of the daily life, the culture and worship of those ordinary people who heard Him gladly. This is just what is so difficult to do. We can understand Josephus, Philo, Pilate or Herod, but of the ordinary man we know very little, and of his spiritual life, less.

We cannot be confident that we know a great deal even of the religious leaders of New Testament times. We have a great deal of rabbinic literature written after AD 135, but this literature must be handled very cautiously when it refers to earlier events. Still less are we entitled to equate this pattern of reorganized Judaism, even that of the Mishnah, with Judaism of the first century. The Catholicism of Luther's day cannot be judged by the Council of Trent, nor the moral lives of the priests before the Reformation by the lives of the Jesuits after it. Although the Talmuds do record some disreputable acts by individual rabbis, yet, if the Pharisees of the first century were like the rabbis of the later centuries, then the Gospels sadly malign them. However, Judaism had not only its Counter-Reformation but also the trauma of the destruction of the Temple and of the Jewish state, leading to a radical reorganization of religion under some rather autocratic leaders.

What could be more exciting then, than the announcement that we now have literature which represents 'the general religious culture of the time', which 'nourished the piety of Mary, Joseph, John the Baptist and his parents' (R. Le Déaut)? We are told that knowledge of the Palestinian targum will be 'indispensable' for the exegesis of the New Testament. P. Kahle said (The Cairo Geniza: Oxford, 1959, p. 208): 'In the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch we have in the main material coming down from pre-Christian times which must be studied by everyone who wishes to understand Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity. And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it was similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians.

Unfortunately, as E. Y. Kutscher remarked ('Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäische' in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 51, 1960, p. 35), all this is 'vollkommen unbewiesen', completely unproved. More than that, it does not appear to be true.

THE TARGUMS
The term 'targum' is generally restricted in its application to those Aramaic translations of the Scriptures which were made for and used by Jewish communities, and to the Samaritan Aramaic version of the Pentateuch. Christian versions (in Syriac and Christian Palestinian Aramaic) are excluded.

Three Jewish targums of the Pentateuch are known: the Babylonian, the Palestinian, and Pseudo-Jonathan.

The Babylonian targum. This targum was the standard version of fifth-century Babylon, and became the authoritative version of Judaism as Targum Onkelos, although this ascription to Onkelos is not made before the ninth century and is almost certainly false. The translation is pedantically literal, although there is some paraphrase and (occasionally) explanatory additions. Many manuscripts are known, but all are late.

The textual variants are not significant, although they are far more numerous than has been generally recognized. Its origin is still quite obscure.

The Palestinian targum. The paucity of manuscripts and the large number of variants make it difficult to establish the text of this version. Before 1930 it was known only by citations (from the twelfth century onwards) and by a series of extracts (thirteenth century onwards). These extracts, collectively known as the Fragment Targum, Jerusalem Targum or Targum Jerushalmi II, are found in five manuscripts (Vatican 440, Leipzig 1, Nuremberg Solger 2', ms Sassoon 264, Paris 110), and a scrap in the British Museum. The text of the Nuremberg manuscript (= the Sassoon manuscript) was printed in the first Rabbinic Bible of 1517. Only Paris 110 has any really significant variants.

In 1930 P. Kahle published fragments from five manuscripts of this targum, which he labelled Manuscripts A to E. These manuscripts, which were found in the Geniza (lumber room) of an old synagogue in Cairo, may be dated from AD 700 to 900. Considerable variation is found between the texts.

In 1956 A. Diez Macho recognized that Codex Neofiti I (Vatican Library) was not — as it was catalogued — 'Onkelos', but our only complete manuscript of the Palestinian targum. Many alternative readings are noted in the margin and between the lines of this manuscript, which greatly increases its value. Some preliminary work has been done, the most valuable by Dr Shirley Lund.

The Palestinian targum is (in the main) very literal, occasionally more so...
than Onkelos. The additional matter characteristic of this version is usually interpolated between the verses or halves of the verse. These interpolations are either imaginative expansions of the narrative or (in later manuscripts) commentaries on the wordings or significance of the text.

Pseudo-Jonathan. There is only one manuscript of this version known. It is a sixteenth-century manuscript in the British Library and, though almost identical text was printed in Venice in 1591.

The manuscript and edition are entitled The Targum of Jonathan ben Ussishkin. As this is also, of course, certainly false, it is generally known as "Pseudo-Jonathan." During the last century, when it was mistakenly thought to be the Jerusalem Targum, it was known as Targum Jerusalmi I. Its origin is obscure, and is unlikely to be clarified until the better documented Palestinian targum is understood.

THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

Despite the achievements of great scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, targumic studies are still in their infancy. Work on the Palestinian targum has only just begun.

Hence it is with regret that I view the state of books and articles now appearing, which the New Testament in the light of this targum (even for such basic matters as the meaning of Christ's death), which call in question the earlier one. One is grateful for the information afforded, but cannot accept the conclusions.

