**Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the Masoretic Cantillations**

**Abstract**

This article compares the Targum with Masoretic cantillations. The first part deals with a comparison of the reading traditions that are expressed in the cantillations and in the translation. The comparison shows agreement in everything concerning the division between one verse and the next. There is also usually agreement on the division within each verse, particularly when both the cantillations and the Targum respond to an ideological or exegetical problem in the text, and such agreement is usually consistent with a midrashic tradition. Juxtaposing the cantillations and the Targum in this manner may also reveal aspects of the stages of development of these two interpretive tools relative to one other.

The comparison of the Targumim and the Babylonian cantillation can also provide insights into the relative dates of their development. Such comparison also strengthens the assessment that the Tiberian accents system was influenced by the Targum for the verses.

The second part of this article contrasts the cantillation marks and Targum for the entire corpus of the Minor Prophets and examines the way each verse is divided. This comparison shows how the Targum seems to prefer a subordinative structure, even when translating paratactic clauses.

## **1. Introduction**

The cantillation marks are one of the additions that the Masoretes attached to the consonantal biblical text, and set down in writing at the end of the first millennium of the Common Era. The accents have a musical function that relates to the melody or the rhythm that accompanies the reading of the text, but they also have syntactical significance, relating to the division of the verse.[[1]](#footnote-2) In the context of the present comparison to the Targum, the focus is on the syntactic division indicated by the accents, and the exegetical significance of that division.

Similar to the Targum, which clearly existed in oral form prior to the earliest manuscripts that include the Targum, that refer to it, the written Masoretic system also reflects a reading tradition that had previously been transmitted orally from one generation to the next. The Talmud mentions the practice of reading the Torah with a tune and with the Targum.[[2]](#footnote-3) However, the search for clear written evidence regarding the development of these traditions has proved futile. The biblical text in the Qumran scrolls is exclusively consonantal, with only short translation segments alongside it. In contrast, even the earliest medieval Bible manuscripts are often accompanied by translations, vocalization marks and accents. Almost a thousand years separate the Qumran texts and the earliest medieval manuscripts, such that it is impossible to trace the development of these traditions through the analysis of a continuous series of manuscripts. Instead, we must reconstruct that development based on external evidence and comparisons between the extant texts.

The current research compares the Targum to the Masoretic cantillation system and to the exegesis indicated therein.

The comparison was conducted on verses whose cantillation is irregular throughout the books of the prophets,[[3]](#footnote-4) and the entire biblical text of the Minor Prophets was compared to the text of the Targum, verse by verse.[[4]](#footnote-5) An additional comparison was conducted between the reading tradition of the Targum and the Babylonian reading tradition, as indicated in the biblical manuscripts annotated with Babylonian cantillation marks; manuscripts in which the verse division is different than that in the Tiberian tradition.[[5]](#footnote-6)

These comparisons yield results regarding the development of the various exegetical traditions and regarding the syntactic characteristics of the Targum.

## **2. A comparison of the reading traditions**

### ***2.1 Double translation, reflecting two reading traditions***

It appears that in everything concerning the divisions between one verse and the next (as opposed to the internal division within each verse), the Targum and the cantillation share the same tradition, even though there existed different division traditions.[[6]](#footnote-7) When the Targum expresses the possibility of another division, this is done via double translation, thereby presenting the two possible readings of the verses, rather than by a verse division that contradicts the division reflected in the cantillation.[[7]](#footnote-8)

For example: The Targum to Amos 5.7-8 translates the Hebrew word הניחו (‘cast’) at the end of verse seven twice. This word is translated the first time in accordance with the division reflected in the cantillation marks. The verse ‘and cast righteousness to the ground’ is translated, ‘and have banished רטשו)) righteousness on the earth.’

An additional translation of this word is at the beginning of verse eight. The verse, ‘He who made the Pleiades and Orion’ is translated ‘left (שבקו) fearing from before the one who makes the Pleides and Orion’.

