

UNITED BIBLE SOCIETIES
TRANSLATION WORKSHOP '84
15-26 MAY 1984, STUTTGART

For discussion only.
Not to be published
in this form.

TITLE: THE TARGUMS: ANCIENT READER'S HELPS?

AUTHOR: ROBERT BASCOM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. <u>Introduction</u>	2
A. Targumic Translation	2
B. The Targums as Synagogal Sermon Notes	3
C. The Translation Process	5
II. Examples of Targumic Translation in Context	6
A. The Great Sea Monsters	6
1. The Biblical Texts	6
2. The Targums	7
3. The Rabbinic Literature	7
4. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	8
5. The New Testament	8
B. The Handmade Sanctuary	9
1. The Biblical Texts	9
2. The Targums	10
3. The Rabbinic Literature	11
4. A Septuagintal Development	12
5. The New Testament	12
a. Paul's Speech to the Areopagus	12
b. Stephen's Speech	13
c. Jesus' Trial	13
d. Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary	13
e. The Body as Metaphorical Temple	14
III. <u>Conclusion</u>	15
Bibliography	17

ABBREVIATIONS

Bar	Baruch	Teh	Tehillim (Psalms)
En	Enoch	TB	The Babylonian Talmud
Esd	Esdras	T ^{FT}	The Fragment Targum
LXX	The Septuagint	T ^{HAG}	Targums on the Hagiographa
Mdr	Midrash	T ^N	Targum Neophyti
Mek	Mekilta	T ^O	Targum Onkelos
MT	The Masoretic Text	T ^{PJ}	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
NT	New Testament	PT	Palestinian Targum Tradition
Shir	Shirata	4Qflor	A manuscript from cave four at Qumran
Syr	Syriac		

I. Introduction

A. Targumic Translation

It is universally recognized that the Targums (the Aramaic translations of the Old Testament) add illustrative material, but the nature of this material, as well as its purpose, is still under considerable discussion.¹

The basic thesis of the following pages is that the Targums are not simply "free" or "paraphrastic" translations of their Hebrew source texts. They are not actually even "interpretive" in the broad sense. Rather, they can be characterized much of the time as formal renderings of a Hebrew biblical text with specific key words or phrases added. These "coded" words or phrases represent a condensed form of Jewish oral tradition on the biblical passage. The full form must now be ferreted out of the late post-exilic and early rabbinic Jewish literature. This three-stage (biblical-targumic- rabbinic) textual development is traceable to the synagogue. There, the OT was read in Hebrew, translated into Aramaic with the sermon notes added, and finally preached as a fully developed sermon on the text.

Many scholars have seen a connection between targumic translation and the methods of atomistic Jewish exegesis (midrash). It would, I submit, be better to simply call the Targums "targumic" and then work on listing exactly what their style and characteristics are in each case. Moreover, while the Targums may at times be "midrashic", they have a distinct character of their own apart from midrashic literature and exegesis. What is unique to targumic interpolation is that traditional material (possibly midrashic in itself) is inserted into an otherwise literally translated text.²

Perhaps what has obscured this basic conservatism of targumic translation is that what it preserves from the oral tradition is often highly midrashic and innovative itself. In other cases the full form the Targum is condensing has been lost completely, or is yet to be discovered in the vastness of the rabbinic literature. The roles the different literature played vis-a-vis the biblical tradition can be outlined as follows:

Biblical Texts = the basic framework of the tradition.

Targums = the tradition and condensed interpretation.

Rabbinic literature = the tradition expanded by interpretation.

Apocalyptic literature = the tradition and its expansion varied from the major stream (cf. En, Syr Bar, and II Esd above).

New Testament = the expanded tradition presupposed (either as a foil or as assumed background).

León has noticed a strict monotheizing tendency in the Targums. This is apparently because by the post-exilic period the various concrete ways of conceiving of God which were present in the biblical text of that time began to clash with certain more abstract ideas in the Judaism of this period.³

James Sanders would agree that the Targums had a fundamentally monotheizing hermeneutic. He has seen this monotheizing hermeneutic as the force which produced the various Jewish and Christian canons. Furthermore, Sanders has classified this hermeneutical activity as either constitutive or prophetic. By constitutive he means that believing communities were comforted and by prophetic he means they were challenged as they turned to their sacred traditions to answer their questions of identity and lifestyle.⁴

Using Sanders' categories, we would expect the targumic "readers' helps" to be constitutive rather than prophetic since the intertestamental period which gave rise to the Targums saw the Jewish community in such a weakened state. In other words, defensive communities are more likely to seek comfort from their religious traditions than to be challenged by them. Our method will check this by comparison of NT hermeneutics applied to the same traditions - as Sanders himself has done.⁵

This paper also hopes to raise some questions for modern translators of the bible. Are readers' helps a new Targum? Should they be? Do sacred texts always require a special language? Is "historical exegesis" possible after all the inner-biblical reinterpretation of tradition that has taken place? Can we separate exegesis and hermeneutics? Can we ourselves escape being a part of the canonical process? Should we try? What should our view of canon be? What was it for the NT writers? Can we reproduce the hermeneutics of the biblical writers for our own time?

B. The Targums as Synagogal Sermon Notes

Those who have seen in the Targums traces of what could be called ancient synagogal sermon notes have taken the best course in understanding targumic translation in its own right.

