
TEOLOGIA BÍBLICA DO ANTIGO E DO NOVO TESTAMENTO





A TEXTUAL STUDY OF THE PASSAGES CONTAINING PLURAL FORMS RELATED TO THE GENERIC NAME OF GOD AND TO THE TETRAGRAMMATON IN THE PENTATEUCH¹

Matthew Oseka²

“Therefore, I venture to say that the Scripture should be explained
in line with its simple (literal) sense, word by word [...]”³.

ABSTRACT

The present paper is focused on the textual study of the passages containing the plural forms touching the Divinity in the Hebrew Bible. Those passages, namely Genesis 1.26-27, 3.22, 11.7, 20.13, 35.7, Deuteronomy 4.7, 5.26(23) and 2 Samuel 7.23, were acting as a catalyst for profound theological analyses both Jewish and Christian. It was observed that the text of the plural forms touching the Divinity analysed in the present paper was stable and no variants of the Hebrew text were evidenced except for Genesis 20.13 and 35.7 in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Furthermore, the aforementioned *loci* were examined in light of the ancient biblical translations and in view of the talmudic references which bear testimony to an early Jewish interpretation of them.

¹ Artigo recebido em 18 de outubro de 2016 e aprovado pelo Conselho Editorial em reunião realizada em 2 de dezembro de 2016, com base nas avaliações dos pareceristas *ad hoc*.

² Matthew OSEKA (岳誠軒), Th. D. (Christian Theological Academy, Warsaw / EU), Professor at Concordia Theological Seminary, Kowloon, Hong Kong. E-mail: matthew.oseka@yahoo.com.

³ RASHI. Schemoth. In: **Der Pentateuch**: Die Fünf Bücher Mosche mit worttreuer deutscher Übersetzung nebst dem Raschi-Kommentar. Vol. 2, ed. and trans. Julius DESSAUER. Budapest: Schlesinger, 1905, p. 41-42 (Exodus 6.9).

Keywords: Tetragrammaton IHWH. Name of God. Plural forms of the divine Name.

RESUMO

O presente artigo possui seu foco no estudo textual das passagens que contêm as formas plurais referentes à Divindade na Bíblia Hebraica. Essas passagens, a saber, Gênesis 1.26-27, 3.22, 11.7, 20.13, 35.7, Deuteronômio 4.7, 5.26 (23) e 2 Samuel 7.23, estavam agindo como um catalisador para profundas análises teológicas judaicas e cristãs. Observou-se que o texto das formas plurais que tocam a Divindade analisada no presente artigo era estável e nenhuma variante do texto hebraico foi evidenciada, exceto Gênesis 20.13 e 35.7 no Pentateuco Samaritano. Além disso, os *loci* acima mencionados foram examinados à luz das antigas traduções bíblicas e em vista das referências talmúdicas que dão testemunho de uma interpretação judaica das mesmas.

Palavras-chave: Tetragrama IHWH. Nome de Deus. Formas plurais do nome divino.

INTRODUCTION

Passages containing plural forms related to the generic name of God (אלה, אלוה, אלוהים, אל) and to God's very Name (י) are noticeable in the Tanakh because in historical terms those *loci* were acting as a catalyst for profound theological analyses both Jewish and Christian. The Jewish exegetical tradition sought a grammatical and contextual interpretation of those passages which would conform to the Jewish paradigm of the absolute oneness of the Divinity (אל המיוחד), while the Christian exegetes from the apostolic fathers to the age of the Reformation were unanimously adducing those *loci* as proof of the trinitarian concept within the Hebrew Bible. Although the interaction between the Jewish exegesis and the Christian exposition cannot be denied⁴, it appears that originally Jewish divines, for instance Philo of Alexandria⁵, were engaged in examining some of those *loci*

⁴ This interaction is evident on the one hand in Jewish comments dismissing Christian claims, on the other hand in Christian attempts at repelling Jewish arguments. Despite a vast polemical literature on the Jewish side indexed by De Rossi, it could be argued that in principle the Jewish religious thought was not circumscribed or impacted by Christian concerns. DE ROSSI, Giovanni Bernard. **Bibliotheca Judaica antichristiana**. Parma: Ex Regio Typographeo, 1800.

⁵ PHILO, Alexandrinus. De officio mundi. In: COHN, Leopold and WENDLAND, Paul (Eds). **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1896, p. 24-25 [24]. Idem, Legum allegoriarum libri I-III. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 1, p. 90 [II, 1]. Ibidem, p. 134 [III, 31]. Idem, De confusione linguarum. In: COHN, Leopold and WENDLAND, Paul (Eds). **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 2. Berlin: Reimer, 1897, 261-264 [33-36]. Idem, Quis rerum divinarum heres sit. In: COHN, Leopold and WENDLAND, Paul

not for the sake of polemics but rather out of exegetical curiosity.

The topic is complex and immense for various reasons. In the discussion of the aforementioned passages, the grammatical and hermeneutical aspects were inextricably intertwined and both parties were interpreting those *loci* in their biblical and extra-biblical context. Thus, the Jewish exegesis elucidated those verses in view of other passages of the Hebrew Bible and in accord with theological tenets of Judaism, whereas the Christian reading was dependent on the trinitarian interpretation as initiated by the apostolic fathers and fortified from then on. Furthermore, the patristic exegesis resorted to the Christian Scriptures yet not directly because those passages were never referred to in the New Testament in favour of any trinitarian claims. Nonetheless, the church fathers alleged that the developed concept of the Trinity as sanctioned by the ecumenical councils might be derived from the Bible composed of the Tanakh and the Christian Scriptures or at least could be traced back to this collection of sacred writings.

The plural forms mentioned above occur throughout the Tanakh but the present paper is confined to the passages found in the Pentateuch and to 2 Samuel 7.23 which was listed among *loci* containing the plural forms in the tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b)⁶. In the present study narratives such as Genesis 18-19, Exodus 24.1 or apocalyptic visions such as Daniel 7.9 are touched upon only in connexion with the Talmudic references to the plural forms. Although Genesis 18-19 was vital to the patristic claims of the presence of the trinitarian idea in the Hebrew Bible, the entire argumentation of the church fathers was focused on certain literary features of the narrative which in itself was destitute of the plural forms. The same is true of Exodus 24.1 and of Daniel 7.9. Consequently, the present paper is aimed at examining the text of the aforementioned passages and it is not intent on exploring the multi-faceted history of their interpretation⁷.

(Eds). **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3. Berlin: Reimer, 1898, p. 37-38 [33]. Idem, De fuga et inventione. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3, p. 124-126 [13-14]. Idem, De mutatione nominum. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3, p.161-163 [4]. Idem, "Philonis Quaestionum et solutionum quae in Genesi: Sermo I. In: AUCHER, Joannes Baptista (Ed.). **Paralipomena Armena**., Venice: Lazari, 1826, p. 12-14 [XV-XIX]. Ibidem, p. 34-37 [LII-LIV].

⁶ סנהדרין. In: תלמוד בבלי, vol. 13. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1862, 38v [No. 38b].

⁷ LEBRETON, Jules. **Les origines du dogme de la Trinite**. Paris: Beauchesne, 1919, p. 507-512 [III, VI, Note B]. WESTERMANN, Claus. Excursus: The History of the Exegesis of Gen 1:26-27. In: WESTERMANN, Claus. **Genesis 1-11: A Commentary**, trans. John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984, p. 147-148

1 IDENTIFICATION OF THE PASSAGES

In the ancient Judaism some *loci* containing plural forms related to the generic name of God and to God's very Name came to the fore and were grouped together. Working on the Septuagint, Philo of Alexandria⁸ identified Genesis 1.26, 2.18b, 3.22 and 11.7 as conspicuous for the plural forms touching the Divinity. It is remarkable that in the LXX Genesis 2.18b (ποιήσωμεν)⁹ was conformed to the plural form of Genesis 1.26 (ποιήσωμεν) in defiance of the Masoretic text of Genesis 2.18b which contained the singular form (אֵחָד). The Masoretic reading was vindicated in the Samaritan Pentateuch¹⁰ and reflected in the Targum Onkelos¹¹, in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan¹², in the Jerusalem Targum¹³ and in the Samaritan Targum¹⁴ as well as in the Syriac (Peshitta)¹⁵, Arabic¹⁶ and Persian¹⁷

(Genesis 1.26-27). WILSON, Robert McLachlan Wilson. The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26. In: **Studia Patristica** 1 (1957): p. 420-437. ARMSTRONG, Gregory T. **Die Genesis in der alten Kirche: Die drei Kirchenväter**. Tübingen: Mohr, 1962, passim.

⁸ PHILO. *Legum allegoriarum libri I-III*, p. 90 [II, 1].

⁹ SWETE, Henry Barclay (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1887, p. 4 (Genesis 2.18). FIELD, Frederick (Ed.). **Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt: sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta**. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875, 14 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁰ BLAYNE, Benjamin (Ed.). **Pentateuchus Hebraeo-Samaritanus**. Oxford: Clarendon, 1790, p. 5 (Genesis 2.18).

¹¹ BERLINER, Abraham (Ed.). **Targum Onkelos**. Vol. 1. Berlin: Kauffmann, 1881, p. 2 (Genesis 1.26-27).

¹² Targum Jonathan. In: WALTON, Brian (Ed.). **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4. London: Roycroft, 1657, p. 5 (Genesis 2.18).