"עליהם" In other words, the Targum uses the double translation of the word at the end of one verse and extends that word to the following verse, in order to clarify the connection between the sins in 5.7 and the praise of God in 5.8.[[8]](#footnote-9) The precedence and acceptance of the consensus on the tradition of the verse division is also expressed in the description of the Targum that accompanies the reading in the synagogue, where there is a set number of verses after which the reader is stop and the translation is read;[[9]](#footnote-10) and in the many manuscripts of the Targum, in which each verse is followed by the translation of that verse.

Double translation that reflects two reading traditions is also found in the internal division of the verses. In Zachariah 14, for example, there is a description of a plague that will befall any nation that does not go up to Jerusalem to celebrate the Sukkot festival. Zachariah 14.18 states that if Egypt will not go up, it will not be stricken by plague. That verse is not logical. If Egypt does not go up to Jerusalem, why will it not be stricken by plague?[[10]](#footnote-11) The cantillation marks reflect awareness of this difficulty, and divide the verse such that the first part ends with ולא עליהם – ‘not on them’ – while the second part starts with תהיה המגפה – ‘will be the plague’. In other words, the cantillation marks address the problem, but the resulting verse is difficult to understand. In the Targum the word "עליהם" meaning ‘on them’ is repeated in both parts of the verse, as if it states:

‘And if the kingdom of Egypt will not go up and will not come, (the Nile shall) not rise for them (יסק להון), but upon them (עליהון) shall be the plague’.

While the cantillation marks must cope with the difficulty by dividing the verse incongruently to the syntax, the Targum adds words to the verse and repeats the word עליהם twice – once in keeping with the calculation – (the Nile shall) not rise for them, and again in keeping with logic – the plague shall be upon them. Here too there appears to be a shared reading tradition, because otherwise the Targum could have made do with stating that the plague would come upon Egypt, and would not have had to relate to the Nile not rising.[[11]](#footnote-12)

### ***2.2 Exegetical agreement***

In most cases, the Targumists and Masoretes agreed on the verse division. This is especially true in cases in which both the Targum and the Masora adhere to the literal meaning of the text. In the vast majority of instances, the Targum and the accents also concur with one another regarding the non-standard midrashic division.[[12]](#footnote-13)

Such midrashic traditions are found primarily in verses that give rise to theological or halakhic problems.

For example: In the first clause of Isaiah 40.13, the prophet asks: Who hath meted out the spirit [of the] Lord? This question is theologically challenging: it should not be possible for someone to direct the spirit of the Lord. The Targum therefore reinterprets it as referring to the spirit that is in the mouth of the prophets. The question is: who established the prophetic spirit? And the answer is that the Lord did.

The cantillation marks reflect the same interpretation.[[13]](#footnote-14) Unlike the Targum, however, the cantillation system cannot add words for clarification, but can rather only change the division of the verse. The accents therefore indicate a division between the words ‘spirit’ and ‘Lord’, thus signifying that the verse should be read as a question immediately followed by an answer: ‘Who hath meted out the spirit? The Lord.’

In the next example, regarding priestly marriage restrictions, a midrashic tradition resolves a halakhic difficulty. Chapter 44 of Ezekiel sets down various rules of Jewish law relating to priests, some of which are inconsistent with the corresponding rules in Leviticus. One of these rules relates to the question of whom a priest may marry.

וְאַלְמָנָה֙ וּגְרוּשָׁ֔ה לֹֽא־יִקְח֥וּ לָהֶ֖ם לְנָשִׁ֑ים כִּ֣י אִם־בְּתוּלֹ֗ת מִזֶּ֨רַע֙ בֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְהָֽאַלְמָנָה֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר תִּֽהְיֶ֣ה אַלְמָנָ֔ה מִכֹּהֵ֖ן יִקָּֽחוּ

Neither shall they take for their wives a widow, nor her that is put away; but they shall take virgins of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that is the widow of a priest.[[14]](#footnote-15)

According to Ezekiel, priests may not marry a widow or a divorcee, but they may marry a virgin or a widow of another priest. In contrast, according to Leviticus, an ordinary priest may marry any widow,[[15]](#footnote-16) and only the high priest is prohibited from marrying a widow.[[16]](#footnote-17)