An analogy will make the point. In general, the formal reading of the Bible in modern American Protestant church services is conducted (this until just recently - now RSV) in the King James Version. This corresponds to the biblical Hebrew of the scripture reading. Then a modern version is often read as an aid in understanding the text. This has its closest counterpart in the Aramaic of the Targums. Next, various archaic forms of English are employed in the liturgy. This corresponds to the mix of Aramaic/Mishnaic Hebrew represented in the Jewish liturgy. In the church, the sermon is in current, but formal, educated and elevated English. The ancient sermon in turn was in an educated and formal Greek, Arabic, Late Hebrew or Aramaic. Finally, the Protestant preacher uses the vernacular for sermon illustrations and for the announcements. Again, in the synagogue there was surely a language-level switch to casual speech when it came to the more informal parts of the service, and in the discussion and socializing after the service. The point is not to reconstruct historical usage in particular, but merely to show how widespread the use of different languages, language levels, and language forms is to suit different purposes.⁶

The outline of the synagogue service offered above fits well with what is otherwise known about the different parts of the sabbath ceremony. In particular, the use of Aramaic for the translation of scripture was to keep it separate from the sacred written (Hebrew) text.

Levine has claimed that a major feature of targumic translation is that it "...usually involves elaboration, occasionally alteration, but never deletion of a biblical text."⁷ This is certainly a key point. McNamara concurs:

When a free paraphrase, or a midrash, is given, it has to be inserted into the rendering of the biblical text, occasionally to the detriment of syntax. This results in what we may call "targumic interpolations" in the text itself...⁸

As this paper will attempt to illustrate, McNamara is right here, except that he could more accurately describe the targumic interpolations as simply interpretive additions to the text. His "free paraphrase" (which would simply restate an original text), or "midrash" (which would build a new statement on the key-word skeleton of the original text) is not on the mark, however. Levine is better:

The aggadah is invariably presented "Internally" rather than "Externally." Instead of presenting the additive material alongside of the biblical text, the targum injects the aggadic material directly into the scriptural text, fusing it into a continuous narrative...⁹

Finally, Renée Bloch has conjectured that the PT may have been "...simply the outline-sketch of a series of homilies, given in the synagogue after the public reading of the Torah."¹⁰ Whether this is accurate or not, it seems certain that oral tradition made its way into the Targums as the latter were used in the synagogal liturgy.

The Targums summarized the current widely accepted interpretation of Scripture. In the period in question this was the oral Torah:

a body of legalistic, historical, folkloristic and expository literature which was external to, but in effect supplemented and often modified, the basic biblical text.¹¹

We find this oral tradition written down in fuller form much of the time in the rabbinic literature. Patte and Diez Macho have both noticed that the Tannaitic Midrashim (Mekilta, Sifra and Sifre) contain many of the same interpretations of specific texts as do the Targums, only in fuller form. Diez Macho states: "At first the Targum gave a brief explication which later the [rabbis] amplified."¹² This last comment can be improved on somewhat. It would be better to say that the Targums represent a theological-homiletic tradition of which the Midrashim were merely a further extension. In the targumic translation, biblical texts were enriched with oral tradition - both haggadah and halakah - which later appears in expanded form in the rabbinic literature.¹³

The Targums were shorthand notes for the oral Torah, or at least that part of the oral Torah which was regularly preached in the synagogue homily. Patte illustrates from the Mishnah how at least from the time of Hillel, and probably some time before, formulated oral phrases "served as pegs upon which the unformulated portion depended." By the end of the first century CE, these phrases were written as shorthand notes right into the text of the Targums. Thus, in the words of Renée Bloch, "The Targum...is the hinge between Scripture and Midrash." Or again: "The Targum...is a link between the biblical text and the halakic tradition of the [rabbis]."¹⁴

C. The Translation Process

The descriptive terms so often used of the Targums are "free translation", "loose translation", and "paraphrastic." In taking issue with these characterizations, some basic definitions are in order.

First, a literal word-for-word transfer from one language to another often results not in a translation at all, but merely a transposition of the words of the source language into the terms of the receptor language. At best it could be called a "wooden" translation. Second, a formal correspondence translation (e.g. KJV, RSV) tries to make sense in the receptor language, while maintaining as much of the actual wording and sentence structure of the source language as possible. Third, a dynamic equivalence translation (e.g. TEV) attempts to make the same sense in the receptor language as was made in the source language, but does not feel bound to reproduce the formal constructions or even use the same words. It is important to emphasize, however, that true dynamic equivalence translations use linguistic methods to arrive at "kernel sentences", which are then translated and

reconstructed on the surface level of the receptor language. Thus, dynamic equivalence translation strives to preserve all the same ideas as are present in the original text. Fourth, a paraphrase (an imprecise term) usually means a restatement in the words of the receptor language of the main ideas or thrust of a given text in the source language. A paraphrase is not bound by formal elements or even "kernel sentences." Instead, it usually tries to reproduce the total effect in the receptor language that the paraphraser believes was achieved in the source language. Words and sentences can be left out or inserted as long as the whole captures the spirit of the original. Unfortunately, extraneous material sometimes finds its way into paraphrase, and thus it is often associated with "free" or "loose" (i.e. inaccurate) translation.¹⁵

It will be obvious that the position taken in this paper is that targumic translation most nearly approximates formal correspondence translation among the four types above. There are, of course, external additions in the Targums which really have nothing to do with the source text, but which are taken from oral tradition. It is best to call them condensations or reductions of the oral tradition to a few key words, words which in their reading were to trigger the rest of the material in the minds of the targumist, preacher, and hearers.

