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A. THE WORK 

1. Introduction

The following is an attempt to describe the art of targum in what is almost certainly a text from late medieval times. It is a Targum of the Amidah or Tefillah, the central prayer-text of Judaism. It is offered in the context of the theme Artefact and Text as an example of the survival, or resurrection, of a literary competence belonging to a previous age; an example of the ability and willingness to emulate the processes of authorship of classical works in the post-classical period. As such, it is meant to illustrate the potential for skilful literary mimicry, which may also have been available for other types of rabbinic literature. Just as it is used in our case to create a new work, it may have been used to add to or

* It is a pleasure to acknowledge the kind support of Mr Judah J. Reich of Manchester in procuring printed sources relevant to the study of the Hebrew manuscripts in the John Rylands University Library, including that of the Targum of the Amidah.

1 The following works will be referred to in abbreviated form: M. Gaster, 'Ein Targum der Amidah', Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 39 (NF 3) (1895), 79-90 and 116, reprinted in Gaster's Studies and texts (London: Maggs Bros., 1925-28), vol. 1, 264-70 and vol. 3, 50-6 (references are to the MGWJ pagination, which is also found in the reprint); H. Gollancz, 'Translation of a targum of the Amidah', in G.A. Kohut (ed.), Semitic studies in memory of Rev. Dr Alexander Kohut (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897), 186-97; Yahya ben Yosef Salih, Tikhlal minhag...teman...'im sefer Es hayyim, in 3 parts (Jerusalem: S. Zuckerman, 1894-98) (prayerbook quoted as Tikhlal Es hayyim, commentary quoted as Salih, Tikhlal Es hayyim); G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898); S. Schechter, 'Genizah specimens: liturgy', Jewish Quarterly Review, 10 (OS) (1898), 654-9 (reprinted in Petuchowski, Contributions [note 105], 373-8); I. Elbogen, Der judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, third edition (Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1931); J. Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and patterns (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1977); David b. Yosef Abudarham, Sefer Abudarham, ed. Warsaw 1877; J. Heinemann with J.J. Petuchowski, The literature of the synagogue (New York: Behrman House, 1975); A. Samely, The interpretation of speech in the Pentateuch targums: a study of method and presentation in targumic exegesis (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992).
modify existing texts in a process ostensibly devoted to 'mere' copying and transmitting (see above, Introduction, 5-16).

The scope of the article is restricted in that I try to identify in a rather broad sketch the fundamental targumic activity shaping our document. However, the text is not exhaustively characterized by being called 'Targum', and other aspects, in particular its qabbalistic terminology, are only touched upon in the following (and should the text carry specific but encoded qabbalistic messages, I have not discovered them). Even for the analysis of targumic techniques, the text proved too rich to allow a fully comprehensive, line-by-line account.

The work and its origin, its Vorlage and certain categories useful for the description of targumic texts are treated in this, the introductory part of the paper (A). The second part (B) provides a fresh translation, and an analysis of each of the nineteen Berakhot. The third and last part (C) is devoted to an attempt to give a comprehensive view of the document as a targum.

2. The manuscript
The Targum of the Amidah (henceforth TAM)\(^2\) has been known to the scholarly world since its publication by Moses Gaster in 1895 on the basis of a manuscript then in his possession and now forming part of the Hebrew manuscript collection of the John Rylands University Library Manchester.\(^3\) It seems that this manuscript is the only known representative of the work.

The document forms part of a miscellaneous (and physically composite) codex, Rylands Gaster H 61. The text, introduced with the Hebrew words 'In the name of the Merciful One I will begin to write the targum of the Eighteen Benedictions of the Tefillah, with the help of the God of Abraham', bears the running heading 'Targum' and occupies eight and a half pages (fos. 63b–67b) in a codex of Yemenite origin.\(^4\) It is written in an

\(^2\) The following abbreviations and technical terms will be used: TAM stands for 'Targum Amidah', OAM for 'Original Hebrew Amidah' (if not further qualified, the Yemenite rite). To refer to individual Berakhot (=Blessings) of the Amidah, the Roman letters I to XIX will be used. I shall refer to the concluding eulogy of each Berakhah as the Hatimah.

\(^3\) 'Ein Targum der Amidah'.

\(^4\) The codex has 109 folios of paper of varying sizes (from 142 x 93 millimetres to 164 x 113 millimetres) and textures (at least ten different types) in various Yemenite scripts and a few lines in Arabic script. The contents are in Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic. There are occasional rulings and catchwords. The codex contains mostly short documents relating to astrology and brontology, magic, theological and aggadic material (including midrashic forms and excerpts from Midrash ha-gadol), as well as liturgical pieces (see note 6). Like many of the Gaster codices now in the Rylands, it is an artless product, functional rather than beautiful (part of the codex, including the pages of TAM, is marked by a large brown stain in the bottom half of every opening) and apparently much used. Some background on Moses Gaster and his manuscripts, as well as the John Rylands collection of which it is part, may be found in Samely, 'The interpreted text: among the Hebrew manuscripts of the John Rylands University Library', Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, 73, no. 2 (1991), 1-20.
inexpert Yemenite script of irregular size, with 26 to 28 lines to the page. The end of a section is usually marked by a short double stroke in the upper half of the line, while a new Berakhah is preceded by a lemma, i.e. the opening word(s) of the original Hebrew text of the Amidah (henceforth OAM). These lemmata are usually written in somewhat larger letters, sometimes abbreviated (e.g. ת in the case of III), and occasionally marked by a line above the word (e.g. XVII). XIII is the only Berakhah whose lemma (עלけれיתון) is placed on a line of its own. The punctuation found in Gaster's edition of the text is supplied by Gaster himself.

The copy of TAM contains many mistakes. They range from incorrect orthography (e.g. second person singular pronoun written like the verb prefix of Itpe'el) and inconsistencies of spelling, to confused syntax (see e.g., V), and in a few places they render the text incomprehensible (see the Hatimah of XIV). At the same time, much care was taken to mark pronunciation differences by the use of Rafe. It seems that the copy was produced for private use, and by someone without a full grasp of the text's meaning.

Codex Gaster H 61 is a combination of a considerable number of mostly brief texts. They are mainly magical-mystical, liturgical, or midrashic-parenetic. The codex is made up of parts of clearly different origin (most of them certainly Yemenite). This is evident both from script differences and from different paper types and sizes (one folio had to be folded to fit into the volume). In the immediate environment of our work one finds several texts of a similar kind. The codicological and palaeographical unit containing TAM starts on fol. 59a with the Blessing of Betrothal (תנין נבטתא) and ends with fol. 73 completing two texts entitled 'Death of Moses our Teacher.'

Gaster dated codex H 61 to the seventeenth century or the beginning of the eighteenth. My own impression is that the copy could be as late as the nineteenth century.

5 On this and other orthographic peculiarities, see 'Ein Targum der Amidah', 83f. Gaster's edition reproduces these signs.

6 Between these two documents, one finds the following: the Blessing of Circumcision starts on fol. 60b, a number of liturgical texts forming part of the Havdalah ceremony on 62a. These texts, including their Arabic rubrics, are closely related to (although not wholly identical with) the Yemenite rite as contained in the Tikhlal Es hayyim (see I, 151b, as well as 150b and 152a). TAM starts at the top of fol. 63b. On fol. 67b the end of TAM is marked by a completion formula and a blank line. There follows (67b-68a) a midrash-like unit introduced by Ma'aseh relating to childlessness and divorce (partly quoting bYeb 64a), which in turn is followed (68a) by another text of the same mixed genre under the heading מתהו מגע (page heading מגע מאשייה). Other texts in the vicinity, and apparently written by the same hand, include the prayer for the dead (fol. 69a, Arabic title תוויתא הלוח, and two short texts under the heading 'Death of Aaron' (תמרות ארון), as well as the two longer ones concerning Moses already mentioned.

7 'Ein Targum der Amidah', 82.
3. The genre
The document is unique in more than one sense. Not only is the Rylands manuscript apparently the only witness to the work; the work could well be the only representative of its genre, i.e. a fully targumic rendering of the Amidah, or indeed of a non-biblical text. Gaster relates that the vendor, a ‘Gelehrter aus Sana’a’, was not even aware of the presence of the work in the codex he was selling. In answer to Gaster’s question, he said he had never heard of a targum of the Amidah, either in Sana’a or anywhere else. 8 As to the uniqueness of the text claimed by Gaster, the claim still seems to stand today. I am not aware of a parallel text. Michael Klein’s survey of targumic Genizah material does not seem to have produced an example, 9 and Professor Ratzaby, in a private communication, 10 informs me that he has not encountered such a text during his extensive work on Yemenite literature in manuscript. It seems, therefore, that this manuscript is the only representative of an otherwise unknown genre, namely a paraphrastic targum of an extended prayer text. That a non-biblical text should be chosen for an exegetical treatment otherwise reserved for divine or divinely inspired texts is certainly intriguing. As to the identity of the non-biblical text chosen, the Amidah’s central role is obvious, and it presumably ranks among the most plausible choices for such treatment outside the Hebrew canon (see section C. 6. below).

4. The origin of the composition
Gaster is suitably vague about the date of the original composition, 11 but hints at the possibility of a pre-Islamic(!) origin. 12 His bias in favour of an early date was vehemently challenged by A. Epstein. 13 In particular, Epstein showed that Gaster’s remark that TAM showed no signs of qabbalistic influence 14 was mistaken. Epstein drew attention to a number of linguistic and conceptual links to Zoharic literature, such as the

---

8 ‘Ein Targum der Amidah’, 82.
9 M.L. Klein, Targumic manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah collections (Genizah Series, 8), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
10 Letter of 12 December 1992. I am grateful to Professor Ratzaby for his kindness in replying to my enquiry.
14 ‘Ein Targum der Amidah’, 84.
use of the expression נִיעוּדָא (in III and V) and the identification of the Shekhinah with Batsheva (in VII). Other such links\(^\text{15}\) are the occurrence of the expression ‘sitra ’ahra’ in V and the phrase ‘the Fellows established it’ in VI. Generally speaking, the Aramaic seems to be a late mixture of written Jewish Aramaic dialects, and both in syntax and lexicon it has been influenced by Zoharic Aramaic.\(^\text{16}\) With regard to the meaning, however, I cannot discover in TAM any prominent or explicit representation of characteristically Zoharic concerns in general, or of Zoharic views on the topic of prayer in particular.

Another piece of internal evidence for dating the composition is the appearance of the term ‘Great Qedushah’ in the Hatimah of III. If it is correct to take this expression as referring to the Keter introduction of the Musaf Qedushah, this points to the influence of printed prayer books and to a terminus post quern of the second half of the sixteenth century (see under III Concepts).\(^\text{17}\)

The above literary, codicological, linguistic and terminological observations are compatible with a date of composition from the sixteenth century up to as late as the nineteenth century. Regarding the place of origin, the balance is strongly tipped in favour of Yemen. The only known copy is Yemenite; the targumic Vorlage is closest to the Yemenite Amidah (see next section); Yemen is a place where the Aramaic language and targumic forms were cultivated long after they had become peripheral in other Jewish cultures;\(^\text{18}\) and Yemen provides a plausible background for the qabbalistic influence. As to the author of TAM, I shall call the individual (probably only one, see section C. 3. below) who wrote the text ‘the targumist’ and allocate male gender to ‘him’; a safe guess, it seems to me, given the socio-cultural conditions of the production of religious texts in pre-modern Judaism.\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{15}\) I am very grateful to Professor Moshe Idel, whose reaction to the manuscript after a brief perusal induced me to follow up the potential Zoharic parallels with considerably more vigour than I had originally intended. This does not mean that there is now no need for an expert examination of TAM from a qabbalistic angle – my feeble efforts can be no substitute for that.

\(^{16}\) In this admittedly impressionistic assessment I would include the rather frequent occurrence of the expressions נִיעוּדָא and נַעֲנָא.


\(^{19}\) It is possible, but must remain pure speculation, to read the introductory sentence, ‘In the name of the Merciful One, I will begin to write the Targum of the Eighteen Benedictions of the Tefillah, with the help the God of Abraham’, as containing an allusion to the name of the author (or indeed the scribe), as well as an anticipation of the theme of the first Berakhah.
5. The Amidah of TAM
The text of the Amidah used by the targumist as Vorlage is that recited by the individual, not the version recited at the public repetition of the prayer in the synagogue. It is the full weekday Amidah without any special modifications, and represents the summer text where there are seasonal alternatives (i.e. II and, with certain modifications, IX).

The next question must of course be: which version of the Amidah is actually being rendered by TAM? We shall address this question at relevant points throughout our discussion of the individual Berakhot. The result of systematic comparison is that the Vorlage of the targumist is generally closest to the Amidah as found in the Yemenite prayer book, the Tikhlal. In those parts where the Aramaic text shadows the Hebrew closely, it is mostly the Yemenite rite which is being presupposed. However, there are occasions when other versions seem to have had an influence on the text of TAM, and it is possible that the targumist sometimes drew on his knowledge of non-Yemenite Amidah recensions. The issue is complicated by the fact that the targumic style employed in TAM allows the targumist occasionally to omit individual lexical items of the original (see below, section 7).

6. TAM’s ‘sources’?
The targumist of the Amidah, like the targumists of Scripture, stands in a tradition of ideas as well as of exegesis. However, in creating a targum, he will have undertaken a radical recasting of that tradition in order to meet the requirements of the targumic genre, unless he had a source in the form of a targum on the Amidah available to him. Since we have no knowledge of such a text, we must assume that radical restructuring (although to a lesser extent for the derivative composition passages; see next section) must have taken place. This means that not much in the way of exact similarities in wording between TAM and any source the targumist might have used are to be expected. But if we are to look for TAM’s dependence on ideas and exegetical strategies as such, without recourse to the very words in which they are expressed, the number of potential sources is truly immense. Since the Amidah uses to a large extent biblical phraseology, and speaks

---

20 See III Concepts and notes 79 and 80.
21 For the Yemenite text of the Amidah, I have consulted—apart from Tikhlal Et hayyim and a seventeenth-century manuscript facsimile published under the title Tikhlal Moshia-Shabazi, volume 1, (Jerusalem: Oded, 1986) — the following Tikhlal manuscripts of the John Rylands University Library: Gaster Hebrew 4 (on which see M. Wallenstein, ‘Gaster Hebrew ms. 4 in the John Rylands Library: a Yemenite Tikhlal of the seventeenth century’, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 45 [1963], 505-31); Gaster Hebrew Sadd, and occasionally Gaster Hebrew 2021.
of the classic themes of Judaism, any text ranging from the Bible itself (i.e. the biblical co-text of the phrases used in the Amidah) to, say, a late medieval, Zohar-derivative treatment of the idea of Shekhinah, could constitute such a source, not to mention literature devoted to the interpretation of the Amidah itself. So, if we go down to the level of isolated concepts or exegetical suggestions, in abstraction from their wording, we have a large number of 'sources' for most of these elements in TAM. Apart from using other works for documenting the conceptual and exegetical atmosphere in which TAM was composed (as attempted in a very limited way in part B of this article), how would we recognize a 'source' in the strict sense of that word, involving literary dependence? It seems that we would expect more than one isolated element or idea to come from the same source, either in the form of a characteristic nexus of concepts, or in the form of a largeish number of isolated concepts all also appearing, close to each other, in that source. (Even then one could not automatically discount the possibility that not that document, but some derivative later digest of it, is in fact the 'source' of TAM.) There is only one instance where such a 'source' of TAM is identified in the following (Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, see V).

Regrettably, this 'lack' of strict sources does not amount to a demonstration that there is no literary dependency for TAM, i.e. that our targumist worked on a foundation of ready knowledge with many sources while preserving his independence of all of them. Such a demonstration could only be given or claimed after a perusal of the extremely wide range of Jewish works of the medieval and late medieval period which *could* have been used. No such perusal has taken place, and the present author cannot lay claim to the familiarity with that literature necessary even to estimate the chances of such a source existing. Thus, until someone else, or the collective of scholars over time, provide certainty in this area, we do not know whether the picture emerging in the following pages by default, of a targumist working quite creatively on the basis of his own resources as nurtured by a tradition, is in fact correct.

Accordingly, the parallels or indeed contrasts with other texts pointed out in the course of our discussion are meant more as a synchronic comparison, i.e. as an aid to an understanding of the literary structures of our document, than as clues to the pre-history of TAM as a composition. The only exception to this is the documentation of targumic concerns and forms of exegesis, for

---

22 And it is not much use narrowing down the search to what one 'knows' to have been available in the Yemenite context, for our placing TAM in the Yemenite context partly depends on the literary picture.
this is a literary allegiance our text explicitly declares: it presents itself as a targum among targums, it defines itself as belonging to the targumic genre.

Given that claim, and the exegetical concerns it implies, some texts seemed to be more promising than others in a search for ‘sources’, and these have in fact been given some (i.e. far from exhaustive) attention in our discussion: the biblical co-texts of ‘biblical’ phrases in the Amidah (not an important area for TAM, as it turned out); targumic texts, both in general and wherever biblical wording comes to the fore in TAM (i.e. in the explicit scriptural quotations); classical, widely available rabbinic texts (e.g. the Bavli); the various forms of the text of the Amidah, both in its different performative contexts and in its different rites; other liturgical texts used alongside the Amidah; halakhic treatments of the Amidah (e.g. Maimonides’ *Hilkhot Tefillah*), as well as works (partially) devoted to its interpretation (e.g. *Sefer Abudarham*\(^{23}\)).

7. Terms of analysis
The close analysis of TAM attempted in part B of this paper makes use of terms and categories of description derived from the study of targum (and midrash); TAM’s claim to be a ‘targum of the Eighteen Benedictions of the Tefillah’ invites an analysis in such terms, and the analysis in turn confirms the claim. We shall here introduce the ‘headings’ employed in the subsequent discussion of the individual Berakhot. Most of them are self-explanatory, and will be expanded upon in the final part of this paper (C), but two require a more detailed explanation at this juncture.

The relationship of targumic texts – speaking now of Scripture targums – to their Hebrew original can be quite distant, or very close. This distinction does not focus on the degree of ‘literalness’ of targumic renderings (it seems to me that targums, in principle, have the option always to render non-literally and are fundamentally different from translation\(^{24}\)), but on the quantitative and structural (syntactical) relationships between Hebrew and Aramaic. At one end of the scale, the sentence structure may be left intact while additional targumic words fill grammatical slots within it;\(^{25}\) most passages of Pentateuch targums are of this type.

\(^{23}\) Used regularly by Salih in his commentary in *Tikhlat Es hayyim*.


\(^{25}\) Cp. Samely, *Interpretation of speech*, 30ff, 174ff. I do not speak here of changes which, by their very nature, often fall between clauses rather than within them, for example speech reports.
At the other end, there are targumic renderings which change the overall shape of a verse beyond recognition, and only isolated elements of the Hebrew find their (new) place in a structure created by the targumist. Other aspects of the relationship concern the question whether all lexical elements of the Hebrew are somehow represented, or whether some have been omitted; and also whether those that are taken up appear in their original sequence or not. All phenomena of structural distance from the Hebrew just listed – omission, change of sequence, imposition of a new syntactic structure – are to be found regularly in the targums on the Hagiographa, in particular those to the Five Megillot. In describing TAM, I shall systematically distinguish the ‘close’ from the ‘distant’ modes of targumic rendering. I shall refer to a targumic passage which manifests the above-mentioned signs of formal independence from the original text as *derivative composition*, while referring to a targumic unit which mirrors closely the syntactical and quantitative characteristics of the original as *shadowing*.

Let us look at an example of a derivative composition from a Scripture targum, Targum Song of Songs 1:3:

**Original:**

For scent your ointments are good, ointment poured forth is your name; therefore the maidens (ךלמ) love you.

**Targum:**

At the noise of your miracles and mighty deeds which you wrought for the people of the house of Israel, all nations who heard the report of your might and your GOOD signs trembled. And your holy NAME was heard in all the earth, for it was more choice [belonging perhaps to 'scent'] than the OINTMENT of office, which was heaped upon the heads of kings and priests. And THEREFORE the righteous ones LOVED to walk in...

---

26 A conspicuous Pentateuch example is found in Neofiti’s and Pseudo-Jonathan’s versions of Gen. 3:24.

27 On one of the extremely rare cases of deliberate omission in Pentateuch targums, see Samely, *Interpretation of speech*, 95ff, 106.

28 Cp. also Philip Alexander’s distinction of (in his case, three) modes in the Targum Song of Songs. The one I label ‘derivative composition’ is described by him as follows: ‘In the second method the Biblical text is “dissolved” in a free-flowing paraphrase, in such a way that it is sometimes difficult to tell which Biblical elements lie behind the translation.’ ‘The Aramaic version of the Song of Songs’, *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Age. Colloque international du CNRS*, (Paris: CNRS, 1989) 119–31, here at 123. For the Pentateuch targums, and with special regard to their ‘oral’ origins, a different type of description of the distance between targumic and biblical text is offered by A. Shinan, “Targumic additions” in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Textus* XVI (1991), 139–55.
the path of YOUR GOODness, in order that they possess this WORLD (גאולה) and the WORLD to come.'

Hebrew terms directly represented in the Aramaic (although not necessarily in their original meaning) are given in capital letters, terms whose link to the Hebrew is recognizable but indirect are underlined. It is clear that this mode of derivative composition allows a complete restructuring of the meaning of the original. Not only is the original syntactic framework abandoned, but the targumic text also fails to represent all of the words of the Hebrew (i.e. the second 'ointment'), and those that are recognizably represented are not in sequence (thus the word תובר, 'maidens', which – because of the plural – gives rise to 'world' twice, now comes after the verb). There are other passages in which the licence wholly to omit lexical items of the Hebrew is even more prominent. Differences in this regard may be due to exegetical expediency (cp. for example Targum Song of Songs 1:5, where the 'daughters of Jerusalem' are awkward to accommodate after the decision has been taken to locate the action in the desert). In TAM, we shall encounter derivative composition as well as shadowing, and sometimes the two side by side (for which Targum Song of Songs also furnishes parallels, see below C. 3.).

Such a description of the type of targumic rendering, as well as basic stylistic observations, will be found for each Berakhah under the heading Targumic modes.

The second heading of analysis in need of explication is that of Speech background. Among the more specialized phenomena of Scripture-targumic exegesis is the treatment of direct speech reported in the biblical text. All elements of a direct speech embedded in a narrative situation can attract the targumist's attention.29 In particular, the identity of speaker or addressee, and the circumstances under which a certain utterance makes sense, are of interest to the targumists. Sometimes the implicit conditions of a certain type of speech act are supplied, which is quite prominent – and of some relevance for TAM – in the case of requests.30 While careful attention to reported speech manifests itself regularly in the Pentateuch targums, the exegetical concern with voices in the text becomes particularly prominent in the targums to the later biblical books, and notably the targum to Song of Songs.31 For the understanding of TAM, this concern

29 See Samely, Interpretation of speech, in particular 165ff, 182.
30 For this specific phenomenon, see also my 'The background of speech: some observations on the representation of targumic exegesis', Journal of Jewish Studies, 39 (1988), 252-60.
31 See the introduction of P.S. Alexander's forthcoming Canticles and Lamentations (The Aramaic Bible, 17), (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
with the background of direct speech is of fundamental importance.

The other categories which, together with the preceding two of Targumic modes and Speech background, will make up a loose scheme for the discussion of each Berakhah, are the following (not all Berakhot will attract comment under all of these, and sometimes headings will be combined):

**Renderings.** Non-literal targumic treatment of lexical items will be discussed here (for a summary sketch of targumic concerns in this regard, see section C.1 below). This will also be the point where questions concerning the Vorlage of TAM will be mostly raised, as well as omissions noted. Any specific rabbinic concepts or technical terms used by the targumist will be addressed under the heading Concepts. Under the heading Coherence two distinct facets of TAM will be treated as the need arises: targumic increase of coherence within the Berakhah (Internal coherence), and targumic devices relating different parts of the Amidah. Occasionally, also links created with texts outside the Amidah will be highlighted. Instances of TAM introducing or stressing a comparison of present/future events with those of the past will be addressed under the rubric Past as paradigm. In three cases (II, VII, XIX-conclusion), the place of this category will be taken by that of Analogies of redemption, which explores non-temporal paradigms of God’s acts. In several instances, the targumist goes out of his way to make the point that God is unique, which we shall note under the heading Negated comparison. The term Quotation will indicate those cases where explicit use of scriptural texts is made in TAM. Where the targumic treatment of the Hatimah requires specific comment, this will mostly be dealt with under Speech background.

The translation offered in the following is meant to be the first step of the analysis; accordingly, it is at times painfully literal, and it usually shows exactly where the Aramaic is difficult to construe, or indeed incomprehensible to me. While differing in many respects from Gollancz’s translation, it is also indebted to it. Passages where TAM is representing OAM text verbatim are given in SMALL CAPITAL LETTERS. Biblical quotations in TAM are placed in quotation marks and treated in the same way. Key structural elements or changes are highlighted by **bold** print. ‘Lord’ stands for the appearance of the tetragrammaton in the Aramaic (in the manuscript four yuds/dots arranged in a diamond shape with a curved line to their left), ‘lord’ for the much more frequent ‘mar’. Lemmata are given as they appear in TAM.

---

12 H. Gollancz, ‘Translation of a targum of the Amidah’. 
The analysis of the individual Berakhot will involve a constant comparison of OAM and TAM. Such a comparison cannot proceed from an isolated word or phrase in the Hebrew to the isolated Aramaic counterpart alone. It must also take account of the internal dynamics of the elements of the text and how those change from original to targum. To make this procedure of multiple comparisons initially as transparent as possible, the first Berakhah is offered with TAM and OAM side by side. There is no lemma for I.

**Heading and scribal introduction** (in Hebrew):
In the name of the Merciful One, I will begin to write the targum of the Eighteen Benedictions of the Tefillah, with the help of the God of Abraham.