The Babylonian Talmud resolves this contradiction by distinguishing between the two parts of the verse. According to the Talmud, the start of the verse refers to the high priest, while the end refers to a regular priest.[[17]](#footnote-18) In consonance with this midrashic tradition, the Targum adds the word *שאר* – other – into its translation of the last clause of the verse. The Targum reads as follows: ‘And a widow who is a widow the other priests may marry’. The Targum thus resolves the halakhic difficulty, even though in doing so it creates a textual difficulty, since the meaning of the phrase ‘a widow who is a widow’ remains unclear. It is possible that the phrase could be referring to a widow who has not remarried. In any case, this same midrashic tradition is also reflected in the cantillation marks, in which a division is indicated between the words ‘a widow who is a widow’ and the words ‘of a priest they will be taken’.

Kogut points out a dissonance in this verse between the placement of the *etnachta* – the main disjunctive of the verse – and the placement of the other disjunctive accents, reflecting two separate stages in the development of the accents. According to him, the first-order disjunctive accents – the *silluq* (verse ending) and the *etnachta* – were developed at an earlier stage, while the other disjunctive accents were developed later.[[18]](#footnote-19) If the first-order accents had been placed in conformity with the halakha of Leviticus and the exegetical tradition of the Babylonian Talmud, then the *etnachta* – the main disjunctive accent – would have been located under the word “Israel”, in order to connect the clause regarding marriage to a virgin with the discussion of the high priest in the first part of the verse.

Kogut explains that the location of the *etnachta* does not reflect the distinction between the high priest and an ordinary priest. Rather, it reflects the distinction between what is prohibited and what is permitted. Only at the second stage, during which additional disjunctive accents were developed, did the cantillation system see a need to respond to the halakhic question. At this point, the position of the main accents could no longer be adjusted, and thus a second-order division was introduced between ‘the widow who is a widow’ and the phrase ‘of a priest they will be taken’. This division changes the meaning of the verse; it is not the widow of a *kohen –* rather, it is that a *kohen* can marry a widow.

It thus appears that the Targum, which also interprets the verse in accordance with the same midrashic tradition, developed later than the first stage of the accents. It is also possible that the tradition was first incorporated into the Targum and the Talmud, and this in turn influenced the development of the second stage of the cantillation system.[[19]](#footnote-20)

It is noteworthy that such consensus of the Targum and the cantillation system on midrashic tradition is found not only when theological or halakhic difficulties arise, but also in biblical poetry, and quite often unexpected divisions of poetic parallelisms are reflected in the accents and the Targum. In addition to the shared reading tradition, the unique reading reflects the complex approach toward parallelisms, with respect to both the desire to avoid repetition of content and the attitude to the symmetric structure.[[20]](#footnote-21) The brief scope of this article however, cannot extend to that subject.

### ***2.3 Disagreement between the cantillation system and the Targum***

Although there is a general consensus between the Targum and the accents on the midrashic division of the verse, there are a few examples of disagreement, especially in the secondary division of the verses. For example:

וְלֹא־אֶחָ֣ד עָשָׂ֗ה וּשְׁאָ֥ר ר֨וּחַ֙ ל֔וֹ

וּמָה֙ הָֽאֶחָ֔ד מְבַקֵּ֖שׁ זֶ֣רַע אֱלֹהִ֑ים

And not one hath done so who had exuberance of spirit!

For what seeketh the one? A seed given of God. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth[[21]](#footnote-22)

The difference between the cantillation system and the Targum relates to the second part of the first clause: The Targum reads the verse as a question and an answer: ‘For what seeketh the one? A seed given of God.’ In contrast, the accents introduce a division after the word ‘one’ – meaning: and what is the one – as a continuation of the start of the verse, which speaks of the one, and without any conjunctive: seeking the seed of the Lord.[[22]](#footnote-23)

Garty notes that this verse is another case that reflects the multi-stage development of the cantillation system.[[23]](#footnote-24) In this case, the Targum is consistent with the earlier and less midrashic stage of the accents. He explains that the Targum conforms with the simple and basic division of the verse into two, in accordance with the first-order accents. However, the cantillation system detaches the phrase ‘seeketh a seed of God’ from the phrase ‘and what is the one’. According to this interpretation of the verse, the *etnachta –* the first-order division - should have been placed under the ‘the one’, and the phrase ‘seeketh a seed of God’ should have been connected to the continuation, as part of the conditional sentence – as if the actual text was the following: ‘(If you) seeketh a seed of God, you should take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of your youth’.