II. Examples of Targumic Translation in Context

A. The Great Sea Monsters

1. The Biblical Texts

Gn 1:21 - MT, LXX, T^O: And God created the great sea monsters and every living creature...

Ps 74:13-14 - MT/LXX(73): You...broke the heads of the sea monsters/dragons upon the sea, you crushed the heads of Leviathan/the dragons, you gave him as food for the people...

Is 27:1 - MT/LXX: In that day, YHWH/God will punish Leviathan/the dragon the fleeing snake, Leviathan/the dragon the twisting snake, and he will slay the sea monster/dragon.

The key to the development of an explanatory tradition on a biblical text is often an ambiguity in the text itself. When the ambiguity has frightening or exciting possibilities, the temptation to create a story on the text becomes nearly irresistible. Here the "sea monsters" can be 1) serpents (Dt 32:33; Ps 91:13; Ex 7:9,10,12), 2) dragons (Jer 51:32; Ne 2:13), or 3) sea monsters (Gn 1:21; Jb 7:12; Ps 74:13; Is 27:1; 51:9; Ezk 29:3; 32:2; Ps 148:7).¹⁶

Gunkel has shown the ancient near eastern background of Gn 1 in a convincing manner even though discoveries at Ugarit would modify his thesis somewhat.¹⁷ Still, in Gn 1:21 the sea monsters have been demythologized and become just another part of God's creation. They are no longer individuals, but are a species belonging to the family of fish! It is in fact remarkable how the whole of Gn 1 presupposes, but radically demythologizes, the ancient near eastern creation mythology.

The intriguing idea is present in the biblical texts that a sea serpent (Ezk 29:3-5; 32:2-4) or Leviathan (Ps 74:13-14), both known to the LXX as the dragon, would be food for the animals and birds (Ezk) or the people (Ps), but it is not well-developed. Job 7:12 contains the image of a sea monster which is shut up and kept under guard, but the purpose seems not to be food, but the preservation of order (cf. ancient near eastern creation stories).

Of particular interest here is the interchangeability of terms in both the MT and LXX of Is 27:1. For the LXX, both the sea serpent(s) and Leviathan are the dragon(s). What is more, both are identified with another serpent - the snake of Gn 3:1. Rather than the atomistic creation of individuals from parallel terms (as in the PT and TB), these texts seem to meld images of serpents/sea serpents/dragons together indiscriminately. Typical of

apocalyptic writing, the mythical creatures now stand for something else: "...it follows from the logic of mythical thinking that after the incarnations of evil, the evil itself must be conquered..."¹⁸

2. The Targums

The restraint shown in Gn 1:21 in reducing the sea monsters to fish did not satisfy the mythological hunger of its audience. They knew (even if only from other biblical texts) that these creatures had a more exciting existence at the beginning and at the end of the world. It thus became the job of the targumists to preserve this popular version of who these monsters were discreetly in their translation, in order that it might be fleshed out fully in the synagogal sermon.

Gn 1:21 - T^N: And God created the two* great sea monsters, and every living creature...

T^{PJ}: And God created the great sea monsters, the Leviathan and its mate which were made for the day of consolation, and every living creature...

(* Within quoted sections underscore indicates material added to the biblical tradition.)

If these targumic renderings are compared with the MT and LXX (or with T^O), two things are immediately obvious: a. Something foreign has been added in each case, and b. if the foreign element is removed, the text reads exactly like the unexpanded text. This is as true in Aramaic as it is in translation. Still, just looking at the targumic interpolations above does not tell us much about the tradition which has been preserved there. Looking at other biblical texts which mention the sea monsters does not clear up the matter. Nor will a return to ancient near eastern myths help at this point. The tradition has moved on.

3. The Rabbinic Literature

TB Baba Bathra 74B,75A: R. Johanan said: The verse [Gn 1:21] refers to Leviathan the slant serpent and to Leviathan the tortuous serpent...[Is 27:1] He created...Leviathan...male and female; but if they had mated they would have destroyed the world...so...he castrated the male and killed the female, preserving it with salt for the righteous in the world to come...He will make a feast in the time to come for the righteous out of the flesh of Leviathan...

Though the Babylonian Talmud dates from a later time than the Apocrypha, it here preserves an earlier form of the tradition. This passage pulls both from its own biblical context (Gn 1:27 - created male and female), in what Sonne has called the "area of magnetic field",¹⁹ and from an atomistic treatment of Is 27:1 and the synonymous parallelism there to get two sea serpents out of Gn 1:21. This is abbreviated by an explanatory phrase in T^{PJ}, but only by the addition of the word two in T^N. The TB goes on to explain the Urzeit-Endzeit connection of these two mythical monsters, and T^{PJ} has faithfully condensed this also.

It is impossible to know exactly how much more of the tradition T^N knew as well, but it is likely that the majority of what the TB reports (only the smallest relevant excerpts on the subject have been quoted) hung on that tiny word "two." It is hard to imagine how a tradition about two sea monsters could exist without presupposing a further explanation of their individual roles. Also, nowhere else in the biblical tradition itself do we have precisely two of these sea creatures (usually it is one, with many different names), unless we subject Is 27:1 to the same rules of exegesis we find in the TB. Neither can we count Leviathan and Behemoth (Jb 40:15,25), as this is a different variant of the tradition.

4. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

With the above texts our tradition is not yet full-blown apocalyptic. The TB hints at an eschatological banquet, and Is 27:1 promises that "In that day...", yet the Endzeit is still cloudy and hidden. Not so with the apocalyptic

literature. It takes a different turn and picks up a variant of the above tradition (cf. Jb 40:15,25) which treats Leviathan as the female creature, and Behemoth as the male.

En 60:7-9: And on that day were two monsters parted, a female monster named Leviathan...the male is named Behemoth...and [Leviathan was] cast...into the abysses of the sea, and the other into the dry land...

Syr Bar 29:4: And Behemoth shall be revealed from his place and Leviathan shall ascend from the sea, those two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation, and kept until that time, and then they shall be for food for all that are left.

II Esd 6:49-52: Then thou didst keep in existence two living creatures, the name of one...Behemoth...and the name of the other Leviathan, And thou didst separate one from the other, for...the water...could not hold them both. And thou didst give to Behemoth one of the parts which had been dried up...but to Leviathan thou didst give...the watery part; and thou hast kept them to be eaten by whom thou wilt, and when thou wilt.

Leviathan had already been associated with Behemoth (LXX - "beast", or "snake") in Job 40:15,25, and with the sea monsters in Dt 32:24,33. It is this association that is interwoven with the tradition of the male and female creatures of Urzeit and Endzeit to produce the above texts.²⁰ Though both Syr Bar and II Esd have late first century CE dates, they are important because they obviously preserve earlier material from a particularly Jewish point of view, such as really belong to the background of the NT.²¹ It is interesting how in the progress of a tradition, many times older neglected elements and variants will be attracted to the "snowballing" traditio-historical movement. Thus En and II Esd seem to have picked up overtones of Gn 1:9-13 and the separation of the water (Leviathan) from the dry land (Behemoth). This is done without losing anything significant from the main stream of tradition.

5. The New Testament

Rev 12:3,9,15,17: ...a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns...that ancient snake, who is called the Devil and Satan...was thrown down to the earth... The snake poured water like a river out of his mouth... And he stood on the sand of the sea [cf. 20:1-3, where he is thrown into the bottomless pit for a thousand years].

Rev 13:1-2: I saw a beast emerge from the sea, it had seven heads and ten horns...the dragon had handed over to it his own power...

Rev 17:3,7-8: an angel took me...to a desert, and there I saw a...beast with seven heads and ten horns...the angel said to me... "The beast you have seen once was and now is not; he is yet to come up from the abyss, but only to go to his destruction."

Rev 19:9: The angel said... "Happy are those who are invited to the wedding feast of the Lamb."

Rev 19:21: ...he shouted aloud to all the birds... "Gather together at the great feast that God is giving"...[and the beast and the false prophet] were thrown alive into the fiery lake...[and all their followers] were killed...and all the birds were gorged with their flesh.

The Apocalypse of John is full of allusions. In the above texts, Dn 7 and Ezk 39 figure prominently beside the main stream of tradition being followed in this illustration. It is plain that the author of this apocalypse wanted to make the identification between his dragon and the snake of Gn 3:1, who for him is Satan himself. Instead of two sea serpents, or dragons (as in the Targums and the rabbinic literature), the dragon and the beast are both described in much the same way. They both have seven heads and ten horns, are both watery and/or desert creatures, both are preserved for a time in the abyss or bottomless pit, and are ultimately overcome by God and his armies. The apocalyptic literature examined above (En, Syr Bar, II Esd) form much of the background, but the distinctions

between beast and dragon have been blurred - perhaps due to the influence of Dn 7 and the nature of late apocalyptic writing in general.²² Two creatures are present in Rev 12-20, but their actions rather than their characteristics distinguish them.

That one or both of these creatures will be eaten by the righteous on the day of judgment nowhere occurs in Rev. Instead, the armies of the beast are fed to the birds (cf. Ezk 39:17-20; 29:5; 32:4). There is also an eschatological banquet (Rev 19:9; Mt 8:11; et. al.) which is well-known in the NT, but neither Leviathan nor Behemoth appear any longer as the bill of fare.

B. The Handmade Sanctuary

1. The Biblical Texts

Ex 15:17b - MT, LXX: ...the established place you have made for your dwelling, a sanctuary, O Lord, which your hands have established.

The Song at the Sea, or the Song of Miriam/Moses, has been well researched by many competent scholars.²³ Most agree, moreover, that this is an early poem which has been preserved more or less intact in its ancient form. Earlier scholars tended to see the verses referring to the conquest and possession of Canaan (13-18) as later additions. They took such phrases as "holy encampment" in verse thirteen and "mountain of your inheritance" in verse seventeen as references to Mount Zion, and "established for your dwelling" and "sanctuary" (both in v17) as references to the temple at Jerusalem (cf. I Kg 8:13,39,43,49).

The scholarly consensus has shifted, however, so that now Samuel Terrien can write:

Allusions are found in the early poetry of Israel to Yahweh's "holy encampment", "mountain", "abode", or "sanctuary", and these were probably interpreted [later] during the monarchic period as referring either to Mt. Gerazim (northerners) or Mt. Zion (southerners).²⁴

Martin Noth concurs, and takes all the terms listed above as early general references to the land of Canaan. He does this in spite of the use of "encampment" (v13) in II Sm 15:25, which is a clear allusion to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Noth instead relies on Jer 25:30, which he takes to mean the whole land of Canaan.²⁵ The Jeremiah citation could as easily be understood as the temple, however (cf. Mek Shir 10:37, below). In spite of current scholarly consensus, then, the issue has not been put completely to rest. Brevard Childs still claims "The hymn...recounts the redemptive history from the exodus, through the conquest, to the securing of Zion..."²⁶

2. The Targums

Ex 15:17b - T^O: ...an established place for the house of your Shekinah you have established, O Lord, a sanctuary, O Lord, your hands have established it.

