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The first point of departure for the present thesis is the observation that the Aramaic translation of Job found at Qumran (11Q10) sits uncomfortably in the genre of the 'classical' Targum despite the original editors' classification of the text as '11QtargumJob'. A second stimulus for the study arises from the author's review of scholarly discussion on 11Q10 in which its comparison with the Targum and Syriac versions of Job has been either anecdotal or extremely limited in scope. In light of the obvious relationship between these two observations, and in the hope that the investigation of the latter will shed light on the former, the author attempts to take up the question of the classification of the Qumran text through a synoptic comparison of 11Q10 with the Targum and Syriac versions.

Moving beyond static definitions of literalness, questions of dating and the dependence of the Syriac on the Targum tradition, the author makes use of recent work in Targumic and Syriac studies which has attempted to come to grips with issues of genre through an assessment of modes of representation and the formal treatment of the Hebrew text. Having noted that preliminary investigations of the relationship between these Aramaic versions have been limited to a study of addition and substitution, the present investigation attempts to assess the respective translators' attitudes toward the Hebrew text through an analysis of omission and transposition. Following on from these investigations, the Aramaic versions' treatment of that smallest of Hebrew lexemes—the waw conjunction—is analysed as a further index by which the attitudes of the various translators toward their Hebrew source may be assessed.

Having investigated the attitude of the respective translators to their source text, the author locates his findings both within the context of the Qumran translation's classification as Targum and, more broadly, within the study of the Aramaic versions. The author concludes that, in terms of its representation of the Hebrew text, the Aramaic translation from Qumran shares certain fundamental features with the Peshitta of Job rather than with its nominal cousin, the Rabbinic Targum of Job.
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INTRODUCTION

When taking up the subject of Job in the targumic tradition it has become standard operating procedure for scholars to turn to discussions of ‘targum’ in the early rabbinic literature\(^1\). For students of the Job targumic tradition, one passage in particular has commanded scholarly attention:

Said R. Yose, ‘There was the case involving Abba Halapta, who went to Rabban Gamaliel b. Ribbi in Tiberias, and found him sitting at the table of Yohanan Hannizzop, and in his hand was a scroll of Job in Aramaic translation, and he was reading in it. He said to him, “Remember Rabban Gamaliel, your father’s father, who was standing on the steps of the Temple mount, and they brought before him a scroll of Job in Aramaic translation, and he said to the builders, “Store it away under a row of stones.” So he too, gave orders concerning it and they stored it away.’\(^2\)

With the discovery in the mid 1950’s, of a so-called ‘targum’ of Job\(^3\) in Cave 11 near the site of Khirbet Qumran and accompanying suggestions of its antiquity, the

---

\(^{1}\) See recently C. Mangan, The Targum of Job AramBib 15 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987) 5; R. Weiss, התרגומים הארמיים (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1979): Chapter 1.


אמר רבי יוסי: משה אבותך הלפחת אצלו רבי ממעילים בפתח ולו הכתוב והוה קוקה ביניע דינר אinerary בקבר

על שלחמו של יהודיה חנוך רבי סמר אוח השчас והוה קוקה ביניע דינר אbyn א notícia

וכלאול אביו יבש ושקיה חלקלקל על ב במעילה אחר הנביה והביאו לפני סמר אוח השчас והוה קוקה ביניע

שכחדים בפאת ההברך על ב במעילה אחר הנביה והいい סמר אוח השчас והוה קוקה ביניע דינר א気に

(bT Shab 16:1, L. Goldschmidt, Der babylonische Talmud [Berlin: Calvary, 1897])


\(^{3}\) J.P.M. van der Ploeg, and A.S. van der Woude Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971) (hereafter Editio princeps).
temptation to identify the newly-discovered text with the Aramaic translation mentioned in the *baraita* was considerable. The original editors in fact entertained ‘une sérieuse possibilité’⁴ that their text was indeed the one referred to by Gamaliel in the passage, while scholars since have resisted this temptation with varying degrees of success⁵. In fact, the information at our disposal regarding the targum of the *baraita* on the one hand, and the targum of Cave 11 on the other is basically complementary.

The passages preserved in the talmudic tradition provide us with a brief account of the immuring of a targum in Jerusalem around the turn of the era. Despite supplying the modern reader with various details regarding the suppression of this ‘targum’, including the manner in which it was disposed of, the tradition provides no clue as to the nature of the text itself or the reason for its suppression. On the other hand, while we possess a sizeable portion of the Cave 11 Job ‘targum’ in a reasonable state of preservation, the events surrounding its storage there, and its status vis-à-vis the Jewish communities of late Second Temple Judaism, remain shrouded in mystery.

While the ancient origins of this text are obscure, its history since its discovery in 1956 is less so. According to the Dutch editors, the scroll was found by Bedouin in what became known as Cave 11, before being acquired, along with the rest of the finds, by the Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem.⁶ Plans to recoup some of the costs incurred by the Museum through the sale of the documents to foreign institutions were thwarted when the Jordanian Government in 1961, declared the contents of the Dead Sea caves to be the property of the Kingdom of Jordan. In the end, these costs

---

⁴ *Editio princeps*, 8.


⁶ The respective editors issued their own communications regarding the character and general features of 11QtgJob in French, German and later English—J.P.M. van der Ploeg, ‘Le targum de Job de la grotte 11 de Qumran, Premiere communication’ *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* afd. Letterkunde. (Amsterdam: 1962); A.S. van der Woude, ‘Das Hiob Targum aus Qumran Hohle XI’ *Congress Volume, Bonn 1962 Vetus Testamentum Supps* 9 (1963); B. Thiering (transl.) ‘The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave Eleven,’ *AJBA* 1 (1969) 19-29.
were made good through the sale, not of the documents themselves, but rather the exclusive rights to study and publish the texts. These were acquired in December of 1961 by the Royal Netherlands Academy for Science in Amsterdam and by the Spring of the following year the editors had reported the results of their investigation before the Academy. It would be another decade before the editio princeps, produced with the collaboration of B. Jongeling, and published by Brill in the format of the DJD series, would appear.7

Observation of the plates accompanying the editio princeps confirm that the state of the manuscript as preserved leaves much to be desired.8 B. Zuckerman in his unpublished dissertation on 11QtgJob gives a useful summary of the challenges involved in reading the physical manuscript itself. Interestingly he casts a measure of doubt on the assumed advantages of examining the manuscript first hand. He suggests that the photographic record of the text, while in some ways inferior to naked eye observation, provides superior clarity and legibility due to the use of infra-red film.9 The processes of hydrolysis and oxidation have taken their toll on the leather on which the text is written to the extent that of the presumably complete original, we now possess a single roll measuring 109 x 4-6cm, and over 30 fragments of varying sizes and states of preservation.10 The state of preservation does of course bear directly on the textual material at our disposal and there seems little reason to doubt the editors’ conclusion that of the original Aramaic text of Job, we now possess approximately 15%.11 If this percentage seems lamentably low, most scholars would also agree with the editors that the section preserved constitutes ‘...une part notable,’ containing as it does an Aramaic text corresponding not only to the latter dialogues and the so-called ‘Voice from the

7 *Editio princeps.*
8 *Editio princeps,* 100-131. The photographs of the *editio princeps* may be compared with those included in the recent joint Brill-OUP publication of the CD-ROM edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (ed. Timothy Lim) (Brill-OUP, 1997) and those provided in F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
10 *Editio princeps,* 1. Now also, see F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11.*
Whirlwind’ but also to the Epilogue. In general, 11Q10 seems to confirm the order and structure of the text pointed by the Massoretes, with one notable exception being the possible preservation of a short Epilogue. While the contents of the final column are far from clear, it has been suggested that the text concludes following a rendering of MT 42:11 thereby omitting the final section of the epilogue as preserved in the Masoretic text.

The question of the date of 11Q10 is one which has exercised commentators from the very beginning. Following the editors, attempts to determine the date of the text have for the most part taken two different approaches: the dating of the manuscript itself by means of palaeographical techniques and the dating of the translation through linguistic analysis. The editors, apparently assuming 70 CE as the terminus ad quem, proceed to classify the script of 11Q10 by means of the methodology made famous by Albright, Cross and Avigad. The editors’ application of Cross’ palaeographic criteria suggests to them a date for 11Q10 somewhere in the middle of the first century CE. Further examination and utilisation of Albright’s work leads the editors to the conclusion that the script found in the scroll belongs to the first century CE and more specifically to the period which extends from 37 BCE - 70 CE (Herodian).

While this classification of the script used in the production of the 11Q10 manuscript has gone essentially unchallenged since it was first proposed, Zuckerman has made use of palaeographical techniques in an attempt to shed light not on the dating of

11 Editio princeps, 2.
12 The various fragments contain textual material corresponding to MT Job 17:14-36:33. The small roll corresponds to, MT Job 37:10-42:11. For a list of correspondences according to column see F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 86. Although, for ease of comparison, textual material from 11Q10 will be cited according to the verse in the MT to which it corresponds, roman numerals will be provided to indicate column and line references when relevant.
13 Editio princeps, 87. The arguments for (vdPloeg) and against (vdWoude) the preservation of a ‘short’ epilogue are put forth in a rare disagreement between editors. See page 56 below for further discussion.
14 Editio princeps, 2-3.
15 Editio princeps, 2-3.
the script, but rather on the dating of the Vorlage from which the translation was made. Drawing upon the work of Septuagint scholars, he investigates the possibility that 'information may be derived about the palaeography of the Vorlage of a given translation [in our case 11Q10], based upon the errors one encounters in the latter...'.

He focuses on readings in 11Q10 that seem to reflect a misreading of pairs of letters which are graphically similar and then seeks to relate the Vorlage of the translation to the script within which these misreadings would be most likely to occur. He suggests that the most compatible scripts would be those of either the late Hasmonean or Herodian periods and that therefore the Vorlage should probably be dated to the late 2nd/early 1st c BCE or perhaps even later. On these grounds, Zuckerman suggests further that it is probable that the translation and the production of the autograph of 11Q10 were nearly contemporaneous.

While palaeographical approaches are a welcome addition to the investigation of the date of 11Q10's production (as opposed to its transmission), answers to the question of its dating have traditionally been sought primarily within the field of comparative linguistics. It would be wise to preface a discussion of the linguistic characterisation of 11Q10 with a summary of the methodological considerations which seem to underlie it. Proceeding from the self-evident fact that linguistic (i.e. morphological, lexical, and syntactical etc.) features of Aramaic texts vary to a greater or lesser extent in comparison with each other, a developmental chronology is established and when possible 'anchored' by absolute dating techniques. Various texts are then situated within this chronology according to the presence (or absence) of these diagnostic fea-

---

17 B.E. Zuckerman, 'The Date of 11Q Targum Job: A Palaeographic Consideration of its Vorlage', JSP 1 (1987) 57-78 provides a lucid summary of the difficulties involved in dating 11Q10 both from linguistic and a palaeographic point of view.
18 B.E. Zuckerman, 'The Date of 11Q Targum Job', 64.
19 I.e. B/A, D/S, Y/N.
20 B.E. Zuckerman, 'The Date of 11Q Targum Job', 75.
21 E.M. Cook, 'Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology' Abr Nahrain: Studies in Qumran Aramaic Suppl. 3 (1992) 1-21 sets the issues out clearly with particular reference to Qumran Aramaic and its position vis-à-vis other Middle Aramaic dialects.
tures. Within this general framework there are then introduced other considerations such as dialect variation, or distinctions between literary and vernacular forms in a given period. Thus modern attempts at construing a history of Aramaic (and more importantly for 11Q10, that phase widely known as ‘Middle Aramaic’) are characterised by the use of both synchronic and diachronic approaches to the fact of linguistic variation.22

To the extent that discussions of Qumran Aramaic are directly related to exploration of the language in which 11Q10 has been realised, both synchronic and diachronic processes have been utilised with regard to our text. However, the vast majority of philological treatments of 11Q10 have occupied themselves with situating the text relatively within a Jewish Aramaic chronology.23 In this regard, the editors draw extensively on the work of E.Y. Kutscher.24 Based on stylistic and grammatical considerations, they suggest that the language of 11Q10 stands somewhere between the Aramaic of Daniel and that of 1QapGen which they agree with Kutscher should probably be dated to the 1st c. BCE. This implies a late second c. BCE date for 11Q10. While the editors’ conclusions regarding the date of 11Q10’s production have been challenged, their basic approach to the question has, with the exception of Zuckerman’s study, remained the primary mode of investigation.25

---


23 E.M. Cook, ‘Qumran Aramaic’, 2. A. Diez-Macho, ‘Le Targum Palestinién’, RSR 47 (1973) 169-231 has remained the most notable advocate of an Aramaic diglossia with regard to 11Q10. He sees the language of 11Q10 as a form of literary Aramaic contemporary with the more ‘popular’ Aramaic attested by TgNeofiti.


25 Editio princeps, 3-4; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave 11 Bar Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1974) 9 explicitly adopts the editors’ approach and comes to similar conclusions. S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, 327, sees 11Q10 as belonging to the first c. BCE, while R.I. Vasholz, A Philological Comparison of the Qumran Job Targum and its Implications for the Dating of Daniel (unpublished PhD dissertation [Stellenbosch] 1976) sees more affinities between 11Q10 and the older Aramaic texts and therefore dates it earlier (late 3rd-early 2nd c. BCE).
Zuckerman, in laying the groundwork for his particular palaeographic approach to the dating of 11Q10's production, provides a useful critique of the traditional linguistically-oriented dating methodology.\textsuperscript{26} He suggests that one problem which arises when attempting to date the production of 11Q10 is related to the translational character of its language. Arguing from the premise that a translator's use of language will '...tend to level, alter, and or mask grammatical features of the language, thus making it more difficult to compare with other language types,'\textsuperscript{27} Zuckerman suggests that the situation is further complicated when the texts used for comparison may utilise their target languages in similarly artificial manner. An additional impediment to valid comparison is the linguistic variation that may be attributed to the respective genres to which the sources belong i.e. does the translator's use of Aramaic differ when dealing with prose in the source text as opposed to poetry? Zuckerman also suggests that the possibility of archaising and/or modernising during the transmission of the text should not be overlooked and that this too tends to limit the validity of this type of dating method. Even if we were somehow able to control all of these factors we would still be left with probably the greatest handicap of all: the lack of a firm chronological foundation for most of the texts with which 11Q10 is compared linguistically. Most problematic of all is the Aramaic of Daniel. The work of Kitchen has shown that on linguistic grounds, the date of Daniel may be fixed anywhere between the Sixth and Second centuries BCE.\textsuperscript{28}

As can be seen from the above, the dating of the production of the Aramaic translation of Job contained in 11Q10 is far from straightforward. As the precise date of its production is, however, not the main concern of this study, it will perhaps suffice to suggest that it is fairly certain that we have on archaeological grounds, a \textit{terminus ad quem} of 70 CE. As for a \textit{terminus a quo}, it is conceivable that 11Q10 may have been composed at any time during the three centuries preceding the turn of the era but per-

\textsuperscript{26} B.E. Zuckerman, ‘The Date of 11Q Targum Job’, 57-60.
\textsuperscript{27} B.E. Zuckerman, ‘The Date of 11Q Targum Job’, 59.
\textsuperscript{28} B.E. Zuckerman, ‘The Date of 11Q Targum Job’, 62.
haps as late as the first century CE. Beyond these seeming facts we are left to the probabilities of learned speculation.\(^{29}\)

**Studying 11Q10**

**11Q10 since its discovery: A history of comparison**

In a 1995 article on the Aramaic versions of the book of Job, Walter Aufrecht noted that scholarly interest in 11Q10 had generated nearly a hundred publications in less than fifty years.\(^{30}\) A further indication of scholarly interest in the text is the fact that reviews of the *editio princeps* and Sokoloff’s subsequent edition alone number more than thirty.\(^{31}\) While there are undoubtedly numerous ways in which the story of 11Q10’s reception by the scholarly community might be recited, it is suggested that the concept of comparison might be a useful lens through which to view this history and bring certain aspects into sharper focus.

It is hardly surprising that initial interest in 11Q10 focused primarily on comparisons with its ‘source text’, and more particularly on its value as a textual witness to the Masoretic Text of Job.\(^{32}\) The following statement by Grelot in his review of the *editio princeps* bears witness to the typical priority given to matters of textual witness: ‘La référence à la Septante, à la version syriaque et au Targum classique (qui parfois contient des doublets) est constante; mais naturellement c’est au texte massorétique que

---

\(^{29}\) Perhaps as B.E. Zuckerman, ‘The Date of 11Q Targum Job’ , 75 suggests, the convergence of his palaeographic work and the linguistic study of S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’ would make a later, rather than earlier date more probable.


This particular emphasis is hardly surprising given that the study of the versions has often been considered less an end in itself than a means to an end (that end being an original/improved Masoretic text). Furthermore, it seems entirely reasonable to explore the character of a translation through its relationship to a source text before comparisons to other translations of the ‘same’ source text are undertaken.

While in general, scholars have decided that 11Q10 seems to reflect a MT type Vorlage, A.D York in a dissertation on 11Q10, argues that the Qumran version in 21:5 reflects a pre-masoretic Vorlage and other commentators too have suggested the reading of variants in this MT-type Vorlage at different places in the text. This type of objection is a helpful reminder that any general characterisation of a text as reflecting a MT-type Vorlage is merely that—a generalisation of only limited technical value. To clarify then of the discrepancies between 11Q10 and MT, the vast majority have been seen as the result of the translator’s intervention in rendering the target text, as opposed to being attributable to a source text which differed significantly from the Masoretic consonantal text. A danger inherent in such broad characterisations may be their tendency to lull commentators into a false sense of security—with the result that all discrepancies may be seen as translator’s activity rather than a reflection of a variant text.

More recently, the analysis of translation technique has been added to the battery of methods through which 11Q10 may be compared to its Vorlage. John C Lubbe approaches 11Q10 armed with theoretical assumptions gleaned from the work of linguist

35 M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 6.
36 A.D. York, A Philological and Textual Analysis, 182; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 7 suggests that it is likely that the translation of 42\textsuperscript{11} reflects a different Vorlage while F. Morrow, ‘11Q Targum Job’ sees in 11Q10 the reflection of numerous variants.
37 While Zuckerman’s title The Process of Translation in 11QTGJOB... (1980) would suggest that his concern is with translation technique, his study in its present form resembles a more traditional philological commentary with extensive citation and analysis of corresponding ‘units of translation’ in a variety of versions. The author’s own admission that the work is of a preliminary nature prevents further judgement
and translation theorist Eugene Nida. Criticising the formal conception of ‘literalism’ which he sees in the work of James Barr and Emmanuel Tov, he suggests the need for a more complex, semantic analysis of the translation process in 11Q10. Lubbe is indeed to be congratulated on his introduction of considerable linguistic sophistication into a discussion of the translation process but his conclusions tend merely to confirm the suggestion that, through various means, the target text (11Q10) seeks to ‘...convey the sense of ...[the] source text.’

The above survey is not intended to be comprehensive in scope but rather as representative of the kind of first order comparison undertaken in the investigation of a newly discovered version of a Hebrew book—namely, that of enquiry into the relationship between this translation and its putative source. As Grelot’s comment suggests, this first order comparison is inevitably accompanied (often concurrently) by second order comparisons with other texts that may shed light on it. While texts for comparison may be drawn from a variety of sources, often it is other translations or versions of the Hebrew Bible which are consulted initially. For their commentary on the editio princeps of 11Q10 for instance, the editors cite editions of the Peshitta, Rabbinic targum, Septuagint, Symmachus and the Vulgate. The recognition that the standard commentary format is necessarily limited in its ability to chart relationships between texts in any depth has of course led some scholars to treat the relationship between 11Q10 and other versions/texts more extensively.

---


39 J.C. Lubbe, ‘Describing the Translation Process’, 584. He argues that while phenomena such as lexical consistency, morphological representation (representation of various elements of a source text word in the target text), syntactical representation (retention or source text word order) and qualitative representation are useful, they tend to be rather weak as criteria for literalism.

40 J.C. Lubbe, ‘Describing the Translation Process’, 593. This position (albeit without any substantiation) was expressed in nearly identical terms by S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, 318.

41 For discussion of the limitations of the commentary approach and the format adopted in the present study see ‘Format’ below.
The earliest comparison of 11Q10 with texts beyond the MT was undertaken by Tuinstra in a doctoral dissertation completed prior to the publication of the editio princeps.\(^\text{42}\) Tuinstra's views undoubtedly received a somewhat wider audience when A. Caquot presented them along with his own sympathetic conclusions in an article published in French some four years later.\(^\text{43}\) While Tuinstra's actual dissertation included a chapter devoted to 11Q10's relationship to the Septuagint,\(^\text{44}\) his work is perhaps better known for its claim to have recognised elements in the text pointing to a sectarian—specifically Essene—origin.\(^\text{45}\) While this theory met with a degree of initial acceptance,\(^\text{46}\) the majority of commentators have not found it particularly convincing.\(^\text{47}\)

If connections between 11Q10 and Qumran sectarian texts are generally thought to be quite tenuous, what may be said regarding the subject of Tuinstra's neglected chapter—the relationship between 11Q10 and the Septuagint of Job? An article by John Gray\(^\text{48}\) is perhaps the best known treatment of this subject.\(^\text{49}\) Arguing that divergences between LXX Job and MT Job are best explained as the progressive curtailment of the text through the intervention of the translator, rather than as a result of a non-MT Vorlage, he suggests that 11Q10 and a pre-Origen LXX Job are related at various points and may have drawn upon a common exegetical tradition.\(^\text{50}\)


\(^{44}\) E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten,* 58-64.

\(^{45}\) E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten,* 70. That this aspect of Tuinstra's work on 11Q10 has been emphasised, may be due in part to Caquot's re-presentation and augmentation of this aspect of his work.


\(^{47}\) J. Fitzmyer 'The First Century Targum', 166 may be seen as representative when in agreeing with the editors he says of the targum: '...nothing, apart from its discovery in Qumran Cave XI, suggests that it had an origin in the Qumran community.'


\(^{50}\) J. Gray, 'The Masoretic Text of the Book of Job...', 340 ff. While most commentaries have noted points of comparison between the texts, Gray provides a relatively full analysis of select examples.
Most observations regarding the relationship between the two texts, however, have focused on the respective endings of the two texts. Particular attention has been paid to verse 17 of chapter 42 in LXX Job where a supplement to the epilogue is attributed to a 'Syrian book'\textsuperscript{51}. In his discussion of the possible connections between this Syrian book and 11Q10, Jongeling suggests that the text as preserved could not have been the source of the LXX expanded epilogue. However, some degree of uncertainty regarding 11Q10's conclusion\textsuperscript{52} might allow for the possibility of a connection between the two versions.\textsuperscript{53} Raphael Weiss, taking up the issue in his monograph on the Rabbinic targum of Job, doubts that τῆς Συριακῆς βιβλίου is to be identified with a targum at all, preferring instead the suggestion that the source of the additional details of the LXX epilogue was an aggadic composition in Aramaic which has not survived.\textsuperscript{54}

And what of 11Q10's relationship to surviving ancient Aramaic versions of the book of Job? As is the case with the Septuagint, the editors\textsuperscript{55} faithfully consult the Rabbinic targum of Job in their commentary on 11Q10 as does Sokoloff in his edition of the text.\textsuperscript{56} Unlike the case of the Septuagint, however, extensive treatments of the relationship between the Rabbinic targum and the Aramaic translation found in Cave Eleven have been less popular. With the exception of Fitzmyer's study in 1974,\textsuperscript{57} the examination of this relationship has been relegated to an 'honorable mention' in most work on the Qumran text, with the editors once again setting the tone.\textsuperscript{58} Having sug-

\textsuperscript{52} See below page 56.
\textsuperscript{53} B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 191. Objections to the suggestion that a translation of MT 42:12-17 follows 11Q10 xxxviii, 8 are based on a lack of space required for the preservation of the six verses. Presumably, these same objections may be made with even greater force to suggestions of 11Q10's preservation of a considerably longer LXX-like epilogue.
\textsuperscript{54} R. Weiss, הַרְאוּ מַעַרְבָּי מַלֶּרֶס עָיִב, Ch. 1. Appendix II.
\textsuperscript{55} Editio princeps, 1-87.
\textsuperscript{56} M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 107-169.
\textsuperscript{57} J. Fitzmyer 'The First Century Targum'.
\textsuperscript{58} J. Gray, 'The Masoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum...' Despite the title of his article, Gray does not examine the relationship between 11Q10 and the Rabbinic Targum in any depth, while the perfunctory comments of R.I. Vasholz, A Philological Comparison, 3 and K. Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte,
gested in his preliminary communication that 11Q10 has ‘...practically nothing to do with the original of the Septuagint’ van der Woude continued with the claim that the Qumran text has ‘...just as little to do with the Job Targum which first gained currency in the Middle Ages and was published by De Lagarde.’59 His joint statement with van der Ploeg in their introduction to the editio princeps is only slightly less categorical: ‘...it cannot be doubted that the later targum is independent of 11QtgJob, except perhaps for certain exegetical traditions. The author of the second targum has not known the first [11Q10] or if he has known about it, he has not used it.’ While Sokoloff, in his introduction of 11Q10, merely affirms with the editors that ‘... there is no connection...’ between the Qumran text and the Rabbinic targum,60 Grelot in his review of the editio princeps is even more dismissive of a relationship when he insists that 11Q10 ‘... certainement antérieur à la Mishnah et conservé par des mains esseniennes, diffère totalement du Targum conservé dans la tradition rabbinique.’61 Interestingly, however, such categorical and definitive statements (not merely ‘different’ but ‘totally different’) are accompanied neither by a demonstration of the fact, nor suggestions regarding the particular manner in which these texts do differ.62 It is perhaps even more surprising that such emphatic statements were already being made prior to the publication of Fitzmyer’s study which compared some aspects of the two texts.63 If discussion of the relationship between 11Q10 and the rabbinic targum has been rather limited, what may be said of the treatment of 11Q10’s connections with another ancient Aramaic translation of Job, namely, that of the Peshitta? Until recently, an examination of the Qumran translation’s possible relationship to the Syriac version of Job has, like its comparison

283 agree with the conclusions of Fitzmyer.