Garty presumes that the change arose from an exegetical tradition that ties the ‘one’ with the Lord, and not with a human being.[[24]](#footnote-25)

In this example, in contrast to the example in Ezekiel, the Targum is in accord with the earlier stage of the development of the accents, and it appears that the second stage was influenced by a later tradition.

Overall, a review of verses with unexpected cantillation divisions indicates that when the verses pose a theological or halakhic difficulty, in the vast majority of the cases – over 90% – the Targum reflects the same solution. This is especially true regarding the accents added in the second stage of the development of the Tiberian cantillation system. When the unusual placement of the accents derives from an exegetical problem, such as the example from Malachi, we find a similar correspondence between the accents and the Targum, although at a less dramatic rate (over 70%).

### ***2.4 Comparison to the Babylonian cantillation system***

The Babylonian cantillation system provides an additional perspective regarding the relative chronology of the Targumim and of the accents. This comparison, relies on the research of Ronit Shoshany, who compared the two cantillation systems in hundreds of manuscripts. She noted that the Babylonian system shows a preference for a short unit at the start of a verse – iambic division, while the Tiberian system prefers to start verses with a long unit and to end with a short unit – trochaic division, and presents this distinction as evidence that the Babylonian system is the earlier one.[[25]](#footnote-26)

The examples that Shoshany cites as containing discrepancies between the Babylonian accents and the Tiberian accents, were compared to the Targum. Regarding a substantial majority of these examples it is impossible to determine Targum’s position, because the division serves no exegetical purpose. However, one particularly interesting example is found in Ezekiel 16.63:

לְמַ֤עַן תִּזְכְּרִי֙ וָבֹ֔שְׁתְּ וְלֹ֨א יִֽהְיֶה־לָּ֥ךְ עוֹד֙ פִּתְח֣וֹן פֶּ֔ה מִפְּנֵ֖י כְּלִמָּתֵ֑ךְ

That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame.[[26]](#footnote-27)

The Tiberian accents divide the verse after the word ובשת – ‘and be confounded’. In contrast, the Babylonian system divides the verse in an enigmatic manner, after the word עוד – nevermore. The Targum clearly reads the sentence in the same manner as the Tiberian accents: ‘and never again speak arrogantly’.

A study of the manuscript, Ms. EVR II B 1545 of the St. Petersburg – Russian National Library, provides additional interesting information:

In this manuscript, the Targum is interwoven within the text of the Hebrew Bible: each Hebrew verse is followed by the Aramaic translation. As in many manuscripts, the Targum is also annotated with cantillation marks, according to the Babylonian system. The manuscript clearly shows the disjunctive sign (the Hebrew letter *zayin*) above the word עוד, in both the verse and the Targum.[[27]](#footnote-28) Yeivin has already noted that the accents of the Targum reflect the accents of the biblical verse itself, and do not necessarily conform to the interpretation of the Targum.[[28]](#footnote-29)

This manuscript presents the Babylonian cantillation system in its earliest form, before it was influenced by the Tiberian tradition.[[29]](#footnote-30) It is interesting to note that these Babylonian cantillation marks are transcribed alongside the earlier Babylonian vocalization marks, as well as alongside the Targum, and these by and large conform to the Tiberian accents. The conflation of these two reading traditions may be the result of the biblical text and the Targum text having been copied from different sources that developed independently. Even if this suggestion is not conclusive, however, manuscripts of this kind, which combine elements from two different reading traditions, strengthen the assessment that the Tiberian cantillation system was influenced by the Targum, particularly regarding the second-order disjunctives.