**TAM**

Imploring you, O LORD, give me the OPENing of the MOUTH to TELL YOUR PRAISE and to worship before you, as have worshipped before you OUR FATHERS with a perfect heart. You are he, THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, THE GOD OF ISAAC AND THE GOD OF JACOB. MIGHTY AND FEARSOME GOD, there being no fear like the fear of you, for you are capable of raising a people humiliated among the seventy nations of the world by your might. GOD MOST HIGH, BESTOWING GOOD LOVING-KINDNESS on all your possessions, for you possess ALL, above and below, for you CREATED them and they all rejoice before you. And you do loving-kindness to them in your mercy, and REMEMBER for your people Israel THE LOVING-KINDNESS OF THEIR FATHERS Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and you have redeemed THEIR CHILDREN from Egypt, out of the house of servitude, in your MERCY. And just as you have redeemed them from the hand of all that rose to harm them, so you will in future BRING A REDEEMER, that is, the Messiah ben David, to redeem THE CHILDREN OF THEIR CHILDREN FOR your NAME'S SAKE, which is bound up among them IN LOVE. MERCIFUL KING, HELPER AND REDEEMER, AND strength of the righteous who thank you and bless your name. And thus they will in future give thanks and bless before YOU, O LORD, for you were THE strength of ABRAHAM, your friend.

**YEMENITE OAM**

O Lord, open my lips and my mouth will tell your praise (Ps. 51:17; Eng. v. 15) Blessed are you, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. Great, mighty and fearsome God

God Most High, bestowing good loving-kindness and creator of all (things)

Remembering the loving-kindness of their fathers and having mercy upon their children

and bringing a redeemer to the children of their children for his name's sake in love. Merciful King, redeemer, helper and shield

Blessed are you, O Lord, the shield of Abraham.

---

33 See Samely, *Interpretation of speech*, 4f.
Renderings and internal coherence. The transfer of ‘mouth’ from the second half to the first half of the Psalm verse (taking the place of ‘lips’) serves to eliminate the metaphorical construction ‘my mouth will tell your praise’. This is part of a larger operation concerning the way the Psalm-verse is integrated with the Berakhah. The two independent halves of the verse are syntactically fused to form one sentence. What was linked by ‘and’ in the original (‘my mouth will tell your praise’) is transformed into an infinitive construction, thus bringing to the surface the conditional relationship between ‘opening of lips’ and ‘telling praise’, which is only implied in the Hebrew. The syntactic structure thus created is furthermore expanded to take in another infinitive phrase (‘and to worship before you’), which is repeated as part of a structure of comparison (‘to worship...as have worshipped’, see Past as paradigm). It is as the second element of this comparison that the first literal equivalent of OAM appears, namely ‘our fathers’.

This long, unified period, which comes to an end only after several lines of text, welds two passages of different origin and status together (Psalm-verse and OAM beginning). In other words, the targumist produces a text of stronger internal coherence than the original. The transition between the biblical preface of the Amidah and its first Berakhah is now unnoticeable – it takes place within the space of one sentence. The biblical introduction to the Amidah becomes part of its message, and helps to give the whole of the Berakhah a new focus: the act of prayer or worship itself (see Speech background). By increasing the coherence between originally distinct parts of OAM, the targumist transforms the first Berakhah into an account of the act of praying and thus manages to pronounce on what the Amidah is about.

The Hebrew term הוהי can be rendered either ‘master (possessor) of all’ or ‘creator of all’. TAM deals with it first in the one sense (taking ‘all’ to refer to the two realms of heaven and earth), then in the other (using the rootoft), at the same time explaining how they belong together.

For the double occurrences of ‘God’ and ‘children’, see under Past as paradigm.

The biblical metaphor ‘shield’ for God is represented twice as ‘strength’ (or ‘protection’, אִישׁ; again in XVIII). There are liturgical texts which offer both terms (in Hebrew) side by side. The Yoser for weekdays, for example, contains the phrase:34 ‘O eternal God, our king, in your abundant mercies have mercy upon us, lord of our strength, rock of our refuge, shield of our salvation, refuge of ours!’ Regarding the added phrase, ‘for the righteous’, note Prov. 2:7: ‘He is a shield for those who walk in perfection’ (see also e.g. Ps. 84:12; Eng. v. 11).

34 Tikhal Es hayyim, I, 32a.
The absence of the adjective ‘great’ (גָּדוֹל) from TAM (in ‘the great, mighty and fearsome God’) could be an oversight, of composition or transmission. I can only think of one problem that would be solved by its omission: the implication of divine corporeality. However, a non-literal interpretation of ‘great’ should not have been beyond the ability of the targumist, so oversight remains the most likely explanation. It may be noted that the sequence of the two remaining adjectives is reversed. The absence of the opening eulogy ‘blessed are you Lord’ is probably due to the radical restructuring of the initial phrase discussed above.

Concepts. Stock targumic additions are ‘with a perfect heart’ (e.g. ad Gen. 22:8) as well as the use of the preposition ‘before’ in conjunction with God (which is frequent in TAM). The concept of ‘seventy nations’ is found regularly from rabbinic times onwards. The theme of exile makes its first appearance in TAM at this point. The expression ‘the ones...above and below’ (לְאָלְמָן תָּחֹתָם) refers to the earthly and heavenly realms, and the two terms appear extremely frequently in such nominalized form in Zoharic literature (e.g. Zohar III, 22a). The identification of the ‘redeemer’ as ‘Messiah ben David’ is routine, and indeed anticipates information contained in OAM XIV–XV. It could thus also function to augment the coherence of the text by establishing thematic links between separate Berakhot within the Amidah.

The notion that God’s name is attached to Israel in particular is, with reference to the occurrence of the phrase ‘for his name’s sake’ here in I, found in a qabbalistic commentary on the daily prayers by the thirteenth century author Azriel of Gerona.

The special relationship between God and Abraham belongs to mainstream rabbinic thinking, and its expression by the idea of ‘friend’, ‘beloved’ is found often. Perhaps of particular relevance for the targumist, apart from the biblical precedent II Chron. 20:7, is its liturgical appearance in the section עָלָלָם בַּאֲדָמֶה of the introductory part of the morning prayers: ‘But we are your people, sons of your covenant, sons of Abraham your friend, to whom you swore at Mount Moriah’.

35 See above note 27.
36 See G. Sed-Rajna’s translation of that text from manuscripts: Azriel de Géron, Commentaire sur la liturgie quotidienne (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 102f. The verb מֵתַעֲשָׂה, used in TAM in the phrase ‘which is bound up among them’, is found e.g. in Zohar III, 22a.
38 Tikhal Es hayyim, I, 13b.
39 It may be noted that the Targum Song of Songs renders ‘my love’ in Cant. 1:9 as ‘Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the friends of the Lord’, using שָׁאָה. Cp. also the phrase ‘Abraham my friend’ in the Fragment-Targum’s version of Gen. 18:17.
Speech background. The quotation from Psalm 51 is characterized as entreaty by the targumic addition of 'imploring you' (lit.: 'in appeal from you', **עַבְרָאתָ מִן**),\(^{40}\) which weakens any impression of presumption in the verb forms and is found often in the Berakhot of TAM. An explicit categorization of the type of speech humans address to God is also found in the TAM phrase 'and to worship before you'. It is again no accident that all the 'possessions' created by God 'rejoice before' him, or that the activity reported of the righteous is thanking and blessing. The focus of the Berakhah is subtly shifted towards the topic of prayer as such. A new dimension is then added with the insertion of a speech report towards the end: 'And thus they will in future give thanks...'. The utterance that is being allocated here to the righteous is in fact the blessing contained in the Hatimah of OAM. This Hatimah is given now as indirect speech (a speech event is characterized as 'blessing', but its precise wording is not given); it is allocated to a speaker who is mentioned in the third person (the righteous), and it takes place at some future time (**סִפְרוֹת לַחוֹדֶה**). If we compare this to the Hatima in its OAM form, it becomes clear that the original is a blessing, while the targumic text is a report of such a blessing. This is the first instance of a regular targumic modification which removes the immediacy of the prayer utterance by supplying a speech report (on this phenomenon, see section C. 2. below).

Targumic modes. The whole of this Berakhah is in shadowing mode.

Past as paradigm. The act of prayer ('to tell your praise') from the Psalm verse is first identified and spelled out as the more technical 'serve/worship' and then placed in parallel (with the help of 'as', **נֶאֱגָּה** to the past worship of the fathers. This at the same time strikingly unfolds God's double relationship expressed in 'our God and God of our fathers' (which in the targum is not represented literally). The background to both the original and the targumic modifications is very likely provided by the rabbinic notion that the patriarchs accumulated merit ('merit of the fathers', **יִכְוָּה עֲבִיד אֵל** which induces God to have mercy on Israel throughout the ages (note the use of the word 'remember').

The targumist makes also good use of the appearance of both 'children' (not in the Ashkenazi OAM) and 'children of children'

\(^{40}\) I shall regularly employ the somewhat stiff 'imploring (you)' (instead of 'we/l implore you') for this expression, in order to preserve the frequent ambiguity of TAM as to the first person number ('I' versus 'we'). This term of entreaty or variations of it appear also in V, VII, IX, XI, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII and XIX.
in the text, allocating one to the (post-patriarchal) past, the other to the future. Supplying biblical background for the first occurrence ('their children' = in Egypt), he then uses the exodus as the model for future redemption (from exile) of the 'children of their children'. The construction employed to bring out the paradigmatic relationship is 'and just as ... so you will' (וַיִּконָו עַד וְיַכְלִּתַּם). Phrases such as the 'children of their children' and the concomitant linkage of past to future redemption are widespread in Jewish liturgical texts, even in places where the authorities frowned upon their use (cp. section C. 5. below). At the same time, the targumist highlights the implicitly petitionary character of I.42

It emerges that references to the past with a view to the present or future occur in I explicitly twice. They put the Israelite act of worship as well as the divine act of redemption (from exile) into the context of history. They also link the two events, albeit indirectly: it is the remembrance of the fathers whose worship the targum had mentioned earlier as bringing about redemption from Egypt, which is the model of future redemption. We shall address this interdependency of acts in the past below (C. 5.).

Negated comparison. While the aspect 'might' is qualified by a link with the redemption from exile, that of fearsomeness is said to be without parallel (דבר(Processes) וְיַכְלִּיתַּם).

Quotation. The quotation from Psalm 51:17 is an integral part of OAM; its text is not expressly identified as biblical, and TAM keeps it that way. The rendering offered by TAM is very different from that found in the Targum of Psalms.43

II

MIGHT and ability belong to the lord of the WORLD, the Lord, and his might is FOREVER. And there is not one of those who dwell on earth who does according to your deeds and according to your might. For you will in future REVIVE THE DEAD and awaken all who are asleep among his people, to repay with goodness and truth the righteous who are removed from this world,

41 A flash-point, both of the tendency to see past redemptive acts as models for the future, and of halakhic sensibilities in this regard, is the Ge'ullah. On examples of the pairing of 'fathers' with the past and 'children' with the future, see N. Wieder 'Fourteen new Genizah-fragments of Saadya's siddur together with a reproduction of a missing part', in E.I.J. Rosenthal (ed.), Saadya studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1943), 245–83, here at 251 note 2. See also note 221.

42 Identified by Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 239f, and see below section C. 5.

43 The latter, mentioning Torah, is quoted with slight variations by Salih, Tikhal El hayyim, I, 42a.
because of their deeds which are stored up before you. Therefore you will in future awaken them, and even the wicked you will in future revive to let them know your might. For you repay the righteous who walked willingly in your way with mercy. For the sake of this you will in future redeem them and revive them with that DEW which is hidden in your upper treasure-house, for it is the dew of life and from it are nourished the angels and the souls. And your might is yours, for you do good to the LIVING in this world and NOURISH THEM WITH GOODNESS, REVIVING THE DEAD WITH GREAT MERCY, HELPING THE POOR, RAISING UP THE FALLEN, UNBINDING all the fetters of THE BOUND, HEALING THOSE WHO ARE SICK upon their couches, AND PRESERVING FAITH and oath sworn with the SLEEPERS of Hebron, who humbled themselves in their own eyes like DUST. And there is no one beside YOU, LORD OF MIGHT, AND WHO RESEMBLES YOU, O KING, CAUSING man TO DIE for the sake of his sin, AND REVIVING the dead for the sake of your name. And also redeeming Israel from exile, for they resemble the dead who have neither strength nor power. Just as one dead who, if they strike him, does not have the strength to strike back for his honour, so is Israel in exile. For they resemble the man who has no hearing of the ears, when they hear their revilement from the nations. And there is no strength in their hands to strike for the shame that the nations put them to. Therefore you will in future revive those who resemble the dead and CAUSE your REDEMPTION TO SPRING FORTH AND TO YOU belongs the FAITHFULNESS TO REVIVE them and to awaken for them THE DEAD. They will praise before you and bless your name, and they say: May his great name be BLESSED, who has the ability to REVIVE THE DEAD.

Renderings. Hebrew עלון in the first sentence is represented both by 'world' and by 'forever' (similarly below, XIII), occasioning a double occurrence of 'might'. 'Causing death' (in parallel to God’s ability to revive) is interpreted as judgement (see Concepts). The rhetorical question 'And who is like you, lord of might?', is represented as a negative statement ('And there is no one beside you'). In this transformation, TAM follows standard targumic procedure, although the question format of the subsequent clause ('Who resembles you?') is retained in TAM.

44 Ch. Mendelssohn, 'Zum Targum des Achtzehngebets' (note 13), 303, suggests a different reading at this point (דִּיוֹן instead of דֶּיוֹן, cp. bKet 17b, bBB 38a) with the result '...does not have the strength to object...'.

Central to the exegetical strategy is the exploration of the literal as well as metaphorical dimensions of the terms ‘dead’ (= exiled) and ‘sleep’ (= death). The targumist complements the OAM verb ‘revive’ by the verb ‘awaken’. Further on, he supplements sustenance for the living with sustenance for the departed souls (the dew). He thus creates a symmetry in the treatment of life and death within the Berakhah (on which see Coherence). Another element in the interpretation of ‘sleep’ as ‘death’ is the explanation of OAM ‘sleepers of dust’, which phrase has a model in Dan. 12:2 (see also Isa. 26:19 quoted below), where it refers to the dead.45 The targumist follows this line for ‘sleepers’, but treats the word ‘dust’ separately. ‘Dust’ is taken to mean ‘humble’ and, complemented by ‘like’, the lexeme is represented by literal translation.46 The dead with whom God keeps faith and – targumically – promise, are the Patriarchs; they received a divine promise, and they do their ‘sleeping’ in Hebron, the site of their graves (see Coherence). The same expression, ‘sleepers of Hebron’, is used by the twelfth-century poet Solomon bar Abun, in his pizmon, ‘Judge of all the earth’, where it is linked to the idea of the merit of the fathers. This piyyut forms part of the Yemenite liturgy for Yom Kippur.47 The idea that the patriarchs are referred to at this point in II, and the emphasis on their status as recipients of divine promise, is also found in Sefer Abudarham.48 As for patriarchal humility – Abraham refers to himself (note the targumic ‘in their own eyes’) as ‘dust and ashes’ in Gen. 18:27 – the biblical setting of these words is a prayer of intercession.49

45 It may be noted in passing, merely as an illustration of the infinitely adaptable nature of this cluster of metaphors, that the Zohar (III, 118a), quoting Isa. 52:2, equates lying in the dust with exile. This is of course also a function of the all-pervasiveness of the theological category ‘exile’.


47 See Tikkhal Es hayyim, III, 87b. For the piyyut, see I. Abrahams, By-paths in Hebrew bookland (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1920), 97–101, and Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 275–7. See also the texts quoted in 0. Avisar (ed.), Sefer Hevron (Heb.), (Jerusalem: Keter, 1970), 272.

48 Op. cit., 55: ‘And some explain “And keeping faith with those who sleep in the dust”: For he makes mention of the oath which was sworn to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are called “those who sleep in the dust”...’. Cp. also Azriel of Gerona, Commentaire (note 36), 105, who identifies the Patriarchs at this point, because they are like sleepers, in that the angel of death has no dominion over them.

49 The biblical use of ‘dust’ as self-reference of a praying person (e.g. Ps. 44:26 Eng. v. 25) is taken up in later times, e.g. in the prayer of Mar b. Rabina quoted in bBer 17a (see Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 47ff), which is recited at the end of the Amidah (Tikkhal Es hayyim, I, 48b, and see below our discussion at the end of part B). See also Emil G. Hirsch, ‘Shemoneh ‘esreh’, Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 11, (Chicago, 1905), 270–82, here at 273f.
The targumist then goes on to extract much additional material from the OAM wording by taking death itself as a simile (using the terms מות and מיון). As the targumist explains in some detail (see Targumic modes), Israel in exile is called ‘dead’, because, like a dead man, it is defenceless, both against physical attack and against revilement. A succinct encapsulation of the idea is found in a Tiqqunei ha-Zohar passage (Zohar Hadash 169a): ‘There is no death but exile’. The action that ‘revives’ these ‘dead’ is the redemption from exile. The idea of a dead person is at this point in TAM merged with the simile of a deaf man who does not react to scorn or rebuke; precisely this image – with reference to Ps. 38:14 – is employed by Maimonides in his Epistle to Yemen to describe the silent suffering of the Jews under Muslim rule.50

The imagery of dew is multifaceted. It is mentioned in several versions of OAM, including the Yemenite one, as the ‘summer’ alternative of a text that otherwise refers to wind and rain (for their absence see below).51 In such a context, the topic is one of agricultural blessing (and thus nourishment, see Coherence). Read in such a way, the theme has nothing directly to do with the revival of the dead; it is treated as another – separate – manifestation of might. However, dew also has a direct link to the topic of resurrection, established by a biblical text mentioned above in connection with ‘dust’, namely Isa. 26:19: ‘Your dead shall live, their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy! For your dew is a dew of light...’52 Abudarham quotes this verse in his commentary on II.53 In a paraphrastic Arabic version of the Amidah of Yemenite origin, the following rendering is given: ‘...who raises up the sleepers of the graves with stored dew, to revive with it the dead’.54 The link between dew and revival is also put succinctly in an alternative liturgical wording known to Saadya Gaon:55 ‘...King who revives all with


52 Zoharic literature, too, mentions dew as a means of resurrection, e.g. I, 232a, III 128b (using ‘awaken’), I, 118a (Midrash ha-Ne’elam); Tiqqunei ha-Zohar, Haqdamah 12a.

53 Sefer Abudarham, 55.

54 J. Kafih, ‘The translation of Jewish prayers into Arabic’ (Heb.), *Tarbis*, 26 (1956), 197-208 here at 199 (Hebrew translation 204). I am grateful to Professor Ratzaby for drawing my attention to this publication.

dew (or: rain)'\textsuperscript{56} As for dew as food, rabbinic sources link dew to the Manna, and identify a variety of heavenly (‘upper’) dews (b\textsuperscript{Taan} 75b, cp. Ex. 16:13ff). Dew is mentioned as food for angels in the Zohar (II, 61b): ‘...and from this dew are nourished the holy angels...’. In other words, all the conceptual ingredients of TAM’s treatment of the ‘dew’ idea are anticipated in earlier sources. However, the targumist makes specifically targumic use of these building blocks (see \textit{Coherence}).

The phrase ‘You are great to redeem’, which appears in all versions of OAM except the Palestinian one, has no recognizable equivalent.

\textbf{Concepts.} A whole network of interrelated terms which are not part of OAM make their appearance in TAM. The distinction between lower and upper realms (‘upper treasure house’), the latter populated by angels and souls, is presupposed (similar in I, see also III, IV, VII and in particular the conclusion ‘He who makes peace’ after XIX). The idea that God causes death as well as revival is explained by the targumist as reference to (premature) death in consequence of divine judgement, brought about by sin. The theme of (final) judgement appears towards the beginning of the Berakhah, prompted by the idea of resurrection itself, which is explained as part of the final retribution both for the righteous (having accumulated merit in their lifetime) and the wicked. It is in this eschatological context that the return of the exiles is introduced as another interpretation of the notion of ‘revival of the dead’ (see \textit{Renderings}).

\textbf{Speech background.} The Hatimah is again allocated to a speaker, rather than given in a mode of immediate utterance. The speaker must be Israel, to judge from the co-text. But while the speech report is not specific, it does allocate the utterance to a third person, different from the voice of the targumic text. It also characterizes the utterance itself with two \textit{verba dicendi} which qualify the bland final ‘say’ as prayer (‘praise’, ‘bless’). The act of uttering the concluding blessing does not seem to take place at a specific time or in specific circumstances.

The targumic wording of the Hatimah does not preserve the original second person address structure of ‘Blessed are you...’, but

\textsuperscript{56} A talmudic passage, b\textsuperscript{Taan} 2a, places rain, life and revival in the same category of importance: God does not surrender the keys to these three things to an agent. Abudarham (\textit{Seder Abudarham}, 55) cites the passage, and cp. Zohar I, 102b. Another talmudic statement, in b\textsuperscript{Ber} 33a, places the ‘power of rain’ in parallel to the resurrection of the dead as manifestations of divine might. The mishnaic lemma (m\textsuperscript{Ber} 5:2) ‘They mention the power of rain in [the Berakhah] “revival of the dead”’, is taken up in the Gemara with these words: ‘What is the reason? R. Yosef said: Because it is equal to the revival of the dead; therefore did they fix it in “revival of the dead”’. 

replaces the ‘you’ with ‘his great name’. There is an earlier reference to God’s name in the addition ‘for the sake of your name’, where it stands in parallel to ‘for his (man’s) sin’. The Hatimah is furthermore linked back to the first line of TAM by the second appearance of יִבְרָכֶנָה, ‘ability’.

**Coherence.** We have just explained how the wording of the Hatimah echoes terms used in the main body of the Berakhah. Otherwise it is mainly the targumist’s use of the term ‘might’ that binds together different parts of the Berakhah: he employs the root נבל> as a leitmotiv. The word occurs twice in OAM II, but seven times in TAM.

The theme of dew (see Renderings) also acquires a cohesive force as used by the targumist. It links the two original themes of nourishment of the living and revival of the dead: first the (heavenly) dew ‘of life’ is a means of revival, then of (heavenly) nourishment, a notion taken up in the next original sentence concerning sustenance (on earth) for the living (עם החיים). Thus the dew of life is for reviving those who are not alive, but also for keeping alive those who are. Where OAM has three terms (revival, dew, nourishment) apparently simply juxtaposed, TAM shows up an intimate connection and a logic of thematic progression. Thus the targumic version implicitly justifies the juxtaposition and sequence of these notions in OAM, a classic targumic function.57

An instance of targumic increase of coherence between Berakhot is the targumist’s identification of the ‘sleepers of dust’ as Patriarchs, who were a main theme in I.

The expansion of the Hatimah, ‘may his great name be Blessed’, is identical word for word with a recurrent (response) phrase of the Qaddish (e.g. Tikhalal E’s hayyim, I, 28b) – it could be meant as an allusion. If so, reference may be made to the Qaddish in its liturgical links to the topic of the dead, their revival being the reason for blessing God here in TAM II.

**Targumic modes.** The targumic version contains two passages of derivative composition separated by a section in shadowing mode. The first sentence is clearly a direct representation of OAM’s ‘You are mighty’. There follows an exposition of the topic of revival of the dead as final judgement, incorporating the dew theme (but wholly ignoring the phrase ‘you are great to redeem’). Then we find a second representation of the original beginning of the Berakhah, in ‘And your might is yours ...’, introducing the shadowing section (up to ‘and reviving the dead for the sake of your name’). This is followed by a lengthy explication of death as

---

a metaphor for exile in derivative composition mode. The phrase ‘reviving the dead’ is taken up a second time at the end of that composition (‘Therefore you will in future revive ...’) to lead into the final passage, given again in shadowing mode.

The treatment of the analogy between death and exile is confused and highly repetitive. Wordiness seems to be a hallmark of the targumist’s style when working in the comparative freedom of a derivative composition. This is true of the first section, too; the targumist leads from the topic of the righteous and their deeds and revival to that of the revival and retribution of the wicked, and then back to the righteous (and again their behaviour). This cannot be called tightly organized (even though it makes sense from an exegetical point of view).

**Analogies of redemption.** The presumably ongoing process of revival of the (righteous) dead serves as an analogy of the future redemption of Israel from exile (OAM speaks of redemption in the phrase ‘causing salvation to spring forth’).58 If the resurrection envisaged by the targumist is an event at the end of days, it is its certainty that is treated as paradigmatic for the redemption from exile.

**Negated comparison.** OAM contains a prominent expression of the uniqueness of God in the rhetorical questions (on which see Renderings): ‘And who is like you, lord of might and who resembles you...?’ The targumist represents the same idea at the beginning of II with the statement ‘And there is not one of those who dwell on earth who does according to your deeds and according to your might’. This targumic qualification of divine ‘might’ stands in parallel to the treatment of God’s fearsomeness in I and his holiness in III.

The uniqueness of divine qualities and behaviour is a virtually ubiquitous topic in Jewish literature. It might nevertheless be worth pointing to some liturgical expressions of it. The Sabbath Yoser contains the lines:59 ‘There is none to be compared to you, there is none besides you; there is none but you, and who is like you?260 There is none to be compared to you, O Lord, our God, in this world. And there is no one besides you, our King, in the life of the

58 This phrase is not found in Tikhlal Es hayyim; however, Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 301, Gaster Hebrew 4 and Gaster Hebrew Sadd all have it. The words ‘you are great to redeem’ appearing earlier in OAM are not taken up by TAM.
59 Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 133b.
60 In what follows from this point, the text offers a targum-style allocation of the four highly repetitive elements to four different realms or topics. The four parts of the first sentence are repeated and shown to apply to different dimensions, i.e. they are shown not to be redundant. See Elbogen, Gottesdienst, 114, 275.
world to come. There is none but you, our redeemer, in the days of the Messiah. And who is like you, our saviour, at the revival of the dead? The last phrase offers a direct link of a negated comparison to the topic of the revival of the dead, as does our targumic text at the beginning of II. In another of the benedictions of the Shema, the weekday morning Ge’ullah, we find a list of merciful deeds in favour of the humble, the prisoners, the poor, etc. (similar to the one found here in II), followed by a quotation of Ex. 15:11 which is a biblical example of the denial that God is comparable to anyone, couched in the form of a rhetorical question.