60 Editio princeps, 6; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 5.
62 Presumably Grelot sees the two texts as similar in that they are both Aramaic translations of a Hebrew book of Job. If we do not assume at least some degree of similarity it is hard to see why Grelot (or any commentator for that matter) would have compared 11Q10 to the Rabbinic targum as opposed to any other text.
63 A similar view is expressed more recently by B.E. Zuckerman, ‘Targums of Job’ Anchor Bible Dictionary III (Doubleday, 1992) 867-68.
with RtgJob, been relegated to anecdotal discussion in the commentaries on the Qumran text.\(^{64}\) In fact, while van der Woude’s early communication on 11Q10 takes up the subject of the relationship of 11Q10 with LXX Job and the Rabbinic targum, no mention is even made of 11Q10’s possible connection (or lack thereof) with the Peshitta of Job.\(^{65}\) In subsequent treatments, when the issue of connections between 11Q10 and other versions of the book of Job arises, the Peshitta of Job is often conspicuous by its absence.\(^{66}\) A recent summary article on 11Q10, while noting the existence and independence of the rabbinic targum, makes no mention of the Aramaic translation of Job preserved by the Syrian Christian tradition.\(^{67}\)

If systematic, three-way comparisons of 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job have not been as widespread as might have been expected, several scholars did recognise the relevance of the Aramaic versions and attempt some form of comparative work. In 1973-4, not long after the publication of the editio princeps, R. Weiss devoted a portion of his doctoral dissertation on RtgJob to a discussion of the then recently discovered Aramaic translation from Qumran.\(^{68}\) While recognising that the Qumran translator did stray at times from the Hebrew text he was rendering by adding, omitting or transposing source text elements, Weiss’ characterised the resultant translation as on the whole very literal.\(^{69}\) In support of this assessment, Weiss noted that ‘...the number of expansions in the targum from Qumran is small in comparison to the large number in the later targum. The targum from Qumran lacks homiletic expansions and allusions to midrashim.'\(^{70}\) Weiss provided examples to illustrate that the Qumran translation lacked the midrashic

\(^{64}\) E.g. B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 44-519 and A.D. York, A Philological and Textual Analysis, 3-328.

\(^{65}\) A.S. van der Woude ‘The Targum of Job’.


\(^{68}\) R. Weiss, הדרומ הערמי לפסר איוב, Appendix 1 (16-36).

\(^{69}\) R. Weiss, הדרומ הערמי לפסר איוב, 19-20.

\(^{70}\) R. Weiss, הדרומ הערמי לפסר איוב, 20-21.
insertions and allusions of the later RtgJob. In light of the comparative paucity of additional material in the Qumran translation, and the fact the Rabbinic targum was functioning as his primary point of reference, it is not surprising that Weiss gave strong consideration to the likelihood that it was the excessive literalness of the Qumran translation or one of a similar type which may have given rise to its censure at the hands of the Pharisaic-Rabbinic authorities as described in the Gamaliel baraita.

Despite, or perhaps in some measure, because, Weiss' work was published in the late 1970s in Hebrew, it seems safe to suggest that the best known comparison of the Qumran and Rabbinic Aramaic translations of Job in English scholarship has been that of Joseph Fitzmyer. Indeed, if scholarly interest in the relationship between the ‘targums’ has been conspicuously absent since Fitzmyer’s work, part of the blame must rest with the author himself, for although he clearly did not intend it, his convincing demonstration of the dissimilarity of 11Q10 and RtgJob may have been seen by some as the final word on the subject. Having focused first on an assessment of lexical similarities (and more pertinent from his vantage point, dissimilarities) Fitzmyer then turned to the analysis of a selection of grammatical differences between the Qumran and Rabbinic targum texts. On the basis of this work and his own observation of ‘a greater amount of paraphrasis in [RtgJob]’ Fitzmyer came to the conclusion that 11Q10 as an ancient ‘targum’ differed substantially from the later Rabbinic targum preserved in Lagarde’s Hagiographa Chaldæa.

---

71 30:1, 37:11, 37:15, 40:28, 42:10. R. Weiss, תרגום הארמי למשלי אייב, xv-xvi seems to operate with a rather broad definition of ‘midrash’ for ‘midrashic’ material in RtgJob may find parallels in not only the Rabbinic midrashim, but also in the talmudic material. In fact, it seems that Weiss’ use of ‘midrashic’ encompasses not only parallels to exegetical traditions found elsewhere in Rabbinic literature, but also the targumist’s ‘derashic’ approach to interpreting the text, despite the fact that the results of his interpretation (=midrashic insertions) do not find parallels in the extant Rabbinic literature.

72 R. Weiss, תרגום הארמי למשלי אייב, 13. His comments at this point should however be read in conjunction with the more circumspect evaluation of this possibility which appears later in the same chapter (34).

73 J. Fitzmyer ‘The First Century Targum’. That this article should be read in the wider context of a discussion regarding Diez-Macho’s views on the language of the 11Q10 in comparison with that of Neofiti may be seen from a lengthy footnote (J. Fitzmyer ‘The First Century Targum’, 181 n.69) in the reprinted article. Fitzmyer’s contribution is taken up here in greater detail below.
In this same article, Fitzmyer not only pointed out the need for a more thorough comparison of 11Q10 with a critical edition of the Rabbinic targum, he also suggested the potential fruitfulness of extending this comparison to include the Syriac translation. Nearly 25 years were to pass, however, before Jan Wilson would take up Fitzmyer’s latter suggestion in a paper presented in Jerusalem in 1997. In his study, Wilson focused on the relationship between the Qumran text and the Syriac version as a means of exploring the possibility that the former was used in the production of the latter. This orientation toward the question of textual influence was decisive for Wilson’s choice of methodology and led him to cite only the few texts which might have pointed to a relationship of dependence between the two Aramaic versions. Wilson’s conclusion, however, was that there was virtually no evidence to suggest that the translator of P-Job utilised 11Q10 in his rendering and furthermore, that ‘...11Q10 does not contribute anything to the discussion of the connections between the Essenes and the early Christians at Edessa.’

While Heidi Szpek’s more substantial work similarly focused on the question of dependence of P-Job on RtgJob, her treatment of the subject inaugurated the era of systematic three-way comparison of the available Aramaic versions of Job. Szpek’s work did independently confirm Wilson’s conclusions that the Peshitta is not directly dependent on either of the Aramaic ‘targums’ of Job, but her similar orientation toward an assessment of dependence necessarily led her to focus her attention on congruencies between the texts (on the reasonable assumption that causally-linked congruencies would show the dependency of the Peshitta on the ‘targumic’ versions). Szpek’s

---

76 The five categories utilised by Wilson are as follows: A) The three versions [MT, 11Q10, P-Job] are essentially the same. B) All three versions differ. C) P follows 11Q10 and both diverge from MT. D) P follows MT while 11Q10 diverges from MT significantly. E) 11Q10 essentially follows MT, while P differs significantly from MT.
78 The most decisive type of causally-linked congruency is an erroneous reading in a given text which may
search for similarities in the Aramaic versions led her to focus particularly on two areas of comparison, namely, language and exegesis. It is no surprise that Szpek found that the shared linguistic heritage of the three translators leads them to introduce some common grammatical substitutions such as gender, number, person, verb tense, word class, and voice. Operating on the assumption that RtgJob represents Western Aramaic, Szpek interrogated the Syriac dialect used by the translator of P-Job for signs of Western Aramaic influence. In fact, however, she found only one example of probable West Aramaic intrusion and concluded that even this instance might have been equally explicable as an error on the part of the Syriac translator.

Exegesis, the second area chosen by Szpek for exploration, proved slightly more productive in terms of finding common ground between the three Aramaic versions of Job. Szpek found that in the area of exegesis, the Syriac translator was much more likely to deviate from the Hebrew by adding a variety of minor (often grammatical) elements in order to produce a clearer, more explicit translation. While the Qumran translator also showed an apparent willingness to add elements to the translation for the purpose of explicitness, Szpek notes that the translator of RtgJob was far more cau-

---

81 This is, by and large, a safe assumption (see 'Language' below, however). A specific discussion of how the Aramaic dialect used by the Qumran translator should be related to the Aramaic/Syriac of the other two translations is not provided by Szpek.
83 H.M. Szpek, 'On the Influence of the Targum'. For a different (albeit limited) approach to the linguistic relationship between the three Aramaic versions, see 'Language' below.
84 H.M. Szpek, 'On the Influence of the Targum', 152-4. (see also n. 47) Elements added include: relative pronouns, suffixes, prepositions, conditional particles and words and short phrases.
85 As will be made clear, Szpek's study falls short of a genuine tri-lateral comparison because of its orientation toward determining dependence of P on Tg. In terms of 'elements added' for instance, RtgJob and 11Q10 are consulted and compared only when an element (i.e., relative pronoun) is added in P-Job. This is restrictive in that no account is taken of the addition of elements which appear in the 'targumic' texts but not in P-Job. While Szpek comes to the conclusion that there are not enough relevant passages to determine the Qumran translator's attitude toward explicitation (154), it is worth noting that the total number of additional elements supplied by the respective translators is not adjusted to reflect the fact that
tious than the Qumran and Syriac translators in his additions to the text. In fact Szpek found that only when the degree of potential ambiguity reached a critical level was the targumist responsible for RtgJob willing to make his Aramaic rendering more explicit by means of additional elements.86

With regard to more substantial additions not required by linguistic-stylistic considerations but supplied for extra-linguistic reasons, Szpek found all the Aramaic translators willing to augment their translations. In this case, however, it was the targumist who led the way in terms of the frequency and extent of added elements, supplying sizeable interpolations on topics such as the eschatological day of judgement, Gehenna and the Garden of Eden, the land of Israel and both the study and students of Torah.87 The translator of P-Job on the other hand was less willing to interpolate and when he did so the new material provided was often related to a creative, but contextually appropriate, interpretation of a key word.88 As for 11Q10, Szpek echoes Weiss’ conclusion that in comparison with his Rabbinic counterpart, the Qumran translator too was sparing in his use of material to supplement his rendering.89 While considerably more work might be done on the similarities between the Aramaic versions, Szpek’s treatment is, in the final calculation, sufficient for her purpose, i.e., ruling out the dependence of P-Job on either the targum or Qumran renderings.90

the sample provided by 11Q10 is only approximately 15% of those provided by RtgJob and P-Job. Further research is required, but certainly this factor should be taken into account when comparing the respective translators’ attitudes toward explicitation through addition.

87 H.M. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 157 seems to be relying here on the brief English summary of R. Weiss, חומש התנ”ך יסוד ההד示范区, xv. Weiss follows his introductory discussion of Midrash and Aggadah in RtgJob (and the relation of the traditions in RtgJob to those found in other Rabbinic texts [235-40]) with a discussion of the locations in RtgJob where such traditions are found (241-87).
89 H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 156.
90 In terms of areas for future consideration, RtgJob’s striking use of multiple translation of whole verses (R. Weiss, חומש התנ”ך יסוד ההד示范区, 288-93) and smaller units of texts (191-97) might be systematically compared with the use of double translations in P-Job (H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 153-60) and 11Q10 (Weiss lists 25:2, 30:15, 36:11, 37:13, 38:10, 39:2, 39:21, 40:10, 42:2 as locations where the Qumran translator supplies two words where the Hebrew uses only one).
Although Szpek’s work is an important first step in assessing the relationship between the Aramaic versions of Job, it is limited in some respects. Firstly, the present author can find no evidence to suggest that Szpek has made use of D. Stec’s critical edition of RtgJob in her comparison. Secondly, the clearly defined goal of answering the question of influence of Targum on Peshitta has quite understandably informed Szpek’s methodology in two respects. In the first place, in Szpek’s treatment it is the Syriac version which orients the discussion leaving the Qumran and Rabbinic texts to be assessed primarily in terms of their congruity or incongruity with P-Job only where the Syriac version diverges from the MT. This type of investigation necessarily neglects any features in the Qumran and Rabbinic texts which do not find correspondence in the Syriac version. With Szpek’s work having satisfactorily answered the question of textual or literary dependence (in the negative), it would seem clear that further investigation of the relationship between the Aramaic versions should be based on an assessment of each translation in its own right before comparisons are made. Secondly, as mentioned above, Szpek’s focus on dependence necessarily led her to look for congruencies between the versions. In terms of modes of representation, it is obvious from Szpek’s study that the few similarities which do exist between all three Aramaic versions of Job primarily take the form of either grammatical and semantic substitutions or, alternatively, additions. While Szpek found all three translators willing to supply additional material in their target texts vis-à-vis their Hebrew source text, she drew both qualitative and quantitative distinctions with respect to this additional material. As mentioned above, these additions were found either within the translation of the source text itself (linguistic-stylistic explicitation) or as a supplement to the translation (midrashic interpolations). It is important to note, however, that while Szpek’s exploratory comparison of the Aramaic versions turned up a measure of congruity between the Aramaic versions in the areas of grammar and exegesis, the search for con-

---

91 For use of texts see ‘Texts’ below. While Rignell’s critical edition of P-Job has been cited (H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 143) no information is provided regarding which of the various editions of 11Q10 and RtgJob have served as the basis for comparison with the Syriac version.

92 See ‘Format’ below.
gruence between P-Job and RtgJob found little in the areas of syntax and style.\textsuperscript{93} While congruencies may reveal dependence, a complete assessment of the relationship between the Aramaic versions of Job must take account of both the similarities and the dissimilarities between each of the translations. In fact, the documentation of incongruencies would seem to be an indispensable element of a global comparison of the Aramaic versions and while this approach will not provide evidence of dependence of one version on another (as this has already been explored by Szpek), it may nevertheless be expected to shed light on the relationship from other vantage points.

While much valuable comparative work has been undertaken with regard to 11Q10, the above survey of research on the text to date suggests that much work remains to be done in terms of locating the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job within the context of other ancient Aramaic translations. More specifically, the possibilities of trilateral comparison of the Aramaic versions have only begun to be explored by Szpek’s important, but in some ways, limited investigations.

\textit{Terminology and 11Q10}

Another feature of the story of 11Q10’s reception by the scholarly community which suggests the necessity of an appraisal of the text in the light of other Aramaic versions is that of its classification. While the term ‘targum’ has from the beginning been applied to the Qumran translation of Job, accompanying qualifications of this term suggest that its use may be nuanced in a variety of ways.\textsuperscript{94} Many commentators, including the editors have supplied the qualifier ‘Qumran’ to the targum in formulations suggesting that a reference to the text’s provenance is intended. The title of van der Woude’s preliminary communication (‘The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave

\textsuperscript{93} E.g. word order and clausal relationships involving \textit{waw} (H.M. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 n. 20). Szpek’s assessment of congruence in the area of syntax does not seem to have included the Qumran translation.

\textsuperscript{94} The term ‘targum’ has been used by commentators from the very beginning with reference to 11Q10 and was in fact incorporated into the sigla ‘11QtgJob’ which J.P.M. van der Ploeg, ‘Le targum de Job’ used in his preliminary communication.
Eleven’), that of the editio princeps, as well as the editors’ occasional use of the term ‘Job Targum’ suggest that the term Qumran is being used in the sense of the text’s place of origin. Others including Gray, Jongeling, Kaufman, and Zuckerman seem to be utilising the term in much the same way. There is ample evidence to suggest, however, that the use of ‘Qumran targum’ with reference to 11Q10 is not utilised universally amongst commentators as an indication merely of provenance.

Tuinstra’s conclusions regarding the sectarian (specifically Essene) nature of 11Q10 are the first suggestions that ‘Qumran’ may be understood not merely as an indicator of geographical origin, but also as a means of indicating an ideological affinity. A. Caquot in his endorsement of Tuinstra’s basic position, also reflects this ideological use of the term ‘Qumran’ when he suggests that ‘...11QtgJob illustre les représentations eschatologiques de l’interprète qoumranien...’ and then contrasts 11Q10 as composed by the ‘qumranien targoumiste’ with the later ‘... targum Juif.’ Both Rignell and Vasholz also utilise the term ‘Qumran’ in this manner. Within the broader scholarly discussion, however, the theory of 11Q10’s origins within the Qumran community, as opposed to the more generic milieu of Second Temple Judaism, has not stood the test of time. Like Fitzmyer, the present author remains entirely unconvinced by the arguments mustered by Tuinstra for a sectarian origin of the text and stands by the conclusion of the original editors, namely, that the only clearly ‘Qumranic’ feature of the Qumran translation of Job is its discovery in the caves of the same name. This assessment squares with Beyer’s more recent reiteration of Stanislav Segert’s conclusion that none of the Aramaic texts found at Qumran betray sectarian

97 E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 70.
100 J. Fitzmyer, ‘The First Century Targum’, 166; Editio princeps, 7.
origins but instead reflect the theological and literary traditions of the wider Jewish context. ¹⁰¹

Even if arguments for the ideological use of the term ‘Qumran’ (i.e. Essene) with respect to 11Q10 are rejected, and scholars could agree to restrict the use of ‘Qumran’ to indicate 11Q10’s place of origin, a potential problem of nomenclature would still remain for targums are often qualified with not one but two ‘names.’ Not only are targum texts often classified according to place of origin/redaction (i.e. claims and counter-claims for the ‘Babylonian’ origin/redaction of Onkelos¹⁰²) but in addition, they are often classified according to their location within a particular Jewish tradition (i.e. ‘Rabbinic’ targum tradition as opposed to the targum of the ‘Samaritan’ Jewish tradition). At this point, it is not our concern to argue for the membership of particular targum texts within these categories but rather to suggest that while much investigation of 11Q10 has taken place since its discovery, relatively little effort has been expended in locating it within the context of other ancient Aramaic translation traditions. In short, if it is not a product of a particularly Essene translation tradition, where does it fit within the context of the targum translation traditions?

Studies which have focused on the linguistic character of 11Q10, while not denying the immediate Qumran origin of 11Q10, have nevertheless sought to qualify the application of the term ‘targum’ in rather different ways. Fitzmyer’s article comparing 11Q10 with the Rabbinic targum was originally published in 1974 under the title, ‘Some observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11’. When it was reprinted in 1979, however, its title had become ‘The First-Century Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI’ reflecting Fitzmyer’s conclusion that 11Q10 is, despite Diez-

¹⁰¹ S. Segert, ‘Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen aramäischen Texten von Qumran’, ArOr 33 (1965) 190-206 (esp. 205); K. Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte, 157 sees Jerusalem as the probable origin of the Aramaic scrolls found at Qumran.

¹⁰² For a recent study of this issue see E.M. Cook, ‘A New Perspective on the Language of Onkelos and Jonathan’ in D. Beattie and M. McNamara (eds.) The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context JSOT Suppl. 166 (Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press, 1994).
Macho's claims, older than the Palestinian targum as represented by Neofiti. T. Muraoka, arguing on the basis of linguistic evidence for both an early composition date and the Eastern origin of 11Q10, refers to the text as 'The Old Targum of Job...'.

In the introduction to his substantial volume on the Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea, Klaus Beyer mentions 11Q10 both in his account of the development of the Aramaic language and in his introductory notes on the Qumran 'targums'. Like Muraoka and Fitzmyer, Beyer too is led by his linguistic investigation of 11Q10 to supply a further qualification of the term 'targum'. He favours the term 'Hasmonean', thereby avoiding (at least temporarily) an explicit judgement on the chronological relationship between 11Q10 and the targums. With regard to the characterisation of 11Q10 as an 'Old' targum, an examination of its relationship vis-à-vis the Rabbinic targum and Peshitta of the book of Job would enable us to deal more meaningfully with questions of its status within the development of the 'targumic' genre (i.e. Might 11Q10 be characterised as a 'proto-' or 'pre-' targum?)

Indeed, it seems clear that further qualification of the term 'targum' as applied to 11QtgJob would not be an issue at all, were it not for the fact that when the Qumran text was discovered in the middle of the twentieth century, the title of 'targum of Job' had already been assigned to the Aramaic translation preserved by the Rabbinic tradition in medieval MSS and, subsequent to the Bomberg Bible, in its printed editions. The issue of precedence and terminology was raised explicitly by Zuckerman as early as 1978, where he rightly recognises the importance of nomenclature. He argues that the use of 'Tg1' and 'Tg2' to refer to 11Q10 and the Rabbinic targum respectively, implies the Qumran text’s '...primacy in the targumic tradition for which no evidence

103 See 'Language' below.
107 M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job follows the editio princeps' use of this terminology.
can actually be mustered.'\textsuperscript{108} He avoids this implication by referring to 11Q10 as ‘the Qumran targum’ while designating the Rabbinic targum as ‘Standard’.\textsuperscript{109} While this view is appealing in that it avoids attributing primacy to the ‘Qumran targum’ it appears to purchase this neutrality at a price; for while hindsight suggests to us that the Rabbinic targum is the ‘Standard’ targum, this is nothing more than a function of the eventual triumph of the Pharisaic-Rabbinic tradition. The use of this kind of terminology (‘Standard’ vs. ‘Qumran’) would, it is suggested, rule out what must be considered as a distinct possibility; namely, that in Jewish culture of the first century C.E, it was in fact 11Q10, and not a Rabbinic targum of Job, which represented the ‘Standard’ targum.

More recently the question of 11Q10’s classification was raised by Sebastian Brock within the context of a more general discussion of ancient versions of the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{110} Brock contrasted the character of the Aramaic translations from Qumran [4QtgLev; 4QtgJob and 11QtgJob (11Q10)] with the ‘later targumic tradition’ by suggesting that whereas the Qumran translator saw himself as merely an \textit{interpres}\textsuperscript{111} (literalist translator) the translators responsible for the targums adopted the role of \textit{expositor}\textsuperscript{112} (one who both translates and elucidates).\textsuperscript{113} It is perhaps not surprising that Brock’s \textit{de facto} genre distinction between Qumran and ‘later’ targums was reflected, whether consciously or unconsciously, in his restriction of the term ‘targum’ to the later

\textsuperscript{109} Similarly, W.E. Aufrecht ‘Aramaic Studies’, 56 uses ‘11QtgJob’ to refer to 11Q10 and designates the Rabbinic targum as ‘the official Targum’.
\textsuperscript{111} S.P. Brock, ‘Translating the Old Testament’, 90 ‘the \textit{interpres} does not regard it as his role to remove or elucidate the obscurities of the text he is translating [and]...will be content (indeed) find it his duty) to pass on to his readers a difficulty of the source text in the form of a nonsense translation.’
\textsuperscript{112} S.P. Brock, ‘Translating the Old Testament’, 93. The expositor takes on the added interpretative role renounced by the \textit{interpres} and is concerned to give the sense of the text.
\textsuperscript{113} S.P. Brock, ‘Translating the Old Testament’, 95. See also S. Brock, ‘To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes toward Jewish Biblical Translation’ in G. Brooke et al. (eds.) \textit{Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings} (Atlanta: Scholars’ Press, 1992) 301-338 where the distinction between \textit{interpres} and \textit{expositor} is laid out in an admirably clear manner (312-13).
rabbinic translations and his reference to the Qumran texts as ‘Aramaic translations’. Although Brock’s distinction between the Qumran and Rabbinic targums was not substantiated by illustrative examples drawn from the texts themselves, his views were important insofar as they raised the question of the classification of the Qumran Aramaic translation at a slightly more basic level (i.e. Should 11QTgJob (and the other QTg) be classified as ‘targum’ at all?).

That this question had been raised in the wider scholarly community by Brock may be seen from the subsequent work of two scholars working in the areas of Targum and Syriac Bible respectively. In his illuminating investigation of targumic passages which represent speech reports in the Pentateuch, Alexander Samely arrives at his own assessment of the character of targum which leads him to define it as follows: ‘Targum is an Aramaic narrative paraphrase of the biblical text in exegetical dependence on its wording’.

In his discussion of terminology and the application of the term ‘targum’ to ancient versions, Samely consciously differentiates the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job specifically, and Septuagint, Peshitta, and Vulgate versions generally, from the Pharisaic-Rabbinic targums on the basis of the targum’s formal features discovered in his analysis. While Samely provides insightful discussions of how ‘targum’, as he has defined it, should be clearly differentiated from the genres of ‘midrash’ and ‘re-

---

115 His negative answer to this question is reiterated incidentally in S.P. Brock, ‘A Palestinian Targum Feature in Syriac’ JJS 46 (1995) 274-5.
116 A. Samely, The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums, TSAJ 27 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 180. The basic features of the targum’s literary form according to Samely are: 1) Targum is comprehensive (not selective) in its representation; 2) Targum is exclusive (i.e., while double interpretations are possible alternate interpretations of the same text are not); 3) Targum is narrative (i.e., the narrative voice of the source text is maintained); 4) Targum is dependent on the wording of the original, in both translation and in the result of an interpretation of the original wording; 5) Targum is exegetical; See A. Samely, ‘Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew? A reflection on midrashic and targumic rewording of Scripture’ JJS 45 (1994) 92-100 for a further refinement and restriction of this definition to include only Rabbinic texts.
117 A. Samely, The Interpretation of Speech, 159 He avoids labelling 11Q10 as a targum ‘because on the basis of the characteristics of targumic form established in [his] study, it seems to belong to the group of translations mentioned and not to the targumic texts of PJ,N,M,O,F and C.’
written bible’, his fundamental contribution lies in his delineation of the genre of ‘targum’ on the basis of formal features of actual targum texts. The distinction between ‘targum’ and other ancient versions, such as the Septuagint or Peshitta, on precisely this basis, seems to be implied rather than demonstrated by his study and in light of this it is not surprising that Samely, like Brock, is content to leave his claim regarding the Qumran ‘non-targum’ unsubstantiated and merely suggestive.

In his long-awaited *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*, Michael Weitzman disagreed with Goshen-Gottstein’s conclusion that the Peshitta should be described as a Jewish targum. For Weitzman, the Syriac version’s lack of features which he saw as basic to targumic rendering (virtually constant agreement with MT, continual recourse to rabbinic exegesis, frequent loose renderings) rendered both it and the Aramaic version of Job from Qumran unsuitable for classification as ‘targum’. While this conclusion was to some extent based on Weitzman’s extensive comparison of Syriac and targumic versions, it seems likely that his comparative work on Peshitta and Targum Chronicles was one of the particular and primary bases for the differentiation of P (and 11Q10) from Targum. Although in other respects, the Syriac version of Chronicles bears no small resemblance to targumic translations (e.g. recourse to rabbinic exegesis), Weitzman’s reading of earlier students of the two versions such as Fraenkel and Totterman suggested to him that the two versions of Chronicles are to be distinguished fundamentally on the basis of their representation of the Hebrew text before them. In other words, whereas the targumist makes a concerted effort to repre-

---

118 M.P. Weitzman, *The Syriac version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999) 128; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, Review of A. Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs...*, *JSS* 6 (1961) 266, ‘There is no contradiction between the statement that the Peshitta is based on the Hebrew text and the contention that it depends on a Targum. We may say that P is basically a Targum or that it represents Targumic tradition.’


120 M.P. Weitzman, ‘Is the Peshitta of Chronicles a Targum?’, 192. Similarities include: rabbinic elements, targumic phraseology, and agreements between P-Chronicles and both Targum Jonathan and Targum Chronicles. (see 182-92); S. Fraenkel, ‘Die syrische Übersetzung zu den Büchern der Chronic’ *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 5 (1879): 508-536; C.A.R. Tötterman *Pelguta qadmaya de-
sent the formal features of the text in the order in which they appear in the MT, the Syriac translator of Chronicles displays a less strict approach, deviating from the form of the Hebrew for the sake of intelligibility.\textsuperscript{121} If, however, Weitzman is entirely clear in his rationale for differentiating the Syriac and targumic versions, he, like Samely merely alludes to this same distinction holding for the Qumran translation as well without providing any textual analysis to support it.