T^N, T^{FT}: ...a place designated as the house of your Shekinah you have established, O Lord, your sanctuary, O Lord, your two* hands have perfected it.

T^{PJ}: ...a place corresponding to opposite the throne of your glory, designated opposite the house of your holy Shekinah, you have established, O Lord, your sanctuary, O Lord, your two hands have perfected it.

(* Here the Targums are translating a dual in Hebrew, making the interpolation nearly invisible morphologically.)

It is plain from reading the Targums that, whatever the original meaning of "established/designated place for your dwelling" in Hebrew, it was understood in later Judaism as the temple in Jerusalem. Furthermore, T^N and T^{FT} have made the "holy encampment" of verse thirteen the house of the Shekinah as well. T^{PJ} goes so far as to translate "mountain of your inheritance" in verse seventeen as "mountain of your sanctuary."

Thus "established place for your dwelling" and related idioms are seen by this time in relation to Zion and the temple (I Kg 8).

There are two other interpolations besides the phrase "house of your Shekinah" specifying the temple in Jerusalem. The first is the simple addition of the word two before "your hands." Because of what was discovered above in Gn 1:21, this should not be ignored. The second is the expansive addition in T^{PJ} concerning the sanctuary's location opposite God's throne in heaven. This looks midrashic in origin, as it uses the consonants of "established place", but repoints them as "corresponding to." Without further information, however, these additions (particularly the "two" of T^N and T^{FT}) are cryptic at best.

3. The Rabbinic Literature

Mek Shir 10:24-28: "The place for Thee to Dwell In Corresponding to Thy dwelling place." This is one of the statements [cf. Ex 23:20 in Tanhuma and Rashi] to the effect that the Throne below corresponds to and is the counterpart of the Throne above [reading 'corresponding to' in place of 'established place']. And so it also says "The Lord is in His holy Temple, the Lord, His throne is in heaven." (Ps 11:4) And it also says: "I have surely built Thee a house of habitation, a place for Thee to dwell in forever (I Kings 8:13)"

Mek Shir 10:38-42: "The Sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy Hands Have Established." Precious is the Temple to Him by whose word the world came into being. For when the Holy One, blessed be He, created His world He created it with but one hand, as it is said: "Yea, My hand hath laid the foundation of the earth." (Is 48:13) But when He came to build the Temple He did it, as it were, with both His hands, as it is said: "The Sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy hands have established."

A sophisticated midrash exists at various points in the rabbinic writings involving the repointing of "established place" in Ex 15:17. This is to support a tradition of the direct correspondence of the temple in Jerusalem to God's throne in heaven. This idea is common by the Tannaitic (NT) period, though it already had its roots in the OT (cf. Ex 25:9,40) and in the ancient near east in general. It is this highly involved midrash that T^{PJ} condenses to its essential components, including the repointed key word.

A much more restrained shorthand note, typical of T^N, is also explained by Mekilta. It seems that while God lightly tossed off the earth (either by his word, or here significantly by his one hand), he took extra care when he built the temple, using his two hands.

A question immediately presents itself, however. Mekilta goes considerably further than the biblical text it is based on in making God the builder of the temple. What happened to Solomon? Apparently he had already been eclipsed by God, even in the biblical tradition itself. Othmar Keel has noted the universality of this idea (that the god founds and builds his own temple) throughout the ancient near east. It is not strange, therefore, that alongside a secular historical account of Solomon's achievement (I Kg 5-7) there exist many theological statements as to the true builder of the temple - God Himself.

The sense of the holiness of the temple finds its strongest expression in the concept that Yahweh himself established it...(cf. Ps 78:69; 87:1; 147:2; Ex 15:17) The psalms couple positive assertions that Yahweh is the founder and builder of the temple (cf. Ex 25:9,40) with complete silence concerning Solomon, the earthly builder... In Israel too [as in the ancient near east] the foundation of the temple is occasionally related to the foundation of the earth (Ps 78:69).²⁷

The Mekilta also relates the building of the temple with the foundation of the earth, citing Is 48:13. Solomon is recognized in Shir 10:24-28 as the builder of the temple, while God dwells in heaven, opposite the earthly copy. However, the earthly king in no way interferes in the Mekilta passage which describes God using his two hands in a particularly important act of creation.

4. A Septuagintal Development

It was no doubt inevitable that as soon as ancient Jewish theologians got Solomon's hands off the temple and God's two hands on, that a certain dualism contrasting things made by God's hands and things made by human hands would take shape. The LXX already shows a deep awareness of this distinction. In it, "handmade" has become a technical term for "idol." Every time it occurs, it has this meaning, except in Is 16:12:

And when Moab enters into his temple [handmade] to pray...

In this case "handmade" stands opposite "sanctuary" in Hebrew.²⁸

Here then is the final monotheizing end of this train of thinking: The Jerusalem temple was really built by God's hands, and all other temples (and idols) are built by human hands. It has become unnecessary to specify whose hands are doing the making in each case (in Greek at least) because a technical term "handmade" = "man made" has come into existence. Therefore, Jews by the NT period had an instinctive reverence for the (Herodian!) temple based on a theology of God's having taken special care in building it with his two hands, coupled with an absolute disdain for foreign temples, due to their having been handmade.