¹³ Targum Hierosolymitanum. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4, p. 5 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁴ BRÜLL, Adolf (Ed.). **Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch**. Frankfurt am Main: Erras, 1875, p. 3 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁵ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. In: WALTON, Brian (Ed.). **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 1. London: Roycroft, 1657, p. 8 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁶ Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 1, p. 9 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁷ Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4, p. 5 (Genesis 2.18).

renditions, whereas the Coptic¹⁸ and Ethiopic¹⁹ translations followed the plural form of the LXX. In Graecus Venetus²⁰, a late mediaeval Jewish translation into vernacular Greek, which was independent of the Septuagint, the verb in Genesis 2.18b was interpreted singularly (ποιήσω). Consequently, the church fathers, who except for Origen and Jerome were relying solely either on the Septuagint or on the Vulgate, counted Genesis 2.18 among the passages marked by the plural forms. Notwithstanding the Philonian legacy the Jewish exegetes were anchored to the original text of the Tanakh and therefore did not consider this verse pertinent to the plural forms.

The tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b)²¹ identified the plural forms linked to the Divinity in Genesis 1.26, 11.7, 19.24, 35.7, Deuteronomy 4.7, 2 Samuel 7.23 and Daniel 7.9, whereas the tractate Megillah (no. 9a)²² and the minor tractate Sofrim²³ catalogued Genesis 1.26-27 and 11.7. Furthermore, the Yalkut Shimoni²⁴ registered Genesis 1.26, 11.7, 35.7, Deuteronomy 4.7 and 2 Samuel 7.23, while the Mekhilta²⁵ listed Genesis 1.26 and 11.7.

2 TEXTUAL STUDY OF THE PASSAGES IN LIGHT OF ANCIENT BIBLICAL TRANSLATIONS

In the present article the following *loci* containing the plural forms linked to the Divinity: Genesis 1.26-27, 3.22, 11.7, 20.13, 35.7, Deuteronomy 4.7, 5.26(23) and 2 Samuel 7.23, are subject to textual criticism in light of the ancient

¹⁸ WILKINS, David (Ed. and trans.). **Quinque libri Moysis prophetae in lingua Aegyptia**. London: Bowyer, 1731, p. 5 (Genesis 2.18).

¹⁹ BÜRCKLIN, Georg Christian (Ed. and trans.). **Quatuor prima capita Geneseos Aethiopice et Latine**. Frankfurt am Main: Wust, 1696, p. 10 (Genesis 2.17 /s. c. 2.18/).

²⁰ GEBHARDT, Oscar (Ed.). **Graecus Venetus**. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1875, p. 4 (Genesis 2.18).

²¹ סנהדרין. 38v (No. 38b).

²² מגילה. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 5. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1860, 9r (No. 9a).

²³ סופרים. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 13, 48v (I, VIII).

²⁴ ילקוט בראשית. In: ספר ילקוט שמעוני. Vol. 1. Vilnius: ראובן and ראם, 1863, 6v [XII, V (Genesis 1.21)].

²⁵ WEISS, Isaac Hirsch (Ed.). **Mechilta: Der älteste halachische und hagadische Kommentar zum zweiten Buch Moses**. Wien: Schlossberg, 1865, 20r (Exodus 12.40).

biblical translations.

No variants of the Hebrew text of Genesis 1.26-27 are known to us, yet in those verses we encounter a transition from the singular to the plural as far as God (אלוהים) and human (אדם) are concerned. In Genesis 1.26 God said “Let us [נַעֲשֶׂה] make man in our image [בְּצַלְמֵנוּ], after our likeness [כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ]”, whereas Genesis 1.27 reads “And God created [וַיִּבְרָא] man in His own image [בְּצַלְמוֹ], in the image of God [בְּצַלְמֵם] God created [בָּרָא] him [...]”. Thus, both the verbal forms (נַעֲשֶׂה) and pronominal suffixes (בְּצַלְמֵנוּ / כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ / בְּצַלְמֵם - בָּרָא / וַיִּבְרָא - נַעֲשֶׂה) in the singular and in the plural were used interchangeably. Similarly, in Genesis 1.26-27 human (אדם) is simultaneously depicted as collective and as individual: “Let us make man [...] and let them have dominion [וַיִּרְדּוּ] over the fish of the sea [...] in the image of God God created him [אִתּוֹ]”, which posits that human was created as male and female (Genesis 1.27: “[...] male and female God created them [אֹתָם]”). The Masora Magna²⁶ on Genesis 1.26-27 did not elucidate the issue of the plural forms.

In Genesis 1.26 the Septuagint²⁷ and the revisions thereof (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion)²⁸ translated נַעֲשֶׂה by means of ποιήσωμεν (Subjunctive Aorist Active 1 Plural) and used the Greek possessive pronoun of the first person plural to express the plural form of the Hebrew pronominal suffix (-נו). In Genesis 1.27 the plural form of the pronominal suffix (בְּצַלְמֵם), which in Greek could not be retained, was replaced with the genitive Θεοῦ (LXX, Aquila and Theodotion).

Interpreting Genesis 1.26-27, the Targum Onkelos preserved the plural forms of the Hebrew original except for בְּצַלְמֵם (Genesis 1.27) which was translated either as “in the image of God (אלהים)”²⁹ or as “in the image of the LORD (די)”³⁰.

²⁶ ספר בראשית. In: חמשה חומשי תורה. Vol. 1. Lviv: Balaban, 1869, 7r-8v [Genesis 1.26-27 (מסורה גדולה)]. The text of the Masora Magna printed in the cited edition is usually compatible with that of the Rabbinic Bible of 1524. However, in case of Genesis 1.26-27 the text of the Masora Magna provided in the Second Rabbinic Bible is more complete and therefore should be consulted. ADONIJAH, Jacob ben Hayyim ibn. (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 1. Venice: Bomberg, 1524-1525, [s. p.] (Genesis 1.26-27).

²⁷ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 2 (Genesis 1.26-27).

²⁸ FIELD, 1875, Vol. 1, p. 10-11 (Genesis 1.26-27).

²⁹ BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 2 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁰ The reading “in the image of the LORD” is attested in the text of the Targum Onkelos printed in the First and Second Rabbinic Bible and in the Complutensian Polyglot. PRATENSIS, Felix (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 1. Venice: Bomberg, 1516-1517, [s.

It is notable that in the opening of Genesis 1.26 (ויאמר אלהים) and of Genesis 1.27 (ויברא אלהים) the Targum Onkelos exchanged the generic name of God (אלוהים) for the Ineffable Name (י). This implies that the translators of the aforementioned Targum did not link the plural forms to the grammatical features of אלהים. As regards the plural forms, the Samaritan Targum³¹ followed in the wake of the Targum Onkelos.

In the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan³² it is stated that the LORD said the words “Let us make [...]” to the angels who were created previously and who were ministering in front of Him. The aforementioned Targum retained the plural forms except for Genesis 1.27 (בְּצַלְמֵ) where the prepositional phrase “in the image of the LORD (יי)” was applied. In the Jerusalem Targum³³, which covers only Genesis 1.27, the generic name of God (ויברא אלהים) was translated as “the Word (מימרא) of the LORD (דיי)”, while בְּצַלְמֵ was paraphrased as “in His likeness namely in the likeness (בדמות) from (מן קדם) the LORD (יי)”. Unlike the Targum Onkelos, which was a more literal Aramaic rendition of the Pentateuch, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan tended to be a dynamic translation and regularly offered a theological explanation interwoven with the translated text.

The Syriac³⁴, Arabic³⁵, Persian³⁶, Coptic³⁷ and Ethiopic³⁸ translations as well as Graecus Venetus³⁹ are consistent with the Hebrew original and with the Septuagint, and therefore do not contribute to the textual study of Genesis 1.26-27.

The plural form touching the Divinity in Genesis 3.22 (מְגִנֵּי) arose from the plural forms in the narrative of Genesis 1.26-27. The Hebrew text of Genesis 3.22 was uniform and the Masora Magna⁴⁰ on that verse did not address

p.] (Genesis 1.27). ADONIJAH, 1524-1525, Vol. 1, [s. p.] (Genesis 1.27). **Vetus Testamentum I**. Alcalá: In Academia Complutensi, 1520, [s. p.] (Genesis 1.27).

³¹ BRÜLL, 1875, 2 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³² Targum Jonathan, p. 3 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³³ Targum Hierosolymitanum, p. 3 (Genesis 1.27).

³⁴ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 4 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁵ Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 5 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁶ Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. vol. 4, p. 3 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁷ WILKINS, 1731, p. 3 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁸ BÜRCKLIN, 1696, p. 7 (Genesis 1.26-27).

³⁹ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 2 (Genesis 1.26-27).

⁴⁰ מסורה גדולה (מסורה גדולה), 57v [Genesis 3.22 (מסורה גדולה)].

the issue of the plural form. The LXX translation of Genesis 3.22 (ὡς εἶξ ἐξ ἡμῶν) is literally based on the Masoretic text but the Symmachus' revision⁴¹ departs from the Hebrew text and resembles the rendition found in the Targum Onkelos, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum. Paradoxically, Graecus Venetus⁴² slightly modified the Septuagint translation of Genesis 3.22, yet retained the phrase ὡς εἶξ ἐξ ἡμῶν. The Syriac⁴³, Arabic⁴⁴, Coptic⁴⁵ and Ethiopic⁴⁶ versions reflected the LXX interpretation, while the Persian⁴⁷ rendition sided with the aforementioned Targumim. Let us visualise how Symmachus' revision and the said Targumim ventured to expound Genesis 3.22:

Symmachus	Onkelos ¹	Pseudo-Jonathan ²	Jerusalem ³
καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός	ואמר יי אלהים	ואמר יי אלהים	ואמר מימרא ייי אלהים
and God said	and the LORD God said	and the LORD God said	and the Word of the LORD-God said
-	-	למלאכיא די משמשין קדמוי	-
-	-	to the angels ministering in front of Him	-
ἴδε ὁ Ἀδάμ γέγονεν	הא אדם הוא	הא אדם הוא	הא אדם דברית יתיה
Behold, Adam has become	Behold, Adam has become	Behold, Adam has become	Behold, Adam whom I created
ὁμοῦ ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ	יחידיו בעלמא מניה	יחידיו בארעא היכמא	יחודי בגו עלמי הון מה
unique ⁴ by himself	unique in the world by himself	unique on the earth as	unique in my world just as
-	-	דאנא יחודי בשמי מרומא	דאנא יחודי בשמי מרומא
-	-	I am unique in the heaven above	I am unique in the heaven above
-	-	ועתידין	ועתידין
-	-	and in the future	and in the future
-	-	למיקום מניה	אומין סגיאין למקם מניה
-	-	arise from him those	arise from him those numerous people
-	-	-	מניה תקום אומה
-	-	-	from him arise those people
γινώσκειν καλόν	למידע טוב	דידעין למפרשא בין טוב	דידעה למפרשא בין טוב
to know good	to know good	who know how to discern between good	who know how to discern between good
καὶ πονηρόν	וביש	לביש	לביש
and evil	and evil	and evil	and evil

⁴¹ FIELD, 1875. Vol. 1, p. 17 [Genesis 3.23(22)].