As is clear from the above, while both Weitzman and Samely would presumably agree with Brock in differentiating the Qumran translation of Job from the Rabbinic targum on the basis of the added interpretative element in the latter, both Weitzman and Samely lay special emphasis on differentiating targum from ancient versions (esp. Peshitta) on the basis of its representation of, and relation to, the Hebrew source text. Although their own contributions to the discussion are well-grounded in textual analyses, the quite plausible assessments of Weitzman, Samely and Brock regarding the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job remain merely suggestive unless they can be rooted in concrete textual examples.

\textbf{The Aims of the Present Study}

Thus far we have attempted to provide an outline of the recent scholarly discussion of the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job both from the perspective of a history of comparison with the versions and from the vantage point of its labelling and classification. The above survey seems to point to two \textit{desiderata}:

1) While much valuable study of 11Q10 has been undertaken since its emergence from Cave Eleven near Qumran, our understanding of its relationship to its counterparts in the targumic and Syriac traditions would be significantly enhanced by a systematic, synoptic three-way comparison which is not limited to an exploration of the question of textual dependence.

---

\textit{Baryamin cum hebraeis collata} (Helsinki, 1870).

\textsuperscript{121} M.P. Weitzman, 'Is the Peshitta of Chronicles a Targum?', 160.
2) While in most circles, 11Q10 has been classified as a ‘targum’ and then differentiated adjectivally (‘Old’, ‘Qumran’, ‘First Century’ etc.) in a variety of ways from the Rabbinic targum, it has recently been suggested by some scholars that the Qumran text should in fact be deprived of the name ‘targum’ on the basis of certain formal criteria relating to the representation of its Hebrew source. While suggestive and intuitively credible, these latter suggestions are thus far altogether lacking in any analytical foundation.

As mentioned above, Szpek’s focus on the question of dependence led her to focus on translation modifications such as addition and substitution.\footnote{It is worth noting that while H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’ did not find proof of the Syriac version’s dependence on either the Qumran or Rabbinic ‘targum’, neither did she appear to feel compelled to radically differentiate 11Q10 from the targumic tradition or deny 11Q10 the title of ‘targum’.} In fact, it seems clear that this type of focus is ill-equipped to assess the respective Aramaic versions’ formal representation of their Hebrew source text. Rather, it is the categories of syntax and style—precisely those which Szpek passed over as unfruitful in terms of illustrating congruence between Targum (only RtgJob) and Peshitta—which would seem to offer the best testing ground for an assessment of the respective translators representation of, and attitude toward their Hebrew source text. While a comprehensive assessment of each Aramaic version’s representation of the Hebrew text across the categories of grammar, syntax, semantics and style would take us beyond the scope of the present study,\footnote{That this project would involve a truly massive undertaking is suggested by Zuckerman’s impressive, yet ultimately only preliminary attempt at a comprehensive comparison of 11Q10 with the versions (B.E. Zuckerman The Process of Translation in 11QtgJob: A Preliminary Study) Despite topping 550 pages, his work covered only the first 15 columns of the text.} Szpek’s study points us toward three viable indices by which the formal representation of the Hebrew text might be assessed.\footnote{H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 n. 20.}

1) The respective Aramaic versions’ willingness to omit or pass by elements in their Hebrew source text as they constitute their Aramaic translations.

2) The respective Aramaic versions’ willingness to depart from the word order of their Hebrew source text as they constitute their Aramaic translations.
3) The respective Aramaic versions' treatment of a 'minor' element such as the *waw* conjunction, in terms of its addition, omission, or substitution vis-à-vis the Hebrew source text.

While a systematic, synoptic comparison of the Qumran, Syriac and targum versions on the basis of these three criteria will not satisfactorily answer all questions of the relationship between them, it is hoped that such an analysis would shed light on the question of how the respective Aramaic versions represent the Hebrew text they are translating. It is then hoped that the achievement of this modest goal will in turn help us to advance the discussion of 11Q10's classification and perhaps hint at this text's significance within the broader context of the ancient Aramaic versions.

Finally, it will not have gone unnoticed that the present study prefers to make use of the series number (11Q10) rather than the official *sigla* (11QtgJob) when referring to the Aramaic translation of Job found at Qumran. The series number 11Q10 is at this introductory stage proposed only as a working title—a means of temporarily stepping back from the assumptions implicit in the label 11QtgJob. 125

---

125 An excerpt from Céline Mangan's introduction to her excellent translation of RtgJob (C. Mangan, *The Targum of Job*, 5) suggests that terminology is not irrelevant to the reception of a given text. In her introductory paragraph to the translation, she suggests that if the LXX reference to a 'Syrian book' might refer to an '...aggadic elaboration rather than to a targum proper', then '...it shows that such midrashic elaborations were already connected with the Book of Job, as distinct from the Qumran targum which is surprisingly literal (italics mine). While a reference to 11Q10 as 'literal' is not unexpected, the use of 'surprisingly' is frankly, surprising. If it is safe to assume that this 'surprise' involves, in some sense, the frustration of expectations, then we are entitled to enquire of Mangan as to where these frustrated expectations of 11Q10 being midrashic or aggadic come from? While it seems odd to have 'aggadic expectations' of a text known as 11Q10, it is perhaps more understandable when confronted by a text labelled 'the Qumran targum'. Interestingly, while E. Jan Wilson '11QtgJob and the Question of the Essene-Edessa Connection' utilises '11QtgJob' in the title of his article, the body of his text refers to '11Q10'. The designation 'Rabbinc Targum of Job' (and abbreviations) is to be understood in the sense that whatever its origins, the present targum of Job has been included in the 'rabbinic' reading tradition since at least the time of Saadya Gaon. (C. Mangan, *The Targum of Job*, 8). (The Gamaliel baraita is of course a record of what purports to be a very early rabbinic reference to a targum of Job, however, as mentioned above, its specific textual identity is unknown). For further discussion of the use of the term ‘targum’ see 'Locating 11Q10 amongst the Aramaic versions' (Conclusion) below.
The Parameters of the Present Study

Texts

In a synoptic textual comparison, it is of course of paramount importance that it be made clear exactly which texts are to be utilised. While Fitzmyer, in his comparison of 11Q10 and the Rabbinic Targum of Job could only make use of the editions available to him at the time, he recognised that his study was limited by the fact that critical editions of Peshitta Job and the Rabbinic targum of Job had not yet been produced. This state of affairs began to be remedied in 1982 with the Peshitta Institute’s publication of the critical edition to the Peshitta of Job [Base text: MS B. 21, Milan, Ambrosian Library=7a1]. A dozen years later a critical edition of the Rabbinic targum of Job [Base text: MS Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Urbinas I=很方便 (for sigla of other MSS listed in this study see Stec)] was offered to the scholarly world by David Stec. For the purposes of this study, electronic CCAT versions of these two texts have been graciously provided in the case of the former, by the Peshitta Institute in Leiden and in the


128 L.G. Rignell, (ed.) The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version: Job. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982) [hereafter Rignell]. H. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta’, CBQ 60 (1998) 25 notes that the text tradition of P-Job lacks the earliest text phase of the Peshitta identified by M. Koster (most recently The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta’ in P. Flesher (ed.) Targum Studies 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 15-54. While MS 7a1 is then a representative of the earliest available stage of the text of P-Job, we unfortunately lack the evidence which would allow us to speak of earlier translators’ (or transmitters’) treatment of the waw.

case of the latter, by the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Where necessary, however, the limited critical apparatus of these electronic versions have been augmented through comparison with the official printed critical editions. While the selection of a text of 11Q10 is in some respects less complicated due to the lack of an attested manuscript history, the fragmentary state and, at times, illegibility of the sole surviving manuscript allows considerable latitude for alternative readings. As a forthcoming edition of the text being prepared by B. Zuckerman was not yet available at the time of this study, it was decided that an electronic text of M. Sokoloff's edition of 11Q10 (again, generously provided by the CAL Project) would be utilised. Sokoloff's edition is, however, augmented by the inclusion of the additional fragment published originally by B.E. Zuckerman and S.A. Reed and later included by F. Martinez et al. in the reissued DJD edition of the texts from Qumran Cave 11. Furthermore, due consideration has been given to other editions and readings of 11Q10 and on occasion it will be specifically noted that another reading of this text has been adopted.

Having discussed the textual materials to be included in such a comparison, it now remains to set out the particular criteria employed and to elucidate, in as clear a manner as is possible, the principles by which the following comparison is organised. While this study will concern itself with discrepancies between the putative source text (MT) and the respective translations (and between the translations themselves) this concern

---

130 Special thanks to both Konrad Jenner in Leiden and Jerome Lund in Cincinnati for their co-operation and assistance in providing the texts in CCAT format. Needless to say, responsibility for any errors appearing in the synoptic texts as presented in the following study rest solely with the author.

131 The fragmentary nature of 11Q10 is restrictive too in the sense that synoptic comparison with the other Aramaic versions is limited to those sections preserved by the Qumran text.

132 This new edition is apparently to be based on newer, clearer photographs. (Private communication with Zuckerman).


will of course also highlight the extent to which certain translations agree either with each other, or correspond more closely to the MT. While the general answer to the question of why respective translations of a real or supposed source text display divergences may be found in the seemingly unassailable conclusion that the production of translation is a cultural activity, it is perhaps worthwhile to consider briefly the more particular causes of such differences.\(^1\)

**Vorlage**

Of fundamental importance in any comparative study of translation, is the locating of a corresponding text which has served as the source of the translation(s).\(^2\) While concern for the *Vorlage* underlying a translation has long been a factor in research into the ancient versions, the significance of a different *Vorlage* as a potential source for target text divergences may be lost amidst the enthusiasm generated by the positing of translation theories and techniques of considerable comprehensiveness and complexity.\(^3\) With regard to the Aramaic translations of Job, it is a general consensus that at the macro level, the source texts from which they are derived are of an MT type.\(^4\) However, at the micro level—in terms of individual readings—the possibility

---

\(^1\) Being a cultural activity, a translation is subject to not merely the linguistic, but also the ideological, stylistic and poetic constraints of the culture in which it is produced. See for instance, A. Lefevere, *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literary Context.* (New York: MLA 1992) 86 ff. The emergence of the modern academic discipline of Translation Studies bears witness to the increasing interest in (and fundamental assumption of) non-linguistic factors involved in the production of translation. The revised edition of S. Bassnett, *Translation Studies,* (London and New York: 1991) provides a recent summary of the contributions of this approach to the study of translation.

\(^2\) G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995) 75. provides an extremely enlightening discussion of the importance of source text identity. In the interesting case of a so-called ‘pseudo-translation’ it is discovered that the ‘translation’ is an original composition in the ‘target language’ and that no corresponding ‘source language’ text in fact exists.


\(^4\) For P-Job see G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job: Critically Investigated with Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Summary* (Kristianstad: Monitor, 1994) 363. E.G. Matthews dissents from this view, in his review of Szpek (*CBQ* 56 (1994) 344) suggesting that P-Job was not translated directly
that the source text is not necessarily identical with the MT should always be kept in
mind. Indeed, the very question of a translator’s selection of, and attitude toward their
source text may shed interesting light on the cultural or historical context in which the
translation was produced. While the elucidation of text-critical issues vis-à-vis the MT
is not a particular concern of this study, a conscious attempt has been made to consider
the possibility that a variant Vorlage may lie behind a target text divergence. In the
course of the following analysis, any implications with regard to the nature of the re-
spective source texts will be considered.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{Language and Style}

While it is true that the three target languages of the respective translations chosen
for comparison in this study may all be broadly classified as Aramaic, it is important to
note that the respective target languages display important linguistic differences.\textsuperscript{140} As we
have already mentioned, observed linguistic variation within Aramaic allows students of
Aramaic dialectology to differentiate texts displaying certain linguistic features within the
dialectal framework of the language. While much work remains to be done in the field of
Aramaic dialectology, the current dialectal classification of Peshitta Job, RtgJob and 11Q10
reflects this recognition of distinctive linguistic features.\textsuperscript{141} Whether the differentiation of

\textsuperscript{139} With respect to source text issues, it is perhaps worthwhile here to quote \textit{in extenso} the views of G.
Toury, \textit{Descriptive Translation Studies}, 74: ‘...when devising a research method, provisions should be
made for any kind of possible complication; and there are indeed several cases where \textbf{a multitude of candidates for a source text} may exist. In cases of this kind, any attempt to justify a researcher’s selection
of a source text would depend, at least in part, on what the target text itself exhibits, which would
render the establishment of the source text’s identity part of the comparative analysis itself. In each one
of these cases, the reasons why the text actually picked was deemed preferable as a source text constitute
an interesting issue in itself. Uncovering these reasons may even have important implications for the
overall account of the relationships between function, process and product.’ \textit{[our emphasis].}

\textsuperscript{140} J. Fitzmyer ‘The Phases of the Aramaic Language’ in \textit{idem.}, \textit{A Wandering Aramean...}, 61; K. Beyer,
\textit{The Aramaic Language}, 43. For the use of terms such as ‘Aramaic’ and ‘Syriac’ in Jacob of Edessa see
Lucas van Rompay, ‘Past and Present Perceptions of Syriac Literary Tradition’ Hugoye: Journal of Syriac

\textsuperscript{141} The following classification of K. Beyer, \textit{The Aramaic Language} is here provided not as an endorser-
linguistic features is explained synchronically or diachronically, the fact remains that the use of three more or less distinct Aramaic target dialects produces some degree of textual variation in the respective translations.

This linguistic variation is reflected in the fact that a significant portion of Fitzmyer’s initial comparison of RtgJob and 11Q10 is devoted to a linguistic comparison of the two texts. While he draws attention to particular grammatical features, the centre-piece of his argument for the linguistic dissimilarity of the two texts is a lexical assessment of the degree of similarity/dissimilarity. According to Fitzmyer, the total number of similar words in 11Q10 and RtgJob is approximately 683 (of a total of 1437 preserved in 11Q10) which yields a similarity percentage of 47.5. Although Fitzmyer himself admits that some of the differences between the two translations might well be explained by differing Hebrew Vorlagen, he finds striking dissimilarity both in RtgJob’s choice of entirely different Aramaic synonyms to render a supposedly identical Hebrew word and the apparent lateness of the targumist’s lexical choices.

With the critical editions of RtgJob and P-Job which Fitzmyer lacked now at our disposal, a replication and extension of Fitzmyer’s comparison yields some interesting results. First with respect to the replication of Fitzmyer’s comparison of RtgJob and 11Q10, out of a total of 1278 words preserved by 11Q10, 624, or 48.8% were found to be similar to the corresponding words attested to by RtgJob. The similarity of the results, despite the use of different texts of 11Q10 and RtgJob, suggests that Fitzmyer’s assessment (47.5%) is statistically reliable.

143 J. Fitzmyer, ‘The First Century Targum’, 168. ‘Similarity’ as defined by Fitzmyer, includes not merely identical words, but also words displaying only orthographical differences, and words of the same root with either phonological or morphological differences.
145 For discussion of editions used see ‘Texts’ above. The use of critical editions of RtgJob and P-Job naturally highlights the point that the degree of similarity or dissimilarity to 11Q10 may potentially vary from MS to MS within the respective (RtgJob and P-Job) traditions. However, the low degree of similarity between the three Aramaic versions in general suggests that the greater or lesser similarity produced by this type of MS variation on occasion is probably coincidental and statistically insignificant.
i.e., reproducible. When Fitzmyer's comparison is extended to include P-Job, we find that of the same number of words (1278) preserved by 11Q10, a surprisingly large (and nearly equal) number of them, 606 (47.4%) are to be classified as similar to those contained within the Syriac translation. While the Rtg Job similarity (48.8%) to 11Q10 is marginally higher than that obtained for P-Job (47.4%) it would be difficult to see this difference (1.4%) as statistically significant. In terms of the criteria set forth by Fitzmyer then, we see that P-Job and Rtg Job are basically equal in their similarity to 11Q10. When phrased slightly differently, the statement is perhaps more startling: within these terms of reference, the Peshitta of Job is no more dissimilar to 11Q10 (the Qumran 'targum' of Job) than is its nominal cousin, the Rabbinic 'targum' of Job.

In addition to the lexical comparison, Fitzmyer draws attention to certain linguistic features which seem to indicate to his satisfaction, that the dialect of Aramaic used for the rendering of Rtg Job dates from a considerably later period than does the variant of Aramaic used in 11Q10. Relevant features include:

1. The presence and absence of alaphs in nominal forms both prosthetically and initially in Rtg Job (יָד ‘hand’ Rtg Job 21:5; יָדוּע ‘arm’ Rtg Job 40:9; יָד ‘man’ Rtg Job 25:6, 33:12, 34:11 etc.) in contrast to the corresponding forms attested to by 11Q10.

2. Fitzmyer sees other forms too (such as יָדוּע Rtg Job 35:6, 9 vs. יָדוּע 11Q10 and without medial י Rtg Job 31:29; 36:10) as indicating a later form of Aramaic.

3. Another indicator which suggests to Fitzmyer a later form of Aramaic is the presence in Rtg Job of רָאָה ‘to see’ (Rtg Job 27:12; 29:8, 11; 33:26, 28; 36:25; 40:11; 42:5) etc) as opposed to 11Q10 which utilises רָאָה ‘to see’.

---

146 Although in terms of words identified in 11Q10, as well as words similar between the two texts, Fitzmyer's totals are significantly higher, the reliability of the assessment is suggested by the fact that virtually an identical proportion between the two is obtained.

147 J. Fitzmyer 'The First Century Targum', 170-71.

148 While a MS from the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Plut. Ill.l) reads רָאָה for one of Fitzmyer's examples (40.11) the general picture as painted by Fitzmyer remains essentially undisturbed—רָאָה is undoubtedly the preferred form for Rtg Job.
4. While the 3rd masc. sg suffix on m.pl nouns found in RtgJob is consistently written as "א- (21:21, 24; 24:13; 33:26, etc.,) the corresponding form provided by 11Q10 includes a medial heh which results in the earlier form "או-. 

5. The contracted form of the existential particle and its negation, יָנָא and יָנָא לְ found in RtgJob (25:3, 33:32; 38:28, neg. 22:5; 32:12) are contrasted with the older forms, יָנָא and יָנָא לְ attested to by 11Q10.

6. The prevalence of analytic genitives (involving the interposing of -ד) in RtgJob and its minimal use of the construct is contrasted with 11Q10's almost exclusive use of the construct state.

The inclusion of P-Job in a comparison on the basis of Fitzmyer's features yields the following results. In terms of category 1, P-Job's allegiances are divided, providing a prosthetic aleph for its rendering of 'hand' (like RtgJob) while not doing so in its rendering of 'arm' (like 11Q10). Likewise, while P-Job sometimes agrees with 11Q10 in showing an initial alaph in expressions such as יָפִּלְתָא (25:6) it may on occasion supply יָפִּל (34:11) as does RtgJob. For category 2, again Peshitta Job agrees with 11Q10 in not including the ayin in יָלָת (35:6, 9) but parallels RtgJob and diverges from 11Q10 in failing to include the medial alaph in יָלָת (34:11) as does RtgJob. As for the final four categories, Peshitta Job follows 11Q10 with respect to categories 3 and 4 but then follows RtgJob in the case of the last two categories. To an even greater extent than in the preceding lexical comparison, the inclusion of Peshitta Job in a linguistic comparison of the Aramaic versions of Job finds the Syriac of P-Job sharing certain linguistic features with 11Q10 which are not attested in the RtgJob.149

A recent article by E.M. Cook on the language of Targum Onqelos and Jonathan bears witness to the current lack of consensus (methodological and otherwise) in the field of Aramaic dialectology. In it, Cook rightly criticises the isolation of certain linguistic features as definitive in terms of dialect classification, to the neglect of

---

149 See K. Beyer, 'Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur' ZDMG 116 (2) (1966) 242-54 for a discussion of the remnants of Imperial Aramaic in both the oldest Syriac material, and the language of the Peshitta.
others. For the dialects of Middle Aramaic, he prefers to posit a dialect continuum, in which Syriac and the language of Targums Onqelos and Jonathan belong to a dialect group which he christens ‘Central Aramaic’ as they seem to contain both Eastern and Western Aramaic elements. While the Aramaic material from Qumran is, from a geographical point of view, undeniably Western, the implications of this ‘Western’ classification in terms of Aramaic dialectology are perhaps not as clear as they once were. In addition, the fact that Takamitsu Muraoka argues for the ‘Eastern’ origin of 11Q10 should be taken as fair warning against the dangers of holding a priori dialectological assumptions on the basis of a text’s provenance. To further complicate the dialect classification of the Aramaic versions of Job, S.A. Kaufman suggests that despite the fact that Western elements may be detected in its midst, the Aramaic dialect most closely related to Late Jewish Literary Aramaic (the language of Ps-Jonathan, the targums of Psalms and most importantly for this discussion, RtgJob) is none other than Syriac. It should be clear from the above summary that much work remains to be done in the field of Aramaic dialectology. This is not the purpose of the present study and it should be noted that the purpose of the above discussion is not to evaluate Fitzmyer’s criterion for deciding on the relative dialectal position of the respective versions, nor is it to suggest that in terms of dialectological criteria, P-Job is

---

150 E.M. Cook, ‘A New Perspective’, 149. Cook provides as an example, the classic isoglosses which are used to classify Syriac as an ‘Eastern dialect’ (*Un* as the prefix of the 3rd impf. verbal form as opposed to *y*; *e* instead of *aya* as the m. pl. emphatic; loss of emphatic force of *–a*; elimination of *n-* bearing suffixes in the imperfect indicative).

151 E.M. Cook, ‘A New Perspective’ gives a critical survey of the views of Kutscher, Tal and Greenfield, attempting to problematize terms such as ‘Western Aramaic’, ‘Standard Literary Aramaic’ and ‘Aramaic koine’.

152 T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 425-443 includes among eastern characteristics: a) the abundance of non-assimilated forms; b) the presence of alephs marking the feminine singular and emphatic; c) evidence of the *status emphaticus* taking over the function of *status absolutus*; d) occurrence of the sumero-akkadian word order (where the verb follows the subject or object or both). See also R. Weiss, *וְרֹחָב הַאֲרָאִמִּי לְפַּלְס יִדְיָה*, 30 where he too notes the Eastern characteristics of the language of 11Q10 and suggests (rather than argues for) the possibility of its origins lying outside ancient Palestine.

more or less closely related to 11Q10 than is RtgJob. Any possible conclusion of this sort could only be arrived at through a comprehensive comparison of all relevant linguistic features and such an assessment is not within the scope of the current study. The preceding discussion is intended only to suggest that if the fact of the dialectal dissimilarity between the Aramaic versions of Job is obvious, the exact nature of this dissimilarity and the linguistic grounds for preferring a comparison of the two ‘targums’ (11Q10 and RtgJob) as opposed to 11Q10 and Peshitta Job are by no means clear-cut or self-evident. Whatever the exact relationship between their Aramaic dialects, it is evident that the Qumran, Syriac and targum translations have been realised in marginally different linguistic forms of what is broadly speaking a single language. The point for this study is that within the historical, cultural, and ideological locations in which the respective translations took place, the fact of different linguistic realisations could not have been otherwise. That is to say, following the respective translators’ initial choice to translate into a given dialect of Aramaic (or any other language for that matter), they were to some extent prisoners—captive to a greater or lesser degree to the grammatical, lexical and orthographical constraints of their chosen target language. The question of the extent to which a translator is linguistically and/or stylistically captive to their chosen target language and poetics on one hand, and to what extent their deviations from the source text are reflections of a more personal attitude or approach are of course intimately bound up with questions of intentionality and volition in translation. In many cases, it will be quite obvious that target text deviations from the supposed source text are either intentional or unintentional, voluntary or involuntary. In other cases, however, the exact nature of the motivation behind such divergences—be they linguistic, stylistic, or ideological—may be far from obvious and will therefore require closer investigation. In the end, some cases will undoubtedly remain essentially undecideable. As was the case with regard to Vorlage, while linguistic (and in the present case dialectal) differences between the Aramaic versions of Job are not the primary concern

154 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 49.
of the present study, it is recognised that the comparison which follows is intimately bound up with linguistic considerations and issues arising from such considerations will be dealt with as they are encountered in the course of the comparison.

**Format of the Comparison**

Previous commentaries on the relationship between 11Q10 and the versions have tended to be single-focus studies, with 11Q10 functioning as the base text and the versions cited only with reference to the Qumran text. The weakness of the single-focus format is that while it documents 11Q10 divergences, it is ill-equipped to describe non-corresponding P-Job and RtgJob divergences and convergences. The present study will therefore present passages synoptically and, for the purposes of the textual comparison, avoid privileging 11Q10 as the base-text. The inclusion of parallels drawn from modern English versions deserves some explanation. It should be noted at the outset that the comparison of ancient Aramaic renderings with their modern English counterparts is in no way meant to imply that the two target languages enjoy any particular cognate relationship (as is the case with for instance Hebrew and Aramaic). Nevertheless, while other ancient and modern versions may have been technically available for consultation in addition to the MT in the production of these modern English versions, the English versions cited in the course of this study represent explicit attempts to render the MT text and their treatment of these passages may shed some light on how linguistic-stylistic adaptation of a Hebrew source text may be realized in translation and, at the same time sensitize us to some of the approaches common to ancient and modern translators.

---

156 For example, M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 7 n. 9: ‘Cases where the ancient versions accord with Tg1 against MT have been pointed out in the commentary.’


In addition to the above considerations, it is worth noting that the present study resists (with varying degrees of success) the temptation to focus primarily or exclusively on the word as the unit for comparison. While lexicographers have realised the importance of context in illuminating the meaning of a word, many commentators unfortunately still choose to restrict their comparisons to the word unit. Rather than merely presenting parallel words, this study will present parallel passages (words + co-texts) for analysis.

While reference will be made on occasion to portions of P-Job and RtgJob which are not paralleled by sections preserved in 11Q10, the basic comparison (and therefore the data which may be considered in the forming of basic conclusions) will be restricted to the textual sections preserved in all three witnesses. While this decision undoubtedly entails the exclusion of much potentially interesting textual material, it is felt that the synoptic sample which remains is of sufficient size both to warrant systematic analysis and to sustain the conclusions which may be arrived at in such an analysis. This, so to speak, ‘minimalist’ approach has the benefit of encouraging the analysis to remain firmly grounded in the textual evidence at our disposal rather than in speculation regarding the unpreserved portions of 11Q10.