## **3. Syntactical characterization of the Targum**

In order to provide a more general characterization of the Targum, not only specific verses in which the cantillation system presents an unexpected division, all of the verses in the Minor Prophets were reviewed and examined the division of each of the verses, both in the cantillation system and as reflected by the Targum. This comparison indicated that the Targum has a tendency to deviate from the cantillation-based verse division and to favor complex sentences with subordinate clauses, rather than compound sentences composed of multiple independent parts.

For example:

הַ֥עַל כֵּ֖ן יָרִ֣יק חֶרְמ֑וֹ וְתָמִ֛יד לַֽהֲרֹ֥ג גּוֹיִ֖ם לֹ֥א יַחְמֽוֹל

Shall they therefore empty their net, and not spare continually to slay the nations? [[30]](#footnote-31)

According to the Masoretic division of the verse, the *etnachta* is located on the word חרמו – their net – and the word ותמיד is tied to the continuation of the verse, referring to slaying of the nations – literally: ‘they slay the nations always’. But the Targum understands the word ותמיד as an adverb – בתדירא – continually.[[31]](#footnote-32) Thus, translating *hermo* as armies, the meaning of the verse is that they send their armies continually. This understanding changes the structure of the sentence: instead of two connected clauses, there is an adverb – continually – followed by a description of the objective: ‘in order to destroy nations’.

The following is an additional example:

וְאֶזְרָעֵם֙ בָּֽעַמִּ֔ים וּבַמֶּרְחַקִּ֖ים יִזְכְּר֑וּנִי

And I will sow them among the people: and they shall remember me in far countries.[[32]](#footnote-33)

In the Targum, the word במרחקים – in far countries – is translated as a word that describes the nations, and not one that describes a place where ‘I shall be remembered’. The resulting sentence is contrary to the division suggested by the accents – a division in which there is a break between the phrase ‘And I will sow them among the people’ and the phrase ‘and they shall remember me in far countries’.

The Targum thus transforms the sentence from a compound sentence into a complex sentence: ‘And just as I scattered them among the nations that in a distant land were remembering me’.

This trend is also evident in many other verses in the Targum, regardless of whether it is in accordance with the cantillation system or not. The Targum’s preference for complex sentences appears to its need to adhere to the simple, traditional reading of the verse.

In terms of the dating, another suggestion could be raised regarding the relationship between the Targum and the cantillation system.

In most cases, including the examples discussed here, the Targum creates complex sentences by introducing a subordinating connector after the first part of the verse, thereby incorporating words from the second part of the verse into the first part. The Targum thus expands the first part of the verse into a longer sentence, and the additional information at the end of the verse is left standing by itself in a second and shorter part. In this way, the Targum’s approach resembles that of the Tiberian cantillation system, prompting the – cautious – suggestion that the difference between the two cantillation systems may also reflect the impact of the Targum’s approach.

## **4. Conclusions**

The reading traditions of the Tiberian cantillation system and Targum are very similar, particularly at the level of the first-order disjunctives. In everything concerning the division between one verse and the next, there appears to be full concurrence, and concerning placement of the *etnachta* there is usually concurrence. In addition, the later second-order divisions in the Tiberian system may reflect the influence of the Targum. The movement toward uniformity across divergent reading traditions can be explained as resulting from divergent traditions being written alongside each other in the very same manuscripts. This uniformity may also be explained as reflecting a shared preference for a particular syntactic style.

1. For background on the cantillation marks and their development, see I. Yeivin, **המסורה למקרא**, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2003), mainly pp.131-137. On the question of the role of the cantillation marks, see R. Shoshany, 'תפקידם המקורי של טעמי המקרא', in M. Bar-Asher and C. E. Cohen (eds.), משאת לאהרן׃ מחקרים בלשון מוגשים לאהרן דותן, (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2009) pp. 469–486; B. E. Dresher, 'The Prosodic Basis of the Tiberian Hebrew System of Accents', Language 70,1 (1994) pp. 1-52; S. J. Park, '"Pointing to the Accents": The Functional Development of the Masoretic Accents in the Hebrew Bible',*Hebrew Studies*55 (2014) pp. 73–88. See also the background and literary review. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Meg. 3a, Ned. 37b, y. Meg. 4.1, Gen. R. 36.8. The Babylonian Talmud dates the translation and the cantillation marks for the Torah readings to Nehemiah’s time, meaning the early Second Temple Period. It is doubtful, however, that one can rely on testimony from a thousand years before, regarding the establishment of the authoritative source of the traditions for the Targum and cantillations.

