Targum Jonathan (hereafter, TJ) is a highly literalist Aramaic translation of the prophetic books which was probably originally composed in Palestine as early as the first century CE, but underwent several stages of redaction in Babylonia in the ensuing centuries.¹ Targum (pl. *targumim*) was first identified by scholars as a synagogue genre.² They based this identification on tannaitic sources which both assume and prescribe the recitation of an Aramaic translation of the lectionary texts.³ More recently, Anthony York has argued that the extant written targumim were pedagogical tools. He based this contention on the targumic inclusion of non-lectionary texts, and on Sifre Deut 161 and ARN 12, both of which refer to the use of targum for personal study.⁴ Most contemporary scholars now agree that the targumim were used in both the academic and the synago-
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³ See, for example, m. Meg 4:4, 6:10; t. Meg 4 (3):20, 21.

While synagogue use may have been part of its original function, its scope and format suggest that it was composed largely for use in an academic setting. Unlike PRK and the other texts in this study, TJ does not deal with the biblical texts in their lectionary order, nor does it recognize lectionary divisions. Instead, the targum is a translation of the entire prophetic canon in its canonical order. This feature links TJ strongly to the academic setting. It was in the school, rather than in the synagogue, that entire prophetic books would have been the subject of study.

Within this study, then, TJ provides a marked contrast to PRK and the *kedushtot* of Kallir, which explicitly interpret the biblical texts in their popular, synagogal role as lectionary texts. Thus far, I have argued that the creators of the lectionary cycle created a new, second-order biblical text which articulates a theology of consolation which is different from that of its constituent parts. In the lectionary sequence, the discourse of redemption is unhitched from the discourse of reconciliation and the latter is elevated and underscored as an effective consolatory discourse. PRK and the poems of Kallir expand on this theology of consolation, rather than on the theology of the constituent texts in their biblical context. TJ, which interprets the texts within their canonical context, articulates an interpretation of the haftarah texts which contrasts sharply with those that I have discussed in the previous chapters. Throughout the translation of Isa 40–66, TJ consistently emends or eliminates texts that contribute to the portrayal of the personal, intimate relationship between God and Israel; at the same time, it enhances the tropes of divine transcendence and power. The contrast between TJ’s tendencies and the theology of consolation articulated by the lectionary cycle, PRK, and the piyyutim is relevant to my larger study for several reasons. It articulates an alternative interpretation of Isa 40–66 that existed contemporaneously with the theology of consolation explored thus far. It also supports my assertion regarding the seasonal, liturgical, and contextual specificity of the theology of consolation. While this theology is articulated in those texts which comment on the biblical texts in their lectionary context, it is absent from TJ, which deals with the texts in their original biblical context. Finally, the contrast between TJ and the lectionary-specific texts supports the hypothesis that even though TJ
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was eventually used in synagogues, it was not composed explicitly for use in the synagogue context.

**Targumic Function and Exegesis**

Although the targumim are translations of the biblical text into Aramaic, they probably did not function as versions of a text for Aramaic-speaking audiences who could not understand the text in the original language. Evidence from the third to sixth centuries suggests that most Jews in Palestine during this period were bi-lingual. Certainly the Jews who studied in the academies where targumim were used would have been able to understand the Hebrew of the biblical text. The targumim, therefore, were probably composed as explanatory texts which were designed to complement the Hebrew text and facilitate a particular understanding of it. Several tannaitic and amoraic texts attribute an explanatory function to both the practice and texts of targum, and describe a complementary relationship between the targum text and the original biblical text. For example, j. Meg 4:1 states:

> From where do we derive the practice of targum? R. Zeirah in the name of R. Hananel: And they read from the book, from the Torah of God (Neh 8:8): This is scripture. Clearly (ibid.): This is targum.

There are other texts, however, which focus on the ways in which translations deviate from scripture. B. Meg 9a lists thirteen places in which the Septuagint deviates from a literalist translation of the Hebrew text. While it only offers an explanation for one of these deviations, the impetus behind many of the others is quite clear. Some of the cases alter Hebrew texts that appear to refer to a plurality of gods. Others protect the reputation of Israel, its ancestors and its leaders, while others emend embarrassing comments regarding God’s activity on the seventh day and Israelite polytheism. A reasonable person listening to these biblical verses would derive a meaning which the translators felt was incorrect or inappropriate. In these situations, the translation deviates from literalism and emends the “misleading” Hebrew text in order to bring it into line with the central tenets of the translators’ post-biblical theology.

