

## TARGUM JONATHAN TO THE PROPHETS\*

TARGUM STUDIES, as is well known, have experienced a burgeoning of scholarly interest and activity in the past three decades in several overlapping fields: Rabbinic literature, Aramaic language and linguistics, early Jewish and comparative Bible exegesis, and New Testament studies.<sup>1</sup> The publication of two books on Targum Jonathan to the Prophets under a single cover, one a reprint of a monograph published in 1927, and the other a parallel treatment by two established contemporary scholars of Targum and Rabbinic literature, is an occasion for reflection on how far the study of Targum has or has not come in the intervening years.

The present volume, while comprising two monographs, contains four parts: (1) A "Preface" and an "Introduction" by Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach to both monographs (24 pp.); (2) *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* by Smolar and Aberbach (257 pp.); (3) An uncorrected reprint of *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* by Pinkhos Churgin (originally published as Yale Oriental Series—Researches, 14; New Haven, 1927) (152 pp.); (4) Indexes to both monographs: Biblical Passages, Ancient Versions, Rabbinic and Other Literature, Classical Authors, and Subjects.<sup>2</sup>

Churgin's work, originally a 1922 doctoral dissertation at Yale University prepared under the direction of, and dedicated to, Charles C. Torrey, was remarkably prescient for its time (as was Churgin himself in his other endeavors<sup>3</sup>). At a time in which Christian scholars were beginning to look at the Targumim in search of the Aramaic background to the Gospels, Churgin sought to understand Targum Jonathan to the Prophets as a source of Rabbinic teaching, to be elucidated in the

\* Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, *Studies on Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*; Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (Library of Biblical Studies). New York and Baltimore: KTAV Publishing House and The Baltimore Hebrew College, 1983. Pp. xxxiii + 435.

<sup>1</sup> For recent bibliography see B. Grossfeld, *A Bibliography of Targum Literature* (Cincinnati, 1972-77), 2 vols.; J. T. Forestell, *Targum Traditions and the New Testament: An Annotated Bibliography with a New Testament Index* (Chico, California, 1979); and issues of the *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies*.

<sup>2</sup> The original printing of Churgin's work lacked indexes, making its use as a reference work difficult.

<sup>3</sup> Smolar and Churgin provide in their Introduction a brief sketch of Churgin's fascinating life (1894-1957) and contributions to Jewish religious, political, and intellectual life. See also S. B. Hoenig in *Jewish Book Annual*, 16 (1958/1959), 105-08, as well as eulogies in *Hadoar*, January 1958 and December 1977.

context of other Rabbinic sources. Churgin rejected the then current view that the Targumim had their origins in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah but had been neglected or suppressed in early Rabbinic times in Palestine, only to be reinstated later by being thoroughly revised in the Babylonian "official" versions of Targum Onqelos to the Pentateuch and Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel to the Prophets.

With regard to the "official" Targum to the Prophets in particular, Churgin rejected the supposed Talmudic (B. Meg. 3a) attribution to Jonathan ben Uzziel (a disciple of Hillel), as well as the attributions to Rab Joseph (d. 333) and Theodotian (a 2nd century author of a Greek version). He similarly rejected the common view that this "literal" Targum was produced in Babylonia to replace earlier unofficial "midrashic" ones. Instead, Churgin viewed Targum Jonathan as a "progressive composition,"<sup>4</sup> having no single author or redactor but comprising both early and late translation traditions from the time of the Maccabean revolt (165 B.C.E.) until the Arab invasion (640 C.E.), largely assembled by the time of R. 'Aqiba (early 2nd century) but continuing in its development for some time afterwards. While some changes were made in Babylonia when Targum Jonathan was given its final form, these did not involve a thorough and consistent reworking. "Older" renderings, some contradicting later practices or understandings, were often left untouched, sometimes placed alongside "newer" ones. Thus Churgin rejected the common view that Targum Jonathan was intended to present to its public audience a single "right reading."<sup>5</sup> The extant Targumim are not necessarily the same as those used in the synagogue service in Rabbinic times but rather their "continuation."<sup>6</sup>

Churgin substantiates these general claims with detailed analyses of specific Targumic renderings from four perspectives: historical allusions, textual deviations, hermeneutical principles, and redactional peculiarities.