161 See W.M. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 190 for a brief discussion of this issue.
PART ONE

OMISSION
CHAPTER 1

SHARED OMISSIONS

Of all the adjustments which may be made by translators in their adaptation of a source text to a target language, it is perhaps the omission of extraneous elements that most often goes undetected in an analysis. Although not substantiating his assertion, E. Nida suggests that with respect to biblical translation (and perhaps translation generally?) reductions in, or subtractions from, a source text are less numerous than expansions and have a correspondingly diminished structural importance within the translation transaction.\(^{162}\) The fact that Nida is to some extent operating with a prescriptive rather than a descriptive model of translation studies may, however, partially explain his diminishing of the importance of omission in translation.\(^{163}\) From the perspective of Nida's stated aim of 'reproducing the closest natural equivalent'\(^{164}\) of an element in the source text, the idea of the translator omitting material from the source text for reasons entirely unrelated to the linguistic-stylistic adaptation of the source text to the target language (i.e., theological-ideological) is clearly anathema. Nevertheless, as those familiar with ancient translation will undoubtedly affirm, the omission of material in translating ideologically sensitive texts may of course have a significant effect on the total content of the message and unlike the context in which Nida is operating (namely that of modern

\(^{162}\) E. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating*, 231.

\(^{163}\) Nevertheless, as we will see below, Nida certainly does create space within the framework of 'structural adjustments' for the category of subtraction/reduction. Although Nida's work has an undeniably prescriptive strain running through much of it (See for instance, E. Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (London: Routledge, 1993) much of his work is foundational for subsequent translation studies in general, and biblical translation studies in particular.

biblical translation) factors such as lacunose source text or corrupt textual transmission of either the source or target text may enhance the importance of certain types of 'minuses' in the study of the relationship between ancient source and target texts.\textsuperscript{165}

For the student of ancient translations such as the Aramaic versions of Job, the identification, assessment and classification of omission in translation is in some respects more difficult than that of other modes of representation such as addition, substitution or transposition. In the case of these latter modes, the translation of course preserves if not the translation process itself, then at least the textual material from which a reconstruction of the translator's motivation can theoretically take place. With omission on the other hand, the translator conceals, in some sense, the evidence of his activity and while the character of the minus may be partly revealed through a consideration of the unit omitted, all arguments are necessarily \textit{e silentio}.\textsuperscript{166} With these caveats (and others which will appear in due course) in mind, we turn then to an assessment of the phenomenon of omission in the Aramaic versions of Job. The orienting questions for the discussion which follows are:

1. Do any of the Aramaic versions leave elements of the source text unrepresented in their translations?
2. If so, what type of elements are omitted and what if any cause may be posited for their omission?
3. What light, if any does the phenomenon of omission (zero representation) shed on the question of the relationship between the Aramaic versions of Job?

\textsuperscript{165} The Septuagint's text of Job, for instance, lacking as it does an estimated 15-25\% of the Hebrew text, (cf. J. Gray, 'The Masoretic Text of the Book of Job...') is presumably a prime example of the difference that \textit{either} the translator's radical omission of source text \textit{or} antecedent or subsequent textual issues may have on an ancient version. (Of course it seems likely that both factors will have often played their own [often indistinguishable] part in the divergences displayed by most ancient versions).

\textsuperscript{166} For instance, not only is it often possible to reconstruct a targumist's motivation for inserting a 'midrashic' interpolation on the basis of the relationship between the added text and an element within the source text, but it is virtually inconceivable that such an addition could have been added by 'accident'. Omission on the other hand may often be attributed to an error on the part of the translator or later copyist.
Following a presentation of examples from the respective Aramaic versions, we will attempt to draw some conclusions about the relationship between these translations. In the examples which follow, the Aramaic translations will contain numerous divergences from the source text which, while interesting in their own right, are not directly pertinent to this discussion of omission. Therefore the passages will not be treated exhaustively but rather presented and discussed only insofar as they make some contribution to the phenomena under consideration.

For the purposes of the following discussion, we make use of the general definition of omission utilised by Szpek. As will be clear from some of the examples which follow, it will not always be entirely clear whether an element has been ‘omitted’ in the Aramaic version or whether some element should be identified as a ‘substitution’ for the source text element. Formally, however, the general conceptual distinction between ‘omission’ and ‘substitution’ as formulated by Szpek seems clear and beyond dispute.

A. Shared Omissions in the Aramaic Versions of Job

A1. Minus shared by all three Aramaic versions

Of all the material examined in the course of the present study, only one unequivocal example of a shared omission appears:

---

167 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 31: ‘The adjustment of omission involves the exclusion of a morpheme, word, phrase, clause or sentence with no replacement.’ While words such as ‘omission’ will on occasion be used interchangeably with more neutral terms such as ‘minus’, the motivating factor in each instance in which a source text element does not appear in one of the Aramaic versions will hopefully be made clear in the analysis. The general question of whether (and to what extent) adjustments in the Aramaic versions should be attributed to translator intervention or the variation contained in a supposed Vorlage, is dealt with at some length in the Conclusion below.

168 It is possible that a preposition 2–5 in a difficult Hebrew context at 36:12 has been omitted by all three translators, however, the combination of an unclear Hebrew text and the intrusion of Aramaic idiom makes analysis problematic.
He brings the clouds to punish men, or to water his earth and show his love. NIV
Whether to punish ( ) earth's peoples or as a work of faithful love, he despatches them. NJB

While the implausibility or incongruity of MT אֲמַלַּקְרִין ‘whether for (the good of?) his land’ in its present form and location has led RtgJob to provide a radically expanded interpretation of the Hebrew clause ( ‘gushing rain for the trees of the mountains and the hills’) P-Job and 11Q10 for their part have retained a proximate translation in their renderings (ןַעְלָאְרִינָא/לָאֶרְחָא). However, the latter translations’ omission of the 3 masc. sg. suffix in translation directs our attention back to RtgJob where we see that the suffix which would normally find representation in the targumist’s Aramaic rendering has not been included. Although the determination of the precise relationship between the Hebrew text and its RtgJob translation is not without difficulty, it does seem likely in light of the other versions obvious


170 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job. 81 n.9; As R. Weiss, 278 notes, while some elements of the Targum’s interpretation to this verse are paralleled in b.Ta’anit 8b) not all elements are found in this particular text (including ‘on the seas and in the deserts’). As is usually the case, determining whether the targum is reliant on the Rabbinic sources or vice versa is extremely problematic. See R. Weiss, for further discussion.

171 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 148.

172 We might easily imagine the targumist rendering, for instance, ‘gushing rain for the trees of his mountains and (his) hills.’
omission of the suffix that the targumist has also opted to leave it unrepresented in translation. Although Szpek suggests that P-Job has omitted this suffix due to its perceived redundancy, it is perhaps possible to be more specific with regard to the motivation. As neither of the structurally similar, parallel clauses in this Hebrew verse possess the pronominal suffix (אָמַּם לֹא-יִשְׁכִּיב לֹא-יִשְׁכִּיב אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יִשְׁכִּיב) it seems evident that all three translators have harmonised their translations of אָמַּם לֹא-יִשְׁכִּיב with the un-suffixed forms both before and after it. Although some English translators of the MT (NIV) have chosen to harmonise in a different way, a different adjustment—the addition of the suffix on the final noun: 'his love'—appears to bear witness to this same influence of surrounding forms.

A2. Minus shared by 11Q10 and P-Job

In addition to the above instance common to all three versions, the Qumran and Syriac translations of Job diverge from both the MT and RtgJob in sharing one other minus.

He does not take his eyes off the righteous; he enthrones them with kings and exalts them for ever. NIV

---

173 H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 98 classifies this omission as being due to redundancy.
174 Although the translation in C. Mangan *The Targum of Job*, 78 'he builds them up...' seems to imply that the Aramaic root in view is *לְבַל* 'to build', the present forms are in fact derived from causative suffixed forms of Aramaic *לבכ*. 
The irregular structure of Hebrew 36:7b has prompted considerable innovative activity on the part of the Aramaic translators. Both 11Q10 and P-Job appear to have understood the preposition in MT יַֽלֹּכִ֑ים ‘with kings’ as the *nota accusativi* and rendered the phrase accordingly as the direct object of a verb ([P-Job] מָלַּכְתֶּ֨הוּ בַּקָּרִ֥ים / [11Q10] לְמִלְאָכָּוּבָּהּוּ בַּקָּרִים). While all three Aramaic versions have provided a form of Aramaic רֵיחַב ‘to sit’, the translators of 11Q10 (רֵיחַב) and P-Job (רֵיהַב) have apparently intended their rendering of יִשְׁעַיבֵּמ ‘and he seats them’ to refer to 7b and have thus diverged from the word order of MT in moving their translations of this verbal form toward the front of the Aramaic clause. RtgJob has also provided a form of this verb (לֵיהוּב) in response to the perceived problem at hand but a transposition has not occurred because the targumist also provides an appropriate equivalent (וֹרֵאתָם) for יִשְׁעַיבֵּמ in a location which corresponds to that of the MT. Although the 3rd masc. pl. objective suffix has been retained in RtgJob’s translation of the Hebrew, the translators of the Syriac and Qumran texts have obviously omitted this element as superfluous in their newly reconstituted Aramaic versions of the Hebrew. While the NIV does show a type of transposition in some ways related to that 11Q10 and P-Job, it retains the suffix of the Hebrew in its English rendering.

**A3. Minus shared by 11Q10 and RtgJob**

There are no instances where these two versions show an omission of the same element of the Hebrew text in their respective Aramaic renderings.

---

175 ‘and he sits them’ seems to be related to the preceding clause (והָלַּכְתֶּ֨הוּ בַּקָּרִ֥ים) despite the occurrence of the *waw*. R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 414 attributes the Hebrew irregularity to the metrical requirements of the poet.

176 See G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job*, 299 (P-Job); M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 137; *ATQ*, 51; F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave II*, 141. (11Q10).
A4. Minus shared by RtgJob and P-Job

There are no instances where these two versions show an omission of the same element of the Hebrew text in their respective Aramaic renderings.

Summary of Shared Omissions among the Aramaic versions

Given that 11Q10, P-Job and RtgJob are all three renderings of a putatively similar Hebrew Vorlage into distinct but related dialects of Aramaic, it is perhaps rather surprising that these versions do not find themselves in agreement more often in terms of omission at identical junctures in the text.\(^\text{177}\) Certainly, this lack of shared omissions lends further weight to the conclusion that these versions are not reliant on each other in any demonstrable manner. What, if anything may then be said on the basis of the paucity of examples put forward in the above discussion? Both the single minus shared by all three versions and that shared only by 11Q10 and P-Job are suffixes (one pronominal, the other objective) and both occur in contexts in which the Hebrew text is, if not necessarily problematic, then at least in some measure, irregular. For all three versions in the first case (A1) the omission of the suffix is an example of the normal priority of fidelity to the Hebrew text being overridden by a desire to harmonise a perceived incongruity with the surrounding grammatical context. The second example of omission on the other hand (A2) seems to be tied up inextricably with other modifications of the Hebrew text which have rendered the suffix redundant or superfluous in its new Aramaic context. Although the material mustered thus far is meagre it does shed some light on the issue of omission in the Aramaic versions. Admittedly slightly different in terms of motivation, both omissions should be classified as being either directly or indirectly related to linguistic-stylistic adaptation of the source text. While the examples of precise agreement are, as we have seen scarce, both the type of omission (bound morpheme) and

\(^\text{177}\) Even in light of the seemingly unassailable conclusion that the three Aramaic versions constitute independent renderings (H.M. Szpek 'On the Influence of the Targum'), one might expect a certain amount of agreement.
motivations for omission illustrated in the above examples will recur in the following analysis of the versions in their own right.
Chapter 2

11Q10

Although previous work on the Aramaic versions of Job has not primarily concerned itself with modes of representation, deficiencies of the respective Aramaic target texts vis-à-vis their assumed MT-type Vorlage have been documented on an ad hoc basis by scholars who have explored these texts. With respect to 11Q10, E. Tuinstra’s mention of omission is primarily limited to a discussion of the waw conjunction.\(^{178}\) The original editors of the text, for their part, note that despite other similarities to LXX Job, 11Q10 does not parallel the Greek version in lacking sizeable portions which appear in the Hebrew text.\(^{179}\) Sokoloff notes the absence of material in 11Q10 which has been preserved in the Hebrew text but does not elaborate on the source of such minuses.\(^{180}\) The following discussion is therefore the first attempt at a sustained analysis of omission in the Qumran text. While a quick glance through the extensive collection of variants preserved in the critical apparatus of both P-Job and (to an even greater extent) RtgJob bears witness to the effect that textual transmission can leave an indelible mark on a given text(s), both the targum and Syriac versions of Job have, by and large, been preserved in their entirety.\(^{181}\) The Aramaic text from Qumran on the other hand differs from these versions in having been preserved in only one manuscript and in having spent the better part of two millennia, not in a library but in a desert cave near the settlement at

\(^{178}\)E.W. Tuinstra, _Hermeneutische Aspecten_, 49. See chapter 11 for the Aramaic versions’ treatment of waw.

\(^{179}\) _Editio princeps_, 7.

\(^{180}\) M. Sokoloff, _The Targum to Job_, 7.

\(^{181}\) Possible exceptions to this general rule in P-Job are dealt with in the next chapter.
Qumran. The conditions in which 11Q10 was stored mean that the text has understandably suffered considerable deterioration in the course of its stay in the desert and is extant now only in a fragmentary state. The unfortunate state of some preserved portions of 11Q10 has implications for the analysis of the phenomenon of textual minus because in particularly fragmentary sections, it is not always clear if an omission should be attributed to the activity of the translator or to the elements which have progressively degraded the manuscript. Sometimes the main reason for supposing that a minus has occurred in the text of 11Q10 is simply the apparent lack of space sufficient to contain even a word-for-word rendering of the source text. This situation is illustrated by the following examples:

\[My relatives and my close friends have failed me\] NRSV

The beginning of 11Q10 column ii, line 3 clearly preserves the Aramaic rendering of the middle portion of Job 19:13 (דְּרָדְךָ יִדְעֵי ב...[......] יְדֵי) but the following line 4 begins with MT v.15 (בָּרוּךְ אָמַר לְהַבַּרְךְ)...[אֶמֶתֶּה יְדֵי]. In light of this, the editors and subsequent commentators have suggested that, given the normal column measurements, there is insufficient space in 11Q10 for the Aramaic translation of all or part of a rendering of 19:14. Assuming that 11Q10's text is lacking material at

---

182 For discussion of the preservation and extent of 11Q10 see Introduction.
183 Editio princeps, 7. ‘Parfois on peut conclure à l’absence de quelques versets dans des parties perdues du texte, lorsqu’on constate que la lacune entre deux fragments est beaucoup plus petite qu’elle ne devrait être normalement.’ For a full listing of the ‘vital statistics’ involved in the reconstruction of the column size see F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 81-5.
this point, it seems most likely that the omission of v.13b-14a may have taken place due to homoioteleuton.  

An error of a similar sort has also taken place at 33:12:

\[
\text{Behold, in this you are not right. I will answer you. God is greater than man. RSV}
\]

An examination of the photograph (DJD 23, Plate XII) suggests that, as many commentators have noted, there does not seem to be enough room for a rendering of 33:12a.  
While the end of the previous line (5) is not preserved it is difficult to see how an equivalent of Hebrew v.12a (‘Behold you are wrong in this—I will answer you’) might be squeezed in before the beginning of the following line where a translation of v.12b clearly begins. Tuinstra has noted that while the LXX does not omit v12a, its rendering does noticeably weaken the force of the MT (LXX: \(\pi\delta\varsigma\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\zeta\ \delta\iota\kappa\kappa\iota\alpha\zeta\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \varepsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\chi\kappa\alpha\o\nu\ \mu\ou\)) and on this basis, he has suggested that a translation of the Hebrew may have been omitted by the translator of 11Q10 in order to protect the reputation of Job.  
While this is a possibility, other explanations should also be considered. Perhaps the material was not in the translator’s Vorlage or, as has been suggested by Sokoloff, perhaps this part of the verse has been omitted by a copyist.

184 Editio princeps, 15; B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 41; B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 92. The occurrence of this common textual phenomenon here is suggested by the similarity of (v.14) and (v.15).
185 For reconstructed widths of sheets and columns see F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 83-4.
due to homoioteleuton. Once again, however, any conclusions are necessarily tentative due to the fact that the textual minus may only be inferred from a lack of space.

A similar situation appears to obtain later on, in the Qumran translation of Job 31:10:

While RtgJob provides an alternative equivalent, the Qumran translation begins line 3 of col. xviii with a cognate equivalent of MT מָתַר (MT 31:10)\(^{188}\). At the end of the same line, however, where the text is again preserved, the Qumran translation corresponds to the middle of MT v.11 (\(נַתַּרְתָה לא יִתַּרְתָה\)) and the gap which intervenes on line 3 does not appear to be of a sufficient size to contain a translation of verse 10 in its entirety. Some have suggested that this abridgement may be related to the potentially offensive sentiment of v.10b (‘let others bend over her [my

\(^{187}\) M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 131. This suggestion relies on the observation that both Hebrew מָתַר (beginning of v12a) and מָתַר (beginning of verse 12b) may be translated by Aramaic מָתַר in 11Q10. It is quite easily conceivable that a copyist’s eye might have passed over v12a after having copied the first occurrence of this Aramaic word.

\(^{188}\) The Rabbinic targum’s translation of Heb. מָתַר ‘let her [i.e., my wife] grind’ with Aramaic מָתַר מָתַר ‘let her sleep [euph. for intercourse]’ clearly indicates that the translator has understood the Hebrew to have a sexual connotation. For discussion of ‘grinding’ as an allusion to the sexual act here, see A. Brenner and F. van Dijk-Hemmes, *On Gendering Texts: Female and Male Voices in the Hebrew Bible* (Brill, 1993) 143. As R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 346 has noted, this connection is made both in midrashic (Gen. Rabba 48 [end]) and talmudic (b.Sotah 10a) literature but is also followed by the Vulgate. This passage here in Job is cited in support of this meaning in the Midrash. E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 454 is of the opinion that both Tg and Vulg. have followed the Rabbinic interpretation and while this seems most likely the direction of influence is difficult to determine. See also LXX which may have provided a euphemistic translation (but cf. Dhorme) which would suggest a sexual interpretation (κρέαζω[from κρέαζω ‘to please’]).
wife].\textsuperscript{189} B. Jongeling in fact goes so far as to suggest that this should be seen as an illustration of the Rabbinic injunctions restricting the targumist’s normal treatment of certain passages.\textsuperscript{190} It is worth noting, however, that this practice of omission in the rabbinic targums seems to have been restricted primarily to the exclusion of certain passages from targumic readings (i.e., a synagogue setting) as opposed to their omission from written targum texts which seem likely to have also been used in other contexts.\textsuperscript{191} This understanding is to some extent supported by the fact that none of the passages marked out for special treatment in rabbinic sources are to be found in the targums to the writings.\textsuperscript{192} It is perhaps not surprising then, that although the targumist responsible for $\text{RtgJob}$ has offered an apparently euphemistic translation of this verse, he has clearly felt no qualms \textit{per se} about including a translation of the verse. While the Qumran text itself provides no evidence of a liturgical use, it is certainly possible that there may indeed be euphemism at work here in the Qumran text. But even if, as Klein has shown to be the case, the Palestinian targumim do actually omit an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew (as opposed to Tg. Onkelos’ provision of prohibitive ‘reading notes’ in the margin) it is crucial to note that in such cases the Hebrew text is supplied in its stead and the formal integrity of the text is preserved intact, with each element receiving representation.\textsuperscript{193} If insufficient space in $11\text{Q10}$ does indicate an \textit{omission} of text due to euphemism, it is interesting to note that this is clearly not an approach which the producers of the Rabbinic targumim have utilised to any great extent. In this case unfortunately, the poor preservation of the Qumran text once again does not allow us to move beyond speculation to anything like a definitive conclusion.

\textsuperscript{189} \textit{Editio princeps}, 46; F. Martinez et al., \textit{Qumran Cave 11}, 123; E.W. Tuinstra, \textit{Hermeneutische Aspecten}, 18.
\textsuperscript{190} B. Jongeling, \textit{Een Aramees boek Job}, 81.
\textsuperscript{191} This is noted both by P.A. Alexander, ‘The Rabbinic Lists of Forbidden Targumim’ \textit{JJS} 27 (1976) 187 and M. Klein, ‘Not to be Translated in Public—$\text{XTD'Sri}$ $\text{Dnn&Xb}$’.\textsuperscript{192} For the relationship between the main rabbinic sources of this information (m.Meg 4.10; t.Meg. 4.31; b.Meg 25a/b) see P.S. Alexander, ‘The Rabbinic Lists of Forbidden Targumim’; M.L. Klein, ‘Not to be Translated in Public—$\text{XTD'Sri}$ $\text{Dnn&Xb}$’.
\textsuperscript{193} M.L. Klein, ‘Not to be Translated in Public’, 191.
In a final example from 39:10, it is not so much a question of whether material has been omitted but rather which of two elements (prepositional phrase or noun) preserved in the MT has not been rendered in the Qumran translation.

Can you bind him in the furrow with ropes, or will he harrow the valleys after you? RSV

Because the first of the two small lacunae in 11Q10’s translation is not large enough to contain Aramaic translations of both Hebrew יָרֵעַ ‘ox’ and בַּקְטָן ‘to a furrow’, scholars have suggested that it is the equivalent to the former (דְּרָאָמה), which must be reconstructed in the gap.194 While the identity of the substantive to which it has been added is debated, the 3d masc. sg. suffix of 11Q10 דְּרָאָמה is clearly evident and would seem to require an antecedent.195 In light of the preservation of an Aramaic verb form (רַחְסִפָּה) which appears to closely approximate the Hebrew, the reconstruction of the object (דַּאָרָם) is not, however, the only option. As Pope observes, יָרֵעַ has been omitted in the LXX and it seems quite possible that 11Q10 may also have omitted the implied object which has already been provided, in any case, in 39:9.196 Despite providing a proximate

---

194 The somewhat tentative conclusion of the Editio princeps (75) has been followed by M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 90. See F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 156 for more detailed discussion of the spacing of the text.

195 The reading of 11Q10 is open to conjecture here (דהרעה | ב Editio princeps, 74; ATQ, 62. דרעה | ב F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 156; both meaning ‘rope’). The reading of M. Sokoloff above tallies with that of P-Job’s translation תּוּלְחָה (meaning ‘yoke’) and seems fairly reasonable in the light of P-Job’s similar translation of a general Hebrew term for cords or ropes in 39:5.

196 M. Pope suggests that this substantive may have been a gloss in the Hebrew text. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the English translation provided by RSV provides a pronominal reference ‘him’
equivalent of עַבָּדִי ‘to a furrow’ at 36:28, P-Job translates this phrase here with עַל ‘upon his neck’. This may suggest that the translator has felt the awkwardness of the Hebrew construction in the present context and sought to provide a smoother rendering. If it is clear that some part of the Hebrew text has gone unrepresented in the Aramaic version of Job from Qumran, the question of which element of the text has been passed over or omitted is in this case undecideable.  

As we have seen above, the fragmentary preservation of the Qumran translation of Job does from time to time allow the inference of a textual minus in comparison with the MT and its two other Aramaic versions. A marginally more clear case of a minus arises when it is evident that a particular element in the MT has not been represented in a corresponding order in the Aramaic translation provided by 11Q10. In fact, were it safe to assume that the Qumran translation reproduces the word order of the MT in all cases, the evident lack of such Aramaic equivalents would provide us with certain cases of material omitted in translation. Such assumptions regarding word order are clearly unwarranted (see chapter 6 below) and thus the possibility must be admitted that a ‘missing’ word or phrase may have been represented in a neighbouring portion of 11Q10’s

rather than repeating the noun.

197 Interestingly, E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 602 without apparent reference to the Syriac, favours an emendation of the Hebrew which results in: רָבַּת הָנִֽי שָׁנֵה יַעֲשָׂה, ‘Will you bind a rope about his neck?’ Either the translator of P-Job has read a different Vorlage or has simply modified the text in order to provide an intelligible rendering for his readers.

198 In addition to the above examples, 11Q10 also appears to be lacking a translation of Job 21:23. The potentially largest instance of omission in 11Q10 is unfortunately also amongst the most dubious. (M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 7; B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 151) The editors assessment that the remaining number of lines in Column XXXVIII and a single line at the top of XXXIX would be sufficient to contain a translation of vv 12-17 would seem to be accurate: a simple word count of the text omitted between the last preserved line of Col XXXVII and the first line preserved substantially in Column XXXVIII (approx. 70) corroborates the editors’ suggestion that 11Q10 may well have contained a translation of some sort in the portion of the scroll now lost to us. Furthermore, the suggestion that 11Q10 did contain a translation of these verses is strengthened by the apparent joins of Fragments V and W by F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 170; (K. Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte, 298 also provides a translation of the beginning of v.12) Although little can be made of the text, it does seem clear that there was text on the line below line 8 of this column and that therefore sufficient space does (or did) exist for a translation of the remainder of the book.
translation which has since been lost to the elements. This situation is illustrated by the following passage drawn from Job 21,

His buckets are full of milk, and there is no loss of strength in his bones. BBE
His pails are full of milk, And the marrow of his bones is moistened. ASV

Here at 21:24, we see that all three Aramaic versions have represented the Hebrew lexeme עשתמרתי ‘his bones’ with the expected suffixed equivalent נדדמדות in P-Job and RtgJob (and most English versions including the ASV, ‘is moistened’) follow the MT in preserving an equivalent to the verbal element (יהימ) in a position after the subject (P-Job: מִרְבּוּ ; RtgJob: עשתמִיד). The Qumran translation by contrast, appears to preserve ‘his bones’ as the final word in its rendering of Job 21:24. That this is the case is shown by the fact that the words which appear immediately following this Aramaic lexeme on the same line in the Qumran text correspond clearly to the beginning of MT 21:25 (ך狐月山). Although at least one English version (BBE) also provides an equivalent (‘his bones’) in the final position of its rendering of the verse, the remainder of the English translation shows that whatever the formal imprecision of its rendering, the verbal component has in fact been taken into account in the translation process. In the case of 11Q10, however, we of course do not have access to the text now lost in the lacuna and therefore it remains uncertain whether we are dealing with an outright minus or rather simply a removal of the verbal equivalent to a prior position in the re-ordered Aramaic equivalent clause.