One further text needs to be noted here. The initial negated comparison in TAM finds a parallel in the Palestinian recension of the Amidah (version B), which has the opening line: "האנה בנו והי בוה והוא דודִי. נכּם חק והי יוהלמ."

III

"Therefore all above and below know that you are holy. And your holiness is not like the rest of holiness [of holy things] of the world, but your holiness is highest holiness. And it is not a holiness of man, for he has cessation after a while and he has a body of clay, and too much or too little, and there is lack because of the desires of the body for food and drink and sleep. Because of this their holiness is not perfect. And your holiness is again not like the holiness of the angels above, who have quality, finality and a form known to all, so that it may be marked in the heart properly. Instead, your holiness, lord of the universe, is free of the holiness of humans, and of the holiness of angels who serve before you in holy form. For your holiness is aloof from the holiness of all, for not one can touch it at all, for all that are created are too weak to touch that holiness. Even all the holiest of the HOLY ONES are not clothed in that holiness of yours. Therefore the Great Qedushah is said.

61 It may be noted that in some versions of this text the rhetorical question of the fourth component is transformed into a negated statement. For TAM treating OAM in a similar way, see above under Renderings.

62 Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 40a–b. For the topos status of this list and its various liturgical contexts, see J. Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 58f.


64 This expression is found frequently in the Zohar, cp. M.Z. Kaddari, The grammar of the Aramaic of the ‘Zohar’ (Heb.), (Jerusalem: Qiryat-Sefer, 1971), 64.
Renderings and concepts. We meet again the expression ‘upper and lower ones’ (��Ᵹ=mysqli, see I Concepts). An exegetical basis for mentioning both humans and angels is the ambiguity of the phrase ‘holy beings praise you’, which can be taken to refer to Israel as well as the angels. For Israel reference is made to Lev. 19:2, ‘You shall be holy, for holy am I, the LORD your God’.65 Mentioning both Israel and the heavenly hosts is highly apposite, for here in the Qedushah the angelic worship is mentioned explicitly (in the congregational recitation of III), and that is declared as being in parallel with Israel’s service.66 There are two other places in the liturgy mentioning the angelic praise of God, the so-called qedushah de-sidra67 and the Yoṣer benediction; the latter has already been mentioned as of potential relevance for the constitution of TAM in II (and see Negated comparison). Thus, the double exegesis of the term ‘holy ones’ is completely in tune with the liturgical function, i.e. pragmatic setting, of the text of this Berakhah.

The metaphorical use of ‘clothed in’ for divine attributes is found from biblical times (cp. Isa. 51:9; Ps. 93:1, 104:1f; applied to Zion, Isa. 52:1) onwards.68

The last two words of the Berakhah, as found in the manuscript of TAM, are אברת נב. I have followed Gaster in taking this as an error for אברת נב,69 ‘Great Qedushah’, because I cannot make sense of it otherwise (see, however, note 78). ‘Great Qedushah’ is a technical term.70 ‘Qedushah’ is the normal

65 Cp. Sefer Abudarham, 55; See also Ps. 16:3 (cp. Hirsch, ‘Shemoneh ‘esreh’ [note 49], 276).
66 On this parallel, see in particular Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 76ff and the collection of introductions to the Qedushah in J.J. Petuchowski, The liturgy of the synagogue: history, structure, and contents’, in W.S. Green (ed.), Approaches to ancient Judaism 4: studies in liturgy, exegesis and talmudic narrative (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 1-64, here at 51f (see also 37); Elbogen, Gottesdienst, 62f. See also A. Goldberg, ‘Service of the heart: liturgical aspects of synagogue worship’, in A. Finkel and L. FrizzeU (eds), Standing before God. Studies on prayer in scriptures and in tradition in honor of John M. Oesterreicher, (New York: Ktv, 1981), 195-211, in particular 204-6; K.E. Grözinger, Musik und Gesang in der Theologie der frühen jüdischen Literatur. Talmud Midrasch Mystik (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1982), 89ff, 318ff. In a medieval work, Aggadat tefillah shemoneh ‘esreh, the idea is found that the angels originally spoke the Hatimot of the Amidah. See A. Jellinek (ed.), Bet ha-midrasch. Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der älteren jüdischen Literatur, vol. 5 (Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahlmann, 1938), 54-5 and cp. note 106.
67 In this concluding section of the service, the trishagion Isa. 6:3 appears alongside a targumically expanded version. The targumic rewording takes the triple occurrence of ‘holy’ to allude to holiness in the upper realm (י ‘ל רשא כמלכת תифארת שומרי הגזע), and ‘for ever’. This is just another illustration that the idea of upper and lower realms is very much a topos for the understanding of III.
68 The angels are said to take on the shape of humans by ‘clothing themselves in air and material substances’ in Zohar I, 101a; in I, 144a they are said to ‘clothe themselves in a body’. Ganister, ‘Ein Targum der Amidah’, 85.
70 Occasionally, the whole of the Amidah (in its reduced form on Sabbath eve) is referred to as qedusha, see T. Kronholm, Seder R. Amram Goan, part II: the order of Sabbath prayer (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), 28.
expression for the (public) recitation of III (also the Qedushah in the Yosher). ‘Great Qedushah’ is used to refer to the expanded (public) version of III of the Musaf service (on Sabbaths and festivals) which begins ‘A crown (keter) will they give you, O Lord, our God, the angels, hosts on high, together with your people Israel gathered below’.71 In other words, the targumist, in using this technical term, introduces into the individual’s weekday form of III a reference to the public repetition of its holiday version.

Use of the term ‘Great Qedushah’ in the technical meaning explained also gives us a terminus post quem for the composition of III, and therefore probably for the whole of TAM. For the original rite of the Jews of Yemen, following Maimonides,72 had no special version of the Qedushah for Musaf services. Only later was the (Sephardi) Musaf Qedushah accepted into the Yemenite liturgy.73 The question when this change took place is not easy to answer. Kafih, in a footnote to his edition of the Es hayyim prayer book, observes that only ‘the earliest’ prayer books did not have the Keter,74 while the Es hayyim commentary itself links the newer custom to Zoharic literature.75 Z. Madmoni, in an article devoted to post-Maimonidean influences on the Tikhlal,76 traces the impact of Sephardi and Palestinian liturgy, brought to Yemen in the form of printed prayer books, in Tikhlal manuscripts. In a manuscript from the year 1594 the earlier wording is erased in favour of the Keter formulation.77 Madmoni dates the beginnings of the Sephardi-Palestinian liturgical influence to the second half of the sixteenth century; thus this period seems to be the earliest in which TAM in its current form could have been composed in Yemen.78


75 See Salih, Tikhlal Es hayyim I, 141a.

76 Madmoni, ‘Maimonides and the prayer rites of the Jews of Yemen’ (note 17), 393.

77 Madmoni, 375 and 393. The manuscript is Ben-Svi Institute no. 1194; see also 380 for a ‘Keter’ reading in a manuscript dated to 1661.

78 All of this presupposes that the targumist uses ‘Great Qedushah’ indeed in the technical sense known from other sources. Given the lack of elaboration in TAM, however, there remains perhaps a shadow of doubt about the meaning of the term in TAM’s parlance.
We now can see that while the targumist's interpretation of III presupposes the public or indeed festival-version of this Berakhah with its mention of the angelic liturgy, he avoids giving us any hint of the wording of that form of III, and only refers to it by a name. His avoidance of actually quoting those verbal elements may have to do with the fact that major halakhic authorities prohibited the recital of the public form of the Qedushah containing the proclamation 'holy' (and its introductory formula in the plural) in private.79 Maimonides forbids the recital of the Qedushah without a minyan (quorum).80

As for the scribal error assumed in our explanation of the text (מצב for נצר), it could in itself be significant. The plural form of the word written in the manuscript, 'hosts' (בעב for נצר), appears as part of the trishagion (quotation of Isa. 6:3), which is central to the public Qedushah. Perhaps this text was before the eye of the scribe, or indeed on his mind.

The phrase 'and your name is holy' (in the Palestinian text: 'and fearsome is your name') does not seem to be represented. Absent, too, are the words 'they praise you all day, Selah' (the Hatimah is treated in the next section).

Speech background. Both the beginning of the Berakhah and the Hatimah are allocated to a specific voice. In the first sentence, the report concerns thought (knowledge), not speech. The effect of distancing the wording from the voice speaking TAM is the same as if it had been a speech report: someone other than the voice heard elsewhere in the text thinks these thoughts (not here, not now, or only also here and now). The statement is furthermore, given as an indirect quotation, prefixed by 'that'. As for the Hatimah, its speech is eliminated altogether; it is in no way rephrased, not even as indirect speech, but instead reads: כנין נאמה. It is linked with the foregoing by the conjunction 'therefore'. It does not reformulate the blessing, but rather refers to it by name: 'Great Qedushah'. This is a term for a speech act, and

79 See e.g. L. Ginzberg, Geonica I: the Geonim and their halakhic writings (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1909), 130. Cp. bBer 21b and Soferim 16:12. The first of the two Arabic versions published by Kafih, 'The translation' (note 54), does in fact contain the trishagion, 199 (Hebrew 205), while the second (202) keeps strictly to the wording of the individual form of III. In an Amidah hymn ascribed to Saadya, the third blessing does not contain the angels' praise. The composition was published by M. Zulay, The liturgical poetry of Sa'adya Gaon and his school (Heb.), (Jerusalem: Schocken Institute for Jewish Research of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1964), 248-57, and see Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 37-45.
80 Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Tefillah VIII, 4 and 6. Emphatic also the Zohar (II 132b), making a distinction between the Hebrew form of the Qedushah and the 'targum' (the Aramaic version in the qedushah de-sidra), the latter being for individual recitation.
the words of that speech are not given. And also no trace of the word of the original Hatimah is left: even the key term ‘blessed’ has disappeared.

The term ‘Great Qedushah’ points from the private written (or public but silent) text to the publicly recited form of III (and as such unrepeatable in private). Although the targumist does not usually make exegetical use of this pragmatic – i.e. performed – version of the Amidah, here he acknowledges its existence and also its difference from the OAM which underlies TAM. In other words, the liturgical context, and pragmatic uses, of the Amidah are made part of the targumist’s treatment of the document.

Coherence. The first word, the conjunction רָאָי, seems to create a link to the preceding Berakhah. However, it is difficult to give substance to its meaning, for while II ended in a report on ‘their’ affirmation of God’s ability to revive the dead, III starts with a different group of speakers (including, as it does, the angels) addressing a different topic (God’s holiness). Nevertheless, TAM here makes the gesture of linking the two Berakhot.

TAM also seems to establish links to the other centrally important Qedushah in the liturgy, the Yoşer benediction (see below, Negated comparison), in the version used on Sabbaths. If so, this is the second time the Sabbath Yoşer provides a reference point for our description of the targumist’s exegetical decisions (see Negated comparison in I); it is possible that the targumist meant to establish some limited links between the Amidah and other texts in the liturgy.

Targumic modes. Here in III, the mention of upper and lower world becomes constitutive for the text of TAM. The targumic version could be described as a two-fold exposition of the uniqueness of God’s holiness, contrasted in turn with the human and the angelic natures which are described in some detail. The style is again convoluted. There is little progress in the argument, making it sometimes difficult to determine the syntactical relationships between sentences or clauses. The basic idea is repeated again and again, with the root יֹודְנ appearing twenty times, making up almost one fifth of all the words of III in TAM. OAM, on the other hand, is a very short Berakhah (fourteen words). As a result mainly of repetition, III grows to almost ten times its size in TAM.

Negated comparison. While TAM II could be seen to have grown out of the exploration of the semantic properties of the key terms ‘dead’, ‘revive’ and ‘dew’, the present Berakhah is constructed around a negated comparison of targumic origin, applied to the
upper and lower realms. There are two other liturgical texts which could have had an influence on the targumist’s handling of OAM at this point. There is the Yoser benediction for Sabbaths, which contains the line: ‘All thank you and all praise you. And all say: There is none holy like the Lord’. The parallel consists in the appearance of ‘all’ (in TAM ‘all know’), and the pronouncement of a negated comparison specifically regarding God’s holiness. Also part of the Sabbath liturgy (on Sabbath eve) is a single benediction used as an abridged version of the seven Berakhot of the Sabbath Amidah (ברכה אתת מעין שבע ברוך). In this text, the third Berakah concerning God’s holiness is represented by the phrase ‘the holy God, like whom there is none’ ( אלה ידידו שיאנו הבון). The Yigdal contains the line “his holiness defies comparison”, and it may also be noted that the Ge’ullah’s quotation of Ex. 15:11 mentioned above (II Negated comparison) contains the phrase ‘...who is like you, majestic in holiness...?’ The second sentence of the Palestinian recension of OAM, too, contains a negated comparison (although not specifically concerning God’s holiness): ‘There is no God beside you’.

Concerning the astonishingly specific treatment of human and angelic nature, it seems to employ a terminology with philosophical background, for example the Hebrew (!) word מוד, ‘form’, which is used in referring to the angels. According to Maimonides in his Mishneh Torah, whose influence in Yemen was very great, the angels are form alone (and not form and matter combined, like human beings). The term מאכלא (‘quality’) is also used in an abstract and technical manner. Not even the nature of angels, let alone the bodily existence of man, can provide the slightest experience of the unique holiness of God – the categorical

81 Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 133a; see also Kronholm, Seder R. Amram Gaon, part II (note 70) 74f, and cp. 1 Sam. 2:2.
83 Schechter, 'Genizah specimens', 657.
84 On the extraordinary authority the Yemenite Jews accorded Maimonides in general and his liturgical views in particular, see S.C. Reif, Judaism and Hebrew prayer: new perspectives on Jewish liturgical history (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 193f and 196-9, as well as Madmoni, 'Maimonides and the prayer rite of the Jews of Yemen' (note 17).
85 Mishneh Torah, Hilkhon Yesodei ha-Torah II, 3-7. The idea, however, that their nature is ‘known to all’ cannot derive from that source; see II, 8. On the other hand, the TAM terminology for describing that complete knowledge is itself reminiscent of how Maimonides describes in Yesodei ha-Torah I, 10 Moses’ wish to know God. On the Zoharic adoption of the term ‘form’, see I. Tishby/F. Lachower, The wisdom of the Zohar: an anthology of texts (English by D. Goldstein), (Oxford: Oxford University Press/Littman Library, 1989), vol. 1, 65; cp. also 77.
86 A Zohar passage (II, 129b) states, à propos the simultaneous recitation of the Qedushah in heaven and on earth, that Israel is inferior in holiness to the angels.
nature of this denial once again recalls Maimonides and his via negativa theology.88

IV

תָּנָה Before a human being comes forth into the open world, the angel that is appointed over the generation of man takes that embryo and stands him before the lord of the world and thus he says: Lord of the world, what shall it be with this human being? Will he be a wise man or wily, or wicked or worthy? And the lord of the world does not answer him. For if he were to answer him, that nature would be found to be his decree. However, he should have the choice to turn south, so that that decree should not orient a man to turn towards one side. Instead, he does not answer him, so that that man may ask for himself spirit and understanding and knowledge. And that is what he will say in his prayer before the lord of the world: YOU are he who mercifully gives man knowledge and teaches him understanding and knowledge, and gives us from the treasures of your goodness understanding and knowledge and wisdom so that he may know the way of goodness with perfect knowledge. And we shall be blessing you, for having mercifully given us the spirit of knowledge.

Renderings and concepts. The targumist uncovers a moral dimension in the OAM terms ‘knowledge’, ‘understanding’ and ‘insight’. Insight is thus almost certainly (although tacitly) understood as insight into Torah. The idea that the embryo after conception is brought to God, who then refuses to pronounce on its future, is contained in classic rabbinic sources, such as the Babylonian Talmud and Midrash Tanhuma.89 It is also used prominently in medieval works, such as the Seder yesirat ha-welad (Order of the formation of the embryo)90 and Midrash ha-gadol, a Yemenite

87 See, e.g. his denial that ‘unity’ or ‘knowledge’, applied to God, mean what they mean in humans or angels: Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Yesodei ha-Torah I, 7 and II, 10.
88 For a concise recent account, see O. Leaman, Moses Maimonides (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 33-5.
89 Tanhuma Pequde 3 has God decide on a number of basic qualities, ‘but not whether [the person will be] righteous or wicked’.
midrashic compilation. The following account is found in bNiddah 16a (in the name of Hanina bar Papa): ‘The angel that is appointed over pregnancy – “night” is his name. And he takes the drop and stands it before the Holy One, blessed be He, and says before him: Master of the universe, what shall it be with this drop: Strong or weak, wise or foolish, rich or poor? But these: “wicked or righteous” he does not say...’. The various versions of Seder yeşirat ha-welad are somewhat closer to our text in that the angel does indeed ask the question concerning the moral qualities, but God refuses to answer, while in one variant of the reply God also declines to determine the intellectual qualities of the future human being. It is clear that the aspect of intellectual disposition is central to the targumist’s use of this material, because it is the one that provides the speech background answer to the request for knowledge outlined below (Speech background).

The phrase ‘choice to turn south’ could be taken as elliptic for an expression such as ‘to turn north or south’. However, the selection of south as the only direction mentioned may be significant. In the prayer book ascribed to Amram Gaon, the following statement concerning the performance of the Amidah is quoted in the name of R. Yishaq: ‘He who wants to become wise faces south and he who wants to become rich north’ – a quite precise parallel. However, if the clause ‘choice to turn south’ is intended to convey (on the strength of R. Yishaq’s or a similar dictum) ‘choice to pray for wisdom’, the freedom of choice stressed in the continuation, ‘so that that decree should not orient man to turn towards one side’, does not quite fit. TAM’s main point – that man is free even to choose non-wisdom, wickedness – is thus obscured (not that this constituted a decisive argument against the targumist’s use of the idea).

---

91 The parallels in Midrash ha-gadol are identified in Higger.
92 There are two types of divine reply. In one, found in Jellinek’s first version of the work, op. cit. 153, God determines whether the person is going to be strong or weak, tall or short, man or woman, foolish or wise, poor or rich – ‘but whether righteous or wicked he does not decree, for we are told: All is in the hand of heaven except the fear of heaven.’ In the second version, found in Higger, 257, the angel suggests to God a number of spiritual and bodily possibilities (not including the moral dimension, but including wisdom), ‘and they do not tell him the answer’. In Jellinek’s text of that second version (156), the moral dimension (‘righteous or wicked’) is again raised and left without a reply (‘he does not tell him’).

93 Hedegård, Seder R. Amram Gaon, I (note 51), 33 (Hebrew) and 81. The source of the dictum is bBB 25b, where prayer is not mentioned (but see Rashi). Mendelssohn, ‘Zum Targum des Achtzehngebetes’ (note 13), 303 believes the phrase in TAM is elliptic.

94 Zoharic literature offers rich symbolic meaning for the four directions (south being connected to the Sefirah Hesed), but I have not found a concrete link to our TAM text here. Zohar III, 204a speaks of south in connection with (morning) prayers, identifying specifically the healing of the sick as the effect of such prayer.
Speech background. The function of the long targumic addition is to introduce the prayer for knowledge, and to explain its background. That background is a recurrent situation, repeated for every individual human being: the refusal of God to decide man’s mental and moral disposition. Since such a ‘prelude in heaven’ takes place for every man, everyone has to ask for knowledge at a later stage. The basic exegetical idea behind this speech background is found several times applied to narrative situations in the Pentateuch targums. It is the assumption that, if you require someone else to do something, it is not something which the addressee would do automatically, or if left to his own devices. One only asks for what is not coming one’s way in any case. The targumists of the Pentateuch occasionally infer from the fact that a request or order is reported the behaviour or intentions of the addressee before the request. Applied to our case: the fact that man has to ask God for knowledge makes only sense because it is not something that God would have given automatically. In particular, he has not given it at birth. After supplying the background, the targumist introduces the (general) man, whose moral qualities God had refused to determine, as speaker: ‘And that is what he says in his prayer...’. There then follows (see Targumic modes) the wording of OAM in its targumic rendering, as direct speech reported of a third person. The Hatimah has its own speech report which includes the voice in the text (‘we’), but separates the utterance from the text itself (also placing it into the future). The gist of the Hatimah is given in indirect speech; the verb ‘bless’ is used only in the report, not as part of the utterance, and there is no direct term of address (divine name). So this targumic version, once again, inserts a hiatus between the text concerned with the prayer, and the prayer itself, distancing the act of speaking TAM as it were from the act of speaking the prayer ‘Amidah’.

Coherence. It may be worth noting that the theme of IV, knowledge, made an incidental appearance in a targumic addition to III (‘...all above and below know that...’).

Targumic modes. The distribution of derivative composition and shadowing is quite obvious: the latter (still considerably modified) starts with ‘You are he who mercifully gives...’, introduced by the (first) speech report. The text before that is devoted to describing

---

95 See my ‘The background of speech’ (note 30). Cp. also, Interpretation of speech, 58ff.
96 This Berakhah is, in the traditional grouping of the Berakhot of the Amidah, identified as the beginning of the petitions. The first three are classified as praise, and the last three as thanksgiving, cp. bBer 34a, Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Tefillah I, 4. See Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 203, 244.
the context of the request (see *Speech background*) and reflects individual wording elements of OAM to a limited extent (man, understanding, knowledge). The text is repetitive almost to the point of confusion (in particular in the passage explaining why God does not answer).

V

When Israel had sinned and the sanctuary had been destroyed they went down to Babylon and they forgot the Torah out of their mouths. And they were not able to pray to, and to implore and to procure pardon from their lord, the master of the world, the living and eternal God, to have mercy upon them and to return the captives of their exile from the land of Sheshakh. For their language was mixed up and they could not utter words of Torah properly, as it is said [Neh. 13:24]: ‘AND THEIR CHILDREN, HALF OF THEM SPOKE the language of ASHDOD AND half of them spoke THE LANGUAGE OF JUDAH’ And they could not utter words of prayer properly (דיקא איה). And at that time Jehoiakim, King of the house of Judah, was with them in exile. For Nebuchadnezzar, servant of the King of Babylon – an evil servant – brought him by the hand of Nebuzaradan, chief of the slayers, and exiled to Babylon the exile of Judah and Benjamin together with Jehoiakim their king. At that time, the teaching of Torah was forgotten in Sheshakh, the witness of the ‘other side’ (ジョン nit), and so with Jehoiakim, King of the house of Judah, who was a wise and pious man in that day - he returned in repentance before the lord of the world, and he knew the upper secret (אלהים עלוה), which is the Ma’aseh Merkavah. He too forgot the principles of the secrets of the words of the Merkavah (דבירנה). And when Merodakh lifted\(^97\) him, his soul was stirred to the study of the secrets of the words of the Merkavah. And he decreed to the sons of priests, who were at that time – such as Ezekiel and his fellows the priests, prophets of the Lord – that they learn the secrets of the words. And he fixed them a time, and Ezekiel and his fellows were righteous at that time and in that generation proclaimed a fast. And after that time, when they had fasted and stood in supplication and prayer before the lord of the world, afterwards they went down to Babylon. For they had gone down and came up to the land of Israel by the permission of the king. And when they came down that

\(^{97}\) For the choice of verb, cp. Jer. 52:31.
second time, when he had arrived at the bridge over the river Khebar, the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord rested upon Ezekiel son of Buzi the priest, in the land of the Chaldeans. And in prophecy that rested upon him he saw hidden secrets and mysteries of the Work of the Merkavah. And he went down and taught Jehoiakhin the secrets of the king and brought him (יְהוּאוֹלִיאָה הָאָמָרָה) his teaching (הָעַרְבִּית) properly. And the spirit of holiness dwelled in the midst of Israel, and they prayed before their lord, that, because of their REPENTANCE, he may turn to gather in their exile and redeem them from their distress and RETURN to them TORAH. And they prayed: 'RETURN US, O OUR FATHER, TO YOUR TORAH' [in Hebrew]. And this prayer was fixed (םְתַקַּנְתֶּנָה) until they came up out of the land of captivity. And Ezra the priest arose, and his fellows in the Great Assembly and they fixed this prayer, which is the principle of all prayers and all requests. And it was marked in the mouth of all Israel and it was ordered in their mouth in that generation. And thus we too pray it before the lord who is in heaven, that he may turn his Memra to have mercy upon us as in the former days and that he may work for us a miracle and redemption, as he redeemed us from Babylon. And we ask of him, imploring that the words of Torah may not be forgotten from our hearts, so that we may be comforted in exile. And thus do we pray: RETURN US, O OUR lord, TO YOUR TORAH, AND BRING US NEAR, O OUR KING, TO YOUR SERVICE, AND RETURN US BEFORE YOU IN PERFECT REPENTANCE. And may the repentance be one of favour, so that [you] receive us before you. And we shall bless YOU, our lord, you who receives REPENTANCE.