Under "The Historical Background" Churgin attempts to find in the translations of Targum Jonathan allusions to historical events, persons, or circumstances, including Hasmonean, Herodian, and Roman rulers, the destruction of the Second Temple and its aftermath, the Bar Kokhba revolt, and the fall of Babylonia to the Arabs. While Churgin's thesis that the Targumic renderings are derived from several periods remains sound, his attempts to identify positively the historical allusions in particular Targumic renderings are not always convincing. As in much of Rabbinic literature, the determination of such allusions is usually slippery and subjective. For example, in a cumulative tradition such as that of Targum Jonathan, references to suffering or persecution could refer to any number of events or periods, or may reflect perceptions unrelated to any specific

<sup>4</sup> Churgin, p. 258. All page numbers refer to the reprinted edition.

<sup>5</sup> Churgin, p. 248. Of even greater composite nature, according to Churgin, is Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch, which he terms an "Aramaic Jalqut" (p. 270).

<sup>6</sup> Churgin, pp. 263-64.

event. Churgin sometimes, but too infrequently, recognizes such ambiguities.<sup>7</sup> He correctly realizes that the broad historical context that lies behind the renderings of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets is the same as lies behind Targum Onqelos, with which it has close affinities, as well as (although he does not develop this) behind the unofficial (so-called Palestinian) Targumim to the Pentateuch. In fact, he sees no reason to presume, as was and is commonly done, that the Targumic translations of the Pentateuch antedate those of the Prophets.

Under "Textual Variations" Churgin presents a typology for Targum Jonathan's "deviations" from the Hebrew (Masoretic) text of the Bible: (1) those reflecting alternative vocalizations of the consonantal text (many shared with other ancient versions), (2) those reflecting grammatical "corrections" (again, many shared by other versions), and (3) those reflecting harmonization of similar Biblical phrases and sentences. A chart of examples is given for each type, indicating Masoretic text, Targumic rendering, and presumed retroversion. Churgin, however, fails to recognize that such "deviations" may be of exegetical, and not necessarily text-critical, significance.<sup>8</sup>

In the most interesting section, "The Exegesis in Jonathan," Churgin groups Targum Jonathan's exegetical strategies under four principles: allegorical, metaphorical, complementary, and lexical. Allegorical interpretation, Churgin argues, is used by Targum Jonathan in a limited way to reveal the meaning of "passages which garb implication."<sup>9</sup> Neither from his definition nor from the few examples given is it clear that "allegorical" is the correct term. What is intended is the rendering of elliptical prophetic messages so as to make explicit their implicit message. Metaphorical interpretations are those which render a Biblical metaphor with what it represents, or in some cases with its literal meaning alongside its representative meaning. Under complementary exegesis Churgin includes cases where poetic words are provided with complementary clauses which specify their meaning. Where a word is repeated for emphasis, or provided with a synonym in parallel construction, Targum Jonathan complements the two words in such a way as to attribute to each a distinct meaning.<sup>10</sup> Lexical interpretations are those in which a nonallegorical word is rendered not according to its literal meaning but

<sup>7</sup> As on pp. 255-56.

<sup>8</sup> This is a serious dilemma confronting critical interpreters of all ancient versions. See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism—The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint," *Textus*, 3 (1963), 130-58; M. Greenberg, "The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text," *Vetus Testamentum Supplement*, 29 (1978), 131-48; and most recently, E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies) (Jerusalem, 1981).

<sup>9</sup> Churgin, pp. 308-09.

<sup>10</sup> On the Rabbinic treatment of Biblical parallelism in general, see J. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven, 1981), pp. 96-109.

according to its "idea."<sup>11</sup> Other tendencies, bordering on "commentary," include the shifting of (unfulfilled) prophetic predictions to the Messianic age, the transformation of gloomy Messianic portrayals into glorious ones, and the changing of rhetorical interrogatives into categorical statements. As in Targum Onqelos, these principles are pursued in such a way as to keep the rendering concise "and in considerable measure . . . within the boundaries of the text."<sup>12</sup> Churgin compares, but not in detail, Targum Jonathan's use of these methods with the renderings of the Septuagint and the Peshitta.

