of any base text quotations   Targum Esther Sheni
does not disrupt or undermine the text's narrative or
thematic progression.

I will apply these to Onqelos Genesis below; and in other articles in this volume, these points will be applied to Targums Qohelet, Canticles, Lamentations, and Esther Sheni. But it will be clear that very different kinds of Targum are covered by the generic definition of 6.13, while that group of categories still distinguishes Targum-like literary phenomena clearly from so-called rewritten Bible, non-canonical recensions of biblical texts and Midrash. While these additional points allow some of the typical deviations from any normative idea of translation which we associate with most historical Targums (in varying measure), they remain governed by two points of the definition of 6.13 which I have not yet stressed, namely that the base text is represented in a complete manner, and that, whatever the equivalent of the base text in the Aramaic may be, is found at the same point in the sequence. This amounts to saying that, by and large—'all or almost all verbal matter', in the words of the 6.13 definition— recognizable sentences, understood as sequential parts of the text, are presented in their original sequence and without omissions other than those motivated by the independent engagement with the object to be mentioned below, or erroneous omissions. A text that fits the 6.13 definition thus does, on the whole, not employ omissions as a deliberate means to change the meaning without having to engage the original wording, nor does it deliberately rearrange whole sentence meanings.[15] In this context it is worth mentioning 1 Esdras. This does share with the Targums the 6.13 criterion of being in another language, in this case Greek, as well as having an ostensive object orientation. It represents, as 6.13 requires, substantial parts of the verbal matter also found in parts of the texts today known as 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. But it parts company with the criteria set out in point 6.13 in the matter of *sequence*. In comparison with those texts now found in the Bible, 1 Esdras shifts around sections (just as does Jubilees), and thus cannot be understood as standing in a 6.13 relationship to the biblical texts as known today. (Saying this does not deny the possibility that the Hebrew underlying 1 Esdras may have represented a non-Masoretic biblical text.)

---

[15] By contrast, Jub. 24.2–6 for instance places Esau's trading of his birthright into the context of a famine by moving a sentence to an earlier position in the narrative which in the biblical account of Gen. 25.29 ff. is only mentioned later. For Genesis Apocryphon, see R. Bernasconi's article in this volume.

It is now clear that a text falling under the definition of 6.13 can conform closely to the text type of its base text, or deviate from it quite dramatically. This depends on what combination of subordinate points under 6.13 apply, and 6.13.6 in particular, realized in Targum Esther Sheni, opens the text up to entirely new structures, as no biblical text explicitly quotes from another text. A text dominated by the structure described in 6.13.3, on the other hand, will tend to reproduce the earlier text's shape. Thus Targum Onqelos of Genesis is, like Genesis, an episodic narrative; and the same goes for the Palestinian Targums of Genesis. The Targum of Proverbs, on the other hand, reproduces the basic shape and genre of the biblical book of Proverbs, which is not a narrative, but a kind of thematic discourse. So the Profile of a Targum-like text will tick box 6.13 in the Inventory and some of its subordinate points. But additionally it will tick all the other Inventory points which describe the overall literary shape of the Targum as a separate text, a new text in its own right. Depending on how close the Targum is to the biblical text, some or most of these boxes will be the same as those which the original biblical text would also tick, if the Inventory were applied to that biblical text. Many Targums mirror most of the basic literary features of the book of which they are the Targum, and Onqelos Genesis is shown by the Inventory to be a narrative of exactly the same shape as the biblical Genesis. To this phenomenon we now turn.

3. The Targum Engages with Biblical Events as Objects: Narrative

Section 4 of the Inventory profiles narratives, including those Targums that have narrative shape, which is most of them. The Targumic *mirroring* of biblical narrative is not as such part of the descriptive points of section 4, because it describes the Targumic narrative in its own right. But it is still possible, by an additional sign positioned at the beginning of the points, to indicate if a particular feature would also be found in the profile of the corresponding biblical book, and I use the sign '#' for that purpose. Every literary feature of Genesis Onqelos that would also appear in an Inventory-style profile of the Masoretic text of Genesis will have such a hash-sign in the Onqelos Profile. As it happens, this includes all subordinate points under section 4. Even Jacob's blessings in Gen. 49, the most expansive passage of Targum Onqelos Genesis, does not disturb this coinciding of biblical and Targumic narrative structures. The extra Targumic information found in Genesis 49 is contained, in both senses of the word 'contained', within the extended direct speech of a narrative character, Jacob. The additional verbal matter is put into the mouth

of that character and the narrator does not take responsibility for it. The speech changes the knowledge horizon of the biblical character Jacob, who in Onqelos' version is more clearly characterized as a prophet seeing into the future. But it does not turn the *narrator* of the events into someone who knows the future; that narrative voice only reports a character's speech. In other words, by placing the extra information of Gen. 49, involving as it does links to later parts of the Bible and later history, into an already existing speech act, the Targumist does not directly change the epistemic stance of the biblical/Targumic narrative voice. Even the length of quoted speech of Gen. 49 is not a conspicuous change: the biblical version of that speech is already uniquely long for Genesis.