TJ’s deviations from literalist translation conform to the two views of targum articulated in the rabbinic literature. Many of TJ’s deviations from
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7. See also b. Meg 3a; b. MK 28b; b. San 94b; b. Ber 28b.
the literal are exegetical in nature. TJ replaces difficult Hebrew locutions with more comprehensible elements; it interprets poetic or metaphorical passages and incorporates these interpretive decisions into the translation. For example, TJ sometimes identifies speakers or addressees where the Hebrew text leaves them unnamed, or replaces a presumed metaphor with an assumed referent.

Other emendations, however, are ideologically or theologically driven. In some of these cases, TJ replaces a (problematic) Hebrew element with an Aramaic element that deviates from it or even contradicts it. In other cases, TJ incorporates a prevalent interpretive tradition into its translation or uses a syntactic or thematic feature of the text as an occasion to insert a common targumic phrase or idea. Many of these content-driven emendations occur in TJ’s translations of descriptions of God or divine action:

1. While TJ translates most anthropomorphisms literally, it does emend a significant minority of anthropomorphic locutions.

2. TJ frequently emends texts in which God is represented as the direct subject or object of action. In most cases the targumist transforms these texts into the passive voice through the inclusion of the preposition “before” (פָּרָא).

3. TJ emends most references to divine movement.

4. TJ sometimes replaces references to God as YHWH with circumlocutions such as “shekhinah,” “glory,” or “glory of the shekhinah.”

There is a wide range of scholarly opinion regarding the significance of this set of emendations. Michael Klein and Martin McNamara have argued that these emendations have little effect on the received meaning of the biblical text. According to McNamara, circumlocutions for YHWH “were merely other ways of saying ‘the Lord.’ They were reverential ways of speaking about the God of Israel.” Similarly, Klein argues that the “issue of anthropomorphism was not of theological import” to the targum-
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8. The distinction between exegetical and content-driven emendations is, to some degree, heuristic. As the examples below will demonstrate, the two motivations probably intertwine in many cases. A theologically problematic verse is identified by the targumist as metaphorical discourse and consequently is translated in a way that represents the text’s “true” referential meaning in the eyes of the targumist.

9. Martin McNamara, Targum, 98.
ists. If it had been, Klein argues, they would have emended anthropomorphisms more consistently and completely.\textsuperscript{10}

In contrast, Bruce Chilton has argued that TJ’s anti-anthropomorphisms are theologically significant: “Rather than being merely replacement words, designed to avoid anthropomorphism, such terms deliberately emphasize some aspect of God’s activity . . .”\textsuperscript{11} Leivy Smolar and Moshe Aberbach argue that the emendation of anthropomorphism radically changes the theology of the biblical text: “It was precisely because the Bible frequently expresses concepts and views which were later rejected by the rabbis that TJ . . . significantly changes the translation with a view to eliminating all traces of unorthodox theology.”\textsuperscript{12} While I disagree that TJ’s theology can be identified as “orthodox” rabbinic theology, I agree that its emendations do have a significant effect on the portrayal of God in TJ. The aggregate effect of the reduced anthropomorphism, the circumlocutions, and the distancing of God from direct interaction with human subjects, results in the portrayal of a divine character which is significantly more transcendent and less imminent and intimate than that of Second Isaiah. This revised portrait of God differentiates TJ’s interpretation of the texts of the haftarot of consolation sharply from those of PRK and Kallir. While the midrash and the piyyut underscore the discourse of divine intimacy and assert its consolatory power, TJ’s typical emendations dilute this discourse while enhancing the discourse of transcendent power.

**Analysis of Targum Jonathan to Isaiah 40:1–23**

TJ to Isa 40:1–23 provides a representative example of the effects of TJ’s typical emendations on the theology of the text. Within the biblical pericope, God commands unnamed addressees to comfort Jerusalem and proclaim the end of her time of punishment. The text goes on to announce the imminent advent of God and to praise his incomparable power as creator of the cosmos and master of history. TJ translates about half of the references to God and divine action in the pericope literally. In these translations, it preserves references to God as the creator of the universe (vv. 22, 26),\textsuperscript{13} a force which intervenes in history (v. 23), and a speaking entity (vv.

\textsuperscript{10} Michael Klein, *Anthropomorphisms*, xi.
\textsuperscript{11} Chilton, *Isaiah Targum*, xvi.
\textsuperscript{13} In Isa 40:22, the description of God’s creative acts is translated literally, but the reference to the heavens as “a tent for dwelling” is rendered, “as a dwelling of glory for his shekhinah.”
It also preserves three anthropomorphisms and a reference to divine movement (vv. 10–11). Finally, it renders literally three verses which conform to conventional targumic discourse by referring to God’s glory and God’s word and by using the phrase “considered by him” (vv. 5, 8, 17).