⁴² GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 6 (Genesis 3.22).

⁴³ "Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina.", vol. 1, 14 (Genesis 3.22).

⁴⁴ "Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina.", vol. 1, 15 (Genesis 3.22).

⁴⁵ WILKINS, 1731, 8 (Genesis 3.22).

⁴⁶ BÜRCKLIN, 1696, 14 (Genesis 3.22).

⁴⁷ Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 4, p. 7 (Genesis 3.22).

		“Had he kept the commandments which I appointed to him, he would have lived and subsisted as the tree of life forever” ⁴⁸	“And now it is good that we keep [דנטרוד] him from the garden of Eden [...]” ⁴⁹
--	--	--	--

The Targumim cited above explicated the ramifications of Adam’s fall as depicted in the Book of Genesis in view of his acquisition of the knowledge of good and evil. At first sight it appears that the difficulty of the plural form (מְמַנֵּי) was circumvented but in the Jerusalem Targum a new plural form ([...] we keep [דנטרוד] him [i. e. Adam] from the garden of Eden) not occurring in the Hebrew original emerged, probably, after the fashion of Genesis 1.26-27.

In Genesis 11.7 there are two (נְרַדָּה and וְנִבְרָלָה) plural forms pertinent to the Divinity. The Hebrew original of that verse was uniform, while the Masora Magna⁴⁸ on it made reference to Genesis 43.4 and to 1 Samuel 14.36 where exactly the same form (s. c. Qal Imperfect 1 Plural Cohortative) of the verb ירד was found. In the Septuagint (δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγγέωμεν)⁴⁹ the Hebrew plural forms were preserved by means of the verb in the first person plural (συγγέωμεν - Subjunctive Aorist) modified by the circumstantial aorist participle (καταβάντες - Nom. Masc. Pl.) which was plural too because of συγγέωμεν. Both Hebrew נְרַדָּה and Greek δεῦτε function as adverbs and therefore are unrelated to the grammatical category of person. In Aquila’s revision⁵⁰ ἀναμίξωμεν was used in lieu of συγγέωμεν but both forms were the first person plural of Subjunctive Aorist. Graecus Venetus (δεῦρο καταβῶμεν συγγέωμεν)⁵¹ simplified the LXX interpretation by replacing the circumstantial participle καταβάντες with the first person plural of Subjunctive Aorist (καταβῶμεν), thus building a series of two verbs exactly in the same grammatical form (καταβῶμεν and συγγέωμεν). Besides, the Syriac⁵², Coptic⁵³ and Persian⁵⁴ versions retained the plural forms enshrined in the Masoretic text.

The Targum Onkelos⁵⁵ to Genesis 11.7 preserved both plural forms,

⁴⁸ (מסורה גדולה) 81r, ספר בראשית.

⁴⁹ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 17 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵⁰ FIELD, 1875, Vol. 1, p. 28 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵¹ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 19 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵² Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 42 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵³ WILKINS, 1731, p. 24 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵⁴ Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 4, p. 19 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵⁵ BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 10 (Genesis 11.7).

while the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁵⁶ did the same, adding that the LORD was speaking the words “Come, let us go down, and let us confound there their language” to 70 angels standing in front of Him. Thus, it should be noted that with reference to the plural forms touching the Divinity in Genesis 1.26-27, 3.22 and 11.7 the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan while tasked with explicating the Scripture in exegetical and theological terms introduced the concept of angels ministering in front of the LORD as the recipients of His words in order to facilitate the understanding of those *loci*.

The Masoretic text of Genesis 20.13 reads “And it came to pass, when God caused me to wander [הִתְעוּ] from my father’s house [...]” (JPS), while the Samaritan Pentateuch⁵⁷ contains the singular form of the verb (הִתְעָה) which is also reflected in the Samaritan Targum⁵⁸. The Masora Magna⁵⁹ on Genesis 20.13 did not touch upon the plural form attested in the Masoretic text. The Septuagint (ἐξήγαγέν)⁶⁰ and other ancient non-Aramaic versions interpreted the aforementioned verb simply as singular. The interpretations offered in the Targum Onkelos⁶¹ and in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁶² were complex and therefore should be visualised as follows:

JPS	Onkelos ⁷	Pseudo-Jonathan ⁸
And it came to pass when	And it was when	And it was when
God caused me to wander [הִתְעוּ]	the people erred [טעו]	they sought [בעו] to turn me aside [לאטעאה]
	after the works of their hands	to the worship of idols
	the LORD did bring me near [קריב] to the fear of Himself	and I went forth [תפקית]
from my father’s house [...]	from (among) the house of my father [...]	from my father’s house [...]

The Targum Onkelos and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan supposed that the hiphil הִתְעוּ (root תעה) denoted “to cause to err”, not “to cause to wander”, and

⁵⁶ Targum Jonathan, p. 19 (Genesis 11.7).

⁵⁷ BLAYNE, 1790, p. 44 (Genesis 20.13).

⁵⁸ BRÜLL, 1875, p. 21 (Genesis 20.13).

⁵⁹ ספר בראשית, 118v [Genesis 20.13 (מסורה גדולה)].

⁶⁰ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 32 (Genesis 20.13).

⁶¹ BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 19 (Genesis 20.13).

⁶² Targum Jonathan, p. 35 (Genesis 20.13).

in view of the plural form of the verb both Targumim designated not God, but the “people” mentioned previously⁶³ as the subject of the verb. According to the Targum Onkelos, the said people themselves erred, chasing after the idols, while according to the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, the said people attempted to make Abraham err. It is notable that in Aramaic the root תעה (טעא), which in the Hebrew hiphil might signify “to cause to wander”, could denote only “to err” or “to cause to err”⁶⁴. Thus, in the Targumim the Hebrew verb הִתְעוּ was interpreted from the Aramaic perspective on the assumption that the use of the root common both to Hebrew and to Aramaic should be favoured in the process of translation.

In view of the Targumic interpretation of Genesis 20.13 the noun אֱלֹהִים in the Hebrew original would be left unattended and the prepositional phrase מִבַּיִת would modify no verb. For the sake of the said phrase, the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan introduced new verbs קָרִיב and וּנְפָקִית respectively. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan attributed the action of leaving his father’s house to Abraham himself. Graecus Venetus ([...] ἐπλάνησάν με οἱ θεοὶ πρὸς τοῦ δόμου [...])⁶⁵ for no obvious reason ascribed the action of getting Abraham out of his father’s house to “gods” which is inexplicable in the light of the narrative.

In the Masoretic text of Genesis 35.7 the plural form of the verb (נִגְלוּ) was linked to הָאֱלֹהִים, while the Samaritan Pentateuch⁶⁶ provided the singular form of the verb (נִגְלָה) which was also adopted in the Samaritan Targum⁶⁷. The Masora Magna⁶⁸ on Genesis 35.7 did not deal with the issue of the plural form. In the Septuagint⁶⁹ נִגְלוּ אֵלָיו הָאֱלֹהִים was translated by means of the singular form (ἐπεφάνη αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς [God appeared to him]). The Syriac⁷⁰ and Coptic⁷¹ versions

⁶³ Genesis 20.11: “[...] and they will slay me for my wife’s sake” (JPS).

⁶⁴ LEVY, Jacob. *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Teil des rabbinischen Schrifttums*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1867, p. 311-312 [s. v. טעא]. JEHIEL, Nathan. *Rabbinisch-aramäisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zur Kenntnis des Talmuds, der Targumim und Midraschim*. Vol. 3, ed. Moses Israel LANDAU. Prague: Scholl, 1820, p. 743 [s. v. טעא].

⁶⁵ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 35 (Genesis 20.13).

⁶⁶ BLAYNE, 1790, p. 89 (Genesis 35.7).

⁶⁷ BRÜLL, 1875, p. 42 (Genesis 35.7).

⁶⁸ (מסורה גדולה) 199v, ספר בראשית [Genesis 20.13].

⁶⁹ SWETE, 1887. Vol. 1, p. 66-67 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁰ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 152 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷¹ WILKINS, 1731, p. 92 (Genesis 35.7).

rendered this locus similarly.

Given the emergence of angels in the narrative of Genesis 28.12, the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁷² construed the appearance reported in Genesis 35.7 as pertinent to the angel(s) of the LORD. In the text of the Targum Onkelos printed in the First and Second Rabbinic Bible⁷³ it is stated that “the angels of the LORD appeared to him” and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan rendered it thus. Nonetheless, the text of the Targum Onkelos found in the Complutensian Polyglot⁷⁴ reads that “the angel of the LORD appeared to him”, whereas the text of Berliner’s edition - “the LORD appeared to him”⁷⁵. The Arabic⁷⁶ and Persian⁷⁷ translations of that verse generally sided with both Targumim. Again, for no particular reason Graecus Venetus (πεφανέρωνται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ θεοὶ)⁷⁸ claimed that “gods have manifested themselves to him” albeit such an idea seems to run counter to the narrative.