Despite the usually profound literary differences between Targums and works of 'Rewritten Bible', the use Onqelos makes of the direct speech of Jacob points to an interesting link. This is more generally speaking not an unimportant phenomenon for Targums. The Palestinian Targums add new direct speech in Gen. 4.8, albeit prompted by the presence of a verb of speaking; and in Targum Sheni Esther there are long speeches by characters which have no equivalent at all in the biblical text. Some of the extra-canonical Jewish books of antiquity are characterized by being the direct speech of biblical figures. Putting a whole work into the mouth of a biblical figure is quite different, yet structurally related to the device of expanding a biblical character's speech that otherwise remains firmly within an already biblical situation of speaking as in Onqelos Genesis 49. Some of the so-called pseudepigraphic texts have elaborate settings of the biblical figure's speech, in particular the so-called 'Testaments', but also texts like 1 Baruch and Jubilees (Jub. 1.1–2.1). Others provide no particular setting for a first-person speech, thereby perhaps signalling that the first-person speech is more akin to a 'book'.[16] Be that as it may, prominent post-biblical or para-biblical works appear, if contrasted to biblical books, as exercises of a *change in perspective* for material at least partly told in the biblical books from the perspective of an anonymous third-person narrator. Lamech, Noah and Abraham in the Genesis Apocryphon, the angel in Jubilees, Enoch in the Book of Watchers of 1 Enoch, the patriarchs in the Testament of the Twelve

---

[16] This feature is expressed by point 2.2.1.1 of the Inventory. Tobit (up to Tob. 3.7) and 1 Enoch (Book of Watchers) are the main examples; but perhaps the I-narrations of Genesis Apocryphon were meant to be like this also. See R. Bernasconi's Profile of the Noah-part elsewhere in this volume. It is impossible to say, as its beginning is missing, whether the Temple Scroll is meant to have that structure.

Patriarchs, Baruch in 1 Bar. 1.10 ff.[17] and Job in the Testament of Job come to mind.[18] From this angle, the Temple Scroll, otherwise a most daring experiment in perspective, constitutes a less dramatic change, for it has God utter the laws which are already in the Pentateuch put into the mouth of God, albeit quoted as specific speech acts embedded in a narrative and reported by the anonymous narrator. Apart from the Temple Scroll, the books that re-allocate to a biblical character narrative information that in Scripture is spoken (and 'seen') from the perspective of the anonymous narrator tend to limit to a personal point of view information that in Scripture is anonymous or impersonal, and thus reshape the telling of events even if the events themselves are exactly the same as those in Scripture.[19] The large-scale retelling of substantially biblical events without changing away from the third-person anonymous narrator is in fact restricted to only a comparatively small number of non-Targumic works, in particular Joseph and Aseneth and *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. In Jubilees this overlap of event and narrative perspective is restricted to the first chapter, which frames the bulk of the narration re-perspectivized in the voice of the angel; and in Joseph and Aseneth the overlap with Genesis is restricted to a few sentences. Of these three works, it is in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* that the overlap is most sustained in both narrative perspective and narrative substance.[20]

---

[17] The narrative leading up to the quoted text of the message to the Jerusalemites is not spoken by Baruch but is about Baruch; the message itself is largely a generic prayer-text which has no distinct person traits and uses also the collective first person plural, in that sense not specific to the individual persona Baruch.

[18] This in addition to the key inner-biblical example: Deuteronomy. This book, however, is marked by very little narrative substance to be re-told from Moses' first-person perspective, in comparison to the extensive retelling of God's acts of law-giving.

[19] A recent attempt to sketch out the sensibilities surrounding 'authorship' in Jewish antiquity is H. Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 12–19; see also L. Schiffman's 'The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period', in E.G. Chazon, M.E. Stone, A. Pinnick (eds.), *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 121–131. Both these accounts suffer from a failure to distinguish clearly between intended presentation of authorship on the one hand, and the author's choice of a narrator's perspective on the other.

[20] See the forthcoming Profile of this book by Robert Hayward in the *Database of Anonymous and Pseudepigraphic Jewish Literature of Antiquity*.

The fact is that when Onqelos Genesis adds unusual amounts of extra information, for Onqelos, just at the point when there is already a long biblical speech in the biblical text which only needs expanding, it uses a biblical character's speech precisely with the effect that the *narrator* remains close to the biblical narrator. For it would be a very different kind of narrator from the biblical one who made all these prophetic announcements. Even in a Targum like Esther Sheni, which has no qualms about changing entirely the epistemic horizon of the anonymous third-person narrative voice from the horizon of its biblical counterpart, there is still a tendency to pack much of the additional information into direct quoted speech of the characters. These various trends inside and outside Targums highlight the importance of Inventory point 4.13. This point registers the use of extended speeches by one or more characters (see below and in the Appendix). Where a Targumic Profile indicates such extended direct speech foreign to the biblical text (e.g. Neofiti Gen. 4.8), this can show that the Targumist uses speeches as a narrative gateway for additional object information. Targum Canticles' use of direct speech quotations stands in a different relationship to Scripture, as direct speech is the medium of biblical Canticles, but may still be contextualized by these observations.

Here then is a summary of literary features of Targum Onqelos taken as a narrative of events. Italics mark the generic formulations of the Inventory; the hash sign marks structural similarities with the biblical narrative of Genesis.

4. Narrative coherence (aggregate or self-bounding)

4.2.   *The event sequence is projected as related to the sequence of text parts as follows*:

> 4.2.1.   *# The report sequence mirrors the projected chronological sequence of events mostly or wholly, not precluding 4.2.2–5.*
>
> 4.2.2.   *# There is use of prolepsis or analepsis: Gen. 2.5 introduces an analepsis*; Gen. 14.4 is the central point of another analepsis.
>
> 4.2.4.   *# There are chronological gaps which are merely implied, or indicated but left vague.*

4.3.   *# The text presents several sets of internally complex episodes with no explicit or manifest causal or motivational nexus between them. Where characters are identical, or linked, they do not figure in one continuous set of events.*

> 4.3.1.   *# The episodes have a common main character, or several characters of approximately equal narrative prominence, who is the subject of the action*: The narrative focus moves from one character to another (or a cluster of characters), starting with God (in the creation narrative) and Adam and ending with Joseph and his brothers.

4.6.   There are meta-narrative explanations occurring in the narrative (editorial comments by narrator): see 4.9.

4.8. # *The text provides scene-setting information, other than the introduction of an I-narration*: It could be argued that the creation narrative (plus the appearance of first humans) creates a kind of scene-setting for everything that follows, a history of humanity, narrowed down in due course to that of the ancestors of Israel. However, for none of the specific narrative units (episodes) is there a specific setting of the scene in the sense of temporal or spatial markers, or introduction of main characters (except indirectly by way of genealogies, e.g. Abram in Onqelos Gen. 11.26).