The remaining theological references deviate from the literal. TJ emends most anthropomorphic references to God and most references to divine movement. TJ consistently emends references to God’s hand, mouth, spirit/breath (ון):

1. Isaiah 40:2: “She has received from YHWH’s hand double for her all her sins.”
   TJ: “She has received a cup of consolations from before YHWH as if she had suffered two for one for all her sins.”

2. Isaiah 40:5: “For the mouth of YHWH has spoken.”
   TJ: “For by the memra of YHWH it is decreed.”

3. Isaiah 40:7: “For the breath/spirit of YHWH blows on it.”
   TJ: “For the breath/spirit from before YHWH blows upon it.

4. Isaiah 40:12: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span . . .”

14. In Isa 40:10–11, the anthropomorphisms and reference to divine movement occur within a simile which compares God to a shepherd. While the verses attribute the anthropomorphisms and verbs of movement directly to God, and not to the shepherd to whom God is compared, the presence of the simile might have served as a softening factor which led the targumist to refrain from emending these features.

15. In addition to emending the anthropomorphism, TJ inserts a reference to the cup of consolations. It also softens the phrase, “has received from the hand of YHWH double for all her sins” by transforming the end of the verse into a simile: “as if she had suffered two for one for all her sins.”

16. There is a scholarly debate over the precise function of the term memra. Some scholars identify it as a hypostatization of God while others see it as a means through which God communicates to humanity. See Klein, Anthropomorphism, 124–35 for a summary of the debate and analysis of the term. For discussion of the term in TJ to Isaiah, see Domingo Muñoz-León, “Memra in the Targum to Isaiah,” in Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (ed. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem: World Congress of Jewish Studies, 1986), 135–42.
TJ: “Before whom all the waters of the world are counted as a drop in the hollow of his hand, and the expanse of the heavens as if they had been adjusted with a span.”

5. Isaiah 40:13: “Who established/plumbed the spirit of YHWH?”

TJ: “Who established the holy spirit in the mouth of all the prophets?”

As I mentioned above, many critics are unwilling to see the targumic emendations of anthropomorphisms as significantly revisionist. They describe these emendations as strategies for avoiding misunderstanding on the part of the lay public. This reading assumes that the Bible itself is essentially non-anthropomorphic and that to read the references to God’s hands or mouth with any degree of seriousness (either literal or metaphorical) would be a misunderstanding. Theologians, however, have described the centrality of anthropomorphism to the theology of the Hebrew Bible. The portrayal of God as a character with anthropomorphic and anthropopathic characteristics is one of the defining features of the Bible’s personalist theology. It is essential to the idea that God and Israel, as well as God and humanity, exist in meaningful and dynamic relationship to one another. By diluting the anthropomorphic portrait of God in Second Isaiah, TJ preempts the theology of intimacy articulated by the lectionary cycle. In order to be Israel’s lover, God must be invested with anthropomorphic and anthropopathic features. The discourse of divine power, however, is not diluted by these emendations. Rather, TJ’s anti-anthropomorphic emendations render God more transcendent than in the biblical text.

TJ also emends most of the references to divine movement in the pericope:

1. Isaiah 40:10: Behold, the Lord, YHWH, comes in strength.

TJ: Behold, YHWH, God, reveals himself in strength.


   TJ: “[He] who caused the shekhinah of his glory to dwell in the mighty height . . .”

Even implied references to divine movement are replaced:

1. Isaiah 40:3: “Prepare a way for YHWH; make straight in the wilderness a highway for our God.”

   TJ: “Prepare a way before the people of YHWH; level in the wilderness roads before the congregation of our God.”


   TJ: “The kingdom of your God is revealed.”

Both Michael Klein and Bruce Chilton have hypothesized about the impetus for these emendations. Klein addresses divine movement as a sub-category of anthropomorphism.19 This identification suggests that the emendations of references to divine movement stem from a discomfort with the concrete nature of these references. If God can come and go, then God must have a defined and bounded physical presence. References to divine movement, like references to God’s back or feet, give an incorrect impression of the physical nature of God. Chilton suggests that these emendations are part of a targumic theology of consolation. He argues that in TJ’s version of Second Isaiah, the heavenly Jerusalem exists intact in the exilic present as the dwelling place of God. Consequently, God’s return to Zion is no longer a necessary part of the redemptive picture, so references to it are emended.20 These suggestions help to illuminate both the anxieties and theology of TJ, but they do not address the strong theological revisionism of the text.