199 The English Bible in Basic English is a now infrequently used version published originally in 1965 (Cambridge Press).
With the above cases, we have seen that our analysis of textual minuses is impaired by the less than ideal state of the Qumran manuscript. In other instances, we may conclude with greater certainty that a minus does in fact occur in the Qumran text but, at the same time, still be comparatively uncertain about the precise cause of the textual minus. The theoretical possibility that 11Q10 (or any translation for that matter) lacks an element vis-à-vis the ‘source text’ because its version of the source text was for whatever reason deficient in this respect must always be considered. While in the case of P-Job, discussion of the causes of textual deficiencies in relation to the Hebrew may be located within the context of the wider corpus of Peshitta translation, the Qumran text lacks a comparable body of material from which to extract general principles. Nevertheless, in various locations throughout the Qumran text, scholars have, with varying degrees of unanimity, hypothesised that 11Q10’s lack of a particular textual equivalent to the MT is due not to ideological, linguistic or stylistic influences but is rather to be attributed to a difference of underlying Vorlage or alternatively to an error of omission by the translator or a later抄ist of the translation. An example which clearly illustrates this point is provided by the Qumran version of Job 34:25:

Thus, knowing their works, he overturns them in the night, and they are crushed, (v.26) He strikes them for their wickedness in the sight of men,... RSV

---

200 It is of course no coincidence that most of the above examples are drawn from the fragments rather than from the better preserved material found on the so-called ‘small scroll’ (See Introduction).

201 M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 7. For preliminary discussion see Introduction: Vorlage.

202 While one might debate the utility or accuracy of generalisations regarding the translation technique of the Peshitta as a whole (see for instance, M.P. Weitzman, ‘The Interpretive Character’, 587-611 ) it is at the very least, a coherent and plausible concept given a complete corpus.
As may be seen above, 11Q10’s rendering of verse 25 appears to end with its translation of MT ἐνέργεια ἦν ἃς ἀνέβας, ‘their works’. As the material following seems to correspond closely to the latter portion of v.26 in the Hebrew it seems clear that both v.25b and the first portion of v.26a have not been included in 11Q10’s translation of the Hebrew. This suggests that either this material has been omitted by the translator or was not present in his Vorlage and as there does not appear to be any likely reason for its exclusion on literary, stylistic or ideological grounds, it seems probable (but of course not certain) that some or all of this textual material was not in the Hebrew at this point.

A different type of minus appears in the Qumran text’s version of 36:29 where it is a single word which is lacking in the translation of the Hebrew.

Can any one understand the spreading of the clouds, the thunderings of his pavilion? RSV

---

203 11Q10’s translation of ἐνέργεια ἦν ἃς ἀνέβας, ‘to strike or clap (hands?) with ἔριμα ἅμα ἀπανθάματα ἐπετρέπει ‘and he throws them...’ attests to the translator’s inadequate comprehension of this Hebrew lexeme. While the addition/substitution of the independent plural pronoun (ἔριμα ἅμα ἀπανθάματα) is due to language difference, the choice of verb may show the influence of Heb. ἔριμα ἅμα ἀπανθάματα ‘and he overturned/overthrew’ which appears in v.25b. If this is the case (by no means certain), it would certainly problematise the suggestion that 11Q10 has omitted v.25b due to its absence from the translator’s Vorlage.

204 The editors (Editio princeps, 60) do not provide an evaluation of the situation but merely observe that ‘Le traducteur n’a pas traduit le verset 25b (et les deux premiers mots du verset 26); dans G cet hémistiche est sub asterisco.’ The fact that the omission of 25b is paralleled in LXX may provide some measure of support for the theory that this represents a variant text, but this does not explain the lack of v.26a in 11Q10. The later editors, F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 137) classify this omission as due to a variant Vorlage.

205 An error of omission involving a single character occurs at 41:12 where 11Q10 translates Hebrew שומס ים מים ועם Aramaic שומס ים מים ועם. Comparison with P-Job שומס ים מים ועם makes it seem likely that the yodh which would be expected at the end of שומס ים מים ועם has been omitted due to haplography (Editio princeps, 83; F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 167).
It is quite clear from the above example that the translator of 11Q10 has left a *vacat* in the text where the Aramaic equivalent to יָבִיב would be expected. Certainly it appears that P-Job's translation of MT דָּרֶס יָבִיב reflects the challenge presented by this Hebrew expression. While H. Szpek suggests that it is the ambiguity of the multi-purpose particle דָּרֶס which has led to P-Job's translation, her explanation provides only part of the answer. P-Job has seemingly responded to this problem by referring to a similar context in chapter 26. After chapter 26 opens with a proclamation of divine sovereignty over the watery forces above and below (vv. 26:6-13) verse 14b concludes יָבִיב נַעֲרָתָה יָבִיבת מֵקִימָה יָבִיבת ‘But the power of his thunder *who can understand*’. It is clear that the latter portion of this rendering (דָּרֶס נַעֲרָתָה) provides a precise parallel to the form found here in v.29. Turning our attention back to 11Q10, because the Qumran text is not preserved in its entirety, it is difficult to be certain about the precise effect which this *vacat* has on the understanding of the verse as a whole. While the obvious lacuna where an equivalent to the Hebrew verbal form would be expected clearly attests to the textual minus in the translator’s text, the question remains: why has an equivalent not been included? Again we are left to wonder whether the translator has perhaps found his *Vorlage* illegible or corrupt at this point and left a blank to indicate this or, alternatively, that the translator was planning on returning to the passage but later neglected to do so for some reason.

At 39:24, we again encounter the phenomenon of omission but in this case it is a matter of not merely a single word gone missing, but most or all of a verse,

---

206 The Hebrew may be understood as ‘Can anyone understand?’ or ‘Indeed, can one understand?’ For the Hebrew text see R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 420-1.


208 As suggested by M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 141.
...and the javelin. 39:24 With fierceness and rage he swallows the ground; he cannot stand still at the sound of the trumpet. 39:25 When the trumpet sounds, he says... RSV

The Qumran version’s rendering of כִּיַּיְהָרָה ‘javelin, dart’ with וּרְדָה יָכַף ‘sharp sword’ suggests that the translator of 11Q10 either did not understand the technical meaning of the Hebrew or simply lacked the lexical resources (having already depleted his lexical arsenal considerably in this verse alone) for a more proximate rendering.209 Whatever the niceties of the semantic correspondence, it is evident that this Aramaic lexeme signals the end of 11Q10’s translation of Job 39:23. Unlike the other two Aramaic versions, which include renderings of 39:24, the Qumran translation appears to skip directly to a translation of verse 25 (כְּלַקַלְקָל מִיֶּרֶם). While some scholars have suggested that 11Q10’s rendering of MT יָכַף שִׁפְּרָה is possibly a telescoped rendering of the end of verse 24 and the beginning of verse 25,210 both the translations of 11Q10 כְּלַקַלְקָל מִיֶּרֶם ‘at the sound of the horn’ and P-Job יָכַף שִׁפְּרָה lend support to Gordis’ suggestion that the Hebrew may be understood as: ‘At the distant sound of the shofar’211 and as such, render the above suggestion at the very least unnecessary and probably unlikely. In any case

---


211 Reading with R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 463: מִיַּרְא הָעֲרָבָא ‘hum, rumble, rustle’.
the possibility that this Aramaic phrase is intended to do double duty for the end of v.24 and the beginning of v.25 does not explain why the remainder of verse 24 is clearly lacking from 11Q10’s translation. Again, as there does not seem to be anything worthy of omission from a theological or ideological stand-point, the most likely remaining possibilities are either: a) the translator or a subsequent copyist has omitted the text by accident, or b) the translator’s Vorlage did not contain this verse.

With the above examples then, we seem at least to be on firmer ground in concluding that an actual textual minus has occurred in the Qumran translation. However, unlike substitutions or additions where the translation provides the evidence from which to reconstruct the genetic relationship between a source text and the divergent translation, a minus offers less evidence. If neither an ideological nor linguistic-stylistic motivation for the minus can be plausibly reconstructed, we are left to assume that the omission must be in some sense beyond the translator’s control, i.e. an element has been omitted erroneously (either due to the translator’s own error or—in the case of an already deficient Vorlage—that of the person or persons responsible for transmitting his Vorlage).\footnote{11Q10’s translation of 35:13 provides another case of an omission whose motivation is uncertain (see text of 35:13 in chapter 3 below). The translator of 11Q10 has omitted the negative נ in its translation of 35:13 and both the original (Editio princeps, 63) and most recent (F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 139) editors of the text are uncertain as to whether this omission has been made erroneously or intentionally in order to avoid the suggestion of a limitation of God’s power (E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische As- pecten, 26).}

The above example suggests the possibility that the translator’s decision to omit textual material found in his source text may stem from some type of textual difficulty. H. Szpek, in her work on the Syriac version of Job suggests that ‘an alteration is said to be motivated by a textual difficulty when the Hebrew text presents a form that consonantly or vocalically may be questionable.’\footnote{H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 45. The example cited by Szpek following this definition is that of P-Job’s rendering (םייחכ) of a Qere/Ketib in the MT at 24:6a.} Of course the textual difficulty of Job in particular has long been recognised. Marvin Pope, in the introduction to his commentary on Job, joins a long list of eminent scholars in concluding that ‘...the Book of Job is
textually the most vexed in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{214} In fact Pope apparently considered following Gray and Driver in omitting particularly difficult passages, ultimately deciding against it, however, ‘...because it is hard to decide how to grade degrees of difficulty and uncertainty and to know when to despair. The size of the Book of Job would be greatly reduced if all the difficult passages were omitted.’\textsuperscript{215} The fact that experienced Hebraists equipped with the arsenal of the modern Semitic philologist are forced to contemplate the omission of material in translation due to the ‘vexed’ nature of its text should serve as a reminder that deciphering the text of Job is no easy matter. It would be churlish to suggest that Pope’s inclusion of difficult material in his translation on one hand, as opposed to Driver and Gray’s omission on the other, in anyway reflects a greater or lesser degree of Hebrew proficiency on the part of the respective commentators. This difference of approach, however, does serve to highlight the fact that whether a text is to be classified as ‘questionable’ or not depends to a large extent on the respective attitudes and abilities of the respective Aramaic translators. In light of this, the present study is particular concerned with passages which have been perceived by the ancient Aramaic translator or translators as presenting textual difficulties; while some of the passages to be encountered below no longer pose insurmountable problems for the modern Hebraist, several others which have troubled the Aramaic translators do remain ‘difficult’ even for the modern commentator.

\textsuperscript{214} See M. Pope, \textit{Job}, xliii for a brief survey of like-minded Hebraists.

The combination of an unusually placed preposition (וְלָצָת) in the MT and a plural ending in 11Q10 (וְלָצָתָה) has led Zuckerman to suggest that the translator of 11Q10 may have possessed a corrupt or defective Vorlage (וְלָצָתָה). However, modern English translations apparently based on the difficult MT see fit to omit the preposition in exactly the same manner as appears to be the case in the Qumran translation (e.g. NIV, RSV, NRSV ‘the gate of the city’). The Peshitta of Job also reacts to the incongruous preposition but provides a waw conjunction in order to co-ordinate the two nouns instead of rendering as a genitive. In the above case, we see that while the Qumran and Syriac translations react differently to the difficulties of the Hebrew (as one would expect of two independent idiomatic translations) they appear to be responding to the same stimulus in the source text. RtgJob, either unaware or unconcerned with the difficulties perceived by the other two versions, preserves a proximate rendering of the Hebrew text. The English translation of the MT solves the perceived ‘problem’ here by simply transposing the preposition to an earlier position in the clause and rendering the latter two nouns (‘gate of the city’) in the construct as is the case in 11Q10.

Another case of this same preposition creating apparent difficulties appears at 34:13:

216 Like many English translators of this verse (e.g. AV, ASV, NIV, RSV, NRSV i.e., when I went to the gate), the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job provide alternate target language prepositions (2 and 3 respectively) before their renderings of ‘gate’. (H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 145) This is an example of both Aramaic translations explicitly providing a preposition which seems to be implied by the Hebrew.


218 R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 319 argues that the unusual syntax of 29:7a reflects an ‘idiomatic’ mode of saying ‘when I went out to the city’ (MT), i.e., city-gate. He does not however provide other examples of such ‘idiomatic’ usage. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (I), 247 on the contrary understand the reference to ‘gate’ to be that of Job’s own house/estate (i.e., ‘when I went out of my gate...’).

219 A. Mandl, Die Peschitta zum Hiob, 26 notes only that the preposition has been omitted while E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 189 suggests the possibility that P-Job’s Vorlage possessed the conjunction in place of the Hebrew preposition.
Who gave him charge over the earth and who laid on him the whole world? NRSV

As was noted by the editors of the *DJD* volume, 11Q10’s rendering of MT נַחֲלָה (who) appointed him over the earth’ with נַחֲלָה ‘He made the earth...’ is paralleled both by LXX (ὅς ἐποιήσεν τὸν γῆν) and by the second rendering of RtgJob (לֹא מָמַר אָרְעָה). In light of the parallel modifications in these versions, it seems unnecessary to suggest that the Qumran translator here is laying particular or unique emphasis on the concept of God as creator. Rather, it would seem to reflect a common degree of uncertainty about the meaning of על in the present context. When used with פֶּד this preposition sometimes introduces the person or thing over which a subject has been ‘appointed’ (hence, ‘who gave him charge over the earth?’) whereas the one who has been appointed is normally marked as the direct object. However, the use of על with פֶּד is rather ambiguous and such an ambiguity may have caused problems for the translator at this juncture. Further support for the suggestion that the presence of this preposition has been perceived as problematic in the present context is provided by the fact that where a similar construction appears in the Hebrew of Job 36:23, the Greek and Syriac translators treat it as they have done here (through omission and substitution [א] respectively). That the translator of 11Q10 does not ap-

---

220 F. Martinez *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 11*, 134.
221 Such is suggested by E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten*, 23 ‘Dit zou aansluiten bij de belangrijke plaats die het thema van de schepping in onze targum inneemt.’
222 See for example, Jer. 15:3 and Nu. 27:16.
223 In Jeremiah 51:27 על in conjunction with this verb must mean ‘prescribe against’. See Koehler-Baumgartner [Engl. Ed.] (hereafter KB) 955ff for further examples of this flexibility.
pear to represent this preposition in his translation would tend to corroborate the above suggestion. Again as above, RtgJob preserves a rendering of the preposition \textit{in situ}.

\begin{align*}
\text{RtgJob} & \quad \text{Out of its nostrils comes smoke, as from a boiling pot and burning rushes. NRSV (41:20)}
\end{align*}

The above example from 41:12 again illustrates the perceived difficulty of the text and a resulting omission in the translation of 11Q10. It appears that the Hebrew form \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) is to be understood as comparative particle + noun ‘like a pot’ and both P-Job and RtgJob have clearly understood the Hebrew as intending a simile.\textsuperscript{224} It is possible that 11Q10 \( \text{להשה} \) is in fact a rendering of Heb. \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) ‘pot’.\textsuperscript{225} But the apparent lack of a comparative particle\textsuperscript{226} (and resulting elimination of the simile) lends credence to the suggestion that the translator has not recognised this form but has been influenced by his understanding of the Heb \textit{hapax} \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) ‘sparks’ in the preceding verse and translated \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) here in light of this with \( \text{להשה} \) which Sokoloff suggests should be translated as ‘torch’.\textsuperscript{227} P-Job’s rendering \( \text{אָבֵּד אַלֶּכֶּה} \) (meaning uncertain) seems a reasonably certain in-

\textsuperscript{224} S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, \textit{The Book of Job} (II), 340; E. Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}.
\textsuperscript{225} Both F. Martinez et al., \textit{Qumran Cave II}, 166. and \textit{ATQ}, 71 favour this reading on the basis that Sperber’s edition of TgZech 12:8 provides \( \text{להשה} \) as a rendering of \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \).
\textsuperscript{226} Alternatively \textit{Editio princeps}, 83 and \textit{ATQ}, 70 suggest that the \textit{lamedh} has the force of the comparative. This seems unlikely in light of the provision of Aramaic \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) as an equivalent \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) on more than a dozen occasions (See M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 211).
\textsuperscript{227} M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 165 notes that \( \text{להשה} \) (SA) translates \( \text{םַחַרְדָּה} \) (ST Gen. 3:24) and a denominative SA verbal form translates the corresponding Heb. verb (ST Dt 32:22). M. Pope, \textit{Job}, 343 (evidently under the influence of 11Q10’s rendering) assumes that the connection drawn by the Aramaic translator between the two forms (v.11 \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \) v.12 \( \text{ךַּרְדָּה} \)) reflects the correct understanding of the MT.
ner-Syriac textual corruption from יביה. It is unclear whether יביה ‘of the cauldron’ is a second rendering of the Hebrew lexeme meaning ‘pot’ or whether it should be understood as a compound noun (kettle-pot) not previously known. It seems that the Qumran translation has misconstrued what is, even by modern standards, a difficult text and has, in the process, eliminated the simile which is evident in the Hebrew.

Another example of a textual irregularity which apparently has led to a minus in the Qumran translation is found in its rendering of 42:11,

...בְּכֶל-יִדְרוֹּד לֵּפָּנִים יַעֲבַרַל עַמּוֹ ... 42:11
...become xxxviii, 6 J1Q10

...become RtgJob
...become 11Q10
...become P-Job
...and all who had known him before, and ate bread with him... RSV

In the narrator’s account of Job’s rehabilitation, a list is provided of those invited to eat with him. The final phrase בְּכֶל-יִדְרוֹּד לֵּּפָּנִים serves as a catch-all phrase following the preceding mention of the specific invitees. The renderings of RtgJob and 11Q10, however, suggest that these two translators perceived something slightly irregular about the temporal use of בְּכֶל-יִדְרוֹּד. In fact, in the only other instance in Job (17:6) where this Hebrew complex preposition בְּכֶל-יִדְרוֹּד occurs independently (i.e., lacking a following noun and functioning adverbially) RtgJob provides an interpretative rendering. Here, the targumist supplies a demonstrative pronoun הנה following the preposition (‘before this’) in order to create an acceptable Aramaic rendering of the text. The translator of 11Q10 for

---

228 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1899) 47.
229 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 352 favours the latter solution but, in support of the former double-rendering option, R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 486 has noted that both Rashi and Saadia render יביה as ‘pot’ despite no known evidence to support this meaning.
230 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 166 provide the comparative in parentheses ‘...(as from) a burning pot and an incense burner,...’ and thus the English translators too have apparently provided an additional
his part apparently fails to include an equivalent for this preposition in his Aramaic translation.\textsuperscript{231} Thus we see that while in both cases, the translators have adapted the Hebrew in order to produce an acceptable Aramaic translation, the manner in which they have done so differs markedly. The translator of RtgJob supplements the text in order to preserve the irregular element, while in 11Q10 the perceived irregularity leads to its own omission.

One final example, drawn from 38:24 again shows an obvious minus documented by a vacat in the MS.

\[
\text{Which is the way to the place where the wind is measured out, and the east wind sent out over the earth? BBE}
\]

By what way is the light parted, Or the east wind scattered upon the earth? ASV

Most commentators have found the conjunction of רָקִים \textsuperscript{232} ‘light’ in the first stich and הַרְחָבִים ‘east wind’ in the second, to be an incongruous one and have suggested various approaches to righting the situation.\textsuperscript{232} 11Q10’s rendering of verse 24a דָּבָא יֵש or ‘how does it go forth?’ seems to be a generalised, contextual rendering of the MT ...רָקִים הַרְחָבִים ... ‘In which path is (the light) dispersed...’ which suggests that the translator may have understood Hebrew רָקִים ‘way’ in the sense of ‘manner’ (i.e., in what preposition under the influence of the same preposition at the beginning of the verse.

\textsuperscript{231} M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 168 suggests that the form did not appear in the translator’s Vorlage in the first place. While this is of course theoretically possible, the assemblage of evidence seems to suggest rather the influence of the translator’s Aramaic idiom.

\textsuperscript{232} S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (II), 304 canvass previous commentaries and supply a number of different suggestions: רָקִים ‘wind’ \textsuperscript{78} ‘mist’ רָקִים ‘hoar-frost’ (after Gk πάχυν) רָקִים ‘steam’. They opt for the first of these, while M. Pope, Job, 297 prefers רָקִים.
manner) rather than in the sense of 'road or path'. But, as the editors note, there is a quite obvious vacat following פֶּסֶן where in the source text one finds the subject of the verb (יִנָּה). Although it is difficult to be certain about the cause of the vacat, the fact that the subject of the MT is now no longer represented explicitly in the Aramaic translation seems likely therefore to be related to its incongruity in the present context. As there is no sign of erasure, it may well be that the translator of the Qumran text simply omitted the unexpected word, thereby removing the perceived incongruity. Alternatively, as was suggested with a previous vacat, it may be that the translator had planned to return to the text. In light of the above suggestions, however, it does appear to be clear that it is not so much a difficulty with the element itself יֵנָה 'light' which has led to its omission but rather its relation (or perceived lack of relation) to its immediate context (v.24bff).

The above examples have illustrated that some textual minuses in the Qumran translation seem to be related to the fact that the translator has struggled to understand the text. Whether the translator's struggles are due to the inadequacies of the text as opposed to a lack of Hebrew proficiency is of course a very difficult question to answer satisfactorily. However, the enduring challenges offered by the Hebrew text of Job caution us against drawing the conclusion that the Qumran translator's understanding of Hebrew was radically deficient. Furthermore, unlike some of the minuses whose causes are less clear, instances of omission related to textual difficulty seem to find some correspondence in P-Job (29:7; 34:13)—not in terms of the mode of representation (P-Job in these cases prefers substitution to omission)—but in terms of their common awareness

---

233 So M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 89; F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 153. Alternatively, '(from) where?' is preferred by E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 30. Editio princeps, 73; ATQ, 59.

234 Editio princeps, 72 suggests that the targumist may have read (or understood) מָרַח 'wind'. So also E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 30; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 89.

235 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 152.

236 If it is assumed that 11Q10 is not the autograph but simply a later copy of the Aramaic translation of Job, the question then becomes: did the copyist simply find a vacat in his Aramaic Vorlage and transmit it or was a form provided in the Aramaic text he was copying but failed to receive representation in the ex-
of, and response to unusual or irregular textual phenomena. The translator of RtgJob on the other hand, whether more able to cope with Hebrew textual problems, or satisfied to pass over them, appears to follow the Hebrew text more closely.

Although the last example (38:24) is related to the issue of coping with a difficult text, it also highlights the role that surrounding context can play in leading to textual minuses. This leads us to consider related cases where the translator’s omissions seem not to be related to the textual unit omitted per se, but rather to a ‘preceding’ modification in the linguistic context (or co-text237) in which the minus is to be found.

Who gave him charge over the earth and (who) laid on him the whole world? RSV

The Qumran translation’s rendering of 34:12 has, like the Greek translation, transformed the negative assertion of the MT into a rhetorical question through the substitution of interrogative heh for Hebrew איה. (MT: איה אמונת אול לא-יושב; 11Q10: וכהי עליה לישראל ישכן.)238 Here in verse 13, however, where a question is indicated in the Hebrew text through the use of interrogative pronouns (党委书记), the translator of 11Q10 supplies נוכי[,] thereby eliminating the question from the verse. It is not clear whether the translator was uncomfortable with the Hebrew text’s rhetorical invitation to challenge divine creative power or whether the introduction of an interrogative into the preceding verse rendered a second successive interrogative stylistically inappropriate.
priate in the eyes of the translator here in verse 13. What is fairly obvious is that, after having supplied נָ[ַנ]... in the first half of the verse as a substitute for ר, the translator of 11Q10 does not feel it necessary to provide an equivalent for the second occurrence of the interrogative pronoun at the beginning of 13b. Initially, it seems possible that the omission of the pronoun here is more likely to be related to the perceived redundancy of this second ר than to the translator’s logically prior transformation of the Hebrew question into the Aramaic statement. On examination of the translator’s treatment of other similarly structured verses, we see that it is the prior transformation which has led to this omission. For instance, in 38:5 where the MT also begins each half of the verse with ר, the Qumran translator provides רל, the expected Aramaic equivalent, in both locations and equivalents are also apparently provided for both occurrences of this pronoun in 38:29.239 This evidence suggests that had he followed the MT in rendering the interrogatives, the translator of 11Q10 would have provided equivalents for both occurrences of ר. With the restructuring of the sentence, the translator clearly no longer felt the need to provide an equivalent for every element of the Hebrew text and translated accordingly. It is quite clear that here, as in the previous case, the textual minus arises under the influence of a prior translation decision. The omission of the element would then seem to follow as a result of the translator’s attempt to provide an idiomatic expression in light of his previous adjustment of the source text.

Modification of the co-text again appears to be the main cause for omission of an element in the 11Q10’s Aramaic translation of 40:12.

239 The second רל is only partially preserved due to increasing fragmentation toward the end of the line.
Look on every one that is proud, and bring him low; and tread down the wicked where they stand. (RSV)

In place of the imperative (+ 3rd masc. sg. suffix) of the MT "and bring him low" 11Q10 supplies either a 3rd fem. or perhaps, conceivably, a 2nd masc. sg. imperfect form: בָּרֵכַה (‘you will break’ or ‘(it) will be broken’). Whatever the form, it is clear that the 3rd masc. sg. objective suffix present in the Hebrew and represented in the translations of the RSV and RtgJob is not accounted for in 11Q10. As Sokoloff’s summary of 11Q10’s morphological characteristics shows that the translator is often quite willing to include suffixes with verbal forms in his translation, the motivation for the omission of this suffix must therefore be sought elsewhere. In this case, it appears to be found in the co-text and the translator’s adjustment of it for the main clue to the mystery of the missing suffix seems to be provided by the omission of הָרֵכַה at the beginning of 11Q10’s translation of this verse. To understand this minus, it is in turn important to note that the end of verse 11 and the beginning of verse 12 here bear a striking similarity. Both 11b and 12a begin with הָרֵכַהּ and in both cases the following verbs (וְנָשַׁソフト and לְכָלֵ思い出 respectively) refer to ‘bringing low’ or humbling of the proud. The fact that P-Job lacks v.12a suggests the possibility that it was the similarity

240 This form may be read as a 3rd fem. sg. lthpe. (F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 162) or a 2nd masc. sg. Pe. (Editio princeps, 79; J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 43; ATQ, 67.) While the latter may be preferable due to the imperative mood of the grammatical context, this would require the ellision of a medial הָרֵכַה. The fact that a similar modification of mood takes place in RtgJob at 38:3 and 40:7 is hardly surprising as the imperfect may be used with imperative force in Targumic Aramaic.

of the two texts which has led to this omission, whether because of textual error (homoioarchon) or the perception that the second occurrence of these words in such close proximity was superfluous and unnecessary.\textsuperscript{242} As was noted first by Tuinstra, 11Q10 and LXX do not follow the Peshitta in omitting the entire clause in their translations but do lack an equivalent of הָעַתָּן.\textsuperscript{243} It seems quite likely that the underlying motivation behind such an adjustment is that the Qumran translator saw the repetition of the identical verb here in verse 12a as redundant.\textsuperscript{244} To return then to the case of the lost suffix, it seems that the omission of the suffix in 11Q10’s translation is related to this restructuring of the syntax of v.12a (the main verb of v.12a in the Qumran translation is now רָבֵּה) and the collapse of the two verbal clauses in Hebrew into a single clause in 11Q10’s translation. In this new Aramaic translation (‘and all haughtiness of spirit will be broken’) there is no longer a need for the 3 masc. sg. pronominal suffix which is required in the Hebrew and preserved in RtgJob’s translation.\textsuperscript{245} Again, it is the translator’s prior modification of the co-text which seems to have led to the omission of a given element in his rendering of the Hebrew.