Renderings. TAM’s expansion can be seen actively to promote a double connotation (grammatically distinguished, to be sure) of the root נָשׁ ‘return’ that is already used in OAM. It appears as a verb in the Hif'il ‘to cause to (re)turn’ (in TAM נָשִּׁיט), where its meaning may be literal or figurative; it also appears twice in the word הָעַרְבִּית, ‘Teshuvah’, where it must be figurative-technical, meaning ‘repentance’ (תְּשׁוֹעָה in TAM). This latter sense is prominently used by the targumist (appearing five times). But even more crucial for the targumic version as a whole is the idea of a physical movement from one place to another, the literal ‘return’. This is identified as the return from exile, in particular the Babylonian exile. In addition to this, the whole expression ‘return us to your Torah’ is accorded another, distinct, meaning.
The phrase is understood to presuppose concrete separation from Torah in the form of a loss of linguistic competence (see *Speech background*). Israel could no more utter the Hebrew words of Torah properly. And just as a plea to be returned to Torah implies — in the targumist’s reading — a loss of the competence to utter words of Torah, the petition to be brought near to the service implies loss of service, *in concreto*: loss of the competence to utter words of prayer. In fact, the term ‘service’ of OAM makes its appearance in two ways in TAM: as the sanctuary, the loss of which is briefly mentioned in the first sentence, and as prayer, the story of whose regaining makes up the main part of TAM’s text. In the latter perspective, the term is understood as synagogue rather than Temple service. The loss of language, and thus of Torah/prayer, is also linked to the loss of the land, i.e. the exile idea, by the Nehemiah quotation (see *Quotation*).

The term of address, ‘our father’, is transformed in the shadowing mode into ‘our lord’ (while being represented in the Hebrew quotation). See VI *Renderings and concepts* and note 111.

**Concepts.** The narrative uses a mainly biblical framework. The names of people mentioned (Ezekiel, Jchoiakhin, Nebuchadnezar, Nebuzaradan [II Kings 25:8-12], Evil-Merodakh, Ezra) and places (Babylon, Khebar, Sheshakh) appear in Ezekiel, the last chapter of Jeremiah and the last two of II Kings and Ezra. Ezekiel’s vision of the heavenly chariot, the ‘Ma’aseh Merkavah’ (see below), is linked to the river Khebar in Ezek. 1:3 (see also 10:15ff).

At the same time the narrative account cites post-biblical concepts. The term ‘Ma’aseh Merkavah’ is used, in allusion to the Ezekiel visions, to refer to mystical experience. TAM’s terminology, however, is influenced by the later qabbalistic tradition, to which the term ‘other side’ (*nrw Nl?t*) belongs. In

---

98 It seems to me that the loss of Temple is mentioned as the condition for the further loss of the ability of praying. Service as Temple service reappears in TAM only in the shadowing mode towards the end.

99 Beyond the shared link through loss of Hebrew, there is a concrete point at which loss of Torah means automatically loss of prayer: the Shema. However, if that was on the targumist’s mind, it left no trace in his text.

100 The term ‘Sheshakh’ appears first in Jeremiah 25:26 and 51:41, where it is taken as a name for Babylon (‘bavel’ in *atbash* mode).


102 The word in front of ‘other side’ could also be read as ‘arouser of the other side’ — , instead of ‘witness’. Nebuchadnezar is called the ‘hater of God’ (using , from ‘to stir up’) in an exegesis of the word in yBer IV, 7b. Gollancz reads with *dalet*, taking it to be the preposition ‘up to’ and translating ‘to the lowest degree’; see ‘Translation of a Targum of the Amidah’, 190.
Zoharic literature it refers to God's 'dark' side springing from the Sefirah 'Din'. The role accorded in TAM's version of V to secret mystical knowledge is crucial: it is the study of these secrets which lets king Jehoiakhin take the initiative for the fast, and which, after Ezekiel's vision, precedes a change to the better for the Israelites.

The members of the Great Assembly ( pagina ) make their appearance in rabbinic literature as an important pre-rabbinic group from the time of Ezra. They are credited with the creation of legal precedent and the transmission of oral Torah (see mAvoth 1:1f). In the Gemara, they are explicitly identified as a source of liturgical ordinances, and the installation of the 'blessings and the prayers' is ascribed to them in bBer 33a. See further Speech background.

The term Memra (lit. 'word') belongs to the distinct terminology of targum renderings, and appears also in VII, X and XII.

Speech background. In the preceding Berakhot we have seen the targumist allocate the OAM text (e.g. the Hatimah) to a named individual or group as direct speech. Here in V this exegetical device is taken a step further, for the targumist also embeds the speech allocation in a narrative, quasi-historical, framework. Let us first look at the mechanics of the targumic transformation of utterance into reported utterance. The act of speaking or praying as such is referred to many times in the course of the narrative. The first speech report, with Israel in the Babylonian exile as speakers, is 'And they prayed'; the utterance thus allocated is the first line of the OAM text, given in the original Hebrew. A second speech report employing present tense and first person plural follows several lines further down (and also marks the transition to

---


104 The idea that Jehoiakhin had esoteric knowledge is not found in the earlier sources, see Halperin, The faces (note 101), 188.


106 Cp. also bMeg 18a, speaking of 120 elders 'among whom were several prophets' instituting the Eighteen Benedictions. For the historicity of these and similar claims, see Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 13. In the Aggadat tefillah shemoneh 'esreh (note 66), 55, the angels praise the Great Assembly's fixing of the prayer with an additional Berakhah, whose theme is God as the giver of wisdom to those who fear him.

shadowing, see *Targumic modes*): 'And thus do we pray'. The Hatimah is again introduced separately, and transformed into indirect speech ('We shall bless you', similar to IV). The speaker is 'we', the time the future.

The formal nature – and profound effect – of the targumic transformation of 'praying' into 'reporting on prayer' becomes very clear in the case of 'And thus do we pray'. Here the time is 'now', the speaker is 'we'. But while what is reported may be a (habitual) prayer belonging to the present and to 'us', it is precisely not *performed* at the moment of speaking – it is quoted.

The main exegetical idea of the targumic text, similar to IV, is the question: under what circumstances does the request to 'return' to Torah and service make sense? The answer is not, as in IV, found in some aspect of the human condition. The request for Torah and service (understood as prayer, see *Renderings*) must come from a point in the story of Israel when both were unavailable, having been available before (because of 'return'). The historical situation chosen to fit this speech background, the Babylonian exile, is depicted at great length in the derivative composition mode (see *Targumic modes*). Although there may also be an echo of Zoharic literature here,108 some important elements of TAM's account, including the biblical quotation (see *Quotation*), seem to be lifted from Maimonides' brief explanation of the origin of the Eighteen Benedictions in his *Mishneh Torah* (Hilkhot Tefillah I, 4), or from a later source using Maimonides. It is important to notice the difference of purpose of this narrative in the Maimonidean setting, and in its use by the targumist. What for Maimonides is the reconstruction of a plausible picture of the emergence of a non-biblical commandment (namely, to recite the Amidah), is, for the targumist, a concrete background of the first performance of a prayer whose wording is OAM (or V in OAM). In other words, while TAM does not dwell on the obligation's non-biblical status, Maimonides does not use his account to provide background for the text of the Amidah (let alone V). As for the substance of the narrative, the overlap is considerable:

'When Israel was exiled in the days of Nebuchadnezar the wicked, they were intermingled with Persians and Greeks and the rest of the nations and there were born to them children in the countries of the nations and the language of those children became confused. And the language of each and every one was a mixture of many

---

108 Israel's loss of speech when they went into exile (which is also the Shekhinah's dumbness) is mentioned in Zohar III, 45b ('they could not open their mouth'); cp. Tishby, *Wisdom of the Zohar* (note 85), vol. 1, 416 note 211.
languages. And when they spoke, they could not express all they needed in one language except with mistakes, as it says [Neh. 13:24]: "And their children, half of them spoke the language of Ashdod and they did not know to speak the language of Judah, but the language of each people." And therefore, when one of them prayed, his language was inadequate to ask his needs or to express the praise of the Holy One, blessed be He, in the holy tongue, without mixing it with other languages. And when Ezra and his Bet Din saw this, they rose and ordained for them the Eighteen Benedictions in order ...

This material contains the basic idea that the introduction of the Amidah had something to do with the loss of language (as well as the link to Neh. 13:24). It is supplemented by the targumist with a long account of the situation in Babylonia incorporating Ezekiel's visions and thus the mystical tradition. The cause of the loss of Torah and prayer is identified as ignorance (the verb 'forget' occurs four times), brought about by sin. This narrative of loss and recovery sets the stage for the first occasion, and thus the original speech background, of the utterance of V (that the targumist can quote it in its original Hebrew wording highlights the fact that the exegetical effect is brought about by supplying the speech background alone109). The account of the very first performance of V is then extended into a report on its subsequent adoption by the religious authorities (see Concepts) and its establishment as an obligatory, that is, repeatable prayer. At this point, the account of TAM seems to become vague as to the exact identity of the prayer under discussion: it could be V, but it may also be the Amidah as a whole ("... the principle [מִיתָה] of all prayers and all requests"). The latter is an attractive option, because the targumist interprets V as a prayer for the gift of prayer, and the Amidah is of course the Prayer ("Tefillah"). If so, TAM offers here in V an account of the emergence of the Amidah as a whole (which tallies with traditional claims, see Concepts).

Targumic modes. The first part of the Amidah is an elaborate account of the situation into which V was spoken for the first time. This derivative composition takes up key terms of OAM, e.g. service (sanctuary), repentance, return to Torah, and incorporates

---

109 The modification of the speech report in the Pentateuch targums often goes hand in hand with a literal rendering of the utterance itself, many of the passages discussed in my Interpretation of speech are of this kind, and see also "The background of speech" (note 30), 259f.
the opening words of OAM in Hebrew in a report on the first occasion of utterance. After providing as much interpretative information of the terms involved as possible (in particular also their application to the present, see Past as paradigm), the transition to shadowing mode is sudden and marked, as in the case of IV, by a speech report ('and thus do we pray: Return us...').

The chronology of what purports to be basically biblical history is remarkably opaque and in two places construing TAM's words meaningfully seems impossible. The long account of happenings around Jehoiakhin and Ezekiel (for which the above-quoted passage of Maimonides could not have provided the material) is very repetitive, and key terms keep recurring. 'Repentance' makes its appearance five, 'Torah' seven times. Alongside key words of the Hebrew, other significant terms of targumic origin make repeated appearances. The word prayer, in the form of the root בּ, occurs ten times and more often, if one counts synonyms like 'supplication' or 'request'. 'Secrets' or 'secrets of the Merkavah' appears six, 'Merkavah' four times. 'Exile', which could be said to be the notion that holds this long account together (exile from the land brings about exile from the language and exile from Torah and prayer) is found six times. All in all, TAM is about twenty times longer than OAM.

Past as paradigm. The paradigmatic role of a past state of affairs is implied in the OAM use of 'return' (and see below on the Palestinian recension). It is therefore not surprising, given the targumic interest in this theme, that we encounter an explicit statement to the effect in TAM. Much time is spent describing the situation into which V was spoken for the first time. But then it was installed as repeatable prayer, and thus comes to be said here and now. The references to the past are twofold. When it was pronounced in the situation of the Babylonian exile, the state to which return was envisaged was that which pertained before the destruction of the first Temple. That return became reality. At V's performance today, it is presumably as much the period of the second Temple as that of the first Temple which is paradigmatic and the aim of the return. However, there is now a paradigm also for the return itself (and that is of targumic making). The targumist asks for the return to be fulfilled, just as it was fulfilled already once before, when the Babylonian exile ended ('as he redeemed us from Babylon'). There is also, if only by implication, the idea here that the return from Babylon was the fulfilment of a prayer request (namely the performance of V). If so, the efficacy of prayer for redemption from exile itself is prefigured in those past events, and the paradigm extends to include the act of praying V as such: Answer this prayer for return in repentance
just as you answered once before the very same prayer by leading back the exiles from Babylonia. One aspect, however, of the targumic explanation of the original function of V cannot apply to the present, because there is no loss of language. The meaning of prayer for the restitution of Torah is therefore changed to prevention, as expressed in the text leading up to the speech report with which the shadowing starts: ‘and we ask of him...that the words of Torah may not be forgotten from our hearts’.

No reference to former times is found in any of the OAM recensions except the Palestinian one, which reads ‘Return us, o Lord, to you and we shall repent, renew our days as of old (דחק), blessed are you...’

Quotation. We have for the first time a scriptural quotation in targumic rendering, Neh. 13:24. Its function must be that of proof of a statement (namely that Israel had lost its language), as prefigured in the Mishneh Torah text (see Speech background). In TAM’s rendering, however, the quotation is modified in a way which seems to undermine somewhat its probative function. The claim that there was a loss of language is best served by the phrase ‘...and they did not know to speak the language of Judah...’ This strong negative, however, is transformed into a targumic positive ‘half of them spoke the language of Judah’. For the verse itself, this modification produces a neat symmetry absent from the original Hebrew (which does not tell the reader about the other ‘half’), but its impact as a proof in TAM is thereby weakened, which may reflect a previous different use of the targumic version.

VI

סלאס And also when WE HAVE SINNED against the Torah he has mercy on us and is FORGIVING our sin. And we shall ask for us from our lord that he may forgive us, as he forgave us the many sins which we sinned before him, from the day when we stood at the Red Sea and in the wilderness. And when (we) went up to the land of Israel, and when we sinned before him and prayed before him and he forgave us and redeemed us by the hands of the Judges who judged Israel. And thus it is also that, because of our sin, we are in exile, wherefore we ask from him that he may forgive our sin in his mercy. And the Fellows (אירא) established it (חונמ) thus: MAY OUR lord FORGIVE US, FOR WE HAVE SINNED. FORGIVE US, OUR lord, FOR WE HAVE rebelled. YOU ARE THE GOOD GOD

to FORGIVE sins and iniquities of all who return in repentance before you. BLESSED is THE LORD who has mercy and FORGIVES all who return before him.

Renderings and concepts. In providing the verb ‘sin’ with the object ‘against the Torah’ the targumist selects both a plausible and a very general interpretation. It could be an almost automatic choice (but see Coherence). The mention of repentance before forgiveness (once in the main text, once in the Hatimah) expresses fundamental rabbinic doctrine and is a natural exegetical reflex at this point (and see below). The Hatimah itself does not have the second person pronoun (ך י מ ז נ נ מ ה ב ר כ י ה) and the targumist turns its infinitive construction (‘gracious...to forgive’) into a parallel structure. The condition of repentance can be understood to be fulfilled by the very act of praying this Berakhah.

A cluster of interrelated terms is formed by the targumist out of the original elements sin and forgiveness: sin, exile (=punishment), forgiveness, redemption (from exile). We find again the ideas of prayer (see Speech background) and repentance as well as of exile (see Past as paradigm). The latter theme is imported by comparing the present situation (outside Israel) to the past situation (in Israel), when Judges were the redemptive solution supplied by God. The exegetical function of the notion is slight or non-existent in the present Berakhah.

Both ‘father’ and ‘king’ as terms of address are reduced to ‘lord’ (ך) in the targumic text.¹¹¹

Speech background. The speaking of prayer is again integrated into a historical perspective of paradigmatic events (see Past as paradigm). The general situation of utterance, and lasting and present relevance, is given in the phrase ‘and we shall ask for us from our lord that he may forgive us’. The exact wording of the OAM in shadowing mode (see Targumic modes), however, is again transformed into reported speech. As such, it is allocated to a speaker from the narrative of history, on the occasion of the institution of the prayer as prayer. This passage is likely to hark back to V, where the term ‘fellows’ appeared two times applied to Ezekiel’s circle, and once with reference to the Great Assembly (‘Ezra ... and his fellows in the Great Assembly’). Hebrew haver appears in rabbinic sources as a technical term, often applied to

¹¹¹ Abudarham (Sefer Abudarham, 56) emphasizes this pair of terms strongly and interprets their position in the OAM sentence. He does the same in his explanation of V (55f), where TAM represents the terms, without, however, making use of them for its exegesis.
personalities of pre-rabbinic times. However, while the targumist may in fact have intended nothing more than a repeated reference to the Great Assembly mentioned in V, the word choice could be taken to connote a different sort of Great Assembly, found in Zoharic literature. In the Zohar the term 'the fellows' (or: 'companions'), used absolutely, occurs very frequently and is bound up with the portrayal of mystical elements among the early rabbinic teachers (i.e. Shim'on bar Yoḥai and his circle). The 'Fellows' are members of that later period's 'Great Assembly' ({idra asutat}, e.g. III, 144a, 127b (Idra Rabba), and they are sharers of secret knowledge (e.g. I, 216b; III, 120b). The phrase 'the Fellows established (or: explained) it' (אוכפומ התבריא), is part of the Zoharic style, where it often points the reader to a fuller treatment of a theme elsewhere (e.g II, 155b), and is linked regularly to the interpretation of a biblical verse (אוכפומ התבריא, e.g. III, 74a; 196a, the verb alone: II, 143a). Neither the text-deictic function nor the link to scriptural exegesis are present in TAM's use of the term here; instead, the targumist uses it to describe the promulgation of the wording of a prayer.

Again, the speaker of OAM's text is either someone else in the past, or the first person plural in the future ('we shall ask'), i.e. the prayer is encapsulated in a report of a prayer.

**Coherence.** The conjunction at the beginning of VI (וזא) links its topic explicitly to that of the preceding Berakhah, binding the theme of Torah (i.e. V) into the scheme of sin and forgiveness which is the topic of VI. This is clearly a transition sentence; its theological implications are not elaborated. It provides a sort of formal coherence between the two Berakhot, and offers an explanation of their proximity and sequence in the Amidah.

Another link with V is the expression 'the Fellows' without further qualification. Since TAM cannot be taken to use the term in its Zoharic sense, this usage presupposes the targumic text of V. The mention of Judges here in VI does not establish a link to the later Berakhah devoted to 'judges', XI. The terms used (מונד in VI, cp. Targum Ruth 1:1;مي in XI) are different, and so is their meaning.

**Targumic modes.** TAM's derivative composition mode makes use of the OAM key terms 'sin' and 'forgive'. The composition is

---


113 The term 'Idra' makes its appearance in TAM itself later in XI.

114 See also Tishby, *Wisdom of the Zohar* (note 85), vol. 1, 5f.
repetitive; the two terms just mentioned appear nine and six times, respectively. The two targumic modes are found in their usual distribution (derivative composition at the beginning, shadowing towards the end). The transition from one to the other is marked, as before, by a speech report (‘And the Fellows established it thus’). The only significant deviation from the original in the shadowing are the two references to repentance, one of them in the Hatimah (see Renderings).

Past as paradigm. Several groups of events in the past are mentioned in TAM and linked to the present by the expression ‘and thus also’ (והא). Their combination transforms the prayer topic from forgiveness in general to redemption from exile in particular. There is a group of paradigmatic sins committed in the (biblical) past: at the Red Sea, in the wilderness, in the land of Israel. They are matched by present sin which is the cause of exile (‘And thus it is also that, because of our sin, we are in exile ...’). There is furthermore prayer, which is mentioned explicitly for the time after taking possession of the land, and for the time of the ‘Fellows’. This past prayer is going to be matched by ‘our’ prayer in the future (‘and we shall ask for us from our lord that he may forgive us...’). There is finally the past example of forgiveness (on all the occasions of sin mentioned), and entailing ‘redemption’ in the time of the Judges. The components are neatly lined up in the phrase ‘we ... prayed before him and he forgave us and redeemed us by the hands of the Judges’. The targumic text asks for the whole of this paradigmatic cluster of sin-repentance-prayer, followed by forgiveness-redemption, to be repeated in the future. As for prayer (a concept not appearing in OAM), its role is pivotal. It is the prayer for forgiveness which the ‘Fellows’ established and whose future performance is referred to by the phrase ‘we shall ask’. In other words, the text of TAM implies again the efficacy of prayer. Of this whole targumic paradigmatic construction there is no trace in OAM.

VII

The sons of Babylon sent to the sons of the land of Israel: ‘[that] it is proper for them to weep about the destruction of the house of our God and to make mourning about the exile of the holy people from their land and [that] they are left without the Shekhinah and were driven from place to place – behold, like a poor man who turns to every door and gate. And also even here the Shekhinah was reduced to MISERY among them. And at that time there was nothing for her [the
Shekhinah] herself which was not changed much for them.

And we pray before our lord that he may LOOK from his holy abode to have mercy on the Shekhinah — for she is in exile with us — so that the Holy One, blessed be He, will have mercy on his daughter, Batsheva, the mother of King Solomon. Therefore he shall have mercy on us with her. And thus do we say: SEE now, imploring you, SEE OUR AFFLICTION AND JUDGE OUR JUDGEMENT out of the hands of those who drove us about: exact retribution from them on earth and from their princes in heaven and have mercy on your poor daughter and son. Would that you REDEEMED US, FOR YOU ARE A GOD STRONG IN REDEEMING. BLESSED be THE LORD whose Memra REDEEMS ISRAEL.

**Renderings.** The root of the term ‘our affliction’ (עיוות) is taken up in TAM in two distinct meanings. The first is the sense of ‘oppression’ (in conjunction with the idea of ‘plead our cause’) which, for the targumist, means exile; the second is as ‘poverty’, where it is used as a metaphor — again for exile. The homeless beggar who turns in vain from door to door is a simile for Israel in exile in the same way as the dead were such a simile in TAM’s understanding of II. In the context of VII, the idea of exile is also a perfect complement to the OAM ‘redeem’.

The first targumic occurrence (out of three) of the signal OAM term ‘see’, ‘that he may look’, is put into context by mention of the place (‘the holy abode’) from which the looking is taking place. The Hebrew expression usually translated as ‘plead our cause’ (ריבויrides), which could represent the idea of struggle in general, is narrowed down to the quasi-legal realm of God’s judgement of the world (‘judge our judgement’, oo רדנ). It may be noted in passing that one of the Shema’s benedictions, the Ge’ullah, has a fundamental topical connection to VII, and there the pleading for the sons is seen as being in parallel with that of the fathers: o מ Howell נייר לייב ריבים לאבותנו (Tikhal Esh hayyim, I, 39b; not in the Ashkenazi version). The whole of that benediction (which also contains the phrase ‘our redeemer and redeemer of our fathers’) could have served the targumist as inspiration for treating the past as paradigmatic, had he wished to do so (see Analogies of redemption).116 The reference to (angelic) princes of

---

115 The tense chosen here for the verb is actually future; for such usage in the Zohar, cp. Kaddari, Grammar (note 64), 82.

116 The Arabic version of the Amidah contains at this point the idea of exile and introduces a reference to the past (‘redeem us...as you redeemed us formerly’), see Kafih, ‘The translation’ (note 54), 200 and 205 (version A).
the nations, whose function it is to represent their nations in the heavenly court finds its place in this quasi-legal context (see Concepts).

The OAM term of address 'O king' is not represented, unless 'King Solomon' is meant to be the equivalent, which is not likely.

**Concepts.** The theme of 'daughter'/Batsheva' is not derived from OAM. It is an elaboration of the idea of the Shekhinah. In the qabbalistic system of Sefirot, seven Sefirot are sometimes seen as being summed up by the notion of the Shekhinah, and in Zoharic literature Batsheva (= 'daughter of seven'), the 'mother of Solomon', is found as an alternative name for the Shekhinah. Furthermore, the Assembly of Israel itself is treated as identical with the Shekhinah in certain contexts (e.g. Zohar III, 42a-b). That the Shekhinah is in exile with Israel is a very common notion found from rabbinic times onwards (cp., for example, bMeg 29a; also Zohar, e.g. II, 41b; I, 182a). It is also possible that a more specific parallel between TAM and the Zohar exists in TAM's mention that the Shekhinah was 'changed' in exile, an idea that is expressed in Zohar I, 182a. The Zohar also offers a passage (interpreting Isa. 21:11f) in which God praises Israel for being concerned for the Shekhinah (תאטיונמ) instead of their own troubles in exile (III, 22a). However, here in TAM the idea that Israel and the Shekhinah share the exile is used in such a way that asking God to redeem the Shekhinah amounts to asking him to redeem Israel (see Analogies of redemption).

The idea that the (seventy) nations have, similar to Israel, angelic representatives in heaven who plead their case in the heavenly court - their 'princes' - is frequently found in classical rabbinic times. For the specifically targumic term 'Memra', see above, V Concepts.

**Speech background.** The derivative composition is basically devoted to describing the situation of 'affliction' as exile (see Renderings), and to showing how the Shekhinah is affected by both exile and redemption from exile (see Concepts). The details of the historical narrative, which is not used directly as background for a speech report, are somewhat obscure. The letter is quoted in

---


118 With reference to Isa. 52:14: 'As many were appalled at you - so marred was his appearance unlike that of a man ...'

indirect speech, and I have indicated where I think its text is meant to start and end by single quotation marks (it could end a sentence earlier). I take 'they' to mean the Israelites (addressees of the letter) and 'also even here' (Am 6:10) to refer to Babylonia, point of origin of the letter. The meaning of נָחַל (for which 'here' is an approximation) and the present tense, however, are incompatible with the indirect speech perspective, while the use of the third person plural suffix in the phrase 'reduced to misery among them' and in the following sentence is incompatible with any (unmarked) switch to direct speech.

There are two speech reports in the first person and present tense (participle), the second of which ('and thus do we say') introduces the shadowing (see Targumic modes). Even while ascribing the prayer to the here and now, the speech report distances the pronouncement of the prayer from the voice of TAM (cp. V Speech background).

Targumic modes. The two speech reports (one using the verb pray and followed by indirect speech, the other using 'say' and introducing direct speech) mark the internal sections of the Berakhah. Up to 'And we pray' we have the (indirect) quotation of the letter, introducing the topic of the Shekhinah in exile. From that phrase, the targumist paraphrases the petition of VII to include the Shekhinah and make the point that by redeeming Israel, God will redeem 'his daughter'. Finally, the beginning of shadowing (taking up OAM’s ‘see’ twice) is marked by a new speech report. The phrase concerning 'judgement', which had not been mentioned in the derivative composition (in contrast to affliction, redemption and the act of looking) receives a fuller treatment, and the common fate of daughter and son (Israel) are stressed one more time. The Hatimah is given a near-literal rendering (including the participle ‘blessed’ in the direct speech, but omitting the second person pronoun): בְּרִי מְדִימֶרָה פְּרוֹקָא לָישָׂרָאֵל.

As usual for TAM’s derivative composition mode, the same or similar points are made several times without any strict progression in the argument (note the different statements featuring the Shekhinah and their sequence).