Churgin next turns to what he calls "General Peculiarities," that is, ways in which typically Rabbinic points of view are expressed through patterns of Targumic rendering. Most of Churgin's examples involve the differentiation of meaning in the rendering of Hebrew expressions used in the Bible to denote both holy and profane persons, places, objects, or activities. Thus, God is distinguished through the use of different Aramaic words from false gods, a proper altar from an idolatrous altar, divine worship from idolatrous worship, Torah law from gentile law, true prophet from false prophet, and Israel as a people from the other peoples. Churgin also finds in Targum Jonathan a pronounced leaning against the "nations," especially Rome, and an emphasis on Messianic hope.

Under "Interpolated Targum" Churgin exemplifies the composite nature of Targum Jonathan. He argues, especially with regard to Isa. 1-35, that "later Midrashim" have been interpolated into the "original, simple exegesis of Jonathan," usually in such a way as to make it "impossible to release the original from the new form. . . . Few additions can be safely pointed out. Some of them will be found to be two different renderings put side by side."<sup>13</sup> Here, it seems to me, Churgin contradicts his own earlier critique that "literal" renderings need not necessarily antedate "expository" ones. If different layers of Targumic rendering have been juxtaposed or interwoven, what criteria are there (other than language, with which Churgin does not deal) for disentangling the "old" (literal Jonathan) from the "new" (later midrashic one)? Churgin is correct in finding in the Targum Jonathan a cumulative collection of renderings, but he is wrong in presuming that a "midrashic" commentary has been grafted onto a "literal" translation, and the examples he adduces do not make a convincing case.

Finally, in a section called "Additions," Churgin gives examples of fragmentary Targum quotations in Talmudic and Midrashic sources, fragments which may have once been part of Targum Jonathan.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Churgin, p. 318.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Churgin, p. 354.

<sup>14</sup> See now M. Goshen-Gottstein, *Fragments of Lost Targumim*, Part 1 (Hebrew) (Ramat Gan, 1983); idem, "Liqrā't heqer hašseqi' in šel mesorot hatargumim ha'aramiyim," in *Studies in Rabbinic Literature, Bible and Jewish History Dedicated to Professor E. Z. Melamed*, ed. Y. D. Gilat et al. (Ramat Gan, 1982), pp. 43-47.

While Churgin's classic treatment of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets had its shortcomings (when viewed with the advantage of sixty years of hindsight), it bequeathed to subsequent Targumic scholarship an impressive, albeit complex and still largely untackled, agenda: (1) to view this collection historically, intellectually, and literarily, in the broader context of the Rabbinic oeuvre; (2) to recognize that its collective and cumulative nature does not permit easy historical conclusions, regarding either its relation to historical events or circumstances or its relation to other collections of Targumic (or for that matter Midrashic-Talmudic) tradition; (3) to examine systematically the manner in which Targumic renderings originating in different historical (and perhaps social) contexts have been editorially combined, juxtaposed, and interwoven, sometimes in incongruous ways; (4) to develop typologies for describing this Targum's exegetical methods, both in its reading of Scripture as text and in its incorporation of Rabbinic teaching into the translation of that text; (5) to evaluate, based on the preceding, the intellectual and social place of such a Targum within the program of ancient Rabbinic Judaism: what are the particular ways in which Targumic renderings and their redaction seek, as Scriptural translation, to communicate (and to whom) Rabbinic teaching?

Smolar and Aberbach provide what was originally to have been a prolegomenon to the reprinting of Churgin's monograph (as in other volumes of the Library of Biblical Studies series) but evolved into a "fuller, independent study."<sup>15</sup> They usefully summarize Churgin's views and provide an interesting biographical sketch, strengthen several of his points, mainly through extensive exemplification, question some of his examples, provide a summary of recent scholarship on Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, particularly with regard to its dating, and investigate additional areas of halakhah and theology. They do not, however, carry the study of this Targum very much forward in addressing the broad issues which, as I have argued, Churgin's monograph suggests.