In Deuteronomy 4.7 (קְרָבִים) and 5.26/23 (תַּיִים) the plural forms of the adjectives were linked to אֱלֹהִים. Such a phenomenon is permissible from the grammatical point of view because the noun אֱלֹהִים is plural in terms of parsing and it can denote not only the LORD but also the human or angelic agent(s) or even the idol(s), depending on the context. Irrespective of its meaning, אֱלֹהִים may be linked to singular or plural verbal or adjectival forms, yet אֱלֹהִים signifying the LORD usually occurs with the singular forms. Therefore, the verses pregnant with the plural forms came under scrutiny of the Jewish divines.

No textual variants of Deuteronomy 4.7 and 5.26/23 are known as far as the plural forms of the adjectives are concerned. The Masora Magna on Deuteronomy 4.7⁷⁹ and on Deuteronomy 5.26/23⁸⁰ did not illuminate this issue. Since in Greek, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic or Persian the generic names of God do

⁷² Targum Jonathan, p. 68 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷³ PRATENSIS, 1516-1517, vol. 1, [s. p.] [Genesis 35:7]. ADONIJA, 1524-1525, vol. 1, [s. p.] (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁴ *Vetus*, 1520, [s. p.] (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁵ BERLINER, 1881. Vol. 1, p. 39 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁶ *Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina*. Vol. 1, p. 153 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁷ *Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina*. Vol. 4, p. 68 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁸ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 71 (Genesis 35.7).

⁷⁹ ספר דברים. In: חמשה חומשי תורה. Vol. 5. Lviv: Balaban, 1869, 24v [Deuteronomy 4:7 (מסורה גדולה)].

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, 35r [Deuteronomy 5.26/23 (מסורה גדולה)].

not resemble אלוהים in terms of number, the ancient biblical translations used the singular forms of the adjectives in the aforementioned passages. The Samaritan Targum⁸¹ to both verses retained the original Hebrew phrasing. Nevertheless, in Deuteronomy 4.7 the Vulgate⁸² interpreted אלהים קרבים as “deos appropinquantes” (gods approaching).

The Targum Onkelos⁸³, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁸⁴ and the Jerusalem Targum⁸⁵ to Deuteronomy 4.7 translated אלהים אילה (אלהא) and used the singular form of the adjective (דיקרב / קריב) there. As regards Deuteronomy 5.26(23), the Targum Onkelos⁸⁶ resorted to the phrase “the voice (קל) of the Word (מימרא) of living LORD (דיי קימא)”, in which the adjective was singular due to God’s very Name, while the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁸⁷ proposed the wording “the voice (קל) of the Word (מימרא) of living God” (דאלה קיים) where the plural form of the adjective emerged. Thus, we realise that the Aramaic אלה might occur either with the singular form of the adjective (e. g. דיקרב / קריב) or with the plural form thereof (e. g. קיים). Besides, Graecus Venetus⁸⁸ interpreted Deuteronomy 4.7 (אלהים קרבים) as “gods approximate” (οἱ θεοὶ ἐγγύζουσ[ν]), while in Deuteronomy 5.26(23) Graecus Venetus⁸⁹ offered the mainstream interpretation “the voice of God of life”.

The Masoretic text of 2 Samuel 7.23 contains the plural form of the verb (הִלְכוּ) linked to אלוהים: “And who is like your people, like Israel, a nation one in the earth, whom God went [הִלְכוּ אֱלֹהִים] to redeem unto Himself for a people [...]” (JPS). The Hebrew text was uniform, whereas the Masora Magna⁹⁰ on that verse did not raise the issue of the plural form הִלְכוּ. In 1 Chronicles 17.21 we

⁸¹ BRÜLL, 1875, p. 210 (Deuteronomy 4.7). Ibidem, p. 213 (Deuteronomy 5.26/23).

⁸² TISCHENDORF, Konstantin and Theodor HEYSE (Ed.). **Biblia sacra Latina Veteris Testamenti Hieronymo interprete ex antiquissima auctoritate in stichos descripta.** Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1873, p. 163 (Deuteronomy 4.7).

⁸³ BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 10 (Deuteronomy 4.7).

⁸⁴ Targum Jonathan, p. 323 (Deuteronomy 4.7).

⁸⁵ Targum Hierosolymitanum, p. 323 (Deuteronomy 4.7).

⁸⁶ BERLINER, 1881. Vol. 1, p. 10 (Deuteronomy 5.26/23).

⁸⁷ Targum Jonathan, p. 328 (Deuteronomy 5.26/23).

⁸⁸ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 359-360 (Deuteronomy 4.7).

⁸⁹ GEBHARDT, 1875, p. 365 (Deuteronomy 5.26/23).

⁹⁰ ADONIJAH, Jacob ben Hayyim ibn (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 2. Venice: Bomberg, 1524-1525, [s. p.] (2 Samuel 7.23)

encounter the text parallel to 2 Samuel 7.23 but with the singular form of the same verb (יָלַח) which could imply either that in the tradition of the Book of Chronicles the plural form of the verb (יָלַחְוּ) attested in 2 Samuel 7.23 was regarded as equal to the singular one (יָלַח) or that the Chronicles' tradition found the aforementioned plural form challenging and refined it accordingly.

Interpreting 2 Samuel 7.23, the Septuagint⁹¹ remodelled the sentence but this had nothing to do with the plural form of the verb because the parallel text in 1 Chronicles 17.21⁹² was reshaped similarly though it contained the singular form thereof. To capture the LXX approach both to 2 Samuel 7.23 and to 1 Chronicles 17.21, let us juxtapose JPS translation based on the Masoretic text with the Septuagint:

JPS (2 Samuel 7.23, 1 Chronicles 17.21)	And who is like your people, like Israel, a nation one in the earth,
LXX (2 Samuel 7.23)	καὶ τίς ὡς ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ ἔθνος ἄλλο ἐν τῇ γῆ;
LXX English (2 Samuel 7.23)	And what another nation [ἔθνος] in the earth is like your people [λαός] namely Israel?!
LXX (1 Chronicles 17.21)	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ ἔθνος ἐτι ἐπι τῆς γῆς
LXX English (1 Chronicles 17.21)	And there is no nation [ἔθνος] in the earth like your people [λαός] namely Israel
JPS (2 Samuel 7.23, 1 Chronicles 17.21)	whom God went to redeem unto Himself for a people [...]
LXX (2 Samuel 7.23, 1 Chronicles 17.21)	ὡς ὠδήγησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λυτρώσασθαι αὐτῷ [ἑαυτῷ] λαόν [...]
LXX English (2 Samuel 7.23, 1 Chronicles 17.21)	in the same way God led Israel [αὐτὸν = Ἰσραὴλ] in order to redeem for himself a people [λαόν] [...]

The inference is that the Septuagint evaded the interpretation of the plural form יָלַחְוּ, stressing God's action upon Israel aimed at making them His own people (λαός), His unique nation (ἔθνος) among other nations.

While translating “The messengers departed from the LORD in order

⁹¹ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 625 (2 Samuel 7.23).

⁹² SWETE, Henry Barclay. (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907, p. 39 (1 Chronicles 17.21).

to redeem for Him a people”, the Targum Jonathan⁹³ to 2 Samuel 7.23 assigned the action of making Israel God’s unique people to the angels coming from the LORD’s throne and representing the LORD. In the Masoretic text of 2 Samuel 7.23 and of 1 Chronicles 17.21 “Israel, one nation in the world” represented by the relative pronoun **רשׂא** was the direct object of God’s action of redeeming (**תִּירָפֶּלְ**) because neither **יֵל** nor **מִפְּ** [alternatively **מִפְּ**] could function as the direct object within the parameters of the analysed sentence. Although the Septuagint (**ὡς ὠδήγησεν αὐτὸν** [i. e. Ἰσραήλ] **ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λυτρώσασθαι αὐτῷ λαόν**) added a comparison (**ὡς ὠδήγησεν αὐτὸν**) missing from the Masoretic text, it is unclear whether the LXX tended to view **מִפְּ** [alternatively **מִפְּ**] as the direct object because the Greek construction **τοῦ λυτρώσασθαι αὐτῷ** [alternatively **ἑαυτῷ**] **λαόν** plausibly indicated not that God was to redeem a people for himself but rather that by redeeming Israel, God was transforming them into His special people. In other words, it seems that God’s unique people were not the direct object of the verb “to redeem” but rather the end result of God’s redemptive action upon Israel.

3 PLURAL OF MAJESTY IN GREEK

The Byzantine Greek scholarship, which codified the technical vocabulary of Greek grammar and brought forth grammatical manuals in the contemporary sense of the term, was oblivious of the plural of majesty as far as Greek verbs were concerned⁹⁴. The modern textbooks noted that in certain instances the plural form of a noun might be expressive of the idea of majesty or fullness⁹⁵, yet this seems to be inapplicable to the plural forms of Greek verbs.

Since a theoretical basis for the plural of majesty pertinent to Greek verbs appears to be tenuous, it is difficult to determine how the plural verbal forms related to the Divinity in the Septuagint were perceived by the original audience of the LXX. On the one hand, from Philo’s comments it could be argued that

⁹³ DE LAGARDE, Paul (Ed.). **Prophetæ chaldaice**. Leipzig: Teubner, 1872, p. 117 (2 Samuel 7.23).

⁹⁴ GAZA, Theodore. **Introductio grammatica**. Basel: Walder, 1541.

⁹⁵ GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau and Charles William Emil MILLER. **Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes**. Vol. 1. New York: American Book Company, 1900, p. 26 [§ 52].

the Greek-speaking audience was prone to take those forms at face value, on the other hand in 1 Maccabees 10.19 and 11.31 the plural of majesty captured in the royal epistles was incontrovertible and the plural form in Daniel 2.36 (ἐροῦμεν) standing for Aramaic נְאִמְרָא plausibly conveyed a sense of self-exhortation.

