

UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN

Faculté de théologie



*Judgment, Prophecy, and Vindication*

*A Text-Critical and Exegetical Study of the Targum of Hosea 1-3*

Mémoire présenté par Abir Lal MITRA  
en vue de l'obtention du  
diplôme de Master en Études bibliques,  
finalité approfondie.

**Promoteur** : Professeur Jean-Claude HAELEWYCK

Année académique 2012-2013



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>PREFACE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 TEXT OF TARGUM HOSEA 1-3</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.1 Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2 Modern Critical Editions of Targum Hosea: Before and After Sperber</b>	<b>10</b>
1.2.1 Paul de Lagarde (1872)	10
1.2.2 Alexander Sperber (1962)	11
a) Manuscript Tradition(s) and System(s) of Vocalisation	13
b) Confusing 'Tradition' with 'Vocalisation'	16
c) Transcription of the Divine Name	17
1.2.3 Joan Ferrer i Costa (1989)	18
<b>1.3 The Text Presented in This Study</b>	<b>19</b>
1.3.1 The Problem(s)	19
1.3.2 Errors in Sperber's Edition	20
1.3.3 Manuscripts: Description and Significance	21
1.3.4 Arrangement of the Text	25
1.3.5 List of Orthographical and Other Recurring Variants in MS c with respect to MS v	26
a) Presence/Absence of ך as mater lectionis	26
b) Presence/Absence of ם as mater lectionis	28
c) Presence/Absence of ך as mater lectionis	29
d) Presence/Absence of ם as a Coordinating Conjunction	29
e) Interchangeable ך and ם	29
f) Singular/Plural	29
g) Hebraisms: Hebraic Forms in Aramaic	29
h) Early/Late "Yemenite" Spellings for the Imperfect 1 <sup>st</sup> Person Singular	30
i) Errors and/or scriptio defectiva	30
j) Unclassified/Miscellaneous	31
1.3.6 Sigla and Signs in the Critical Text	31
<b>1.4 Critical Text of Targum Hosea 1-3</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2 A STUDY OF TARGUM HOSEA 1-3</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2.2 Targum and "Orality"</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>2.3 Targum(s): Fluidity or Uniformity?</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>2.4 Targum and/as Midrash</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>2.5 Contesting the Stereotypes</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>2.6 The Translation and Commentary Presented in This Study</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>2.7 Tosefta Targum to Hosea: Translation and Commentary</b>	<b>49</b>
2.7.1 Introduction	49
2.7.2 The Text, Translation, and Analysis	51
<b>2.8 Targum Hosea 1: Translation and Commentary</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>2.9 Targum Hosea 2: Translation and Commentary</b>	<b>79</b>
2.9.1 Call to Return: 2:1-3	81
2.9.2 Israel's Faithlessness and God's Faithfulness: 2:4-15	82

2.9.3 God's Commitment to Israel: 2:16-25	87
<b>2.10 Targum Hosea 3: Translation and Commentary:</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>95</b>
1. Manuscripts of Targum Hosea	95
2. Guides to Manuscript Sources:	95
3. Instrumenta Studiorum	95
3.1 Dictionaries	95
3.2 Grammars	96
3.3 Concordances and Other Tools	96
4. Bible Versions, Critical Editions with Translations	96
5. Unpublished Works	97
6. Secondary Literature	97

## PREFACE

---

The present study focuses on the textual and exegetical aspects of the first three chapters of the Targum of Hosea (hereafter TgHos). The dissertation is accordingly divided into two main chapters, each containing several sub-sections. In my treatment of a subject both complex and rarely studied, I have tried to align the present study with the current state of research in the world of Targum Studies, and to take advantage of what has been done in this emerging field of research over the last three decades. Indeed, a renewed interest in the Targum to the Prophets during recent years have thrown light on the large vacuum which is yet to be filled up. This includes the acute need for a critical edition of the individual Prophetic Targums on the basis of recent manuscript discoveries and most up-to-date studies and working tools in view of updating and eventually replacing the edition of Alexander Sperber (1962). The first part of this study presents a full view of the history and the current state of research on the critical text of TgHos and a detailed critique of Sperber's text with which every text-critical study of an individual Targum has to begin. This is followed by the presentation of an "eclectic" text of TgHos whose objective is two-fold: to verify Sperber's edition against the original manuscript used by him for the basic text, and to present the two parallel texts of TgHos – the "official" Targum Jonathan and the Tosefta (additional) Targum – side by side on the basis of two manuscripts for highlighting the textual and interpretational "plurality" that exist even within the Prophetic Targums.

The second part of this study introduces certain general themes related to the Targum in order to question certain stereotypical views of its nature and functions. Their selection is based on their link with the following section of the chapter which comprises of an English translation of and a detailed commentary on the text presented at the end of the first chapter. The commentary analyses in detail certain key concepts and terms which recur throughout the text and contribute to its understanding. A careful study of the translation techniques and exegetical methods shows that the remarkable difference existing between the MT and TgHos versions of the first three chapters of Hosea arises mostly out of its reception and understanding within the wider context of Rabbinic Judaism and the consolidation of the Targumic

traditions. This is one of the factors which differentiates the Targum from the other ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible and seriously challenges the reader to reconsider its status as a “translation” in equal terms with the LXX, the Peshitta, or the Vulgate. The concluding section underlines the limitations of the present study and highlights the possibilities of further research on the subject which the present author intends to address through a larger research project in the near future.

I want to express my sincere gratitude starting with the institutions that have supported me in my academic endeavours at Louvain during the past three years: notably the Notre-Dame Abbey in Scourmont, the Faculty of Theology of Louvain-la-Neuve, and the Solidarité Orient. I am immensely grateful to my dissertation supervisor Prof. Jean-Claude Haelewyck for inducing into me a serious interest in Aramaic and North-West Semitic Philology and having made himself available at all times for answering my queries and bearing with me with utmost patience, to Prof. Didier Luciani and Dom Benoît Standaert for introducing me to the fascinating world of Rabbinic Judaism which I hope to keep wading through, to Prof. Geert Van Oyen for his unfailing help and assistance, and above all to Prof. Andrea B. Schmidt for helping and encouraging me to come to study at Louvain. Prof. Luciani and Prof. Hans Ausloos have also read parts of this dissertation and have offered valuable suggestions. I am also grateful to Profs. André Wénin, Jean-Marie Auwers, and all the other professors of the Department of Exegesis at the Faculty of Theology for their contribution towards my academic enrichment. For a privileged access to the very limited resources on a topic such as the present one, I must acknowledge the help of Miss Sally Style, librarian at the Montefiore Endowment, London, and to Miss Ilana Tahan, Lead Curator of the Hebrew collections at the British Library for helping me in locating the relevant manuscript portions and allowing me to use them in the present study. I am indebted to Prof. Joan Ferrer i Costa of Barcelona, Prof. Gudrun Lier of Johannesburg, and to Prof. Jonathan Kearney of Dublin for sending me their unpublished papers, dissertations, and theses without momentary hesitation. Mr. Paulo Rodrigues, assistant at the Faculty of Theology, has helped me with the technical components of this dissertation. And last but not the least, I must thank my parents and my dear friend Parichay Patra, researcher at Monash University in Melbourne, for their constant support and encouragement.

## ABBREVIATIONS

---

### **Biblical Books**

Gen	<i>Genesis</i>
Exod	<i>Exodus</i>
Lev	<i>Leviticus</i>
Num	<i>Numbers</i>
Deut	<i>Deuteronomy</i>
Josh	<i>Joshua</i>
Judg	<i>Judges</i>
Ruth	<i>Ruth</i>
1-2 Sam	<i>1-2 Samuel</i>
1-2 Kgs	<i>1-2 Kings</i>
1-2 Chr	<i>1-2 Chronicles</i>
Ezra	<i>Ezra</i>
Neh	<i>Nehemiah</i>
Esth	<i>Esther</i>
Job	<i>Job</i>
Ps	<i>Psalms</i>
Prov	<i>Proverbs</i>
Eccl	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>
Song	<i>Song of Songs</i>
Isa	<i>Isaiah</i>
Jer	<i>Jeremiah</i>
Lam	<i>Lamentations</i>
Ezek	<i>Ezekiel</i>
Dan	<i>Daniel</i>
Hos	<i>Hosea</i>
Joel	<i>Joel</i>
Amos	<i>Amos</i>
Obad	<i>Obadiah</i>
Jonah	<i>Jonah</i>
Mic	<i>Micah</i>
Nah	<i>Nahum</i>
Hab	<i>Habakkuk</i>
Zeph	<i>Zephaniah</i>

Hag	<i>Haggai</i>
Zech	<i>Zechariah</i>
Mal	<i>Malachi</i>

### **Selected Tractates of the Mishnah and Talmudim**

The prefixes *m*, *b*, and *y* followed by a dot before the abbreviated form of each tractate denote their provenance being the Mishnah, Talmud of Babylon, and Talmud of Jerusalem respectively.

<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakhot</i>
<i>Pes.</i>	<i>Pesahim</i>
<i>Meg.</i>	<i>Megillah</i>
<i>Sot.</i>	<i>Sotah</i>
<i>Qid.</i>	<i>Qiddushin</i>
<i>Sanh.</i>	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
<i>Avot</i>	<i>Avot</i>
<i>Hull.</i>	<i>Hullin</i>
<i>Tem.</i>	<i>Temurot</i>

### **Others**

BCE	Before Common Era
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> (Kittel)
BT	Talmud of Babylon
CE	Common Era
DJBA	<i>Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic</i> (Sokoloff)
DJPA	<i>Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic</i> (Sokoloff)
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
R.	Rabbi
Tg	Targum
TJ	Targum Jonathan (to the Prophets)
TO	Targum Onqelos (to the Pentateuch)

## CHAPTER 1

### TEXT OF TARGUM HOSEA 1-3

---

#### 1.1 Introduction

The current state of research on the Targums in general and the Targum Jonathan to the Prophets in particular indicates that each study on an individual Targum of the Prophets is bound to take into account two important issues: the lack of a critical edition containing an up-to-date information on all the Targum manuscripts hitherto discovered and catalogued, and a critique of the sole existing edition of Alexander Sperber.<sup>1</sup> For the Targum of Hosea (hereafter TgHos) with which we are concerned here, apart from the edition of Sperber, there exists only an unpublished doctoral dissertation by J. Ferrer i Costa which is a critical edition of TgHos based on the “Yemenite” tradition.<sup>2</sup> But even there, J. Ferrer has chosen to present a “diplomatic” text in which he reproduces the basic text from a Yemenite manuscript and as the title of his thesis suggests, this unpublished edition does not make use of all the extant manuscripts from the two other major traditions namely the Babylonian and the Palestinian/Tiberian (Western) text-traditions.<sup>3</sup> First, a lack of information on all the

---

<sup>1</sup> A. SPERBER (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, 4 vols., Leiden, Brill, 1959-62. The Text of Targum Hosea 1-3 can be found in v. III (*The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*), p. 385-391. The cataloguing of all the extant manuscripts containing texts of Targum is a process still in its infancy. First, such a cataloguing should arrange each Targumic text in terms of the particular tradition (Babylonian, Yemenite and so on) to which it belongs and also cases in which traits of more than one tradition are present. Secondly, it should also record the Targumic texts found in liturgical documents such as the *Haftaroth*. Finally, citations of and quotations from the Targums scattered across different medieval commentaries (Rashi, Qimḥi, Ibn-Ezra among others), the two Talmudim and various works of Rabbinic literature which often present parallel versions and in some cases versions of Targumic texts completely different from those preserved in the “official” Targums of Onqelos and Jonathan. This is what one is confronted with, as we shall see, in Targum Hosea. One of the major problems of locating Targum manuscripts is the fact that the Aramaic text of the Targum occurs in most manuscripts as “interlinear” to the Hebrew Biblical text, the reason why many manuscripts containing the Targum are often listed, even in the library catalogues, under Hebrew manuscript collections. In most cases, the catalogues are not updated and the direct study of each manuscript for such an objective is quite impossible for either an individual and even for a team. On this last aspect, see Luis Díez MERINO, *Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions*, in D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNAMARA (eds.) *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup, 166), Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994, p. 54-55.

<sup>2</sup> J. FERRER I COSTA, *El Targum d’Osees en tradició iemenita*, unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Barcelona, 1989, 652 p. Prof. Ferrer has been kind enough to send me from Barcelona the typed copy of his manuscript for use.

<sup>3</sup> J. Ferrer reproduces the text of MS Or. 1474 of the British Library as the basic text for his “diplomatic” edition of TgHos. This manuscript was also used by Sperber for variant readings and dates from 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup>

extant manuscripts containing Targum to the Prophets makes it difficult to draw up a *stemma codicum* for an individual Prophetic book and thereby constructing a history of the textual transmission of the Targums.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, an acute penury of knowledge in the field of different traditions and systems of vocalisation (Babylonian, Yemenite and Palestinian/Tiberian) and the exact relationship among them should be the reasons for making use of as many manuscripts as possible. In recent years, a number of studies have appeared on individual prophetic Targums but unfortunately each of them reproduces the text of Sperber's edition *ditto* for the purpose of translation and commentary.<sup>5</sup>

The textual scholars have largely opted for "diplomatic" rather than "eclectic" editions for the text of the Hebrew Bible for several theoretical and practical reasons, one of them being that scholars today have mostly abandoned the idea of the existence of an original text for any of the biblical books.<sup>6</sup> The idea of such an *Urtext* for the Targums is all the more problematic as there are not only difference strands of traditions (Palestinian, Babylonian, fragmentary and so on) transmitting different textual forms but also texts with dissimilar contents conveying different exegetical traditions. In the field of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the variant readings in the Targums in most cases do not stand for different Hebrew *Vorlagen*, but rather as witnesses to ancient exegetical traditions and translation techniques. This fact alone requires a different kind of approach in analysing a Targumic text in comparison to its parallels

---

Century. Please refer to section 1.2.2 for detailed discussions on the subject of different manuscript traditions. Among the Twelve Minor Prophets, there exist critical editions (published) other than Sperber based on one or another tradition only for the following Prophets: Jonah: E. LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version of Jonah*, Jerusalem, 1975; Nahum: J. RIBERA FLORIT, *La versión aramaica del Profeta Nahum*, in *Anuario de Filología* 6, Barcelona, 1980, p. 291-322; Zephaniah: J. RIBERA FLORIT, *La versión aramaica del Profeta Sofonías*, in *Estudios Bíblicos* 39 (1981), p. 127-158; Haggai: J. RIBERA FLORIT, *La versión aramaica del Profeta Ageo*, in *Anuario de Filología* 4, Barcelona, 1978, p. 282-303; Zechariah: L. DÍEZ MERINO, *Targum del Profeta Zacarías en la tradición sefardí*, in *Aula Orientalis*, 18 (1999-2000), p. 269-285; and Malachi: J. RIBERA FLORIT, *El Targum del Malaquias*, in *Estudios Bíblicos* 48 (1990), p. 171-197. For further details, see the list prepared by A. HOUTMAN and E. VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN, *Targum Editions After Sperber*, Kampen, Protestant Theological University, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> W.F. SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden, Brill, 1995, p. 113.

<sup>5</sup> Recent studies on Prophetic Targums employing Sperber's text in a likewise manner would include Ahuva Ho, *The Targum of Zephaniah*, Leiden, Brill, 2009; E. VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN, *The Targum of Samuel*, Brill, Leiden, 2002; and the aforementioned SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges*.

<sup>6</sup> Although most of the modern translations of the Hebrew Bible tend to be eclectic, drawing simultaneously upon readings from the MT with parallels from other versions such as the LXX. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, in D.N. FREEDMAN et al. (eds.) *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, v. 6, New York, Doubleday, 1992, p. 394.

found in other ancient versions such as the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate. The situation for the Prophetic Targums may apparently seem to be less complex than the Pentateuchal Targums since unlike the latter, it has come down to us in the unique form of the Targum Jonathan. But recourse to different manuscript traditions and quotations from the Prophetic Targums in the Babylonian Talmud and other Rabbinic texts shows various other strands of textual traditions often reflecting a very different theological worldview and exegesis than what is found in the “official” Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. Recent studies on the Targum to the Prophets have tried to take up the question of such marginal variant Targums which have generally been termed as “Tosefta” or “additional” Targums (*Zusatzthargum*) since they are often marked with the heading **של תרגום של תוספתא** or simply **תוספתא** on the manuscripts in which they are found (often as marginal notes), as is the case in one of the two manuscripts used here for first three chapters of TgHos.<sup>7</sup>

Considering these two facts – the paucity of discovered Targum manuscripts and the dearth of expertise in the field of different manuscript traditions, and the different “Tosefta” Targums conveying alternative theological traditions – I have chosen here to produce an “eclectic” text of the three first chapters of TgHos. By drawing upon both the “official” text of the Targum Jonathan to Hosea and the “Tosefta” Targum in the form of a prologue, I have tried to show the “plurality” of interpretations which is often overlooked in case of the Prophetic Targums and thereby expounding more

---

<sup>7</sup> This should not be confused with the “Tosefta” which is the compilation of Tannaitic teachings read as a supplement to the Mishnah. We shall take up the issue of the Tosefta Targums in the second part of this study. Critical material on the subject is rather scanty and there is still a substantial examination to be carried out before one may pronounce any judgment on their history and origin. In our study of the Tosefta to TgHos we shall mostly be concerned with its literary and theological functions derived from the existing text as it appears on the manuscript. A recent study closely related to this subject and which also addresses the issue of the variant Targumic readings from a historical-critical point of view is A. HOUTMAN and H. SYSLING (eds.) *Alternative Targumic Traditions: The Use of Targumic Readings for the Study in Origin and History of Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, Brill, 2009. The two major studies directly concerned with the Tosefta Targums are those by R. KASHER, **תוספתות תרגום לנביאים**, Jerusalem, 1996; and M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, **הארמיית שקיעים מתרגומי המקרא**, 2 vols, Ramat Gan, 1983-1989. But both of them are in Hebrew and currently said to be unavailable. See HOUTMAN and SYSLING, *Alternative Targumic Traditions*, p. 4 n. 7.

thoroughly the dual task of the Targumist(s) as a translator and a theologian (commentator) at the same time.<sup>8</sup>

## 1.2 Modern Critical Editions of Targum Hosea: Before and After Sperber

### 1.2.1 Paul de Lagarde (1872)

The Aramaic text of the Targum Jonathan to Hosea had been published along with the Masoretic text as part of the several Rabbinic and Polyglot Bibles since the early sixteenth century in Europe beginning with the first Rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg printed in Venice between 1516 and 1517.<sup>9</sup> As far as “modern” critical editions of the Targums are concerned, there are only two of them containing the Targum to all the Latter Prophets (*nevi'im aḥaronim*) including Hosea under the Twelve Minor Prophets (*tere 'asar*). With the beginning of critical investigation into the text of the Targums since the nineteenth century, Paul de Lagarde published an edition of the Codex Reuchlinianus.<sup>10</sup> The text is unvocalised and based on the Palestinian/Tiberian tradition. But this was clearly not a critical edition as it was based on a single manuscript and thus did not contain any critical apparatus.

Paul de Lagarde's work was apparently the only available edition of the Targum to the Latter Prophets when Alexander Sperber began his ambitious project of publishing a multi-volume edition of the Targums to the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Hagiographia. However, Lagarde's edition of the Codex Reuchlinianus came under severe attack by Sperber himself who, as part of his doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Paul E. Kahle in 1924, verified Lagarde's printed edition against the original manuscript of the Codex at the Badische Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe. For example, Lagarde changed the usual Targumic transcription for the Tetragrammaton (יְיָ) into יהוה which eventually misled Rudolf Kittel in his *Biblia Hebraica* to suggest the

---

<sup>8</sup> By the term “Targumist”, I do not conceive of an unknown yet individual author behind the composition of Targums in general and TgHos in particular. It is used throughout this study as a generic term for referring to a group of people or institutions who played a major part in the development and consolidation of the Targumic tradition(s).

<sup>9</sup> For a list of such pre-critical texts of TgHos, see J. FERRER, *El Targum d'Osees*, p. 17-19.

<sup>10</sup> P. DE LAGARDE (ed.), *Prophetæ Chaldaice e fide codicis reuchliniani*, Osnabrück, O. Zeller, 1872. For TgHos 1-3, see p. 433-436. An important critique of this edition was published by W. BACHER, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum*, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 28 (1874), p. 1-72.

reading for certain Biblical passages since Ladarde's was the only Targum edition for the Prophets available at that time.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, Lagarde misinterpreted and thereby misprinted many Hebrew/Aramaic abbreviations found in the Codex which are typical of any Rabbinic composition.<sup>12</sup> Such a thorough examination of Lagarde's edition against the original manuscript of the Codex Reuchlinianus led Sperber to pronounce an outright rejection of the work as being without any merit:

Other (not consistent) deviations from the basic Codex Reuchlinianus ... are due to his (Lagarde's) apparent lack of even elementary knowledge of the Rabbinics, and this should have disqualified him outright from publishing the Targum, which after all is a Rabbinic text.<sup>13</sup>

Lagarde, in the prefatory material to his edition, made a brief comparative study of the text of the Codex Reuchlinianus with that of the First Rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg (1516/17) and on the basis of the differences he found with the Hebrew text, he suggested some emendations to the latter wrongly attributing them to a different *Vorlage*.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Lagarde's text contains far too many errors compared to Sperber even at the level of reproducing the consonantal text from the manuscript.<sup>15</sup>

### 1.2.2 Alexander Sperber (1962)

Alexander Sperber eventually published in four volumes Targum Onqelos to the Pentateuch, Targum Jonathan to the Former and Latter Prophets and Targums to the Hagiographia, the volume III (Latter Prophets) of which includes the sole published critical edition of TgHos used by students and specialists alike.<sup>16</sup> He used four manuscripts and three printed editions for the critical text of TgHos.<sup>17</sup> Not quite unlike Lagarde's method but without the latter's incompetence, Sperber, in his diplomatic edition of TgHos, chooses to reproduce the Targumic text as it appears in the MS BL Or. 2211 (siglum v). This basic text is followed by three critical apparatuses. The first one contains phonetic variants i.e. differences in the vocalisation or spelling, the

---

<sup>11</sup> A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB: *The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden, Brill, 1973, p. 18.

<sup>12</sup> SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB, p. 19.

<sup>13</sup> SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB, p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN, *The Targum of Samuel*, p. 5

<sup>15</sup> R.P. GORDON, *Sperber's Edition of the Targum to the Prophets: A Critique*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 64 (1974), p. 318 n. 15

<sup>16</sup> See n. 1

<sup>17</sup> Not all the manuscripts and printed editions listed by Sperber should be taken into account but only the ones listed above which he actually used for the text of TgHos in particular.

second apparatus records consonantal variants while the third one is reserved for the “testimonia” i.e. quotations from the *Arukh of Rabbi Nathan* and from the works of Rashi and David Qimḥi, carrying the sigla A, R, and K respectively. In the second apparatus containing consonantal variants, Sperber has used the following manuscripts and printed editions:

- London, British Library, Or. 1474, 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> Century CE (Targum interlinear with supralinear vocalisation), siglum *z*
- London, British Library, Or. 1470, 1484 CE (contains Haftaroḥ portions from the Prophets, in our case Hosea 2:1-22), siglum *5*
- London, Montefiore Endowment, H. 7, 1486 CE (Targumic text unvocalised with a “Tosefta Targum” in the form of a prologue to TgHos), siglum *c*
- Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Codex Reuchlinianus, 1105 CE (Targumic text unvocalised with lengthy marginal readings but NOT in case of TgHos 1-3), siglum *f*
- First Biblia Rabbinica, Venezia, Daniel Bomberg, 1515/17, siglum *b*
- Second Biblia Rabbinica, Venezia, Daniel Bomberg, 1524/25, siglum *g*
- Biblia Polyglotta, Antwerpen, Christophe Plantin, 1569/73, siglum *o*

One of the earliest reviews of Sperber’s edition was published by Malachi Martin which was mainly concerned with the aspects of manuscript tradition and vocalisation.<sup>18</sup> Soon after, there were two consecutive reviews by Robert P. Gordon and Alejandro Díez-Macho.<sup>19</sup> Although the third volume of *The Bible in Aramaic* of Sperber containing the text of the Targum to the Latter Prophets including TgHos was published in 1962, he had already finished working on them and they were ready for publication by 1934 when Sperber left for the United States.<sup>20</sup> Díez-Macho’s remarks, as we shall discover, are not without basis when he attributes the many imperfections

---

<sup>18</sup> M. MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition and Targum*, in R. DE LANGHE (ed.), *Le Psautier: ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son influence*, Louvain, Publications universitaires, 1962, p. 425-451.

<sup>19</sup> These are respectively: R.P. GORDON, *Sperber’s Edition of the Targum to the Prophets: A Critique*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 64 (1974), p. 314-321; and A. DíEZ-MACHO, *Review of A. SPERBER, The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB, Leiden, Brill, 1973, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 6/1 (1975), p. 217-236.