In 11Q10’s translation of Job 21:6, it is not a suffix but a noun which is omitted,

\textsuperscript{242} The former is suggested by E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1899) 46 and H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 166 while the latter is the view adopted by G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 340.

\textsuperscript{243} E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspeken, 36.

\textsuperscript{244} Thus to speak as M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 159 does, of ‘combining’ the two occurrences in verses 11 and 12 is slightly misleading. F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 162 consider 11Q10’s provision of the waw conjunction here as a substitution for הָעַתָּן, but in the light of the translator’s well documented tendency to add conjunctions to the beginning of the verses in his translation (see Part Three), it is also possible to see this modification as comprising the addition and omission of separate elements rather than signifying a substitution.

\textsuperscript{245} The contrast between 11Q10 and RtgJob is also seen in their renderings of Hebrew עָנָן. The Qumran translation renders this term here in v.12a with the synonymous Aramaic expression הוה הָעַתָּן ‘haughtiness of spirit’—an alternative rendering to the translation provided by the translator in the previous verse (הָעַתָּן). 11Q10’s treatment contrasts strikingly with that of RtgJob where the translator has provided virtually the same equivalent in both cases (albeit pl. vs. sg). Whereas consistency of rendering is a top priority for the translator of RtgJob, the translator of 11Q10 places a higher premium on variety of expression.
When I think of it I am dismayed, and shuddering seizes my flesh. RSV

Both 11Q10 and the Syriac translation take Heb. בֵּית (subject in MT)\(^{246}\) as the object and mark their translations of this lexeme with a *lamedh* to indicate its objective status in the Aramaic.\(^{247}\) Although the Aramaic מַעֲשֶׂה ‘*me*’ fulfils the role of Hebrew נַעֲשֶׂה ‘my flesh’ and is in some sense a substitution, formally the 1\(^{st}\) c. sg. suffix is retained in the Aramaic translation while the nominal form מַעֲשֶׂה does not receive representation in the Qumran translation. As for the motivation behind this minus, Zuckerman is rightly cautious in noting Pope’s suggestion that the Qumran translator’s failure to represent מַעֲשֶׂה ‘flesh’ in favour of the 1\(^{st}\) c. sg. pronoun is motivated by a wish to avoid the sexual connotations of the מַעֲשֶׂה.\(^{248}\) A more reasonable explanation for the modification may be advanced in relation to 11Q10’s rendering of מַעֲשֶׂה ‘shudder’ with מַעֲשֶׂה ‘amazement, confusion’.\(^{249}\) While ‘my flesh’ might well be seized by ‘a shudder’, a more general pronoun such as ‘me’ might have seemed more appropriate to the translator of 11Q10 in connection with the choice of the less corporeal ‘amazement’. If this latter explanation is to be preferred then we have here an example of a textual minus oc-


\(^{248}\) With the only other occurrence of this lexeme being rendered with its Aramaic cognate by all three versions (41:15) this seems less likely.

\(^{249}\) B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 152 notes that 11Q10’s rendering of MT מַעֲשֶׂה ‘a shudder’ with the more general (and less corporeal) מַעֲשֶׂה ‘amazement’ may indicate a contextual guess on the part of the translator, while H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 67 suggests that P-Job’s rendering of the MT singular with the plural מַעֲשֶׂה suggests a misunderstanding of the nominal ending -ut as a marker of the plural.
curring again as a result of the translator’s modification of the Hebrew co-text as it is rendered into Aramaic.

While 11Q10 shows two minuses vis-à-vis the Hebrew text of 37:18, it is the lack of the second preposition (?) which is of interest here.

Can you, like him, spread out the skies, hard as a molten mirror?  NRSV

The omission of an equivalent for lamedh in 11Q10 seems to be related to 11Q10’s attempt to make sense of the rare Hebrew verb "םוקית וּלְשׁנָהוֹ תֻּנָּה הָאֶרֶשׁ מֵרָחִים 37:18"

[.....] xxix, 9 אָרֶשׁ ינש [.....] 11Q10

ורקע טמעה לְשׁנָהוֹ תֻּנָּה וּתֵחָמַהוֹת תְּרַדְּחַנְו 11Q10

RtgJob אָסָפָה רֶדְּחַנְו/אָסָפָה ינש/סַנְנַה P-Job

Can you, like him, spread out the skies, hard as a molten mirror?  NRSV

The omission of an equivalent for lamedh in 11Q10 seems to be related to 11Q10’s attempt to make sense of the rare Hebrew verb וּלְשׁנָהוֹ תֻּנָּה. 250 Only here at Job 37:18 does this root appear in the Hiphil251 and whether it went unrecognised by the translator of 11Q10 or yielded a substitution for some other reason now no longer obvious, the Qumran text diverges in its rendering by providing הָאֶרֶשׁ ‘to blow, inflate’. Both P-Job and RtgJob follow the MT in their own renderings by providing cognate Aramaic verbs and both too supply equivalents for the Hebrew lamedh. It seems reasonable to suggest that the Qumran translation lacks the lamedh before אָרֶשׁ because according to the sensitivities of the translator, the new Aramaic verb which has been introduced into the translation (וּלְשׁנָהוֹ) does not idiomatically require (or allow?) the inclusion of לְשׁנָהוֹ before the noun. Here again, we seem to encounter a case where an element in the Hebrew fails to find representation in the Aramaic of 11Q10 because of a modification to the co-text.

250 For a discussion of the omission/transposition of an equivalent of וּלְשׁנָה see chapter 6 (37:18).
The last few examples have illustrated the way in which even elements which are not on their own problematic in any obvious way to the Qumran translator are nevertheless omitted due to modifications in the immediate co-text. The use of words like ‘preceding’ and ‘logically prior’ is not meant to suggest that we are able to reconstruct the translation process in any kind of exhaustive or mechanistic way but merely to indicate that the lack of certain elements in the translated text seem to be best explained by the translator’s decision regarding the rendering of text in the vicinity. The general impression suggested by these examples is that in 11Q10, ‘minor’ grammatical elements may be sacrificed in the translation process for the sake of idiomatic fluency.

The topic of idiomatic fluency leads directly to a final, large category of minuses detected in 11Q10. In the following set of examples, it is again the concern for an acceptable and intelligible Aramaic target text which seems to lie behind the omission of certain elements present in the Hebrew source text and preserved to various degrees in other translations. In the previous examples an element seemed to have been excluded because it did not ‘fit’ within the immediate Aramaic co-text as reconstituted by the translator. In the instances below on the other hand, it seems to be the linguistic reconstitution of the Hebrew text into Aramaic which has led to the textual minus, rather than discernible local or immediate textual concerns. In other words, these elements are apparently omitted because they are perceived by the translator as either not required (i.e. a stylistic-poetic constraint) or not permitted (i.e. a properly linguistic constraint) by the form of Aramaic into which the translation is being made. In the context of original composition in a given linguistic idiom, the drawing of a line between linguistic and stylistic constraints is, in theory at least, possible. Several considerations in the present context, however, mean that any such line which may be drawn here must not be considered in any way absolute. First the lack of a clear provenance of 11Q10 prior to its entombment in the Qumran escarpment prevents us from pinpointing texts which might provide comparable samples of non-translation Aramaic. Second, it must be admitted

252 As was discussed in the introduction, linguistic dating relies on precisely this ‘dialect’ difference (between 1QGMap, 11Q10 and the biblical Aramaic texts) as a means of determining the relative dates of the
that in any translation transaction it is virtually impossible to entirely insulate the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the target language from those of the source language and thus the probability arises that the language and idiom of the target language has been influenced by the language and idiom of the source text.\textsuperscript{253} Finally, the fragmentary preservation of the text prohibits the careful researcher from making hasty assumptions regarding what was required or permitted in the Aramaic dialect utilised by the translator of 11Q10. Given these caveats therefore we will only occasionally advance suggestions regarding whether a given modification in the Qumran Aramaic translation is due to either exclusively linguistic or stylistic constraints. While it will be apparent that a given modification is broadly linguistic/stylistic in nature, we must most often satisfy ourselves with locating such adaptations somewhere on a continuum between the stylistic and the linguistic.\textsuperscript{254}

Both 11Q10 and P-Job modify the syntax of the Hebrew in their rendering albeit in different ways. As shown elsewhere in its treatment of Job (e.g., 32:1, 32:6, 33:18, 33:24, 32:1, 32:6, 33:18, ...) texts' composition.

\textsuperscript{253} The question of this influence and the resulting ‘artificiality’ of the Aramaic of Targum Onqelos was raised long ago by G. Dalman, Grammatik, 13. This use of the term ‘artificial’ should be distinguished from that advanced by E.M. Cook, Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum PhD dissertation (UCLA, 1986) 281 as a characterisation of the composite nature of the Aramaic dialect in which Pseudo-Jonathan was composed.

\textsuperscript{254} S.P. Brock's conceptualisation of translation adjustments as being located on a continuum between two poles (optional/voluntary vs. mandatory/involuntary) is useful at this point. (S.P. Brock, ‘Translating the Old Testament’, 95-96) Although, in the present study, it may not be appropriate to speak of even the most optional of stylistic adjustments as being ‘deliberate’ (in the sense of self-consciously applied) the inconsistent or optional appearance of stylistic preferences may be contrasted with adjustments that are consistently required by the linguistic constraints of the Aramaic target language.
33:28, 34:30) the Syriac utilized by the translator of P-Job does not tolerate the Hebrew construction יָד + infinitive construct. Here, as at 34:30, the Syriac translator has chosen to replace this particular Hebrew construction with מֵא. Although the translator of the Qumran text appears to tolerate the יָד + infinitive construct construction at 32:1 where he reproduces the Hebrew syntax, here the source text has prompted a modification from the Qumran translator. Although 11Q10’s fragmentary rendering of 33:28 lacks the relevant material, P-Job’s translation of v.28a מִפְּדוּת מֵא בָּשַׁלְהֶנָּה with 

shows that the Syriac translator has chosen to exclude an equivalent for the Hebrew infinitive while retaining the preposition (מ) in his translation. Here in the Qumran rendering of 33:24 we see that the translator has, like P-Job in 33:28, opted to omit a rendering of the infinitive while at the same time preserving an equivalent of the preposition (וַ) vs. MT מִפְּדוּת מֵא). In light of the above discussion and the lack of other plausible reasons for this form’s omission by the Qumran translator, it seems most likely that linguistic-stylistic constraints have impinged upon the rendering in 11Q10 and that the omission of this verbal element from the Aramaic has been the result.

In the following example drawn from Job 34:30, the presence and function of the Hebrew preposition יָד again provokes a variety of responses from the respective Aramaic translators.

255 Although it is not preserved in 11Q10’s translation at 33:30, P-Job translates MT יָד יָד ‘pit’ with מֵא. ‘ruin/destruction’. Here in 33:24, both 11Q10 and P-Job provide this same lexeme as an equivalent for the Hebrew. While F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave II, 132 note that this more abstract rendering (סָבַל) is also found in the rabbinic targumim, the targumic translator of Job consistently provides the Aramaic cognate מֵא thereby maintaining the poetic use of ‘Pit’ as an equivalent of destruction. (9:31, 17:14, 33:18, 22, 24, 28, 30).
to keep a godless man from ruling, from laying snares for the people. NIV
that a godless man should not reign, that he should not ensnare the people. RSV

Here in verse 30b, all three Aramaic translators have reacted to the fact that the Hebrew preposition יֵּשׁ appears in a causal infinitive clause. Each translator differs in their precise approach to rendering this construction into an Aramaic form which will be acceptable to their respective readerships. RtgJob specifies the meaning of the preposition through the provision of a more specific Aramaic preposition מֵּשָּׁל. The translator of P-Job has, alternatively, substituted a waw conjunction in place of the preposition as part of his extensive re-writing of the verse. The Qumran translator’s response to this Hebrew construction is simply to omit it altogether and render יֵּשָּׁל with a verbal form of the correct root יֵּלֶּדֶה ‘they were ensnared/trapped’. While all three Aramaic versions have apparently felt the need to adapt their texts in translation, 11Q10 prefers to exclude the alien construction from its Aramaic rendering through omission.

256 See B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 36.2.2b.
257 P-Job renders יֵּשָּׁל with יִשָּׁל ‘sins’ providing a contextually appropriate translation which fits with its re-writing of the verse. This may in fact be the implied meaning of the Hebrew in any case (R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 393 refers to the use here of the subjective genitive: ‘because of the snares set by the people’ [i.e. because of the sins committed by the people’]) See G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 287 for further discussion and a translation of P-Job’s rendering of this verse.
258 While M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 135 favours reading this as a hitpael, F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 137 note that the other possible reading (as haphep) would correspond more closely to the Hebrew.
259 In 33:10, a preposition present in the Hebrew is again omitted by the Qumran translation. In this case however it is not יֵּשׁ, but a suffixed form of לְ which has been left out of the Aramaic rendering. Other modifications are present in this verse, but it is unclear why this element has not been included.
Although this line of 11Q10 is not preserved in its entirety, it seems clear that the translator has omitted 'the heavens' in his rendering of Job 35:11 [and more than)...the birds he has made us wise'. Interestingly, where this construct phrase appears in 28:21, both elements are rendered by the Qumran translator (וַחַיָּה תְהוֹם). While there is no obvious motivation for the omission of a rendering of here, it is equally true that its loss in translation has little effect on the basic meaning of the verse. Assuming that was present in the Hebrew text which lay before the translator, it is perhaps this very superfluousness which has led to its omission. Because the communicative aim of the Hebrew verse is to point out the superiority of God’s tutelage of humanity as opposed to non-human creatures, the distinction between ‘birds of the air’ and ‘animals of the field’ functions primarily as a poetic device. In light of this, it seems most likely that was omitted in translation because the translator felt that its inclusion added little to the overall meaning of the verse. In the preceding two examples, the evidence suggests that linguistic differences between Hebrew and Aramaic led to adjustments in translation. In this case, however, the fact that the translator chose to include in his translation of 28:21, but not here in 35:11 shows that this omission should be understood as resulting more from stylistic preference than linguistic necessity.
How much less when you say that you do not see him, that the case is before him, and you are waiting for him! RSV

The Hebrew compound conjunction and following verb form (ָּלַּל ְֶלִּיִּךְ בָּנָּהָן לָּל) may mean either 'how much less (is it the case), when you say...' or alternatively 'Even if (i.e. although) you say...'. It seems that all three Aramaic versions have taken the text as meaning the latter although their representations of the Hebrew differ. We see that while P-Job (וָּלָּל being a contraction of וָּלָּל) and RtgJob (וָּלָּל בָּרָּם אֶרֶנְוַה) retain equivalents for both emphatic (וָּלָּל) and conditional/temporal components (וָּלָּל) of the Hebrew expression, 11Q10 appears to omit an equivalent to הוָּלָּל, despite rendering הוָּלָּל with הוָּלָּל 'if'. Although the Syriac translator here provides an equivalent for this particle, Szpek notes that P-Job sometimes fails to render it at the beginning of a verse due to the translator's perception of it as redundant. Such seems to be the case here in 11Q10, but it is equally important to note that the Qumran translator can and does also provide Aramaic הוָּלָּל as an equivalent for its Hebrew cognate at both 37:11 and 40:8. While the occasional omission of the Hebrew particle הוָּלָּל by the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job seems to reflect a stylistic flexibility in their approach to rendering the text into Aramaic, RtgJob both here and in the other instances discussed above consistently provides the Aramaic equivalent מְדַרְבָּן. Again the analysis seems to suggest that the translator of

261 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 228. See for instance 19:4 and 34:12 (where 11Q10 provides a substitution).
11Q10 has failed to provide a precise formal equivalent of an element in the Hebrew text because it was not deemed to be stylistically important in his Aramaic translation.

As we have already seen (40:12 above), the translator of 11Q10 is willing to omit bound morphemes (suffixes) when they follow verbs. In the following examples, we see that the Qumran translation may also lack pronominal suffixes which appear following nouns in the Hebrew text.

Can any one understand the spreading of the clouds, the thunderings of his pavilion? RSV

At the beginning of 36:29 we encounter an omission which has already been described above. While it is unclear if the Syriac translator has made some attempt to represent the Hebrew particle יְהֹוָה in the favoured rendering, יְהֹוָה, it is evident that the Qumran translator has again passed by this particle in his Aramaic translation (see immediately preceding discussion) on account of its perceived superfluousness. The poor preservation of the beginning of line 7 unfortunately prevents us from seeing how the entire verse was understood by the translator of 11Q10. What is clear, however, is that the final 3 masc. sg. suffix has been omitted from the Qumran translation’s equivalent for יָהָא, ‘his hut/pavilion’. Although we lack the translator’s rendering of תַּרְפָּה, this unsuffixed form, occurring as it does in a parallel position earlier in the verse, may have exerted some influence on the omission of the suffix on מֵלָל. Whether specifically related to the influence of the parallel form or not, it would seem that the translator has not seen the retention of the suffix as necessary in his rendering of the Hebrew. If this were the only instance of the Qumran text lacking a suffix in comparison with the MT, we might be willing to attribute its absence here to an error. However, other cases do present
themselves. The repetitive nature of this modification when combined with a pronounced tendency to add suffixes as the context demands, suggests that the Qumran translator is open to omitting a suffix in translation in a given context when it seems stylistically appropriate.

While suffixes may be omitted, larger elements in the Hebrew text of Job may also be lacking in the Qumran translation as we see from this rendering of Job 41:9,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{They are joined one to another; they clasp each other and cannot be separated.} & \quad \text{RSV (41:17)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

While the other Aramaic versions follow the Hebrew text in providing two verbal forms in succession in the middle of verse 9, 11Q10 provides only one verb, [תֹּאַמְרְוַת] ‘they embrace’ as opposed to the parallel verbal forms in [יתֹּאַמְרְוַת] ‘they cleave; they seize each other’. Because the semantic fields of the two verbs largely overlap it is impractical and basically irrelevant to consider which of the two verbs has been rendered by the single Aramaic equivalent [תֹּאַמְרְוַת]. This virtual synonymy of the two verbs is of course the most reasonable explanation of the ‘telescoping’ of the two verbs into a single equivalent; the two have become one because to render both was seemingly perceived as unnecessary by the translator. But if parallelism, whatever its precise characteristics, is a common enough feature in the Hebrew poetry of Job, what then has led the translator

\[\text{262 See, for instance 11Q10’s lack of suffixes on its translations of Hebrew } \text{and } \text{and } \text{(40:8) } \text{and } \text{(29:10).}\]

\[\text{263 For the addition of suffixes in 11Q10, see ‘Translator’s Intervention’ (Conclusion) below.}\]

\[\text{264 Editio princeps, 82.}\]

\[\text{265 M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 164 refers to this as a ‘telescoping’ of the translation.}\]
to omit a parallel element in this particular verse? Several factors may have played a part in this case. The similarity of structure and content in the preceding verse 8: ‘One is so near to another that no air can come between them.’ (אֲחָדָה בֶּאַשְׁרָיו נָשָׁה לֹא-יִבָּאוּ פְּנֵיהֶם) may have played a part in influencing the omission of the verb form in v. 9. Verse 8 possesses a general antithetical structure (a, not b). As translated in 11Q10, verse 9 also has this same structure (a, not b) despite the fact that the Hebrew of verse 9 should properly be understood as a,a', not b. The fact that in verse 9 (as in verse 8) the primary verb of ‘a’ (脱颖נ) comes at the end of the clause and is directly apposed—rather than conjoined with waw—to the second verb (הָיָהוּ) has undoubtedly contributed to the translator’s stylistic decision to provide only one equivalent.266

Verse 26 of chapter 38 also provides a clear example of the Qumran translation’s disruption and collapsing of the parallel structure of the Hebrew verse.

לָתֹמֵר עָלָיו אֶלְּ-אָשָׁר לֹא-אָלְמָה לְאַל-אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ הָיָה מִצְרַיִם פִּּוּלָה 11Q10
לָתֹמֵר עָלָיו אֶלְּ-אָשָׁר לֹא-אָלְמָה לְאַל-אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ הָיָה מִצְרַיִם פִּּוּלָה RtgJob
לָתֹמֵר עָלָיו אֶלְּ-אָשָׁר לֹא-אָלְמָה לְאַל-אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ הָיָה מִצְרַיִם פִּּוּלָה P-Job

to bring rain on a land where no man is, on the desert in which there is no man: RSV
to bring rain on a land where no one lives, on the desert, which is empty of human life, NRSV

Several commentators have noted that 11Q10 does not preserve an equivalent for MT מִדְבָּר in its translation of the verse, apparently placing מִדְבָּר and מִדְבָּר in construct.267 As in the case above, this minus has the effect of telescoping the parallelism of

---

266 Another omission of a verbal form due to its perceived redundancy has already been mentioned above in connection with a smaller minus in 11Q10’s translation of 40:12.
267 Editio princeps, 72; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 150 (also 8); F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 154; H. Ringgren, ‘Some Observations’, 119.
the MT and creating a single unit in the Aramaic translation. What factors in the present context have contributed to the triggering of this modification? Sokoloff has observed that the Aramaic construct phrase (אֵֽרֵּֽע עַרְוֵֽי הָרְעָֽשָׁה, ‘land of wilderness’ [i.e., wilderness land]) which is formed as a result of the omission is found both in Proverbs 21:19 and in Deuteronomy 32:10. Even if two occurrences of a phrase are sufficient grounds to give it stereotypical status, this consideration on its own seems insufficient to have motivated the omission of the phrase which intervenes in the Hebrew. The RSV’s translation of both לָאֵֽרֵּֽע עַרְוֵֽי הָרְעָֽשָׁה and לָאֵֽרֵּֽע עַרְוֵֽי הָרְעָֽשָׁה with virtually identical English equivalents illustrates the synonymy which seems more likely to have triggered the omission of the former phrase in the Hebrew. Of the two phrases, the latter has perhaps been retained because it is not only fuller (in its inclusion of the prepositional phrase) but also conveniently located at the end of the sentence. While the other Aramaic and English translations preserve the poetic form and structure of the Hebrew text, the Qumran translator has apparently seen the first of two near-synonymous phrases in this verse as superfluous with respect to the content of the verse as he construed it. The stylistic constraints within which the Qumran translator worked have clearly allowed him to omit the phrase in translation on account of its perceived redundancy.

...and ate with him in his house. They comforted and consoled him over all the trouble... NIV
...and ate bread with him in his house; and they showed him sympathy and comforted him for all the evil... RSV

Although a previous case of omission has already been discussed above with regard to this verse, here we remember that Job 42:11 describes the response of Job’s former associates and friends following his restoration. In their own way, both the RSV
and NIV attempt to convey the similarity of the successive Hebrew phrases יִרְבּוּ לְאִדָּמָרֶתִי in the middle of 42:11. While the NIV manages by accident or intent, to reproduce the alliteration of the Hebrew (‘comfort’ and ‘console’ for וַיה and וַהֲנֵמָר) it fails to reproduce the reiteration of the object as does the RSV (repetition of ‘him’). The similarity of the two verbal forms appears also to have been noticed by at least one and perhaps two of the Aramaic translators, but with rather different results. The Syriac translator of P-Job provides dalath ‘for’ in place of the Hebrew waw conjunction in order to link his translation of the first of the two phrases (יָרָבִּימוּ) with the preceding clause: ‘and they ate with him in his house for they had shown sympathy for him (חָמָּה אָמַּה אָמַרָה)’.\(^{268}\) The second phrase is already grammatically and syntactically related to what follows it and therefore the Syriac translator simply follows the Hebrew in his translation of this portion of text. That P-Job’s modification of the Hebrew text is a subtle response to the perceived repetitiveness or redundancy of the successive phrases seems to be supported by the Qumran translator’s rendering. As in previous cases, 11Q10 apparently responds to this same perceived redundancy by failing to provide an equivalent for this Hebrew clause. Clearly the stylistic constraint of economy of expression has, in this case, overridden the translator’s commitment to furnish an Aramaic equivalent for each element in the Hebrew text.

\(^{268}\) See G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job*, 358. P-Job’s relatively rare use of the compound tense (pfct. + rcom) to render the consecutive imperfect may indicate that the translator intended the pluperfect. While H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 79 agrees that this compound tense corresponds to the ‘pluperfect’, T. Muraoka, *Classical Syriac*, § 85 suggests that this tense corresponds in time reference to the simple perfect.
They turn round and round by his guidance, to accomplish all that he commands them on the face of the habitable world. RSV

In Job 37:12, divine sovereignty over nature is illustrated through a reference to the deity’s directing of the clouds. It is at the end of this verse that we encounter another example of a minus in 11Q10 when compared with the MT. The combination of תֵבַל ‘world’ and הָאָרֶץ ‘earth’ is not a common one. Where it is attested elsewhere in Proverbs 8 (verse 31) it is preserved in the form of ובֵיהֵנֵי לֶאָרֶץ leading some to suggest that here in Job, the Syriac translator’s rendering (סֵמָא הָאָרֶץ ‘his world’) reflects the correct Hebrew reading rather than הָאָרֶץ which, if it is to be retained, perhaps represents a poetic form also preserved in 34:13.269 In light of the Syriac translator’s clear tendency to provide suffixes under the influence of the assumed context (i.e., making explicit what the Hebrew is perceived to imply) the Syriac suffix may not necessarily point to an alternate Hebrew text.270 RtgJob in its rendering simply provides an intervening preposition perhaps in order to clarify the syntactical relationship between the two nouns. The gen-

270 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 102 n.109 lists more than 25 instances where P-Job’s addition of a suffix has been motivated by a desire for clarity and explicitness.
eral synonymy of בָּרוּךְ and בּוֹרֵכָה is demonstrated by the fact that they frequently occur in parallel stichs elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Is. 14:21, 24:4, 34:1, Je 10:12, Ps 19:5 etc.). Job too provides an example of this usage in 34:13, a passage discussed earlier, where the Qumran translator provides the expected Aramaic cognates of the Hebrew terms. Here, however, the two terms appear not in parallel but adjacent to one another and the Qumran translator has clearly responded to this perceived semantic overload of two synonymous lexemes in such close proximity by failing to provide an equivalent for Hebrew בּוֹרֵכָה.