McNamara assumes, (following P. Kahle), that: the Law was read in Hebrew and translated orally. (b) this translation was in Aramaic; (c) this was the common language of the people; (d) the dialect of Aramaic spoken was more or less similar to that spoken in Galilee in the first century. (e) this translation was amplified by homiletic material (and/or paraphrase); the two are consistently confused; (f) the translation was relatively fixed in form and content (not extemporaneous) and handed down from one generation to the next.

It is from these assumptions that many of the arguments for the early date of the Palestinian targum begin. They aim to prove that there was an ancient manuscript contain the same text as was in common use in the first century, the one to which Psalm 105:48 have regularly listened ..., as was explained by the Meturegan in the manuscripts (McNamara, op. cit., p. 254). McNamara says bluntly that it is certain: these Aramaic renderings had a long history and were used behind them by NT times and are probably as old as the Scripture readings in the synagogue.

This by no means certain. He (gives absolutely no evidence. He merely cites a secondary source — which gives no evidence either.) Every one of the above assumptions may be questioned, and all but (c) are probably untrue.

(a) The role of a translator is found in the Mishnah. This was composed by R. Judah the Prince — on the basis of earlier collections of laws around 200. Earlier cantillation of the Law is quoted in the name of earlier rabbis, or, if they come from earlier sources, anonymously, by some such phrase as the 'translation of the section in which the translator is mentioned.

(b) McNamara knows that the origin, transmission and nature of the Palestinian Targum may be most satisfactorily explained if the date of composition be settled. There are written translations previous to this date. Greek versions were quite common. M. Megillah 2: I forbids the reading of the book of Esther from a previous language in Pr. 9: 26. The concession that follows is difficult to interpret. It may mean that an oral translation is permitted if the Hebrew is not translated; so that a Greek translation (but no other) was permitted, for those who spoke Greek only.

(c) This was the text that was to be read in Hebrew, says the Mishnah, even if the language was not understood.

(d) R. Judah was noted for his opposition to Aramaic. If he permitted that language, it would be very much as a concession. Greek, on the other hand, had been used in the synagogue; the rabbis seem to have used Greek translations, solely, at least until the fourth century. Hence, the people do seem to have used Aramaic. Again, the evidence is not ambiguous. This translation seems to have been added, but there was an oral translation in New Testament times, so there is an a priori probability that it was in Aramaic, in most synagogues of Galilee. This is the farthest we can go, which is not very far.

(e) The Aramaic dialect of Aramaic, which is getting close to Chancr or Aramaic. This assumes, too, an isolation of the Aramaic dialect from the standard Aramaic language, which is from the first century. The dialect of the Aramaic dialect from the standard Aramaic language, which is from the first century. The dialect of the Aramaic dialect from the standard Aramaic language, which is from the first century. The dialect of the Aramaic dialect from the standard Aramaic language, which is from the first century.
McNamara gives a number of quotations, dated from AD 170 to 350, which he claims are citations of the Palestinian Targum. Two of these are wrongly dated in the pre-Christian period instead of the fourth. The remaining citations are not from an Aramaic version, but from a Greek one. For example, the comment in Philo, cited by G. F. Moore as Rashi Rabbah, is from the Talmud of Palestine, and is found in a Latin (ex-Greek) work of the same general period.

We cannot say, Ito has pointed out, are not real variants, but examples of the normal kind of errors made in transmission of a text. This pre-Christian date of citation is not completely clear, but seems to show that at that time the readings of the Palestinian targum were known, at least as one oral version. There may have been others. This all tends to confirm the tradition mentioned above, that the targum was first current in the fourth century.

**INTERNAL EVIDENCE**

From this we turn to internal evidence. The linguistic arguments have been consistently ignored by most writers on this targum. The recognized authorities on Aramaic (e.g. Kutscher, Fitzmyer, Grelot, Baars, Milik — cf. also Albricht) have indeed implicitly or explicitly ruled out a pre-Christian date of composition for the Aramaic text. Many are found in the translation Aramaic of the Christian Palestinian lectionaries, but not in any other Aramaic texts. These are:

(a) The complete absence of the pronominal object affixed to a finite verb. The object is affixed in every other form of Aramaic (transliterated Aramaic of the New Testament), except Christian Palestinian Aramaic. This is one of the most striking features of this form of translation Aramaic. It is inexplicable if the Hebrew text was used, either orally or in written form. It is not surprising that in later manuscripts, isolated forms of this kind of translation Aramaic are found — or that they should translate a Hebrew affixed form, invariably in Onkelos and regularly in Pseudo-Jonathan.

(b) The use of the relative. In the translation the targum follows Greek usage, as does Christian Palestinian Aramaic. It is found in a Latin (ex-Greek) work of the same general period. The linguistic arguments have been consistently ignored by most writers on this targum.
before prepositions. The targum, when translating a relative followed by a preposition always adds a finite verb or its equivalent. This is characteristic of Classic Aramaic, only when the Septuagint has the relative (plus finite verb). Our targum also avoids a relative before a participle; even the normal Aramaic usage and occurs in the Hebrew and in other targumes. Where the relative does occur before a participle, it represents the article (in both Greek and Hebrew), and takes a different orthographic form.