4.9. # *There is prominent or sustained characterization of key figures in the narrative*: Editorial comment is made occasionally, as for Noah or Abraham. The Targum's narrator is— selectively—less forthright than the biblical one or 'tones down', reports of actions which could reflect badly on certain characters, e.g. avoiding the word choice of 'to steal' (in Rachel's case, Onqelos Gen. 31.19), replacing 'guile' with 'wisdom' in Onqelos Gen. 34.13, etc.[21] However, as a feature of the overall attitude of the narrator to characterization, this manner of characterization is perhaps only visible in comparison with the Hebrew, and not necessarily within the literary stance of Onqelos itself.

   4.9.1. # *There is editorial comment on the qualities of a character from a third-person narrator.*

   4.9.3. # *A figure is characterized by her or his moral or religious traits*: This happens implicitly on several occasions when biblical characters and groups are portrayed as behaving in a way that is pleasing or not to God. In the case of Jacob, the additional information in Onqelos Gen. 49 characterizes him more clearly as a man with the gift to see specific events in the future than does his speech in MT.

      4.9.3.2. # *Moral/religious traits are not manifestly linked to the ethnicity and/or gender of the figure.*

4.10. # *A character's relations to her/his community are foregrounded, including any two-fold social environment (e.g. a diaspora setting)*: This is clearly the case only for the figure of Joseph, although traces of it are also found for Noah, Abraham (in Ur, at Pharaoh, Abimelekh, the Hittites) and Jacob (in Laban's place and with respect to Rachel's taking of Laban's idols).

   4.10.4. # *A main character is portrayed as in conflict with his/her environment (or as being an 'Other'), whether the environment is single or doubled*: This is particularly clear in the case of Joseph who is in conflict with his brothers, then with Potiphar, and later, from a position of integration in Egypt, again with his brothers before their reconciliation.

4.11. # *Supernatural characters appear in the narrative, whether introduced casually, or accounted for elaborately*: Apart from the direct agency of God and angels, there is the use of natural powers by God in the flood narrative, and the creation narrative as a whole; later on, God's guiding hand in the Joseph narrative, while in the episodes of the three patriarchs it is mostly in acts of direct communication/revelation that supernatural events happen (e.g., Gen. 15).

---

[21] See M. Aberbach, 'Patriotic Tendencies in Targum Onkelos', *Journal of Hebraic Studies* 1 (1969), pp. 13–24.

4.13. *# The narrative pace is slowed down or changed by frequent or prominent quotation of speech, thought or text.*

   4.13.1. *# The quotation constitutes a plot-driving event in its own right*: Dialogue is perhaps the single most important plot-driving event. In one case, the speech is not a dialogue at all, and also extensive, namely Gen. 49.

   4.13.4. *# The quotation differs from the surrounding text in its form (e.g. poetry), style or language*: See 4.15.1 on the language of Onqelos Gen. 49 (some of the poetic devices of the Hebrew are mirrored in the Aramaic).

4.15. *# There are imbalances in the level of detail provided between adjacent parts of a continuous narrative, in the absence of narrative developments or conventions that obviously account for them*: Probably already in the Hebrew original, but certainly in the Targumic version, the death bed speech of Jacob is unusually extended, providing a particularly long suspension of the physical action.

   4.15.1. *# This coincides with the occurrence of unique literary forms, more detail for narrative contents absent from a biblical partner text (see 7.1.2.1.4.1), recurrence of information or wording, etc.*: There appears to be sufficient poetic and heightened language in Onqelos Gen. 49 to meet the description 'unique literary forms', although the contrast is not as clear as for the poetic language of biblical Gen. 49 (within direct speech).

This excerpt from the Onqelos Genesis Profile records the basics of how the text tells its narrative. For this is what Onqelos, on its surface, does. It does not comment on Scripture, preach, pray or lecture. The basic narrative features of Onqelos Genesis are:

– A governing voice that has an omniscient point of view (recorded in section 2.1.1, see below)
– An alignment of the sequence of reports of events with the sequence of those events (chronological sequence, rather than e.g., extended flashbacks; 4.2.1)
– An episodic character (4.3)
– Undefined chronological discontinuities within the narrative (4.2.4)
– Eschewing explicit scene settings (4.8)
– Explicit editorial comments on characters (4.9, 4.10)
– Supernatural characters (4.11)
– Plot-driving dialogue and one extended speech (4.13, 4.15)

As the occurrences of the hash sign # above show, every substantive Inventory point would also apply to a Profile of biblical Genesis, if we were to produce one. Within the points some of the divergences are noted, but Onqelos Genesis enacts the procedures defined under 6.13 in such a manner that they do not

create a text shape fundamentally different from that of biblical Genesis. The Profiles of many other Targumic texts would show a similar closeness to the basic literary shape of the biblical text; for different relationships, see the treatments of Esther, Qohelet, Canticles, and Lamentations in this volume.

4. Relationships with Bible

This brings me to the final dimension of the Inventory particularly relevant to the nature of a Targumic text. Inventory section 7 describes a text's synchronic relationship to another text, including one or more biblical texts. Point 6.13 assumes that the biblical text precedes the Targumic text, in line with all other points under section 6 which deal with explicit commentary, as that implies a clear priority and dependency. In section 7, on the other hand, the result of the Targumic process is described from the point of view of correspondences and overlaps between texts, that is, without necessarily judging the priority. This makes the structures of Targum comparable with works whose chronological succession to biblical texts is uncertain or controversial. In many cases scholars will still assume that the biblical text precedes and provides the basis for the text in the Project corpus. But insights from Qumran and Septuagint studies have made scholars more cautious when assigning a historical relationship and literary dependency between 'Bible' and 'Rewritten Bible/Scripture'. Section 7.1 acknowledges this by describing relationships very largely from a purely synchronic perspective (something that would make no sense for section 6), although it still singles out the relationship to Bible from relations with non-biblical works, which are indicated in section 7.2. In other words, depending on the user's ideas of the chronology of works, the features recorded in 7.1 can be read as merely synchronic, or under the assumption that the biblical text precedes the text under discussion, or even under the assumption that the non-biblical text precedes. For a Targum like Onqelos Genesis three main points emerge under 7.1: (a) the basic narrative is tacitly shared with that of the biblical partner text; (b) the wording of this narrative is very largely shared with that of the biblical partner text, in a second language and entirely tacitly; and (c) the basic narrative perspective is tacitly the same or virtually the same. The other books of Onqelos, and Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan, are likely to tick the same boxes. Before reviewing the brief entry under 7 for Onqelos Genesis, it may be useful to present the overall shape of section 7.1:

7. Narrative and thematic correspondences or wording overlap between texts

Generic Definition of Inventory Point	Examples from the Project Corpus
7.1. Narrative or thematic correspondences, or overlap of specific wording, occur between the non-biblical text and one or more biblical texts in a manner that is prominent or pervasive. (This point is based on a synchronic comparison and makes no assumptions about historical priority except for explicit quotations and similar phenomena.)	
7.1.1. Characters correspond between the non-biblical narrative and the narrative of a biblical text or texts.	Jubilees, LAB, GenApoc, 1 Enoch, 1 Bar., Tobit
7.1.2. Chronology, physical setting or emplotment correspond between the non-biblical narrative and the narrative of a biblical text or texts:	Jubilees, LAB, GenApoc, 1 Bar., TJob, Sib. Or.
7.1.2.1. The narrative's chronological and spatial framework, as well as certain events, are co-extensive with that of a biblical partner text, or with some extended part of it.	1 Bar.
7.1.2.2. While the narrative or some part of it covers the same chronological-spatial ground or plot as a biblical text, it lacks extended speeches of law-giving, prophecy or other kinds found in that biblical text.	LAB Ex. 20 ff., etc.; TJob
7.1.2.3. The narrative is located at a particular point ('niche') in a chronological-spatial framework also known from a biblical text, but there is no overlap in the narrative substance.	Tobit, 4 Ezra
7.1.3. There is prominent use of explicit quotations of biblical wording, whether in non-narrative or in narrative (but for lemmatic commentaries see section 6).	Damascus Document, Tosefta (also Mishnah), Targum Esther Sheni
7.1.4. The text shares features of language with the Hebrew Bible, or exhibits tacit overlap with specific biblical wording, whether narrative or not.	Sirach, 1QpHab, Wisdom, 1 Bar., LAB, 4 Ezra, 4 Macc. Jubilees, Psalms of Solomon
7.1.5. The projected persona of the governing voice of the text, whether narrative or not, is also known from a biblical text; or the governing voice takes an epistemic stance similar to that of a biblical text.	4 Ezra, GenApoc part-texts, Jubilees (Angelic narrative), Sirach, Targum Onqelos Genesis, Wisdom

7.1.6. The range of themes in the non-narrative text is wholly or nearly contained within the specific range of themes found also in a biblical text. (Does not apply to 6.1 commentaries in relation to their base text.)	Temple Scroll
7.1.7. The sequence of themes in (at least) substantial parts of the non-narrative text is tacitly isomorphic with the sequence of themes in a biblical text.	
7.1.8. The non-narrative text pervasively or prominently presupposes the narrative fabric of biblical events/reported speech, beyond the contents of any specific biblical quotations it may contain.	4 Macc., Sirach, Damascus Document, 1QpHab, all exegetical Midrash
7.1.9. While sharing the basic narrative-chronological framework of biblical texts, the narrative also mentions characters or events which presuppose a potentially quite different framework.	Tobit (Ahiqar), 1EnWatchers (Gilgamesh)

This will give an impression of how 7.1 works. I have left out subordinate points of 7.1 and the whole of section 7.2, which concerns the relationships of a text to other non-biblical texts in the Project corpus. If one applies the generic possibilities of both 7.1 and 7.2 to the specifics of Onqelos Genesis one obtains the following picture. The generic Inventory wording is again in italics.

7.1. *Narrative or thematic correspondences, or overlap of specific wording, occur between a non-biblical text and one or more biblical texts in a manner that is prominent or pervasive.* See 6.13 for details.

  7.1.5. *The projected persona of the governing voice of the text, whether a narrative or not, is also known from a biblical text, or the governing voice assumes an epistemic stance similar to that of a biblical text.*

    7.1.5.3. *The epistemic stance of the governing voice (narrative or not, first person or not) can be interpreted as falling into the same generic category as one of the following stances also adopted in biblical texts:*

      7.1.5.3.2. *The omniscient narration, as in Genesis-Joshua; or unrestricted knowledge of a described reality, similar to Genesis 1*: This holds true for the occasional provision of narrative information for which there is no equivalence in the Hebrew original of Genesis. There are also slight differences in the characterization of certain biblical characters (which are entirely identical between biblical and Targumic narrative), which are treated in somewhat less openly critical manner in the dramatic characterization by the Targumic narrator than that of the biblical narrator (e.g. avoidance of the descriptor 'stole' for Rachel, Onqelos Gen. 31.19), although this usually only emerges from a direct comparison with the Hebrew wording, not as conspicuous narrative choice in itself within the Targum.

7.2.   Narrative or thematic correspondences, or overlap of specific wording, occur between the non-biblical text under discussion and other non-biblical texts in a manner that is prominent or pervasive. (Again the comparison is synchronic.)

> *7.2.4.   The wording or specific theme of self-contained thematic units is occasionally identical to those of another non-biblical text (or part-text), without being marked as quotations from that other text (does not apply if 7.2.6, 7.2.8 or 7.2.9 applies)*: There is overlap of narrative and other ideas (insofar as these are not entirely and manifestly identical with the biblical original ones) with many parts of rabbinic literature, in particular the Midrashic works, and here in particular Bereshit Rabbah.