<sup>20</sup> DíEZ-MACHO, *Review*, p. 217.

of Sperber's edition to the enthusiasm and curiosity of the latter's career as a young student rather to the shortcomings of a long and systematic academic project:

[les volumes de la Bible en Araméen] sont pour la plupart le fruit de la jeunesse de l'auteur... Même les testimonia ou citations du Targum, édités dans un apparat à part dans le 3<sup>e</sup>. vol. de sa Bible en Araméen, avaient été rassemblés dans ses cahiers de sa jeunesse, bien que leur inclusion dans l'apparat critique fut un travail postérieur. L'œuvre de SPERBER sur le targum est fondamentalement une œuvre de jeunesse ... Cela explique que tant de choses publiées par SPERBER dans le domaine targumique, soient, le jour de leur parution, déjà dépassées.<sup>21</sup>

Indeed, Sperber himself came to realise the outdated nature of his work when on a visit to Barcelona at the request of Díez-Macho, the latter showed him Targum manuscripts with genuine Babylonian pointing found at the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York where Sperber himself had been a professor.<sup>22</sup> But be it as a result of an uncritical enthusiasm of his youth or the lack of knowledge on the current state of research, Sperber's edition of the Targum to the Prophets, in spite of its obvious merits, has certain highly objectionable features which call for new critical editions for each Targumic book of individual prophets based on a particular manuscript tradition and on recent studies and updated study-tools available after almost half a century since the publication of Sperber's *The Bible in Aramaic* volumes.

Sperber's edition has come under severe criticism as a result of his choice of manuscripts, aspects of vocalisation and other imperfections. Due to the "diplomatic" nature of his text, the arrangement of the text of TgHos 1-3 is also problematic in his edition. Before I justify my choice of manuscripts for the text presented here and the way it is presented, we must first turn to the major critical opinions concerning Sperber's edition of the Targum to the Prophets some of which are directly applicable to the specific sections of TgHos with which we are dealing here.

#### *a) Manuscript Tradition(s) and System(s) of Vocalisation*

The main objection raised against Sperber's edition is it being a *mixtum compositum*.<sup>23</sup> Sperber drew his text not only from rather arbitrarily chosen manuscripts and printed

---

<sup>21</sup> DíEZ-MACHO, *Review*, p. 217.

<sup>22</sup> DíEZ-MACHO, *Review*, p. 223.

<sup>23</sup> MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition*, p. 450.

editions, but he attempted to establish an authentic Babylonian text-tradition on the basis of Yemenite manuscripts which themselves were not representatives of genuine Yemenite tradition. Both the Babylonian and the Yemenite traditions used to employ supralinear vowel signs as opposed to the sublinear vowel signs of Tiberian/Palestinian tradition which finally overtook the place of prominence among all the Hebraic manuscript traditions. In this study, for avoiding any technical discrepancy, I shall mostly be using the terms ‘supralinear’ and ‘sublinear’ except when referring to the different authorial opinions and the problems of Sperber’s edition. The supralinear vowel signs are said to be much older than its sublinear counterpart and virtually nothing was clearly known about it within the academic circles until the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.<sup>24</sup> The vocalisation system of the Babylonian supralinear tradition grew from a very simple system and then gradually developed into a complex one after being adapted by Yemenite scribes. The growing hegemony of the Tiberian sublinear system which strongly influenced later Yemenite scribes has scarcely left us with manuscripts showing genuine and adulterated picture of the old Babylonian tradition. The following table shows the supralinear system in its simplest type with the corresponding sublinear system in brackets:<sup>25</sup>

Qamets (ֿ)	ֿ
Pataḥ and Seghol (ֿ ֿ ֿ)	ֿ
Tsere (ֿ)	ֿ
Ḥireq (ֿ)	ֿ
Ḥolem (ֿ)	ֿ
Shureq (ֿ)	ֿ
Vocal sh <sup>e</sup> wa including Ḥateph (ֿ ֿ)	ֿ

Paul E. Kahle’s lengthy quest for Biblical manuscripts with supralinear punctuation for preparing his *Biblia Hebraica* led him to believe that authentic Babylonian tradition

<sup>24</sup> MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition*, p. 427.

<sup>25</sup> The table has been adapted from W. STEVENSON, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962, 2nd ed., p. 12.

was preserved particularly in the Targums.<sup>26</sup> The difference between the Babylonian and the Yemenite traditions – both employing supralinear vocalisation – according to Kahle, arises from the fact that the Babylonian punctuation was later revised and corrected by the scribes of the Yemenite tradition in order to bring it more in line with the Tiberian system.<sup>27</sup> But this process of appropriation developed gradually which is the reason why a Targumic manuscript copied at an earlier date may have more chances of being closer to the older tradition. According to Kahle, older Yemenite manuscripts have more possibilities to contain some remnants of the older Babylonian tradition, particularly in portions containing the Targum.<sup>28</sup> Yemenite Biblical manuscripts date roughly from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. The 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Century manuscripts that Díez-Macho discovered in the library of the Jewish Theological Library in New York and some of which he showed to Sperber are said to reproduce the old Babylonian tradition for the Biblical as well as for the Targumic text and in Kahle’s opinion, such older manuscripts are representatives of the fact that the development of the characteristically Yemenite punctuation in conformity with the Tiberian punctuation was affected at a later stage.<sup>29</sup>

However, the basic text that Sperber has chosen for his edition of TgHos, as indicated above, is the MS BL Or. 2211 which dates only from late fifteenth century (1475 AD). That is why when Sperber claims in the final volume of *The Bible in Aramaic* that “The MSS. Which I have chosen as basic MSS are representative of the Yemenite vocalisation in its older form (for the prophets)”, he is a bit far from the reality. According to Martin, the “take-over” of the Yemenite tradition by the Tiberian influence was so thorough that it is far from possible to come across signs of the older Babylonian tradition in a manuscript as “young” as the MS Or. 2211.<sup>30</sup> Díez-Macho thus drives the point home when he says that Sperber was aware of this complex set of

---

<sup>26</sup> P. KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1959, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 64.

<sup>27</sup> KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 60.

<sup>28</sup> KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 64.

<sup>29</sup> KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 64. Kahle believes that the Babylonian Jewish scribes were influenced by the vowel-systems of the East Syrians as they lived in the same geographical area. He makes reference to R. DUVAL, *Traité de grammaire syriaque*, Paris, Vieweg, 1881, p. 61-69. Díez-Macho provides short descriptions of the manuscripts in his article: A. DÍEZ-MACHO, *Importants manuscrits hébreux et araméens aux États Unis*, in *VT Supplement*, IV (1957), p. 27-46.

<sup>30</sup> MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition*, p. 448.

criteria but applied them quite wrongly while choosing the MS Or. 2211 in search of an authentic Babylonian text. Moreover, as we shall see below, Sperber even contradicts himself while justifying his choice of manuscripts.

*b) Confusing 'Tradition' with 'Vocalisation'*

On the basis of the discussion in the preceding section, one should be able to point out Sperber's fallacy when one looks into the list of manuscripts and printed editions in his edition of the Targum to the 'Latter' prophets. He designates the manuscripts with the sigla *v* and *z* (see 1.2.2) with the sub-heading "Manuscripts with Babylonian vocalisation". The manuscripts are Babylonian as far as they are vocalised with the "supralinear" vowel-signs but they can never be said to belong to the Babylonian text tradition only by virtue of their supralinear vocalisation! The reader should now understand why towards the beginning of this chapter, I made the choice of using the terms "supralinear" and "sublinear" rather than "Babylonian/Yemenite" or "Tiberian" while categorising the vowel-signs.<sup>31</sup>

Two valid arguments can be provided here in support of the above opinion. First, according to the Babylonian system, the placing of the supralinear vowel-signs in Sperber's edition is incorrect. In the Babylonian system, according to Martin, the supralinear vowel-signs are placed "*over the space* in front of the letter with which they are to be pronounced."<sup>32</sup> This is much like the position of the furtive pataḥ in the Tiberian tradition except that it is placed *under* the space between two letters. In the MS Or. 2211 serving as the base-text for TgHos, which Sperber claims to be modelled on the Babylonian tradition, the supralinear vowel-signs are spelled *right on top* of the letters concerned. This is a clear sign that the said manuscript, claimed as the bearer of

---

<sup>31</sup> After coming to such an inference by myself, I was happy to find my views endorsed by Martin. See MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition*, p. 448-449. Martin continues in the same vein: "We come back again to a basic distinction mentioned previously, between *tradition* and *the vowel-signs of that tradition*. Hence, in a strictly scientific language we cannot say that Sperber has edited a Babylonian Targum of Onkelos or Jonathan. All the manuscripts used by the author are either thoroughly Yemenite or originally Babylonian texts which have been rather thoroughly worked over by a Yemenite hand and, therefore, exhibit Yemenite characteristics with their Tiberian colouring." p. 449.

<sup>32</sup> Martin here draws upon the explanations given by Sa'adya Ga'on who is said to have been aware of the systems prevalent both in Babylonia and Tiberias in his time. MARTIN, *The Babylonian Tradition*, p. 449 n. 98

the Babylonian tradition, had already come under the strong influence of Tiberian system of vocalisation.

Secondly, and this is where Sperber contradicts himself, in the brief section on the vocalisation of the Targumic texts, Sperber enunciates the rule that the Yemenite vocalisation in its “older” form has, for the imperfect 1<sup>st</sup> person singular form, the prefix א vocalized as א but as א or א in its “younger” form. To cite just one example, the MS Or. 2211 has the spelling/vocalisation (in its sublinear equivalent) אַשְׁבוֹק [I shall forgive] whereas, according to the older Yemenite tradition which was closer to the Babylonian system, one would expect the form אַשְׁבוֹק or even אַשְׁבוֹק.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, this is the form that one comes across in the MS Montefiore H. 7 which contains the unvocalised form אִשְׁבוֹק. Therefore Sperber’s designation of his basic text/manuscript as “Babylonian” is rather erroneous.

### c) Transcription of the Divine Name

If Lagarde’s transcription of the divine name was an issue for Sperber to criticise him, then Sperber himself cannot escape criticism on the same ground since his transcription of the divine name is not entirely correct. In the Targum manuscripts in general, there are occurrences of the ubiquitous triple-yod (יִי) standing for the Tetragrammaton. The peculiarity of the MS Or. 2211 is that in it the three yods are engulfed by a large qamets which gives rise to an illusory looking shape very nearly like יִי and hence the error committed by Sperber. Recent studies on the various Targums using Sperber’s edition continue to reproduce this erroneous form for the *nomina sacra*.

There are still some important aspects of Sperber’s edition which deserve criticism but these will be discussed in the following section (under 1.3) in conjunction with the introduction to the critical text presented here since these are some of the shortcomings of Sperber’s text, along with the ones analysed above, that the present study tries to address and to some extent resolve.

---

<sup>33</sup> The form with א is also attested in the paradigm charts in G. DALMAN, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960 (1905), p 402.

### 1.2.3 Joan Ferrer i Costa (1989)

Joan Ferrer's unpublished doctoral dissertation happens to be the only post-Sperber critical edition of TgHos based on, as he puts it, on the Yemenite tradition.<sup>34</sup> Preceded by a short introduction, each page of the thesis contains the Aramaic text of a single verse of TgHos and a critical apparatus with its translation into Catalan on the facing page. In my opinion, one major problem of the edition lies in that it chooses the MS BL Or. 1474 as its basic text. The manuscript dates from 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> Century and based on the preceding discussion, it is safe to presume that the Targumic text in it shows a more advanced stage of Tiberian influence which the author attests in his following remarks:

El TgOs del ms. Or. 1474 [sic] no ha estat mai editat fins ara i té un text que és un model excellent de la tradició de l'arameu targúmic de les comunitats iemenites, es un model de llengua coherent que conforma una tradició lingüística que ha de ser reivindicada dins del món de la filologia aramea perquè testimonia no sols romanalles de l'antiga tradició babilònica, sinó perquè, per elle mateixa, mostra l'aplicació intelligent de les lleis de la gramàtica tiberienca realitzada per escribes que tenien un coneixement vivent de la llengua aramea des Tgs, contrariament a l'artificiositat gramatical i fonològica que palesa la vocalització del Tgs del mss. medievals europeus -- els anomenats mss. occidentals – o les mateixes edicions de les Bíblies Rabíniques, realitzats per copistes que no tenien un coneixement prou sistemàtic de la gramàtica aramea.<sup>35</sup>

But this is a rather general statement which might prove true for many other Targum manuscripts including the MS Or. 2211 to the extent that its scribes were acquainted with the Aramaic language in its “living” state. The MS Or. 1474 as an “excellent model” of the Yemenite tradition, as Ferrer claims, still shows identical problems of vocalisation as discussed in the section 1.2.2b. However, compared to the MS Or. 2211, there are less of serious grammatical and copying errors. Nevertheless, the critical edition of TgHos of Ferrer is already a development on Sperber and presents us with a better state of affairs for two major reasons: First, it tries to present the critical text of TgHos from a particular textual tradition namely Yemenite, and secondly, it includes seven more manuscripts, of which four are fragmentary containing only some parts of TgHos, in addition to those used by Sperber. But as far as the text of TgHos 1-3

---

<sup>34</sup> See n. 2 and 3 for bibliographical reference.

<sup>35</sup> FERRER, *El Targum d'Osees*, p. 23.

is concerned, Ferrer's edition is still not completely free of errors and there is a problem in the arrangement of the text to the extent the significance of the Tosefta Targum is concerned.

### 1.3 The Text Presented in This Study

#### 1.3.1 The Problem(s)

Despite the innumerable faults in Sperber's edition in terms of his choice of manuscripts, arrangement of the text, problems of vocalisation, spelling errors and above all his fallacious conviction of having reached close to an *Urtext* of the Targums, the judgment of D. Barthélemy concerning Sperber's text has been rather harsh but not unreasonable:

C'est à propos du Targum que le défaut d'une véritable édition critique se fait le plus lourdement sentir. L'édition qu'en a donné Sperber ne mérite en effet guère ce titre. La tradition textuelle du Targum est certes trop complexe pour qu'on puisse *reproduire le texte d'un ms yéménite, parfois mal choisi*, en prétendant y trouver "le Targum".<sup>36</sup>

Largely due to the penury of knowledge in the matter of all the existing and known Targum manuscripts, it is difficult to come up with a definitive critical edition for the text of TgHos. But what can still be done is to work towards a betterment of the existing text editions by tallying them with the original manuscripts in order to make them error-free to a greater extent. The above quotation from Barthélemy makes apparent the need for an "eclectic" edition for a Targumic text given the paucity of manuscripts and the imperfections embedded in each of them.

I therefore propose an eclectic text of TgHos 1-3 in the first part of this present study with two primary objectives:

- to tally the text of Sperber against the MS Or. 2211 to find out printing errors (if any)
- to propose a different arrangement of the text of the main body of the Targum with the Tosefta Targum on the basis of the MS Montefiore H. 7 in which the Tosefta Targum is found.

---

<sup>36</sup> D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, v. 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les Douze Prophètes* (Orbis Biblicus Orientalis 50/3), Göttingen, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, p. ccix.

- to correct the text of Sperber and to find out more textual variants (if any) which have been left out in Sperber’s edition on the basis of these two manuscripts
- to distinguish between variants arising from spelling differences and those including additions, omissions or different words affecting the meaning.

### 1.3.2 Errors in Sperber’s Edition

According to Gordon, one of the chief values of Sperber’s edition is considered to be its success in reproducing the consonantal text of the Targum.<sup>37</sup> J.B. van Zijl, however, had already published two successive lists of “errata” for Sperber’s edition of the Targum of Isaiah in which she came across 121 printing errors (!) in that single Targumic book which led her “distrust the reliability of the edition as a whole.”<sup>38</sup> However, Gordon, upon acknowledging the merit of Sperber’s effort, goes on to add that an “attempt to measure the accuracy with which Sperber made his collation would be a major undertaking, and yet it would appear to be necessary.”<sup>39</sup>

The table below charts the copying errors found in the basic text of TgHos 1-3 in Sperber’s edition when tallied against the MS Or. 2211 – there are four of them just across three chapters – and two grammatical errors comprising of incorrect orthography for the imperative plural of אמר found in the same manuscript which Sperber may have been compelled not to correct for the reason of not tampering with the “diplomatic” nature of his text (?):

Tosefta Tg line 17	ברין	read: בריך
TgHos 1:4	דקטילגון	read: וקטילגון
----- 2:3	אמרו	read: אימרו
----- 2:4	ואמרו	read: ואימרו
----- 2:21	ואקיימנכון	read: ואקיימנכון
----- 2:24	לגלות	read: לגלות

<sup>37</sup> GORDON, *Sperber’s Targum*, p. 318.

<sup>38</sup> J.B. VAN ZIJL, *A Second List of Errata in Sperber’s Edition of Targum Isaiah*, in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem*, 7 (1968-69), p. 133. The other (former) article containing the first list of errors is J.B. VAN ZIJL, *Errata in Sperber’s Edition of Targum Isaiah*, in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem*, 4 (1965), p. 189-191. I was led to check the references on the basis of Gordon’s article: GORDON, *Sperber’s Targum*, p. 315-316.

<sup>39</sup> GORDON, *Sperber’s Targum*, p. 319.

In addition to these printing errors, there are variant readings in the MS Montefiore H. 7 which have not been recorded by Sperber. The reader is invited to compare the list of orthographical variants and the critical apparatus presented in this study with the apparatuses of Sperber's edition to discover the variant readings left unrecorded. It is not unsafe to assume that the total number of similar errors would be much greater if the remaining eleven chapters of TgHos are taken into account. This clearly justifies my project of checking Sperber's text of with the two most important manuscripts that he used for his edition of TgHos.<sup>40</sup> The other weak points of Sperber's text of TgHos shall be seen in the course of the succeeding sections.

### 1.3.3 Manuscripts: Description and Significance<sup>41</sup>

*v* London, British Library, MS Or. 2211, AD 1475, f. 262-264<sup>42</sup>

[photographic reproduction on the next page]

This manuscript has been described by G. Margoliouth and it contains the "Latter" Prophets according to TJ and an Arabic translation of Isaiah by Sa'adia ben Joseph.<sup>43</sup> The date of copying is known from a lengthy colophon on f. 320a that mentions a certain Benayah ben Se'adyah ben Zeharyah ben Marga as the scribe and Abraham ben Yosef ben Sa'id ben Abraham as the patron and San'a as the place of copying.<sup>44</sup> There are two initial pages with intricate medallions and inscriptions with the patron's name conforming to Islamic tradition along with elaborate Chinese floral motifs.<sup>45</sup>

The text of the Targum runs interlinear to the Hebrew text of Hosea presented in the form of two parallel columns each containing 24 lines. The Hebrew and Aramaic texts are vocalised with sublinear and supralinear vowel signs respectively, and are separated from each other with a colon (:). The Masora Magna runs along the bottom of each page while the Masora Parva is placed between two columns. The author

---

<sup>40</sup> In any case, as I have already tried to show by citing major critical opinions, this should constitute one of the first approaches for anyone taking up a text-critical study of any individual Prophetic Targum.

<sup>41</sup> "Significance" of the manuscripts are very important with respect to the present study because it explains the precise reasons for including them for proposing the critical text of TgHos 1-3 here.

<sup>42</sup> For convenience, I have kept the sigla of Sperber unchanged: *v* for the MS Or. 2211 and *c* for the MS Montefiore H. 7.

<sup>43</sup> G. MARGOLIOUTH, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, v. 1, London, The British Museum, 1965, p. 102-103.

<sup>44</sup> I. TAHAN, *Hebrew Manuscripts: The Power of Script and Image*, London, The British Library, 2007, p. 28-29.

<sup>45</sup> These are reproduced in colour in TAHAN, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, p. 28-29.

informs us that the manuscript was ordered to be written for use in the synagogue.<sup>46</sup> This is evident in the text of TgHos itself as the beginning of Hos 2:1 is marked with the words אפטר דבמדבר סיני indicating the beginning of the first *Haftara* to the Book of Numbers (Hos 2:1-22). The end of the *Haftara* portion, between vv. 21-22, is marked with a large ornamental ס.

*Significance:* The primary significance of choosing MS v has already been explained in the course of the discussion above (see especially 1.3.1 and 1.3.2). The table above listing the errors proves the efficiency of checking Sperber's text of TgHos 1-3 against MS v. As an important additional point, I would like to draw the reader's attention to the comments of Gordon concerning the "indistinguishable" nature of the letters כ and כּ in v which prompted Sperber to miscopy some words. I should point out that, in spite of the manuscripts' large Yemenite characters, Sperber has confused between the letters ג and נ (2:24), and also ד and ו (2:21).<sup>47</sup>

*c London, Montefiore Endowment, MS H. 7, 1486 CE, f. 220v-222v*

[photographic reproduction on the next page]

This manuscript contributes to one of the most significant dimensions of the present study since a part of its contents, namely the Tosefta Targum to Hosea, has never been subject to a critical study and analysis.<sup>48</sup> It is currently part of the Montefiore Endowment and housed at the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue at the Lauderdale Road in London. There was an initial difficulty in tracing this manuscript as it was either partially or wrongly cited in some recent works or with its old accession number and location (*London, Jews' College, MS p. 116*) used by Sperber which actually never existed. The old accession number was "H. 116" and not "p. 116" which has become rather contagious due to Sperber's wrong citation.<sup>49</sup> In fact, as I am led to discover

---

<sup>46</sup> TAHAN, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, p. 29.

<sup>47</sup> It is rather perplexing to see that Sperber's reading דקטילונן in 2:21 does NOT exist in either v or c. One is given to wondering as to the provenance of such a reading.

<sup>48</sup> I hereby acknowledge my immense gratitude to Miss Sally Style, the present librarian of the Montefiore Endowment, London who most kindly sent me colour photocopies of the folios containing the text of TgHos.

<sup>49</sup> H. HIRSCHFELD, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts of the Montefiore Library*, London, McMillan, 1904, p. 2. In a recent work, the authors quote the older number "H. 116" citing it as the "current" accession number, probably as a result of having consulted this old catalogue of Hirschfeld without having any first-hand access to the manuscript itself. HOUTMAN and SYSLING, *Alternative Targum Traditions*, p. 42.

with the assistance of the present librarian of the Montefiore Endowment and from their old catalogue, its accession number had already been changed from “p. 116” to “7” by the time Sperber used it during the early decades of the last century!<sup>50</sup> According to the information provided to me by Sally Style, “p. 116” was the original “Halberstam” number of the shelf on which it was placed at the Ramsgate College library (the then “Jews’ College”) in London. It was originally in the possession of Samuel David Luzzatto, the Italian Jewish scholar and poet and is believed to have reached London through the Rabbi Solomon Halberstam whose name it previously bore. Sperber quotes from an article by Luzzatto which gives some interesting information and was the first to mention the manuscript:

Zu dem Thargum der Propheten führt Kimchi in seinem Commentare zuweilen noch ein Zusatzthargum an unter dem Namen של תוספתא ... Noch einige solche Zusätze, welche von Kimchi nicht erwähnt sind, fand ich in einem Thargum, das ich vor Kurzem aus Afrika erhielt. Das Mspt. ist aus Papier in Kleinfolio geschrieben in Afrika 1482 (beendigt 1 Schebat 5247), enthält das Thargum zu den Propheten und zu den Psalmen, Hiob und Sprüchen ... Der Rand enthält ausser eingestreuten mit א״א bezeichneten Varianten die genannten Zusätze mit der Bezeichnung תוספתא, auch תוס דארע דישראל.<sup>51</sup>

Some of the above information provided by Luzzatto comes from the manuscript itself including that it was written for a certain “David ben Nissim, the physician, ben Vivas (ביבש)”<sup>52</sup>. The “Afrika” mentioned by Luzzatto must be parts of Egypt or its vicinity in Northern Africa which has been the provenance of many important ancient Hebrew/Aramaic manuscripts. The manuscript’s own claim to be originating from the “Land of Israel” is rather fallacious as it displays clear linguistic characteristics of Eastern (Babylonian) Aramaic and ideas developed in later Talmudic literature. Indeed, such designations with a link to a Palestinian origin are not uncommon for Tosefta Targums. For a translation and detailed analysis of its contents on TgHos, see the section 2.2 in the next chapter.

*Contents and Significance:* This is the oldest of the very few manuscripts containing the Tosefta Targum of Hosea which precedes the official text Targum “Jonathan” to Hosea

<sup>50</sup> HIRSCHFELD, *Descriptive Catalogue*, p. 2.

<sup>51</sup> S.D. LUZZATTO, *Nachträgliches über die Thargumim*, in A. GEIGER (ed.), *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, 5 (1844), p. 131. Quoted in SPERBER, IVB, p. 139.