5. The New Testament

a. Paul's Speech to the Areopagus

Acts 17:24-25a: The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in shrines made by man [handmade], nor is he served by human hands...

Luke seems to presuppose and agree with some major elements of the tradition reflected in the Targums, Mekilta and the LXX. There is a disdain for human shrines, and an insistence that God really dwells in heaven (cf. Mek Shir 10:24-28). Since Paul is not in Jerusalem, this is not a point of view on the temple there. While it is not likely that in this argument Luke's Paul would have considered the shrine in Jerusalem "handmade", (cf. Acts 21:26), Luke has rendered this judgment in another speech in Jerusalem with some direct verbal relationships to the one in Athens.

b. Stephen's Speech

Acts 7:44-50: God told Moses to ...make an exact copy of the pattern [Ex 25:40]...but it was Solomon who built a house for him. Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made by hands, as the prophet says "Heaven is my throne and earth my footstool. What house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things [Is 66:1]?"

The correspondence of heavenly throne and earthly sanctuary is alluded to in the OT quotes of Ex 25:40 and Is 66:1 (cf. T^{PJ} Mek Shir 10:24-28). God's hand is responsible for creation, bringing to mind in a passage concerning the temple the two-fisted concern of God with his sanctuary (cf. T^N, T^{PJ}, Mek Shir 10:38-42). But Luke's argument is that God does not live in handmade shrines (cf. Mek Shir 10:24-28, LXX Is 16:12). He sits on his throne in heaven. The temple which contemporary Jews believed God used two hands to establish thus is Luke's "handmade" shrine, since Solomon, not God, did the work.

It is often assumed that Stephen's tirade in vv 51-53 is what finally enraged his opponents. For good Jews of the NT period anything would have been superfluous after vv 48-50. This kind of dramatic reversal of their time-honored beliefs would have been nothing but blasphemy. Yet the sophisticated manner in which it is presented makes it virtually impossible to dispute. Of course God does not dwell in man-made shrines! And his true dwelling is, after all, on his throne in heaven (Mek Shir 10:24-28), which stands over against the sanctuary in

Jerusalem. But this is Luke's speech, of course, and not Stephen's, and while it does not tell us why Stephen died, it may well have been that it was because he was not as skilled as Luke at midrash.

c. Jesus' Trial

Mk 14:58: We heard Jesus say: "I will destroy this temple that is made by hands and in three days I will build another, not made with hands"

This passage, taken by itself, relates most nearly to the dramatic point scored in Stephen's speech: The temple in Jerusalem is "handmade." Further, Jesus' promise to build another may have God's two-handed building in the background. A new word is employed, however, which seems to go a step further than the handmade vs. God's two hands distinction. "Not made with hands" is Pauline (2 Cor 5:1; Col 2:11), and its use there has nothing to do with the temple. Instead, it is used to describe the resurrected body and spiritual existence. If the Pauline use is in the background here, there is a second level of meaning which is made explicit in Jn 2:21. At this level Jesus would not have been referring to the temple, but to his own death and resurrection.

d. Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary

Heb 9:11-12a: But when Christ appeared as high priest of the coming good things, he entered through the greater and more perfect tent (not made by hands, that is, not of this creation)...

Heb 9:24: For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, an antitype of the true one, but into heaven itself...

Here is the direct end-product of the Stephen tradition. The two arguments are the same ones made in Acts 7. First, the temple in Jerusalem is a copy of the one in heaven. The background is of course the combination of Ex 25 and I Kg 8, plus the tradition of T^{PJ} at Ex 15:17 and Mek Shir 10:24-28. Then the whole tradition is turned on its head, so that instead of the copy being superior to all other shrines by virtue of its special relationship to the heavenly original, "antitype" becomes the symbol for inferiority in relation to heaven itself. Second, if the temple in Jerusalem was made by hands (and it was not God's hands anyway, but Solomon's), the heavenly sanctuary was made without hands!

Surely this is Christian one-upmanship. If your temple is an exact copy, ours is the original. If yours was made by God's two hands (and it wasn't - it was man-made), ours is not even part of creation! This last point could only have been made in a period where this spiritualization of the tradition would have found an audience. What is interesting is how here the spiritualization is directly reached. The subject is still the temple - earthly or heavenly. It is only Paul in the NT who is able to completely detach the ideas of inferiority and superiority in this temple tradition from the temple itself.

e. The Body as Metaphorical Temple

2 Cor 5:1: For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

Eph 2:11b: ...you Gentiles in the flesh, called the uncircumcision by what is called the circumcision, which is made in the flesh by hands...

Col 2:11: In [Christ] also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands...you were buried with him in baptism...

In the Corinthian letter, Paul metaphorizes the temple tradition, making our earthly bodies correspond to the tabernacle, while our heavenly bodies are the equivalent of the heavenly temple. There is overlapping, two-tiered imagery here. There is the contrast of tent versus building/house which brings to mind the tabernacle (tent) versus

the solid stones of the Jerusalem sanctuary. Yet both tent and temple are earthly, and so are contrasted with the uncreated eternal sanctuary.

There is similar imagery of earthly tents versus a "city which has foundations, whose maker and builder is God" in Heb 11:9-10. God's two-fisted concern has not disappeared in the NT in a game of one-upmanship after all, but it is still spiritualized. When the temple is no longer the issue, God is a builder all right, and the project is heaven itself.