> > *7.2.4.1.   Such overlapping units are found in text types which differ from each other in their thematic arrangement*: This holds for parallels with the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, and with Midrashic works.

> > *7.2.4.2.   It is common for such overlapping units to be marked as the speech of a character or as anonymous quoted speech in one or both of the non-biblical texts*: This only occurs in the non-Targumic partner text, not in the Targum itself.

Important differences emerge under section 7.1 when comparing Targums to the texts of so-called rewritten Bible, for example with regard to the Temple Scroll and Jubilees. For these two also have substantial overlap with the wording of the biblical partner texts they relate to. And as in the case of most Targums, that overlap is tacit. The overlap does not, however, cross language boundaries, as the Hebrew Qumran finds show for the original text of Jubilees. Also, the narrative differences in Jubilees are often not open to being interpreted as direct exploitation of the meaning possibilities of the Hebrew wording as is often the case in the Targums (see next section). As for the perspective of the narrator, the perspective assumed in the direct speech reported of an angel to Moses, which makes up the bulk of the narrative of Jubilees, is radically different from that of Genesis and Exodus; something similar is true of the Temple Scroll, although the latter is not a narrative but a thematic discourse, constituting apparently one continuous speech of normative promulgation. Section 7 of the Inventory helps to pin down the relationship of Targums to the Scriptural text which they mirror, and thereby also potentially differentiate them from other texts of Jewish antiquity and from each other. Section 7.2 serves to point to general links between Targum and non-biblical literature in the Project corpus, for example Midrashic texts.

5. The Question of the Perspective of the Governing Voice

What has been said up to this point about the Targum's orientation towards the events, persons or objects of the (biblical) past has a bearing on the perspective

assumed by the governing voice of the text. When we hear the Targum speak, what attitude or person does the text's voice project? This is different from the question: Who was the Targumist? The latter question examines the historical person who produced the Targum, or redacted it. The earlier question asks: what is the *persona* which the text creates, the point of view from which everything in the text is spoken? What is the identity which the text *creates for its speaking voice*? For narrative, this distinction adopts what has long been standard procedure in literary studies, the conceptual separation of 'author' from 'narrator'. This is a very basic step in literary analysis, but its precise conceptualization is far from basic.[22] Section 2 of the Inventory is concerned with the question of the narrator or of the *governing voice* of the text, to use a term which includes both the narrator of a narrative, and the voice which produces a thematic discourse or a commentary. Basically, the governing voice is the voice one hears speaking when no-one else is quoted as speaking, whether in narrative, thematic discourse or lemmatic discourse. In describing a text's perspective, section 2 asks: Does the governing voice present itself as knowing directly everything it tells ('omniscient' narration), or does it provide mediating sources of information? The points of the Inventory under 2 also examine what the governing voice takes for granted, and thus what the text projects as the knowledge horizon it shares with the addressee (which term only refers to the text-created persona of that addressee, not the historical persons whom the author meant to receive the text). Here proper names are of great importance. Which names are simply used, without explanation, is a good indicator of what knowledge is presupposed, and sometimes allows one to see how exclusively a text wishes to position itself within one particular cultural and historical context. The Inventory breaks down the category of proper names into persons and unique entities, deities, locations, calendar times, and texts. It also notes

---

[22] Perhaps the most important type of text for which it appears to break down is the autobiography. But this impression would be based on a misunderstanding. Even if every single statement in an autobiography is factually correct, the text still creates a new, different *persona* for the author, by virtue of the fact that what the speaking voice (the narrator) says of her/himself is limited, contextualized, and perspectivized in entirely different ways from the life as lived by the historical person of the author. It is this unavoidable but artificial boundedness and selective contextualization (in a word, this perspective) for which the words 'narrator' or 'governing voice' are meant. The governing voice is a function of the unity of the text, and arises from that unity: it excludes all external information about an 'author', and is an abstraction from the text taken as representing a person speaking. (And it appears that, on some profound level, one always seeks to understand a text's meaning in light of it being a 'person speaking'.)

the languages and special terminologies the text takes for granted; and any proper names that are explained rather than being taken for granted, and thus marked as being outside the assumed knowledge horizon.[23] When pointing out proper names occurring in the text, the Inventory Profile is illustrative, not comprehensive. The full information on such matters is usually available from the indices of the editions, translations or studies upon which the Inventory Profile relies, and which are indicated in the bibliographical segment of the Profile under 'Editions and Translations'.[24] In the case of Targums, the proper names selected for mention under 2.4 will tend to be the ones that only occur in the Aramaic, not the Hebrew original. If the points of Inventory section 2 are applied to Onqelos Genesis, the following picture emerges. As before, I use italics for generic Inventory text and the hash sign for biblical features.

2.1.   *The information conveyed in the text defines the perspective of the governing voice in the following way*:

2.1.1.   *# The text does not thematize how the governing voice comes to know the text's contents (or its right to command obedience from the addressee), but suggests that its knowledge (or authority) is unlimited.*

2.1.1.1.   *# In narrative, the governing voice's perspective tacitly is that of someone 'present' at all events equally, regardless of their time, place, or nature (e.g. thoughts or private utterances of characters).*

2.1.7.   *# The governing voice (whether first or third person) is anonymous, that is, is not presented as tied to a specific personal identity (or to personhood in general).*

2.1.8.   *# The governing voice speaks at no point in the first person (except for any 2.2.4.3) and all persons/objects are mentioned from a third-person perspective.*

2.4.   *The governing voice defines a horizon of knowledge as shared with the projected addressee by taking for granted the following linguistic usages or references (in selection)*:

2.4.1.   *Persons or unique objects referred to by proper name or by technical expression*: In addition to the objects and concepts mentioned in the Hebrew text, the following occur (often only once or twice): the Temple (only in Onqelos Gen. 49.11, *hekhleh*); 'the righteous' (Gen. 49.11); more often, but still not frequently, occur: *orayta* (Torah, 'law', e.g. Onqelos Gen. 12.5, 27.40; Onqelos Gen. 49.11, 24), prophecy (Onqelos Gen. 15.1, Onqelos Gen. 49.24), 'holy spirit' (Onqelos Gen. 45.27); see also 'scribe' (*safra*), Onqelos Gen. 49.10.