In their Introduction, Smolar and Aberbach confront the question of the dating of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets by surveying recent studies of its language (a subject ignored by Churgin).<sup>16</sup> These studies suggest affinities with the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls and strengthen Churgin's argument that this Targum came into being in its initial form in the early 2nd century in Palestine, and was not as thoroughly revised later in Babylonia as was previously thought. Targum Jonathan to the Prophets is therefore not necessarily later or less "Palestinian" than the so-called Palestinian Targumim to the Pentateuch. But the history and nature of the transmission and transformation of Targum Jonathan until its final editing in Babylonia remains unclear, and it is doubtful whether language studies alone can move us much closer to a solution to this riddle.

<sup>15</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. ix.

<sup>16</sup> See especially A. Tal, *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* (Tel Aviv, 1975). For further bibliography on this topic see Smolar and Aberbach, pp. xiii-xv.

Smolar and Aberbach divide their own studies of Targum Jonathan into four categories: halakhah, historical and geographical allusions, and theological (in a broad sense) concepts. Issues of exegetical method and redactionary composition, so usefully and promisingly addressed by Churgin, are not the focus here. Rather, Targum Jonathan is mainly approached as a source ("a compendium of Rabbinic Judaism"<sup>17</sup>) from which can be extracted information, halakhic, historical, and theological. The particular methods by which such information is incorporated into translation are either ignored or dealt with superficially.

In the section on halakhah, Smolar and Aberbach demonstrate that the halakhah of the Rabbis, as found in the Midrashic-Talmudic sources, permeates Targum Jonathan's translation of the Prophets. In particular, the halakhah of Targum Jonathan is "undoubtedly that of the School of R. 'Aqiba."<sup>18</sup> Targum Jonathan repeatedly projects this halakhah back into Biblical times, and the Biblical text is brought into agreement with Rabbinic law—it is made "halachically above board."<sup>19</sup> The unexpectedness of such "halachic intrusions" is particularly striking given the non-halakhic nature of most of the Biblical text which the Targum renders. Seemingly innocuous Biblical statements are altered lest they lead to a halakhically unacceptable idea. Examples are provided which deal with areas of legal procedure, Temple cult, marriage law, sexual cleanness, and life cycle changes. The authors conclude:

The evidence leaves no doubt that the laws and customs depicted in TJ are not necessarily what they were in Biblical times, but a retrojection of halachic practice in the Talmudic age. It cannot be sufficiently emphasized that the central purpose of the Aramaic translation of Biblical texts was not to provide an accurate rendering for the benefit of scholars, but to instruct the masses with an up-to-date version of the Scriptures, one which perforce had to agree with current laws and customs. Inevitably, accuracy and historical truth had to be sacrificed on the altar of halachic orthodoxy.<sup>20</sup>

I will return to this statement and its implications later on.

Under "Historical and Geographical Allusions" Smolar and Aberbach provide what they call "intelligent speculations."<sup>21</sup> They criticize Churgin for his having identified too many of Targum Jonathan's historical allusions with the period of the Maccabean revolt and its Hasmonean aftermath. When in doubt, they prefer a later date, especially the period between the destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.) and the Bar Kokhba revolt (135 C.E.). Allusions to religious persecution

<sup>17</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. xxviii.

<sup>18</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. 1. Here and elsewhere I was not convinced by the examples that Targum Jonathan is derived from the school of R. 'Aqiba per se.

<sup>19</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. 1.

<sup>20</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. 61.

<sup>21</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. 63.

refer not to the period of the Maccabean revolt, as Churgin sometimes argued, but to the times of Rabbi 'Aqiba, who, they claim here as in halakhic matters, "decisively shaped the entire ideology of TJ."<sup>22</sup> But the authors' speculations remain just that. The historical allusions are for the most part vague and unspecific, as they generally are in midrashic commentary, perhaps for good reason. Here the collective and cumulative nature of the Targum tradition, as proposed by Churgin, is suggestive: each successive generation could understand a Targumic allusion to suffering, persecution, or an oppressive ruler in its own way. Even if we could identify with relative certainty the originally intended objects of a few such renderings, what would we have learned about the extant Targum Jonathan into which such renderings were subsequently incorporated and within which they were newly understood?<sup>23</sup>

More promising is Smolar and Aberbach's uncovering of broad patterns of retrojection in Targum Jonathan: historical circumstances and institutions, geographical identifications, and linguistic usages of Talmudic times projected into the Biblical past and text. The next step would be to elucidate how such retrojections are exegetically accomplished.