Other passages, in which the Masoretic text presented the plural verbal forms commonly classified as the plural of majesty, yet with reference to human being(s), were rendered in the Septuagint inconsistently. In Genesis 29.27 the context compels us to construe the plural form of the verb (וַיְהַבְרֶה) as denoting the singular. The plural was mirrored in the Targum Onkelos⁹⁶, in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁹⁷ and in the Persian⁹⁸ translation, whereas the singular was attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch (וַאֲתֵן)⁹⁹ and reflected in the LXX (δώσω)¹⁰⁰, in the Jerusalem Targum¹⁰¹, in the Samaritan Targum¹⁰² and in the Syriac¹⁰³ and Arabic¹⁰⁴ renditions. On the contrary, in Numbers 22.6 (בָּרַךְ) the Septuagint (δυνώμεθα πατάξαι)¹⁰⁵, the Samaritan Targum¹⁰⁶ and the Syriac¹⁰⁷ version sided with the Masoretic text versus other ancient translations which resorted to the singular form. Similarly, in Daniel 2.36 (נֹאמַר) the Septuagint (ἐροῦμεν)¹⁰⁸ concurring with the Masoretic text ran counter to the Syriac¹⁰⁹ and Arabic¹¹⁰ versions.

⁹⁶ BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 31 (Genesis 29.27).

⁹⁷ Targum Jonathan, p. 55 (Genesis 29.27).

⁹⁸ Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 4, p. 55 (Genesis 29.27).

⁹⁹ BLAYNE, 1790, p. 71 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰⁰ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 53 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰¹ Targum Hierosolymitanum, p. 55 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰² BRÜLL, 1875, p. 34 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰³ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 126 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰⁴ Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 127 (Genesis 29.27).

¹⁰⁵ SWETE, 1887, Vol. 1, p. 304 (Numbers 22.6).

¹⁰⁶ BRÜLL, 1875, p. 185 (Numbers 22.6).

¹⁰⁷ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 1, p. 642 (Numbers 22.6).

¹⁰⁸ SWETE, Henry Barclay. (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894, p. 508 (Daniel 2.36).

¹⁰⁹ Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. In: WALTON, Brian (Ed.). **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 3. London: Roycroft, 1656, p. 186 (Daniel 2.36).

¹¹⁰ Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. Vol. 3, p. 187 (Daniel 2.36).

4 DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN THE TALMUDIC REFERENCES TO THE PLURAL FORMS AND THE EMENDATIONS OF THE SCRIBES

It is essential to differentiate between the Talmudic references to the plural forms and the emendations of the scribes (תיקון סופרים) because even in the literature of the subject it happens that those two categories are confused¹¹¹. To begin with, let us define what is meant by the emendations of the scribes. Certain Jewish religious documents and marginal notes on some manuscripts of the Masoretic text stipulated that scribes emended some passages of the original text so that the extant text of the Tanakh contained the altered version of them¹¹². Certain documents provided the text of some of those passages presented as original namely antecedent to the emendations of the scribes, while in case of other passages scholars were able to reconstruct a plausible original form of them, assuming that the said emendations actually took place.

The concept of the scribal emendations challenged the Jewish scholars of the 16th century¹¹³ and it continues to challenge contemporary interpreters because the identity of the scribes (סופרים), who were supposed to emend the text, is unknown. Since in most passages, in which the emendations were claimed, the Septuagint was allied with the Masoretic text, the question arises when those alleged emendations could occur and how the knowledge of them might be handed down from generation to generation. If those purported emendations eventuated from the very late redaction of the text, they should not be treated as corrections (תיקון) of the text but rather as a process intrinsic to the formation of the Scripture. Furthermore, not all reliable manuscripts of the Masoretic text register the scribal emendations which implies that they might originally be viewed as a non-authoritative, provisional addendum to the Masoretic apparatus, not as a part thereof.

¹¹¹ WESTERMANN, Claus. **Genesis 1-11: A Commentary**. Trans. John J. SCULLION. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984, p. 552 (Genesis 11.7).

¹¹² GINSBURG, Christian David. **Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible**. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897, p. 347-363 [II, XI, 5, IX]. WEDELL, Abraham. **De emendationibus a Sopherim in libris sacris Veteris Testamenti propositis**. Breslau: Lindner, 1869, passim.

¹¹³ ADONIJAH, Jacob ben Hayyim ibn. **Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible**. Ed. and trans. Christian David GINSBURG. London: Longmans, 1867, passim.

Irrespective of the interpretation of the scribal emendations, it is evident that those purported emendations (18 in number) were on the one hand distinct from *qere* (קרי) enshrined in the Masoretic apparatus, on the other hand they had nothing to do with the Talmudic references to the plural forms linked to the Divinity because the passages pregnant with those plural forms evidenced in various tractates of the Talmud were never counted among 18 emendations attributed to the scribes.

5 INTERPRETATION OF THE TRACTATE SANHEDRIN (N^o 38B)

In the edifice of the Jewish thought the tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b) was the text underlying the approach of the Jewish exegesis to the passages in which the plural forms were connected to the Divinity. Those *loci* were elucidated primarily by juxtaposition with the literary context of them. Accordingly, the plural forms touching the Divinity were confronted with the singular forms related to the Divinity found in the preceding or following verses.

On the one hand the Scripture attributed the words “Let us make [נעשה]” (Genesis 1.26) to God, on the other hand in Genesis 1.27 God was said to create man (“And God created [ויברא] man”). The same LORD, to whom Genesis 11.7 assigned the words “Come, let us go down [נרדה], and let us confound [ונבלה] there their language”, is said to come down (“And the LORD came down [וירד]”) in Genesis 11.5. Furthermore, Genesis 35.7 reads “[...] there God was / were revealed [נגלו] unto him [...]”, while in Genesis 35.3 it is written “I will make there an altar unto God who was answering [הענה] me in the day of my distress”.

Processing Deuteronomy 4.7, the tractate Sanhedrin noted that despite the plural form of the adjective (קרבים) modifying the appellation “God”, the same text announced that the Covenant People were calling “upon Him” (אליו), not upon “them”. Similarly, in 2 Samuel 7.23 it is written “[...] a nation one in the earth, whom God went [הלכנו] to redeem unto Himself [לו] for a people [...]” (JPS) by virtue of which the plural form of the verb is situated against the singular form of the pronominal suffix.

The tractate Sanhedrin asserted that the plural forms in the *loci* cited above originated from the fact that in the Scripture God was pictured as the One who was doing nothing without consulting His heavenly court (פמליא) as typified

by Daniel 4.14. The latter passage, to which the tractate Sanhedrin appealed, should be examined in its own right which however could not be afforded in the present article. Similarly, the study of the concept of the heavenly court prominent in the Tanakh is beyond the purview of the survey¹¹⁴.

As regards Genesis 19.24, Exodus 24.1 and Daniel 7.9, those passages were subject to complex literary scrutiny in the tractate Sanhedrin. According to the said tractate, Genesis 19.24, which reads “Then the LORD caused to rain upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven” (JPS), was utilised by “dissenters” (מינים) to compromise the absolute oneness of the LORD. Thus, “dissenters” argued that the LORD who caused rain must be distinct from the LORD from whom fire stems because otherwise “from him” (מאתו) would stand for “from the LORD”.

In response to this argument, the tractate Sanhedrin pointed out that for the sake of emphasis in the Hebrew Bible nouns or even proper nouns were occasionally repeated instead of being supplanted by personal pronouns or pronominal suffixes. Consequently, Genesis 4.23 was adduced as illustrative thereof. Thus, in Genesis 4.23, which reads “And Lamech said unto his wives: Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech [...]” (JPS), logically one would expect “my wives” (נשי) instead of “wives of Lamech” (נשי למך) but the tractate Sanhedrin reminds us that idiomatic features of any language are not defined by the logic.

From the contemporary perspective it could be assumed that the duplications observed in Genesis 4.23, 19.24 and Exodus 24.1 might be derived from the process of compiling various sources. Presuming that diverse sources solidified into a coherent biblical narrative as it is known to us, one may ask why in the process of final redaction the text was not refined by removing the aforementioned duplications. This question however remains unanswered.

Exodus 24.1 reads “And unto Moses He / he said [אמר]: Come up unto the LORD [אל]” and the context would suggest that the LORD spoken of in the preceding verses was the subject of the verb “said” (אמר). Nonetheless, if the LORD was the One who in Exodus 24.1 was addressing Moses, the question arises why in the direct speech “Come up unto the LORD [...]” the pronominal suffix of

¹¹⁴ ALEXANDER, Philip. 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch. In: **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**. Vol. 1, ed. James H. CHARLESWORTH. New York: Doubleday, 1983, p. 240-245.

the first person singular (אלי - unto me) was not used in lieu of “unto the LORD” (אל יי).

For that reason, the tractate Sanhedrin cum Rashi’s commentary maintained that the subject of the verb “said” (אמר) was Metatron who according to the Jewish tradition was an archangel acting on behalf of the LORD and who was generally equated with the angel of the LORD referred to in Exodus 23.20-21. Furthermore, the tractate Sanhedrin clarified that although Metatron was the LORD’s special agent within whom God’s Name was present in a special way (cf. Exodus 23:21), Metatron was not equal to the LORD and did not forgive human transgressions.