   On talmudic references to the Targum and to reading to a tune, see W. F. Smelik, *Rabbis, language and translation in late antiquity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), particularly pp. 173-174.

   On the antiquity of the cantillation marks, see a discussion of the evidence of the existence of an accent system in a second-century CE Greek manuscript, E. J. Revell, 'The Oldest Evidence for the Hebrew Accent System,' BJRL 54 (1971/1972) pp. 214-222; E. J. Revell, 'Biblical Punctuation and Chant in the Second Temple Period', JSJ 7 (1976) pp. 181-198. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The highly systematic nature of the Tiberian cantillation system provides us with an a priori expectation regarding most Biblical verses as to the placement of the cantillation marks, at least with respect to the primary divisions. It is therefore notable noteworthy when the accents diverge from this expectation. This study is based on a set of such verses, in which the accents diverge from their expected placement in order to provide a particular exegesis of the verse. Lists of such verses have been prepared by a few scholars: W. Wickes, *Two treatises on the accentuation of the Old Testament:‎ Taame emet on Psalms, Proverbs, and Job; Taame kaf-alef sefarim on the twenty-one prose books*.‎ Prolegomenon, by Aron Dotan, (New York :‎

   Breuer compares the cantillation marks to the Targum in some of the verses, and notes whether the cantillation marks concurred with the Targum or interpreted the verses differently, but does not offer any insights to the relationship between the cantillation marks and the Targum.

   S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1996); I. Yeivin, המסורהלמקרא, pp. 85-190; The verses in these lists and the exegesis indicated by the cantillation marks was were compared with that those of the Targum. In most of the examples in these lists the differences are not evident in the Targum. I focused only on the verses for which the translator’s opinion can be determined. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The division of each of the verses was examined both in according to the Tiberian accents as recorded in the Aleppo Codex and as reflected by the Targum. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. R. Shoshany, מערכת הטעמים הבבלית: כללי ההטעמה והחלוקה, שלבי ההתפתחות, והזיקה למערכת הטברנית, (Ph.D. diss., Tel-Aviv University, 2003). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Qid. 30a, Ned. 38a attest to different traditions for the division into verses. See a discussion of the debate over the division of the verses and when it occurred, in Y. Ofer, המסורה הבבלית לתורה עקרונותיה ודרכיה, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2001) pp. 154-184. In addition, in sources that attribute reading with a tune to Nehemiah (y. Meg. 4.1, Ned. 37b, Meg.3a), there is a distinction between the cantillation in general and the division into verses. In Genesis Rabba there is a distinction between *rashei psukim, hakhraot and etnachta.*

   I. Yeivin, המסורה למקרא assumes that the division into verses is earlier, but *etnachta* does not refer to the cantillation with which we are familiar, but rather to some sort of pause in the reading. S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp. 273- 274, on the other hand, opines that this is a reinforce to the cantillation itself, and that the two main pause marks predate the other cantillation marks. Even so, he too stresses that there is no disputing the precedence of the division into verses. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The cantillation marks cannot reflect two different traditions, such that even if two traditions were known to the copyists, they had to be decisive. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Another example of this type of double translation is in Targum Onkelos to Genesis 49.6-7, where the word ארור at the end of verse six is translated again at the beginning of verse seven. This is an interesting example, because there are explicit talmudic references to the existence of two traditions for the division of those two verses, and that “there is no decision.” In other words, there are two ways of reading the verses, and no decision was reached regarding which is correct. A discussion of that expression and is significance can be found in Y. Breuer, 'ושוב למקראות שאין להם הכרע', in R. I. (Singer) Zer and Y. Ofer (eds.), ישראל - מחקרים בלשון לזכרו של ישראל ייבין, (Jerusalem: Publications of the Hebrew University Bible project, 2011), pp. 53- 63.