Within Second Isaiah, references to God’s coming and going communicate a dynamic sense of divine presence and absence. By stating “Behold, the Lord, YHWH comes in strength,” Isa 40:10 communicates both that God is arriving and that God has been absent until now. The Aramaic rendering “Behold, YHWH, God, reveals himself in strength” does not negotiate God’s presence or absence. Rather it merely speaks of the self-revelation of the ever-present deity. TJ’s reluctance to speak of divine movement not only represents an emendation of the biblical text, it also stands in marked contrast to the haftarah cycle. In their lectionary context, the haftarot of consolation are a carefully calibrated response to the accusa-
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tions of divine rejection and abandonment voiced in Lamentations and by Zion in the second haftarah of consolation. In their lectionary context, the haftarot of consolation both announce and enact God’s emotional and relational return to Israel. By emending the references to divine movement, TJ both denies the sense of divine abandonment articulated by Zion’s voice in the cycle and nullifies the consolatory effects of the tropes of return. The patterns of literalist translation and anti-anthropomorphic emendation which occur in TJ’s treatment of Isa 40:1–23 recur throughout its treatment of Isa 40–66. Thus, throughout TJ’s treatment of the lectionary texts, the theology of redemption remains intact while the theology of intimate reconciliation is diluted significantly.

The Romantic Trope:

As I discussed in the previous chapters, both PRK and the kedushtot of Kallir develop the trope of the erotic relationship between God and Israel. For both the midrash and the piyyut, the romance between God and Israel is a central vehicle for the expression of notions of divine presence, and divine devotion and attachment to Israel. In the lectionary cycle, the midrash and the piyyut, God’s romantic love for Israel motivates God’s intervention in history on Israel’s behalf. Thus, the erotic trope is at once a figure of intimacy and of redemption. In contrast to the other three genres, TJ does not capitalize on the erotic trope. Instead, TJ consistently emends references to the erotic relationship between God and Israel. This persistent emendation does not mean that TJ rejects notions of redemption or divine intimacy. However, it does attest to TJ’s rejection of the erotic trope as a vehicle for the expression of these theological ideas.

The gendered personification of Zion is central to the erotic trope. According to the heterosexual orientation of biblical and early Jewish culture, Israel must be imagined as a woman if she is to be the romantic partner of the male God. While the targumist does not manifest discomfort with the personification of Zion per se, he is less comfortable with texts which attribute gender and sexuality to the personification. TJ translates references to Zion’s feet (49:23), hand (51:22), and eyes (60:4) literally. Verbs of movement and human action such as drinking and lying down (51:22–23), rising, sitting (52:2), singing (52:9), and dressing (52:1) are also rendered literally. However, the gendered representations of Israel as mother and lover are treated less consistently. TJ preserves references to Zion’s children in Isa 49:22, 25; 51:18, 20; 54:1, 3; and 60:9. It also preserves a reference to Zion’s young womanhood and widowhood in 54:4. However, the other depictions of Zion as mother and lover are altered in the
targum. References to “the children of your bereavement” (49:20) and “your children” (60:4) are translated “the children of the people of your exiles.” These changes replace the representation of Zion as the mother of her inhabitants with representations of the city as the home of the exiled community. Similarly, in Isa 50:1, TJ replaces the reference to “your mother” with “your congregation.” “Where is the bill of divorce of your mother whom I dismissed?” becomes “Where is the bill of divorce which I gave your congregation, that it is rejected?” Thus, while TJ still speaks of the (false) rejection of Israel by God, the Aramaic version is not as explicitly gendered as the Hebrew.

TJ also desexualizes the personified Zion by eliminating the paradoxical image of the barren mother in 49:20–21 and 54:1. While TJ’s rendering of 49:20–21 is, in many respects, quite literalist, the few deviations serve to dilute the feminized and sexualized portrayal of Zion. Isa 49:20–21 states:

The children born in the time of your bereavement will yet say in your ears,
“The place is too narrow for me; make room for me to dwell in.”
And you will say in your heart, “Who caused me to bear these? I was bereaved and barren, exiled and put away, but who has brought up these?”

TJ renders these verses:

Henceforth, the children of the people of your exiles will say, each one in your midst,
“The place is too straight for me; give place to me that I may dwell.”
And you will say in your heart, “Who has brought up these for me, seeing I am bereaved and solitary, an exile and driven forth? These, who has brought them up?”