<sup>52</sup> Information provided by Sally Style.

on f. 220v. The script is of large Oriental square character with some calligraphic peculiarities: it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish between the letters ט and ו, ט and ש, and even ו and נ as the latter set of characters are written in a round shape. The Tetragrammaton is represented by the usual יי. Each page contains thirty lines of a running Targumic text in which the beginning of a new verse is indicated by quoting the first word of the corresponding Hebrew text (*lemma*) in large characters with three dots on top of the Hebrew word in a triangular shape. The beginning of the Tosefta Targum marked with the word תוספתא on the right margin which indicates that the text springs from a 'Tosefta' (additional) Targum source. It is followed by the main Targumic text of Hosea which is marked with the name הושע on the left margin in accordance with the norm followed throughout the manuscript.

There are plenty of valid and important arguments that can be cited in favour of choosing this manuscript. Among all the manuscripts used by Sperber for his edition of TgHos, the Codex Reuchlinianus (see 1.2.1) and the present manuscript *c* are of unique importance. As the editors of the English translation of the Targum of the Twelve Minor Prophets point out:

More interest attached to the two manuscripts listed by Sperber as having "Tiberian (or no) Vocalization" (i.e. the Codex Reuchlinianus and *c*) ... Both texts are characterized by a higher incidence of significant variants, sometimes contracting midrashic elements within a brief span, than are found in the other Sperber texts. *In this respect the unique readings of Ms c would repay special study scarcely less than those of Reuchlinianus.*<sup>53</sup> [italis mine]

In the case of TgHos 1-3, such "midrashic" elements are to be found in MS *c*, and not in the Codex Reuchlinianus which makes its choice for the present study all the more understandable.

The second argument comes from D. Barthélemy who, with his editorial team for the multivolume textual commentary on the Old Testament, attempted to verify all the Sperber manuscripts for the Targums but could not have access, for some unspecified reason, to *c*:

---

<sup>53</sup> K.J. CATHCART and R.P. GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 14), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1989, p. 19.

On comprendra donc que, dans cette situation déplorable de l'édition du Targum de Jonathan, nous ne nous sommes pas limités à reproduire le texte édité par Sperber. Nous avons contrôlé presque tous les témoins qu'il cite (*le ms Montefiore étant le seul de ces témoins auquel nous n'avons pas eu un accès direct*).<sup>54</sup> [italics mine]

One is not certain if the many wrong citations of MS c in Sperber and other works were partly the reasons for not having had a direct access to it. However, the present study in this respect may attempt to complement the gap through a detailed study of the text and the contents of c.

Both the arguments show that MS c deserves a critical attention in its own right. Moreover, it allows locating additional textual variants which were left unrecorded by Sperber. The existence of a parallel Targum with a theology/interpretation very different from that of TJ and quite a few significant variant readings, MS c stands for the "plurality" of text and interpretation even when it comes to the Prophetic Targums.

#### 1.3.4 Arrangement of the Text

It has already been pointed out that the text of TgHos 1-3 presented here is "eclectic" in nature. The overall shape differs from Sperber as I have placed the Tosefta Targum as the "prologue" to the Targum Jonathan as it appears in MS c. Sperber's citation of it rather as a textual variant is both incorrect and not conducive to a proper understanding of the existing multiplicity. The marginal readings both inside and outside the main body of the text have been included and put within brackets some of which are significant for understanding the functions and/or the *Sitz im Leben* of certain pericopes.

The main critical apparatus below the text contains only those variants that affect the semantics and also additions and omissions. All orthographical variants have been placed in the following section (1.3.5) divided into ten sub-categories.

---

<sup>54</sup> BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, v. 3, p. ccix.

### 1.3.5 List of Orthographical and Other Recurring Variants in MS c with respect to MS v

Since we have chosen to reproduce the text of MS v as the basic text in this study without “normalising” its word spellings, the following list attempts to group different categories of variants (mostly orthographical) found in *c* which do not give rise to any difference in the meaning. Variants of the latter categories are placed in the critical apparatus following the basic text. Such an arrangement has the added advantage of not crowding the critical apparatus with all categories of variants of varied significance.<sup>55</sup>

One marked peculiarity of MS c is that it contains three types of *matres lectionis* in a consistent manner since it carries an unvocalised text: ך, ך, and א. In addition, there are also other types of orthographical variants some which are grouped together under the sub-heading “Unclassified/Miscellaneous” since they are too irregular and non-recurring to be classed under a particular category. Throughout the following list, the variant on the left side of the sign “]” belongs to MS c whereas the one on the right to MS v. But there are certain variants marked with the sign “□” in which cases the *mater lectionis* is to be found in MS v instead of in MS c. The references within the brackets after each set of variants indicate the verse in TgHos in the text presented in the section 1.4 here.

#### a) Presence/Absence of ך as mater lectionis<sup>56</sup>

(א) פיתגמ [פיתגמ(א) (1:1; 1:2; 1:9)

עם [עם (1:1; 2:9; 2:20 bis)

איתנבי [אתנבי (1:2; 1:3; 3:1)

אינון [אנון (1:2; 1:4; 1:9; 2:6; 2:23; 2:24; 3:1)

דיירי [דירי (1:2)

למיטעי [למטעי (1:4)

---

<sup>55</sup> I have drawn inspiration from J.-C. Haelewyck’s critical edition of Gregory of Nazianzus’ Oration XL for the idea of classifying orthographical and related variants separately from the main critical apparatus: J.-C. HAELEWYCK (ed.), *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera: Versio Syriaca I: Oratio XL* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca, 49; Corpus Nazianzenum, 14), Turnhout-Leuven, Brepols, 2001, p. xxv-xxxviii.

<sup>56</sup> There is only one case which is not classed here: כיןֹבכיו and כןֹבכן. This is because of its inconsistency as both the with- and without-*yod* types keep occurring in either of the manuscripts.

(עידן א) [עידן א] (1:5; 2:11; 2:18; 2:20; 2:23)

(1:6) [משבק] מישבק

(1:7) [ובפרישין] ובפרשין

(2:1) [מתמני] מיתמני

(2:1) [ואתאמר] ואיתאמר

(2:4; 2:15; 3:3) [כנשתא] כנישתא

(2:4) [מקביל] מיקבל

(2:4) [מקביל] מיקביל

(2:5) [דלמא] דילמא

(2:5) [אתקרבת] איתקרבת

(2:5) [מנה] מינה

(2:7) [שקרא] שיקרא

(2:7) [ומשתי] ומישתי

(2:8) [מקלקיל] מקלקיל

(2:8) [דסיגין] דסיגין

(2:9) [ותרדוף] ותירדוף

(2:9) [ותבעי] ותיבעי

(2:9) [רבוני] ריבוני

(2:10; 2:11; 2:24) [עבורא] עיבורא

(2:11) [למלט] למילט

(2:12) [רחמהא] רחימהא

(2:12) [אנש] אינש

(2:12) [ישיזבנה] ישיזבינה

(2:15) [מרגליתהא] מרגלתהא

(2:15) [למפלח] למיפלח

(2:16) [משעביד] משעבד

ניסין [2:16)  
ליבה [2:16)  
ותתנהון [ותיתנהון (2:18)  
ותפלחון [ותיפלחון (2:18)  
קים [2:20)  
רחשא [2:20)  
למידחל [2:22)  
ותדעון [2:22)  
משחא [2:24)  
אתתא [3:1)  
למפטרה [3:1)  
ישתביק [3:1)  
תקליא [3:1)  
דתיגלון [3:3)  
ותתנקון [ותיתנקון (3:3)  
דעבד [3:4)

*b) Presence/Absence of  $\omega$  as mater lectionis*

בימי [1:1)  
עזיה [1:1)  
(ל)טעותא [1:4; 2:9; 2:10; 2:15 bis; 2:18; 3:3)  
בסוסון [1:7)  
פלחני [2:4; 2:5; 2:18)  
טעותהא [2:4)  
(ד)הות [2:7; 2:15 bis)  
בכתליא [2:8)  
גופנהא [2:14)

בקשתא [בקשתא] (2:21)

לגלות [לגלות] (2:24)

*c) Presence/Absence of א as mater lectionis*

דפלוחו [דפלוחו] (1:4)

זכאי [זכאי] (1:4)

גופנה [גופנה] גפנאהא

ותינה [ותינה] ותינהא

נבייא [נבייא] (2:16)

*d) Presence/Absence of ו as a Coordinating Conjunction*

ישתביק [ישתביק] (1:3)

ואם [ואם] (1:3)

ואף [ואף] (2:17)

ובחסדי [ובחסדי] (2:21)

וחמרא [וחמרא] (2:24)

ולא [ולא] (3:3)

*e) Interchangeable ש and ס*

סערין [סערין] (3:2)

*f) Singular/Plural*

עגליא [עגליא] (1:4)

כנושהון [כנושהון] (2:2)

כסותי [כסות] (2:7)

מישחי [מישחי] (2:7)

נבייא [נבייא] (3:3)

*g) Hebraisms: Hebraic Forms in Aramaic*

בר [בר] (1:1)

ותיכילנון] ותוכלינון (2:14)

*h) Early/Late "Yemenite" Spellings for the Imperfect 1<sup>st</sup> Person Singular*

איבטיל] אבטיל (1:4; 2:13; 2:20)

איתבר] אתבר (1:5)

אישובק] אשבוק (1:6)

אירחים] ארחים (1:7; 2:3; 2:6; 2:25)

איפרוקינון] אפרוקינון (1:7)

אשתכחו] אשתכחו (1:8)

איסליק] אסליק (2:5)

אישוינה] אשויהנה (2:5)

איהך] אהך (2:7; 2:9)

איפסיק] אפסיק (2:8)

איתוב] אתוב (2:9)

איגלי] אגלי (2:12)

אישוינון] אשויהנון (2:14)

איעביד] אעביד (2:16)

אימליל] אמליל (2:16)

אימני] אמני (2:17)

איגזר] אגזר (2:20)

אקי(י)מנכון] איקי(י)מכון (2:21 bis; 2:22; 2:25)

איקביל] אקביל (2:23)

איפקיד] אפקיד (2:23)

*i) Errors and/or scriptio defectiva*

מדבית] מבית (2:2)

יספקון] יסוףון (2:24)

*j) Unclassified/Miscellaneous*

שרית [שריות] (1:2)

למחטיא [למחטי] (1:2)

וייחול [ויחול] (2:5)

בבוצרתא [בביצורתא] (2:5)

חידוה [חדותא] (2:13)

ייקר [יקר] (2:14)

1.3.6 Sigla and Signs in the Critical Text

[ ] marginal readings

-- separating two variants

+ addition

*omit.* omission (*omittit*)

**s** Sperber's edition (signifies miscopying by Sperber/printing error)

The variants containing no MS siglum after them belong to MS c. Otherwise they are always specified with the siglum **v** or **s**.

## 1.4 Critical Text of Targum Hosea 1-3

[תוספתא]

אמיר על ידי הושע נבייא הוא הושע נבייא דאיתנבי בריש ארבע נביין הושע וישעיה עמוס ומיכה שריות פיתגמא דיי בהושע ואמר יי להושע איזיל איתנבי נבואה על יתבי קרתא טעיתא דאינון מוסיפין למיחטי ארי מיטעא דיירי ארעא מבתר פולחנא דיי מתיב הושע ואמר קדמוהי דקודשא בריך הוא רבון עלמא יי אם חטן ישראל קדמך חליפנון באומא אחריתי בכך אמר קודשא בריך הוא עלוהי דהושע הוה ליה למילף מן משה רביה דצלי על ישראל ובעא רחמין עליהון ואמר וכען אם שבקת לחוביהון ואם לא מחיני כען מספרך דכתבת ולא מסתיה דלא בעי רחמין קדמי אלא אמר חליפנון באומא אחריתי כען אימר ליה דיסב איתתא זניתא ותליד ליה בנין ואימר ליה דיחליף יתה וידע אידא שיגושיא בליביה דאינש דמחלף איתתיה ובנוהי בכך אמר ליה קודשא בריך הוא להושע איזיל סב לך איתתא זניתא ותליד לך וולדין דזנו ואזל ונסיב ית גמר בת דבלים גומר דכולי עלמא זיני וגמרי בה דבלים דתבעי לה אינשי כמא דתבעי האי דבילתא ועדיאת וילידת ליה תרין בנין וברת ואמר ליה איזיל חליף הדא איתתא זניתא ובנהא דהיא זניתא ובנהא דזנו מתיב ואמר קדמוהי בבעו מינך ריבון עלמא הלא מן קדמך איתגזר עלי למיסבה וכדו דילידת לי תרין בנין וברת את מפקד עלי לחלפא יתה יהי רעוא מן קדמך דתיחוס עלי ולא תפריש ביני לבין בניי מתיב קודשא בריך הוא ואמר ליה הושע נבייא הלא הוה לך למילף ממילי דילך דאיתתא זניתא ובנין דזנו לית את בעי למיחלף ואיכדין את אמר לי למיחלף בניא חביביא דיילי בניהון דאברהם יצחק יעקב דהליכו קדמי בקשוט ובזכו ובליבא שלימא בכך [תב] הושע ואמר קמי קודשא בריך ° הוא חבית קדמך יי מתיב ואמר ליה לא איקביל מינך עד דתברכינן לישראל ותינבי עליהון טבוון בכך פתח הושע ואמר בנבואה עליהו דישראל ויהי מנין בני ישראל כחלא דימא וכו

ברין [ברין s

1 פתגם נבואה מן קדם ייי דהוה עם הושע בר בארי ביומי עזיה יותם אחז יחזקיה מלכיא דבית יהודה וביומי ירבעם בר יואש מלכא דישראל 2 שריות פתגמא דיי בהושע ואמר ייי להושע איזיל אתנבי נבואה על יתבי קרתא טעיתא ואנון מוספין למחטי ארי מטעא יטעון דירי ארעא מבתר פולחנא דיי 3 ואזל ואתנבי עליהון דאם יתובון ישתביק להון אם לא כמיתר עלי תינין יתרון ואוסיפו ועבדו עובדין בישין 4 ואמר ייי ליה קרי שומהון מבדריא ארי עוד ציב חד כזעיר ואסער דם פלחי טעותא דאשד יהוא ביזרעאל וקטילנון על דפלחו לבעלא תבו אנון למטעי בתר עגליא בבית אל בכין אחשביניה דם זכי על בית יהוא ואבטיל מלכותא מבית ישראל 5 ויהי בעדנא ההוא ואתבר ית תקוף עבדי קרב ישראל במישר יזרעאל 6 ואוסיפו ועבדו עובדין בישין ואמר ליה קרי שומהון דלא רחמיין בעובדיהון ארי לא אוסיף עוד לרחמא על בית ישראל ברם אם יתובון משבק אשבוק להון 7 ועל דבית והודה ארחים ואפרוקינון במימרא דיי אלההון ולא יתפרקון בקשתא ובחרבא ובעבדי קרבא בסוסון ובפרשין 8 ודריהון דאיתגליאו לביני עממיא אשתכחו דלא הוו רחמיין בעובדיהון ואוסיפו ועבדו עובדין בישין 9 ואמר קרי שומהון לא עמי ארי אתון לא עמי בדלית אתון מקיימין פתגמי אוריתי מימרי לא הוה בסעדכון

---

2 : בהושע] עם הושע -- ארי] די -- 3 : אם לא] + ותובון -- עובדין] פיתגמין 4 : ליה] לי --לבעלה] לעגליא -- מבית] דבית -- וקטילנון] דקטילנון s -- מבית] דבית -- ואוסיפו] + עוד -- 7 : ועל] וית -- יתפרקון] אפרוקינון -- קרבא] קרב

**2** ויהי מנין בני ישראל סגי כחלא דימא דלא מיתכל ולא מתמני ויהי באתרא דאיתגליאו לביני עממיא כד עברו על אוריתא ואתאמר להון לא עמי אתון יתובון ויתרבון ויתאמר להון עמיה דאלהא קיימא **2** ויתכנשון בני יהודה ובני ישראל כחדא וימנון להון רישא חד מבית דוד ויסקון מארע גלותהון ארי רב יום כנושהון **3** נבייא אמרו לאחיכון עמי תובו לאוריתי ועל כנישתכון ארחים **4** אוכחו לכנשתא דישראל ואמרו לה ארי היא לא מתעניא בפלחני ומימרי לא מקביל צלותה עד דתעדי עובדהא בישיא מקביל אפהא ופלחן טעותהא **5** דלמא אסליק שכינתי מנה ואעדי יקרה ואשוינה רטישא כיומאי קדמאי עד לא אתקרבת לפלחני ויחול רוגזי עלה כמא דחל על עם דרא דעברו על אוריתי במדברא ואשוי ארעא צדיא ואקטלינה בבוצרתא **6** ועל בנהא לא ארחים ארי בנין דטען אנון **7** ארי טעת כנישתהון בתר נביי שקרא בהיתו מלפיהון דחות אמרא אהך בתר עממיא רחמי מספקי מיכלי ומשתי כסות מילא ובוץ משח וכל פרנוסי **8** בכין האנא מקלקיל ית אורחתך כמא דסיגין בכוביא ואפסיק כמא דמפסקין בכתליא ושבילהא לא תשכח **9** ותרדוף שלם עם עממיא רחמהא ולא תדביק ותבעי סעיד ולא תשכח ותימר אהך ואתוב לפולחן רבוני קדמאה ארי טב לי כד הויתי פלחא קדמוהי מכען לא אפלח לטעותא **10** ואינון לא ידעין ארי אנא בריכית להון עבורא וחמרא ומשחא וכספא אסגיתי להון ודהבא מניה עבדו לטעותא **11** בכין יתוב מימרי למלט עבורא בעדן אידריה וחמרא בזמן מעצרתיה ואציל כסות מילא ובוץ דיהבית לה לכסאה ית קלנה **12** וכען אגלי ית קלנה לעיני עממיא רחמהא ואנש לא ישיזבנה מן ידי **13** ואבטיל כל חדותה חגהא ירחאה ושבהא וכל מועדהא **14** ואצדי פירי גופנה ותינה דהות אמרא יקר אינון לי דיהבו לי עממיא רחמי ואשוינון לחורשא ותיכילנון חית ברא

---

3 : נבייא omit -- לאוריתי] לאוריתא – אימרו] אמרו v – 4 : ואימרו] ואמרו v – לכנשתא] בכנישתא --  
5 : דחל] + רוגזי -- ארעא] ארעהא -- ואקטלינה] ואיקטלינה 8 : דמפסקין] דפסקין – ושבילהא] ושבילא  
– תשכח] תשכחין -- 9 : תדביק] + יתהון -- סעיד] + מינהון -- תשכח] יהנון -- 10 : בריכית] יהבית --  
מניה] דמניה -- 11 : יתוב] אתיב -- בזמן] בעידן – 14 : לי] עלי

**15** ואסער עלה ית יומיא דהות פלחא לטעותא ומסקא להון בוסמין הות דמיא לאיתתא דשבקת ית בעלה ואיתקנת בקדשהא ובחליטת מרגליתהא וטעת בתר רחמהא כין כנשתא דישראל רחימת למפלח לטעותא ופלחני שבקת אמר יי **16** בכין האנא משעביד לה לאוריתא ואעביד לה נסין וגבורן כמה דעבדית לה במדברא וביד עבדי נבייא אמליל תנחומין על לבה **17** ואמני לה ית פרנסהא מתמן וית מיישר עכור לתחמודי נפש ויתנהון תמן למימרי כיומי קדם ואף אנא אעביד להון נסין וגבורן כיום מסקהון מארעא דמצרים **18** ויהי בעדנא ההוא אמר יי תתנהון לפלחני ולא תפלחון עוד לטעותא **19** ואעדי ית שום טעות עממיא מפומהון ולא יהי דוכרן משומהון עוד **20** ואגזר להון קים בעדנא ההוא דיהון שלם עם חית ברא ועם עופא דשמיא ורחשא דארעא וקשתא וחרבא ועבדי קרבא אבטיל מן ארעא ואשרינון לרוחצן **21** ואקיימנכון קדמי לעלם ואקיימנכון קדמי בקשטא ובדינא ובחסדא וברחמי **[ס] 22** ואקיימנכון קדמי בהימנותא ותדעון למדחל מן קדם יי **23** ויהי בעדנא ההוא אקביל צלותכון אמר יי אפקיד ית שמיא ואנון יחתון מטרא על ארעא **24** וארעא תרבי עבורא וחמרא ומשחא ואנון יספקון לגלות עמי **25** ואקיימנכון קדמי בארע בית שכינתי וארחים עליהון דלא רחימין בעובדיהון ואימר לדהויתי אימר להון לא עמי ברם עמי אתון והוא יימר אלהי

---

15 : להון] לה מסין -- הות] דהות -- בקדשהא] בקדשא -- 17 : ויתנהון] ויתנהון -- 21 : ואקיימנכון] ואקיימנכון s -- 23 : מטרא] טובא -- 24 : תרבי] + ית -- לגלות] לגלות s -- 25 : אימר] אמר -- ואקיימנכון] ואקיימנכון

**13** ואמר יי לי עוד איזיל אתנבי נבואה על בית ישראל דאינון דמן לאתתא דרחימא על בעלה ומזניא עלוהי וכל כדין רחים לה ולא צבי למפטרה כין רחמת יי על בני ישראל ואנון מתפנן בתר טעות עממיא ברם אם יתובון ישתביק להון ויהון דמן לגבר דאשתלי ואמר מילא בחמריה **2** ופרקתינון במימרי ביום חמישת עסר לירח ניסן ויהבית כסף תקליא כיפור נפשהון ואמרית דיקרבון קדמי עומר ארמותא מעללת סערין **3** נביא אימר לה כנשתא דישראל חוביכון גרמו לכון דתגלון יומין סגיאין תתנהון לפלחני לא תטעון ולא תפלחון לטעותא ואף אנא עתיד לרחמא עליכון **4** ארי יומין סגיאין יתבון בני ישראל לית מלכא מדבית דויד ולית דעביד שולטן על ישראל ולית דדבח לרעוא בירושלם ולית קמתא בשומרון ולית אפוד ומחוי **5** בתר כין יתובון בני ישראל ויתבעון ית דחלתא דיי אלההון וישתמעון למשיחא בר דויד מלכהון ויתנהון לפולחנא דיי וסגי טוביה דייתי להון בסוף יומיא

-----

- 1 : עוד אינון] אינון עוד -- כל כדין *omit* -- בתר טעות] לטעות -- דאשתלי] דמשתלי -- בחמריה] בחבריה  
-- 2 : ביום חמישת עסר] בחמשת עשר דירח -- נפשהון] נפשטהון -- דיקרבון] דיהון מקרבין -- 3 : לה] להון --  
גרמו *omit* -- 4 : מדבית] + ישראל – לרעוא] רעוא -- קמתא] + בירושלים -- 5 : דחלתא] פולחנא

## CHAPTER 2

### A STUDY OF TARGUM HOSEA 1-3

---

#### 2.1 Introduction

A passing reference was made towards the end of the introduction to the first chapter in 1.1 about the different status of the Targum compared to the other ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible. While it is true that the translator behind other such versions as the LXX or the Peshitta had to confront theological problems in the source text and eventually the daunting task of tackling such problems by coming to terms with them through diverse modifications in the target text, the Targumist's task as a translator cum theologian was a great deal different from that. First, the Targumist, while possessing a sacrosanct respect towards the consonantal Hebrew text, approached it always with a set of criteria in terms of exegetical techniques, points of view, and theological convictions all of which attained a certain level of uniformity over time during the formative period of Rabbinic Judaism. The Biblical text was conceived as an inexhaustible treasure-trove which was capable of generating an endless array of meanings and interpretations. The Targumist, as an exegete, thus saw his interpretations already embedded in the source text, and what we may consider as the "actual" meaning of that text could be of minor importance.<sup>57</sup> Secondly, the Targumist had another goal in mind which is intricately linked with its *Sitz im Leben*. The Targum owes its origin to the liturgy of the early synagogue and its primary role is believed to have been to render the message of the "written Torah" intelligible and theologically acceptable in a language that could be accessible to the general public, which differentiates its style and contents to a large extent from the Mishnah or the Talmud which, in spite of springing from a similar tradition, were primarily aimed at the literary elite. This naturally prompted the Targumist to deal in a special way with certain scriptural passages and pericopes which, although quite understandable to a well-trained reader engrossed in private study, could not however be read aloud in midst of

---

<sup>57</sup> R. LE DÉAUT, *Targum*, in J. BRIEND and M. QUESNEL (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, XIII, Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 2002, col. 244.

a public assembly such as the synagogue, as we shall gradually discover with reference to our analysis of the first three chapters of TgHos.

However, in this and the following introductory sections, it is not our aim to delineate the history, origin, or function of either the Targums in general or the Prophetic Targums in particular since a considerable amount of critical literature is available on such introductory areas.<sup>58</sup> Each Targumic book share some of the fixed sets of “criteria” mentioned above, and at the same time contain features of its own depending on the particular Biblical book it translates. The field of Targum Studies is not as “untrodden” as it was about fifty years ago, and much work has been done by both Biblical and Rabbinic scholars over the past three decades which have helped us in appreciating the Targum in a much different light than other ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible, and in avoiding certain stereotypes which the Targum always came to be seen or connected with. In the following sections, I shall therefore try to address very briefly some of the issues which fall under stereotypical categories related to Prophetic Targums and which, at the same time, are intricately linked with the study and analysis of the first three chapters of TgHos which should occupy our primary attention in this chapter.