The statement recorded in Exodus 23.21, that on his mission Metatron did not forgive sins (לא ישא), was interpreted by Rashi¹¹⁵ as if Metatron was permanently unable (לא יכול לסלוח) to remit any sins. By stressing that Metatron must be regarded as a mere envoy (שליח) of the LORD, the tractate Sanhedrin and Rashi commenting upon that statement were probably refuting the patristic insistence on the identification of the LORD’s angel from Exodus 23-24 as the pre-incarnate Jesus to whom the developed theology of the ancient, imperial church accorded the unconditional Godhead peculiar to the LORD as depicted in the Tanakh. The Talmudic concern about the ontological status of Metatron was also articulated in the tractate Hagigah (no. 14b-15a)¹¹⁶. Additionally, the pseudepigrapha testify to Metatron’s elevation to the semi-divine status¹¹⁷ which has not been accepted in the Rabbinic Judaism. Reading the text of the Haggadah¹¹⁸, which could be traced back to the late Middle Ages¹¹⁹ and which was expanded in the Yemen tradition¹²⁰, it transpires that certain precautions were taken to curb the elevation

¹¹⁵ RASHI, סנהדרין בבלי. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 13, 38v [No. 38b].

¹¹⁶ הגיגה. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 6. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1860, 14r-15v [No. 14b-15a].

¹¹⁷ ALEXANDER, Philip. 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch, p. 243-244 [Theological Importance, The Heavenly Household]. The Book of Enoch. In: **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**. Vol. 1, p. 284-285 [30].

¹¹⁸ FÜRSTENTHAL, Raphael Jacob (Ed. and trans.). **Hagada**: Gebete für den häuslichen Gottesdienst am ersten und zweiten Abend des Pessachfestes. Prague and Breslau: Brandeis, 1900, p. 24-25 [ויציאנו].

¹¹⁹ ABRAVANEL, Isaac (Ed.). סדר הגדה של פסח [National Library of France, Manuscript, Hebrew Collection, No. 1406] [s. p.] [ויציאנו].

¹²⁰ GREENBURG, William H. (Ed. and trans.). **The Haggadah according to the Rite of Yemen**. London: Nutt, 1896, p. 36-38 [XXVI]. Ibidem, p. 28-30 [XXVI].

of the angel(s) because the Haggadah clarified that the LORD alone, not an angel, was passing through the land of Egypt, smiting every firstborn and that the LORD alone, not an angel, brought Israel out of Egypt.

In fact, there was no consensus among the Jewish exegetes on Exodus 24.1. Abraham ibn Ezra¹²¹ and Nahmanides (רמב"ן)¹²² hesitated to acknowledge Metatron as the subject of the verb "said" (אמר) and they pointed out that an inconsistent use of the persons and pronouns was natural to the Tanakh. Consequently, Abraham ibn Ezra cited the example of Ezekiel 24.24¹²³ and 1 Samuel 12.11¹²⁴, while Nahmanides - that of Genesis 4.23, Daniel 9.17¹²⁵ and 1 Samuel 12.11.

In Daniel 7.9 it is stated that the thrones (כרסין), on which the LORD pictured as the Ancient of days was to sit, were to be placed (רמיז). Granted that both the noun (scilicet "thrones") and the verb (i. e. "were to be placed") were plural, the tractate Sanhedrin tried to explicate it in view of the absolute oneness of the LORD. For this purpose, two explanations attributed to Akiva ben Joseph were offered and evaluated. Additionally, the voice of Eleazar ben Azariah was adduced.

According to the first explanation, one throne was reserved for the LORD, while the other one - for David. This interpretation was objected by rabbi Jose who denounced Akiva for viewing the divine presence (שכינה) in corporeal terms. In his commentary on the tractate Sanhedrin Rashi¹²⁶ contended that by portraying the LORD as subject to sitting in physical terms the first explanation might predicate the corporeality (symbolised by body and blood) of Him.

According to the second explanation, one throne was representing the divine judgment (דין), whereas the other one - the divine righteousness (צדקה).

¹²¹ EZRA, Abraham ibn. Exodus 24.1. In: **The Commentators' Bible**. Vol. 2, ed. Michael CARASIK. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2005, p. 206-207.

¹²² NAHMANIDES. Exodus 24.1. In: **The Commentators' Bible**. Vol. 2, p. 206-207.

¹²³ Thus shall Ezekiel be unto you a sign [...] (JPS). The Book of Ezekiel presented these words as said by the LORD to Ezekiel.

¹²⁴ This passage is a valid illustration on the stipulation that the words "And the LORD sent [...] Samuel [...]" (JPS) are attributed to Samuel which is questionable in light of the narrative especially in view of the preceding and following verses.

¹²⁵ In this prayer God is referred to in the second person singular except the phrase "for the Lord's sake".

¹²⁶ RASHI, סנהדרין, 38v [No. 38b].

Thus, two thrones were said to stand for two aspects (attributes) of the Godhead. This interpretation was not repudiated explicitly in the Talmudic narrative but the tractate Sanhedrin appears to be circumspect about it, concluding the discourse with the practical view of Eleazar ben Azariah who asserted that the first throne was a throne *sensu stricto* (namely to sit on), while the other one functioned as a footstool (שרפרף) meant to support one's feet.

The opening of the paragraph in the tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b) explains the rationale behind the discussion on the plural forms linked to the Divinity, saying that “dissenters” (מינים) attempted to justify their heterodox views on the ground of the passages analysed above. Expounding the Megillah (no. 9a), Rashi¹²⁷ admitted that those dissenters appealed to Genesis 1.26 (“Let us make”) in order to substantiate their claim of two principles (רשויות) active in the process of creation.

Commenting upon the tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b), Rashi¹²⁸ identified those, who were using the Hebrew Bible in support of their deviation from the truth, as the Sadducees, which in light of the sources known to the modern scholarship seems to be highly debatable¹²⁹. From the contemporary perspective two identifications of dissenters appear to be plausible, yet either of two possibilities is flawed in some respects.

Consequently, it is assumed that dissenters mentioned above denoted either Gnostics infiltrating Jewish or Christian community of faith or Christians. Let us probe into the Gnostic hypothesis. Undoubtedly, both communities of faith were exposed to the Gnostic ideas in all their variety and were vulnerable the dualistic tendency coming from the Persian religious and cultural milieu. Although the plurality of divine agents or powers active in the universe was conceivable within countless Gnostic traditions and compatible with the paradigm of the ancient Gnosticism (presuming that it is an operative category at all), the comments about the Gnostic references to Genesis 1.26 made by the church fathers¹³⁰ imply that

¹²⁷ RASHI. מגילה. In: תלמוד בבלי, vol. 5, 9r [No. 9a].

¹²⁸ RASHI. “סנהדרין.” 38v [No. 38b].

¹²⁹ HERFORD, Robert Travers. **Christianity in Talmud and Midrash**. London: Williams & Norgate, 1903, p. 261-266 [I, B, ii]. Ibidem, p. 291-303 [I, B, iii]. GRAETZ, Heinrich. **Gnostizismus und Judentum**. Krotoschin: Monasch, 1846. FRIEDLÄNDER, Moriz. **Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnostizismus**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898.

¹³⁰ IRENAEUS, Lugdunensis. *Adversus haereses*. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**:

on the ground of Genesis 1.26 some Gnostics tried to validate not a duality but plurality of divine emanations hardly distinguishable from amorphous angelic or cosmic powers or agents populating the Gnostic universe¹³¹. Actually, the same church fathers¹³², who recorded the Gnostic use of Genesis 1.26, used this verse to impose the trinitarian concept upon the Tanakh, but on that basis of Genesis 1.26 they themselves only argued in favour of the two principles¹³³ to wit in favour of the Father and the Son equated with Jesus¹³⁴.

According to the pseudo-Clementine homily¹³⁵, Simon Magus, who appealed to Genesis 1.26 in order to prove that there were at least two builders of the universe, was opposed by Peter who claimed that the words “Let us make [...]” were said by God to His Wisdom (σοφία). Furthermore, it appears that the Gnostic cosmology was inclined to speak of a single, inferior agency involved in the work of creation so that the duality or plurality typical of the Gnostic cosmology presupposed that the creative activity was delegated to a single demiurge-like agent.

The fact that the church fathers not only appealed to several passages

Series Graeca. Vol. 7, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 673-675 [I, XXIV, 1-2]. Ibidem, p. 697-699 [I, XXX, 6-7]. Ibidem, p. 975 [IV, Praefatio, 4]. HIPPOLYTUS. Refutatio omnium haeresium. In: **Werke**. Vol. 3, ed. Paul WENDLAND. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916, p. 208-209 [VII, 28]. PSEUDO-CLEMENS, Romanus. Recognitione. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca. Vol. 1, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 1266-1268 [II, XXXIX-XLI]. Idem, Homilia XVI. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca. Vol. 2, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 365-384.

¹³¹ Cf. the Mandaean concept of creation: LIDZBARSKI, Mark, trans. **Ginza**: Der Schatz oder Das grosse Buch der Mandäer. Göttingen and Leipzig: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht and Hinrichs, 1925, p. 106-109 [Rechter Teil, III, 99-102]. Ibidem, p. 114-118 [Rechter Teil, III, 105-108]. Ibidem, p. 175-177 [Rechter Teil, V/1, 169-173]. Ibidem, p. 243-245 [Rechter Teil, X, 241-245]. Ibidem, p. 265-267 [Rechter Teil, XI, 267-270].

¹³² IRENAEUS, Lugdunensis. Adversus haereses, p. 673-675 [I, XXIV, 1-2]. Ibidem, p. 697-699 [I, XXX, 6-7]. Ibidem, p. 975 [IV, Praefatio, 4]. NOVATIANUS. De Trinitate. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina. Vol. 3. Paris: Migne, 1886, p. 964-965 [XVI/XXI].

¹³³ Although Irenaeus of Lyons contended that the words “Let us make [...]” (Genesis 1:26) were uttered by the Father to the Son and to the Spirit, he was intent on securing the divine status of the Son viewed as a means of creation. IRENAEUS, Lugdunensis. Adversus haereses, p. 1032 [IV, XX, 1]. Ibidem, p. 975 [IV, Praefatio, 4].