In the texts concerning circumcision all that is left are the contrasting terms "handmade" and "not handmade", which Paul obviously thinks apply very well to the physical act of circumcision versus the spiritual event of baptism. This contrast is distinctly Pauline, and may underlie the use of these terms in Hebrews and Mark as well. Thus what began as an extensive tradition of God's special care in constructing his sanctuary with two hands has finally trickled out as the negative term of a Christian idiom used to contrast the physical realities of first century Judaism with the spiritual realities of nascent Christianity.

III. Conclusion

The key to the form of the targumic sermon notes was their ability to trigger the full text of the sermon with the smallest amount of added material. T^N is thus a better example than T^{PJ} of pure targumic translation. In the examples shown above, T^N adds only one word. In each case the word or phrase fits so well into the text that it is scarcely noticed in casual reading. Once seen, however, each cipher demands an explanation. Why were there two sea monsters? Why did God use his two hands to build the temple?²⁹

Formulas, word associations, incipits, summaries, etc. were mnemonic devices which were used to compress the tradition into the shortest possible form that could still trigger the complete version,³⁰ yet the examples chosen for this paper also show another pattern. The coded words are mnemonic, as would be expected, but they are also numerical. While this is doubtless not always the case for targumic code words, it is more than coincidental.

Some of the points previously made by scholars regarding targumic translation have been borne out by the above investigation. For example, Patrick Skehan has traced two tendencies in the Targums which he considers ancient: First, they adhere closely to the original text. Second, they introduce narrative material.³¹ If the underlined portions of the Targum quotes in this paper were to be bracketed off, the result in every case would be something very close to the MT.

Daniel Patte also makes two points about the targumic literature which are dramatically illustrated in the examples above. The first is that in the Targums, scripture is to be explained by scripture.³² A casual reading of the targumic texts in relation to their rabbinic elaborations will show how often a second biblical text is brought in to provide the basis of the (usually midrashic) rabbinic exegesis. The linking texts are usually not from the Pentateuch, and are often from the Psalms or a poetic portion of the Prophets (e.g. Is 27:1, Ps 78:20). The parallelism of Hebrew poetry allows an atomistic exploitation of these texts, particularly when the midrash is based on there being two of something. The Targum then condenses this midrash faithfully, rather than adding anything of its own. Patte's second point is that according to targumic typology, everything in the Hebrew Bible refers to a small cluster of central word-events plus their eschatological counterparts. Thus the sea monsters are created for the day of consolation, and the temple, created by two hands, will be rebuilt with the same care in the age to come.³³

If this investigation has been on target, the Targums have a conservative hermeneutic in and of themselves. Their purpose is to preserve in a formal way both the biblical text and the oral tradition. The additions they make to the text they are translating agree with some external tradition of interpretation, which they refer to in a condensed form.

Therefore in the many cases where we cannot understand the reason for a targumic interpretation, we should resist the temptation to conclude that it is the product of the mere fancy either of the targumist or of the community.³⁴ The targumic interpolations are secondary or referential in what they add, and not innovative at all.

The NT use of the targumic-rabbinic tradition has been a sub-theme of this paper. Roger Le Déaut has been hesitant to postulate any direct relationship between the NT and the traditions contained in the Targums, no matter how early the targumic material seems to be. He is satisfied with showing the similarity in general method as well as specific techniques used in arriving at their various interpretations of biblical texts.³⁵ This paper has tried to go beyond this and show a more or less continuous line of development from the biblical texts through the traditions preserved in the targumic and rabbinic literature to the NT. These traditions were either presupposed as the background (the sea monsters) for the NT text, or were a foil (the handmade sanctuary) for the NT writers.

It is in the comparison of the hermeneutics employed by the Targums on the one hand and the NT on the other that James Sanders' categories are most helpful. While the targumic/rabbinic examples chosen above were consistently constitutive, the NT writers at times adopt a prophetic stance and challenge the religious status quo of their day. Both Judaism and early Christianity were struggling with a monotheistic hermeneutic, but disagreed over whether it was to be applied in a constitutive or a prophetic mode. This finding bears out what Sanders has shown for several other biblical traditions.³⁶

The NT adopted the tradition of the Targums as many times as it rejected it, however. Thus the traditional questions about the extent of the canon (which books/traditions are in or out) become difficult to lay hold of and give way naturally to the other focus of canon - that of the authority of sacred texts and traditions for a believing community at a given place and time.

Each generation reads its authoritative tradition in the light of its own place in life, its own questions, its own necessary hermeneutics.³⁷

Seen in this light, the Targums are hardly translations in the modern sense at all. Instead, they are attempts by a specific believing community to apply scripture to its own needs, using the accepted methods of the day. We may disagree with the targumic product at times (as the NT writers' did), but the canonical process was as inevitable then as it is now. The text gives life only within the context of hermeneutical application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

The Babylonian Talmud. Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein, ed. London: Soncino, 1935-48.

Barrett, C.K. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New" CHB. Cambridge: UP, 1970 (vol I).

The Bible in Aramaic. A. Sperber, ed. Leiden: Brill, 1959 (vols 1-4).

Bowker, J. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. Cambridge: UP, 1969.

Brown, R. et. al., eds. The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Charles, R.H. The Book of Enoch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Childs, B.S. The Book of Exodus. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Cross, F.M. and Freedman, D.N. Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry. Missoula: SP, 1975.

Diez Macho, A. "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums" VTSup VII (1959) 222-245.

Das Fragmententhargum. Dr. M. Ginsburger, ed. Berlin: Calvary, 1899.