## 2.2 Targum and “Orality”

The question which should start tickling us at this point concerns the status of the Targum as part of the “oral Torah” and the uniformity of its translation-interpretational techniques with respect to its origin and development within an “oral” tradition. Regarding the widely assumed prohibition on “writing down” the oral Torah in which the Targum certainly had its place, the classic proof text that is often cited is an extract from *b. Tem. 14b*:

R. Yehuda bar Nahmani, the interpreter of Resh Laqish, expounded: a scripture verse says, ‘Write down these words’, and then it says, ‘according to these words’ (Exod 34:27), in order to teach you: whatever is (transmitted) in oral form, you may not recite from a written document; and whatever is (transmitted) in writing you may not recite orally (by heart/from memory).

---

<sup>58</sup> Many of the studies on individual Targums listed in n. 4 and 5 start with an introduction to and a brief overview of Prophetic Targums. The most recent introductory work on the subject would be P.V.M. FLESHER and B.D. CHILTON, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*, Baylor University Press, 2011. Also, see the bibliography.

The following part of the discussion continues on the subject of writing down the *halakhot*, but Strack explains that the above passage is concerned with the condemnation of the use of a “written Targum” in the synagogal readings, and that R. Yehuda ben Nahmani himself was a *meturgeman*.<sup>59</sup> There is a consensus among scholars as to whether such a prohibition on everything labelled as “oral” was really effective and applicable at all moments or it represents an “ideal” situation. According to Strack, for example, a contrastive comparison between the later French and Spanish Jewish traditions, represented by Rashi and Maimonides respectively, reveals that the former considered that none of the oral traditions were written down in the Talmudic period whereas the latter possessed a contradictory opinion.<sup>60</sup>

The strict ban on reading out the Targum from a written text in the synagogue seems to have sprung from the impression which might have led the audience to think that the translation/interpretation given by the *meturgeman* were also contained in the Torah scrolls i.e. they were part of the Biblical text. In a public assembly, there were not only different individuals to read the Hebrew and the Aramaic but there also existed fixed rules on the manner of recitation. The reader, while reading out the Biblical text in Hebrew verse by verse, was not supposed to look up outside the scroll lest the audience thought that he was “inventing” the Biblical text from memory, and likewise, the *meturgeman* could not read from a book lest people thought the Targum had the same status and sanctity as the written Torah. This also explains the rule that a blind person could not recite the Hebrew but had no restraints on reciting the Aramaic.<sup>61</sup> In private study of the Targum by an individual at home, these rules could not be applicable, but one had to recite the Hebrew verse (*parashah*) twice followed by the Targum only *once* (שנים מקרא ואחד תרגום).<sup>62</sup> Moreover, in both public worship

---

<sup>59</sup> H.L. STRACK and G. STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 33. The author mentions in the same page how R. Samuel bar Isaac, as narrated by R. Haggai, saw a certain Bible teacher in the synagogue who used to recite the Targum from a book, and was therefore chastised by R. Samuel for doing so on the basis of the prohibition mentioned above.

<sup>60</sup> STRACK and STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, p. 32. It seems that by “Talmudic”, the author (or the said tradition) here actually refers to the pre-Mishnaic period since there is a reference to the Mishnah being written down by Rabbi (R. Judah ha-Nasi) himself.

<sup>61</sup> W.F. SMELIK, *The Rabbinic Reception of Early Bible Translations as Holy Writings and Oral Torah*, in *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 1 (1999), p. 252-253.

<sup>62</sup> *b. Ber. 8a*. P.S. ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, in in D.N. FREEDMAN et al. (eds.) *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, v. 6, New York, Doubleday, 1992, p. 330.

and private devotion, the reading from the Targum should have been preceded by a *single* verse for the Torah but by *three* verses at a time for the Prophets which shows the greater canonical importance of the former.<sup>63</sup> One may infer from all these observations that the ultimate objective was not so much to prevent the Targum from being put into writing, but to maintain its “secondary” status with respect to the Hebrew scriptures.

Anthony D. York has made an interesting observation in this regard which might be used here to carry this point further.<sup>64</sup> On the basis of the following citation from *y. Meg. 4:1* which goes like this:

R. Samuel bar Isaac entered a synagogue [and] saw a certain man translating (מתרגם) while leaning against a pillar. He said to him: ‘It is forbidden to you! Just as it was given in awe and reverence, thus we have to treat it in awe and reverence.’<sup>65</sup>

York concludes that according to the said R. Samuel, the same respect has been paid to the Targum as to the Torah. Though I shall not be inclined to draw an inference from any isolated saying of an individual Talmudic rabbi, the expression “given in awe and reverence” (ניתנה באימה ויראה) with reference to the Targum evokes the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai. York goes further to allude to the controversy centred on a *halakhic* saying in *b. Ber. 45a* partly based on Exod 19:19 which apparently compares Moses to a reader of the Torah and God to a *mertugeman*!<sup>66</sup> Such an extreme valorisation of the Targum almost bewildered later Tosafists who tried to explain the passage by other way round, which eventually led R. Joseph Qaro (1488-1575) to attribute an equal status to both the reader and the *meturgeman* and thereby to what each of these two represented.<sup>67</sup>

### 2.3 Targum(s): Fluidity or Uniformity?

Whenever an oral tradition comes to be written down, it has to go through the passage from the oral to the written form, and then a certain control is exerted upon

---

<sup>63</sup> SMELIK, *The Rabbinic Reception*, p. 252.

<sup>64</sup> A.D. YORK, *The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 10/1 (1979), p. 74-86.

<sup>65</sup> I follow in this particular case the text/translation provided by York.

<sup>66</sup> YORK, *The Targum in the Synagogue*, p. 76.

<sup>67</sup> YORK, *The Targum in the Synagogue*, p. 76.

the codified text in view of a faithful transmission. The plural term תרגומים used for referring to the genre of the Targumic literature may already signify the existence of more than one i.e. the two “official” Targums: Targum Onqelos to the Torah/Pentateuch and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. In the BT, TO is already referred to in Aramaic as תרגום דילן (“our Targum”)<sup>68</sup> which signifies its popularity among the Babylonian Jewish community, but also the existence of other Targums among which TO came to enjoy somewhat of an “official” status.<sup>69</sup> There may not have been a similar appellation for Jonathan, but there is no doubt that it enjoyed an equivalent status in Babylon, and was even held authoritative in matters of *halakah*.<sup>70</sup> In a passage which is often cited in the Rabbinic tradition to refer to the origin of the TJ to the Prophets, its “legendary” author Jonathan ben Uzziel, a student of Hillel the Elder is said to have the Targum declared (dictated?) “from the mouths of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.”<sup>71</sup> The passage describes the incidents that took place as Jonathan ben Uzziel accomplished the translation of the Prophets from the “Holy Tongue” into Aramaic:

Palestine was shaken four hundred parsangs by four hundred parsangs. A heavenly echo came forth and demanded, “Who has revealed My secrets to mortal man?” Immediately Jonathan ben Uzziel rose to his feet and declared, “It is I who have revealed Thy secrets. But it is clearly known before You that I did this not for my own glory, nor for the glory of my father’s house. Rather, for Your glory have I done it, so that dissension into Israel might not increase.”

---

<sup>68</sup> *b. Qidd.* 49a.

<sup>69</sup> Alexander argues for a Palestinian origin of TO (and of TJ as well) on the basis of its language which, according to him, is a kind of literary *koiné* (“Standard Literary Aramaic”) and very close to the Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran. The *haggadah* in TO is also attested and sometimes even found in fuller forms in the corresponding Palestinian sources such as in the Palestinian Targums. On the other hand, the system of vocalisation in TO shows the influence of Babylonian schools. Therefore Alexander opts for a hypothesis of the existence of what he calls a “Proto-Onqelos” which originated in the West (Palestine) and was subsequently brought to the East and thoroughly revised there by the Babylonian communities to make it their “official” Targum. It is normal that he should also advocate the same views for the TJ to the Prophets in terms of its history and origin. See ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 321. Alexander’s hypothesis seems to be the most widely held view among scholars today. See E.M. COOK, *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos* (Studies in Aramaic Interpretations of Scripture, 6), Brill, 2008, p. xi. However, this chapter is concerned with historical elements in the Targumic traditions only to the extent they help us to appreciate the translational and exegetical methods embedded in the text of the Targum (as presented in chapter 1).

<sup>70</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 325.

<sup>71</sup> *b. Meg.* 3a.

The expression “so that dissension into Israel might not increase” is significant since it suggests the idea that the TJ to the Prophets was written down to promulgate certain uniformity in the Aramaic interpretations of scripture (in this case, the Prophets) which seem to have been proliferating around that time. Even on the basis of a comparison of grammar and vocabulary, lexical similarity, recurrent terms and expressions between TO and TJ, there seems to be a remarkable uniformity which could not but be the result of a thorough redactional process which both of these Targums had undergone in Babylon around a certain point of time. Pinkhos Churgin, in one of the first book-length studies on TJ, seems to endorse this view:

The inference will yield the only possible conclusion that that there was a common source for the official Targumim. They were originated in one and the same time; in one and the same way, under one and the same circumstances and share a common history ... Hence also the remarkable balance between the paraphrastic and the literal so skilfully maintained in the official Targumim.<sup>72</sup>

The existence of fragmentary Targums to the Pentateuch of Palestinian origin retrieved from the Cairo Geniza, and moreover, that of full-length Pentateuchal Targums such as the Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan clearly point to the fact that a promulgation of TO and TJ as the officially transmitted Targum texts resulted in the suppression and the eventual falling into disuse of Targums belonging to other parallel traditions. Whether similar parallel Targums existed for the Prophets remains a frequent object of thought among scholars today. The question however goes largely unanswered except the fact that fragments of much older Aramaic translations found in Qumran such as 11QTgJob and 4Q550<sup>f</sup>, the latter containing an Aramaic translation of Isa 14:31-32, according to some, may point to the existence of a “proto-Jonathan” but evidences of fragmentary manuscripts on that basis are remarkably few in number, and moreover, there is an added difficulty in determining the specific genre of such Aramaic translations and

---

<sup>72</sup> P. CHURGIN, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, Yale, Yale University Press, p. 35. For Churgin, the present Targumic texts of TO and TJ therefore represent early Targums used in the public worship PLUS the later Targums overlaid on them. See p. 37. But one may go far from the reality in assuming that any of the extant Targums actually represent written “transcriptions” of the oral Targums recited in the early synagogues.

classifying them as “Targum”.<sup>73</sup> The *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) found in Qumran could serve as a case in point. There is also a particular affinity among some scholars towards the several Targumic Tosefot (“additions”) or Tosefta Targums in classifying them as vestiges of an ancient Palestinian tradition of Prophetic Targums but we shall look briefly at this issue in the section 2:7 on the Tosefta Tg to Hosea.

In conclusion to this section, the nature of the Targumic text should then be located somewhere between fluidity and uniformity. Unlike the other ancient translations of the Hebrew Bible, the Targum owes its origin to the oral expositions within a Jewish liturgical context which quickly turned into something of an institution. Its existence in Qumran and other ancient sources indicates that the Targum was a pre-Rabbinic institution which came under strict Rabbinic control and thereby paved the way towards the emergence of the “official” Targums to the Torah and the Prophets.<sup>74</sup> But the development of the Targumic traditions, as we have seen, was largely connected to the geographical area of its origin in which it served the spiritual nourishment of the local community. The remarks of Alexander in this respect seem quite pertinent: “despite the present textual fluidity, the content of the Targum in any given locality was probably always largely predetermined and traditional.”<sup>75</sup>

## 2.4 Targum and/as Midrash

The term Midrash as a literary genre has been used in a loose and uncritical manner in relation to the Targums in older as well as more recent literature on the subject. For example, a salient characteristic of the translation techniques found in TJ to the Prophets is termed as “Midrashic”.<sup>76</sup> R.P. Gordon, in one of his articles which relates directly to the subject, selects the issue of “contemporising” as the only Midrashic

---

<sup>73</sup> See, in this respect, the section 1.3.2.3 entitled “Was There an Older Targum to the Prophets?”, in SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges*, p. 73-74.

<sup>74</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 330.

<sup>75</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 330.

<sup>76</sup> Strack justly points out that the classification of a Biblical or related text as Midrash has become rather “fashionable”, especially in NT scholarship in which scholars often do not consider the particular characteristics of the Rabbinic Midrash as their point of departure. The term has often been loosely used for such NT narratives as the infancy gospels or the temptation of Jesus. STRACK and STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, p. 237.

aspect in the Prophetic Targums.<sup>77</sup> Other than the Targumic “contemporising” of the Biblical text in terms of situating the theology and the *halakha* within the contemporary context, linking obscure geographical names to familiar locations, or explaining the metaphorical proper names, Gordon chooses to talk about something more basic and fundamental, that is the special type of Targumic Aramaic words, expressions and syntactical structures that resulted from such “contemporising” efforts.<sup>78</sup> In Strack’s view, the line of demarcation between Targum and Midrash is almost “impossible” to draw.<sup>79</sup> The Targum is “Midrashic” to the extent it is an “explanation” and often “expansion” of the Bible by means of *haggadah*.<sup>80</sup> From this point of view, it is indeed difficult to differentiate among the Targum, Midrash and even the homiletic exposition of the *darshan* in the synagogue, whose task was to preach a sermon following and expounding the translation/interpretation given by the *meturgeman*. Moreover, in the Talmudic period, it was often difficult to distinguish between the *peshat* (literal meaning) and the *derash* (homiletical appropriation) as the “literal” meaning was often the “opinion (of the translator) sanctified by long tradition or teaching authority.”<sup>81</sup> A distinction based on translation techniques, methods of interpretation, or the *Sitz im Leben* of selected passages in the Targums do not therefore seem to be the proper criteria for defining the precise relationship between Targum and Midrash.

In my opinion, therefore, this relationship can be best seen in terms of the precise differences between the Targum and Midrash as literary genres and the structure or presentation of the Biblical text in each. Philip S. Alexander lays down *five* points of differences for distinguishing between Targum and Midrash which are based on their respective form and genre:<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> R.P. GORDON, *Targum as Midrash: Contemporizing in the Targum to the Prophets*, in R.P. GORDON (ed.), *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006, p. 327-337.

<sup>78</sup> See introductory remarks in GORDON, *Targum as Midrash*, p. 328-329.

<sup>79</sup> STRACK and STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, p. 236.

<sup>80</sup> STRACK and STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, p. 236.

<sup>81</sup> STRACK and STEMBERGER, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, p. 235.

<sup>82</sup> P.S. ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum*, in J.A. EMERTON (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, XXXVI), Leiden, Brill, 1985, p. 15. Alexander here takes as his model the classical Midrashim such as the *Mekhilta of Rabbi Ismael*.

- The Targum, unlike Midrash, does not cite any Rabbinic authorities by name, although the anonymous interpretations can be found attributed to some Rabbinic authority elsewhere within the Rabbinic corpus.
- The Targum, unlike Midrash, does not include any citation-formula such as שני אימר even though other scriptural portions may be “tacitly” quoted or indirectly alluded to.
- The Targum, unlike Midrash, does not indulge into any argument and although, like the latter, it may send out some conclusive message or interpretations such as *halakhic* decisions, it always conceals such conclusions under the apparent structure of a scriptural translation.
- The Targum, unlike Midrash, does not introduce any variant interpretations of the same passage by using formulaic expressions like דבר אחר. But one can always confront multiple interpretations in it but always without the use of such clear-cut formulas.
- The Targum, unlike Midrash, does not have a line of separation between the *lemma* (scriptural passage under consideration) and the explanatory additions. In Midrash, these two components are often abruptly juxtaposed whereas in the Targum, they are carefully fused together (see the table in p. 62).

Taking the third point above, one may link it up with the preceding section (2.3) to remark that the Targum, as an institution, might have started out as a translation of the Bible *sui generis*, but gradually developed into a different genre altogether with the help of the subtle artistry of the meturgeman and the exegetical innovations of Rabbinic Judaism, but also careful enough to disguise such generic components under the guise of “translation”.<sup>83</sup>

## 2.5 Contesting the Stereotypes

In the two preceding sections we have seen how a detailed examination of both structure and contents of the Targums against the background of Rabbinic literature and its *Sitz im Leben* within the context of the society that produced such a peculiar type of literary corpus reveals many stereotypes and miscomprehension regarding the

---

<sup>83</sup> ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules*, p. 15-16.

function and status of the Targums as Bible translations. One such generalisation is often made concerning the “literal” translation of TO and the “paraphrastic” approach of TJ in translating the Biblical text. But the overall complexion of TJ as more “paraphrastic” or “haggadic” than TO arises for a greater part from the fact that poetry constitutes a greater proportion of the Prophets than of the Pentateuch as is the case in the first three chapters of TgHos.<sup>84</sup> In this respect, the model of two types of Targumic texts (called *A* and *B*) proposed by Alexander, in my opinion, may be seen as complementary to the binary of the “literal” and the “paraphrastic”.<sup>85</sup> This is how Alexander defines the type *A* and type *B* translations:

*Targum Type A:* Type *A* consists of a base translation + explanatory additions. The base translation follows the Hebrew very closely, and corresponds on the whole one-to-one with it. It represents the *verbum e verbo* style of translation ... The explanatory plusses are carefully and skilfully inserted into this base in such a way that they can normally be bracketed out, leaving behind a linguistically viable, non-expansive version of the original.<sup>86</sup>

*Targum Type B:* Type *B* Targum consists of free-running paraphrase in which the original is more or less “dissolved” in the expanded translation, so that it is difficult, if not impossible, to extract a simple and grammatically viable base translation from the mass of plusses. To use a musical analogy, type *B* Targum is a fantasia, or, perhaps, a set of variations on the theme of Scripture.<sup>87</sup>

As we shall discover in the course of our translation and commentary below, our text TgHos 1-3 falls more or less into the category of “Type *A*” Targum in which only the theologically “problematic” parts of the Hebrew text have undergone paraphrastic modifications while the Targumist makes a hard effort to preserve the skeletal structure of the Hebrew text from the numerous additions and paraphrases.<sup>88</sup>

The assumption that the *raison d'être* of the Targums was to make the scriptures available to the “masses” can never be taken at its facevalue. This is evident from the very “artificial” nature of Targumic Aramaic in its attempt to reproduce the syntactical features of the Biblical Hebrew by introducing certain features which are clearly not

---

<sup>84</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 324.

<sup>85</sup> See ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules*, p. 17-21.

<sup>86</sup> ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules*, p. 17.

<sup>87</sup> ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules*, p. 19.

<sup>88</sup> Appropriate examples of “Type *B*” translation can be found in the Targum of the Song of Songs in which the Targumist has to confront a much larger problem regarding the literary genre among other things.

part of any dialect of Aramaic. It is therefore hard for someone without a close knowledge of the Biblical Hebrew texts to fully appreciate the peculiarities of Targumic Aramaic. Secondly, the fact that the reading of the Targum continued in the synagogue liturgy long after Arabic had replaced Aramaic as the Jewish vernacular in the Middle East shows that one of its fundamental role was to provide a theologically “acceptable” translation of the scriptures which had already stamped its authority upon the liturgy of the synagogue and Jewish understanding of the Biblical text.<sup>89</sup> Thirdly, Alexander remarks that the *verbum e verbo* aspects of the Targum’s translation were used by teachers in schools and synagogues to teach Hebrew to beginners.<sup>90</sup> However, this part of Alexander’s hypothesis on how Jews in Talmudic times acquired a knowledge of the “sacred language” by means of the Aramaic Targumim remains controversial but not without basis.

## 2.6 The Translation and Commentary Presented in This Study

There should not be any justification for attempting an English translation of the text of the Tosefta Tg for which no such translation yet exists, let alone a commentary. The case of TJ to Hosea 1-3 is still more favourable due to the existence of the sole English translation by Cathcart and Gordon.<sup>91</sup> I would like to define my translation of TgHos in this study rather as a “calque” of the Aramaic text. Given the complex task of translating a translation, I have tried to render the Aramaic of the Targum as “literally” as possible, and obviously at the expense of good English. But in certain cases where the placing of an Aramaic word would have rendered the English far too awkward, I have put it in brackets “[ ]”. This means the bracketed word is present in the Aramaic text but is not incorporated into the English translation due to syntactical problems. On the other hand, where a word is NOT present in the Aramaic text but must be supplied in the English for making sense, it is enclosed within parentheses “( )”. There are, however, other differences in the way the text and the commentary are presented for the Tosefta Tg and the rest of TgHos i.e. TJ to Hosea 1-3.

---

<sup>89</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 330.

<sup>90</sup> ALEXANDER, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules*, p. 22-23.

<sup>91</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. See the full citation in n. 52.

*For the Tosefta Tg:* The text of the Tosefta Tg is not divided into verses in MS c. I have therefore divided the text into pericopes on the basis of a unity of sense. The Aramaic text for each pericope is based on the text presented in the section 1.4 which is followed by an English translation and a brief commentary. This is followed by (where applicable) a citation of the parallel text from *b. Pes. 87a-b*, both the Aramaic original and an English translation. For more details on the arrangement and other aspects of the text, see the introductory remarks in the following section (2.7).

*For TgHos/ TJ to Hosea 1-3:* The commentary on TgHos 1-3 is based on the text presented in the section 1.4 and since it is already divided into verses, the sections 2.8 to 2.10 does not cite the Aramaic text but only the English translation followed by the commentary. In the commentary, sometimes more than one verse are taken together, specially in case of TgHos 2, in which there are recurrent key concepts and translation techniques which are already analysed in detail in the preceding section (2.8) on TgHos 1. These key concepts can be certain terms and doctrinal ideas that the Targum uses and inserts into the translation from time to time to accomplish a diverse set of functions. I have thus chosen to enclose each of such concepts in boxes with the title “Key Concept” 1, 2 and so on. They are abbreviated as “KC” and referred to throughout the commentary on the basis of the number given to each of them within the box. This helps in citing the various applications of each concept in one place as well as in avoiding unnecessary repetition.

At this stage, it is very important to underline the fact that the following commentary is on the Targumic text of Hosea and NOT on the MT. For explanations of the different nuances present already in the MT, the reader is invited to consult the numerous studies and commentaries existing on the Hebrew text of Hosea. The commentary in this study is based on a method of comparison and contrast between TgHos and MT<sup>92</sup>. Theories of translation view the deviations from the source text (in this case MT) informative for “uncovering” the methods and intentions of the translator (in this case the Targumist).<sup>93</sup> Gudrun Lier, for example, in her study of the translation techniques

---

<sup>92</sup> This is the approach taken in most modern critical commentaries on the Targums. See A.F. VAN ZYL, *Translation Techniques in Malachi According to Targum Jonathan*, unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Johannesburg, p. 6.

<sup>93</sup> SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges*, p. 190.

in TJ to Malachi, distinguishes between the “technical” and “exegetical” translation techniques.<sup>94</sup> The “technical” aspects include the Targum’s frequent use of certain key phrases and terms such as the double preposition מן קדם or the divine surrogate מימרא and such alike. The exegetical aspects are seen mostly in certain paraphrastic modifications and interpretations in the translation such as the way TgHos interprets the divine commandment to Hosea to marry a prostitute and have children by her in the MT. I have therefore tried to put the “Targumic deviations” *in italics* in my English translation whereas the portions typed in normal font represent a “literal” rendering of the Hebrew text. The different translation techniques employed in the TgHos have already been discussed across the present and the preceding sections, but they have been addressed in detail in the course of the following commentary.

## 2.7 Tosefta Targum to Hosea: Translation and Commentary

### 2.7.1 Introduction

The text of the Tosefta Tg is a parallel interpretation of God’s command to Hosea to marry Gomer the prostitute and have children by her. I have placed the text in the section 1.4 as a “prologue” to the text of TJ on the basis of its location in MS c. But this prologue narrative should be distinguished from the main Targumic text which gives a “metaphorical” interpretation of Hosea’s marriage in the form of Israel’s unfaithfulness to God. By contrast, the Tosefta happens to be the only text in which a close “Aramaic” rendering of the original marriage story of Hosea is found. There exists a very close parallel of this narrative in *b. Pes. 87a-b*. The narrative in BT, however, is much longer than the one found in the Tosefta and does not correspond exactly to the latter. But there are certain concepts and word-plays in both texts that help in the translation and understanding of the latter. It is difficult to say which text predates which one. But since MS c is still the oldest known (15<sup>th</sup> Century) manuscript to contain this text, it might be safe to assume that it postdates the interpretation found in BT. Moreover, the vocabulary of this text is much closer to the Aramaic spoken by the Jews in

---

<sup>94</sup> G. LIER, *Translation Techniques in Malachi According to Targum Jonathan*, Paper Presented at the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament Conference, Helsinki, 2010. I am grateful to Prof. Lier for sending me the handout and the power-point version of her paper from Johannesburg. She has also helped me in acquiring the unpublished M.A. dissertation of her student A.F. Van Zyl on Targum Malachi mentioned above.