In TJ 49:20, the “children of your bereavement” are identified as “the children of the people of your exiles.” In TJ, these children no longer speak intimately in mother Zion’s ear; rather, they speak to one another in her midst. In the Hebrew text, mother Zion’s amazed response refers to acts of giving birth and raising. In the Aramaic, the word הָרָב (“bring up”) is used to translate both terms. Thus Zion is not concerned with the question of how she could have given birth to children despite her barrenness. She is

21. The reference to “your children” in Isa 49:17 is translated “your builders.” However, this change may reflect a different base text. The Qumran manuscript reads בָּנוֹת (“your builders”), a reading reflected in Aquila and the Vulgate as well.
only concerned with how she could have raised them. Similarly, the word “barren” is rendered as “alone,” thereby desexualizing the portrait of Zion.

TJ to Isa 54:1 effects a similar desexualizing through a striking midrashic reading. Isaiah 54:1 states:

Rejoice, barren one who has not given birth; burst forth in joy, shout gladly, you who did not writhe.
For the children of the desolate one will be more than the children of her that is married, says YHWH.

TJ:

Sing praises, O Jerusalem, who was as a barren woman that did not bear; break forth into a song of praise and rejoice, you who were as a woman that did not conceive.
For more shall be the children of desolate Jerusalem than the children of inhabited Rome, says YHWH.

In this case, the de-personification of Jerusalem occurs through the insertion of the comparative particle -ו (“as”). Zion is not a barren woman; she is like a barren woman. The second half of the verse deviates more dramatically from a literalist reading. “The children of her that is married” becomes “the children of inhabited Rome.” This gloss relies on the targum’s consistent replacement of forms of the verb בזא (“be master/husband”) with forms of the verb בז (“dwell”).22 For the targumist, references to God’s espousal of/sexual intercourse with Zion are metaphorical references to the resettlement of the exiles. Consequently, “her that is married (תּוֹאֳלָה)” is read as a reference to the quintessentially inhabited city, Rome.23 The pattern of desexualization continues in Isa 62:4–5, in the final haftarah of the cycle. Isaiah 62:4–5 states:

You will no longer be called “Forsaken” and your land will no longer be called “Desolate.”
For you will be called “My delight is in her” and your land will be called “Espoused” (הָעֵנִי).”
For the Lord delights in you, and your land shall be married (כָּפָה)
For as a young man marries (כָּפָה) a virgin, so shall your sons marry you (כָּפָה); an a bridegroom over a bride will your God rejoice over you.

22. See also Isa 54:1, 62:4 (twice), 62:5.
23. This emendation is also polemical. It states that Jerusalem will eventually supersede its conqueror, whereas the biblical verse compares Jerusalem’s future to its own past.
The Targum renders:

You shall no more be termed “Forsaken” and your land shall no more be termed “Desolate”;
But you shall be called, “Those who do my pleasure in her,” and your land, “Inhabited”;
For there shall be pleasure before YHWH in you, and your land shall be inhabited.
For just as a young man dwells (דומעעת) with a virgin, so shall your sons settle (יוחיתון) in your midst;
And just as a bridegroom rejoices with a bride, so your God rejoices over you.

In this pericope, the four occurrences of the root בּעָלָא are replaced with forms of the verb בּייטה. There is no semantic relationship between the two roots. The Hebrew root signifies “to be master,” “authority,” “owner,” “husband,” and “male sexual partner.” The Aramaic root means “to sit” or “to dwell.” By replacing forms of בּעָלָא with forms of בּייטה, TJ identifies a presumed metaphor and replaces it with an assumed referent. This replacement of the term of simultaneous mastery/authority and sexual intimacy with the term of habitation shifts the focus of the text. In the Hebrew, בּעָלָא (the passive participle of בּעָלָא) is the name of the redeemed Zion. The sign of redemption is marriage to God and sexual union, as well as submission to God’s authority. In the targum, the name of the redeemed Zion is בּייטה (“Inhabited”). The sign of redemption is the return of the exiles and the habitation of Jerusalem.