In their chapter on "Theological Concepts" Smolar and Aberbach strike what are by now familiar chords: Targum Jonathan, "with rare exceptions," expresses the theology of

orthodox Judaism as developed by the Pharisees and Rabbis. As in other areas, it is the religious ideology of the school of Rabbi 'Akiba which prevails throughout. It was precisely because the Bible frequently expresses concepts and views which were later rejected by the Rabbis that TJ, which was designed for the religious edification of the masses, significantly changes the translation, with a view to eliminating all traces of unorthodox theology.<sup>24</sup>

The following subjects are then treated: the Concept of God, God and Man, Idolatry, Fear of God and Sin, Prayer, Reward of the Righteous and Punishment of the Wicked, Sin and the Justice of Punishment, Mysticism and Eschatology in Targum Jonathan. What is of interest again is not the fact that Targum Jonathan expresses "theological" views in consonance with Rabbinic literature more

<sup>22</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, p. 64.

<sup>23</sup> Since the Targum traditions are included in a redacted Rabbinic source, it would be interesting to see in which strata (Tannaitic or Amoraic) of other Rabbinic genres (Midrashic and Talmudic) and in what forms their parallels are found. This would be more suggestive for historical purposes than the elusive historical allusions.

<sup>24</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, pp. 129–30. Once again, the examples (p. 129, n. 1) do not necessarily point to the "religious ideology of the school of Rabbi 'Akiba" *per se*.

generally, but the specific ways in which those views are expressed through the medium of translation. The focus of the authors' survey is the former, and only secondarily the latter. The larger context of Rabbinic literature is seldom referred to here, since it is assumed that the broad theological concepts expressed in Targum Jonathan are those of Rabbinic Judaism.

But it would have been more interesting and suggestive to have contrasted the ways in which these common theological views are expressed in conjunction with the same Biblical passages in the particular contexts of Targum, Midrash, and Talmud. It would also have been revealing to show that Targum Jonathan's renderings of particular verses represent choices from among several exegetical possibilities preserved elsewhere in the Rabbinic corpus. Furthermore, it would be worth asking whether the nature of the particular Biblical (in particular, prophetic) text translated affects the style and method by which common motifs are presented in this particular translation. I kept wanting to know what is being communicated by this Targum that makes it distinctive within the larger context of Rabbinic literature? How is the medium of translation employed so as to say in a different way what has already been said elsewhere? What has been rhetorically gained? Is this Targum simply a source of additional examples of what we already knew, or have we learned something new about the diversity of form and function of Rabbinic teaching in the Talmudic age?

I suspect that Smolar and Aberbach would reply that what is of interest in this Targum (and in Targum in general) is the way in which common Rabbinic law and teaching are formulated for consumption by an "unsophisticated synagogue audience." This presupposed audience is frequently invoked by the authors in order to explain some aspect of Rabbinic halakhah or theology as expressed in Targum Jonathan. The clear implication is that in the Targumim the Rabbis present their teaching in ways suitable to the uneducated simplemindedness of the "masses," who were particularly susceptible to the allurements of promiscuity and idolatry, and who needed abstract Rabbinic teachings to be presented in popular garb, such as miracles and angels.<sup>25</sup> If indeed Targum Jonathan is intended for the unsophisticated masses, it should be possible to demonstrate this by contrasting its exegesis of specific verses or its presentation of particular motifs, halakhic or others, with similar exegeses or treatments found in those branches of Rabbinic literature which were intended for Rabbinic scholars. Thus, referring to the authors' above-quoted statement summarizing Targum Jonathan's treatment of halakhah,<sup>26</sup> we may ask for evidence that the Rabbis in addressing one another as "scholars" were any more interested in "accurate renderings" or "historical truth."

I cite one example from the authors' halakhic discussion:<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> For examples see Smolar and Aberbach, pp. 141, 182, 226.

<sup>26</sup> See quote from Smolar and Aberbach, p. 61, above at n. 21.

<sup>27</sup> Smolar and Aberbach, pp. 49–50.