---

[23]   Thus the term 'pentekost' is explained, rather than simply used, in Tob. 2.1 (Greek Long Recension).

[24]   The bibliographic section of the Profile makes no attempt to be comprehensive in citing secondary literature. It refers almost exclusively to editions, facsimiles, online texts and translations.

2.4.1.1. *For persons mentioned or presented in narrative usage; as characters; or topics*: In addition to those of the Hebrew original of Genesis one finds these among others: the Messiah, Onqelos Gen. 49.10, taking the place of 'Shilo' in the Hebrew; there are also persons which are not mentioned in Onqelos but are mentioned in the Hebrew text of Genesis, e.g. in Onqelos Gen. 19.38 the proper name 'Ben-Ammi' is not retained as a name, but rendered, as Bar-Ammi; the proper name 'Ahuzzath' is rendered as 'company [of his friends]' in Onqelos Gen. 26.26; 'Arabs' for Ishmaelites (Onqelos Gen. 37.27).

2.4.1.3. *For Gods/mythical figures/supernatural beings, etc., for example*: In addition to the Hebrew Bible references to God and angels, the following modifications or circumlocutions in particular are occasionally found, both in the narrator's voice and in the speech of characters: (a) the Memra ('word') of the Lord (e.g. Onqelos Gen. 8.21, 15.6, 20.3, 21.20); in several places it is clear that the 'Memra' is not presented as a separate character in the narrative, e.g. when there are substitutions with other divine names, or through self-reference in the divine speech; (b) *yeqara* ('glory') of the Lord (fewer occurrences than 'Memra', e.g. Onqelos Gen. 17.22, 18.33, 28.13, 35.13—mostly for God in the act of leaving a person—in the narrator's voice); (c) *shekhinta* (e.g. Onqelos Gen. 9.27, in quoted speech; also Onqelos Genesis 49.27); the 'holy spirit' is reported as resting upon Jacob in Onqelos Gen. 45.27 (Hebrew just *ruach*). Grossfeld summarizes the research on such terms.[25] Additionally, biblical 'Elohim' is usually represented by the Tetragrammaton in the Targum.

2.4.1.4. *For locations, for example*: In addition to or in the place of names found in the Hebrew text, the following are found: Kardu (for Ararat, which is not mentioned) in Onqelos Gen. 8.4; Jerusalem (for Salem, Onqelos Gen. 14.18); Babylonia (e.g. Onqelos Gen. 10.10, 11.2, 14.1), Euphrates (e.g. Onqelos Gen. 24.10, Onqelos Gen. 36.37); the names disappearing from the text because of substitutions include Hasasson-Tamar (Onqelos Gen. 14.7 has En-Gedi in its stead), Shur (becoming Hagra in Onqelos Gen. 16.7); land of the Temanites (becoming: of the south), Onqelos Gen. 36.34; Arabs for Ishmaelites (Onqelos Gen. 37.27; 39.1).

2.4.2. *Circumlocutions, names or descriptions employed as 'code' names*: Samson is not named but referred to clearly, by way of an 'oracular' or coded description as a person of the future (Onqelos Gen. 49.16 f., in direct speech).

2.4.3. *The text as a whole routinely employs the following language(s), knowledge of which is taken for granted*: Aramaic.

2.4.3.1. *Additional language(s) taken for granted in quoted speech or certain parts of the text are*: Occasionally, the Aramaic text giving a (Hebrew) name's etymology presupposes an understanding of that name's Hebrew meaning (as one side of a semantic equation); see e.g., Peretz in Onqelos Gen. 38.29 (although פרץ occurs in Babylonian Aramaic).

---

[25] B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 6; Edinburgh: Clarke, 1988), pp. 25–30.

2.5. *# The text contains deictic or other expressions referring to the governing voice's time or place, or place it after/before some key event*:

> 2.5.1. *# As part of the words of the governing voice*: Several of the deictic references to facts or names that are valid 'to this day' (and similar) which occur in the Biblical Hebrew original are reproduced in the Aramaic, e.g. Onqelos Gen. 22.14 (*be-yoma hadeyn*), Onqelos Gen. 32.33, 35.21, 47.26.

2.7. *# All information concerning the epistemic stance, knowledge horizon, moral stance and identity of the governing voice, and concerning the projected addressee, is entirely implicit.*

As the entries regarding proper names show, Onqelos changes a number of names to suit what is clearly an improved or updated *object orientation* for the resulting text, whatever role the hermeneutic engagement with the original text may have played in generating that improvement or updating (see below). These 'new' names, compared with those of the Hebrew Bible, indicate the horizon of knowledge that the Targum presents itself as laying claim to, which is different from saying that the author of the Targum always expected the audience to be acquainted with them.[26] As such, it is part of the text's self-presentation and the projection of its point of view, the reason it is treated in Inventory section 2. Changes of the assumed knowledge horizon from the biblical original are of course of great historical interest to the Targum scholar, but frustratingly difficult to allocate to a particular time and place of composition. Yet as even just a *difference*, they are of immediate interest for the Inventory Profile of a Targumic text. This is the topic of various aspects of the subordinate points of Inventory 6.13, quoted above. The result of applying these to Targum Onqelos is as follows. Again, the generic part of the wording is in italics:

6.13. *The text constitutes a complete and sequential representation, in another language and in object-oriented perspective, of the perceived meaning of all or almost all verbal matter of a complete set of base text segments*, rendering the sentences of the Hebrew Bible Genesis into Aramaic: This is the case, and apparently without any omissions. Insofar as this 'automatically' recreates structurally important features of the biblical Book of Genesis, the respective entries in this Profile of Onqelos Genesis are marked by #.