Analogies of redemption. We have noted the somewhat surprising absence of a reference to the past as paradigm in the targumist’s treatment of this Berakhah (see Renderings). It could be that the targumist fails to make such a reference because he is proposing a different kind of parallel instead: that between the redemption of the Shekhinah and of Israel. The text, however, does not offer any explication of that idea which would confirm such a construction.
The assembly of Israel said: HEAL ME, O LORD, for I am sick because of my sins among the nations whom you have caused to rule over me on account of my former sins which I sinned before you. And now I have returned to you and it is fitting for you to have mercy on me. Reveal your might over me to REDEEM me. They [read: we] have no hope but for the healing that comes from you. REDEEM us with a PERFECT redemption so that there will be no trouble and exile later. And let there be an eternal redemption from the people who have enslaved me. May it be revealed before you what they have done to me and CAUSE PERFECT HEALING TO ARISE for all those who are scattered and sick from their sins, FOR YOU ARE A GOD WHO HEALS IN MERCY AND FAITHFULNESS. Therefore (?) are all creatures obliged to bless your name and to say: BLESSED ARE YOU, O LORD, from whom there is healing to HEAL HIS PEOPLE ISRAEL who are SICK.

Renderings. Two of VIII’s key notions, healing and sickness, are interpreted by the targumist in the light of a third OAM element, redemption (‘save us’). The targumist takes them as metaphors for redemption and exile, respectively, and uses them also in their literal sense (in the phrase ‘scattered and sick’, and probably also in the Hatimah). In the sentence ‘Redeem us with a perfect redemption’, ‘redemption’ occupies the syntactical position of ‘healing’ in OAM. ‘Sick’ is also used as a metaphor for exile in the construction ‘sick...among the nations’, the tertium comparationis being provided by ‘sin’: just as illness is caused by sin, so is exile.

The phrase ‘and we shall be healed’ (following the expression ‘heal us, O our God,’) does not seem to be represented.

Concepts. We have again a full network of concepts paving the way from the OAM theme of healing to the ubiquitous TAM topic of redemption from exile. Apart from sin, there is repentance (‘And now I have returned to you’) and mercy. In explaining the adjective ‘perfect’ (namely as ‘everlasting’), the targumist expands: ‘so that there will be no trouble and exile later’, a wording which is reminiscent of one of the expansions of the Ge’ullah published by Wieder. It reads: ‘and he shall

120 The Arabic Amidah (version A) seems to reduce VIII wholly to the aspect of redemption from exile, see Kafih (note 54), 200/205.
121 The passage, from Siddur Aleppo (MS Oxford Marsh. 90), fol. 25b, is quoted in Wieder, ‘Fourteen new Genizah-fragments’ (note 41), 252.
redeem us with a ... redemption after which there is no servitude (גאולה שאתי ואחיהNeal שעה)."

**Speech background.** The text is framed by speech reports at two points of strategic importance for the targumist's segmentation of OAM: the beginning of the Berakhah, and the beginning of the Hatimah. There is no narrative embeddedness. We have a minimal historical perspective through the past tense of the verb 'say' in the first speech report; but the speaker, the assembly of Israel, can also be understood to be identical with the timeless congregation of worshippers (i.e. as a reference to the context of the performance of OAM). At the same time we have, similar to IV, a statement of a universal need ('all creatures') for healing=redemption.¹²²

**Targumic modes.** The transition between derivative composition and shadowing mode is clearcut (without being marked by a speech report); shadowing begins in the sentence. May it be revealed before you what they have done...'. But this time different parts of OAM are treated by different modes exclusively, with only 'perfect' appearing in both modes. In the relatively short derivative composition, sentences seem, once again, to be going round a theme in circles (note in particular the first sentence, with its causal relationships). Moreover, repetition is as usual prominent (the root of 'heal' appears six, that of 'mercy' five, that of 'sin' four times).

**Negated comparison.** There is a mere hint of this targumic topic, if defined as the uniqueness of the divine redemptive power as well as of the divine nature, in the phrase 'We have no hope but for the healing that comes from you'.

IX

When Israel went into exile from their land into a strange land and all sacrifices ceased, the blessings ceased. At this the assembly of Israel asked before the lord who is in heaven – for the blessings are his and he is the source of blessing and providence, the blessings for the world are from his providence – and she [the assembly] prayed before the LORD OUR GOD: BLESSED be [you], who provides for us with your blessing, as in the days when you where BLESSING US, when I offered in your sanctuary the half-sheqel to atone for our souls before you. And bless

¹²² The phrase 'and all are obliged to give him thanks' appears in mourning prayers, see Kafih, *Tikkhal shivat Siyyon*, I, (note 74), 242.
for us the YEARS with DEW and RAIN of favour as the year when I offered before you in the sanctuary the Omer and the two loaves and gave to the priests the Terumah and to the tribe of Levi the tithe; and the second tithe which I ate at the time when I showed myself before you three times a YEAR; and the gifts of the poor and needy through the gleaning, and the forgotten sheaf, and the corner of the field and the tithe for the poor. For when the commandment of the sheqel ceased, there ceased for me commerce; and when the libation of water ceased, there ceased DEW AND RAIN of blessing; and when the two loaves and the Omer ceased, there were annulled the blessings from the HARVEST of the field. And now, imploiring and entreating you, BLESS FOR US THE WORK OF OUR HANDS, O LORD, OUR GOD, AND BLESS FOR US THE YEARS WITH DEW AND RAIN OF BLESSING AND FAVOUR LIKE THE GOOD YEARS that were from the former days and we shall bless your name you who will BLESS for us THE YEARS, for you bless us with the years.

Renderings and concepts. The targumist takes very seriously, on a number of levels, the concrete agricultural dimension of the Berakhah. In providing his ingenious narrative background for the speech (see Speech background), he preserves the agricultural theme without symbolic re-interpretation. The long list of offerings (see Past as paradigm) is clearly an elaboration on the phrase ‘all manner of harvest’ of the ‘winter’ version of IX (see Targumic modes), narrowing down the meaning of rain and dew to the beneficial effects they have on produce. All the offerings listed are precisely linked to produce (apart from the sheqel); no animal sacrifices appear. TAM’s link between them could be summarized: as long as there stood a Temple to which the produce could make its way as sacrifice, the growth of that produce was blessed. The crucial link between a blessing of the harvest and the series of offerings is established, it seems to me, by a word the targumist does not directly present in TAM. The ‘summer’ version of the Berakhah contains the phrase: ‘...and bless our years with the dew of favour, blessing and freewill [or: abundance]...’. While ‘favour’ and ‘blessing’ make their appearance in the shadowing section of TAM, ‘freewill’ does not. But the word נא ideas has a crucial second meaning besides ‘voluntary act’, namely ‘voluntary offering’. Here, in the equivocal meaning of ‘freewill’ placed in the context of agricultural blessings, seems to lie the seed of TAM’s derivative composition.

123 Cp. the phrase יגוע, ‘rain of abundance’, in Ps. 68:10.
Liturgical texts make reference to temple sacrifices in a number of contexts (prayer is thought to take, to a certain extent, the place of sacrifices in the temple). One of the texts mentioning the sacrifices, appearing as part of the morning prayer, reads: 'And you have, because of our sins, destroyed the sanctuary, and the Tamid has ceased, and we have no longer a priest in its service...'. The word translated here 'has ceased' is the same as that used by the targumist (ביעל).

The term ‘providence’ (or ‘supervision’), נחון, occurs in the Zohar (for example, II, 122b).

Speech background. The request for blessing is understood by the targumist as presupposing the loss of an earlier blessing. The exegetical idea is, once again, to identify the situation in which the request is meaningful. There was a time ('as in the days', cp. Past as paradigm), when blessings were received on the basis of Temple sacrifices. Those ceased, and afterwards blessings must be specifically requested – this is the situation of speaking which the targumist construes. The situation used to contextualize the request is given in its totality in the first sentence; historical detail is saved for the long reminiscence of the assembly of Israel (see Targumic modes). The speaker is the (praying) congregation both in the concrete situation of the aftermath of the Temple destruction and ever since. Although the situation of exile forms the background to the utterance, the end of exile is not made the topic of the petition.

Almost the whole of IX is quoted as direct speech of the assembly of Israel. Even within that direct speech, however, the Hatimah wording is identified as a separate speech event taking place in the future (and reported indirectly).

Targumic modes. The double representation of the key terms, once in derivative composition and once in shadowing, helps us to find the point of transition from the one to the other. The shadowing starts in the sentence beginning 'And now'. The derivative composition which constitutes the first part of TAM's IX takes on
board quite a few terms from OAM. As before, the targumist’s own style is prolix. But there is also skilful composition here, in the part beginning ‘For when the commandment of the sheqel ceased’. A powerful threefold repetition links the cessation of certain types of blessings to the cessation of certain types of offerings; this is a summary of the message of the derivative composition and leads on to the shadowing part. The matching of offering to blessing is done with some care: money and commerce, water of libation and rain/dew,\(^{128}\) grain produce (Omer) and harvest.

Looking at the shadowing part of TAM, the question of the targumist’s Vorlage arises. IX exists, in the Yemenite and Sephardi rites, in two different versions for the two seasons of the year. The ‘summer’ version is the one basically underlying TAM here;\(^{129}\) the ‘winter’ version is much longer, and does not contain the words ‘of blessing and favour’. However, the words ‘dew and rain’ (ט ניק), as opposed to just ‘dew’ (넬), belong to the ‘winter’ terminology, and so does the mention of ‘all manners of harvest’ (הueblo) (see Renderings). Either the targumist had a different version for the seasons in front of him,\(^{130}\) or he deliberately combined elements of both.

Past as paradigm. A reference to the past in its paradigmatic function is part of OAM, in the phrase ‘as the good years’. This vague mention is reinforced by the targumist through repetition and an elaboration on a grand scale. The ‘good years’ are identified as those when the Temple still stood, and Israel could bring offerings. The future years are requested to match those blessed passed years.

X

ה עב The assembly of Israel said: Master of the universe, you have sworn to us with your right hand and your strong arm that you will redeem us and bring us up out of exile. And now, when will your word (Memra) to gather your exile be established? And thus she says: SOUND THE GREAT SHOFAR to gather us TO FREEDOM and verily (? מירא) come TO GATHER OUR EXILES FROM THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE EARTH TO OUR LAND. As

\(^{128}\) Cp. K. Kohler, ‘The origin and composition’ (note 105), 64.

\(^{129}\) See Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 44b.

\(^{130}\) The version given in Dalman, Worte Jesu, 302 is the long one; similarly in Rylands Gaster H 4, fol. 8b and Gaster H 5add, fol. 22b. The Palestinian version is also longer than the OAM used by TAM; version A has ‘dew and rain’, while version B has an interlinear ‘dew’ (נפל), see Schechter ‘Genizah specimens’, 657 and 659.
it is written by the hand of the prophet [Isa. 27:13]: 'AND IT WILL BE AT THAT time, when the Lord will return to gather the exile of his people THAT HE WILL SOUND THE GREAT SHOFAR AND THEY SHALL COME WHO WERE PERISHING IN THE LAND OF ASHUR AND WHO WERE SCATTERED IN THE LAND OF EGYPT AND THEY SHALL WORSHIP before THE LORD ON THE HOLY MOUNTAIN [for בנוו read בנטו] AT JERUSALEM.' Therefore they shall say: BLESSED BE THE LORD WHO GATHERS THE exile OF HIS PEOPLE ISRAEL.

Renderings and concepts. This is the Berakhah where TAM's concern with exile comes into its own. The phrase 'strong arm' linked to a gesture of swearing points to Ezek. 20:33f ('strong hand and outstretched arm', twice) where God is quoted as making an oath to gather the exiles. That passage may have served as one of the stimuli for the formulation of OAM.\(^\text{131}\) Another dimension of this scriptural allusion is that it recalls the classic description of the exodus from Egypt. The expression is used to characterize the exodus in Deut. 5:15 and 26:8 (cp. also Deut. 4:34, 7:19) and Egypt is mentioned in Ezek. 20:36 (see Past as paradigm). The targumist merges these two aspects – promise and actual redemption – of the 'strong arm' image.

Speech background. We have three speech reports in this Berakhah, featuring the knishta de-Israel or simply 'they'. As often, the Hatimah receives its own particular speech report, and is translated almost literally (except in the choice of the lexeme galut; see Past as paradigm).

Targumic modes. The two modes are distributed as usual to opposite ends of the Berakhah. All strategic points are marked by a speech report: beginning, beginning of the shadowing mode, beginning of the Hatimah. The latter is separated from the bulk of the Berakah (in shadowing) by a lengthy scriptural quotation.

The use of the rhetorical question is remarkable. The theme of exile is original; however, where the notion appears only once in the Hebrew, it occurs five times in the Aramaic.

Quotation. The long scriptural quotation is introduced as such ('as it is written by the hand...'). It is not identical with Targum Jonathan; in particular, the additional phrase 'when the Lord will return....' is not found in that scriptural targum. Jonathan renders

‘who were exiled to the land of Ashur’, instead of the more literal TAM ‘were perishing’; however, in the Hatimah TAM adopts this very term ‘exile’ as a rendering of the same Hebrew term סדה. Where the two targums render literally, they are very similar. The additional phrase inside the quotation is meant to tie in with the surrounding Berakahah, bringing to prominence the theme of גלות. It thus could be that a Jonathan-style translation was adapted for the present literary setting (adding a phrase where Jonathan had a non-literal substitute of ‘perishing’), giving additional prominence to one aspect of the theme of the Berakhah, גלות, which also forms a recurring theme of the TAM rendering of the Amidah as a whole.

As to function, TAM offers in this verse a biblical passage which is thought to belong to the biblical prehistory of OAM itself. It does not prove an incidental or subservient point (as Neh. 13:24 in V): there is a strong verbal overlap between the scriptural quotation and OAM. Does this mean that the targumist is quoting the ‘source’ of the Amidah at this point? If so, the targumist would choose an exegetical strategy pursued consistently, e.g. in Sefer Abudarham, namely to bring OAM together with its biblical ‘prooftexts’ (the Isaiah verse is quoted by Abudarham right away, page 56). Thus, together with the Ezekiel passage mentioned above (Renderings and concepts), TAM would offer two biblical support texts for the Berakhah in its original form. There is another possible function for the Isaiah quotation: it could furnish a reference to the past as paradigm (see next section).

Past as paradigm. Past paradigmatic events are mentioned only obliquely. The allusion to Ezek. 20:33f is almost certainly meant also as an allusion to redemption from Egypt (see Renderings and concepts), and Ezek. 20:36 contains a biblical past-as-paradigm structure. The Isaiah verse, on the other hand, makes mention of two former exiles from which there was a return. So, either the targumic concern with the paradigmatic past is met in this Berakhah by scriptural references alone, or the targumist was not in fact interested in the topic in the context of X.

XI

Therefore the assembly of Israel said: When we were in the holy land, we had the Great Yeshivah in the court of the temple. They were judging me according to the words of Torah. And they were beloved to me as the

ball of my eye, and they were cherished by us as our souls. But now that I am exiled, the seventy [of the] Sanhedrin, who were beloved like the round ‘threshing floor’ before the altar and were establishing the commandments of Torah, the principle of the commandments of your Torah, are no more with me. Now, imploring and entreating you, RETURN TO US THE JUDGES AS IN FORMER TIMES AND counsellors of OUR COUNSEL AS FROM THE BEGINNING. As you wrote for us by the hand of Isaiah your prophet [1:26]: ‘AND I SHALL appoint among you JUDGES of truth established AS AT FIRST AND counsellors of YOUR COUNSEL AS FROM THE BEGINNING’. AND REMOVE FROM US strife AND SIGHING, AND REIGN OVER US in your kingdom SOON, ALONE, IN MERCY, in truth AND IN JUDGEMENT. BLESSED BE the name of THE LORD, the KING WHO LOVES truth AND JUDGEMENT.

Renderings. The notion of truth in judgement is prominently imported by the targumist. He adds it as a qualification to the word ‘judges’, while in the shadowing section, ‘in truth’ takes the place of ‘in justice’ (דיעק), appearing a third time, in the Hatimah, in place of ‘righteousness’ (צדק). On the phrase ‘counsellors of our counsel’, see Quotation.

In representing the key terms of the body of the Berakhah, TAM explains who the judges and counsellors are of which OAM speaks. They are identified as the members of the pre-rabbinic Jerusalem Sanhedrin (‘Great Yeshivah’), assembling on the temple site. Rabbinic literature knows of a ‘Chamber of Hewn Stone’ in the inner temple court, seat of the Great Sanhedrin or Great Bet Din (mSan 11:2; mMiddot 5:4). Its layout in the form of ‘the half of a round threshing floor’ is mentioned in ySan I,19c: הַחֲלֹת הָנוֹן עַלֹולה, and the word for ‘threshing floor’ is used for ‘court’, as is its Aramaic counterpart, אידרה (‘Idra’). TAM’s phrase, translated literally above because of the ‘like’ in the sentence (which could be scribal error for ‘in’), is the exact equivalent of this technical term for court, applied in particular to the Great Sanhedrin residing on the Temple Mount. Azriel of Gerona, too, thinks of the Chamber of Hewn

---

133 Cp. the benediction ending ‘judge of truth’, יושב משפט, recited on hearing bad news or by a mourner, Tikhal Es hayyim, I, 173b.
134 The Arabic version A published by Kafih (note 54, 200/205) does the same, identifying them as the prophets.
135 On the exact location of the Chamber of Hewn Stone in the Temple area, see F. Schürer, The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ, revised and edited by G. Vermes, F Millar, M. Black, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1979), 224.
136 In the Zohar, ‘Idra’ has the fixed meaning of the assembly of the companions of Shim’on bar Yohai (see VI, Speech background), and there is also an ‘Idra of the sanctuary’ אידרא בית המקדש. Zohar III, 127b [Idra Rabba].
Stone when explaining XI; he reads the phrase 'as at first' as meaning that the very same members of that body are to come back, so that this Berakhah for him is really about the transmigration of the soul.137

The state of affairs in the past to which the future is hoped to be a return is depicted, once again, as having ended at the moment of exile ('But now that I am exiled'). It is not easy to link the loss of 'judges' plausibly to exile (at least not if the judges are identified as the rabbis); the targumist manages by narrowing the group down to the Sanhedrin that resided in the Temple (whose destruction is just another term for exile).

*Speech background.* The initial speech report transposes the whole of the Berakhah into reported speech; the Hatimah is a fully integrated part of that utterance without a separate introduction.

*Coherence.* The Berakhah is opened by the conjunction 'thus, therefore' (כִּי), joining the beginning of XI to X or the end of X. However, in the absence of any elaboration, the link is purely formal (cp. VI Coherence).

*Targumic modes and past as paradigm.* The different components of the Berakhah and their mutually related functions are clearly distinguishable. At first there is the derivative composition (part of the utterance of the assembly of Israel). It is devoted to identifying the precise reference of the expressions 'judges'/counsellors' and highlights the esteem they enjoyed (a measure of the strength with which they are wanted back). OAM contains an emphatic double reference to the past as paradigm ("as in former times", "as at the beginning"); TAM supplies a picture of that earlier state which is invoked as a model.

This depiction of the ideal former state is followed by a shadowing representation. On the background of the information supplied earlier, the past paradigm constructions, represented literally, take on precise reference. There follows a scriptural quotation closely paralleling the text of OAM, after which the text is brought to a close in the shadowing mode. If the scriptural quotation (which could not come at a more appropriate point) is bracketed out, the Berakhah falls clearly into the two components of derivative composition and shadowing, with a smooth transition and neat division of interpretative labour between them.

*Quotation.* The targumist again quotes what could have been the biblical model of the statement made in the Berakhah, Isa. 1:26,
very much like a prooftext. It actually contains in direct divine speech the promise whose theme is the theme of XI (in contrast to X which contained a prediction not spoken by God). (The targumist could have quoted this promise with God as speaker, but instead marks it as coming from Scripture.) The rendering of Targum Jonathan is almost identical, including the additional words ‘...of truth established...’. If Targum Jonathan is TAM’s source, this would at least partly explain an otherwise puzzling fact: the rendering of the opening word is non-literal, using ‘appoint’ rather than ‘return’. Had the biblical passage been rendered specifically to fit its present co-text, this would be a little surprising, because it obscures the very precise match of wording between the biblical and the OAM texts. The expression used to render OAM ‘counsellors’ outside the quotation is the same as the one appearing in the Isaiah verse (Jonathan/TAM): ‘counsellors of...counsel’ (מלכי מלכתי). It looks at this point as if the Targum Jonathan version had exerted its influence on TAM’s rendering of OAM. This could also account for the prominence of the concept ‘truth’ (see Renderings).

XII

But woe to the wicked who have transgressed your Memra and gone and worshipped the idols of the nations. And all the nations who trusted in idols – woe to them on the day when the lord of the universe is revealed to request judgement from them. For they have not considered their end, what will be with them on the day when the lord of the universe will exact the retribution of his servants, the righteous, from them. And they will not have support or hope on that day, about which is written [Isa. 63:4]: ‘FOR THE DAY OF retribution IS before me AND THE YEAR OF THE REDEMPTION of my people HAS ARRIVED.’ And the wicked of the world will trust, but they do not have good deeds to shield them. And the assembly of Israel says before the lord of the universe: Woe to these sinners, MAY THEY HAVE NO HOPE before you and all those who go astray and make their deeds evil, MAY THEY BE DESTROYED IN an hour. AND THE KINGDOM of wickedness UPROOT AND BREAK SOON. May you cause them to be destroyed and broken from before you SOON. And our eyes shall see what King David said [Ps. 58:11]: ‘THE RIGHTEOUS ones SHALL REJOICE, FOR

138 Cp. Sefer Abudarham, 57.
TAM introduces the topic of the Berakhah as one of idol worship, with the culprits coming both from inside Israel ('transgressed your Memra and went and worshipped') and outside (in the subsequent sentence). Overall, the specific collection of terms found in OAM is much reduced in TAM, and more general. There is no direct equivalent for the ‘apostates’ (ממעידין), ‘heretics’ (מ甯) and ‘informers’ (стеים) appearing in the first sentence of the Yemenite XII.140 The terms used for culpable groups in TAM are: the wicked (of Israel?), the nations, a combination of the two (the ‘wicked of the world’), idol worshippers in general, and ‘sinners’. Thus TAM fails to represent the dimension of enmity against Israel from within which is expressed by the OAM terms. Insofar as villains from Israel are mentioned at all, they are only characterized by their sin against God (idol worship). Instead, TAM gives immediate prominence to the OAM theme of ‘the kingdom of arrogance’/‘enemies’, basically equated with ‘the nations’. These terms, providing the topic of TAM’s derivative composition, are taken up literally in the shadowing section.141 In an abridgement of the middle Berakhot of the Amidah (חבר), the theme of this Berakhah is summarized as ‘and against the wicked raise your hand’ (yBer 4:3/8a, and cp.

139 Schechter, ‘Genizah specimens’, 657. Cp. Zohar I, 123b (Tosefta), containing a ‘woe’-exclamation concerning the wicked and the fact that they are not ‘written’ down for resurrection.

140 See Tikhal Es hayyim, I, 46a, Gaster H 4 fol. 9a (with מ甯 marked as coming from a printed edition), H 5add fol 23a and cp. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 300 note 1 and Madmoni, ‘Maimonides and the prayer rite of the Jews of Yemen’ (note 17), 385.

141 The hymnic paraphrase of the Amidah ascribed to Saadya similarly uses only terms like ‘wicked’, ‘enemy’ and ‘arrogant’, see Zulay, The liturgical poetry (note 79), 253. On such trends in the early understanding of the Berakhah, see P. Schäfer, Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 45-55, here at 51 and note 35, and see Elbogen, Gottesdienst, 34 and 38.
In concentrating on the outside enemies of Israel, the targumist also highlights the situation of exile (although the word does not appear).

Through the various forms of punishment invoked in OAM the targumist leads to the topic of the final judgement and retribution. The latter term appears three times in TAM – including both quotations – and has no counterpart in OAM (but note the ‘book of life’ of the Palestinian OAM).142 The additional targumic word ‘day’, carrying the connotation ‘day of judgement’, also occurs several times, once also in the Isaiah passage.

According to TAM, both the righteous and the sinners are resurrected, the former for reward, the latter for punishment (a proposition also expressed in TAM’s version of II). Already the Mishnah (San 10:3, cp. bSan 108a) distinguishes various degrees of non-participation in the world to come; some sinners are even excluded from the final judgement, while others are revived to take part in it. This latter position is found in the Zohar couched in terms not unlike those of TAM.143

The eschatological dimension of the Berakhah finds an indirect but potent expression in the temporal adverbs מתי ו’elle הרואים. These are not represented directly by the targumist, but are transformed into the phrase ‘our eyes shall see it’ which is echoed in the words ‘they shall see’ of the Psalm verse. It is in particular the OAM phrase ‘in our days’ which is being represented in this way, with its immediacy and the first person plural pronoun preserved. ‘In our days’ is interpreted in the same way again in XIV. ‘Our eyes shall see’ also appears in the OAM of XVII, and is thus perhaps used by the targumist as an eschatological leitmotiv in this latter part of the Amidah. The theme of the seeing of the righteous, linked to the defeat of the realm of arrogance, is also found in the Musaf Qedushah on Rosh Hashanah. There the phrase ‘for you shall make the dominion of arrogance pass away from the earth’, is preceded by the words ‘And then the righteous shall see and rejoice ...’144

Speech background. The beginning of the Berakhah is given in a direct speech perspective (use of ‘woe’, mention of God in the second person), but no speaker for the utterance is introduced. This could mean that TAM (just as OAM) is intended to address God directly; though this cannot be excluded, it would not fit well

---

143 E.g. Zohar I, 68b, which reads (with reference to Ps. 9:6): ‘Woe to the sinners, for they will not rise for eternal resurrection, but to stand in judgement.’ For the exclamatory form, see also note 139.
144 Tikhlal Es hayyim, III, 72a. This insertion is also found in the other rites, see Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 5”ff.
with TAM’s style so far. Perhaps more likely is that the speech report introducing XI is understood to be in force for XII as well. The use of the conjunction at the beginning and a certain thematic continuity (see Coherence) point in this direction. When a speaker is finally introduced, half way into the Berakhah, it is again, as at the beginning of XI, the assembly of Israel, repeating the exclamation ‘woe’. As so often, a separate speech report introduces the Hatimah (‘Therefore shall the righteous ones...’). This second speech report either presents a new speaker or, as is more likely, identifies the assembly of Israel with the righteous ones (who are also the speakers in I); the act of speaking the Hatimah lies in the future, and it is characterized as an act of thanksgiving.