Although the Talmud and Midrash are often very explicit in referring to bodily functions and sexual activities,<sup>28</sup> the Targumists, who had to translate and expound the Scriptures for the masses, felt that what might be suitable for lecture halls and houses of study could not be applied in synagogues while rendering Holy Writ into the vernacular. The relatively unrestrained language of the prophets, and the rough language to be found occasionally in various parts of the Bible could not be conveyed literally to the ordinary people who might all too easily mistake linguistic frankness and sexual imagery for license. At the very least such language might arouse the prurient interests of the licentious. It, therefore, became necessary to censor the Biblical text and alter it in such a way that rough expressions and sexual imagery were eliminated in favor of various euphemisms and circumlocutions characterized by clear, unimpeachable language.

From this statement we might assume that when the Rabbis interpret the loose talk of the prophets among themselves, they do so in a different manner than that of the Targumists when they do so for the "ordinary people." It would be interesting to see examples of such a double standard. However, the authors continue,

As a matter of fact, the Rabbis no less than the Targumists were profoundly committed to clean language and to the avoidance of gross expressions, even when discussing potentially titillating themes. Refined terminology and generally decent language were to be used at all times, even when referring to topics where such primness was not altogether suited for the employment of honest, explicit language.

In the examples that the authors provide the Targum is no more puritanical than the parallels in the Talmud and Midrash. So what is so typically Targumic here? Why presume that the Targumic rendering is suited for an audience of "ordinary people," or that the Scriptural passages in question would be differently rendered or interpreted in the schoolhouse (*bet midrash*)?<sup>29</sup>

This raises the thorny question of the provenance of the extant Targumim, and in particular their relation to the Aramaic translations that were provided in the synagogue. Need we assume that these texts were intended for the synagogue rather than for the schoolhouse? Given the fact that the two institutions were

<sup>28</sup> Here Smolar and Aberbach cite S. Glasner, "Judaism and Sex," in *The Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior*, ed. A. Ellis and A. Abarbanel (New York, 1967), pp. 575ff. It is not clear, however, whether the contexts in which such explicit references occur are suitable for comparison with the rendering of Scripture, regardless of the audience.

<sup>29</sup> I stress that this is not an isolated example. I counted fourteen instances of such invoking of the "unsophisticated synagogue masses" as an explanation of a Targumic rendering.

often associated, and that the Targum served as an aid to study (e.g., B. Ber. 8a), they may have served several functions, including pedagogic ones, among Rabbis and their students.<sup>30</sup>

To sum up, the present two works contain a wealth of information concerning the ancient Rabbinic Aramaic rendering of the Prophetic canon of the Hebrew Bible. The excellent indexes to both monographs make this information easily accessible to scholars with a variety of interests. Both treatments suggest that the Targumim in general, and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets in particular, need be taken more seriously as sources for our understanding of Rabbinic Judaism in antiquity.<sup>31</sup> But what does it really mean to study the Targumim in the broader context of Rabbinic literature? To show that what can be extracted from this branch of the literature is paralleled by what can be extracted from the others? Or to analyze the specific and unique ways in which the extant Targumim—as translations, that is, as forms of interpretation of Scripture—have contributed, both individually and collectively, to the formidable Rabbinic program of social and religious reconstruction through the pedagogy of hermeneutics?<sup>32</sup>

Yale University

STEVEN D. FRAADE

<sup>30</sup> Thus, the didactic functions of the Targumim as literary crystallizations of Targumic tradition need to be taken more seriously. See Anthony D. York, "The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School," *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 10 (1979), 74–86. The Targum to the Prophets presents a particular problem of "sitz im leben" since much of what it translates is not known to have been read as part of the synagogue lection.

<sup>31</sup> This is not to deny the important contributions which the study of Targum can make to the study of ancient Bible exegesis more generally, or to its early Christian manifestations in particular. However, there is little basis for assuming that the Targumim are earlier and more popular in provenance than other branches of early Rabbinic literature and exegesis, and therefore more relevant to such concerns. It does seem to me, however, that Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, because of its focus on the Prophetic canon, can be of particular comparative significance in understanding the exegeses of the New Testament and of the Dead Sea Scrolls, given that the interpretation of Biblical prophecy is central to their hermeneutical concerns as well.

<sup>32</sup> Bruce D. Chilton's *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenance of the Isaiah Targum* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 23; Sheffield, England, 1982) came to my attention only after the above was completed and, therefore, could not be discussed here.