Babylonia during the Talmudic and Geonic periods (roughly 3<sup>rd</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> Centuries CE) both in terms of orthography and morphology which sets it apart from the language of the main body of TgHos, commonly designated as “Targumic Aramaic” i.e. the Aramaic of the Onqelos-Jonathan type.<sup>95</sup> However, deducing the date or exact provenance of the composition of this text falls clearly out of the scope of this study.

*Abbreviations and Symbols Used:* There are three recurrent abbreviations for the three lexical tools that I have used in my translation and analysis of the text of the Tosefta Tg. The references to these works are cited within the body of the text and not in the footnotes due to their very frequent occurrences only in this section on the Tosefta Tg. They are the following (also mentioned in the bibliography under “Instrumenta Studiorum”)

DJBA: Michael SOKOLOFF, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*, Ramat Gan, Bar Ilan University Press and Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Jastrow: Marcus JASTROW, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, Peabody MA, Hendrickson, 2005 (1943).

Margolis: Max L. MARGOLIS, *Lehrbuch der Aramäischen Sprache des Babylonischen Talmuds*, Munich, Oskar Beck, 1910.

Each verse of the prologue in Aramaic is cited and is followed by an English translation *in italics*. This is followed by a grammatical analysis of certain words and/or mention of any variant in Sperber’s edition, a brief commentary (where necessary), and citation of the parallel (if any) from BT, both the Aramaic text and the English translation adapted from the Soncino bilingual edition.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> M. SOKOLOFF, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*, Ramat Gan, Bar Ilan University Press and Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002, p. 50.

<sup>96</sup> I. EPSTEIN (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices*, 18 vols., London, Soncino Press, 1935-1948.

## 2.7.2 The Text, Translation, and Analysis

אמיר על ידי הושע נבייא הוא הושע נבייא דאיתנבי בריש ארבע נביין הושע וישעיה עמוס ומיכה

*It is said concerning the prophet Hosea that Hosea was the first prophet to have prophesied among the four prophets (namely) Hosea, Isaiah, Amos, and Micah.*

על ידי: idiomatic expression: *since, because* etc. [Margolis, p. 119]

The first line of the prologue, which is also the first line on the manuscript page, breaks off after the nun of דאיתנבי the reason why the word is repeated again in the next line. The order in which the names of four prophets appear is neither canonical nor chronological. An exactly same order is found in the parallel found in *b. Pes. 87a* below, where Hosea is described as the “greatest of all of them” (גדול שבכולן). Hosea’s greatness is partly derived from the fact that he was the first of the four above-mentioned with whom God spoke. The text of Hosea 1:1 from the MT is quoted to endorse this point.

### Parallel in *b. Pes. 87a*:

דבר ה' אשר היה אל הושע וגו' בימי עוזיהו יותם אחז יחזקיה מלך יהודה בפרק אחד נתנבאו ד' נביאים וגדול שבכולן הושע שנאמר (הושע א) תחלת דבר ה' בהושע וכי בהושע דבר תחלה והלא ממשה עד הושע כמה נביאים א"ר יוחנן תחלה לארבעה נביאים שנתנבאו באותו הפרק ואלו הן הושע ישעיה עמוס ומיכה

*‘The word of the LORD that came to Hosea, the son of Beerī, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.’ Four prophets prophesied in one age, and the greatest of all of them was Hosea. For it is said, ‘The LORD first spoke with Hosea.’ Did he then first speak with Hosea? Were there not many prophets from Moses until Hosea? R. Johanan said, “He was the first of four prophets who prophesied in that age, and these are they: Hosea, Isaiah, Amos, and Micah.”*

שריות פיתגמא דיי בהושע ואמר יי להושע איזיל איתנבי נבואה על יתבי קרתא טעיתא דאינון מוסיפין למיחטי ארי מיטעא דירי ארעא מבתר פולחנא דיי

*The beginning of the word of the LORD to Hosea: And the LORD said to Hosea, “Go, speak a prophecy concerning the inhabitants of the idolatrous city, those who continue to sin. For the dwellers of the land go astray from (after) the worship of the LORD.”*

This may apparently seem to be identical with 1:2 in the main body of the Targumic text found in the next page of the same manuscript:

שרית פיתגמא דיי עם הושע ואמר יי להושע איזיל איתנבי נבואה על יתבי קרתא טעיתא דאינון מוספין  
למחטיא די מטעא יטעון דיירי ארעא מבתר פולחנא דיי

But as can be seen, there are some noticeable variants between the two both in terms of orthography and vocabulary. The first variant denotes the one in the prefatory material under discussion whereas the second variant is found in the main Targumic text of the same manuscript:

- שריות instead of שרית
- בהושע instead of עם הושע
- מוסיפין instead of מוספין
- למיחטי instead of מחטיא
- ארי instead of די
- the longer form of the infinitive absolute, no doubt a calque of the Hebrew, is found instead of the shorter מיטעא

These differences show that this verse is very much an integral part of the preface narrative under discussion and should not be considered an insertion of the “verse 2” of the main Targumic text as Sperber thinks. Moreover, it fits very much into the narrative context of the prologue in initiating the dialogue between God and Hosea after the initial introduction.

מתיב הושע ואמר קדמוהי דקודשא בריך הוא רבון עלמא יי אם חטן ישראל קדמך חליפינון באומא אחריתי

*Objecting, Hosea spoke before the Holy One Blessed Be He (saying), “If Israel sins before you, exchange them for another nation.”*

מתיב: Participle active *Aph’el* תובכ meaning “answering”, “responding” but also “raising an objection” in the Babylonian idiom. [Margolis, p. 177]

From this verse onwards, the interlocutor starts referring to God using the longer epithet “The Holy One Blessed Be He” (קודשא בריך הוא) frequently used in Rabbinic literature. Hosea is seen to be represented in a negative light which “compensates” for the harsh criticism launched against the Israelites both in the MT and in the main Targumic text. This matches with the general theological tendency of the Talmudic

literature in attempting to resolve any negative portrayal of the Israelites as a people. Unlike in the MT and in the Targum, the Tosefta/prologue here makes the otherwise silent and inactive Hosea enter into a bargaining with God.

בכך אמר קודשא בריך הוא עלוהי דהושע הוה ליה למילף מן משה רביה דצלי על ישראל ובעא רחמיין עליהון

*Then the Holy One Blessed Be He said to him that Hosea should have learned from Moses his master to pray for Israel and to seek mercy for them.*

[Sperber] רחמיין = רחמיין

In Rabbinic literature, more than the actual historical chronology of the Biblical figures, what is more important is the order in which they appear in the Pentateuch or in the Biblical canon. This is why Moses here is seen as a predecessor of Hosea and possessing greater authority than the latter. Moses, as the receiver of both the written and oral Laws on Sinai, possesses the status of the prophet *par excellence* in the Rabbinic tradition and is attributed a heavier authority than any other prophet.

An element of the Israelite “nationalism” which is a strong tendency in the Targumic and Rabbinic theology starts to show up from this passage onwards.<sup>97</sup> It is often a tendency of the Targumic writers to portray a derogatory picture of the “nations” surrounding Israel in terms of their idolatrous practices, rejection of the Torah, and God’s impending judgment which would befall them.<sup>98</sup> In an attempt to explain and justify God’s command to Hosea to marry a prostitute, the author accuses the latter of having committed the worst possible act of anti-nationalism by asking God to exchange Israel for one of its surrounding nations. The rest of the passage will be a realisation on Hosea’s part the extent of this offence which he has committed before God.

#### Parallel in *b. Pes. 87a*

אמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא להושע בניך חטאו והיה לו לומר בניך הם בני הנוניך הם בני אברהם יצחק ויקב  
גלגל רחמיך עליהן לא דיו שלא אמר כך אלא אמר לפניו רבש"ע כל העולם שלך הואהעבירם באומה אחרת

*The Holy One Blessed Be He said to Hosea: “Your children have sinned”, to which he should have replied, “They are your children, they are the children of your favoured*

<sup>97</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Propehts*, p. 9.

<sup>98</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Propehts*, p. 9.

*ones, they are the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Extend your mercy to them.” It was not enough that he did not say thus, but he said to him, “Sovereign of the Universe! They whole world is yours. Exchange them for a different nation!”*

ואמר וכען אם שבקת לחוביהון ואם לא מחיני כען מספרך דכתבת ולא מסתיה

*And he (Hosea) said, “Now if you forgive their sins but if you do not have pity on me, then delete me from the book which you have written”*

This plea here is a reference to Exod 32:32.

דלא בעי רחמין קדמי אלא אמר חליפונן באומא אחריתי

*Yet he did not seek mercy before me but said, “Exchange them for another nation”!*

דלא בעי: *bis*. Dittography not indicated by Sperber

The passage switches to first person narration as the above words are uttered by God here. Hosea’s offence is reiterated by God himself implying its gravity.

כען אימר ליה דיסב איתתא זניתא ותליד ליה בנין ואימר ליה דיחליף יתה וידע אידא שיגושיא בליביה דאינש דמחלף איתתיה ובנוהי

*Now I shall ask him to take an adulterous woman and she will bear him children. And [then] I shall tell him to exchange her so that he may know how perplex it is in the heart of a man to exchange his wife and his child!*

שיגושיא: *confusion, perplexity, excitement* [Jastrow, p. 1557]. The word appears in the Targums versions of 1 Sam 5:9, Amos 3:9, and Zech 14:13, each time translating the Hebrew מהומה. In each of these three texts, the word denotes a confusion or tumult, either natural or mental or emotional, instigated by YHWH. Here, God’s monologue expressing his desire to unite and then separate Hosea from his (adulterous) wife would give rise to such an emotional turbulence within Hosea’s mind.

This prologue, apart from its counterpart in the Gemara of the Babylonian Talmud, seems to be the only “Targumic” text where one finds an Aramaic rendering of Hosea’s marriage to a prostitute as it is narrated in the MT. Unlike in the main body of the Targumic text, it is not an allegorical or symbolic interpretation of the MT that one finds here from this passage onwards in the prologue.

Parallel in b. Pes. 87a

אמר הקב"ה מה אעשה לזקן זה אומר לו לך וקח אשה זונה והוליד לך בנים זנונים ואחר כך אומר לו שלחה מעל פניך אם הוא יכול לשלוח אף אני אשלח את ישראל שנה

*The Holy One Blessed Be He said, "What shall I do with this old man? I shall command him, "Go and marry an adulterous woman and have children of adultery. And then I shall tell him, "Send her away from your presence." If he will be able to send [her] away, so I too shall send Israel away."*

בכך אמר ליה קודשא בריך הוא להושע איזיל סב לך איתתא זניתא ותליד לך וולדין דזנו ואזל ונסיב ית גמר בת דבלים גומר דכולי עלמא זיני וגמרי בה דבלים דתבעי לה אינשי כמא דתבעי האי דבילתא ועדיאת וילידת ליה תרין בנין וברת ואמר ליה איזיל חליף הדא איתתא זניתא ובנהא דהיא זניתא בנהא דזנו

*Therefore the Holy One Blessed Be He said to Hosea, "Go, take for you an adulterous woman and she will bear you children of adultery. And (so) he went and took Gomer, daughter of Diblaim. Gomer, in whom the entire world (i.e. everybody) satisfied (lit. finish/accomplish) [their] lust, [and] Diblaim, who desired every man as much as she (lit. this one) desired ill-fame. And she conceived and bore him two sons and a daughter. And he (God) said to him, "Go, exchange this adulterous woman and the children of this adulteress (or prostitute), [which are] the children of adultery."*

The parallel in BT below is considerably longer and contains multiple explanations on the meanings of the names "Gomer" and "Diblaim". In both cases, however, the explanations are given in the form of appositions and there are word-plays on the roots *g-m-r* and *d-b-l*. The root *g-m-r* suggests an act of accomplishment, hence the suggestion that all men accomplished or satisfied their lust in Gomer. In addition, the Bavli draws upon the *Pa'el* form of the root (*gammer*) which signifies destruction and in this case, the destruction of Israel at the politico-economic level at the hands of foreign invaders. Diblaim, the mother of Gomer, has had her name associated with *devilah/deviltah* which is a sweet-flavoured cake of pressed figs which bears a sexual connotation of signifying a woman of loose morals whose body is "trodden upon" by male lust. BT again uses the intensive form *dibbah* (ill-fame) to highlight the negative attributes of a prostitute associated with her name.

Parallel in b. 87a-b

ויאמר ה' אל הושע לך קח לך אשת זנונים וילדי זנונים וכתוב וילך ויקח את גומר בת דבלים גמר אמר רב שהכל גומרים בה בת דבלים דבה רעה בת דבה רעה ושמואל אמר שמתוקה בפי הכל כדבלה ורבי יוחנן אמר שהכל דשין בה כדבלה דבר אחר גמר אמר רבי יהודה שבקשו לגמר ממונן של ישראל בימיה רבי יוחנן אמר בזו וגמרו שנאמר (מלכים ב יג) כי אבדם מלך ארם וישמם כעפר לדוש

*And the Lord said to Hosea, "Go, take for you an adulterous woman and children of adultery." And it is written, "So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim." "Gomer", Rab said, "is she in whom all satisfied their lust (גומרים: lit. accomplished); the daughter of [87b] Diblaim, (a woman) of ill-fame (דבה רעה)." Samuel said, "[It means] that she was as sweet in everyone's mouth as a cake of figs (דבלה)." R. Jonathan interpreted, "[It means] that all trod upon her like a cake of figs [is trodden]." Another interpretation: "Gomer", Rab Judah said, "They desired to destroy (Pa'el: to destroy) the wealth of Israel in her days." R. Jonathan said, "They did indeed despoil [their wealth], for it is said, 'For the King of Aram (Syria) destroyed them and made them like the dust in threshing. (2 K 13:7)'" At this point, the Bavli quotes the MT of Hosea 1:3-6, 8-9 which does not occur in our manuscript. This is followed by the following passage:*

לאחר שנולדו [לו] שני בנים ובת אחת אמר לו הקב"ה להושע לא היה לך ללמוד ממושה רבך שכיון שדברתי עמו פירש מן האשה אף אתה בדול עצמך ממנה

*After two sons and one daughter were born to him, the Holy One Blessed Be He said to Hosea, "Should not you have learned from Moses your teacher? For as soon as I spoke with him he parted from his wife. So you should also part from her."*

מתבין ואמר קדמוהי בבעו מינך ריבון עלמא הלא מן קדמך איתגזר עלי למיסתבה וכדו דילידת לי תרין בנין וברת את מפקד עלי לחלפא יתה יהי רעוא מן קדמך דתיחוס עלי ולא תפריש ביני לבין בניי

*Objecting, he (Hosea) spoke before him [saying], "I beseech you, from you O everlasting lord, was it not by you that it was decreed for me to take her, and now that she has borne me two sons and a daughter, you command me to exchange her! May it be your will [from before you] that you have pity on me and may you not bring separation between me and my children!"*

With this verse, Hosea begins to realise the extent of the offence he is said to have committed. The parallel in BT is much shorter.

Parallel in b. Pes. 87b

אמר לו רבש"ע יש לי בנים ממנה ואין אני יכול להוציאה ולא לגרשה

*He (Hosea) pleaded, "Sovereign of the Universe! I have children by her, and I can neither expel her nor divorce her."*

מתיב קודשא בריך הוא ואמר ליה הושע נבייא הלא הוה לך למילף ממילי דילך דאיתתא זניתא ובנין דזנו  
לית את בעי למיחלף ואיכדין את אמר לי למיחלף בניה חביביא דילי בניהון דאברהם יצחק יעקב דהליכו  
קדמי בקשוט ובזכו ובליבא שלימא

*Answering, the Holy One Blessed Be He said to Hosea the prophet, "Should not have you learned from your words that [if] you do not want to exchange an adulterous woman (or wife) and the children of adultery, how could you then ask me to exchange my beloved children, the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob who walked before me in truth and [with] a righteous heart?"*

The identification of Israel as the chosen people is validated by highlighting their lineage with the three patriarchs. This status of Israel is elaborated in the parallel below in BT by identifying Israel as one of God's four cherished possessions, the other three being the Torah, the heaven and the earth, and the Temple. The first and the third are clearly identifiable with two of the three pillars of the world as described in the tractate *Avot* 1:2 namely the study of the Torah, the Temple-cult (*avodah*) and acts of loving kindness (*ge'milut chasadim*). Hosea seems to stand accused of a lack of knowledge of the Torah as he did not act as Moses did and he has also unknowingly betrayed the duty of observing the most fundamental laws of parental love in asking God to exchange Israel for another nation.

Parallel in b. Pes. 87b

א"ל הקב"ה ומה אתה שאשתך זונה ובניך [בני] זנונים ואין אתה יודע אם שלך הן אם של אחרים הן כך  
ישראל שהן בני בני בחוני בני אברהם יצחק ויעקב אחד מארבעה קנינין שקניתי בעולמי תורה קנין אחד  
דכתיב (משלי ח) ה' קנני ראשית דרכו שמים וארץ קנין אחד דכתיב (בראשית יד) קונה שמים וארץ בית  
המקדש קנין אחד דכתיב (תהילים עח) הר זה קנתה ימינו ישראל קנין אחד דכתיב (שמות טו) עם זו קנית  
ואתה אמרת העבירם באומה אחרת

*The Holy One Blessed be He said to him, "Then if you, whose wife is an adulteress and your children are the children of adultery, and you do not know if they are yours or they belong to others, yet [you] are so; then Israel who are my children, the children of my tried ones, the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; one of the four possessions that I have acquired in this world – The Torah is one possession, for it is written, 'The Lord acquired me as the beginning of his way.' Heaven and earth is one possession, as it is written, '[God Most High] who possesses heaven and earth'. The Temple is one possession, for it is written, 'This mountain (the Temple Mount) which his right hand had acquired'. Israel is one possession, for it is written, 'This people that you have acquired.' Yet you say, "Exchange them for a different nation!"*

בכך [תב] הושע ואמר קמי קודשא בריך הוא חבית קדמך יי

*Then Hosea repented and said before the Holy One Blessed Be He, "I have sinned before you, O LORD!"*

Parallel in b. Pes. 87b

כיון שידע שחטא עמד לבקש רחמים על עצמו

*As soon as he perceived that he had sinned, he arose to seek mercy for himself.*

מתלב ואמר ליה לא איקביל מינך עד דתברכינן לישראל ותיתנבי עליהון טבוון

*Answering, he (God) said to him, "I shall not accept [this] from you unless you bless Israel and say prophesies of good tidings to them."*

Parallel in b. Pes. 87b

אמר לו הקב"ה עד שאתה מבקש רחמים על עצמך בקש רחמים על ישראל שגזרתי עליהם שלש גזירות  
בעבורך

*The Holy One Blessed Be He said to him, "Instead of seeking mercy for yourself, seek mercy for Israel against whom I have decreed three decrees (the children of Hosea standing for three maledictions against Israel) because of you!"*

בכך פתח הושע ואמר בנבואה עליהו דישראל ויהי בני ישראל כחלא דימא וכו

*Then Hosea opened [his lips] and uttered a prophesy for Israel [saying], "And the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sands of the sea..." and so forth.*

### Parallel in *b. Pes. 87b*

עמד ובקש רחמים ובטל גזירה והתחיל לברכן שנאמר (הושע ב) והיה מספר בני ישראל כחול הים...

*[Then] he (Hosea) arose and sought mercy. And He (God) annulled the decree[s]. Then he (Hosea) began to bless them, as it is written, 'And the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sands of the sea...'*

The Tosefta or the prologue, as in BT, ends with an “inclusion” with the beginning of the second chapter in both MT and TJ. In MS c, the prologue forms a text distinct from the main body of the Targum since it is immediately followed (after וכו) by the main Targumic text beginning at chapter 1. The primary function of this prologue seems to form a link between the series of divine maledictions hurled against Israel culminating in God’s denial of Israel as his people and the beginning of the second chapter which marks a surprising turn of thought as God recounts his promises to make a great nation out of the Israelites. The ending of the prologue creates a smooth transition between these two ideas as the reader is given to understand Hosea’s own responsibility in incurring divine displeasure against Israel and God’s benevolence in turning the maledictions of the first chapter into the benedictions of the second chapter through Hosea’s prophetic agency.

Secondly, the Tosefta reflects the well-established theological concepts governing the Targumic writers about Israelite nationalism, Land theology and theological orthodoxy which will be discussed in following sections.

## 2.8 Targum Hosea 1: Translation and Commentary

**1:1** [The] word of prophecy from before the Lord which was with Hosea son of Beeri in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, kings of the house of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam, son of Joash, king of Israel.

The superscription introduces or rather specifies Hosea’s divinely ordained mission as “prophecy” which would be developed over the following verses. His function as a prophet would constitute the diplomatic link between himself and God on one side, and the Israelites as a collective entity on the other. The tetra-literal word פתגמא, of Persian origin, is widely used in Targumic Aramaic as an exact equivalent of the

Hebrew דבר. The superscription keeps the MT more or less intact apart from introducing a technical and an exegetical alteration.

The double preposition “from before” (מן קדם) falls into the category of typical Targumic renderings whenever the preposition מן in the MT is placed before the Tetragrammaton. The ubiquitous addition of קדם is a literary trope employed in the Targum – albeit at the expense of good Aramaic – to show respect to God, and not so much for avoiding an anthropomorphic representation. This can be endorsed from its use in Biblical Aramaic where the double preposition is used in relation to the king in Ezra 7:14 (מן קדם מלכא), but the usage without the מן seems to have been more usual as in Dan 2:10 and 5:17 (only קדם מלכא). However, קדם as a preposition is a characteristic of Targumic Aramaic and is often applied to any individual without the additional preposition מן. From this point of view, its occurrence in the somewhat tautologous and artificial expression מן קדם, according to some, show that the usual preposition קדם had lost its “force” in Targumic Aramaic.<sup>99</sup>

In rendering the אל in the MT as עם objectifies the פתגמא or the divine discourse as a substantial entity, and in this respect, the Targum establishes an identifiable relationship between the different agents of divine manifestations in the world such as the Memra and the Shekinah as will be seen below. The Targum, in converting the temporal or locative sense of אל to עם gives a spatial dimension to the relationship between פתגמא and Hosea. It is by the virtue of the “possession” of the divine word that Hosea’s designation as a prophet becomes visibly more evident.

**1:2** [The] beginning of the word of the Lord *with* Hosea: and the Lord said to Hosea, “Go and *speak a prophecy against the idolatrous city!*” *And they continue to sin because the inhabitants of the land surely go astray from after the worship of the Lord.*

One of the many objectives of the Targumic translation is to render the Hebrew of the MT comprehensible by smoothing out any lexical and conceptual ambiguity. It is difficult to consider the ב in בהושע in the MT as a *dativus instrumenti* in the context of the dialogue between God and Hosea, and it is even more bewildering that the Targum keeps it unchanged. However, in this case, the variant reading עם in MS c certainly

---

<sup>99</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. lv.

makes more sense. This is one instance to show the existence of inter-Targumic reinterpretations in which a Targumic text of one tradition may attempt in interpreting, and as in here, smoothing out the text of a parallel or already existing Targumic tradition.

The TJ or the “official” version of TgHos then presents a parallel tradition of interpretation of Hosea’s marriage with a prostitute to that of the Tosefta Tg. It seems highly probable that the Targumist’s interpretation of the MT in this case is a halakhic arrangement to make the Targumic text “theologically acceptable”, irrespective of the specific phase of the Rabbinic movement which the precise *halakhic* information refers to.<sup>100</sup> The Targumist’s interpretation of God’s commandment to Hosea to go and marry a prostitute as a mission for prophesying to the Israelites is not, as some unwittingly suppose, an example of “bland theological substitutes”.<sup>101</sup> This interpretation is not something unique to TgHos, but is also applied elsewhere in the Prophetic Targums and is governed by well-observed Targumic principles.

There are two “interpretative” Targumic techniques involved in this striking contrast between the MT and TgHos in the rendition of Hosea 1:2. First, the Targum may interpret a “symbolic” command given by God as a mission of prophecy irrespective of its contents. A good example of this can be taken from Tg Zech 11:4:

MT: Thus says the Lord my God, “Be a shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter.”

TJ: Thus says the Lord my God, “Prophecy against the leaders who were appointed to lead the people but who ruled over them as if they were a flock doomed to slaughter.”