¹³⁴ Ibidem, p. 1032 [IV, XX, 1]. Ibidem, p. 975 [IV, Praefatio, p. 4]. NOVATIANUS. De Trinitate, p. 944-946 [XVII/XXV]. Ibidem, p. 946-950 [XVIII/XXVI]. Ibidem, p. 964-965 [XVI/XXI].

¹³⁵ PSEUDO-CLEMENS, Romanus. Homilia XVI, p. 373-376 [XI-XII].

conspicuous for the plural forms related to the Divinity in order to plead the trinitarian concept but also began collating some of them¹³⁶ lends credence to the proposition that Christians might be meant by the dissenters in the aforementioned Talmudic *loci*. The objection, that Christians would profess not two but three (i. e. the Father, the Son and the Spirit) principles active in the process of creation, can be dismissed because the Jewish literature was not aimed at elaborating upon the mature trinitarian teaching of the ecumenical councils but rather captured distinctive features of the Christianity in its formative years, and prior to the programmatic works by Basil of Caesarea the Christian theology was riveted by the idea of the divine or semi-divine ontological status of Jesus who was commonly thought of as the instrument of creation. Thus, perceiving the Christian doctrine as the espousal of two principles of creation (namely the Father and the Son identified as Jesus), the Jewish *literati* would give an account of the actual focal point for the church of that period.

Nonetheless, the disquisition on the status of Metatron perpetuated in the tractate Hagigah (no. 14b-15a)¹³⁷ problematised a quest for dissenters' identity. According to the Talmudic lore, due to the mystical experience rabbi Elisha ben Abuyah became heterodox, declaring that Metatron was one of the two principles (רשייית), yet no reference to the creation was made. Furthermore, Elisha ben Abuyah, who as a result of his apostasy was named "the other one" (אחר), announced that God created not only good phenomena but also their counterparts (כנגדו). The latter description might reflect some dualistic influence probably of Gnostic or Persian origin.

Realising the ontological perspective accruing from the Jewish concept of the divine oneness, it should be noted that in the Judaism the absolute oneness of the Divinity did not eliminate the idea of mediation or representation thereof.

¹³⁶ As exemplified by: IGNATIUS, Antiochenus. Ad Anthiochenos. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca. Vol. 5, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 899-900 [II]. NOVATIANUS. De Trinitate, p. 964-965 [XVI/XXI]. SYRUS, Ephraem. A Rhytm against the Jews delivered upon Palm Sunday. In: **Select Works**. Trans. John Brande MORRIS. Oxford and London: Parker and Rivington, 1847, p. 68-69 [11]. Idem, Rhytm the Sixth. In: **Select Works**, p. 127-129 [3-4]. EUSEBIUS, Caesariensis. Demonstratio evangelica. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca. Vol. 22, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 379-386 [V, VII-X]. PROCOPIUS, Gazaetus, Commentarius in Genesisin. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca. Vol. 87/1, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1865, p. 311-316 (Genesis 11.7).

¹³⁷ חגיגה, 14r-15v [No. 14b-15a].

For instance, the Targumim were inclined to insulate the LORD from the creatures and thus attempted to circumvent the situation in which the Creator would be thought of as the direct object of human action. For this purpose, the Targumim were on a regular basis introducing the LORD's Word (מימרא) as the instrument mediating between the intangible and the tangible especially in the context of creative operations engaging the Transcendence¹³⁸. This approach concurs with the Philonian concept of λόγος and it could even be traced back to the late strata of the biblical literature (e. g. Job 28 or Proverbs 3:19, chapter 8) which recorded the idea of divine Wisdom (חכמה, σοφία) emerging in the Hellenistic Judaism.

In the Jewish tradition the Word of the LORD (identical with the divine Wisdom)¹³⁹ was viewed as the instrument of creation used by the LORD and as the instrument of communication between the LORD and humankind, yet in the Jewish thought the LORD's instruments or representations, even if conceptually personified, never enjoyed the unconditional divinity but rather they were thought of as created by or emanated¹⁴⁰ from the Godhead and therefore they were perceived as entirely dependent on their sole and unique source and regarded as potentially provisional.

6 INTERPRETATION OF THE TRACTATE MEGILLAH (N° 9A) AND THE MINOR TRACTATE SOFRIM

Although the tractate Megillah (no. 9a) and the minor tractate Sofrim look alike and refer to the same passages (viz. Genesis 1.26-27, 11.7), those tractates should be interpreted separately. While discussing the legitimacy of translating the Hebrew Bible into foreign languages, the Megillah observed that

¹³⁸ Cf. Genesis 1:27 in the Jerusalem Targum: Targum Hierosolymitanum, p. 3 (Genesis 1.27).

¹³⁹ Likewise, from the Jewish point of view רוח אלהים could be interpreted as the divine breath by means of which God was proactive at an early stage of the process of creation. RASHI, Bereschi. In: **Der Pentateuch**: Die Fünf Bücher Mosche mit worttreuer deutscher Übersetzung nebst dem Raschi-Kommentar. Vol. 1, ed. and trans. Julius DESSAUER. Budapest: Schlesinger, 1905, p. 3 (Genesis 1.2).

¹⁴⁰ The Jewish mysticism adopted the Neoplatonic ontology and brought forth a sophisticated system of emanations (ספירות). As a matter of fact, in the late Middle Ages the Western Christianity began misreading some statements taken out of the Jewish mystical writings in order to amplify its proselytising and anti-Semitic campaigns.

the Septuagint translators were able to capture an accurate sense of complex *loci* inclusive of those marked by the plural forms touching the Divinity (i. e. Genesis 1.26-27, 11.7). The difficulty is that following a legend of the LXX origin, the Megillah stated that those translators “wrote” (וּכְתָבוּ) for the king Ptolemy “I will make [אֵעֲשֶׂה] man in the image [בְּצִלְמִם], after the likeness [וּבְדְמוּת]” (Genesis 1.26) and “Come, let me go down [אֲרִדָּה], and let me confound [וְאֲבִלֶה] there their language” (Genesis 11.7).

Since there is no ancient Greek version of the Tanakh corresponding to the singular verbal forms quoted above, it might be inferred that the Megillah was treating of the translators’ proper understanding of those *loci*, emphasising that they realised and handled well the difficulty of the Hebrew original. Certainly, the Megillah never suggested that the Hebrew text of Genesis 1.26-27 and 11.7 was altered or rectified. In his commentary on the Megillah (no. 9a) Rashi¹⁴¹ remarked that those, who on the basis of the statement “Let us make” (Genesis 1.26) were propounding two principles (רְשׁוּיִת) in the process of creation, departed from the truth. In the present paper the identity of “dissenters” (מִיָּנִים) has been discussed with reference to the tractate Sanhedrin (no. 38b).

The tractate Sofrim belongs to the minor tractates which are appended to the edition of the Talmud but considered less authoritative than the major tractates¹⁴². Regarding the plural forms related to the names of God, the tractate Sofrim maintained that the Septuagint translators altered (שִׁינּוּ) the text of Genesis, replacing in Genesis 1.26 נֵעֲשֶׂה with אֵעֲשֶׂה and בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ with בְּצִלְמֵם וּבְדְמוּתֵם, whereas in Genesis 11.7 נִרְדָּה with אֲרִדָּה and וְנִבְלֶה with וְאֲבִלֶה. This statement is inexplicable in light of the extant text of the Septuagint and its revisions.

CONCLUSION

It was observed that the text of the plural forms touching the Divinity analysed in the present paper was stable and no variants of the Hebrew text were evidenced except for Genesis 20.13 and 35.7 in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The status of the Samaritan text is debated by scholars. Generally speaking, the

¹⁴¹ RASHI. מגילה, 9r [No. 9a].

¹⁴² BLAU, Ludwig. Soferim. In: **The Jewish Encyclopedia**. Vol. 11, ed. Isidore SINGER. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalis, 1905, p. 426-428.

affinity of some Samaritan variants to the Septuagint can be interpreted either as an indication of its antiquity and superiority over the Masoretic text or as a token of the Hellenisation of the Samaritan community.

The Septuagint retained the plural forms of the Hebrew original in Genesis 1.26-27, 3.22 and 11.7, while in Genesis 20.13, 35.7 and in 2 Samuel 7.23 the singular was used in place of the plural. In case of Deuteronomy 4.7 and 5.26(23) the laws of Greek grammar necessitated the singular forms. The Targumim were not only sheer Aramaic renditions of the Scripture but also a type of concise exposition thereof. As regards the plural forms, non-Aramaic ancient biblical translations tended to rely either on the LXX or on the Targumim.

Expounding those forms, the Targumim regularly utilised the concept of angels ministering in front of the LORD as the recipients of His speech. The function of Targumim was twofold. On the one hand, they reflected the mainstream of the biblical interpretation at their time of origin, on the other hand, they formed the exegetical mind-set of the subsequent generations of Jewish *literati*. The theme of heavenly court consulted by God before taking action has been playing a prominent role in the history of the Jewish interpretation of the aforementioned *loci*.

From Justin's disquisition¹⁴³ it is evident that there were diverse interpretations of those passages circulating within the Jewish community of that time. Some of those interpretations were not perpetuated in the Talmud albeit the Talmudic approach to the plural forms pertinent to the Divinity certainly laid the foundations for the subsequent development of the Jewish exegesis in this respect.

REFERENCES

- ABRAVANEL, Isaac (Ed.). סדר הגדה של פסח [National Library of France, Manuscript, Hebrew Collection, No. 1406].
- ADONIJAH, Jacob ben Hayyim ibn. **Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible**. Ed. and trans. Christian David GINSBURG. London: Longmans, 1867.
- _____ ibn (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 1. Venice: Bomberg, 1524-1525.
- _____ ibn (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 2. Venice: Bomberg, 1524-1525.