The overall interpretative result of this background for the utterance contained in XII is strikingly plausible: it is the righteous people who ask God to punish the wicked. In other words, the targumist asked here: ‘Who can utter this request?’ Only the just do not call a curse upon themselves when requesting divine punishment for the wicked. In other words, the targumist uses the terms appearing in the utterance to define a ‘negative image’ of the plausible speaker – it must be the non-sinner, the non-arrogant, the non-wicked whose voice is heard in this request. This is how the righteous become the speaker of the Hatimah.145

Coherence. Links to XI: We have a conjunction, signalling that XI and XII are connected. This time (in contrast to the beginning of X itself), the link is not purely formal, but feeds on a continuation of the topic ‘judgement’.146 God’s love of justice (XI, Hatimah) which is expressed by the installation of a human system of justice within Israel (XI as a whole), also brings final retribution to the wicked and enemies of Israel (XII, and cp. bMeg 17b). What is the cause of joy for Israel in XI becomes the cause of woe for the wicked in XII, and so the choice of the conjunction בְּ in the sense of ‘but, however’ falls into place (although it could also go with the ‘woe’ as a particle of emphasis, i.e. ‘truly’).

Links to XIII: We find the targumist supplying a picture of the punishment of the wicked, as it were from the perspective of the righteous. Indeed seeing that punishment, exacted on behalf of

145 This is rather like the speaker identification found in the meta-text of some prayer books with regard to the benediction ‘Blessed are you... who has not made me a woman’. ‘Men say’. See The authorised daily prayer book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the Commonwealth (London: United Synagogue/Singer’s Prayer Book Publication Committee, 1990), 15. Cp. the mishnaic ruling (mBikk 1:4) that a proselyte cannot utter the words ‘God of our fathers’ in prayer, but must change them to “God of the fathers of Israel”

the righteous, is itself part of the reward of the righteous. Thus one could say that XII becomes a first contribution to the topic of XIII, which is devoted to the reward of the righteous. There are a number of terms used in targumic additions in XII which recur in XIII as renderings of OAM: the verb ‘to trust’ appears twice in TAM XII, and is original to XIII occurring in the Hebrew three times; similarly, the term ‘support’ occurs in XIII as well as in TAM’s additions to XII.

We have already mentioned the recurrence of the phrase ‘our eyes shall see’ in XIV and XVII (see Renderings).

Targumic modes. The modes are distributed following a now familiar pattern. The derivative mode occupies the first section and the beginning of the shadowing is marked by a fresh speech report (‘and the assembly of Israel says’). As for the quotations, one of them appears inside, one outside the shadowing. The Hatimah, introduced by a separate speech report, is modified considerably. There is only one verb (instead of two in OAM), and three objects (instead of two in OAM); a מ is placed between ‘blessed’ and ‘the Lord’.

Quotation. The rendering of Isa. 63:4 is quite literal and is, apart from the orthography, congruent with Targum Jonathan on that verse. The Aramaic of Ps. 58:11, on the other hand, is different in rendering and word choice from that found in Lagarde’s edition. Conspicuously, Lagarde’s text has ויהי and אדם (i.e. ‘Palestinian’ forms), while TAM has ויהי and ז י (i.e. ‘Babylonian’ forms – elsewhere TAM has mostly ויהי!). In other words, this targumic rendering of Ps. 58:11 seems to come from some previous text, but this text was not identical with the Targum of Psalms which we know. The quotation formula is once general (‘it is written’) and once personalized (David) with a verbum dicendi. The second quotation’s phrase ‘for they shall see’ is precisely matched by the targumic ‘and our eyes shall see’ (see Renderings). The first quotation is linked to OAM only by the idea of judgement, and in particular, day of judgement. Similarly, the second biblical passage supports what the targumist has to say about the satisfaction of the righteous. The scriptural quotations therefore have no direct link to the original of XII, their function being closer to the one documented in V than to that found in X and XI.

147 The choice of words in the phrase ‘trust in... deeds’ (ועזרה) finds an echo in Zohar II, 143a with regard to the righteous, and in what manner they do or do not trust in their deeds).

148 Paul de Lagarde, Hagiographa chaldaice (Leipzig: Teubner, 1873), 32.
As for THE RIGHTEOUS in their ways AND THE PIOUS in their deeds and those who rely on them in truth AND THE REST OF YOUR PEOPLE ISRAEL, let YOUR MERCIES be turned to them, O LORD OUR GOD. AND GIVE us a good share, and A GOOD REWARD TO THOSE WHO TRUST IN YOUR NAME IN TRUTH. AND SET OUR SHARE WITH THEM in the Garden of Eden in the WORLD to come, with those souls on the day of great light. AND MAY WE NEVER BE PUT TO SHAME before you. FOR IN YOUR NAME WE HAVE TRUSTED AND FOR YOUR REDEMPTION WE HAVE hoped. BLESSED are YOU, O LORD, for you are the SUPPORT AND TRUST OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

Renderings and concepts. The additions 'in their ways' and 'in their deeds' introduce a distinguishing dimension to two terms that otherwise seem so close as to be redundant, apparent redundancy being a classic targumic-midrashic concern. The phrase 'those who rely on them' is the targumist's representation of OAM's 'righteous proselytes', completing the list of four groups found in the opening sentence of the Yemenite version of XIII. The targumist may be taking up the Hebrew preposition לע in this construction, for which he otherwise has no use; and in adding the adverbial phrase 'in truth', he could be representing the idea of righteousness (from the term צדק; see XI Renderings). עולם is rendered both as 'world' (in 'world to come') and as 'forever' (cp. II Renderings). The expression משכ היה מתו is represented once in a literal manner and once as 'good share' (anticipating the later OAM appearance of 'share'). The targumist links the 'Garden of Eden' idea with the 'share' terminology. Similarly, the first of the prayers (R. Eleazar's) listed in bBer 16b as being performed by individual Rabbis after the Amidah contains the phrase 'and set our share in Gan Eden'. Abudarham quotes a slightly different version which is even closer to TAM:149 'May my share be with the righteous in the Garden of Eden'. Light as a metaphor for redemption is common; a biblical model for the expression 'great light' with reference to redemption is Isa. 9:1 (Eng. v. 2), while the Musaf Qedushah on Rosh Hashanah reads:150 'Give then glory...and a clear shining light unto the son of Jesse, thine

149 Sefer Abudarham, 57.
150 Tikhlal Es hayyim, III, 72a.
anointed, speedily in our days'. The following (Hebrew) expression comes from the Zoharic Midrash ha-Ne’elam (I, 118a): ‘to revive with the dew of the great light of above’ (with reference to Isa. 26:19, see II Renderings and concepts).

Speech background and coherence. This time it seems very likely that the strong nexus between XII and XIII (see XII Coherence) led the targumist not to repeat the speech report concerning the assembly of Israel. It could even be that we are to assume that the speaker last mentioned, the righteous (XII, Hatimah), speaks this text, too.

Targumic modes. There is no derivative composition here. This may have to do with the absence of a speech report, and the concomitant absence of any depiction of speech background. However, the targumist will be seen in the subsequent Berakhot to neglect increasingly to portray the circumstances of the utterance even where he reports on a speech.

XIV

The assembly of Israel said in prayer: Lord of the heavens, reveal your might over us and let DWELL your Shekhinah IN THE MIDST OF JERUSALEM YOUR CITY which you have chosen from the whole earth, and cause us to dwell in safety SOON, as you have said [I Kgs. 6:13]: ‘AND I will send your [read: my] Shekhinah TO DWELL AMONG THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL AND I WILL NOT CAUSE MY PEOPLE ISRAEL to be distant.’ BUILD and finish IT AS AN ETERNAL BUILDING and perfection. And I shall give thanks to the lord IN OUR DAYS, and our eyes shall see and we shall rejoice in it before you. AND THE THRONE OF king DAVID YOU WILL ESTABLISH IN ITS MIDST. BLESSED are YOU, O LORD, you who ... (note 17) TO BUILD JERUSALEM.

151 The following sentence is found in several rites (although not the Yemenite one) at the end of the Sabbath Yoser: ‘O cause a new light to shine upon Zion, and may we all be worthy soon to enjoy its brightness.’ See Elbogen, Gottesdienst, 19f. On its absence from the Yemenite liturgy, see Madmoni, ‘Maimonides and the prayer rite of the Jews of Yemen’ (note 17), 384.

152 On the other hand, there is an unusual aspect about the presentation of this Berakhah in the manuscript: it is the only one whose lemma is placed on a line of its own. It is just conceivable, though there is no specific evidence for this, that the text in the copyist’s exemplar was not in order at this point, and he reacted to this by starting a new line. If so, it could have been a speech report that was missing or corrupt.

153 The point of transition between speech report and utterance is uncertain here: ‘in prayer’ could be the beginning of the utterance (functioning like ‘imploring you’).
Renderings. For the expression ‘in our days’ being represented by ‘our eyes shall see it’, see XII Renderings. Here in XIV we find that the original wording in translation and its non-literal equivalent are side by side, a phenomenon familiar from the scripture targums. It is likely that the Hebrew ‘soon’ (בקד, lit. ‘in proximity’) receives a double interpretation, once as ‘soon’ (בקד also in the Aramaic) and once as (spatially) ‘close’. In other words, the OAM clause ‘dwell in the midst of Jerusalem your city soon’ is read by the targumist as ‘dwell in the midst of Jerusalem your city close [to us]’, with the addition ‘cause us to dwell in safety’ as a result. There is also the immensely suitable ‘I will not cause my people Israel to be distant’ of the targumic version of the biblical verse (see Quotation). The fact that the crucial non-literal rendering ‘be distant’ is also found in Targum Jonathan, however, makes this almost too good to be true. We either have to assume that TAM re-invented for his own purposes an already existing rendering, or that he used Jonathan and indeed selected it with a view to this non-literal rendering, which is possible, but somewhat too elaborate.

The targumic addition of ‘finish’ (שלם, for which I read with Gaster: שלם) and ‘perfection’ (שלם) is somewhat conspicuous (doubling for emphasis is quite rare). The term also makes an appearance in one of the texts of the Palestinian version of XIV, in which the phrase: ‘...build your house, finish you palace (שלם ימכס)’ is found, and the phrase is also used in the Qaddish de-rabbanan (Tikhalal Es hayyim, I, 81a). This can hardly be an accident (and see XV).

Speech background. This Berakhah returns to the pattern of initial speech reports with the assembly of Israel as speaker. Inside what is now the assembly’s utterance, there is a further speech report in the future tense which characterizes the subsequent utterance as thanksgiving (‘and I shall give thanks’, see XII). It may be noted that the terminology of prayer is generally prominent in this Berakhah (‘in prayer’, ‘give thanks’, ‘rejoice’). The Hatimah is given as part of the utterance in direct speech; it contains in the verb position a word that looks like נפנפ, which I have been unable to make sense of (as was Gollancz).

---

154 The question of its significance in the Pentateuch targums is discussed in Samely, Interpretation of speech, 22f, 30f, 105f, 174-7.
155 The term does not appear in the text of Tikhalal Es hayyim, I, 46 and Rylands Gaster H 5add (which have a ‘quickly’ at a later point in the text instead), but it is found in the manuscript used by Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 303 and also in Rylands Gaster H 4, fol. 9a.
156 Azriel of Gerona, Commentaire (note 36), 117, offers a similar treatment of the word ‘soon’, with reference to Ps. 73:28.
Coherence. It is clear that this rendering of XIV presupposes a version of OAM which contains the phrase ‘and the throne of David establish in its midst (speedily)’. Neither the Yemenite rite nor Maimonides\(^{158}\) include these words in XIV. They are found in the Sephardi and Ashkenazi Amidah;\(^{159}\) and the Palestinian recension, while not mentioning the throne, mentions the kingdom of David (even including his name in the Hatimah).\(^{160}\) The Arabic Amidah (version A) contains no hint of it, although it inserts the idea of the gathering of the exiles.\(^{161}\) The inclusion of this phrase, which clearly presupposes the targumist’s knowledge of one of the Amidah recensions containing it, can be understood as an exegetical decision concerning the relationship of XIV and XV. As we shall see, there is some evidence in XV also that the targumist treats these two as a unit.

Targumic modes. There is no derivative composition. The Berakhah is given in shadowing, and even the introduction to the scriptural quotation could be allocated to a wording taken over literally from OAM.

Quotation. The scriptural quotation blends with the original text in an exceptionally neat way. The original Hebrew already contains mention of a speech event (‘as you said’). The targumist turns this mention into a speech report followed by a quotation of what it was God said. This quotation comes, of course, from Scripture, and OAM’s reference to God’s speech provides a ‘personalized’ quotation formula (instead of ‘it is written’); the biblical passage consists indeed of a quotation of God’s words. The quotation proves that God said what the targumist ascribes to him, namely that he will make Israel dwell in safety.\(^{162}\) It is possible that the quotation has another role to play, and has been chosen with extraordinary care for its non-literal element ‘not...to be distant’ (see Renderings). The biblical passage also lends additional force to the targumic link between God’s taking up residence in Jerusalem and Israel’s dwelling in safety, for it is a model of such a link. 1 Kgs. 6:12 begins: ‘Concerning this house which you (= Solomon)
are building...’. The Aramaic version given in TAM is very close to but not identical with Targum Jonathan. The latter has שָׁמוֹשׁ instead of TAM’s שָׁמוֹשׁ (while TAM uses שָׁמוֹשׁ as the equivalent for עשָׁנָה in the opening clause of the Berakhah). However, the crucial ‘cause to be distant’ as a non-literal rendering of the original ‘forsake’ is found both in TAM and Jonathan.

The type of question to which the targumist provides an answer here, namely ‘What is the utterance to which the base text makes a passing reference?’, belongs to the classic targumic-midrashic concerns. However, its function within the scriptural targums is bound up with high expectations of internal coherence of the biblical text. If the speech event is referred to only in passing, and if Scripture is ‘complete’, it must have been given in full in some other location in the text, and the targumists are keen to identify that place. Here in XIV the concern cannot be quite the same, for the Amidah does not form a text continuum with Scripture (although it is treated as if it formed some sort of literary continuum with it, see section C. 6. below). However, the mention of the past speech event in OAM, if it is to be given a concrete source, can hardly come from anywhere else but Scripture, for Scripture (and not the Amidah) is the place where God’s speech to Israel is recorded. Thus, the targumist’s concern with a speech event that is only mentioned in passing, his provision of a fitting direct speech, and his selection of a scriptural source for that speech, all make very good sense against the background of targumic tradition.

XV

Imploring you, MAY YOU set up redemption for the house of DAVID and MAY YOU RAISE its strength BY YOUR REDEMPTION. BLESSED shall you be, O LORD, who sets up strength FOR THE REDEMPTION of his people.

Renderings. The metaphors ‘shoot’ (צומח) and ‘horn’ (קר) are given an abstract but non-metaphorical interpretation: ‘redemption’ and ‘strength’, respectively. The same is true for the verb ‘to cause to grow’, which is twice replaced by ‘set up’ (אֲסָטִים). If the adverb ‘quickly’, היי (Tikhal ES hayyim, I, 46b) was in the targumist’s original, it is not represented.

Speech background and coherence. This is the second time that TAM offers no speech report framework whatsoever for a Berakhah (cp.

163 See my Interpretation of speech, chapter 5 (107–23).
XIII. It is possible that here, again, considerations of coherence have led to the decision. The topics of XIV and XV are notoriously close, and David is—in some rites—mentioned in both. 164 We have seen that the targumist went out of his way in XIV to include mention of the throne of David (not part of the Yemenite OAM), which of course contributes to seeing the two Berakhot as one unit.

**Targumic modes.** The Berakhah generally manifests only small-scale targumic intervention. Apart from the fairly standard targumic changes mentioned in *Renderings* and the similarly unremarkable additions ‘the house of’, ‘of his people’ and a petition formula at the beginning, there are no modifications.

**XVI**

The assembly of Israel said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Master of the worlds, merciful God, imploring you: (That) every time that we pray before you, receive OUR PRAYERS, for (יהוה) you are the LORD, OUR GOD. And HAVE PITY ON US (עללני) in your MERCY, AND receive IN MERCY AND FAVOUR OUR PRAYERS. And FROM BEFORE YOU, O OUR lord, we shall NOT RETURN EMPTY-HANDED, FOR (祢) YOU RECEIVE THE PRAYER OF EVERY one who prays before you. BLESSED are YOU, the LORD, WHO RECEIVES PRAYER.

*Renderings.* Almost all the targumic additions have to do with modes of address, or terms of entreaty. The Hebrew ‘hear’ is throughout rendered ‘receive’ (which also occurs in OAM), stressing the acceptance and thus the success of prayer, which is the point of the Berakhah. Two additions draw attention to the repetitive character of regular prayer: the request for acceptance of prayer ‘every time’, complemented by the ‘everyone who prays before you’ towards the end. This renders the phrase ‘receive the prayer of every mouth’. 165 The latter point could be a reflection of the fact that this Berakhah is viewed as the place in the Amidah where individual petitions could be inserted (bAZ 7b–8a). Due to the additions at the beginning of the direct speech, the words ‘Lord, our God’ which are the terms of address in OAM, are now superfluous in that function. The targumist reinforces their significance as a choice of address by using them in a new

---

164 On this issue see the literature cited in note 160.
165 The second version of the Arabic Amidah published by Kafih reads at this point: ‘of every mouth that calls to you’ (see ‘The translation’ [note 54], 203 and 208), and similarly Salih, *Tikkhal Es havvnm.* I. 47a, with reference to Ps. 145:18.
function, namely to give a reason. Because he is LORD (the divine name signalling the attribute of mercy) and ‘our’ God, he accepts the prayer of Israel. That very phrase, ‘for you are the Lord our God’, occurs as part of OAM XVIII.

The expression ‘our king’ is, as several times before, represented by ‘our lord’ (on this, see section C.I. below).

TAM employs both יִרְאֵה and שְׁמוֹ in this Berakhah, separated by only two lines (see XII Quotation).

Speech background. We find again the speech report concerning the assembly of Israel which we have come to expect in recent Berakhot. It is, however, expanded to include mention of the addressee; the expression ‘the Holy One, blessed be He’, very common from rabbinic times, is also used in VII. The beginning of the direct speech is enlarged to suit the pronounced petitionary character of this Berakhah. It consists of two terms of address, one (‘merciful God’) clearly stressing the supplicatory gesture, and an entreaty formula. This may be the targumist’s way of marking the fundamental importance of this prayer (which is about prayer in principle), and its above-mentioned status as a vehicle of personal petitions (Renderings).

Coherence. As mentioned above (Renderings), the targumist anticipates a phrase occurring in the original (but not the targumic version) of XVIII; however, since it does not in fact recur in TAM’s XVIII, no link seems to be intended.

XVII

The assembly of Israel said: Imploring you, 0 LORD, OUR GOD, that FAVOUR may be before you FOR YOUR PEOPLE ISRAEL, AND MAY YOU RECEIVE THEIR PRAYERS WITH FAVOUR. AND RETURN for us THE SERVICE of your name to the INNERMOST PART OF YOUR HOUSE. And their SACRIFICES AND PRAYERS RECEIVE WITH FAVOUR AND MAY THE WORSHIP OF ISRAEL YOUR PEOPLE, which they worship before you, ALWAYS FIND FAVOUR AND MAY YOU BE PLEASED WITH US. AND MAY OUR EYES SEE when your Shekhinah RETURNs TO YOUR PLACE, TO ZlON, IN MERCY, AS IN

166 On the early history of this expression in the context of prayer, see Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 252f, 280.
167 This targumic addition is paralleled by a manuscript variant of the original Hebrew found in Rylands Gaster H 4, fol. 9a, where XVI opens with the words נַפְסָחֵת דָּאָּסְהֵנַּה.
168 The lemma is marked by a line above it.
the time when your Shekhinah was dwelling among them. BLESSED are YOU, O LORD, for you RETURN your SHEKHINAH TO ZION.

Renderings. Apart from an additional supplication formula ('imploring you'), we find only a number of small-scale additions of a mostly explanatory character in the form of added adverbial phrases or relative clauses. The complement ‘of your name’ in the phrase ‘WORSHIP of your name’ echoes a very similar phrase (with ‘his name’) in the Qaddish de-rabbanan (Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 81a). The representation of ‘your return’ as ‘when your Shekhinah returns’ is doubly apt, because it is a more indirect reference to God’s movement, and because that technical term for the divine presence is used in OAM in the Hatimah.

Speech background. We find the standard speech report in its usual place.

Coherence. We have encountered ‘our eyes shall see’ as a targumic addition in XII and XIV. Here is its model in OAM. In repeating this phrase, the targumist establishes a verbal link between these three Berakhot. There may be an allusion to the Qaddish (see Renderings).

Past as paradigm. The targumist seizes the opportunity to elaborate on the OAM expression ‘as of old’ (זמני). His explanation is kept general (no concrete historical references).

XVIII

The assembly of Israel said words of thanks: WE shall GIVE THANKS before YOU, O LORD, FOR YOU have created our lives and the might of OUR REDEMPTION for us. YOU endure FOR GENERATIONS everlasting. WE SHALL GIVE THANKS before YOU AND speak of YOUR PRAISE, FOR OUR LIVES WHICH ARE DELIVERED INTO YOUR HAND, AND FOR OUR SOULS which are with us in YOUR CHARGE, FOR YOUR presence (דַּבֵּרָה) and FOR the WONDERS and YOUR GOODNESSES169, WHICH AT ALL TIMES, EVENING AND MORNING [you....?] to do with us. GOOD God, FOR YOUR MERCIES DO NOT STOP, IMPLORING you, MERCIFUL ONE, FOR YOUR goodn...
DO NOT END, FOR ALL LIVING BEINGS SHALL PRAISE YOUR GREAT NAME, FOR you are GOOD, O GOOD GOD. BLESSED ARE you, O LORD, WHOSE NAME IS GOOD FOR EVER.

Renderings. ‘You have created our lives for us’ is the targumic rendering of the Hebrew metaphor ‘rock of our lives’,\footnote{Rylands Gaster H 4, fol. 9a, has at this point ‘our rock, rock of our lives’.} interpreting the word ‘rock’ (רוּם) in the light of ‘to form’ (תֹּמָא), and rendering it as ‘to create’ (תֹּמָא). ‘Shield (of our redemption)’ is rendered as ‘strength, might’ (cp. I, Renderings). The idiomatic ‘for generation and generation’ is represented as (literally) ‘for the generations of eternity’, thus avoiding the repetition. For the phrase ‘OUR SOULS which are with us in YOUR CHARGE’ compare the passage ‘My God, the soul which you placed within me...’ in the morning prayers, which contains the line ‘and you preserve it within me’ (Tikhhal Es hayyim, I, 7a). At a number of points, the targumist makes use of an Amidah original which varies within the Yemenite tradition, or differs from it altogether. At the point where TAM has the three terms ‘presence’(?), ‘wonders’ and ‘goodnesses’, Tikhhal Es hayyim, I, 47b and Rylands Gaster H 5 add, fol. 23b, have only two words for miracles, while Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 303 and Rylands Gaster H 4, fol. 9a, have the two words for miracles plus ‘goodnesses’. Where TAM mentions only ‘evening’ and ‘morning’, all these Yemenite sources add also ‘noon’. In TAM there is an illegible word at this point in the manuscript (fol. 67b line one);\footnote{Gaster, ‘Ein Targum’, 90, does not indicate its presence.} from the changed construction of TAM, however, one would at this point expect a predicate to go with the infinitive ‘to do’ rather than the missing ‘noon’. As for the additional phrase ‘to do with us’, it finds a limited parallel in the Palestinian version, which reads: ‘... mercies which you have granted to us and have done to us and our fathers before us’.\footnote{Schechter, ‘Genizah specimens’, 657 and 659.} However, of the latter reference to the past, as well as of other themes characteristic of the Palestinian recension, there is no trace in TAM. The second expression of pleading, ‘IMPLORING you’ probably renders the particle מַעַן which appears in Dalman (Die Worte Jesu, 303). In not having the extended Hatimah with the words ‘and to you it is fitting to give thanks’, TAM’s Vorlage seems also to have agreed with the text published by Dalman. The Hebrew phrase ‘for you are the Lord our God’ at the beginning of the Berakhah is dissolved; the divine name is combined with ‘before you’, and the ‘you are’ becomes part of the phrase regarding God’s creating ‘our lives’. On this, see under XVI Renderings and Coherence.
Speech background. We have the usual speaker being introduced by the targumist at the beginning of the Berakhah. The Berakhah is characterized as a thanksgiving, which grows out of the (carefully preserved) double occurrence of 'we give thanks' in OAM and is in keeping with the notion that the last three Berakhot are devoted to thanksgiving. There is an ambiguity concerning the limits of the speech report clause: 'words of thanks' could already be part of the wording of the utterance. However, I think it is more likely that the phrase is meant to characterize the whole of the utterance, and that the beginning of the direct speech coincides precisely with the Berakhah's original beginning.