The basic structure of 1:2 in the MT i.e. two independent clauses joined by the causal conjunction *כי* in the MT (*ארי* in TgHos) is kept unchanged in TgHos. In the table below, either side of the verse divided by the conjunction is arranged in parallel columns. In

---

<sup>100</sup> Pinchus Churgin thinks that the Targums do not always conform to the contemporary *halakhic* exposition. In his opinion, therefore, later redactors brought both the “official” Targums of Onqelos and Jonathan in line with the established *halakhic* and *haggadic* norms in cases where they differed from popular interpretations. P. CHURGIN, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, Yale, 1907, p. 17. Smoler and Aberbach contests Churgin’s view to some extent while attributing most of the Targumic theology to the earlier period of R. Aqiva. See L. SMOLAR and M. ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York-Baltimore, Ktav, 1983. p. 129. But as already explained, the precise date and provenance of a particular Rabbinic opinion do not concern us in the present study, but rather how the Targumist makes use of such opinions in the Targumic text under consideration.

<sup>101</sup> A.A. MCINTOSH, *Hosea* (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1997, p. lxxxi.

spite of the alterations in TgHos, the altered words can be easily linked up with their corresponding sources in the MT.<sup>102</sup> The additions made by TgHos are highlighted in bold:

זנה תזנה הארץ מאחרי יהו	כי	לך קה-לך אשת זונים וילדי זונים	MT
מטעא יטעון דירי ארעא מבתר פולחנא דיי	ארי	איזיל אתנבי נבואה על יתבי קרתא טעיתא ואנון מוספין למחטי	TgHos

The rendering in TgHos introduces two elements into the translation: interpretative and additive. The interpretative element has the task of making the scriptural message “theologically acceptable” whereas the additive element helps to make it more “intelligible”. In most cases, these two elements are intermeshed and share their respective tasks. Comparing the two sides of the above table, the additive element in TgHos turns out to be the phrase *ואנון מוספין למחטי* [*and they continue to sin*] which explains why the city is called “idolatrous”. Regarding the theological acceptability of the divine commandment, Etan Levine points out that a strictly literal understanding of the commandment in Hosea 1:2 would have been a clear violation of the “Pharisaic-Rabbinic law” i.e. the *halakha* according to which an adulterous woman (אשת זונים) was forbidden both to her husband and her partner, all the more to a prophet.<sup>103</sup>

This point is taken to a further extent by Smolar and Aberbach in their chapter on the Targum and halakhic regulations. First, one has to take into account the “puritanical” mindset of the Targumic/Rabbinic authors even when dealing with the Biblical text:

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 ... It, therefore, became necessary to censor the Biblical text and alter it in such a way that rough

<sup>102</sup> This clearly corresponds to Alexander’s “Type A” model of Targum translation as defined in the section 2.5 above. We shall continue to encounter this type of translation throughout the following portions.

<sup>103</sup> Levine here makes reference to *m. Sot.* 1:1 which deals with the prolems of bringing a woman suspected of adultery to a public trial and the requirement of acquiring two witnesses in order to convict her. The allusion is of course an indirect one. E. LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 174), Berlin, De Gruyter, 1988, p. 150.

expressions and sexual imagery were eliminated in favor of various euphemisms and circumlocutions characterized by clear, unimpeachable language. 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.<sup>104</sup>

Such uneasiness of the Targumist in dealing with language and images of sexual promiscuity can be evidenced from the many alterations in the Targum of Ezekiel, especially in the chapters 16 and 23 which abound in vivid images of sexual metaphors. For example, in translating Ezek 16:8, the mention of nudity or sexual organs are supplanted with theological terminology and at the same time, stereotypical Targumic terms/concepts such as “Exile” or God’s “*Memra*” are introduced for performing the additional task of contextualisation:

MT: “...you (Jerusalem) were at the age for love. I spread the edge of my cloak over you, and covered your nakedness.”

TJ: “...the time for your redemption had come; so I protected you with my *Memra*, and I removed your sins.”<sup>105</sup>

Even more than such a dialogue between God and somebody else (in this case, Jerusalem personified), a direct commandment coming from God that involves actions which are not compatible with the *halakhic* norms or with the Rabbinic conception of God have serious implications over the translation in the Targum. The expression “and the Lord will lay bare their (that of the daughters of Zion) secret parts” in Isa 3:17b was an perplexing issue for the Targumist since it not only speaks candidly of female sexual organs, but of God himself being the one who will “uncover” them! The Targum, without fully changing the wording, employs nevertheless an over-extended euphemism: “and the Lord will remove their honour/glory (יקר).”<sup>106</sup> It therefore perfectly falls in line with traditional Targumic translation method when the Targumist substitutes the language of the divine commandment in Hosea 1:2 involving

---

<sup>104</sup> The authors connect such Puritanical attitude of the Targumist towards language use of to the *Sitz im Leben* of the Targum as it was read aloud in public in the synagogue as the “authoritative” rendition of the scripture. And this is what distinguishes the Targum’s restraints on the language as opposed to the candidness with which sexual subjects are dealt with in the Mishnah and the Talmud which were accessible only through a private study among the elites. SMOLAR and ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan*, p. 49-50.

<sup>105</sup> SMOLAR and ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan*, p. 53.

<sup>106</sup> SMOLAR and ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan*, p. 54 n. 301.

relationship between the prophet and an adulterous woman with an injunction against the collective misdeeds of the Israelites.

◇ Key Concept 1: טעיתא (idolatry):

There are, however, close semantic links between the terms signifying “prostitution” in the MT and the words used in TgHos for “idolatry” to substitute the former. The root טעי or טעא in Aramaic has multiple connotations. The basic sense of the root is “to wander about”, “go astray”, or “to err”.<sup>107</sup> From this basic meaning, one derives the connotation of indulging into prostitution or idolatry. The substantive טעיתא, therefore, may indicate an error or mistake, and in its enlarged sense, a prostitute as well as an idol either of which is believed to allure the righteous person to go astray from a godly way of life. The Aramaic equivalent used in the Targum thus has a broader implication than the Hebrew זנה.

The use of the root טעי and its various derivatives by the Targumist also springs from the strict line of demarcation that he draws between the God of Israel and the other gods, both of whom are sometimes designated in the MT with the common appellation אלהים. However, one sometimes comes across the term אלילם (lit. non-existent entities) in the MT (eg. Lev 26:1) based on the belief that such foreign gods or idols do not actually exist. The Targumist takes a two-fold initiative to clarify on this point. First, his choice of the root טעי in designating them as “errors” is theologically more pungent, and secondly, there is often a hesitation and even abstinence on the part of the Targumist to mention the pagan gods by their names or designating them under a collective appellation (see 2:19).<sup>108</sup> The latter technique is said to be based on the prohibition found in Exod 23:13b: “Do not invoke the names of other gods (אלהים אחרים); do not let them be heard on your lips.”

The next significant alteration noticeable in this verse is the change of the term “the land” (MT: הארץ) to the “inhabitants of the land” (TgHos: דירי ארעא) who go astray “from after” the worship of the Lord. It is not difficult to understand that a sacrosanct

<sup>107</sup> The *Aph'el* has the causative sense of leading someone astray or deceiving someone. JASTROW, *Dictionary*, p. 543.

<sup>108</sup> SMOLAR and ABERBACH, *Studies in Targum Jonathan*, p. 41.

respect for the land (*terra sancta*) and attachment to it may partly be the reason behind such a modification. This brings us to the concept of the nationhood and what scholars have termed as “land theology”:

◇ Key Concept 2: Nationhood and Land Theology:

Etan Levine has remarked that ever since the destruction of the First Temple in 586 BCE, the idea of a people evolving into a “textual community”, a largely “scattered” people or a “nation-in-exile” knit together around a sacred text became quite intense among the Jewish people.<sup>109</sup> The Biblical portrayal of the majestic post-Exilic convocation in Jerusalem in Neh 8 to which the origin of the Targumic tradition is often traced back in the popular mind endorses this intricate connection between the scripture and the homeland. As we have already seen in the Tosefta Tg, the main accusation against the prophet Hosea by God himself was that he dared to ask for an “exchange” of the people of Israel for another nation. It was even considered a “sin” in the divine eyes to have treated the Israelites, the descendants of the meritorious patriarchs, with an equal status with any other surrounding nation.

Such a nationalistic sentiment expressed through the valorisation of Israel and their attachment to their homeland or the Torah is particularly strong in the Targum of the Twelve Prophets.<sup>110</sup> This is expressed in several ways in TgHos: retrieval of blessings on Israel from the prophet himself (Tosefta Tg); promise of forgiveness on the condition of showing repentance (1:3), promise of a return from exile followed by a reunification and restoration of the people (2:1,2; 3:5) and similar ideas.

The double preposition “from after” (מן בתר = מבתר), unlike its antonymic equivalent מן קדם, is nothing more than a literal rendering of the Hebrew מאחרי, which is yet another example for showing the extent to which the Targumist can go for rendering “literally” the Hebrew text, even at the expense of good Aramaic. The Targumic addition of “the worship of” (פולחנא ד) before the Tetragrammaton serves a double purpose: first, it accomplishes an anti-anthropomorphic function by preventing to

<sup>109</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 6.

<sup>110</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 9.

place such a spatial prepositional expression מבתר before the divine name, and we shall discover, the Targum prefers to speak with reference to certain manifestations or agencies of God rather than to God himself. Secondly, the term פולחנא itself is endowed with some theological significance in TgHos which deserves a broader attention in the box below.

◇ Key Concept 3 : פולחנא (worship/service/cult):

The root פלח in Aramaic may signify any kind of work including manual labour under the subservience of either man or deity.<sup>111</sup> But in Targumic literature, the frequently occurring substantive פולחנא refers primarily to priestly service to a divinity.<sup>112</sup> In this sense, the expression פולחנא דיי here refers exclusively to the priestly and cultic worship of the Israelite deity and is often distinguished elsewhere from פולחנא נוכראה which stands for the cult of foreigners i.e. various forms of idolatry as in 2:15.

The term פולחנא is the nearest Aramaic equivalent of the Mishnaic Hebrew עבודה. And very similar to Mishnaic contents, the Targum, regardless of its post-Exilic or post-Biblical redaction, has an ongoing concern for the Temple cult and priesthood and their restoration or maintenance following a period of crisis. It is closely related to prayer (צלותא) which also forms an important element of the fullness of the divine “worship”. As Levine notes, elsewhere in TgHos (14:3), prayer (צלותא) as an institution may have the potential to replace sacrifice.<sup>113</sup> Indeed, in classical Rabbinic concept as exemplified by the Mishnah, the “worship” or the divine cult (פולחנא/עבודה) constitutes one of the three pillars of Rabbinic Judaism even in the absence of the Temple or sacrifice, the other two being the Law (תורה) and charitable deeds (גמילות החסדים).<sup>114</sup>

In TgHos, however, there is an interesting parallel between the Israelite cultic worship (פולחנא) and the “fear” (דחילתא) of God. In 3:5 in MS c, the term פולחנא דיי (the *worship* of the Lord) has been replaced by the expression דחלתא דיי (the *fear* of

<sup>111</sup> JASTROW, *Dictionary*, 1178

<sup>112</sup> JASTROW, *Dictionary*, 1141

<sup>113</sup> Levine distinguishes between prayer (צלותא) which in the Targum is always directed to God and the term בעותא which may stand for any non-religious form of request or supplication. LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 131.

<sup>114</sup> m. *Avot* 1:2

the Lord) to which the repented Israelites shall return. This may be understood from an internal textual criterion with reference to the two succeeding verses 14:2 and 14:3 in TgHos (as in MS v):<sup>115</sup>

14:2: Return, O Israel, to the *fear* (אִתְּיָד) of the Lord your God!

14:3: Return, O Israel, to the *worship* (פּוֹלְחָנָא) of the Lord!

**1:3** And he went and *prophesied against them that if they repented, it shall be forgiven to them. If not, like falling of figs, they will fall. But they continued to sin and did evil deeds.*

This verse continues in the same vein as the preceding one by substituting Hosea's marriage with a prostitute and replacing it with his mission of prophecy. There is no mention of the proper names Gomer and Diblaim, unlike in the Tosefta Tg where at least metaphorical interpretations of the two names are given. But in spite of the change of content, as in the preceding verse, the Targum preserves the structure and syntax of the MT. This is the duality of the Targumic translation technique that will be witnessed over and over again and throughout the following verses. The Targumist's departure away from the MT's subject-matter based on theological incompatibility overlaps with his struggle to follow the MT as closely as possible. In this verse, as there is a complete diversion from the contents of the MT, there is at the same time a striking resemblance with the MT in terms of structural pattern. The change is also motivated by the objectionable connotation of certain verbs employed in the MT. The neutral verb הִלַּךְ of the MT is translated with its usual Aramaic equivalent אָזַל. But the succeeding verb לִקַּח with Gomer the prostitute as its direct object has definite connotations of receiving and entering into a physical union with the woman in question. So the Targum replaces it with the verb אִתְּנַבֵּי (denominative) and thereby replacing the objectionable or the profane task with a sacred vocation.

---

<sup>115</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 4.

The Targumic translation of 1:3 has to introduce an additive element since **אתנבי** is an intransitive verb and therefore the contents of the prophecy in question need to be specified. The additive translation contains an elaborate metaphor in which fall of the unrepentant Israelites are compared with that of figs. The obvious source of this metaphor is the name Diblaim itself which the Rabbis interpreted as the dual of **דבילה** which is a cake made of pressed figs. This is exactly the interpretation found in the Tosefta Tg (see the explanation on p. 55-56). Apart from this indirect word-play on the proper name Diblaim without mentioning it, the verse introduces the well-established concepts of repentance and forgiveness.

◇ Key Concept 4: **תיובתא** (repentance):

In Targumic literature in general, and always in TgHos, the verb **תוב** takes precedence over the substantive **תיובתא**, implying that the inner abstract quality of repentance is ideally accompanied by a concrete act of making a “return” on the part of the penitent. In most cases, this return is directed towards God’s Torah or to God’s worship as in 2:1 where there is a link between the transgression of the Torah and the future return of the Israelites on the condition of repentance. The Hebrew equivalent **תשובה**, literally meaning “return”, as some point out, gains the connotation of “repentance” only in post-Biblical Hebrew literature and not in the MT.<sup>116</sup> According to Rabbinic beliefs, repentance, along with the Torah, are among the seven things that were created before the world was made.<sup>117</sup>

The introduction of the theme of repentance in TgHos usually takes place through the additive translation technique, that is to say, the TgHos adds to the content of the MT the theme of repentance which was otherwise absent in it. In so doing the Targumist provides an ever-existing option for repentance and possible forgiveness where such an option is not usually offered by the MT. One of the most notorious Biblical characters such as Cain is also given this option in Gen 4:7 in the Targum

<sup>116</sup> The substantive **תשובה** occurs eight times in the MT (1 Sam 7:17; 2 Sam 11:1; 1 Kgs 20:22; 1 Kgs 20:26; 1 Chr 20:1; 2 Chr 36:10; Job 21:34; Job 34:36) signifying either the return of natural seasons/moments or a physical return of some individual or troops. In TgHos as well, the verb **תוב** is obviously not used always to imply a physical act of return of an individual or object. See 2:11 for such a use of **תוב** without any connotation of repentance.

<sup>117</sup> *m. Avot*, 4:11, elaborated upon in *b. Pes.* 54a. See JASTROW, *Dictionary*, p. 1708.

where God's advice to Cain on offering sacrifice in the MT is turned into a clear-cut invitation to repentance in TO, identical to ones in TgHos 1:3, 1:6, and 3:1: "... and you will be punished if you do not repent but if you repent you will be forgiven" (TO on Gen 4:7b).<sup>118</sup>

In this context, it should be pointed out that in the Targum, repentance has in some cases an individualistic nature and in other cases, as in our text of TgHos, a more collective as well as a communal nature.<sup>119</sup> This communal nature is often linked to a "national" repentance as in 2:1 where the Israelites as the chosen nation ("people of the living God") shall return from the exile as a result of their repentance. This matches with Levine's interesting observation that it is only when in a state of repentance that Israel is considered to be "God's children", as the series of maledictions gives way to a solemn benediction in 2:1.<sup>120</sup>

The phrase "But they continued to sin and did evil deeds" which recurs in 1:6 has also a subtle theological motivation behind it. It substitutes the narrative of Gomer's conception and giving birth of the first son of Hosea (ותהר ותלד לו בן). Since all the modifications in the verse spring from the Targumist's intention to save the figure of the prophet from a problematic and disrepute marital connection, it must also substitute the narratives of the child-births resulting from such a connection. The exact phrase is repeated in 1:6 substituting in the same way Gomer's giving birth to the second child, a daughter. The theme of continuity is present both in the MT (עוד) and in TgHos (וְיִסְי) to indicate the repetitive child-births of Gomer and the recurrence of sinful acts committed by Israel respectively. It also serves the function of setting the prophesying prophet in contrast to the "people" who continue to commit sinful deeds without paying heed to his prophecy. In this sense, this verse could be set as an example for underlining the stark difference in the theological framework between TJ and the Tosefta Tg versions of the prophetic mission of Hosea within TgHos.

<sup>118</sup> See LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 126.

<sup>119</sup> B.D. CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT Supplement, 23), Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 1983, p. 38.

<sup>120</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 125.

**1:4** And the Lord said to him, “Call *their* name *Scattered Ones*, for in yet a little while, I shall visit upon the blood of the *worshippers of idols, which Jehu shed in Jezreel, and he massacred them because they had worshipped Ba’al. They themselves have turned back to go astray after the calves of Bethel. Therefore I shall consider it as innocent blood* against the house of Jehu and I shall abolish *kingship from* the house of Israel.

**1:5** And it will happen at that *time* that I shall shatter the *might of the warmongers* of Israel in the valley of Jezreel.

Contrary to what the authors of a recent article on the first three chapters of Targum Hosea think regarding the change of the name “Jezreel” in the MT to “Scattered Ones” (מבדריא) in TgHos, it is not just a mere by-product of the Targum’s evasion of Hosea’s marriage narrative.<sup>121</sup> This is evident from the fact that in vv. 6 and 9, the Aramaic versions of the Hebrew proper names are found with a somewhat different contextual arrangement. First, there is a change from singular to plural as the imperative “Call *her* name” in the MT becomes “Call *their* names” in TgHos substituting Gomer’s new-born child for the Israelites as a collective entity. Secondly, the name “Scattered Ones” clearly refers to the exiled/dispersed state of the Israelites which would become a recurring theme from the second chapter onwards. In Tg Zech 10:9, the same root בדר occurs in relation to the idea of the exiled state of the people: “And I shall scatter (בדר) them among the nations...” However, there is also a possibility to see the root בדר in *Pa’el* as a direct translation of the Hebrew זרע to the extent the latter may also convey the idea of “scattering”. In such case, the translation in the Targum could be seen as a word-play on the name “Jezreel”.

There is a particular theological problem involved in the MT for 1:4 which the Targum tries to resolve. The reference to Jehu’s ruthless massacre of the idolatrous priests in the valley of Jezreel refers to the narrative in 2 Kgs 10 where the bloodshed instigated by Jehu is clearly presented as a fulfilment of God’s word (2 Kgs 10:30). Therefore God’s announcement of punishment against the house of Jehu in 1:4 in the MT on

---

<sup>121</sup> D.C. BÖHME, J. MÜLLER, H.D. NEEF, *Hoseas Botschaft als Prophetie: Targum Jonathan zu Hosea 1-3*, in *Biblische Notizen*, 131 (2006), p. 19-20. To my knowledge, this seems to be the sole existing journal article focusing on a study of the first three chapters of TJ to Hosea.

account of the said event is quite puzzling. The interpretation in TgHos attempts to provide a solution to this puzzle in three different but closely related ways:

*a) Modifying the Content of the MT:*

The Targum makes the worshippers of Ba'al slaughtered by Jehu the object of God's vengeance. There is a textual problem involved in 1:4. In Sperber's text, which is followed by the English translators, there is a miscopying of וקטילנון as דקטיילנון. The latter reading may render the phrase structurally less awkward but it is found neither in MS v nor in c. The substitution of ך with ך creates a separate statement in the form of a compound sentence which emphasises the fact that it is because of their worship of Ba'al that Jehu had massacred the idol-worshippers. In MS c, the name of Ba'al (בעלא) is substituted by "the calves" (עגליא), probably to create a harmonisation with "the calves of Bethel" mentioned in the additive component in the latter part of the verse.

*b) Introducing an Additive Element:*

The additive component in the verse introduced by the Targum "They themselves have turned back to go astray after the calves of Bethel" probably refers to the prolepsis in 2 Kgs 10:29 in the MT in which Jehu is said to have eventually committed the similar sins of venerating golden calves in Bethel and Dan. The Targumic addition thus may also be seen as an attempt for contextualising Jehu's sin of idolatry within the context of Israel's disobedience and adaptation of foreign cults which would eventually result in their deportation into exile.

*c) Filling up the Lacuna in the MT:*

Taking the sections *a* and *b* together, one may see that TgHos keeps the divine injunction against the house of Jehu of the MT more or less intact by introducing the explanation through the additive element which stresses the fact, with the help of the same reference to 2 Kgs 10:29, that in spite of Jehu's "justifiable" massacre of the worshippers of Ba'al, God shall consider it as "innocent blood" *against* (על) Jehu's household since they have eventually gone astray or erred (ׁטעי ׁ: or "have gone whoring"?) by indulging into the worship of Ba'al.

The MT mentions God's intention of abolishing the "kingdom of the house of Israel" (ממלכות בית ישראל) which TgHos changes into the abolition of "kingship from the house of Israel" (מלכותא מבית ישראל). It seems that TgHos somehow mellows down the tone of the divine injunction by substituting the abolition of the entire kingdom of Israel with that of just the institution of monarchy. The monarchy as an institution had ceased to exist for the Israelites by the time the official Targum traditions were being condensed. Is this subtle change introduced for making it relevant to the contemporary situation?

The next verse 1:5 has been appended to the present one as it is a continuation of the same prophecy in 1:4 in link with the valley of Jezreel. The only significant change to be seen here is the use of the abstract noun "might" (תקורף) for "bow" (קשת). A similar change from "bow" to "might" or "power" can be found in other places such as Tg Hab 3:9, Tg Zech 9:10, and 10:4. Although such a substitution of the particular by general and *vice-versa* is part of the Targumic translation technique, in this case, the Targum could also take advantage of the word-play between the two Hebrew words קשת (bow) and קשה (hard/severe).<sup>122</sup> Apart from this, TgHos simplifies the use of the synecdoche in the MT by introducing the elaborate appellation "the warmongers (עבדי קרב) of Israel" in the place of "Israel".

**1:6** *And they continued to do wicked deeds, and he said to him, "Call their name Larehimin in their deeds. For I shall not continue to have mercy upon the house of Israel. But if they repented, I shall surely forgive them.*

The first part of this verse is identical to that of 1:3 in the way the continuous misdoings of the Israelites replace Gomer's act of conception of and giving birth to the second child. The English translation of Cathcart and Gordon translates the Aramaic name לא רחימין as "Not pitied".<sup>123</sup> But in this case, it is a literal Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew לא רחמה, and therefore it seems best to leave it in the state of a proper name. Like in the MT, in TgHos the name is matched with God's refusal to continue to show mercy as a result of the same verbal root רחם in both languages. The final and additive part is in the same way identical to that in 1:3, but involves a particular

<sup>122</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 158 n. 42.

<sup>123</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 30.

translation method which is a key-feature of Targumic interpretation known as “converse” translation.

Key Concept 5: Converse Translation:

This unique aspect of the Targumic translation technique was first underlined by M.L. Klein in one of his articles which analyses this particular translation method in detail with various examples.<sup>124</sup> Basically, this happens when the rendering in the Targum comes to generate a meaning which is contradictory to the “plain meaning” (*peshat*) of the Hebrew source text. Apart from the “additive” and “interpretative” translations of the MT both of which we have already confronted in TgHos, this appears to be another significant element in the ensemble of the translation techniques employed in TgHos. Klein proposes three different ways in which such a “converse” translation may take place: by a deletion of the negation or the negative particle in the MT, by changing the Hebrew verb for an Aramaic verb of opposite meaning, and by changing a rhetorical question in the MT (often expecting the answer “no”) to a simple statement. But in each case, the ultimate goal of the translator is either to provide a satisfactory answer to some apparently puzzling or ambiguous verse in the MT or to obviate some theologically objectionable concept. This is particularly important to bear in mind since, as we have observed throughout, the translator otherwise possesses a sacrosanct respect for both the contents and structure of the Hebrew text and avoids meddling with it without any proper theological and/or technical reason.

In 1:6, for example, there is a marked ambiguity in the MT in the final part of the verse regarding the infinite absolute אַשׁאֵן אַשׁאֵן. The ambiguity centres on whether the letter ׀ in the root אַשׁאֵן is a *śin* or *šin*.<sup>125</sup> In the first case, which is followed by the majority of the translations, it may be translated as “I shall surely forgive them” but this seems to be incongruous with the immediate context of divine malediction against the house of Israel. On the other hand, taking the letter ׀ as a *śin*, one may

<sup>124</sup> M.L. KLEIN, *Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique*, in *Biblica* 57 (1976), p. 515-537.