(c) Greek words are used in the translation which are not integrated into the language. The possessive pronouns are not affixed to these words (as in normal Aramaic, and in the Hebrew original). These words are usually reserved for the independent possesses—this is bad Aramaic, but good Greek. This phenomenon (Greek words giving the impression of being a foreign body in the language) has been noted elsewhere by Saul Lieberman. It is inexplicable if the original text was Hebrew. Why were not the perfectly good Aramaic equivalents used? Or the original Hebrew?

(d) The agreements with Greek versions. These agreements noted above. The most striking are of those that give Greek words in translation.

(e) In Hebrew and Aramaic the word for ‘food’ (showing the Semitic background of the manuscripts) differentiates between ‘bread’ and ‘food’ as do the Greek versions, and unlike the Hebrew or any other targum. As French words are not identical, it is inexplicable why a translator seeing (or hearing) the Hebrew text should search around for another Aramaic word which does not precisely translate the Hebrew.

The only explanation that seems, on present evidence, to fit the facts is that the targum was translated from a Greek version. This version seems to have been a revision of the Septuagint, which brought it more in line with the later MSS of the Bible. The Septuagint version, except for the New Testament itself, is for the most part a Greek translation of the second century, so that any composition must be before the second century. We could, therefore, be justified in appealing to them if we had strong independent evidence that the targum, with interpolations, was translated from the first century to the twelfth. This we do not have—so we must say the least.

Even without knowing that the targum stems from a Greek version, it is fairly clear that all the manuscripts belong to one tradition. In the earlier manuscripts there are isolated examples of the kind of alteration which we find in the later texts (particularly adaptation of the Hebrew translation into the Greek). This New Testament passage in terms of a targumic passage must be entirely ruled out as inadmissible. The New Testament proves, in some cases, that the same ideas were also current in the first century, as well as in the fourth.

NEW TESTAMENT PARALLELS

McNamara claimed that 'if we can show that there is a break between the PT and the NT we have established a strong argument for the pre-Christian date of the PT as such' (op. cit. p. 35). This is only true if we are established literary dependence, and the priority of the Palestinian Targum has been proved beyond reasonable doubt. Grudt, in general agreement with McNamara, yet says of some examples 'il faut reconnaître qu'il y a un effet de contacts entre les deux, dû à l'antiquité des traducteurs'. The New Testament probably has a...
tinian targum reads (passages bracketed are additional to the text; those words shown in italics differ from the Masoretic text):

'The Law' is not in heaven, saying (O that we had one like Moses) that would go up to heaven and bring it to us and make us hear (the commandments) and we would do them.

Neither is (the Law) beyond the (great) sea, saying (O that we had one like Jonah the prophet) that would descend to the depths of the (great) sea and bring it to us and make us hear (the commandments) and we would do them.

It is clearly erroneous to compare the interpolated material with Paul's interpretation. McNamara (op. cit. p. 77) speaks of 'Christ the New Moses, who had taken the New Law from heaven'. Nothing is further from Paul's mind at this point. It is Christ Himself (not the Law) whom it is futile to seek in heaven.

It is not Christ (as the New Moses) who is to ascend to heaven, but someone in search of Christ. There is no contact between the interpretations at all.

Yet there is a striking resemblance between the two translations. We are indebted to McNamara for drawing attention to this passage. The resemblance between 'descend to the abyss' and 'descend to the depths' may not be accidental, though the interpretation of the two is totally unrelated. It is just possible that the two were developed in isolation: Paul's reading of Christ's death in symmetry to Christ's exalation; the targum citing the only prophet to have had much to do with the sea, and his submarine adventures the best-known. Yet neither Paul nor the targum seem to be forming an ad hoc version. The targum translation is as well attested as our manuscripts allow (the only alternative reading seems secondary), and the 'markers' show it to be original, translated from Greek.

The conclusion seems inevitable that Paul (as the later rabbi) was using a Greek version. This version was the same as that from which the Palestinian targum was translated. This, as we have seen, is related to that of 'Theodotion'. Paul indeed cites this version in 1 Corinthians 15: 54 (serbatim) and, probably, in 1 Corinthians 3: 19. Peter (or Luke?) also cites it in Acts 2: 18. We do not have much material from this version extant.

CONCLUSION
The Palestinian targum is a translation of a Greek version, made at the earliest in the second half of the third century. The large claims made for it are unwarranted. However, it is not altogether useless. The text sometimes witnesses to the (or a) Greek text current in first-century Palestine. The interpolated matter sometimes preserves interpretations and sayings from the first century. Some of these may even have come from Christian sources. It is, of course, not a contemporary source even of these sayings, and we can only be sure that an interpretation is first century, if first-century material confirms the existence of that interpretation. The language is that of Galilee some 300 years after the New Testament, and is therefore not without value.
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