> 6.13.1. *The statements of the text are displayed in manuscripts as alternating in mere juxtaposition with segments of verbal matter from the base text (without linking quotation formulae).*

---

[26] In other words: it is always possible that a text wishes to flatter an audience, or wishes to educate an audience without appearing to do so, and many other historical possibilities.

6.13.2. *The text's governing voice is almost always identical with, or a consistent extension of, the persona projected by the governing voice of the base text.*

6.13.3. *The text tends to use the sentence structure of the base text to accommodate any additional or modified object information.*

6.13.4. *The text creates new syntactic structures within which the words of the base text can be recognized*: this holds only for Onqelos Gen. 49.

Point 6.13.1 draws attention to a presentational feature of most Targums, namely their being copied alongside a biblical text in the manuscripts. However, this is not part of the Targumic literary constitution as such, but a layout convention. The Targumic words do not *refer to* the biblical words, nor can the Hebrew and Aramaic sentences be read as one continuous, bilingual text. Rather, this layout brings to the attention of the users the kind of 'lemmatic' and meta-linguistic attitude the Targums embody as engagements with the linguistic signs of Scripture, without thereby however transforming the fabric of the Targumic text into a meta-linguistic format of the kind informing Midrashic units. The layout points to the linguistic orientation or meta-linguistic attitude which the Targumic text itself *hides* behind its object orientation.

Point 6.13.2 explicitly addresses the perspective projected in the governing voice considered in its comparison to Scripture; this is treated in more detail under 7.1.5.3, cited above. Point 6.13.3 draws attention to the fact that all interventions changing the meaning from a direct translation of the Hebrew are accommodated within the syntactic structures given by the Hebrew original, except for Onqelos Gen. 49 (which falls under 6.13.4).

Returning to the question of perspective and knowledge horizon, the Profile point 2.4.3.1 cited earlier notes that some familiarity with Hebrew is presupposed in the Aramaic representation of the biblical name etymologies, a common feature in Bible-related texts of ancient Judaism in languages other than Hebrew. Also, the Targumic text reproduces the original deictic references of the text voice to its own time ('this day', see point 2.5.1 above). Of basic importance is the reproduction in Onqelos of the omniscient third-person perspective of the biblical narrator. In the Profile, this important feature is recorded in 2.1.7 and 2.1.8 for Onkelos Genesis as a textual structure in its own right, and again in point 7.1.5.3, considered as a relationship to Scripture.

6. Ostensive Object Orientation and Tacit Linguistic Orientation

I now return to a distinction I employed earlier in this paper. This is the dichotomy between an object orientation and a linguistic orientation: Does a

text have only the one, only the other, or both? And if a text has both, are both orientations apparent, that is, displayed on the text surface? For most Targums, the answer to the first question is: they have both an object orientation and a linguistic orientation, because they engage with both. They are not merely mechanical transpositions into Aramaic of a Hebrew wording, and would thus have only linguistic orientation. Rather, additional knowledge of the biblical subject matter, world knowledge, is contained in the Targum and generates new text. In other words, new information, even if partly obtained from readings of the biblical text itself, appears in the Targum. In answer to the second question, namely which of the orientations is visible on the surface, one has to say that it is *only* the object orientation, this engagement with a world of events, persons or objects, which is ordinarily visible on the Targumic text surface. The Targumic text does not make the biblical *text* its subject matter, as Midrashic units do (see above). The regular display of original Hebrew sentences alongside or interlaced with the Aramaic sentences in the manuscripts is a vitally important clue to their contextual function, and is noted in point 6.13.1, but does not change this picture. So the fact that each Targumic sentence is either partly or entirely the result of a linguistic engagement that targets every word of the biblical text is not signalled on the text's surface, as it is not part of the *meaning* of the Targumic sentences.[27]

   Some of this goes for any text ordinarily called 'translation'. Any translation has an ostensive object orientation, in that it reproduces whatever is the object orientation of the original text and yet translations are the result of a linguistic engagement with the words of the text to be rendered.[28] But even for non-Targumic translations, further engagement with the world is the norm, in addition to engagement with the wording of the original text. Often meaning 'differences' between the original and the translation can indicate that the translator imports independent knowledge of the original text's subject matter into the translation.[29] And this is certainly true of Targumic texts, whose

---

[27] For an earlier examination of the role of sentences as sense units for Targumic renderings, see my 'Scripture's Segments and Topicality in Rabbinic Discourse and the Pentateuch Targum', *JAB* 1 (1999), pp. 87–124.

[28] There are of course texts which have a linguistic subject matter (e.g., commentaries, grammar books) and which, when translated, retain that meta-linguistic attitude. But the translation does not address the linguistic constitution of the commentary text or grammar text, but the linguistic entities which commentary or grammar were about in the first place.

[29] As an illustration it may be worth remembering that many modern scholarly translations of technical rabbinic texts routinely incorporate such information in brackets, that is, as part of the flow of the text (as opposed to in footnotes). These convey the meaning of the

'non-literal' translations show that the Targumists are happy to make claims which are not made in so many words in the biblical text. But the converse is not true. The absence of such meaning differences between original and translation does not indicate the absence of an object orientation in the translator's procedure. In the modern context, at least, translators use their own object orientation, their knowledge *of the world*, to avoid making inaccurate choices in the translation even when they would be perfectly defensible on linguistic grounds.[30] The objective knowledge of the translator interacts with the results of an engagement with the linguistic entities that are words and sentences, as objects of being rendered into another language. In the case of Targum, Bible-independent knowledge of biblical objects can at any time come into play. But many differences between Targumic and biblical meaning are based on certain further, more complicated engagements with the biblical text, namely as a source of *clues* on those very objects. In such cases one might say that the object orientation itself has a second meta-linguistic source, sometimes in the very same sentence that is being translated, sometimes in biblical passages elsewhere. Often the same objective information is also found in the explicitly meta-linguistic Midrashic units of rabbinic literature, and this is the general nature of the 'parallels' between Targum and Midrash. Targum is thus capable of assuming at any point in its production a two-fold *meta-linguistic* attitude to the biblical text:

1. An attitude that targets the linguistic entities of Scripture so as to produce a translational transposition into Aramaic of what are the word and sentence meanings of the biblical text, understood 'at face value';[31] and
2. An attitude that targets the meaning of Scripture so as to produce an object-language account of *further information* on those face value objects

---

text by adopting and developing its object orientation beyond representing its verbal matter; they say more than the text actually says, because they speak 'on behalf' of the rabbinic text translated—in addressing the text's object, subject matter, topic.