   For a discussion of Onkelos’s double translation of this verse, see M. A. Carasik, 'Syntactic double translation in the "Targumim"', in: E. M. Meyers and P.V.M. Flesher (eds.), *Aramaic in Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010) pp. 217-231.

   Carasik views the double translation as an attempt to express the possibility of different readings inherent in the consonantal biblical text. The understanding that there is an additional reading that implies a different interpretation only reinforces the fact that the tradition of the verse division in the Targum is the same as the tradition of the division reflected by the Tiberian cantillation marks. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. M. Meg. 4:4 – According to the Mishna, the translation is done after each verse of the Torah reading and after every three verses of readings from the Prophets. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. LXX and Pesh. both state that the plague will come upon them. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. R. P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets from Nahum to Malachi* [Supplement to Vetus Testamentus 51], (Leiden: Brill 1994) pp. 69-71 cites S.D. Luzzatto, 'Nachträgliches über die Thargumim', WZJT 5 (1844) pp.124-137, who wrote that the cantillation marks and the Targum usually agree on the solution to a problem, but goes on to ask about the Targum’s possible effect on the tradition of the wording. With respect to Zach. 14.18, he assumes that the Targum affected the cantillation – because of our knowledge of their chronology – but if the cantillation followed the Targum, the *etnachta* would have to be under ולא. Gordon therefore concludes, ‘The evidence is probably not conducive to a theory of a more specific relationship between the two.’ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. It is noteworthy that I gained a slightly different impression of Targum Onkelos, in which there are more verses whose division differs from that of the accents. If we assume that the traditions influenced one another, there appears to have been more meticulous adherence to the traditions for the reading of the Torah. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. M. Breuer, טעמי המקרא בכ"א ספרים ובספרי אמת, p. 373; S. Kogut,המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp. 81-82 address this verse, and even note the affinity between the accents and the Targum. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Ezek. 44.22, JPS. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Lev. 21.7. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Lev. 21.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Qid. 78b, L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, (New York and Baltimore,‎

    As part of the discussion in Qid. 78b, R. Nahman asks if it is possible for a verse to be written in such a manner, and Rabba answers in the affirmative, citing 1 Sam. 3.3 as an example. According to the Talmud, that verse is also divided such that it relates to two different topics: "And the lamp of God was not yet gone out” in the Temple of the Lord, “and Samuel was laid down in his place” This verse is another example of a shared tradition between the accents and the Targum, addressing a halakhic difficulty in the verse. A similar tradition is reflected in the Qumran fragment of The Vision of Samuel (4Q160), and in the Oxford: MS heb. d.49/4 Recto manuscript, in the Babylonian cantillation marks. See also a discussion of this verse in R. P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets from Nahum to Malachi*, pp.71; E. van Staalduine-Sulman, *The Targum of Samuel*, (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 105, 229-230, 710.

    This verse is also an additional example of the double translation of part of a verse in the Targum and its attachment to the next verse: in order to explain what is happening in the sanctuary of God – which is not the place where Samuel was lying, the Targum adds the words וקלא אשתמע- and a voice was heard – in keeping with the beginning of verse 3.4, which states that God called to Samuel.

    פסוק זה הוא גם דוגמה נוספת לתרגום כפול של חלק מפסוק אחד בתוך התרגום לפסוק הסמוך: כדי להסביר מה התרחש בהיכל ה' – שכבר לא מתאר את המקום ששמואל שוכב בו, מוסיף התרגום את המלים ""- וקול נשמע, על פי תחילת פסוק 3.4 שאומר שה' קורא לשמואל. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp. 100-101. In the context of the order of the development of the accents, Kogut expands in additions to this edition, pp. 273-274. See also a discussion of his sources in note 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. S. Garty, 'רבדים במערכת הטעמים הטברנית', Language Studies 14-15 (2013), pp. 51-68. Garty cites an additional verse that he claims shows the discrepancy between the Caesareans and the other punctuators. In Mi. 4.8 the position of the *etnachta* is a midrashic messianic call. If we accept Garty’s claim, this verse could be another example of the Targum’s agreement with the second level of the cantillation system. Garty opines that the messianic interpretation or the commitment to it is what led to the alteration of the accents. In other words, this example could suggest the influence of the Targum on the second level of the accents.