Although the textual minus to be discussed in this instance occurs in 11Q10’s translation of Job 42:10, attention must first be given to the Qumran translation’s rendering of the preceding verse 9. In 42:9, following what appears to be a rather loose translation of the final clause in the MT שמִמּוֹן לָא צָהָרָה בְּכָלָהוּ דָּוָי יָדוֹ (11Q10: נַחֲשֵׁתוֹ בְּכָלָהוּ דָּוָי יָדוֹ) the translator of 11Q10 provides a final clause that finds no correspondence in the Masoretic text: בְּכָלָהוּ לָא צָהָרָה בְּכֶלָדֶהוּ דָּוָי יָדוֹ ‘and he forgave them their sins on account of him’. The substantial similarity between the Greek translation’s addition (καὶ ἔλυσεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦς διὰ Ἰωβ) and that of 11Q10 may be explained either by the translators use of a common Vorlage at this point, or by a similar
translation tradition connected with this verse, or finally, by a dependence of one on the other. While the reasons for the inclusion of this ‘additional’ material in the Qumran translation its presence here in verse 9 seems to have had some bearing on the translator’s treatment of verse 10 below,

After Job had prayed for his friends, the LORD made him prosperous again and (_____) gave him twice as much as he had before. NIV

And the LORD restored the fortunes of Job, when he had prayed for his friends; and the LORD gave Job twice as much as he had before. RSV

As we can see above, the MT phrase הָבֵנָהּ לָ換えָּ אֵת אוּלָּבָּהּ כְּפוּלָּאָּ שָּפָּרָּה לָאֹלָּבָּהּ כְּפוּלָּאָּ שָׁםָּ נַכָּרָּה "...when he prayed for his friends’ is apparently not translated by 11Q10. In light of 11Q10’s tendency to omit

271 While the editors of F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 171 rightly observe that ‘the relationship [between the Hebrew, Greek and 11Q10] is complicated’ it is perhaps possible to offer a tentative explanation of the situation. In light of the wide variety of idiomatic uses of the Hebrew verb נָפָשׁ it is not surprising to encounter this verb earlier in Job, in conjunction with בָּשָׁם. In an earlier context in chapter 7 (v.21) נָפָשׁ appears to refer to the forgiveness of sins (יִתְבָּשָׁשׁ הַצִּילָה הַשָּׁמָּיָּ הַמַּרְאָה הָעָלָּבָּהּ כְּפוּלָּאָּ שָׁםָּ נַכָּרָּה. ‘Why will you not carry away my sin and cause to pass away my transgression...). Support for this suggestion comes from the fact that in Job 7:21a, both RtgJob and P-Job utilise the exact same verb נָפָשׁ ‘to forgive’ as is used here by 11Q10. It is suggested that a doublet translation here may be related to the conscious or unconscious influence of the parallel verse (7:21) and a reference to Job’s prayer for his friends which appears in the following verse 42:10. That the material preserved in LXX and 11Q10 is nearly identical may suggest the possibility that this doublet translation was already present in a shared Vorlage as opposed to arising from a common translation tradition (which would itself not be surprising at this key theological juncture in the Hebrew book of Job).

272 Hebrew יָנָּרָּה is to be identified according to R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 495 not as a singular (friend)
material considered to be redundant, the most likely motivation for this omission (as suggested in the editio princeps)\textsuperscript{273} would seem to be its similarity to the doublet translation shared by LXX and 11Q10 in 42:9. It would appear that the mention of Job’s praying for his friends here in verse 10 has seemed superfluous to the translator in light of his version of verse 9 ‘and he forgave them their sins on account of him’ in which Job’s role in the friends’ rehabilitation is already discussed. In fact, this omission may shed some light on the question of whether the doublet translation of 42:9 in both Qumran and Greek versions resulted from translator’s intervention or a shared Vorlage. In addition to the unlikelihood of two translator’s arriving at virtually the same translation independently, it seems relatively unlikely that the translator of 11Q10 would intervene to provide a doublet translation in verse 9 and then omit (a portion of the text whose presence is confirmed by its translation in LXX) in the following verse as redundant. This would seem to lend support to the idea that in 42:9 the doublet translation was part of a shared Vorlage being used by LXX and 11Q10. While it is impossible to be sure of this, what does seem fairly clear is that it is the presence of a related passage in verse 9 which has led to the omission of material in verse 10 rather than any intrinsic problem of understanding or comprehension of the clause in verse 10 itself.

Further examination of the Qumran translation’s rendering of this verse provides a final, striking example of the translator’s omission of an element because of its perceived redundancy. Verse 10 begins with the masculine singular subjects explicitly expressed by proper nouns (יהוה and בֵּיתךְ). When the narrative resumes following the intervening temporal clause (omitted as superfluous in 11Q10), the Hebrew text explicitly reiterates the nouns which name these agents (…יהוה וַיַּרְא). When we turn to the Aramaic versions’ treatment of this verse, we see that all three provide the expected representation of the proper nouns in the first portion of the verse. For the tetragrammaton, the Syriac supplies the customary אֲנָּה, while 11Q10 provides its usual אֱלֹהִים and the

\textsuperscript{273} Editio princeps, 86.
Rabbinic targumist augments his representation with *memra* (םימרא)—a convention widely, but not consistently adopted in targum translations. Similarly, when these proper nouns are reiterated in the second portion of the Hebrew text of this verse, both RtgJob and the Syriac translation follow suit in supplying the equivalents already provided earlier in the verse. The Qumran translation, however, parts company with these other Aramaic versions at this point. In 11Q10 we see that although the 3rd masc. singular subject is made clear by the inflected verb form ( 이제ו 'and he gave') the translator has not explicitly expressed the divine name as is the case in both the Hebrew text and 11Q10's fellow Aramaic translations. Similarly, instead of representing the second occurrence of בָּיְתָךְ with the full proper noun in Aramaic as in the Syriac and targumic versions, the translator of 11Q10 instead opts to refer to Job pronominally (גָּזִיל). Although formally this is in fact a substitution rather than an omission it nevertheless stems from the same motivation: the elimination of repetition because of its perceived superfluousness.

The English translation provided by the NIV sheds further light on the Qumran text's treatment of the Hebrew. First, although the translation in its case involves Hebrew to English rather than Hebrew to Aramaic, we see that, as with 11Q10, the second occurrence of the tetragrammaton is not represented in its translation (the LORD made him prosperous again and (_______) gave him...). Those responsible for the NIV have, like the translator of the Qumran text, preferred the economy of pronominal reference to an explicit rendering of the proper noun 'Job'. As we have no reason to doubt that the NIV translators were working from the MT here, this parallel approach to translating the Hebrew suggests that despite the substantial linguistic differences between Aramaic and English, both have preferred economy of reference to the explicit repetition for which the Hebrew text is famed.274

274 Additionally, the fact that the NIV is presumably translating from the MT undermines, to some extent, the necessity of positing an alternate Vorlage as the cause for the Qumran translation's divergence.
Summary of Unique Omissions in 11Q10

Sometimes the main reason for supposing that a minus has occurred in the text of 11Q10 is, as we have seen, simply the apparent lack of space sufficient to contain even a word-for-word rendering of the source text. While the analysis of such apparent textual minuses is not without its problems, possible causes for such minuses include textual error, euphemism, or an element missing from 11Q10’s variant Hebrew Vorlage. In any case, any such conclusions are necessarily tentative due to the fact that the textual minus is simply inferred from a lack of space.

The situation is marginally more clear when it seems that a particular element in the MT has not been represented in a corresponding order in the Aramaic translation provided by 11Q10. In fact, were it safe to assume that the Qumran translation reproduces the word order of the MT in all cases, the evident lack of such Aramaic equivalents would provide us with clear cases of material omitted in translation. In the case of 11Q10, however, we do not have access to the text now lost in the lacuna and therefore it remains uncertain whether we are dealing with a case of an outright minus or rather simply a dislocation in a re-ordered Aramaic translation. In explaining these apparent minuses, the possibility of a copyist’s error in transcribing the Aramaic text which may have preceded our copy of 11Q10 may be added to the catalogue of possibilities already mentioned.

The analysis of more certain instances of a textual minus is nevertheless complicated by the difficulty involved in an assessment of the underlying causes. In some cases, these deficiencies in the Qumran translation seem to be related to the fact that the translator has struggled to understand the text. Whether the translator’s struggles are due to the inadequacies of the text as opposed to a lack of Hebrew proficiency is a very difficult question to answer satisfactorily. However, the enduring challenges offered by the Hebrew text of Job caution us against drawing the conclusion that the Qumran translator’s understanding of Hebrew was particularly deficient. Unlike some of the minuses whose existence, let alone motivation, is less clear, instances of omission related to textual difficulties seem to find some correspondence in P-Job (29:7; 34:13) not in
terms of the mode of representation (P-Job = substitution) but in terms of their common awareness of, and response to, unusual or irregular textual phenomena. The translator of RtgJob on the other hand, whether more able to cope with Hebrew textual problems or satisfied to pass over them, appears to follow the Hebrew text more closely.

It is quite clear that on some occasions in 11Q10, a textual minus has arisen under the influence of a prior translation decision. In other words, the omission of an element seems to follow as a result of the translator’s attempt to provide an idiomatic expression in light of his previous adjustment of the source text. The general impression suggested by these examples is that in 11Q10, certain elements may be sacrificed in the translation process for the sake of idiomatic fluency.

The topic of idiomatic fluency leads directly to a final category of minuses detected in 11Q10. In these examples, it is again a concern for an acceptable and intelligible Aramaic target text which seems to lie behind the omission of certain elements present in the Hebrew source text and preserved to various degrees in the other Aramaic translations. That is, it seems to be the very reconstitution of the Hebrew text into Aramaic which has led to the textual minus, rather than discernible local or immediate textual concerns. The reconstitution of the source text into Aramaic involves both linguistic and stylistic adaptation. In terms of these categories, elements are apparently omitted because they are perceived by the translator as either not required [i.e. stylistic-poetic constraint] or not permitted [i.e. properly linguistic constraint] by the form of Aramaic into which the translation is being made.

Several considerations in the present context, however, mean that any line which may be drawn between linguistic and stylistic constraints should not be considered a hard or fast one. While it is apparent that a modification is broadly linguistic/stylistic in nature, we must at times be satisfied with locating a given adaptation somewhere on a continuum between the stylistic and the linguistic. While a few cases of omission are probably related to properly linguistic constraints which necessarily constrain the translator, most of these omissions fall into the category of stylistic modifications which are intimately bound up with an assessment of the co-text. In particular, several examples
of omission seem to stem from the translator’s perception that a given element in his Hebrew source text is stylistically superfluous. These instances clearly show that the stylistic constraint of economy of expression has in this case overridden the translator’s commitment to furnish an Aramaic equivalent for each element in the Hebrew text.
CHAPTER 3

P-JOB

Unlike the situation with respect to the Qumran Aramaic translation, considerable scholarly attention has been given to the phenomenon of textual deficiency in the Syriac version of Job. It is now more than a hundred years since Mandl provided a simple list of instances where he understood the Syriac translator to have omitted either a character or a word in his production of the Peshitta of Job. E. Dhorme, in his commentary on Job, also provided such a list but it was H. Szpek’s study of P-Job which first examined in a systematic way the omission of material in P-Job’s translation of the Hebrew. Although the scope and structure of her study did not afford Szpek the luxury of including examples of all the instances of omission assessed in the course of her study, she did classify omissions in P-Job under four main categories of analysis: grammar, syntax, semantics, and style. Further discussion of Szpek’s assessment of P-Job is taken up at the conclusion of this study in the hope that a comparative look at the Aramaic versions will shed light both on Szpek’s own analysis of P-Job and the relationship between the Aramaic translations themselves.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the analysis of omission in the Qumran text is complicated by the fragmentary state of the MS. In the case of the Syriac version, however, we are provided with an essentially whole text which, by and large, represents

---

277 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 31-32 similarly draws distinctions between different units of translation such as morphemes, words, phrases, clauses and sentences.
278 H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 suggests that in terms of semantics at least, the
a complete Aramaic translation of the Hebrew book of Job. As a result, in dealing with P-Job, the question of whether or not material has in fact been omitted in the Syriac version, or has simply been lost as a result of the degradation of the manuscript is not one which requires the same attention. If, however, this particular element of uncertainty is removed from the analysis with respect to P-Job, the specific reasons for an element in the Hebrew text going unrepresented in the Syriac version of Job are not necessarily more obvious than was the case with the Qumran translation. We see this in the first example, drawn from the Syriac rendering of Job 22:3:

\[
\text{Nehmām lēsērî ḫaṭākēk līmūmā fi ṣūmā k̓ārākî} \quad 22:3
\]

\[
\text{[...]} \quad \text{vi, 2} \quad \text{[...]} \quad 11Q10
\]

\[
\text{ḥāsubseteq kī ḫaṭārēk keśōrēk awērēk ḫūmēk awērēk ḫaṭālīm awērēk} \quad \text{RtgJob}
\]

\[
\text{(mehēm sāḥāk ḫāsemēk awērēk sāḥāk ḫāsemēk awērēk)} \quad \text{P-Job}
\]

Is it any pleasure to the Almighty if you are righteous, or is it gain to him if you make your ways blameless?  

RSV

While the Qumran translation of Job 22:3 is only partially preserved, the fact that 11Q10 appears to render the MT divine name יָהָּוהָ here with לֵאָלָּהָ 279 suggests that at least part of the first half of verse 3 has been provided with an Aramaic equivalent. Whatever the case with respect to the Qumran text, it does appear that the translator of the Syriac version has omitted the first half of the verse in his rendering. Apart from the latter supplementary phrase (םַסְלָמָא יָאָס ‘out of fear’) 280 the translation provided by P-

---

279 This same equivalent is also chosen by the Qumran translator at 22:17. At 34:12 a form of שִׁמֹעָה is used, while at 17:13b, this divine name is represented by a suffix attached to a preposition. For the Syriac translators representation of יָהָּוהָ (סָלָמּא 13x) in Job see H.M. Szpek, ‘An Observation on the Peshitta’s Translation of ŚDY in Job’ VT 47 [4] (1997) 550-553.

280 The overall length of the Syriac translation approaches that of the Hebrew source text because P-Job has included its rendering of the beginning of MT 22:4 (יְּהוָּהָרַמְּלָא) adding וֶסֶלֶם יָאָס ‘out of fear’ at the end of verse 3 in the Syriac (See G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 177).
Job: מַעְנָה יִשָּׁר וְיִשָּׁר יִכָּה ‘and what gain is it for you to perfect your ways’ corresponds quite closely to the Hebrew text of 22:3b. While Baumann simply notes the omission of 22:3a without reference to possible causes, Szpek reflects on possible motivations for the deficiency here. In the first instance she notes that the omission of 22:3a may have resulted from the translator’s perception that its statement regarding the deity was in some way objectionable. Szpek appears to reject this explanation noting that ‘...the subject matter is no harsher than other statements about God in the text of Job.’ In addition, she later includes 22:3 amongst the passages cited as lacking in P-Job due to translator error. Later in a discussion of ‘significant parallels’ between the Greek and Syriac translations, Szpek also notes that the LXX too lacks a representation of Job 22:3a. Whether intending to or not, Szpek’s analysis of P-Job’s omission of 22:3 amply illustrates that, as was the case with the Qumran translation, the reasons for a given deficiency in P-Job may be less than transparent. Was it an error on the part of the translator which led to this omission or was the error during the transmission of his (and perhaps the LXX’s) Vorlage? Or was Szpek right in the first place to assume that it was a theological ‘problem’ which led the translator to omit this first portion of 22:3? The answer is by no means clear, even if the lack of a Syriac representation of the Hebrew is relatively obvious.

Similarly in P-Job’s translation of 39:10, we see that the Syriac translator has not provided an equivalent for each element of the Hebrew text.

---

281 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita zum Buche Ijob für die Textkritik’ (1899) 39; A. Mandl, Die Peschiitta zum Hiob, 26 also notes an omission in 22:3 but fails to specify that it is only a portion of the verse which lacks representation in P-Job.

282 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 162.

283 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 167 n.88.
Can you bind him in the furrow with ropes, or will he harrow the valleys after you? RSV

G. Rignell may be right in suggesting that P-Job’s paraphrastic translation of MT יֵעָסֶק ‘valleys’ with קָפָסָה ‘a difficult place’ is based on a reading of קְסָמֶה as ‘unsearchable (i.e., difficult)’ (Is. 33:19, Ezek 3:5,6). But if this is the case, it is hard to see why the more straight-forward meaning of the term was not read. Whatever the reasons for this modification, it seems clear that the translator has not provided an equivalent for the final prepositional phrase which is preserved in the Hebrew text (תֵּשְׁלִיחַ) and translated by the other Aramaic versions (11Q10 בוֹזֹה/ RtgJob מְדִינָה). Although E. Baumann notes this omission, he suggests that this deficiency and the divergent translation already discussed קָפָסָה is an unlikely Syriac rendering and proposes instead that the present text is an inner-Syriac corruption from שָׁמַא. While Baumann presents a plausible argument for the corruption of שָׁמַא קָפָסָה to קָפָסָה שָׁמַָא, Szpek in her analysis of the passage remains unconvinced.

---

285 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 332 also suggests the possibility that the translator misread samekh for mem (which presumably led to the reading of קָפָסָה). Where קְסָמֶה is elsewhere translated by the Aramaic versions of Job (39:21) RtgJob and 11Q10 translate as they do here, while P-Job renders with the cognate קָפָסָה.
286 Editio princeps, 74; ATQ, 63 and J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 40; F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 156 read only the resh and final kaph clearly.
287 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta’, (1899) 47.
288 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 168 without explicit reference to Baumann’s discussion com-
Here again we have a case of an element being omitted (or apparently omitted) in the Syriac translation, but the nature of the text leaves us to surmise why such an element of the text is lacking.

Again in 21:4 we encounter a Syriac text which is deficient when compared to its supposed Hebrew source text:

The unusual element in the Hebrew of 21:4 is the elliptical conditional MT formation ‘and if [that is so], why...’. In place of this, the Qumran translation provides an affirmative declaration ‘behold/surely, then...[my spirit] shall not [be impatient?]’ Assuming that the remainder of 11Q10’s translation followed the MT, this modification has the effect of eliminating the interrogative in favour of a pious assertion which reflects rather better on the character and figure of Job. While RtgJob presents Aramaic equivalents for all the elements of the MT, P-Job, like 11Q10, introduces modifications into its translation. The Syriac translator handles the Hebrew text in a dif-

ments: ‘Do we suggest a different Vorlage? a sloppy or sleepy-eyed copyist? In cases such as this no answer at present may be the best answer.’ See M.P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament, 292-300 for the few instances where Weitzman has favoured an emendation of the Syriac text on the basis of a comparison with the MT.


fferent fashion, apparently ignoring both the conditional particle and the negative and instead forming what appears to be a type of indirect rhetorical question 'why [should] my spirit be impatient?'. The translator’s omission of the awkward may be explained as an adaptation of a difficult text (see the differing English versions offered by AV and NRSV above) but the omission of the negative produces a translation which would seem to parallel that of the Qumran translation in terms of meaning. The modified rhetorical question in the Syriac ('Why should my spirit be impatient/troubled?) would seem to have much the same meaning as the apparent assertion in 11Q10, despite the fact that the manner in which the translators have achieved their ends is quite different (substitution vs. omission). The preservation of Job’s reputation may be a factor in the translator’s omission here, but it is also important to note that the unusual Hebrew construction and resulting omission of the conditional particle may have also played a part in P-Job’s adaptation of the Syriac text. One or more of these factors (perhaps in combination) will probably have contributed to the omission here but in this situation, the isolation of primary or sole motivation proves difficult.

As may be seen below, an even smaller element of the Hebrew text has gone missing in P-Job’s translation of Job 38:8,

---

291 As noted by A. Mandl, Die Peschitta zum Hiob, 26; E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1899) 307.
292 R.P. Gordon, ‘“Converse Translation” in the Targums and Beyond’ JSP 19 (1999) 3-21 provides examples of converse translation [i.e., contradictive rendition] (some involving omission of the negative) in the Peshitta and in the LXX and concludes that converse translation as found in the targums ‘...exists in healthy proportions in the other ancient versions and cannot... be dismissed as a product of early, crude approaches to Targumizing’ (19).
293 The similarity between 11Q10 and P-Job here has also been noted by B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 146 n.47. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 203- 211 for discussion of P-Job’s rendering of interrogatives.
Who shut up the sea behind doors when it burst forth from the womb, NIV
Or who shut in the sea with doors, when it burst forth from the womb; RSV

While the general meaning of the Hebrew seems relatively straightforward, the difference between the two English versions (‘behind’ [NIV], ‘with’ [RSV]) in rendering the preposition -ב, suggests the possibility that the perceived ambiguity of this element may have triggered a reaction in one of the Aramaic versions. Both 11Q10 and RtgJob provide the expected renderings of the Hebrew text, with both texts representing the preposition with the Aramaic cognate. The Peshitta translation on the other hand does not appear to provide a Syriac equivalent for the preposition with the result that its equivalents for בלאים, יא לאים appear in construct in the Syriac ( licens). While in the Hebrew text (and likewise in 11Q10 and RtgJob) the doors are the means by which the sea is shut in or closed up, in the Syriac translation the lack of preposition means that it is ‘the doors of the sea’ ( licens) themselves which are closed up tight. G. Rignell suggests that the translator has simply ignored the preposition in his rendering of the text into Syriac, but the question of why this preposition has been ignored by the translator is not necessarily clear. It is true that ‘to close (something) with doors’ is a rather exceptional

294 The Qumran text presents the noun in its plural absolute form ינ לים, while the Rabbinic Targum presents an emphatic plural form ה ינ לים as noted by R. Weiss, תַּנְיָגוֹת מַרְכָּז, 139 and C. Man gan, The Targum to Job, 82. While the RtgJob MS tradition preserves numerous variants to this reading (e.g. ינ לים) these seem to be quite obviously related to inner-targumic corruption based on confusion of characters. In any case the variant texts also preserve an Aramaic element for each corresponding element in the Hebrew text. For complete variant citations see critical apparatus of D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, 268.
expression in the Hebrew Bible in comparison with the more common (‘to close door(s)’
but the Hebrew text here does nevertheless seem to make reasonable sense and does not appear to require modification. While this may simply be an error on the part of the Syriac translator it is also possible that it is instead an error in the co-text which has led to the loss of the preposition for several commentators see the translator of P-Job here as taking the dual ending of מְלָאָה מְדֹד (followed by ב) as a ditography in the Hebrew text and adjusting the translation accordingly so that its rendering of ‘doors’ would be in construct with ‘the sea’. This modification would then lead to the otherwise unexpected omission of the preposition as meaningless (i.e., ‘he shut [with] the doors of the sea’) in the new Syriac translation. Here again, we see that an element has been omitted in P-Job but also that the cause of the deficiency is not altogether clear.

Oh, that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his dwelling! NRSV

The Hebrew idiom expressing a wish (‘Would that [lit. who would allow that]’ occurs frequently in Job and although it is rendered with a variety of Aramaic expressions by the translators of RtgJob and P-Job, this verse is unfortunately the only one preserved by all three versions. The Qumran translator’s treatment of this idiom involves the substitution of a non-verbal Aramaic equivalent (כֵּלֶלֶת) which has close parallels in the Hebrew of Job (e.g. 6:2). While the Rabbinic targumist often provides a lit-

295 E.g. Ju.3:23; 2 Kgs. 4:4, 5, 33; Isa. 26:20; Mal. 1:10; Qoh. 12:4.
eral equivalent of the Hebrew idiom,\textsuperscript{297} here at 23:3 and later on at 31:31, this translator provides an interpretative rendering that appears to diverge from the MT: מְלַבְּשָׁן אוֹלָדִים (‘Who would decree that I should know...?’). The Syriac translator too represents the Hebrew idiom, supplying in its place a common Syriac equivalent "Would that...", which is also supplied on numerous occasions elsewhere in P-Job.\textsuperscript{298} It is, however, not the Syriac’s version of the Hebrew idiom which concerns us here but the fact that an equivalent for the following verbal form (יִנָּחֶה) is apparently not to be found in the Syriac text. The translator does make an attempt to represent מַכְצְנוּ (‘that I might find him...’) through the provision of אַלֹם אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (but the preceding verb is omitted and the parallelism of the Hebrew is eliminated in the translator’s contraction of the two halves of the verse into a single sentence (‘Would that I was able to come to his place’). It is difficult to know for certain why this verb has gone missing in the Syriac. Driver and Gray point out that the Hebrew text is unusual in its conjunction of this Hebrew idiom with a perfect verb form, and thus it may be that the Syriac translator has had difficulty with his source text.\textsuperscript{300} However, the Syriac translator’s treatment of 19:23 (אֵין מַכְצָנוּ מַכְצָנוּ) ‘Would that therefore my words were written down’ in a similar fashion... אַלֹם אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל may suggest that the rephrasing of this idiom into Syriac has played a part in the modification. The possibility that the form may have been lacking in the Syriac translator’s Vorlage is also raised by the fact that מַכְצָנוּ is also missing in Kennicott MS 253.\textsuperscript{301}

\textsuperscript{297} At 11:5 and 14:4 מְלַבְּשָׁן מַלְאָֽךְ is supplied by the targumist while מְלַבְּשָׁן מְלַבְּשָׁן is provided at 6:8, 13:5 19:23 (2x), 38:36).

\textsuperscript{298} E.g. 11:5, 13:5, 19:23, 23:3, 29:2; The more literal מַכְצָנוּ is also utilised at 6:8 and 14:4.

\textsuperscript{299} P-Job has rendered the MT verb form נוֹגֵד מִשְׂרָאֵל) with a (ptcp + enclitic) compound verb tense (lit. ‘I was able’) which is often used in Syriac in sentences which possess a hypothetical or irreal condition. See T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac: A Basic Grammar (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997) § 86.

\textsuperscript{300} S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (II), 160.

\textsuperscript{301} On the other hand, the omission in the Hebrew manuscript may merely attest to the fact that the translator of P-Job is not the only reader to have found its presence to be incongruous. E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 179 corrects Mandl’s erroneous suggestion (26) that it is נוֹגֵד which has
Despite the clear indications then that the form is missing in the Syriac, we are left with a plurality of factors which may singly or in some combination explain its absence.