Greek-English Lexicon. Liddell, Scott, et. at., eds. Oxford: UP, 1978.

Gunkel, H. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.

Hatch, E. and Redpath, H.A. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897 (1975 reprint)

Hebrew-Aramaic-English Dictionary. M. Jastrow, ed. Brooklyn: Shalom, 1967 (vols 1-2).

Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Brown, Driver, Briggs, eds. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Kaiser, O. Isaiah 13-39. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Keel, O. The Symbolism of the Biblical World. New York: Seabury, 1978.

Le Déaut, R. "The Current State of Targumic Studies" RTB IV (1974) 3-32.

Le Déaut, R. Targum du Pentateuque. Paris: Cerf, 1978 (vol I).

Le Déaut, R. "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation" BThB 4 (1974) 243-287.

Le Déaut, R. "Traditions Targumiques dans le Corpus Paulinien?" Bib 42 (1961) 28-48.

León, D.M. "Soluciones de los Targumin del Pentateuco a los antropomorfismos" EB 28 (1969) 263-281.

Levine, E.B. "The Aggadah in Targum Jonathan Ben `Uzziel and Neofiti I to Genesis: Parallel References" Neofiti I, vol II (Anexo III).

- Levine, E.B. "Neofiti I: A Study of Exodus XV" Bib 54, (1973).
- Mechilta D'Rabbi Ismael. Horovitz and Rabin, eds. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1970.
- Mekilta deRabbi Ishmael. Jacob Z. Lauterbach, ed. Philadelphia: JPSA, 1961 (vols 1-3).
- The Midrash on Psalms. New Haven: Yale, 1959 vols 1-2 (trans. by W.G. Braude).
- Midrash Rabbah. Dr. H. Freedman and M. Simon, eds. London: Soncino, 1939 (vols 1-10).
- McNamara, M. Targum and Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Neophyti I. Díez Macho, ed. Madrid: CSIC, 1968 (vols I-V).
- Noth, M. Exodus. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- Patte, D. Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine. Missoula: SBL, 1975.
- The Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary. Rosenbaum and Silbermann, eds. Jerusalem: Silbermann, 1930.
- Pseudo-Jonathan. Dr. M. Ginsburger, ed. Berlin: Calvary, 1903.
- Sanders, J.A. "Adaptable for Life: The Nature and Function of Canon" in Magnalia Dei. Cross, et.al. eds. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976 (531-60).
- Sanders, J.A. "Hermeneutics in True and False Prophecy" in Canon and Authority. Coats & Long, eds. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977 (21-41).
- Sanders, J.A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4" in Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults. J. Neusner, ed. Leiden: Brill, 1975 (75-106).
- Skehan, P.W. "Texts and Versions" JBC (1968) 574-577.
- Sonne, I. and Mann, J. The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue. Cincinnati: HUC, 1966 (vol II).
- The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben 'Uzziel on the Pentateuch. New York: KTAV, 1968 (trans. by J.W. Etheridge).
- Terrien, S. The Elusive Presence. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Wonderly, W.L. Bible Translations for Popular Use. New York: ABS, 1968.

Endnotes

1. León, 270-72
2. Le Déaut, Targum, 46-62
3. León, 264-67
4. Sanders, "Hermeneutics", 35-40
5. Sanders, "Isaiah 61 to Luke 4" et.al.
6. cf. Patte, 35
7. Levine, "Neofiti", 324
8. McNamara, Targum and Testament, 70
9. Levine, in Neophyti, vol II, 539
10. Quoted in McNamara, Targum and Testament, 52-53
11. Bowker, 8; Weingreen quoted in McNamara, Targum and Testament, 30
12. Patte, 87; Dlez Macho, vol I, 69
13. León, 265
14. Quoted in Patte, 14,52; and Le Déaut, "State", 8
15. cf. Wonderly, 50-55
16. BDB, 1072
17. Gunkel, 41-90 sees Gn 1 itself (as well as Rev 12) as an adaptation- condensation of Babylonian and Egyptian creation mythology. While Gunkel treats the background of these texts, this paper treats their outcome.
18. Kaiser, 223
19. Sonne, vol II, xxxvii
20. cf. Gunkel, 29-90
21. The question of Christian influence on these two works has not been settled, but here the tradition they preserve fits best after En and before the NT.
22. Barrett, "Interpretation", 410 makes a cogent comment about typological interpretation which applies well here "...it...looks not to the fulfillment of a prediction, but to the recurrence of a pattern." Thus the beast and the dragon can attract to themselves the characteristics of any or all their predecessors.
23. See, especially Cross and Freedman, Studies, as well the Exodus commentaries by Childs and Noth and their bibliographies.
24. Terrien, 153
25. Noth, 125-26
26. Childs, 252
27. Keel, 174-75
28. Hatch and Redpath, 1467, Brown, et. al., vol II, 184
29. Other examples omitted here include "Why did Moses strike the rock twice?" and "What were Abraham's ten trials?" (cf. also McNamara, et. al.)
30. Bowker, 50-51
31. Skehan, 574
32. Patte, 66-72
33. 4QFlor comments on Ex 15:17: "...that is the house which [...] in the end of days, as it is written in the book of [...] 'The sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established.'" (cf. also II En 61:2)
34. Patte, 67
35. Le Déaut, "Traditions", 30; "Targumic Literature", 289
36. cf. footnote 14 and bibliography.
37. Sanders, "Adaptable", 560