Coherence (internal). In taking רצח as referring to the activity of creating, the targumist could be seen to supply a unifying theme to the Berakhah as a whole: 'life' and the divine gift of both creation and sustenance of life.¹⁷³

XIX

Therefore the assembly of Israel said: My lord, O king, GIVE PEACE, GOODNESS, AND BLESSINGS and a long and good LIFE, GRACE AND LOVING-KINDNESS AND MERCY TO US AND TO ISRAEL YOUR PEOPLE. AND BLESS US, O LORD, OUR GOD, ALL TOGETHER, WITH THE LIGHT OF YOUR Shekhinah. FOR BY THE LIGHT OF YOUR Shekhinah YOU HAVE GIVEN US, O LORD, OUR GOD, THE TORAH which is LIFE, LOVE AND GOODNESS AND LOVING-KINDNESS, RIGHTEOUSNESS AND MERCY AND BLESSING AND PEACE all taken together. Imploring you to BLESS YOUR PEOPLE AT ALL TIMES WITH YOUR PEACE, praise and blessing. BLESSED are YOU, O LORD, WHO YOU BLESS your PEOPLE ISRAEL WITH PEACE.

Renderings. The rendering of 'face' by 'Shekhinah' is unsurprising and referred to (including the idea of light) in Salih's commentary to Tikhlal Es hayyim (I, 48a). 'Life' is qualified as 'long and good life'.

The targumist's treatment of the list of divine gifts can be read in two ways. The first is: you have given us...the Torah, which is life, and you have also given us love and goodness etc. Or it can be read: ...the Torah, which is life. love, goodness etc. In the latter case all the members of the list after Torah, or at least the

¹⁷³ Salih, Tikhlal Es hayyim. I, 47b, makes a point of linking the disparate occurrences of the 'life' theme within XVIII.
first three, are identified as facets of Torah. The emphatic ‘all
taken together’ (מהלך כל נפש), with its second appearance of the
(OAM) term ‘together’, seems to support such an
interpretation. Otherwise, only ‘life’ is identified as an aspect of
the gift of Torah, which certainly finds parallels within the Amidah
tradition in that some versions combine Torah and life (and
several other pairs of words) into a genitive compound. The
Ashkenazi version reads: ‘the Torah of life, and the love of
loving-kindness, and righteousness, and blessing...’. But the
intimate link between life and Torah is mainstream rabbinic
thinking (often found as an interpretation of Prov. 3:18), and
Abudarham, who quotes a text without genitive link, makes the
point anyway. Knowledge of these or similar links between the
first two members of the list might have served as an inspiration
for the targumist, even if he meant to present all of the terms as
facets of Torah.

The attitude of appeal is given prominence, both by the
added ‘imploring you’ towards the end and by the additional terms
of address at the beginning (it is interesting that the term ‘king’ is
here admitted to a targumic addition, see section C.1. below).

The term ‘in your eyes’ is not represented; ‘Israel’ is left out
from the phrase ‘your people Israel’.

Speech background. We have the standard introductory speech
report and a second person ‘you’ perspective in the Hatimah. The
alternation between the first person singular and plural forms
reflects partly the plural OAM suffixes (which do not agree with
the grammatical singular of ‘assembly of Israel’, but are
nevertheless taken over in TAM), but also manifests an oscillation
between a collective and individual treatment of the assembly of
Israel.

Coherence. The Berakhah is formally linked to the preceding one
with the conjunction וְלִכְבָּשׁ, ‘therefore, thus’ (cp. VI and XI).

174 Salih, Tikhlal Es hayyim (I, 48a), speculates on the significance of the six terms
appearing (in that text of the Amidah) alongside the opening ‘Torah’, taking them as
denoting the totality of the commandments.

175 Baer, Avodat Israel (note 159), 103.

176 This genitive compound is not found in any of the Yemenite Amidah versions
available to me, nor in Maimonides or Saadya (Siddur R. Saadya Gaon, note 55, 17). Of
the three manuscripts representing Amram in Hedegard’s edition, two have the genitive
link, one does not (Seder R. Amram Gaon, I [note 51], Hebrew 38).

177 Commenting on the word ‘life’, he says: ‘This is the Torah, according to what it
says “For that is your life and the length of your days”’ (Deut. 30:20), Sefer Abudarham,
58.

178 The list of terms itself differs slightly in the sources, with seven to nine members in
the Yemenite OAM texts compared. TAM’s nine-member list is also found in Rylands
Gaster H 4, fol. 9a, offering the same terms in a different sequence.
Psalm 19:15 and Psalm 119:168 ‘MAY FIND FAVOUR before the master of the universe THE WORD OF MY MOUTH AND THE RECITATION OF MY HEART BEFORE YOU, O LORD our God, MY strength AND MY REDEMPTION’, WHO MAKES PEACE in his familia, between Michael and Gabriel, [and] may you MAKE PEACE IN your MERCY FOR US AND FOR ALL your people ISRAEL, O faithful God.

Renderings and concepts. The ‘rock’ metaphor is dissolved into ‘my strength’ (in I and XVIII ‘shield’ was treated in the same way), and see Quotation. The idea of peace in God’s ‘upper realm’ (המוריים in OAM) is applied to the notion of the divine ‘familia’ of angels, naming perhaps the two angels most intimately linked with Israel179, presumably as leaders of angelic camps.180 The phrase ‘he makes peace in his upper realm’ is the subject of rabbinic interpretation in its biblical setting of Job 25:2. The two elements ‘dominion’ and ‘fear’ appearing in that verse are identified as Michael and Gabriel, and it is between them that God makes peace.181 A talmudic passage, furthermore, employs the ‘peace’ motif while using the familia terminology. In bBer 16b–17a, R. Safra is quoted as having concluded the Amidah with: ‘May it be your will, O Lord our God, to establish peace in the familia above and in the familia below, and among the disciples who occupy themselves with your Torah...’182 The Zohar adopts this statement almost verbatim, in speaking of the last Berakhah (II, 262a). It also connects the customary three steps while saying ‘He who makes peace’ with the three angels, Michael, Gabriel and Rafael (III, 307b).183

179 Michael is the guardian angel of Israel. Occasionally, however, it is Gabriel. See P. Schäfer, Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen (note 119), 22f, 30, 54f, 63 and note 141 (on Gabriel).

180 Schäfer, op. cit., 47f.

181 Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana 1,3 (ed. Mandelbaum, 5). A number of passages in earlier literature relating to these two angels are loosely collected in S. A. Horodezky, ‘Michael und Gabriel’, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, 72, (NF 36) (1928), 499–506.

182 The notion of familia in rabbinic sources and works of early Jewish mysticism (Heikhalot) has been examined by P.S. Alexander in his ‘The family of Caesar and family of God’, in L. Alexander (ed.), Images of empire (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 276–97. Both bBer16b–17a and bSan 99b, another pertinent passage, are discussed 282f.

183 This latter point highlights another dimension of the mention of angels at the end of the Amidah: the idea that angels transport Israel’s prayer before God (see for the earlier period P. Schäfer, Rivalität [note 119], 29f, 70). The two angels mentioned in TAM are singled out for this in yBer IX, 13a: ‘When trouble comes upon man, he shall not cry to Michael nor to Gabriel, but to me he shall cry and I answer him immediately’ (cp. Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 19). However, it does not seem to me that TAM is expressing this aspect.
The expression ‘in his (TAM: your) mercy’ in the last sentence is found in some Yemenite versions of OAM; Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 49b has both this and an additional ‘in his loving-kindness’. The last word after XIX is in the Yemenite sources followed by the word ‘Amen’, which is taken up by the targumic ‘faithful (מחיימנו) God’.

Coherence (internal). Similar to the beginning of the Amidah, its end is marked by a biblical quotation, Ps. 19:15 (Eng. v. 14). TAM links this text to the concluding prayer line ‘He who makes peace’ with the help of the relative pronoun (ו). On a much smaller scale, the targumist here parallels his concern for integrating Ps. 51:17 into the text of I.

Quotation. The rendering of the Psalm verse is – even apart from the additions – not identical with that found in the Targum of Psalms (but the rendering of ‘my rock’ as ‘my strength’ is shared).

Analogies of redemption. There is here, as in II and VII, a structure which outlines a comparison between what God is asked to do with Israel and what he is doing or expected to do in his own realm (i.e. with his familia), namely grant peace. This doubling is, however, given in OAM itself.

The text at the end of the Amidah. In Tikhlal Es hayyim, I, 48b–49b, the final ‘He who makes peace’ is separated from the end of XIX by the short prayer ‘My God, guard my tongue...' (מליח נתן), while the biblical line ‘May find favour’ comes twice, once after XIX and once at the end of the added prayer. A similar arrangement is found in the Ashkenazi prayer books.

C. THE ART OF TARGUM IN TAM

1. RENDERINGS
We have collected much detailed information about TAM in the preceding pages. It is now time to take the analysis, mostly under the descriptive headings used in B, a little further by looking at TAM as a whole, pointing to targumic tendencies. Concerning TAM’s rendering technique, which we only need to consider

---

185 On this prayer, ascribed in bBer 17a to Mar b. Rabina, see above note 49.
186 Where ‘My God, guard my tongue’ comes immediately after XIX, see Baer, Avodat Israel (note 159), 104.
insofar as it is non-literal, just about every phenomenon registered for TAM can also be found in the Scripture targums.\textsuperscript{187} We have seen the targumist react exegetically to apparent redundancy of expressions, to cases of ambiguous meaning of terms (e.g. הַתּוֹלֵךְ in I, נָשָׁה in II and XIII), and — very prominently — to the use of metaphors in OAM.\textsuperscript{188} Besides, we find the targumist display regular interest in the internal coherence of Berakhot, and occasionally of whole neighbouring Berakhot. In these two realms of reading and rewording the original Hebrew, the targumist reflects genuine targumic competence and concerns.

However, a comparison of the targumist’s handling of the small-scale syntactic relationships with Scripture targums (in particular those on the Pentateuch) also shows an interesting difference. Conveying non-literal meanings (i.e. producing renderings whose meaning is palpably different from that of the original word or phrase) is achieved in Pentateuch targums either by replacing a given Hebrew term with a non-literal counterpart, or by surrounding such a term, while translating it literally, with new, additional, co-text (thus altering, bending or narrowing down its original meaning).\textsuperscript{189} The modifications of meaning achieved by the latter means can be radical and far-reaching, in particular if they take the form of an added genitive complement\textsuperscript{190} or direct verbal object.\textsuperscript{191} Now, we find quite a number of changes in the shadowing parts of TAM which stay within the syntactic framework given in the Hebrew, but only very few of them, as far as I can see, are used to achieve a striking change of meaning.

\textsuperscript{187} A concise account of the targumic genre, conceived as dedicated exegetical rewording of Scripture in Aramaic, would need to mention that its often radical rewording is informed by a group of rabbinic background assumptions about the biblical text as divine communication. These assumptions entail that the text is emphatically meaningful at any given point, contains no non-truths, internal inconsistencies or mere repetition, and that its semantics are only partly known from human Hebrew (cp. on this Samely, ‘Scripture’s implicature: the midrashic assumptions of relevance and consistency’, \textit{Journal of Semitic Studies}, 37, no. 2 [1992], 167-205). The interpretative results sanctioned by these assumptions are, in targum, written back into the framework of the original (i.e. they do not generate meta-linguistic statements as in midrash), often integrating post-biblical notions into the (usually) narrative result. On the notions and themes expressed in this way, see, for example, A. Shinan, \textit{The embroidered Targum: The aggadah in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch} (Heb.), (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992); E. Levine, \textit{The Aramaic version of the Bible: contents and context} (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988).

\textsuperscript{188} Cp. the articles by Böhl cited in note 46.

\textsuperscript{189} See Samely, \textit{Interpretation of speech}, 30f, 175-9.

\textsuperscript{190} Consider the case of the Deut. 25:7 phrase: ‘his brother's wife shall go up to the gate to the elders’, rendered in Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan and Onkelos as ‘his brother's wife shall go up to the gate of the Bet Din ...’ (cp. \textit{Interpretation of speech}, 21).

\textsuperscript{191} In Num. 25:7, it is said of Pinhas that he ‘saw, and he rose up ...’; Pseudo-Jonathan's modifications of this verse include the following phrase: ‘When he saw that they were silent, he rose up ...’ (see \textit{Interpretation of speech}, 47 for this example, and 42ff and 80 for the phenomenon).
Perhaps the only clear examples are ‘SLEEPERS of Hebron’ found in II, ‘JUDGES of truth’ in XI and ‘THE TORAH which is LIFE’ in XIX. But of these, the latter is prefigured by an original genitive compound, and the second example comes from a Scripture targum (Isa. 1:26). Many other inner-syntactic changes are found which take the form of attributive (‘ABRAHAM, your friend’, I) or adverbial additions (‘SICK upon their couches’, II), and none of these use the scope of added co-text to impart a strongly different meaning to the text. This seems to me to be linked with the relative frequency, in shadowing sections, of additional text taking the form of whole clauses and sentences, and in particular with the existence of derivative compositions in TAM. On the one hand, the latter’s freedom to express new meaning obviates the necessity for some of the more radical modifications within the shadowing section; on the other, the author’s adoption of a style of targum which allows for derivative composition might in itself indicate a lack of competence or taste for the filigree-work of imparting ‘strong’ readings at close syntactic range. The disposition to achieve maximum exegetical effect by miniscule means seems diminished in TAM (and this holds true to a certain extent already for the Hagiographa targums which are likely to have served as TAM’s main models).

A certain hesitancy can be observed in the rendering of divine epithets. There is a tendency to replace the word ‘king’ by ‘lord’ (in VI, VII, XVI), but it is by no means comprehensive (‘king’ is represented in I, II, III, XI and used in a targumic addition in XIX). A similar picture emerges for ‘father’, which is not used at all except in the Hebrew quotation of V, i.e. avoided in the rendering of V and VI (and see note 111). The most frequent expressions used to refer to God in targumic additions are ‘lord’ and ‘lord/master of the world/universe’) and variations of these (e.g. ‘our lord’). A final
facet of the translation style is the fact that individual lexemes or whole phrases which we must presume to have been contained in the targumist’s Vorlage do not appear in TAM (e.g. the divine attribute ‘great’ in I). In most cases, no special reasons for these occasional omissions (noted at the end of the Renderings sections in part B) are discernible, but, if we are not to assume a coincidental pattern of textual corruption, we must conclude that the targumic style adopted for TAM allowed for them, just as in the case of the targums to the Hagiographa (see section A. 7 above and note 27).

Before leaving the topic of translation techniques in the narrower sense, we need to address the influence on TAM’s wording of the Palestinian recension of the Amidah, which came up repeatedly in our discussion. Do the parallels documented make it probable that some version of this type of OAM, known to us from Genizah finds, was accessible to the targumist? Let us review the evidence, starting with the recurrent targumic structures. We found parallels in the Palestinian versions for negated comparisons in II and III, and for a reference to the past in V. As seen above, however, these are potential structural elements of Jewish prayer texts in general, and may say more about ‘popular’ tendencies of the Palestinian Amidah than about any influence on TAM; moreover, TAM employs them often where there is no Palestinian parallel. Of a somewhat similar nature — a natural enough development in the context — is the appearance of a contrast with the fate of the wicked in the Berakhah on the righteous, XII. More important are, perhaps, specific observations on wording: a phrase absent from TAM in II (‘you are great to redeem’) is also absent from the Palestinian text; the shared uses of ‘finish’ in XIV, ‘to do with us’ in XVIII. But again, the evidence is far from compelling. The first of these is a negative parallel; the second is also found in the Qaddish, and the last is not very exact and presupposes the isolation of a single phrase. In the absence of many other, and more central, Palestinian features from TAM, the question can in any case only be whether the targumist had also access to a Palestinian Amidah. On the whole, the parallels noted do not seem to me to warrant such a conclusion.

2. SPEECH REPORTS
Turning now to the targumist’s interpretative vision for larger passages or whole Berakhot, his most important recurrent strategy is the reporting of OAM as speech. Of the nineteen Berakhot of the Amidah, seventeen contain at least one speech report (i.e. clauses containing a verbum dicendi introducing direct or indirect
speech), the utterance thus being introduced representing all or part of the wording of OAM in a targumic rendering. The exceptions are XIII and XV. These either constitute a break in the pattern, or we must assume the absence of a speech report to be an expression of the strength of coherence prevailing between them and the immediately preceding Berakhot (see XIII and XV *Coherence*). Looking at the point in the text where the speech report makes its appearance, the following picture emerges: it is found at the beginning of the Berakhah eight times; to introduce the Hatimah alone twice, or where there is also another speech report, five times; somewhere in the body of the Berakah, or near its beginning, five times; and to introduce the shadowing mode in Berakhot which also have a derivative composition section, six times. All in all, there appear 25 speech reports in the text of 17 Berakhot. It is clear from even this rudimentary classification that the speech report does, functionally speaking, two things: it constitutes a targumic comment on the Amidah as direct speech, and it segments the texts of both OAM and TAM. We shall address these two aspects in turn. In looking first at the interpretation of OAM as direct speech, it is useful to separate (a) the speech report structure itself from (b) the narrative information it carries; afterwards we shall turn to (c) its segmentative function.

(a) *From uttering the utterance to reporting the utterance*

Placing text into quotation marks is a way of distancing one’s own voice from the text thus quoted and of turning whatever speech act would be performed by uttering the text into a report of such a speech act. This is basically what the targumist does by prefacing the OAM text with speech reports. OAM contains the wording of a prayer; whatever else it takes to perform a prayer, uttering this wording is part of it. TAM contains the wording of reports of people uttering the words of the prayer that constituted OAM.

Put differently, to utter TAM is not to utter a prayer – at least not in the same way in which uttering OAM could constitute prayer in an immediate sense. What does or does not constitute the wording of a prayer cannot be decided just by looking at the grammar of a text. If an example were needed, the Shema furnishes it. Whatever the contextual parameters are which turn the Shema into a prayer, that is, something spoken by Israel and

198 The details are as follows. Speech report in the first sentence of the Berakhah: III (‘know’), VIII, X, XI, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX; in the second sentence: VI, IX; introducing a derivative composition section: VII, IX; in mid-narrative: V; introducing the shadowing section: IV, V, VI, VII, X, XII; related to the Hatimah only: I, II; related to the Hatimah in addition to elsewhere in the Berakhah: III, IV, V, X, XII. See below section 2(c) on segmentation.
addressed to God, it is not the speech perspective actually engraved in the text, for that goes in the other direction. In a similar sense, to say that TAM, just because it contains report on prayer, could not itself be used as prayer, would be jumping to conclusions; there is probably no foretelling the pragmatic uses of a text from its grammatical or literary structures. What we can say, however, is that while OAM is the speech of whoever utters its words to God, TAM is in most instances speech about that speech, without God being addressed by the voice in TAM. This is at least compatible with the notion that the function of TAM is basically exegetical and meta-linguistic – it does not emulate the prayer structure of OAM; in fact it eliminates it to a certain extent. In other words, it is compatible with the hypothesis that the function of TAM is radically different from OAM, the former being discursive where the latter is liturgical. We are on familiar ground here. By analogy, the Pentateuch targums could be called ‘narrative’ only by way of a first approximation: their narrative quality turns out to be a function of their wording dependence on a narrative text (the Pentateuch), while the targumic text is determined by exegetical (and thus discursive) concerns, not narrative ones. TAM’s endeavour is in more than one way profoundly related to the concerns of Scripture targums.

(b) Narrative embeddedness of speech
All the above would be true even if the speech reports used by the targumist would give no other information than: ‘someone said: “OAM”’. In fact, TAM offers much more than this. The targumist often embeds the speech report in an historical narrative, and even where he does not do so, the terms appearing in the speech report itself conjure up a context into which the utterance was spoken (e.g. the ‘assembly of Israel’, reported as having spoken in the past, or indeed someone speaking in the future, see below C.5.). In supplying further context for speech which, in the eye of the exegete, is not supplied with ‘enough’ context in the original, and thus being able to interpret it decisively even without modifying its wording much, the targumist is in good targumic company, and we have outlined the basic parallels above in A. 7. The case, however, is not quite comparable, for in the Pentateuch

199 Samely, Interpretation of speech, in particular 54ff, 179f, 182f.
200 It seems very possible that the author of TAM chose the reported speech device also to distance the targumic text from the liturgical function of the Amidah, just as the liturgical function of the Scriptural reading in the synagogue was expressly not taken over by the Targum. This tallies with the pointed use of the wording of the Amidah meant for individual prayer (see above III Concepts). All this still does not amount to a proof that TAM could not have been used liturgically – as suggested above, no such proof is possible on the basis of the internal evidence of the text alone.
201 See also note 109.
the quoted speech of biblical heroes is embedded into a narrative text identifying and introducing it. And almost all the biblical books which consist of text in the first/second person speech perspective are prefaced by some narrative framework including a speech report. OAM, however, is a different sort of text: it consists of extended direct speech using first and second person pronouns, without any identification of the speaker or the situation of utterance.

In some biblical texts the narrative framework consists merely of a minimalist speech report and nothing else, e.g. in Proverbs or the Song of Songs. In such cases, the literary nature of the book as perceived by a reader with an historical perspective is likely not to be fundamentally affected by the framework. However, in the rabbinic view of things, these utterances are firmly embedded in the story of Israel, and targumic exegesis reflects this strongly. But the names contained in the speech reports introducing such books mean more than the allocation of utterances to a period in Israel: when ascribed to prophets like Solomon and David (Psalms), they can open up other speakers’ perspectives and past or future situations of speaking. The Song of Song begins with the elliptic speech report ‘Song of Songs, which is Solomon’s’ – it could hardly be briefer. But ‘which is Solomon’s’ is all the targumist needs, for Solomon ‘the prophet’, speaking ‘in the spirit of prophecy’ (Targum Song of Songs 1:1) can assume the voice of the ‘assembly of Israel’ in different ages besides his own. Not even such a minimal (let alone a prophetic) speech report is available in OAM. There is only one self-contained text in the Hebrew Bible which stands in formal parallel to OAM: Lamentations. But after what we have said so far, it would occasion no surprise even if we did not have the precedent of the

202 On the Psalm headings as results of inner-biblical exegesis, see M. Fishbane, Biblical interpretation in ancient Israel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 403–7. An example of a text from antiquity employing a first person/second person perspective without any speech-report framework is Plato’s Apologia. Socrates’ voice in this text is speaking from the first to the last sentence, without any external, narrative embedding, and without being directly identified.

203 See John Barton’s illuminating account of the way ‘we’ read the book of Proverbs, not as a narrative with an inordinate amount of reflective-discursive material, but as a text of fundamentally reflective-discursive nature with a short narrative introduction. Reading the Old Testament. Method in biblical study (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1984), 132. This is very precisely one of the points at which rabbinic reading differs: the short introduction which provides the only linkage of sentences of apparently story-transcending general import to the story of Israel must be made the pivot of interpretation.

204 A delightfully subtle example of such a construction of voices can be found in David Qimhi’s commentary on Psalm 122. There (122:1) he explains that David (in whose days the Temple was not yet) anticipated, presumably with prophetic foresight, the perspective and voice of the Israelites in exile (in whose days the Temple was no more) recalling the perspective and voice of the pilgrims to Jerusalem during Temple times.
Septuagint to discover that Targum Lamentations 1:1 contains a speech report. Instead of exclaiming ‘Ekhah’, the targumist reports (really ‘reasons!’): ‘Jeremiah the prophet and High Priest said: “Ekhah”’. This is the precise transformation the author of TAM applies to OAM.

Let us now look at just what the information is which the targumist conveys in his speech reports. We have already drawn attention to the targumist’s treatment of requests and their presuppositions (asking for knowledge in IV, for return to Torah and Service in V, for blessings in IX, for judges in XI). As for the choice of speaker, nothing could be more plausible than the ‘assembly of Israel’ (in VIII–XII, XIV, XVI–XIX), with its very strong connotation of the congregation in prayer, quite apart from any resonances which the choice of this group might evoke in targumic (Targum Song of Songs), general theological and qabbalistic literature. The assembly of Israel is a hero potentially present in all parts of the one story of Israel, and someone who is at the same time identifiable with the praying congregation whose main utterance is being interpreted by the targumist in the past as well as in the present. Where deviating from this basic choice in favour of a narrower identification, the targumist shows some care, as when naming ‘all above and below’ as speakers of III and ‘the righteous’ (also occurring in I) as those of XII. Other speakers appearing in TAM are Israel as redeemed from exile (II) and Israel while in exile (V); ‘we’ (absolute in VII, in addition to the more specific speakers in V), man (IV, ‘he’, later transformed into ‘we’); Ezra and the Great Assembly (V ‘fixing’ the prayer), the ‘Fellows’ (VI ‘establishing’ it), and ‘all creatures’ are said to be obliged to bless in VIII.

The narrative–‘historical’ information given in TAM is, we have seen, tailored to fit OAM, OAM being taken as an utterance reflecting certain situational parameters. In contrast to the Pentateuch targums, but in parallel to Targum Song of Songs, the

205 Note, however, that it is just the Yemenite tradition of Targum Lamentations which represents at this point a ‘corrected’ version of the targum, see van der Heide, The Yemenite tradition (note 18), 30. On cases of targumic “the prophet said” in general, see R.P. Gordon, ‘Targum as midrash: contemporizing in the Targum to the Prophets’, Proceedings of the ninth world congress of Jewish studies: Bible studies and ancient Near East (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 61–73, here at 64f.

206 In other words, in every Berakhah from VIII which has a speech report at all.

207 One exegetical strategy belonging to the cluster of techniques exploiting the speech status of a text not found in TAM (while present in other interpretations of the Amidah) is the placement of one of the Berakhot (or Hatimot) into a biblical situation as a response to something said there. A targumic example is provided by Pseudo-Jonathan’s version of Deut. 6:4 (a biblical-liturgical text!) which is placed in the context of Gen. 49 (similar Neofiti, see Samely, Interpretation of speech, 74, 172). And Azriel of Gerona (Commentaire [note 36], 109) places the Hatimah of IV – as an exclamation of the upper ones – into the context of Ex. 3:15 (for the choice of speaker, compare the Aggadat tefillah shemonah ‘esreh, note 66).