    P. V. M. Flesher and B. Chilton, *The Targums: a critical introduction*, (Leiden: Brill, 2011) p. 224 relate to the messianic interpretation of Mi. 4.8, and view it as as a characterization of the attitude toward the messiah in the Amoraic period. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. An example of consistency between the Targum and the accents in an irregular reading of poetry can be found in the Song of Deborah, in Judg. 5.13, 18, 20, and see W. F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, (Leiden: Brill, 1995) pp.451-453; 464-468. On the manner in which the cantillation system and the Targum relate to the parallels in poetry, see J. L. Kugel, *The idea of biblical poetry: parallelism and its history*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981) pp. 109- 116. Kugel points to a stylistic reservation regarding the structure of the parallels, in line with the talmudic interpretation, both due to the repetition in the content and the lack of understanding of the structure. He argues that the multiple pauses in the Tiberian system resulted in a total blurring of the parallel structure, and the transformation of the poetry into prose. S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp.70-73, disagrees with Kugel, arguing that in verses that require supplementation from strophe to strophe (deficient parallel) the accents do not separate the parts of the parallel, but rather create a single whole part and a second part whose informative content relates to all of the first part. See also, including the literature review on this subject: S. J. Park, ‘Application of the Tiberian Accentuation System for Colometry of Biblical Hebrew Poetry’, JNSL 39 (2) (2013) pp. 113–127. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Mal. 2.15, JPS. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. See the discussion of this verse and its interpretation in S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp.48, 170. Two other examples of verses in which there is inconsistency between the Targum and the accents are: Judg. 6.24, in which the accents are interpretive, out of a desire to address the theological aspect of the verse. See also S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, pp. 165-167; W. F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, pp. 494-495. There is similar inconsistency based on interpretation in Judg. 12.4, With respect to the accents, see W. Wickes, *Two treatises on the accentuation of the Old Testament*, pp. 132. With respect to the Targum, see W. F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, p. 558. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. S. Garty, 'רבדים במערכת הטעמים הטברנית**'.** [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. It is important to note that in Targum Onkelos on Gen. 3.22 כאחד ממנו, interprets אחד as referring to God, while the accents divided the verse according to its simple meaning. See the discussion in S. Kogut, המקרא בין טעמים לפרשנות, p. 41. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. R. Shoshany, מערכת הטעמים הבבלית. Another conclusion that she reaches is that the Babylonian system’s primary objective is prosodic. Other scholars have noted additional aspects that indicate that the Babylonian system developed earlier. See A. Spanier, *Die massoretischen Akzente. Eine Darlegung des Systems nebst Beiträgen zum Verstandnis ihrer Entwicklung* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1927); M. Breuer, 'למערכת הטעמים הבבלית', in A. Maman, S. E Fassberg and Y. Breuer (eds.), שערי לשון, (vol. I, Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2007) pp. 109-114. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Ezek. 16.8, KJV. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. R. Shoshany, מערכת הטעמים הבבלית, p. 184. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. ## I. Yeivin**, מסורת הלשון העברית המשתקפת בניקוד הבבל**, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985) pp. 60.

    [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Shoshany divides the Babylonian manuscripts into four different periods, based on the development of the cantillation system, and this manuscript belongs to the earliest period. Yeivin, who relates to the diacritics, also attributes this manuscript to the earlier stage. Both researchers concur that the early Babylonian stage preceded the Tiberian tradition and was not influenced by it. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Hab. 1.17, KJV. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. R. P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets*, pp. 64 discusses the question of whether the Targumists were working from another version (Vorlage) of the Bible, from which the conjunctive had been omitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Zech. 10.9, KJV. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)