<sup>125</sup> M.A. SWEENEY, *The Twelve Prophets*, v. 1 (Berit Olam. Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry), Collegetown MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, p. 20-21.

translate as “I shall surely oppress them” which seems to go better with the overall context. The text of TgHos, from the latter point of view, results in a “converse” translation by employing the recurrent verb רחם (to show mercy). In terms of Klein, the translation here applies the second method i.e. a substitution of the Hebrew verb for an Aramaic verb carrying an opposite meaning.

**1:7** But upon the house of Judah, I shall have mercy, and I shall save them by the *Memra of the Lord* their God. *And they shall not be saved* by the bow, or by the sword, or by the warmongers, or by horses, or by horsemen.

The concept of the *Memra* is essential to the theology and exegesis of TgHos and it occurs in this verse for the first time in our text.

◇ Key Concept 6: מימרא (*Memra*):

*Memra* (אמר), in Targumic Aramaic, is neither an exact equivalent of the Hebrew דבר nor can be translated simply as “word”, or “command” as sometimes done in a misleading way. A more suitable equivalent in Targumic Aramaic would be the term פתגמא, which indeed translates דבר in 1:1. In our text, the term *Memra* occurs five times and each case with God as the sole possessor of it: in 1:9 as מימרא דיי, and in four other instances with the first person singular suffix as מימרי [My *Memra*] with God as the speaker in question. In most entries on this term, it is unequivocally stated that the primarily and only function of this term is to obviate anthropomorphism.<sup>126</sup> Although such a definition is true to some extent, but the ubiquitous use of the term *Memra* in the Targum cannot be ranked at the same level with other Targumic literary tropes for avoiding anthropomorphic representations of God.

The term owes its origin to the Targum’s concern for the avoidance of using God’s name. Carrying the prohibition against using the *nomina sacra* “in vain” (Exod 20:7;

<sup>126</sup> For example, JASTROW, *Dictionary*, p. 775.

Deut 5:11) to its furthest extent, the Targum deemed it inadequate to use the substitute pronunciation *Adonai* for the Tetragrammaton.<sup>127</sup> According to Levine, the Targumic practice of referring to God in terms of his *Memra* or *Shekinah* (see KC 6) is influenced by similar usage in the scripture, for example, the Israelites see the “glory” (כבוד) of the Lord appearing in the cloud or passing before Moses (Ex 16:10; 33:18) where the term “glory” is a clear substitute for God.<sup>128</sup> But the term *Memra*, more than any of its closer equivalents, seems to be the best known and most frequently used Targumic paraphrase for the Tetragrammaton. It is also unique to Targumic literature in the sense that an identical application of this term is not to be found in contemporary Rabbinic literature in which one may come across the frequently used expression קדוש ברוך הוא or קודשא בריך הוא repeated each time after the mention of God as is the case in our text of the Tosefta Tg. In that sense, *Memra*, along with *Shekinah*, is both a “divine surrogate” in the Targum and a versatile way of encompassing the entire spectrum of God’s endeavours and activities in the world in link with his human subjects on earth.<sup>129</sup> This justifies the choice for leaving the term untranslated in this English translation.

Bruce Chilton, in his study of the Isaiah Targum, distinguishes between eight types of application of the term *Memra* in the Targum, three of which are to be found in our text of TgHos along with another different one:<sup>130</sup>

i. *מימרא* as an agent of punishment: In 2:11, God’s *Memra* is said to return to curse (מלט) the possessions of Israel as a punishment for their ungratefulness to God and their idolatry mentioned in the preceding verse.

ii. *מימרא* as an agent of salvation<sup>131</sup>: The *Memra* of God is mentioned in conjunction with the verb פרק (to save) signifying the act of salvation through its intervention. In 1:7, God’s *Memra* is clearly set in contrast with a series of human battle weapons to

<sup>127</sup> *m. Sanh.* 10:1 states that the one who “pronounces the Name with its proper letters” doesn’t have any share in the “world to come”. Further elaborations are given in the corresponding Talmudic sections. LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 57.

<sup>128</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 58.

<sup>129</sup> S.H. LEVEY, *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 13), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1987, p. 15.

<sup>130</sup> See CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 57-64

<sup>131</sup> Chilton defines the function as “divine protection”. CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 60.

emphasise the fact that it is the former which is the agent of salvation for God's people (see commentary on 1:7). In 3:2, there is a recapitulation of the redemption of Israel by God's *Memra* in link with the Exodus event.

iii. *מימרא* as an object of desire<sup>132</sup>: In 2:17, there is another reference to the Exodus story as a reminder of the happy bygone days when the Israelites “yearned for” (נהי) God's *Memra* in Egypt during the time when God was performing mighty and miraculous deeds for them and was leading them out of Egypt. Here, the verb נהי in *hitpe'el* signifies a longing or a desire for something, especially in link with the noun תחמודא (desire, delight) in the same verse. For the contextual significance of this use, see the commentary on 2:17.

iv. *מימרא* as an intermediary: This is a more generalised usage of *Memra* in the Targum, in which it is often seen as the basis of God's relationship with his people or their “support”. This relationship is often conveyed in the medium of the people's prayer or supplication to God. In 1:9, there is a rejection on the part of God's *Memra* to be Israel's “support” (סעדא) due to their disobedience. Similarly in 2:4, God's *Memra* refuses to hear the prayer of the congregation of Israel due to their lack of humility in God's worship. In both cases, the *Memra* of God denies Israel the favour i.e. its intermediary function between them and God as the result of the former's shortcomings.

All these examples of the use of *מימרא* in TgHos show that the term retains its core function of obviating any anthropomorphic representation of God and introducing a typical Targumic technique of showing reverence for the divine name while at the same time being endowed with one or another significant theological attributes and functions.

In the second half of the verse, the first personal singular of the verb ישע/פרק [*I shall save (them)*] with God as its subject has been changed into the passive voice by converting the verb into *hitpe'el* third person plural [*they shall be saved*], which can be seen as a way of barring God from being the direct agent of using the various war

---

<sup>132</sup> This category is not mentioned particularly by Chilton.

weapons listed therein. On the other hand, in MS c, the text retains the first person singular of the MT (אפרקינן) translating the same concept as in the latter implying the idea it is God's intervention that brings about the salvation and not the war weapons: a good instance to show once again two parallel texts of the Targum Jonathan existing side by side pointing to different theological angles.

**1:8** *And their inhabitants who had been exiled to among the nations were forgotten, for they were not pitied in their deeds. And they continued to do evil deeds.*

This first part of this verse substitutes the succeeding narrative on Lo-Ruhamma and Gomer's third childbirth in the MT, but on the other hand, it continues the idea of the preceding verse in TgHos while introducing the theme of "exile". The additive part is same as those in 1:3 and 1:6.

**Key Concept 7: גלותא (Exile):**

In the Targum, the idea of exile is connected with the the root גלי or גלא, which also has the sense of "revealing" or "uncovering" something, as in TgHos 2:12. Apart from this one exception, the root occurs in five places within TgHos 1-3: twice as a substantive (גלותא) in 2:2 and 2:24 referring to the exiled state of the Israelites, and three times as a verb (1:8; 2:1; 3:3) out of which the first two occurrences are in *Ittaphal* (causative passive) indicating that the Israelites were the object of God's action of sending them to exile. The exile is brought upon the people clearly as a punishment by God either as a result of the transgression of his Torah (1:8; 2:1) or speaking in more general terms, because of their sins (3:3). However, in four out of these five instances (i.e. except in 1:8), the exiled state of the people is accompanied by a promise of return (תובט) or of being gathered (כנשט *pa'el*) by God.

In Targumic literature, the Targum of Lamentations happens to be the *locus classicus* for the full development of the theology of the Exile in which the exilic or dispersed/diasporic state of the Jewish people following the destruction of the First and Second Temples and in later period after the Bar Kokhba revolt are given a more religious rather than a historical-political significance in order to grasp its

significance from the perspective of violation and non-observance of the Torah or various sins and shortcomings on the part of the Jewish people.<sup>133</sup>

**1:9** And he said, “Call *their* name La-‘ammi, because you are not my people. *Because you do not fulfill the words of my Torah, my Memra has not been your support.*

The MT of Hos 1:9b reads **אֲנִי לֹא אֱלֹהִים לָכֵן**, in which the expression could be seen as a reference to the divine name given to Moses in Exod 3:14 which the Hebrew text of Hos 1:9 negates (as the LXX understands it), or as some textual scholars suggest, the whole expression **אֲנִי לֹא אֱלֹהִים לָכֵן** could be a mistake for **אֱלֹהִים לָכֵן**, which would result in the translation “I am not your God” to be seen in many English versions.<sup>134</sup> The Targum removes this part of the MT altogether and adds instead an explanation for God’s apparent rejection of the Israelites as his chosen people which includes the mention of the term **אוריתא** for the first time in TgHos.

Key Concept 8: **אוריתא** (Torah/Law):

The term **אוריתא** is an exact Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew **תורה**. The concept and place of Torah is so central to Rabbinic and thereby Targumic theology that its importance cannot be overestimated. It comes first among the three “pillars” of Rabbinic Judaism as exemplified in the tractate *Avot* (see KC 3). Levine points out along these lines that the Targumic concept of Torah encapsulates the “Oral Law” i.e. the “broad supplementary tradition and detailed injunction” which were also thought to be divinely revealed at the same time as the written Torah.<sup>135</sup> Added to this, the Targum often interpreted an array of different Hebrew terms in the Bible such as “knowledge” (**דעת**), “light” (**אור**), “truth” (**אמן**) and so on as metaphors for Torah.<sup>136</sup>

In TgHos 1-3, the term **אוריתא** occurs in five places (1:9; 2:1; 2:3; 2:5; 2:16) out of

<sup>133</sup> For a detailed discussion of the theology of the Exile as expressed in the Targum of Lamentations, see LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 173-180.

<sup>134</sup> See the critical apparatus in the BHS for Hos 1:9.

<sup>135</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 135. Levine cites the Onqelos version of Exod 18:20 to show how the Targum prescribes the details of Rabbinic teaching through its understanding “Torah” and other different terms related to the concept of “instruction” in the Hebrew scriptures.

<sup>136</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 136.

which three (1:9; 2:3; 2:5) are found with first person singular pronominal suffix [*My Torah*] referring to God as the giver of it. In 1:9, it also occurs in parallel with the term *Memra*, which signifies its divine origin. As Levine points out, the “crucial centrality” of the Torah in the life of the nation and the individual is a major preoccupation of the Targumist.<sup>137</sup> In TgHos, it is the well-being of the nation which is linked with the observance of and adherence to God’s Torah and therefore, the former is always conditioned by the latter. It will be seen in conjunction with KC 7 that the exiled state of the people is resulted, among other reasons, from a transgression of the Torah (2:1). In 1:9 and 2:5 as well, it is a question of the people having transgressed (עבר) the Torah. In 2:3, there is an invitation for the people to make a return (תוב) to God’s Torah, and in 2:16, God vows to make his people subject/adhere (עבד *šafel*) to it.

## 2.9 Targum Hosea 2: Translation and Commentary

A suggestion is often put forward that the Prophetic Targums grew out of the Aramaic versions of the *haftarot*<sup>138</sup>, which often have links with the corresponding Torah portions (*parasha, parashiyyot*) in TO by which they would have already been influenced.<sup>139</sup> One of the many tasks of the readings from the Prophets in the synagogue was to contextualise the corresponding Torah portion and to give it an eschatological dimension. This would often underline themes like the exhortation to the people to return to the covenant or to remind them of the consequences of non-observance of the Torah, and the *darshan* or the synagogue preacher would often

<sup>137</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 139.

<sup>138</sup> Liturgical readings from the Prophets which would follow the reading from a fixed section from the Torah/Pentateuch. This was already an established practice in the ancient synagogue liturgy. See the hint in *m. Meg.* 4:4,5. It is often said from a traditional viewpoint that such readings from the Prophets originated during the Maccabean persecution when Jews were forbidden to read from the Torah. For some, it was also a mark of distinction the Jews employed with respect to the Samaritans who did not believe in the canonical importance of the Prophets. However, we are not concerned here with the origin of the custom of reading of the *haftarot*, or the different liturgical cycles of synagogal readings in Palestinian or Babylonian traditions. Only brief references will be made to the *haftarah* reading of Hos 2:1-22 in case of any noticeable link with its Targumic version. For such general issues, see the ‘Introduction’ in M. FISHBANE (ed.), *The JPS Bible Commentary: Haftarah*, Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 2002, p. xix-xxxii.

<sup>139</sup> ALEXANDER, *Targum, Targumim*, p. 325. But Alexander merely cites this general opinion in his entry.

address one or both of these issues on the basis of the *haftarah* reading.<sup>140</sup> The *haftarot* selections from the Prophets were quite unstable in origin compared to the “fixed” sections for the Torah readings, and they varied greatly from one tradition to the other.<sup>141</sup> But during the Amoraic period, a total number of twenty one verses came to be the norm<sup>142</sup>, which corresponds very nearly to the length of Hos 2:1-22 which is read as the *haftarah* to the *parasha* במדבר (Num 1:1-4:20).

Fishbane mentions two significant particularities of the *haftarot* readings, one historical and one exegetical, which when combined with the general features of Targumic exegesis discussed in the preceding sections, may help us in underlining certain features of TgHos 2, which must have had close links with their corresponding Hebrew *haftarah* text within the liturgical context irrespective of the precise nature of that relationship. First, in the Palestinian tradition there was a marked emphasis on the theme of a “national return to the homeland” in the *haftarot* readings which is evident from the fact that almost two-third of the readings were chosen from Isa 40-66.<sup>143</sup> Secondly, the *haftarah* passage was always interpreted at two levels: within the context of its historical setting and then at the level of conveying its theological message which would also form the criteria behind its selection.<sup>144</sup> And it is through this second aspect that the *haftarot* developed to be what Fishbane calls “a rabbinic unit” infused with rabbinic theological traits and concerns.<sup>145</sup> In the course of the following analysis of TgHos 2, we shall try to identify, along with the patent Targumic techniques, the traces of the role it must have played withing the tradition of the readings of the *haftarot* in the synagogal liturgy. There are many repetitions of the translation techniques and theological concepts throughout TgHos 2 similar to those found in TgHos 1. In such cases, only references to the relevant portions in the preceding section (2.8) will be made. There is a consistent thematic arrangement in

---

<sup>140</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. xix.

<sup>141</sup> C. PERROT, *The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue*, in M.J. MULDER (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen, Van Gorcum, 1988, p. 138.

<sup>142</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. xxiii. But this number was always subject to minor modifications depending on the context or the content of the *parasha*.

<sup>143</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. xxv

<sup>144</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. xxxi.

<sup>145</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. xxxi.

the text of TgHos 2. I have therefore chosen to divide the following commentary into three sub-sections in each of which there is a prevailing dominant thematic pattern. I have adapted the thematic arrangement proposed by Böhme-Müller-Neef with some modification.<sup>146</sup>

### 2.9.1 Call to Return: 2:1-3

**2:1** And the number of the children of Israel shall be *many* as the sand of the sea and it cannot be measured and it cannot be counted. *And it will be from (ב) the land where they had been exiled among the nations when they transgressed my Torah and it was said to them: "You are not my people", they shall return and they shall be made great,* and it shall be said to them: "People of the living God." **2:2** And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall gather together *as one*, and they shall appoint [for] themselves one head *from the house of David* and they shall come up from the land of *their exile*. For great is the day of *their gathering*. **2:3** *Prophets! Say to your brothers: "My people, return to my Torah, and upon your congregations, I shall have mercy!"*

The passage introduces certain technical elements while rendering the benediction in the MT into Aramaic for explaining the similes: the adjective יגו (many) is introduced to explain the simile "like the sand of the sea". Translating the preposition ב as "from" is quite irregular, but translating it as "in" would hardly make any sense within the context. This difficulty arises from the fact that here the Targum translates the Hebrew המקום quite literally in the sense "in the place (land) of" and not as "instead of" which is actually the meaning implied in the MT. For the concept of transgressing the Torah and how is it related with the exile of the people, see KC 8 and 7. At the end of 2:2, the Targum changes the mention of Jezreel in the MT with the word "gathering"<sup>147</sup>, which is significant because the Aramaic root כנש (to gather/assemble) gives the Aramaic word for synagogue (כנישתא; *k<sup>e</sup>nushta* in Syriac) which is found as a substantive in 2:3, 2:15, and 3:3. I have rendered it as "congregation" although "assembly" could have also been an equally appropriate choice, but either of these two translations is

---

<sup>146</sup> BÖHME, MÜLLER, NEEF, *Hoseas Botschaft als Prophetie*, p. 21, 22, 26.

<sup>147</sup> The Hebrew root זרע which gives the proper name "Jezreel" conveys the idea of "scattering" or "dispersing". This converse interpretation of the name "Jezreel" in TgHos tries to impose certain uniformity on the MT text to reinforce the idea of the "gathering" of the children of Israel.

preferable to “gathering” since it would be less effective in highlighting the synagogal context of this *haftarah* passage. The reference to the “house of David” is connected with the Targum’s expectation of the messianic age, and has been dealt with in the commentary on 3:5.

The vocative “Prophets!” at the beginning of 2:3 (missing in MS c) may be seen as an indicator of the *meturgeman*’s claim to a prophetic authority in delivering the Targum.<sup>148</sup> The traditional Talmudic attribution of the Targum to the Prophets to Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi has already been pointed out (see 2.3), and on the basis of that origin, the *meturgeman* could see his place in line with the prophetic chain of tradition which could explain his practice of introducing the Aramaic translation with the statement “the prophet said”.<sup>149</sup> The role of the prophet in TgHos 1-3 is a central one as the intermediary between God and his people and it is his mission of prophecy that has substituted the “biographical” elements of Hosea’s life of the MT in the Targumic text. The omission of the names “Ammi” and “Ruhamma” springs automatically from the fact that the discourse is addressed to the “prophets”, but also in conformity with the Targum’s complete omission of Hosea’s marriage narrative, a technique already developed in TgHos 1.

#### 2.9.2 Israel’s Faithlessness and God’s Faithfulness: 2:4-15

**2:4** *Reproach the congregation of Israel, and say to her (that if) she does not humble herself in my worship, my Memra shall not receive her prayer, until she removes her evil deeds from before her face and the worship of idols from among her cities.* **2:5** *Else I shall remove my Shekinah from her and I shall make her glory depart. And I shall make her abandoned as in the former days until she draws near to my worship. And my anger shall hover over the people of the generation that transgressed my Torah in the wilderness. And I shall make the land desolate, and I shall massacre her with dearth.*

The object of God’s reproach in the MT is the mother of Ruhamma and Ammi i.e. Gomer the prostitute who metaphorically represents Israel, whereas in TgHos it is “the congregation of Israel”. The text of TgHos 2 therefore, continues to use the third

---

<sup>148</sup> CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 53. The link between the *meturgeman* and the prophet(s) is one of Chilton’s conceptual contributions in his detailed study on the Targum of Isaiah.

<sup>149</sup> CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 52.

person feminine singular for referring to the “congregation” (feminine in Aramaic) of Israel i.e. the Israelites as a single collective entity. This allows TgHos to serve a double purpose: staying close to the manner of discourse in the MT but bypassing the language of promiscuity and allusions to Hosea’s marriage and children born out of such an unacceptable union. Such references have largely been interpreted as the “idolatry” of Israelites and their ungratefulness in forgetting God’s manifold mercies in the past and their unfaithfulness towards the covenant. For the theme of idolatry in TgHos, see KC 1. The key term *Shekinah* occurs for the first time in 2:5.

Key Concept 9: שכינה (*Shekinah*)

The term שכינה occurs twice (2:5; 2:23) in TgHos and in both cases, with the first person singular pronominal suffix as שכינתי [My *Shekinah*]. The substantive is derived from the root שכן which signifies an act of “dwelling”, and thereby it stands for the “presence” of God, but mostly in association with the cult or the Temple-worship (פולחנא) as in 2:3.<sup>150</sup> Like *Memra* (KC 6), *Shekinah* in the Targum is employed as a divine surrogate and seems to be an essential element in Targumic theology since, like the other term, it is sometimes used to represent God even where it is not obligatory in translating the Hebrew. But its association with the Temple cult seems to have had serious consequences on its usage in the post-Second Temple Judaism including in the Targumim. The Targum represents a somewhat early stage in the development of the concept of *Shekinah* within Rabbinic thought as Chilton points out that in later Amoraic literature, the *Shekinah* gradually came to be associated with the synagogues and houses of study ( בית מדרש) in the place of the Temple cult.<sup>151</sup> The expression בית שכינתי [the house of my *Shekinah*] in 2:25 is a clear reference to the divine presence in the Temple sanctuary.

One of God’s punishments for Israel’s idolatry in TgHos is the “removal” (2:5) of his *Shekinah* from the midst of Israel. The absence of the *Shekinah* is closely connected with Israel’s exile i.e. her detachment from the land and that is how the theology of the *Shekinah* is intricately linked with the “Land theology” (KC 2) in the Targum. In

<sup>150</sup> B.D. CHILTON, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 11), Wilmington DE, Glazier, 1987, p. lvi.

<sup>151</sup> CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 55.

2:25, within the more positive context of Israel's return to the covenant, God will thus "establish" them before the house of his *Shekinah*. According to Chilton, the recurrent thrusts on the concept of the *Shekinah* arises out of the *meturgeman's* deep concern for recontextualising the question of God's presence among his people in the absence of the sanctuary and the Temple cult in the post-70 CE situation.<sup>152</sup>

**2:6** And on her children, I shall not have mercy because they are the children *who go astray*. **2:7** *For their congregation has gone astray after the false prophets, their teachers are ashamed.* For she was saying, "I shall go after *the nations* that love me, who provide me (with) my food and my drink, clothing of fine wool and linen, oil, and all my provisions.

There is once again a link between prostitution in the MT and Israel's apostatic act of "going astray" in TgHos through the larger context of the Aramaic root טעי (see KC 1). The apostasy of Israel in TgHos is centred chiefly on their indulgence in idolatrous cult practices and non-observance of the Torah, but the point of origin of such acts is seen here to be the evil influence of the "false prophets" (נביי שקרא), literally "prophets of falsehood". The exile of the Israelites was often seen as a grave consequence of having listened to or gone after false prophets, as evident in the Targumic rendering of Mic 2:11 which is quite relevant in the current context<sup>153</sup>:

MT: If someone were to go about uttering empty falsehoods, saying, "I will preach to you of wine and strong drink," such a one would be the preacher for this people!

TJ: For they go astray (טעי) after false prophets (נביי שקרא) who prophesy to them by a spirit of deceit, and teach them about wine and drunkenness; and it shall be, as they are accustomed to go astray after false prophets, so the people of this generation shall be exiled to a land of falsehoods (ארע שקרא).

The false prophets in TgHos are not only seen as the instigators of Israel's apostasy, but they also serve as a "foil" to set in contrast the historical prophet Hosea as the true intermediary between God and Israel as well as the personality of the *meturgeman* as

---

<sup>152</sup> CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 69.

<sup>153</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 117 n. 31.

carrying over the voice of that genuine prophecy within the contemporary socio-religious context. The Targumic association of Israel's "lovers" with the surrounding "nations" (עממיא) as in 2:7, 2:9, and 2:14 is a prominent Targumic technique to differentiate between Israel and the surrounding nations as seen throughout the Tosefta Tg.

**2:8** Therefore I shall *ruin your ways as one hedges up* [with] thornbushes and *I shall divide them off with walls*, and her paths she shall not find. **2:9** Then she shall pursue *peace with the nations*, her lovers but she shall not adhere to it. And she shall lack *help* but she shall not find *it*. And she shall say: "I shall go and return to the worship of my former *master* as it was good for me *when I was worshipping before him*. *From now on, I shall not worship idols.*"

The Aramaic ג'ס which I have translated as "hedging up" has both positive and negative connotations. The root occurs in Mishnaic Hebrew and is found in *Avot* 1:1 where one is instructed to make a hedge or a fence (ג'ס) around the Torah in order to safeguard it. In 2:8 the word is used in an obvious negative sense wherein the wicked ways of Israel are being fenced off in order to cut them off from the way of the Torah. One striking feature however is that the Targum does not introduce any divine surrogate here to ward off the somewhat anthropomorphic picture of God indulging in the act of fence-making.<sup>154</sup>

Since TgHos substitutes the context of the marital relationship between God and Israel with a relationship between the deity and the devotee, it translates the Hebrew אישי [my husband] in 2:9 as רבוני [my master].