208 Cp. Samely, Interpretation of speech, 9ff, 166.
provision of such narrative background is not constrained by a biblical narrative structure already surrounding the utterance. The individual Berakhot of OAM, just as the individual verses (or dialogue utterances) of the Song of Songs, do not carry narrative determination. In both cases, the targumists find the situational background in the history of Israel. In the case of the Scripture targums, the context of such a choice is a longstanding exegetical tradition which links the apparently general and vague passages in the Hagiographa with events narrated in the early parts of the Bible, a manifestation of the rabbinic insistence on biblical coherence. In the case of TAM, the same tradition cannot have applied in the strict sense (the Amidah is no part of the Hebrew Bible). And the selection of historical scenes found in TAM quite neglects the classical sources for situational contexts, Pentateuch/Joshua-Kings, concentrating instead either on exilic (Ezekiel) and post-exilic (Ezra) biblical sources, or drawing on non-biblical situations altogether (Men of the Great Assembly). It is clear that such a shift of period goes hand in hand with TAM’s pursuit of the exile theme, which in turn reflects a prominent facet of OAM itself. In other words, we find the targumist applying a ‘classical’ exegetical approach while taking account of the different status and requirements of the base text.

However, the targumic energy in supplying historical detail is uneven, and in the second half of the Amidah reduced to providing the ‘assembly of Israel’ as speaker, perhaps with the idea that the speech background in those Berakhot is much the same as the ones sketched earlier (in particular in V). There is no attempt to create a chronology of situations (as, for example, in Targum Song of Songs, where neighbouring verses are used to develop narrative sequences of speech, as in 1:4-8). A similar difference emerges when comparing TAM to two other dedicated treatments of the Amidah which link its speech with biblical-historical events, the Aggadat tefillah shemoneh ‘esreh and the hymnic Amidah paraphrase ascribed to Saadya. In both of these, the biblical scenes chosen are in chronological order, and start with early biblical history (the patriarchal link of the opening Berakhah is inviting in this respect). This also means that both of these are much concerned with justifying the sequence of the Berakhot within the Amidah, a theme prominent in Amidah exegesis from early times (see e.g. bMeg 17b-18a), but not of major importance.

209 See notes 66 and 79, respectively. Saadya’s hymn has the sequence Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Pinchas, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Jehosaphat, Isaiah, Hezekiah, Jonah, Hananiah/Mishael/Azariah, Daniel, Daniel and the companions. As for the Aggadat tefillah shemoneh ‘esreh, it is that work’s declared aim (page 54) to explain the sequence of the Berakhot.
to TAM (see, however, the Coherence entries in part B). TAM, instead of allocating situational settings of speech in the chronology of events according to the position of a Berakhah in the Amidah sequence, chooses these situations according to the OAM wording — in this respect being similar to Targum Song of Songs, which has no qualms offering repetitions in the chronology (compare 1:4ff with 1:10ff) when the wording requires it.

With regard to the way the speaking is characterized by choice of the *verba dicendi,* the most frequent of them, ‘to say’ (IV, VII, VIII, X–XIV, XVI–XIX), is neutral. But it is often qualified by adverbs, or supplemented by verbs, which belong to the semantic field of prayer, such as ‘give thanks’ (I, XIII, XIV, XVIII), ‘bless’ (I, II, IV, V, VIII, IX — in particular in conjunction with the Hatimah wording, see below section C. 5.), ‘praise’ (II), ‘pray’ (IV, VI, VII, IX), and, no less prayer-related: ‘fix/establish’ (V, VI). This list only includes **verba dicendi** which can be brought into some direct connection with the speech reports concerning OAM material; if all appearances of speech events mentioned otherwise were to be counted, the number of expressions of this type would increase considerably. The frequency of terms of entreaty should also be noted (see the list in note 40).

**(c) Segmenting the text**

The speech reports appear often at strategic places in the text. In particular, they indicate the way the targumist segmented, for his exegetical purposes, the flow of OAM. In this they resemble the use of lemmata, except that the lemmata (in parallel to those of Scripture targums) do not form part of the meaning of TAM’s sentences. The lemmata show that TAM’s equivalent of the biblical verse is the individual Berakhah. And the placement of speech reports confirms this to a certain extent. Of the seventeen Berakhot containing speech reports, nine (III [‘know’], VIII, X, XI, XIV, XVI–XIX) open with a speech report. And the fact that we find near-identical speech reports at the beginning of neighbouring Berakhot (i.e. the speech report is reported although there is no change in speaker or speech situation) also shows that the Berakhah is a unit of rendering.

Speech reports, however, also mark text segments within the Berakhah. In five cases the Hatimah is allocated a separate speech report (III, IV, V, X, XII) and in two further Berakhot the

---

210 Samely, *Interpretation of speech*, 130f.

211 It is of course not necessary that the number of speech reports should approximate the number of units of rendering. The targumist could, for example, have chosen one situation of speaking for the whole of the Amidah as one speech (as we indeed seem to have two cases of two neighbouring Berakhot ‘sharing’ one speech report [XII–XIII and XIV–XVI]), while still indicating the units by lemmata for the individual Berakhah.
Hatimah attracts the only speech report (I, II). In other words, the position of speech reports shows that the targumist perceived the Hatimah as forming a definite sub-unit of the Berakhah. This is not merely a statement about the form of the Berakhah; in these speech reports the targumist spells out the relationship between the Berakhah and its Hatimah (see below section 5).

Furthermore the targumist places speech reports at the beginning of segments of the composition of TAM itself. In two cases, they mark the beginning of the derivative composition section of a Berakhah (VII, IX); and in six they introduce the shadowing (IV, V, VI, VII, X, XII). In the latter cases, the speech report signals the beginning of something new (without making an exegetical statement on OAM), i.e. it has a text-organizing function (and see next section). 212

3. TARGUMIC MODES
We have paid constant attention to the quantitative-structural relationship between TAM and OAM, classifying the targumic text into ‘derivative composition’ and ‘shadowing’. It remains now to address the conspicuous phenomenon that nine Berakhot of TAM (II, IV, V-X, XII) offer both forms of representation side by side. We cannot discuss this phenomenon properly, however, without looking once again at the position of the speech reports. It turns out that all Berakhot which have both derivative composition and shadowing introduce the latter with a speech report of its own. In other words, where the targumist represents material of OAM twice, he represents it first in describing the situation of speaking and then again in the speech itself. This is quite a complex literary-exegetical constellation: derivative and shadowing mode are juxtaposed, the first functioning as (narrative, or in the case of IV, discursive) context, the second as ‘verbatim’ quotation of an utterance, while the point of transition is marked by a targumic speech report. This finds a precise formal parallel in the following passage from Targum Song of Songs, 2:14:

My dove in the clefts of the rock, in the secret places of the cliff, let me see your countenance, let me hear your voice; for sweet is your voice, and your countenance is comely.

TARGUM: And when Pharaoh the wicked ran after the people of Israel the assembly of Israel resembled a

212 There are also other recurrent signals for the transition between derivative composition and shadowing, e.g. the particle ‘now’, the repetition of lexemes that have appeared earlier, or the use of entreaty formulae.
Dove shut up in clefts of a rock, and a serpent was troubling her from inside, and a hawk was troubling her from outside. Thus the assembly of Israel was shut in from all four directions, for before them was the sea and behind them there was the pursuing enemy and from their two sides the desert filled with quick serpents which bite and kill man with their poison. And immediately did she [the assembly] open her mouth in prayer before the Lord, and a bat qol came from the heavens above and said thus: Oh you assembly of Israel, who resemble the dove which is pure and hidden in enclosures of the cleft of the rock and in the secret places of the cliffs, show me your countenance and your upright deeds, let me hear your voice, for your voice is sweet in prayer in the lesser sanctuary and your countenance is beautiful through good works.

The partial 'doubling' of the original (in this scriptural case, and in the case of the Amidah) in the targumic version is a consequence of the basic exegetical choice to take the original as direct speech to be placed in a context. And while it is not an automatic result of such a decision it makes good interpretative sense: it uses the information contained in the utterance a first time for the reconstruction and description of the situation in which the utterance could have been performed plausibly, and then for the representation of the utterance wording itself.

Turning now to the diachronic view, the question could be asked: do these structural differences testify to paths of text growth? In particular, could it be that a targumic 'base' consisting of shadowing (with or without speech report introduction) was enlarged at a later stage by derivative compositions (whose wordiness we have noted again and again)? Let us look at the Berakhot one by one. I, II, and III do not seem to offer much opportunity of separating text out; IV introduces the shadowing with a speech report that is linked to the derivative composition ('and', 'he'); but the shadowing itself could be detached. The same holds true for V and VI. In VII, the phrase 'poor daughter and son' within the shadowing makes a separation impossible, while VIII is composed partly of both modes. IX, X, XI and XII are like IV-VI in that the shadowing itself, if not usually its introduction (speech report or 'and now' plus entreaty formula), could be independent. XIII-XIX do not contain derivative compositions, and insofar as they have initial speech reports (all except XIII and XV), those could be detached. It is clear from this that not all Berakhot could have grown in the same way. And even some of
those whose shadowing section could be detached contain the
element which in other Berakhot is linked to the derivative
composition mode, namely a speech report (linked to the Hatimah,
it is found in IV, V, IX, X, XII). Scriptural quotation is another
structural element found in derivative compositions which makes
its appearance also in several of those detachable shadowing
sections (X, XI, XII, XIV). In other words, it does not seem likely
that either one of the targumic modes, or indeed one of the two
main structural devices of TAM (speech report and scriptural
quotation), has precedence in the growth of the text, or
alternatively, could be separated out as a secondary acquisition.
The internal evidence is thus compatible with the assumption that
the document was created as a whole, and presumably by one
author. What then about our starting observation, namely the
wordiness and lack of clarity of those parts of TAM which are not
governed by strict exegetical purpose? The answer may lie in the
question whether the discipline imposed by shadowing is not
stylistic, but exegetical, and this might well render any stylistic
comparisons between shadowing and derivative composition
meaningless. Also, convoluted targumic additions are not unheard
of even in the Pentateuch targums, despite the fact that shadowing
prevails in them, reducing the scope for free formulation. 213

4. USE OF QUOTATIONS
Explicit quotations from Scripture appearing in TAM are of two
types: those illustrating or supporting a part of TAM whose
meaning is not found in OAM, and those confirming a proposition
found in OAM. Let us deal with the latter case first. Bringing
together the wording of OAM with is biblical ‘antecedents’ or
‘sources’ or ‘proof-texts’ is one of the basic modes of Amidah
exegesis (and indeed part of historical Amidah scholarship214).
Abudarham’s commentary on the Amidah consists over long
stretches of such linking: a lemma from OAM is followed by the
phrase נְבֹעַ יִתְיַּעֲרָה (‘because of, according to, on account of’)
introducing a scriptural quotation which has the same meaning or
uses the same words. The use of scriptural quotations is a
conspicuous device of interpretation and composition also in the
reworking of the Amidah ascribed to Saadya Gaon.215 In this
regularly structured hymnic piece in Hebrew each of the nineteen

213 There is, for example, Neofiti’s version of Gen. 15:1 (see Samely, Interpretation of
speech, 62), and the repetitiveness of Neofiti Gen. 44:18.
214 Cp. e.g. Kohler’s procedure in ‘The origin and composition’ (note 105).
215 Zulay, The liturgical poetry (note 79); Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the
synagogue, 37-45.
Hatimot is preceded by a quotation from Scripture; none of these quotations is marked as such (i.e. there are no quotation formulae like ‘as it is written’). All these quotations are, in their biblical setting, direct speech; in other words, they manifest the second/first person markers of direct address (of God), and thus blend in with the mode of address of the Amidah paraphrase itself. Their scriptural character is thus not underlined through formal means, which of course does not undermine their ‘probative’ effect as biblical quotation, since they would be recognized as biblical by the reader. However, this also means that they are used by Saadya as a literary device, not a proof-text.

However, quoting Scripture is not restricted to speech about prayer. Biblical quotations are an integral part of certain central liturgical texts (e.g. Isa. 6:3 in the Qedushah), and the citation of biblical passages as ‘proof-texts’ is found regularly in prayers. In other words, here as in other respects, the targumist does not introduce an alien element into the Amidah, even though no model for the explicit quotation of Scripture is found in OAM. The general function of explicit quotations (i.e. citations which are introduced as scriptural) in TAM could be defined as ‘support’ or ‘proof’ of certain statements, for the act of marking a proposition as coming from Scripture in a text that is not itself part of Scripture highlights its authoritative status and forms part of an argument function. However, as we said above the propositions thus supported in TAM are of two different kinds: some are original to OAM, others are targumic additions to OAM. Neh. 13:24 in V is meant to show the extent of the loss of Hebrew, a topic that has no original link to the Amidah text, and Isa. 63:4/Ps. 58:11 also mainly underpin secondary targumic claims in XII. Isa. 1:26 in XI, on the other hand, has a direct verbal and thematic link to the original form of XI, thus supporting an original statement, and the same is true of Isa. 27:13 in X and I Kgs. 6:13 in XIV. Almost all of these quotations are statements with predictive or promissory character, pronouncing on a future state of affairs. The only exception is Neh. 13:24 in V, which deals with a past state of affairs, and is thus the only quotation used by the targumist – in the wake of Maimonides – to support his claims regarding the situation of speaking (rather than those concerning the implications of the speech). In being declaratives, all of these sentences differ from the two (undeclared) scriptural quotations which are attached to the beginning and end of the Amidah; for

---

216 On this see Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud*, 236f.
217 Targumic cross-references within Scripture are usually not explicit quotations, and belong to the concern with cohesion, not to the concern with proof for a statement. See Samely, *Interpretation of speech*, 107ff, 171f.
those are requests (concerning the gift of acceptable prayer). Even where the passages cited by the targumist happen to belong to the biblical models or parallels for OAM phrases and propositions, he is not interested in their original – biblical – setting, in order to highlight their meaning from there.

5. PAST AS PARADIGM AND THE ROLE OF PETITION

One of the targumic structures most conspicuously adopted from forms of Jewish prayer in general and the Amidah in particular is the use of references to a paradigmatic past. In this connection, some considerations are pertinent which belong to what could be called the ‘theory’ of prayer, which is expressed in the talmudic and medieval sources prominently in a halakhic perspective. These concern mainly the conventional grouping of Berakhot – ‘praise’, ‘petition’, ‘thanksgiving’ – within the Amidah: any additions to the text of the individual Berakhot are required to leave the character of these groups intact.218 Furthermore there is, once again, the role of the Hatimah. As halakhic problems, the issues are not applicable to TAM (or would only be if TAM was meant to supplant OAM in its liturgical role).219 But they throw some light on tendencies within the fluctuating wording of Jewish prayers which in turn are reflected in TAM.

Explicit references to the paradigmatic past relationship between Israel and God (usually paradigmatic events of redemption) constitute a widespread ‘argument’ pattern in Jewish prayers. Following numerous examples in the statutory prayers from early times onwards,220 the pattern also found strong expression in liturgical poetry.221 By nature, this pattern is one of petitionary prayer, and where such a dimension is unwanted, it

218 The grouping finds only weak support in the actual wording of the Amidah. See below.
219 On this, see above section C 2(a) and note 200. If one is not to believe that the targumist was unaware of the halakhic sensibilities or was unimpressed by them, one has to conclude that he felt that they were not relevant to an Aramaic paraphrase. The function of such a paraphrase clearly is crucial. Saadya Gaon, who had pronounced views on insertions in prayer texts, is thought to be the author of a hymnic paraphrase of the Amidah (see note 79) which is wholly petitionary in character (cp. note 226); but this composition was not meant to supplant the Amidah in a liturgical function (see Heinemann/Petuchowski, Literature of the synagogue, 38).
220 A striking collection of prayer components containing specific references to the past is found in mTaan 2:4–5. On the structure, see Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 155 and 237–40; he determines this prayer ‘rationale’ as ‘reliance on God’s “paradigmatic” actions in the past’ (237). Cp. also Reif, Judaism and Hebrew prayer (note 84), 128, concerning the growth of liturgical matter between the Shema’ and the Amidah.
221 Piyyutim starting with the phrase ‘as you have saved so save now!’ are listed in I. Davidson, Thesaurus of mediaeval Hebrew poetry, vol. 2 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1929), Kaf 108-129. See Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 155.
requires active suppression, as in the case of the Ge‘ullah. God is praised for past paradigmatic acts, but this is done in order to reinforce a plea for a repetition of those acts. In other words, in importing such a scheme, the targumist imports the dimension of petition, which in the case of the first three or last three Berakhot of the Amidah can be seen to undermine their character of ‘praise’ or ‘thanksgiving’, respectively. Popular Jewish prayer practice manifested a tendency to do just that: to hijack, so to speak, any prayer for the purposes of petition. Thanksgiving and praise, once their theme is declared to be the shadow of things to come, take on inevitably the flavour of petition. Liturgical manuscripts and variations in rites amply testify to encroachments on the praise character of prayers. TAM is an expression of the invasion of urgency and anxiety which turns every prayer into a prayer for redemption from exile, and every occasion of worship into an occasion for pleading.

However, not only does the targumist stand in a trend well documented in standard and non-standard forms of Jewish prayers (including OAM); he also delivers a more precise interpretation of those Berakhot which are supposed to be non-petitionary than underlies the conventional classification. In introducing the past as paradigm, he uncovers strata of meaning in the wording which are only silenced, not removed, by labels such as praise or thanksgiving. This is the case with the first Berakhah, where mention of children’s children makes the petitionary point subtly but unmistakably. In saying ‘... just as you have redeemed them ..., so you will in future BRING A REDEEMER ... to redeem THE CHILDREN OF THEIR CHILDREN’, the targumist spells out something that this already there in OAM. Similarly in the case of XVII, one of the Berakhot categorized as thanksgiving: TAM, drawing on the presence of the phrase ‘as of old’, elaborates on that earlier state (albeit briefly), and spells out the request for God’s future acts very clearly. In II, although there is no reference

---

222 The function of the references to the past contained in the Ge‘ullah was determined as that of praise, not that of introducing the theme of future redemption. Crucial for the exclusion of the petitionary dimension is the past tense of the verb בָּהַ in the Hatimah (see bPes 117b). But future perspectives are nevertheless found in Ge‘ullah texts, as documented, e.g. in Wieder, ‘Fourteen new Genizah-fragments’, 250ff (see note 41).

223 See bBer 34a (one should not ask for one’s needs in the first three and last three Berakhot of the Amidah). The position of three ‘praise’ Berkhot at the beginning of the Amidah is linked to a general rule of prayer that God is to be praised first and petitioned afterwards: בָּהַ יִדְּרֵדָא יִדְּרֵדָא לְמָעְקֵד יְהֹואֵון יְהֹואֵון. bAZ 7b–8a. See Wieder ‘Fourteen new Genizah-Fragments’ (note 41), 260 and R. Brody, ‘Saadta Gaon on the limits of liturgical flexibility’ (note 55), 45 and note 37. However, TAM’s treatment of the first three Berakhot seems to acknowledge their different status in another way: with the doubtful exception of VIII, these are the only Berakhah to contain prominent negated comparisons.

224 See also Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud, 34f.

225 Heinemann, 239f.
to the past, the revival of the dead becomes an urgent symbol for
the redemption from exile (see II, Analogies of redemption), and
suddenly the original phrase ‘causing salvation to spring forth’
comes into its own. Among the middle Berakhot, TAM finds two,
IX and XI, which contain prominent references to the past in their
OAM form, and which the targumist is quick to expand upon. He
also introduces the topic into V, VI and perhaps obliquely into X.
But in several of these targumic additions, it is not just a reference
to acts of past redemption that we find, but also a reference to
past prayer (past prayer or worship followed by redemption is
referred to in I, V, VI, and IX). The paradigm takes on a double
aspect, on the one hand of Israel’s petition, on the other of God’s
redemptive acts, and thus it becomes a paradigm for the efficacy of
prayer.226

The targumist’s according priority to close reading over any
received grouping of Berakhot into prayer classes is also visible in
XII and XIV, ‘petition’ Berakhot into which he introduces terms of
thanksgiving (also in I). The basis of this could well be a precise
reading of the Ḥatimah’s present participle form which implies
praise, anticipating, so to speak, the success of the petition.227
The targumist’s treatment of the Ḥatimah, where the latter has its own
speech report, reinforces this observation. In seven cases (I, II, IV,
V, IX, X, XII, and see also XIV, where the speech report is not
linked to the Ḥatimah), the Ḥatimah’s operative verbum dicendi, ‘to
bless’, is introduced as a future utterance, or itself put into the
future tense. Seen in this light, the strategic placement of speech
reports in front of, or into the Ḥatimah, noted above under
Segmentation takes on a striking significance. The structure is as
follows: the bulk of the Berakah spells out (either originally, or
due to targumic modification) what man wants from God; there
then follows a phrase of the form ‘and they will bless you’ or ‘and
we shall bless you’ (in I, X and XII even introduced by ‘thus,
therefore’). What we have here is a conditional construction, an
‘if/when...then’, governing the relationship between the main
Berakah text and Ḥatimah. The blessing is understood as a
response to the anticipated fulfillment of the human request. In
other words, the targumist brings to the surface and resolves in a

226 This dimension – paradigmatic past prayer – is constitutive for the above-
mentioned Hebrew Amidah hymn ascribed to Saadya. In that composition, every single
Berakah except XIX is given the character of petition by reference to a list of biblical cases
of divine acceptance of prayer. Mostly the mention of a paradigmatic case is followed by a
phrase of the form, ‘Thus (p or 13) accept my prayer also...’. See Zulay, The liturgical
poetry (note 79), and note 209. The basic form of this hymn (biblical hero’s prayer placed
in parallel to speaker’s prayer) is prefigured in a text published by Elbogen, Gottesdienst,
585f; cp. also mTaan 2:4–5.
striking manner the tension between the request form of the petitionary main text and the indicative present praise form of the Hatimah of the middle Berakhot in OAM.

6. THE CHARACTER OF TAM: OAM AND SCRIPTURE
We know now that TAM is indeed a targum, and that its author has achieved a quite sophisticated re-creation of the targumic genre, adapting its exegetical and formal characteristics to suit the specific requirements of OAM. Perhaps the most astonishing feature of TAM, given its derivative nature, is the complete lack of superficial imitation and the absence of empty targumic surface-phenomena: here was someone interested in making targum, not imitating targum. In other words, the exegetical sincerity of the author is paramount. But this sincerity, leading as it did to the adoption of the targumic form, is in itself problematical. At the heart of TAM's literary form lies a paradox: why a targum of a non-scriptural text? As a first approximation, one might say that there must be some sort of confusion concerning the idea of a holy or canonical text. And in a minimalist sense, this is true: the Eighteen Benedictions must have acquired near-canonical status, near-inspired rank, to be accorded such a treatment. However, I do not believe that it is a confusion of status, a lack of canonical precision, so to speak, that is at the foundation of TAM.

The targumist's use of scriptural quotation is one argument against such a confusion. It seems to me that he reaffirms the distinctness of revelation from the Amidah in that he presents Scripture in TAM as a text capable of proving a proposition due to its (scriptural) authority. In other words, the text thus supported (OAM, in several Berakhot) is not authoritative to the same degree; it is a man-made text. And, on the level of content, TAM's narrative never suggests anything other than human speech in its provision of the context of OAM's first utterance or original promulgation.

Moreover, the targumist does not seem to make much of the textual links of OAM to Scripture. One way of accounting for the wording of OAM would be to explain biblical phrases in OAM from their original setting in the Bible, using the co-text of the verse. Such a procedure would treat the Amidah as a continuation of Scripture, and would suggest that they both belong to the same macro-text, so to speak. This would have been easy enough, given the biblical character of OAM's language.

But although the Amidah is not treated as a text continuum with Scripture, it is clearly treated as something like Scripture, in that it is capable of sustaining expansion (or explication of implied meaning) to a degree typically accorded to biblical texts. And looked at from this angle, another non-biblical text comes to mind.
which acquired a similar status, even in classical times: the Mishnah. Gemara in many places expects an extraordinary (and historically speaking quite inappropriate) degree of precision and meaningfulness from the mishnaic text (and later commentators were to treat the Gemara in its turn in such a way). Such metalinguistic treatment is akin to *midrash* on the Mishnah; perhaps it is just an accident that nobody ever seems to have written a *targum* on Mishnah. There is a precise sense, however, in which the Mishnah is entitled to such a treatment: it is seen as Oral Torah. To a certain extent, a similar claim is implied when the wording of OAM is traced back to prophets, priests and the Men of the Great Assembly (cp. V, VI). 228 So, does the targumist's composing of a targum for OAM, while not declaring it to be Scripture, declare it to be Oral Torah?

I still do not think we are quite there. About the importance of the Amidah, one of the central expressions of Judaism, there can be little doubt. And texts outside the Bible did acquire hallowed status, the Amidah included. 229 It seems to be, however, a habit of Jewish religiosity to express reverence for a text by treating it as emphatically meaningful. Many holy texts in Judaism are holy by being all-encompassing and immensely informative. Texts acquired commentaries of this sort in particular after the model of this approach as applied to the biblical text (namely midrash) had gone out of fashion. This, I suggest, is the context in which TAM should be viewed. This still does not explain the author's independence of mind in choosing the targumic form for his exegetical endeavour, or his skill in working with it - but it places the result in a framework of some plausibility. Shall we then say that the targumist, by providing it with a targum, expresses the view that OAM belongs to the holy texts of Judaism? Since the targumist does not speak expressly about this topic at all, and we have to work with a position implied in his choosing the targumic form, the answer can only be: probably.

---

228 And see the passages collected by Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud*, 13.

229 Cp. the introduction to the *Aggadat tefillah shemonoh 'esreh* (note 66), 54, claiming eternal status for the OAM. One of the Arabic renderings of the Amidah (Kafih [note 54], version A) also shows signs of treating OAM as a holy text.