The targumist also emends the references to God delighting in Israel. “My delight is in her” is rendered “they that do my pleasure are in her.” The second reference, “For the Lord delights in you” is rendered “For there shall be pleasure before the Lord in you.” God no longer takes (erotic) delight in Israel. Rather, the first instance refers to the presence of those who do God’s will. The second uses the prepositional phrase “from before” to distance the experience of pleasure from God and to de-personalize it. Finally, in 62:5b, the phrase “the joy of a bridegroom over a bride will your God rejoice over you” is transformed into a simile by the inclusion of the comparative particle מִシン (“as”): “just as a bridegroom rejoices with a bride, so will your God rejoice over you.” In TJ, God does not experience the joy of the bridegroom over a bride; instead, God rejoices in a way similar to the way that a bridegroom rejoices over his bride. Through these strategies of replacement and modification, the entire pericope is desexualized. Habitation, not multivalent mastery, is now the central trope of the relationships between God and Zion and between Zion and her “children.”
The consistent replacement of בעל by תַּעַל is particularly significant. As I argued in chapter 2, the term תַּעַל is central to the lectionary sequence. Because its semantic range encompasses both political mastery and sexual intercourse, the term serves as a highly condensed expression of two of the central theological tenets of post-biblical Judaism. God is Israel’s sovereign and God is Israel’s lover. According to much of rabbinic theology, Israel’s historical fate and destiny are largely determined by these two factors. Because it expresses both of these ideas simultaneously, the term בעל is a powerful and oversignified theological term. In the haftarah cycle specifically, the term brings together the two forms of consolation which are articulated by the cycle. Consolation will come as a result of the exercise of God’s sovereign power. Consolation also lies in the fact of God’s romantic love for Israel. By eliminating the double-edged term from the translation while retaining references to God’s power over nature and history, the targum replaces the material for this double-edged consolation with a more monolithic expression of divine power.

Conclusion

TJ emends the constituent tropes of the theology of reconciliation and intimate relation that are articulated forcefully in the genres explored in the previous chapters. The contrast between TJ’s treatment of the haftarot of consolation and their treatment in PRK and the poems of Kallir underscores the liturgical specificity of the lectionary theology of consolation, and contributes to the ongoing discussion of the nature and function of TJ itself. Although the midrashim in PRK and the poems of Kallir represent different interpretive approaches to the lectionary texts and articulate divergent theological ideas, their interpretations converge around the theology of consolation that I discussed in the previous chapters. Both genres develop the tropes of reconciliation and intimate relationship and argue for both their consolatory and redemptive power. The convergence around these themes can only be attributed to their shared seasonal and liturgical context. As I noted in chapter 4, the piyyutim overlap with but do not replicate rabbinic ideology, especially with regard to the status of the defunct temple and its cult. Nor is this romantic theology so ubiquitous as to render its appearance in the relevant midrashim of PRK and the relevant kedushtot of Kallir meaningless. While the trope of romantic love between God and Israel is not absent from the rest of rabbinic literature, it is by no means the dominant trope. Similarly, it does not dominate Kallir’s piyyutim for the rest of the liturgical year. Rather, the convergence testifies to the liturgical specificity of these themes. The synagogue setting in the Tisha b’Av season became the locus for the articulation of this theol-
ogy of consolation by the creators of the lectionary itself, the authors of the midrashim in PRK, and Kallir.

There are several possible explanations for TJ’s divergence from this pattern. It is possible that TJ’s rendering of the haftarot is a product of later layers of redaction and is not contemporaneous with the other texts explored here. Alternatively, it is possible that the contrast is a result of differing provenances. TJ might represent a Babylonian tradition while the lectionary cycle, PRK, and the poems of Kallir are all Palestinian. It is also possible, however, that TJ’s divergence from these other texts supports the hypothesis that TJ was not composed primarily as a synagogue text, but rather was an academic text that came to be used in the synagogue setting.

The contrast between TJ’s rendering of the haftarot and that of PRK and Kallir is also relevant to the ongoing attempts to define “popular” rabbinic theology. As I mentioned above, many scholars of targum attribute TJ’s anti-anthropomorphic tendencies to its role as a text for “the masses.” According to this position, TJ’s deviations from the literal were designed to prevent laypeople from interpreting the anthropomorphic imagery of the text too concretely. The evidence of the lectionary cycle and the kedushtot of Kallir challenge this hypothesis. These texts, which are more clearly and closely linked to the exegesis of scripture in the synagogue, underscore precisely those anthropomorphic and anthropopathic tropes that TJ emends. Certainly for the creators of the lectionary cycle and Kallir, anthropopathism was a particularly powerful and appropriate trope for the synagogue audience. TJ’s anti-anthropomorphism, then, should not be attributed solely or primarily to a concern for a popular audience, but rather to a theological stance on the part of its authors that would necessitate the emendation of the text in both academic and popular settings.