¹⁴³ JUSTINUS. Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 6, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 617-620 [62].

- ALEXANDER, Philip. 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch. In: **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**. Vol. 1. Ed. James H. CHARLESWORTH. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- ARMSTRONG, Gregory T. **Die Genesis in der alten Kirche**: Die drei Kirchenväter. Tübingen: Mohr, 1962.
- BERLINER, Abraham (Ed.). **Targum Onkelos**. Vol. 1. Berlin: Kauffmann, 1881.
- BLAU, Ludwig. Soferim. In: **The Jewish Encyclopedia**. Vol. 11. Ed. Isidore SINGER. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalis, 1905.
- BLAYNE, Benjamin (Ed.). **Pentateuchus Hebraeo-Samaritanus**. Oxford: Clarendon, 1790.
- The Book of Enoch. In: **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**. Vol. 1. Ed. James H. CHARLESWORTH. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- BRÜLL, Adolf (Ed.). **Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch**. Frankfurt am Main: Erras, 1875.
- BÜRCKLIN, Georg Christian (Ed. and trans.). **Quatuor prima capita Geneseos Aethiopice et Latine**. Frankfurt am Main: Wust, 1696.
- DE LAGARDE, Paul (Ed.). **Prophetae chaldaice**. Leipzig: Teubner, 1872.
- DE ROSSI, Giovanni Bernard. **Bibliotheca Judaica antichristiana**. Parma: Ex Regio Typographeo, 1800.
- EUSEBIUS, Caesariensis. Demonstratio evangelica. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 22. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- EZRA, Abraham ibn. Exodus 24:1. In: **The Commentators' Bible**. Vol. 2. Ed. Michael CARASIK. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2005.
- FIELD, Frederick (Ed.). **Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt: sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta**. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875.
- FRIEDLÄNDER, Moriz. **Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnostizismus**. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898.
- FÜRSTENTHAL, Raphael Jacob (Ed. and trans.). **Hagada**: Gebete für den häuslichen Gottesdienst am ersten und zweiten Abend des Pessachfestes. Prague and Breslau: Brandeis, 1900.
- GAZA, Theodore. **Introductio grammatica**. Basel: Walder, 1541.
- GEBHARDT, Oscar (Ed.). **Graecus Venetus**. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1875.
- GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau and Charles William Emil MILLER. **Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes**. Vol. 1. New York: American Book Company, 1900.

- GINSBURG, Christian David. **Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible**. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897.
- GRAETZ, Heinrich. **Gnostizismus und Judentum**. Krotoschin: Monasch, 1846.
- GREENBURG, William H. (Ed. and trans.). **The Haggadah according to the Rite of Yemen**. London: Nutt, 1896.
- הגיגה. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 6. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1860.
- HERFORD, Robert Travers. **Christianity in Talmud and Midrash**. London: Williams & Norgate, 1903.
- HIPPOLYTUS. Refutatio omnium haeresium. In: **Werke**. Vol. 3. Ed. Paul WENDLAND. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916.
- IGNATIUS, Antiochenus. Ad Anthiochenos. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 5. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- IRENÆUS, Lugdunensis. Adversus haereses. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 7. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- ילקוט בראשית. In: ספר ילקוט שמעוני. Vol. 1. Vilnius: ראובן and ראם, 1863.
- JEHIEL, Nathan. **Rabbinisch-aramäisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zur Kenntnis des Talmuds, der Targumim und Midraschim**. Vol. 3. Ed. Moses Israel LANDAU. Prague: Scholl, 1820.
- Jerusalem. In: **The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: Genesis and Exodus**. Trans. John Wesley ETHERIDGE. London: Longman, 1862.
- JUSTINUS. Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 6. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- LEBRETON, Jules. **Les origines du dogme de la Trinite**. Paris: Beauchesne, 1919.
- LEVY, Jacob. **Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Teil des rabbinischen Schrifttums**. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1867.
- LIDZBARSKI, Mark, trans. **Ginza: Der Schatz oder Das grosse Buch der Mandäer**. Göttingen and Leipzig: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht and Hinrichs, 1925.
- מגילה. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 5. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1860.
- NAHMANIDES. Exodus 24:1. In: **The Commentators' Bible**. Vol. 2. Ed. Michael CARASIK. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2005.
- NOVATIANS. De Trinitate. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**. Vol. 3. Paris: Migne, 1886.
- PHILO, Alexandrinus. De confusione linguarum. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 2. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1897.

- _____. De fuga et inventione. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1898.
- _____. De mutatione nominum. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1898.
- _____. De opificio mundi. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 1. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1896.
- _____. Legum allegoriarum libri I-III. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 1. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1896.
- _____. Philonis Quaestionum et solutionum quae in Genesi: Sermo I. In: **Paralipomena Armena**. Ed. Joannes Baptista Aucher. Venice: Lazari, 1826.
- _____. Quis rerum divinarum heres sit. In: **Opera quae supersunt**. Vol. 3. Ed. Leopold COHN and Paul WENDLAND. Berlin: Reimer, 1898.
- PRATENSIS, Felix (Ed.). מקראות גדולות. Vol. 1. Venice: Bomberg, 1516-1517.
- PROCOPIUS, Gzaeus, Commentarius in Genesin. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 87/1. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1865.
- PSEUDO-CLEMENS, Romanus. Homilia XVI. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 2. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- _____. Recognitione. In: **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca**. Vol. 1. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- RASHI, Bereschi. In: **Der Pentateuch: Die Fünf Bücher Mosche mit worttreuer deutscher Übersetzung nebst dem Raschi-Kommentar**. Vol. 1. Ed. and trans. Julius DESSAUER. Budapest: Schlesinger, 1905.
- _____. מגילה. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 5. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1860.
- _____. סנהדרין. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 13. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1862.
- _____. Schemoth. In: **Der Pentateuch: Die Fünf Bücher Mosche mit worttreuer deutscher Übersetzung nebst dem Raschi-Kommentar**. Vol. 2. Ed. and trans. Julius DESSAUER. Budapest: Schlesinger, 1905.
- ספר בראשית. In: חמשה חומשי תורה. Vol. 1. Lviv: Balaban, 1869.
- ספר דברים. In: חמשה חומשי תורה. Vol. 5. Lviv: Balaban, 1869.
- סופרים. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 13. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1862.
- סנהדרין. In: תלמוד בבלי. Vol. 13. Warsaw: Orgelbrand, 1862.
- STEPHANUS (ESTIENNE), Henricus (Henri). **Thesaurus Graecae linguae**. Vol. 5. London: Valpy, 1823.
- SWETE, Henry Barclay (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1887.

- _____. (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- _____. (Ed.). **The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint**. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894.
- SYRUS, Ephraem. A Rhytm against the Jews delivered upon Palm Sunday. In: **Select Works**. Trans. John Brande MORRIS. Oxford and London: Parker and Rivington, 1847.
- _____. Rhytm the Sixth. In: **Select Works**. Trans. John Brande MORRIS. Oxford and London: Parker and Rivington, 1847.
- Targum Hierosolymitanum. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4. Wd. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1657.
- Targum Jonathan. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1657.
- Targum of Onkelos. In: **The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: Genesis and Exodus**. Trans. John Wesley ETHERIDGE. London: Longman, 1862.
- Targum of Palestine. In: **The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: Genesis and Exodus**. Trans. John Wesley ETHERIDGE. London: Longman, 1862.
- TISCHENDORF, Konstantin and Theodor HEYSE (Ed.). **Biblia sacra Latina Veteris Testamenti Hieronymo interprete ex antiquissima auctoritate in stichos descripta**. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1873.
- Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 1. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1657.
- Versio Arabica cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 3. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1656.
- Versio Persica cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 4. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1657.
- Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 1. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1657.
- Versio Syriaca cum interpretatione Latina. In: **Biblia sacra polyglotta**. Vol. 3. Ed. Brian WALTON. London: Roycroft, 1656.
- Vetus Testamentum I**. Alcalá: In Academia Complutensi, 1520.
- WEDELL, Abraham. **De emendationibus a Sopherim in libris sacris Veteris Testamenti propositis**. Breslau: Lindner, 1869.
- WEISS, Isaac Hirsch (Ed.). **Mechilta: Der älteste halachische und hagadische Kommentar**

zum zweiten Buch Moses. Wien: Schlossberg, 1865.

WESTERMANN, Claus. **Genesis 1-11: A Commentary**. Trans. John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.

_____. Excursus: The History of the Exegesis of Gen 1:26-27. In: **Genesis 1-11: A Commentary**. Trans. John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.

WILKINS, David (Ed. and trans.). **Quinque libri Moysis prophetae in lingua Aegyptia**. London: Bowyer, 1731.

WILSON, Robert McLachlan Wilson. The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26. In: *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): p. 420-437.

(Footnotes)

1 BERLINER, 1881, Vol. 1, p. 4 (Genesis 3.22).

2 Targum Jonathan, p. 7 (Genesis 3.22).

3 Targum Hierosolymitanum, p. 7 (Genesis 3.22).

4 The use of ὁμοῦ in Symmachus' revision seems to be non-idiomatic. STEPHANUS (ESTIENNE), Henricus (Henri). **Thesaurus Graecae linguae**. Vol. 5. London: Valpy, 1823, p. 6733 [s. v. ὁμοιος (ὁμοῦ)].

5 Targum of Palestine. In: **The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: Genesis and Exodus**. Trans. John Wesley ETHERIDGE. London: Longman, 1862, p. 168 (Genesis 3.22).

6 Jerusalem. In: **The Targums**, 1862, p. 169 (Genesis 3.22).

7 Targum of Onkelos. In: **The Targums**, p. 75 (Genesis 20.13).

8 Targum of Palestine, p. 219-220 (Genesis 20.13).