**2:10** But *they do not know that* it was I who *blessed them* (with) grain, and wine, and oil. And silver I have lavished on *them* and gold *from which* they made *idols*. **2:11** Therefore *my Memra* shall return to *curse the grain at the time of its threshing and the wine at the time of its pressing*. And I shall remove *the clothing of fine wool and linen which I gave her* to cover her *nakedness*. **2:12** And now I shall uncover her *nakedness* to the eyes of *the nations*, her lovers. And nobody shall save her from my hand. **2:13** And I shall abolish all her rejoicing[s], her festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbaths, and

---

<sup>154</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 32 n. 19.

all her feasts. **2:14** And I shall make desolate *the fruits of* her vines and her fig-trees concerning which she was saying: “*An honour* they are for me which *the nations*, my lovers gave to me.” And I shall make them a forest, and wild beasts shall devour them. **2:15** And I shall visit upon her (for) the days *on which she was worshipping idols* and offering to them sweet-smelling incense. She was like a woman *who has forsaken her master* and has decorated herself with her earrings, and *her necklaces of her pearls*, and has gone *astray* after her lovers. *So the congregation of Israel loved to worship idols, but my worship my worship she has forsaken*, says the Lord.

In referring to foreign deities, TgHos prefers to use the generic term “idol” (טעותא) as in 2:10 instead of “Ba’al”, the particular or collective designation for the particular deity in question. This is in conformity with the usual Targumic distinction between the sacred and the profane: in the same way Targum distinguishes between priests of Yahweh (כהנא) and pagan priests (כומרא), the shrine of the God of Israel (מדבחא) and that of pagan gods (איגורא) and such alike. In addition to this, following the injunction found in Exod 23:13 (see KC 1), the Targum possesses a tendency to avoid mentioning the pagan gods by their proper or collective names and hence, God’s promise in 2:19 to remove the names of “Ba’als” (MT) or the “idols of the nations” (TgHos) from the lips of the Israelites.

The contrast between the worship of God and the worship of idols in 2:15 has already been underlined in KC 3. In the same verse, the word בעלא has been translated as “master” but could also be rendered as “husband” given the context of Israel’s adulterous relationship with God. I have chosen the translation “master” as it seems more conducive to the pervading theme of the relationship between God and Israel, his chosen people as portrayed in TgHos. But one very remarkable strategy employed in TgHos to render such a relationship is the transformation of the metaphors in the MT into similes in the Targumic text which, however, happens to be a very common Targumic translation technique. In the MT, Israel is represented as the adulterous wife of God whereas in TgHos, nothing more than an analogy has been drawn between Israel’s attitude *vis-à-vis* God and that of an adulterous woman *vis-à-vis* her husband. In MS c, there is a variant for 2:10 in which instead of בריכיתי [I have *blessed*] it has

יהבית [I have *given*], probably for bringing it closer to the MT which employs the verb נתן in Hebrew.

### 2.9.3 God's Commitment to Israel: 2:16-25

**2:16** Therefore, behold I *make her subject to the Torah* and I shall work for her signs and mighty deeds as I did for her in the wilderness, and through my servants, the prophets, I shall speak *comfort* upon her heart. **2:17** And I shall appoint for her her leaders from there and the valley of Achor *for the desires of soul*. And there they will long for my Memra as in the former days. I too shall work for them signs and mighty deeds as in the day when they came up from the land of Egypt. **2:18** And it will happen at that *time*, says the Lord, *that you shall long for my worship*, and you shall no more worship idols. **2:19** And I shall remove the name of *the idols of the nations* from their mouth, and there shall be no remembrance of their name anymore. **2:20** And I shall make a covenant for them at that *time they may be (at) peace* with the wild beasts, and with the birds of the sky, and with reptiles of the earth. And the bow, and the sword, and the *warmongers* I shall abolish from the earth, and I shall let them rest in security. **2:21** And I shall *establish you before me* forever, and I shall *establish you before me* in truth, and in justice, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy. **2:22** And I shall *establish you before me* in faithfulness, and you shall know *to fear from before* the Lord. **2:23** And it will happen at that *time* that I shall *receive your prayer*, says the Lord. I shall *command* the heavens, and they shall *send down rain upon* the earth. **2:24** And the earth shall *produce* grain, and wine, and oil, and they shall *supply them to the exile of my people*. **2:25** And I shall *establish you before me* in the land of *the house of my Shekinah*, and I shall have mercy upon them who were not pitied because of their deeds. And I shall say to those to whom I said: "Not my people", "Now you are my people", and they will say, "My God!"

The image of the wilderness (מדבר) forms the setting in the final part of the *haftarah* and has been interpreted in various ways in traditional exegesis. For commentators such as Rashi and Qimḥi, the expression במדבר is a metaphor for the exile and for Ibn-Ezra, it signifies the homeland in its devastated condition (2:8; 2:14) in which God

would start his process of renewing the covenant with Israel.<sup>155</sup> In TgHos, the wilderness stands both as a place where God would bring Israel to repentance and judgment (2:5) and where he would thereafter “comfort” his people (2:16) before bringing them back to his covenant. The disturbing image of God seducing or alluring (פתה *Piel*) Israel as a lover in MT has not only been fully replaced in TgHos but the Targumist introduces “the prophets, my (God’s) servants” as the intermediary agency through whom God will communicate with Israel in the wilderness. This acts as a literary trope to avoid anthropomorphic engagement on the part of God, but also reiterates the prophet’s place in the transmission of divine message and thereby valorises the *meturgeman* who carries over that prophetic voice. In MS c, the word “rain” (מטרא) has been interpreted on a more general level as “goodness” (טובא), which may also be seen as a surrogate for the former.

## 2.10 Targum Hosea 3: Translation and Commentary:

**3:1** And the Lord said to me again: “Go, *speaking a prophecy against the house of Israel, because they are like a woman loved by her husband, but she betrays him. And just as he loves her and does not desire to send her away, so is the love of the Lord upon the children of Israel, and yet they turn after the idols of the nations. However, if they repent, it shall be forgiven to them, and they shall be like a man who has erred, and has spoken a word in his wine.*”<sup>156</sup>

TgHos retains the first person narrative of the MT in this chapter which runs parallel to the same events described in chapter one. But as in TgHos 1:2 and 1:3, here also the theologically unacceptable commandment of God has been replaced by the Targum with an interpretation of Hosea’s mission as one of prophecy. The *enjeux* of interpretations involved in the two parallel passages are therefore identical. The rendition of the Hebrew “cakes of raisins” (אשישי ענבים) as “his wine” (בחמריה) in the Aramaic might have been influenced by similar interpretation found in *b. Pes. 36b* which interprets the Hebrew as “flasks of wine”.<sup>157</sup>

<sup>155</sup> FISHBANE, *Haftarot*, p. 215.

<sup>156</sup> i.e. he has spoken while being intoxicated with [his] wine.

<sup>157</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 35 n. 1.

**3:2** And I saved them by my Memra on the fifteenth day of the month of Nisan, and I gave the silver shekel as atonement for their soul. And I said they should offer before me an Omer of the offering from the produce of barley.

The purchase of the adulterous woman representing Israel by God has an obvious negative connotation which TgHos substitutes with the nobler act of bringing salvation (פִּרְקָן) which suits much more to the objective of a divine intervention. The Targum's addition of the date "fifteenth day of Nisan"<sup>158</sup> may seem associated with the "fifteen shekels of silver" in the MT on the level of the existence of the identical numerical value in both texts, although applied to different objects. But Churgin points out on the basis of *b. Hull.* 92a that the fifteenth of Nisan is the traditional chronological marker for Israel's Exodus from Egypt in the Rabbinic tradition.<sup>159</sup> The Targum's introduction of the promise of salvation (פִּרְקָן) in the same verse lends credibility to this view.

**3:3** O prophet! Say to her, "Congregation of Israel! Your sins caused you to be exiled (for) many days. Yearn for my worship, do not go astray, and do not worship the idols, and I too shall be prepared to have mercy on you."

Like the recurrent use of the word כְּנִישְׁתָּא indicating a synagogal congregation (2:2; 2:7), the vocative "O prophet!" can be seen as a mark left upon the text of TgHos by its use in the synagogal tradition, which would be used as an exhortative call to the audience.<sup>160</sup>

**3:4** Because for many days, the children of Israel shall dwell without a king *from the house of David, and there will be no one to exercise authority over Israel. And there will be to offer an acceptable sacrifice in Jerusalem, and there will be no standing pillar in Samaria, and no ephod, and no interpreters.*

The first of the two significant Targumic changes in this verse is the introduction of the two place-names: Jerusalem and Samaria. The Targumist's objective here is to draw a distinction between the "acceptable" worship in Jerusalem and the "illegitimate"

---

<sup>158</sup> MS c has "fifteenth month of Nisan".

<sup>159</sup> CHURGIN, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, p. 83 n. 12. The interpretation of the numeral "fifteen" in *b. Hull.* 92a is of the one occurring in the Hebrew text in the expression "fifteen shekels of silver". Was TgHos 3:2 then influenced by this interpretation or *vice-versa*?

<sup>160</sup> This observation is only partially influenced by CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 10.

worship in Samaria.<sup>161</sup> Secondly, the term “teraphim” is translated as “interpreters” (מחוי). The teraphim, partly in the Bible and to a greater extent in Rabbinic literature, has a negative connotation and is often associated with idols as in Gen 31. The Targumist must have therefore had difficulties in placing it with “ephod” which is a sacred liturgical vestment. He therefore takes advantage of the situation in changing such an objectionable and ambiguous term with the term “interpreter” which in Aramaic designates somebody with the attributes of a visionary and in the more precise context, the *meturgeman* who assumes the position of the prophet in the synagogal liturgy. The reference to the “house of David” is dealt with in the following verse.

**3:5** After that, the children of Israel shall return and seek *the fear of* the Lord their God, and they shall *obey the Messiah, the son of David*, their king. And they shall *long for the worship of* the Lord and *great will be his goodness that will come to them* in the end of the days.

The reference to David as king is already present in the MT, but TgHos identifies him as the משיחא which I have chosen to render literally in English due to its familiarity in Biblical literature. The concept of the Messiah is very recurrent in the Targums to the Prophets, and represents primarily a Rabbinic viewpoint regarding the eschatological predicament of the people of Israel.<sup>162</sup> Chilton, in his detailed study of the theology of the Isaiah Targum, in which the figure of the Messiah plays a major role, remarks that the *meturgeman's* interpretation of the Messianic figure remained more or less associated with the idea of “restoration” of the Law.<sup>163</sup> After the devastating incidents of the 70 CE followed by the Bar Kokhba rebellion, there was a noticeable shift in the idea of the Messiah from a communal to a more individualistic one.<sup>164</sup> According to Levine, the Targums do not present us with a diachronic development of this concept and neither the Targumic theology behind this concept is a consistent one.<sup>165</sup> However, both observe that the occurrences of the Messiah theme in the Targums are

---

<sup>161</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 35 n. 4.

<sup>162</sup> CATHCART and GORDON, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, p. 6.

<sup>163</sup> See CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 86-96.

<sup>164</sup> CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 87.

<sup>165</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 200, 213.

intricately linked with the restoration of the Temple cult, the consolidation of the national polity, re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty, and above all, the Messianic figure stands for the Torah.<sup>166</sup> In TgHos 3:4, the figure of the Messiah is indirectly mentioned in connection with the “house of David” and in 3:5, his agency in bringing back the utopic Davidic reign and restoring the Temple cult/worship (פולחנא) in the “end of days” are clearly underlined. In MS c, one finds the expression “the fear (דחלתא) of the Lord” instead of “the worship (פולחנא) of the Lord”, probably as a result of harmonisation with the existence of the former at the beginning of the verse. Nevertheless, as the two consecutive verses 14:2 and 14:3 show, דחלתא and פולחנא are closely related terms conveying two different aspects of a legitimate human enterprise for approaching the Divine.

---

<sup>166</sup> LEVINE, *The Aramaic Version*, p. 199 ; CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel*, p. 96. Chilton, along with Flesher, in a recent work suggests that the reference to the Davidic king in association with the restoration of the Temple worship results from the “cultic abuses” of the Tannaitic period or even earlier which makes the Targumist look back to an ideal age of perfection. See P.V.M. FLESHER and B.D. CHILTON, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*, p. 222-223. But once again, situating the Targumic reference back within the context of a precise date and time falls out of the objective and scope of this study.



## CONCLUSION

---

My attention was drawn towards a study of the first three chapters of TgHos upon my discovery of its striking difference from the contents of the MT. After wading through a detailed study of the translation techniques and exegetical approaches in the preceding chapters, it is more or less clear that such differences spring from certain general Targumic presuppositions which attempt to bring about and impose certain uniformity upon the Aramaic version of the MT. Examples of how the Targum deals with similar passages in other Prophetic books show that the interpretations encountered in TgHos are not unique to it. The fact is that the allegorical dimension of Hosea's vocation of prophecy already present in the MT makes it remarkably different from the other Prophetic books and as a result, it incites the long paraphrastic translation in the Targum which is otherwise present in tiny bits and pieces in other Prophetic Targums such as in Targum Ezekiel and Targum Isaiah among others. The Tosefta Tg is exempted from this general observation as there is no possibility for studying it in conjunction to other Prophetic Targums. In this concluding chapter, I would therefore like to indicate very briefly the further possibilities of research on TgHos as well as the limitations of the present study partly because of its extremely brief scope and partly because of the scarcity of available resources and working tools in various related areas. The following horizons of research are particularly commended:

- On the level of a text-critical study, the necessity for an up-to-date critical edition of TgHos or any other Prophetic or Pentateuchal Targum based on all the extant manuscripts or those of a particular tradition cannot be overemphasised. These factors have already been addressed in detail in the first chapter of this study and need not be reiterated here. It would suffice just to point out that publication of such critical editions would contribute greatly in preparing an exhaustive grammar and vocabulary for studying the Targums which is still a major deficit in this field.<sup>167</sup>
- The example of the Tosefta Tg shows the inter-relation that exists between Targumic and Talmudic theology. The evidence of the existence of such

---

<sup>167</sup> Cook, *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos*, p. x.

additional material in certain manuscripts makes it difficult to postulate if it should be described as a phenomenon of “Talmud in Targum” or “Targum in Talmud”. In this respect, a diachronic study of the development of both traditions may contribute considerably in the history and development of other parallel Targumic traditions other than the “official” TJ to the Prophets.

- A study of TgHos in conjunction and in comparison with the Greek (LXX) and Syriac (Peshitta) versions will throw light on how translators of other exegetical background try to confront the Hebrew text and to know if those versions contain paraphrases or *haggadah* comparable to that in the Targum.
- There is an acute need to study TgHos, or any other Targum for that matter, in the light of ancient Jewish exegetical traditions as present in the other Bible versions mentioned above as well as across the vast body of Rabbinic literature and in the works of medieval Jewish commentators such as Rashi, Qimḥi, Ibn-Ezra and numerous others. For example, there exists a full-length commentary by David Qimḥi on Hosea which uses extensively the text of the Targum of which only the Hebrew text has been published but no translation yet exists.<sup>168</sup> This commentary could be the object of study in its own right and not just to explore the place of Targums in medieval Jewish exegesis. But it can also be helpful for finding variant readings of the Targumic text which the commentators might have used from different sources.

It is more than evident that addressing all these components even within the scope of a single research study is not conceivable. The specialists from various fields such as Biblical and Jewish Studies, Rabbinics, Semitic Linguistics, Translation Studies, and other related areas have already started coming together in addressing multiple issues related to the emerging field of Targum Studies and the present author desires to contribute to this vast yet highly specialised domain on the basis of his own areas of expertise.

---

<sup>168</sup> H. COHEN (ed.), *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Hosea* (Columbia University Oriental Studies, XX), New York, AMS Press, 1966.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### 1. Manuscripts of Targum Hosea

London, British Library, Or. 2211, 1475 CE (Targum with supralinear punctuation)

London, Montefiore Endowment, MS H. 7, 1486 CE (unvocalised Targum with Tosefta)

### 2. Guides to Manuscript Sources:

MARGOLIOUTH G., *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols, London, British Museum, 1899-1935.

HIRSCHFELD H., *Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts of the Montefiore Library*, London, McMillan, 1904.

WRIGHT W., *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1870-1872.

### 3. Instrumenta Studiorum

#### 3.1 Dictionaries

COOK E., *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos: According to Alexander Sperber's Edition* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture, 6), Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2008.

DALMAN G., *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisch Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, Frankfurt, Kauffmann, 1922, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

JASTROW M., *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, Peabody MA, Hendrickson, 2005 (1943).

LEVY J., *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und Einen Grossen Theil des Rabbinischen Schriftthums*, Darmstadt, Melzer, 1966 (1866-67).

PAYNE SMITH J., *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957 (1903).

SOKOLOFF M., *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press and Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

\_\_\_\_\_, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*, Ramat Gan, Bar Ilan University Press and Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_, *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion and Update of C. Brockelmann's 'Lexicon Syriacum'*, Piscataway NJ, Gorgias Press, 2009.

### 3.2 Grammars

DALMAN G., *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960 (1905).

MARGOLIS M. L., *Lehrbuch der Aramäischen Sprache des Babylonischen Talmuds*, Munich, Oskar Beck, 1910.

NÖLDEKE T., *Compendious Syriac Grammar*, trans. J.A. CRICHTON, Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns, 2001 (1904).

PÉREZ FERNANDEZ M., *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, trans. J. ELWOLDE, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1999.

STEVENSON W., *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

### 3.3 Concordances and Other Tools

DE MOOR J.C., *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*, 21 vols., Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1995-2006.

GROSSFELD B., *A Bibliography of Targum Literature*, 2 vols, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1972-1977 (A good bibliographical tool but somewhat dated).

NEUSNER J., *Hosea in Talmud and Midrash*, Lanham MD, University Press of America, 2007 (similar titles for other books of the Twelve Prophets by the same author are also being made available through the same 'Studies in Judaism' series).

המסורה והכתובה תורה, ספר תורה הכתובה והמסורה, vol. 3 (על נביים), Tel-Aviv, Aaron Mordechai (in Hebrew, gives a verse-by-verse reference to the major works of Rabbinic literature of each Biblical book).

## 4. Bible Versions, Critical Editions with Translations

CATHCART K. J. and GORDON R.P., *The Targum of the Minor Prophets. Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 14), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1989.

COHEN H. (ed.), *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Hosea* (Columbia University Oriental Studies, XX), New York, AMS Press, 1966.

DANBY H., *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction, and Brief Explanatory Notes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1933.

EPSTEIN I. (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices*, 18 vols., London, Soncino Press, 1935-1948.

GELSTON A. (ed.), *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (Biblia Hebraica Quinta, 13), Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010.

HAELEWYCK J.-C. (ed.), *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera: Versio Syriaca I: Oratio XL* (Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca, 49; Corpus Nazianzenum, 14), Turnhout-Leuven, Brepols, 2001.

KITTEL R. et al. (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997 (1967).

DE LAGARDE P., (ed.), *Prophetae Chaldaice e fide codicis reuchliniani*, Osnabrück, O. Zeller, 1872.

SPERBER A. (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic, v.3: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1962.

## 5. Unpublished Works

FERRER I COSTA J., *El Targum d'Osees en tradició iemenita*, unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Barcelona, 1989, 652 p.

LIER G., *Translation Techniques in Malachi According to Targum Jonathan*, Paper Presented at the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament Conference, Helsinki, 2010.

VAN ZYL A.F., *Translation Techniques in Malachi According to Targum Jonathan*, unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Johannesburg, xvii + 228 p.

## 6. Secondary Literature

ALEXANDER, P.S., *Targum, Targumim*, in FREEDMAN D.N. et al. (eds.) *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, v. 6, New York, Doubleday, 1992, p. 320-331.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum*, in EMERTON J.A. (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, XXXVI), Leiden, Brill, 1985, p. 14-28.

BACHER W., *Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum*, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 28 (1874), p. 1-72.

BARTHÉLEMY D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, v. 3: *Ézéchiel, Daniel et les Douze Prophètes* (Orbis Biblicus Orientalis 50/3), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

BEATTIE D.R.G. and MCNAMARA M.J. (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup, 166), Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1994.

BÖHME D.C., MÜLLER J., NEEF H.D., *Hoseas Botschaft als Prophetie: Targum Jonathan zu Hosea 1-3*, in *Biblische Notizen*, 131 (2006), p. 17-38.

BOWKER J., *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

CATHCART K.J. and MAHER M., *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOT Suppl., 230), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

CHILTON B.D., *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT Supplement, 23), Sheffield, Sheffield University Press, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 11), Wilmington DE, Glazier, 1987.

CHURGIN P., *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, Yale, Yale University Press, 1907.

DIEZ MACHO A., *Importants manuscrits hébreux et araméens aux États Unis*, in *VT Supplement*, IV (1957), p. 27-46.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Le Targum palestinien*, in *Recherches de science religieuse*, 47 (1973), p. 169-231.

\_\_\_\_\_, Review of A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB, Leiden, Brill, 1973, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 6/1 (1975), p. 217-236.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Un Nuevo Targum a los Profetas*, in *Estudios Bíblicos*, 15 (1956), p. 293-295.

DIRKSEN P.B., *Targum and Peshitta: Some Basic Questions*, in P.V.M. FLESHER (ed.), *Targum and Peshitta* (Targum Studies, 2), Atlanta GA, Scholars Press, 1998.

DUVAL R., *Traité de grammaire syriaque*, Paris, Vieweg, 1881.

FISHBANE M., *The JPS Bible Commentary: Haftarat*, Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 2002.

FLESHER P.V.M., (ed.), *Targum and Peshitta* (Targum Studies, 2), Atlanta GA, Scholars Press, 1998.

FLESHER P.V.M. and CHILTON B.D., *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*, Baylor University Press, 2011.

FRAADE S.D., *Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third-Sixth Centuries*, in L.I. LEVINE (ed.), *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992, p. 253-289.

GELSTON A., *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1987.

GORDON R.P., *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Sperber's Edition of the Targum to the Prophets: A Critique*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 64 (1974), p. 314-321.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Targum to the Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Texts: Textual and Exegetical Notes*, in *Revue de Qumran*, 8 (1973), p. 425-429.

GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN M., שקיעים מתרגומי המקרא הארמיית, 2 vols, Ramat Gan, 1983-1989.

HO A. *The Targum of Zephaniah* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture, 7), Leiden, Brill, 2009.

HOUTMAN A. and SYSLING H. (eds.) *Alternative Targumic Traditions: The Use of Targumic Readings for the Study in Origin and History of Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, Brill, 2009.

HOUTMAN A. and VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN E., *Targum Editions After Sperber*, Kampen, Protestant Theological University, 2010.

KAHLE P., *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1959, 2nd ed.

KASHER R., תוספתות תרגום לנביאים, Jerusalem, 1996.

KLEIN M.L., *Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique*, in *Biblica*, 57 (1976), p. 515-537.

LE DÉAUT R., *Targum*, in BRIEND J. and QUESNEL M. (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, XII, Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 2002, col. 1-344.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne : le 'targumisme'*, in *Biblica*, 52 (1971), p. 505-525.

LEVY S.H., *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, 13), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1987.

LEVINE E., *The Aramaic Version of Jonah*, Jerusalem, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 174), Berlin, De Gruyter, 1988.

MARTIN M., *The Babylonian Tradition and Targum*, in DE LANGHE R. (ed.), *Le Psautier: ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son influence*, Louvain, Publications universitaires, 1962, p. 425-451.

MCINTOSH A.A., *Hosea* (The International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1997.

PERROT C., *The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue*, in MULDER M.J. (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen, Van Gorcum, 1988, p. 137-159.

RIBERA FLORIT J., *La versión aramaica del Profeta Ageo*, in *Anuario de Filología*, 4, Barcelona, 1978, p. 282-303.

\_\_\_\_\_, *La versión aramaica del Profeta Nahum*, in *Anuario de Filología*, 6, Barcelona, 1980, p. 291-322.

\_\_\_\_\_, *El Targum del Malaquias*, in *Estudios Bíblicos*, 48 (1990), p. 171-197.

\_\_\_\_\_, *La versión aramaica del Profeta Sofonías*, in *Estudios Bíblicos* 39 (1981), p. 127-158.

SMELIK W.F., *The Rabbinic Reception of Early Bible Translations as Holy Writings and Oral Torah*, in *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 1 (1999), p. 249-272.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden, Brill, 1995.

SMOLAR L. and ABERBACH M., *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York-Baltimore, Ktav, 1983.

SPERBER A., *The Bible in Aramaic*, v. IVB: *The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden, Brill, 1973.

STRACK H.L. and STEMBERGER G., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

SWEENEY M.A., *The Twelve Prophets*, v. 1 (Berit Olam. Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry), Collegeville MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000.

TAHAN I., *Hebrew Manuscripts: The Power of Script and Image*, London, The British Library, 2007.

TOV E., *Textual Criticism*, in FREEDMAN D.N. et al. (eds.) *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, v. 6, New York, Doubleday, 1992, p. 393-412.

VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN E. *The Targum of Samuel* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture, 1), Brill, Leiden, 2002.

VAN ZIJL J.B., *Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah*, in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem*, 4 (1965), p. 189-191.

\_\_\_\_\_, *A Second List of Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah*, in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem*, 7 (1968-69), p. 132-134.

YORK A.D., *The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 10/1 (1979), p. 74-86.