[30] One position in the theory of translation would be to say that no accurate translation would be possible if the translator were in a state of *radical ignorance* (which is only a theoretical possibility) of the subject matter of the original text. More pragmatically, using the correct view of a subject matter as a yardstick of making translational choices (let alone 'improving' on the objective contents) implies that the translator takes the original text to be accurate on its subject matter. The Inventory deals with this attitude at 6.10.4.

[31] And one might add, potentially shaped to some extent by a striving for 'literalness'.

by scanning the rest of the biblical text as well as the very same passage[32] for implied messages and 'clues', in the manner otherwise also known from Midrashic hermeneutics.

It is part of the *compositional art* of Targum to combine these two types of information into the usually smooth surface of the Targums as we have them. Sometimes this combination will take the form of words or sentences placed next to the results of translational rendering (i.e. the results of attitude 1); at others it will take the form of new verbal matter *replacing* what would be the results of attitude 1. On the other hand, it is part of the *hermeneutic art* of Targum to be capable of doing these two moves when reading Bible, so that the Targumist reads the biblical text for its *words* as well as for its objective *information*. The information can also come, however, from outside the biblical text entirely, as is the case also for modern translations. Then it involves the Targumist's own access to objects within his own personal and cultural knowledge horizon living in a post-biblical period, so that the information added to the Targumic account 'updates' something in Scripture. Both of these sources of information presuppose a Targumic engagement with the subject matter of Scripture, an object orientation. Furthermore, the information gained hermeneutically when reading the clues of Scripture may be the result of spontaneous Targumic interpretation; but it may also reflect the Targumic use of an existing Jewish reading tradition, already verbalized. So one further compositional skill required may have been the integration of pre-existing verbalized information with the results of translating the biblical words, that is, the integration of *given* words with other *given* words. It is thus quite possible that occasionally one will find a Targumic passage in which information comes together from four different sources of knowledge or verbal sources:

a. the verbal matter of Scripture (as transposed into Aramaic)
b. further information on the object of Scripture derived from reading Scripture for 'clues'
c. further information on the object of Scripture known to the Targumist as a person of his own time and place
d. further information on the object of Scripture derived from a familiarity with existing interpretations of Scripture (whether tied to this particular point in the biblical text or some other point).

---

[32] Targum Sheni Esther is unusual in making *this part* of the process visible by using biblical quotations from elsewhere in Scripture, and very occasionally, even from Esther itself at the point of 'translation'. See R. Hayward in this volume.

These could all co-exist side by side in the Targumic version of a single biblical sentence, or a set of neighbouring sentences. But its surface message would not name any of these components, or talk *about* them, but only have the object orientation: Moses did this, the Tabernacle looked like that, Israel travelled from A to B.

Conclusion

When examining Targum Onqelos Genesis with the help of the Inventory categories, the dual orientation of Targum, which it shares with non-Targumic kinds of translations, emerges quite clearly. Its surface is a narrative (Inventory 4), which effectively imitates the story and narrative perspective (2) of biblical Genesis (6.13, 7.1), down to the manner in which specific narrative information is allocated to individual sentences (6.13.3). This produces the Targum's ostensive object orientation, specifically the concern with the events, persons, times and places of the past. On the other hand the Targum is the result of a consideration of and reflection on the meaning of linguistic signs (those of biblical Genesis), both from the point of view of their translational equivalents (6.13) and from the point of view of further clues regarding the events (6.13.3–4). The information gained from this engagement with linguistic signs and, at times, from elsewhere is entirely absorbed into object language sentences. Thus Targum Onqelos Genesis contains no sentences that have meta-linguistic shape (thus *no* 6.1, nor 6.13.6), but is often transmitted in a layout that points to such a meta-linguistic engagement or invites the Targum's use as a 'commentary' on Genesis (6.13.1).

The situation is much more complicated for the other Targums discussed in this volume by R. Hayward and P. Alexander. Some of these have a feature which establishes an additional tacit relationship to their Hebrew Bible base text. The base text is used as a kind of keyword agenda, tacitly accounting for the sequence of themes in a Targumic aggregation of topics. This is the feature 5.5.1.4 or 5.5.2.4, cited in the Profiles of Esther Sheni, Canticles, and Lamentations below. Taking this characteristic of some of the 'difficult' Targums into account, and anticipating to some extent the results of an overview of Targumic works yet to be performed, it appears to me that the Inventory helps to group them in the following way:

A. Targums that come under 6.13 without 5.5.1.4 or 5.5.2.4 being applied. This includes the majority of the works called Targum, exemplified by Onqelos.

B. Targums that come under 6.13 while requiring also 5.5.1.4 or 5.5.2.4, that is, texts whose coherence relies upon recognition of a tacit link to the sequence of topics in the base text. This is a group of Targums which includes Esther Sheni 1.1–9, Canticles, and Lamentations, as discussed in the present volume.

C. Targums that are closely related to Inventory point 6.1 and do not fit point 6.13, because they do not consist of a complete and object-oriented representation of the perceived meaning of the sentences of a biblical book. In contrast to groups A and B, the Aramaic contained in such a text, considered on its own, does not constitute a text in its own right. Instead the text has a selective quotation-comment structure (like exegetical Midrash), even while its comment components consist of object-oriented renderings into another language (unlike exegetical Midrash). This configuration is exemplified by the Fragment Targum.