In 28:26 it is again the preposition -ב which has not found representation in the Syriac translation of the Hebrew.

\[
\text{בעשתו למשר תֵּפָּר תָּקָר לְחֵית ה':} \quad 28:26
\]

\[
\text{בָּכָּמֵר יָזָר קְוָלָלְיָנִי} \quad 11Q10
\]

\[
\text{בָּכָּמֵר יָזָר קְוָלָלְיָנִי} \quad \text{RtgJob}
\]

\[
\text{בָּכָּמֵר יָזָר קְוָלָלְיָנִי} \quad \text{P-Job}
\]

\[
\text{when he made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder;} \quad \text{RSV}
\]

While the other Aramaic versions preserve the temporal clause through the retention of the infinitive construct, the Syriac translator appears to omit the preposition beth and instead supply a finite verb (אֶלֶךָ). Although some adjustment of verbal forms is expected when Hebrew is rendered into Syriac, the omission of the temporal element is one which is neither expected nor necessary from a linguistic point of view. How then can the omission of the temporal conjunction at this point in P-Job be best explained? The omission of the conjunction may have something to do with the fact that the Syriac translator has begun his translation of each of the three previous verses (vv. 23, 24, 25) with a conjunction and has therefore been inclined to resist beginning this verse with the conjunction attested in the Hebrew. Alternatively, this omission may simply result from an indefinable stylistic preference which is dependent on this particular context. In short while the lack of a temporal conjunction in P-Job is obvious

---

302 See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 80-83 for a detailed examination of Syriac and Hebrew verbal correspondences in Job. In 29:7 and 38:9 where the Hebrew also presents the Syriac translator with initial infinitive construct forms, P-Job provides \( \text{ס"מש} \) ‘when’ before finite forms of the verb.

(versus its preservation in its sister Aramaic versions) we are left with little means for deducing the cause of the deficiency.304

While the preceding examples of omission in P-Job have all involved relatively small portions of the Hebrew text, there are also instances where larger units (i.e., verse[s]) are apparently omitted in the Syriac version of Job. For example, although the Qumran translation’s rendering of Job 30:3-4 is fragmentary it is apparent nevertheless that the translator of the text has attempted to make sense of the textual material lying between verses 2 and 5 of chapter 30.305 The Rabbinic targum, for its part, also includes complete translations of the verses in chapter 30, but when we turn to the Syriac version, we see that the Peshitta of Job does not preserve a rendering of 30:3-5a.306 If the deficiency is clear enough, there is little scholarly consensus regarding the reasons for it. M. Weitzman suggests that these omissions result from the translator’s abdication of his responsibility because of the difficulty of the Hebrew material before him.307 It is true that these verses do contain some rare botanical terminology and pose more than their fair share of thorny interpretative questions,308 but Rignell remains unconvinced that the Syriac translator has omitted these verses because of their difficulty when other equally difficult verses are readily translated.309 Instead he appears to attribute their omission to an earlier copy of the Syriac text which has been damaged at some point. H. Szpek, noting that verses are also omitted in chapter 41 in close proximity to one another

304 In 31:28, P-Job’s failure to represent Heb. הוא עליון ‘on high’ in its translation is noted by A. Mandl, Die Peschitta zum Hiob, 26 and E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 195. Presumably because all other occurrences of this Hebrew form in Job have been rendered proximately by the Syriac translator, H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 167 suggests that its omission here stems from an error on the part of the translator. Error may be the cause of the deficiency here but lacking any contextual grounds for such an assumption, it may be safest to simply admit our uncertainty.

305 E.g. 30:3: הצעית [..] xv, 8 [..] quánיד [ר' יד] מְלָאךְ [ך] [ך] xv, 7 and 30:4: [..] [לָחוּמ] [ז] [י] [..] xv, 9 [..] [ך] [ך] xv, 8.

306 A. Mandl, Die Peschitta zum Hiob, 26 notes the absence of these two verses but does not offer an explanation for their absence.


309 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 234.
(v.21a, 22-24a) also suggests that it is probable that here the lacunae of a previously damaged text were translated unwittingly by a copyist. While there is no doubt that Syriac material corresponding to the Hebrew verses is lacking then, it is equally clear that damage to a manuscript, erroneous omission, or a difficult text may all be plausibly advanced as causes for its absence.

The possibility that the Syriac translator has been dissuaded from providing a translation because the material mentioned above was beyond his decipherment leads us to consider other examples which seem to suggest that an omission is related to a perceived textual difficulty or challenge. Again as was the case with the Qumran translation, the key is the Syriac translator’s perception of difficulty rather than textual impossibilities or improbabilities in any absolute sense.

Who hath divided a watercourse for the overflowing of waters, or a way for the lightning of thunder; AV
Who cuts a channel for the torrents of rain, and a path for the thunderstorm, NIV

While P-Job does not appear to preserve a rendering of 38:25a, RtgJob and the Qumran text do attempt to make sense of the first portion of this verse. In fact, it is these translations which may shed light on the reason for the Syriac text’s deficiency. As we have seen in the previous example, some have considered it likely that the Syriac translator has simply failed to translate material which presented insurmountable prob-

310 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 162.
311 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 273 unconvincingly attributes the omission of this half-verse in P-Job to a deficient Vorlage.
lems of comprehension. What suggests that this may be the case here in 38:25? The main source of difficulty for the Aramaic translators seems to have been הָעַלֶּל. Of its occurrences in the Hebrew bible, only here is הָעַלֶּל ‘conduit/watercourse’ used in a figurative sense. Elsewhere it is used with reference to channels dug into the earth (e.g. irrigation canals) and the difficulty or obscurity of this usage here has led to differing treatment at the hands of the respective Aramaic translators. For its translation of הָעַלֶּל, 11Q10 provides בָּרֵא ‘time’. When combined with 11Q10’s translation of the initial verb of the verse with אֲנָהּ ‘(who) set/established’, this modification results in a rendering which corresponds only generally to the MT and is heavily reliant on the context (‘Who establishes a time for the rain’). The translation of RtgJob also shows signs that 38:25a and הָעַלֶּל in particular has proven problematic. The occurrence of הָעַלֶּל in the context of precipitation rather than earthly canals seemingly acts as a trigger, prompting the translator to reinterpret this unusual usage: ‘Who assigns channels for the flood of the deep so that part of them should not be higher (לֵויֵל). While RtgJob’s expansion of the verse radically alters the meaning of the translation, הָעַלֶּל does nevertheless receive representation in the form of לֵויֵל. In light of the above observations regarding the treatment of 38:25a in RtgJob and 11Q10, it is perhaps not surprising that some have attributed the evident lack of a rendering in the Syriac to the challenges presented in this portion of text. If this is indeed the case, we see that the respective Aramaic versions have resorted to different approaches when encountering the same textual ‘problem’. 11Q10 has opted to provide a divergent translation which involves substitutions based on the context. RtgJob supplies equivalents for each element of the Hebrew

---

312 See e.g. Ezek 31:4; 2 Kgs. 18:17; Is. 36:2; 1K 18:32, 35, 38.
313 F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 154 suggest the possibility that the translator has modified his translation as a result of an objection to the Hebrew, however what this objection might be is not clarified.
314 This correspondence is suggested both by the fact that לֵויֵל and לֵויֵל are apparently related to הָעַלֶּל and by the inclusion of לֵויֵל in 38:25 T2 which otherwise bears little resemblance to T1. See C. Mangan, *The Targum of Job*, 85.
but chooses to supplement the translation with explanatory material. P-Job’s response, if Weitzman is correct in his assessment, has been not to substitute or add but simply omit this passage on account of its irregularity.

He does not withdraw his eyes from the righteous, but with kings upon the throne he sets them for ever, and they are exalted. RSV

The RSV’s English translation of 36:7 reveals the difficulty perceived by many commentators in the Hebrew text: יִשָּׁעַבּ "and he sits/sets them" seems to be related to the preceding clause (with kings) despite the occurrence of the waw. While this particular syntactic irregularity gives rise to numerous modifications on the part of the Aramaic translators, it is the Syriac translator’s unrelated omission of an equivalent of the Hebrew preposition which is of particular interest here. It appears that this preposition in MT יִשָּׁעַבּ ‘with kings’ has apparently been read as the nota accusativi by the Syriac translator and consequently omitted in his translation (יִשָּׁעַבּ ‘he sets kings upon the throne’). This understanding of P-Job’s omission is reinforced by the

---

316 R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 414 attributes this irregularity to the metrical requirements of the poet. For other examples of this unusual appearance of the waw, see S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (II) 274.

317 While P-Job and 11Q10’s omission of the suffix in translating יִשָּׁעַבּ ‘and he sits them’ is dealt with below, the textual dislocation evident in both versions’ renderings is taken up in chapter 9 ad loc.

318 G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job*, 299 (P-Job); This misapprehension on the part of the Syriac translator is rather surprising for the lack of י before יִשָּׁעַבּ suggests that P-Job did understand the indefinite reference (i.e., kings vs. ‘the kings’) intended by the Hebrew. For Syriac marking of the object see T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig: 1898) § 287.
Qumran translator’s own apparent treatment of the element in question. 11Q10 prefixes its rendering of ‘kings’ (יְהוֹיָדָע) with ו which serves to mark it as the object.\footnote{M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 188; *ATQ*, 51; F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 141; Other examples of 11Q10’s use of *lamedh* to mark the object include 29:12, 40:6 and probably 32:12.} It seems that both Aramaic translators have erroneously read the preposition as the direct object marker, and, while the Qumran translator has provided a substitution the Syriac translator has omitted a representation of it in his rendering. Unlike his counterparts, the translator of RtgJob is not fooled by the ambiguity of the Hebrew form and appropriately translates with מִנָּה.\footnote{Ambiguity may also be the cause of the omission of a suffix in P-Job’s translation of MT הַפָּלֵל at 38:10. The form is difficult and assessments of the significance of the final *yodh* have varied. (See M. Pope, *Job*, 294 and S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (II), 300). A difficulty with the text may also be behind the omission of a suffix in 34:29. There, in struggling to come to grips with an awkward Hebrew text, ("ךָּלָּלָא לַעְזֵר וְלָהֵר יָשַׁר") the Syriac translator has apparently opted to omit the 3rd masc. sg. suffix on the verbal form (יָשַׁר) as part of his restructured translation: (ךָּלָּלָא לַעְזֵר וְלָהֵר יָשַׁר לַעְזֵר יָשַׁר).} 

In P-Job’s version of 37:17 it is a pronoun—more specifically a relative pronoun—which seems to prove problematic for the Syriac translator.

\begin{align*}
\text{In P-Job’s version of 37:17 it is a pronoun—more specifically a relative pronoun—which seems to prove problematic for the Syriac translator.} \\
\text{you whose garments are hot when the earth is still because of the south wind? RSV}
\end{align*}

Driver and Gray assess the Hebrew construction at the beginning of Job 37:17 as ‘...a pronoun of the 2nd person being the supplement of יָשַׁר.\footnote{S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (II), 294 support this understanding by referring to a similar construction in Hos. 14:4.} While this understanding and the resulting translation (‘you whose garments...’) is reflected in the English translation adopted by the RSV, other interpretations are possible.\footnote{It may be that the pronoun here is to be understood as ‘dann, wenn’ as suggested by B. Duhm, *Das...*} Whatever the correct under-
standing, this form has clearly prompted the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job respectively to clarify what they have also perceived as a textual difficulty. The Qumran translator has provided the Aramaic conjunction יְבֵרֵל וַעֲשָׂר אֵלֶּים ‘since/be­cause’ in order to more clearly delineate the syntactic relationship with the preced­ing material. The translator of P-Job has apparently also sensed this same obscurity in the Hebrew but has chosen instead to not represent this element in his Syriac translation. Here then, we have another example of the Syriac translator responding to a ‘problem’ in the text by simply omitting the element involved while the Qumran translator reacts differently to the same problem and RtgJob follows the MT precisely.

\[\text{11Q10: } \text{They turn round and round by his guidance, to accomplish ( ) all that he commands them on the face of the habitable world. RSV}\]

\[\text{P-Job: } \text{Your garments are/will be hot}.\]

Buch Hiob [Marti (ed.) Kurzer Hand­commentar zum AT] (1897) 178 whereas the RV translators prefer ‘(do you know’ v.16) how thy garments are warm?’

\[\text{323 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 74 also concludes that it is the ambiguity of the pronoun here which has led to its omission.}\]

\[\text{324 See M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 145 for discussion of the significance of this Aramaic conjunction in terms of the history of Aramaic.}\]

\[\text{325 \(\text{יְבֵרֵל וַעֲשָׂר אֵלֶּים}\) ‘your garments are/will be hot’.}\]

\[\text{326 While the fragmentary state of 11Q10’s translation prevents a genuine synoptic comparison of the Aramaic versions of 29:25, it appears that all three translators may have had difficulty with the Hebrew clause \(\text{יְבֵרֵל וַעֲשָׂר אֵלֶּים}\) ‘I sat [as chief’. This seems the most likely explanation for P-Job’s rendering of the verbal form with \(\text{כָּל} \text{כָּל} \text{כָּל} \text{כָּל} \text{כָּל}\) and failure to provide an equivalent for \(\text{יְבֵרֵל וַעֲשָׂר אֵלֶּים}\). H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 166-7 seems to equiv­ocate on the cause of this omission, including it under both ‘intra-verse influence’ and ‘error’ categories.}\]
Although the Aramaic versions’ treatment of Job 37:12 has already been discussed in connection with 11Q10’s omission of הָיוָּשָׁהוּ הָנָּהוּ הָעִבְרָהוּ 327—a phrase at the very heart of a passage which has clearly proven challenging for its Aramaic translators. The greatest modification of the passage is wrought by the Qumran translator whose Aramaic rendering of v.12a as a whole is so unlike the Hebrew that it can only be described as a paraphrase: ‘And he says, let them hear (i.e., obey) him and they go...’. Both P-Job and RtgJob’s translations are formally closer to the Hebrew in the sense that they tend to more faithfully represent each element of the source text in translation. Although RtgJob’s interpretation of the verse is perhaps at variance with modern understandings of verse 12a,329 the taurgumist’s rendering of הָיָהוּ הָעִבְרָהוּ with הָיוּ הָעִבְרָהוּ formally preserves each element of the Hebrew text.330 The Syriac translator seems also to have attempted to render the Hebrew text to the best of his ability but his version differs from the taurgumist in that the Peshitta shows a transposition of the infinitive phrase (הָיוּ הָעִבְרָהוּ) to a location preceding the rendering of הָיָהוּ הָעִבְרָהוּ.331 Alongside, and no doubt related to, this restructuring, P-Job seems to have understood the basic meaning of the difficult Hebrew הָיוָּשָׁהוּ but has included neither the prefixed preposition nor the suffix in his Syriac translation (‘reasonings, intentions, thoughts’). Indeed the Aramaic versions’ treatment of הָיוָּשָׁהוּ also shows signs of considerable

327 Qere: יָבֹעֶהוּ. Ketib: יָבֹעֶהוּ.
328 M. Pope, Job, 283 makes a valiant effort to explain 11Q10’s interpretation, suggesting for instance that 11Q10 יָבֹשָׁהוּ represents a reading of MT יָבֹשָׁהוּ.
329 RtgJob’s rendering of אָבָצָה with אָבָצָה ‘destinies’ may suggest that the translator has understood this Hebrew lexeme as related to הָיָהוּ 2 Chron 10:15 or הָיָהוּ 1 Kings 12:15 (‘turn of affairs’).
330 The translator of RtgJob appears to have had some sense of the meaning of the Hebrew but perhaps has opted for the rendering ‘with his wisdom’ under the influence of this stock expression which appears frequently in the Hebrew Bible. See for instance: Prov 3:19, 24:3, 28:26, 31:26. An alternative RtgJob tradition found in T2 renders the Hebrew here with יָבֹשָׁהוּ ‘by his pledges’ (apparently derived from הבּּוּ ‘to bind, pledge’). It is also possible to read with C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 51 ‘store-houses’ the Greek loanwords being indistinguishable in unvocalised Aramaic script. See also Sokoloff, M A Dictionary of Byzantine Aramaic.... The important point here is that both T1 and T2 preserve equivalents for each element of the Hebrew.
331 For an assessment of this restructuring of the word order see chapter 7.
modification. The Qumran translator appears to have understood the Hebrew as a substantive לְעַברָדָיו לְעַברהֶדָיו ‘their work’. While P-Job has understood correctly that the Hebrew form is in this case a verbal form הָאָדַם ‘to do, perform’, the 3rd masc. pl. suffix has nevertheless been omitted by the translator because of a failure to recognise the antecedent ‘clouds’ in the preceding verse. RtgJob (T1) through the use of an expansion manages to represent both of these grammatical alternatives. לָאָצלָא הָפָלָה הָאָבְרָדָא בָּאָבְרָדָא ‘to make the workers do well (i.e., prosper) on the earth in their deeds.’ It seems that the former element of RtgJob’s version provides a verbal interpretation of the Hebrew while the latter supplies the interpretation of the Hebrew as a substantive. Here we see then another example of the Aramaic versions attempting to come to grips with a challenging text, but doing so by very different means. In P-Job’s case the process of making sense of the text has involved the Syriac translator’s omission of both prepositional and pronominal elements in his rendering. The above example clearly suggests that the Peshitta of Job, like the Qumran translation, displays evidence that certain elements may be omitted in translation not primarily because they themselves have been perceived as problematic but because the translator’s understanding or modification of the surrounding co-text or verse as a whole has rendered them unnecessary or inappropriate.

Although an infinitival form here (‘for their doing’) מִסְלָה ‘their work, deeds’ appears as a suffixed noun at Job 36:9 and 24:5.

E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 565-6 suggests that the third pl. suffix refers to both thunder and lightning (i.e., a plurality of meteorological phenomena?). M. Pope, *Job*, 283 admits that gender and number are greatly confused in this verse, but prefers to read the 3rd masc. pl. suffixes in v.12b as emphatic particles.
For a little while they are exalted, and then they are gone; they are brought low and gathered up like all others; they are cut off like ears of corn. NIV

They are exalted a little while, and then are gone; they wither and fade like the mallow; they are cut off like the heads of grain. RSV

In light of the parallelism of the following line יַלְדוּת נַפְלֵי יְכוֹלָן 'like a head of grain' and comparisons with the lexica of other Semitic languages, it seems likely that the difficult MT כָּפֵל is intended to be a comparative reference to a plant of some kind (i.e. 'like grass'). Although the Qumran translator appears to have got it right in rendering מבולא 'like the cynodon' both RtgJob and P-Job have made the understandable mistake of reading כל as the common Hebrew quantifier. The translator of RtgJob provides וְדוֹד כָּל הָעַבְרָד יֵשֶׁר 'according to all which they have done', clearly representing both the comparative particle and an equivalent for כל. P-Job also includes a suffixed rendering of the quantifier in its translation (כָּלִים מִלְמָכָם 'all the provocateurs') but does not represent the comparative particle. While the simile which follows later in the verse (ךִֽלְיָאָֽו 'like ears of corn') is preserved in P-Job’s translation, the difficulty and resulting reinterpretation of כל has removed the need for the rendering of the first comparative particle which has thus been omitted. While this example, like many of the preceding ones, shows that a textual difficulty on the part of P-Job can lie at the root of an omission, it also shows that this problem may also be found in surrounding co-text rather than in the element which has been omitted.

---

334 See R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 271; M. Pope, Job, 195 and for more thorough treatment L. Grabbe, Comparative Philology... p. 88-89.

335 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 279ff. remains unconvinced by the suggestion that the translator of 11Q10 has successfully identified this extremely obscure lexeme where the translators of P-Job and RtgJob have failed (contra B. Jongeling, 'The Job Targum', 193). In their identification of כל all the commentators follow earlier studies by Löw Die Flora der Juden I (Wien and Leipzig, 1928 and Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1967) I, 697-9.
In the Syriac version of Job 35:11 it is a common Hebrew preposition which is omitted in translation.

While both RtgJob and 11Q10 provide Aramaic equivalents for the Hebrew preposition -ם (ם) which here functions in a comparative role, the preposition does not receive representation in the Syriac translation. As this form serves the same comparative function in Syriac as it does in Hebrew there is no obvious linguistic reason for its omission here in P-Job and we must search elsewhere for the cause of the Syriac translation’s deficiency at this point.336 While the Qumran translation has provided an equivalent for MT מַעָלָהּ מְכַלְכֶּתֶם הַסְּפָרְמָה (ה) the rendering reveals a divergent understanding of the Hebrew. The translator of 11Q10 (רָדָמֶשֶת מְכַלָּרָה) seems to have either read (or performed) a metathesis of the first two root letters (thus פִּלָּה ‘to separate’) and rendered accordingly פִּלָּה ‘he has separated us...’. That this reading seems to lie at the root of the reading in LXX Job (ὁ διόριζεν τῶν) suggests the possibility that a non-MT Vorlage may be the cause of such a divergence.337 While a variant Vorlage at this point is indeed a possible cause of the Qumran translations’ variation vis-à-vis the MT, the Syriac rendering may suggest that this Hebrew form was modified in translation. It seems quite clear that the translator of P-Job has confused מַעָלָה with the compound preposition מַעָלָה מְכַלָּרָה and ren-

336 For the use of מ in comparative constructions see T. Nöldeke, Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik, § 249E.
337 So noted in the Editio princeps, 63.
dered accordingly מֵזַּה ‘from before’. Although the Qumran text’s divergence in rendering נַלְקָא has not resulted in the exclusion of any other textual element, we see that P-Job’s erroneous reading of the form as a compound preposition has not only obscured the comparative function of יה, it also renders any possible prepositional function of the expected translation נר redundant. Here we see that an element of the Hebrew text has gone missing in the Syriac translation purely as a result of the ‘knock-on’ effect of a prior (and, in this case, erroneous) modification.

Surely God does not hear an empty cry, nor does the Almighty regard it. RSV

All three Aramaic versions have included a representation of MT נַשְׁתָּה, with the Qumran translator and the Rabbinic targumist supplying נַשְׁתָּה ‘vanity’ and נַשְׁחָה ‘false-hood’ respectively. The Syriac translator’s rendering of this Hebrew noun makes use of the Syriac adverb מַמְּלָ֑כָּה ‘vainly, in vain’ despite showing signs elsewhere of familiarity with the nominal form attested here in RtgJob.338 Our focus here, however, is limited to the particle which precedes this form (בַּ֣שְׁתָּה) and more particularly the treatment of this particle by the respective Aramaic translators. Although תְּפַנְּי serves a variety of functions, the Aramaic versions provide some evidence which suggests that its variable role has been more or less comprehended.339 Here however, while RtgJob provides an

---

338 At 31:5 the MT נַשְׁתָּה is translated by the Syriac translator with מַמְּלָ֑כָּה. The customary Hebrew adverbialexpression ‘vainly’ requires a prefixed lamedh (לָ֜מֶדֶּה) (E.g. Je 2:30, 4:30, 6:29 etc.).

339 At 33:8 where this same Hebrew lexeme appears similarly at the beginning of the verse, the translators of 11Q10, P-Job and RtgJob render with seemingly proximate equivalents נַשְׁתָּה/לָ֜מֶדֶּה/לָ֜מֶדֶּה.
expected equivalent (ר"ל only, singly) both 11Q10 and P-Job display a different treatment of the particle. The Qumran translation provides יָּרְאָה, a form which serves to represent both 'because' and 'behold' in 11Q10\(^{340}\), and here, commentators are divided as to which meaning has been intended by the translator.\(^{341}\) When we turn to examine the Syriac translator’s treatment it is clear that the particle has for some reason not received representation in the Peshitta. The most likely explanation is to be found in the translator’s rendering of the last portion of the preceding verse (35:12). G. Rignell has suggested that the Syriac translator has understood the causal clause of v.12 (‘There they cry out, but he does not answer, because of the pride of the wicked’...) not as the conclusion to verse 12, as is the case in the MT, but rather as syntactically related to the following verse 13.\(^{342}\) In light of this suggestion it is not difficult to understand why the Syriac translator has opted to omit the Hebrew particle. In each of the six other instances in Job where this particle is found at the beginning of a verse, the translator of P-Job provides an equivalent, but in this case the alternate division of vv 12 and 13 results in a Syriac translation which has apparently left no room for an equivalent for this particle, whether it functions restrictively or as-severatively.\(^{343}\) Here again, it seems to be a separate but related adjustment which has led to the omission of an element in the Syriac translation of Job.

\(^{340}\) For further discussion of this form in 11Q10 and an analysis of its development in Aramaic see M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 110.

\(^{341}\) Although it is understood as ‘behold’ by *ATQ*, 51 and F. Martinez *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 11*, 139, the occurrence of יָּרְאָה ‘for vanity...' at the beginning of 15:31b might lend support to the reading of ‘because’ adopted by the editors, p. 63 and M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 136.


\(^{343}\) While this may suggest that 11Q10’s rendering יָּרְאָה should be understood as ‘because’ the fragmentary remains of the rest of the line provide little corroboration.
Will he then make requital to suit you, because you reject it? For you must choose, and not I; therefore declare what you know. RSV

In the RSV's English translation of Job 34:33, the sentence is marked as a general interrogative through an inversion transformation (He will > Will he?). While the targumist also follows the MT in marking the Aramaic sentence as interrogative, his approach of providing הוה and other Hebrew cognates is more akin to its Semitic cognate Hebrew than to the more distantly related English.344 Neither the Qumran or Syriac translator, however, appear to have taken account of the interrogative הוה in their renderings. In 11Q10 ירא may represent 'behold' or 'because/for'345 and it seems clear that the translator of 11Q10 provides a statement of some sort where we find a rhetorical question in the MT.346 Although the loss of the interrogative sense of the verse has not resulted in a loss of tex-

344 Jastrow’s (M. Jastrow, Dictionary of Targumim…) entry for this lexeme (and its variant) suggests the meaning, 'it is possible' but the usage within the RigJob is complex. For the verses which correspond to those preserved in 11Q10, הוה is found prefixed with Aram. interrogative הוה (21:22, 38:31, 38:33, 39:09) as an equivalent for Heb interrog. he. In other verses, it stands alone in representing the Hebrew question indicator. (18:4; 39:11,20, 40:26, 28, 40:31). In a large number of locations variation in the manuscripts preserve both readings (34:33, 38:34, 39:01,10; 39:26; 40:27,29) (Locations where Aramaic interrogative he is preserved as an equivalent for its Hebrew cognate: 34:31, 38:33, 39:20) As its relationship to the Aramaic cognate of interrog. he in rendering the Hebrew form is unclear, it is difficult to say at what stage, or to what extent הוה should be understood as an intentional deviation from the meaning of the Hebrew question indicator as opposed to merely a reflection of the stylistic preference of Aramaic.

345 'Behold' is preferred by ATQ, 49; F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 137 while J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 33; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 77 opt for 'because'.

346 As is suggested by F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 137.
tual elements in the Qumran translation, in the Syriac version, the translator not only fails to preserve the question but also opts not to supply a formal equivalent for the interrogative marker. According to H. Szpek, the reason for this failure may be that the translator of P-Job does not follow the verse division of the MT in vv 32 and 33, choosing instead to include the rendering of (אָרְעוֹן אֶדֶם) as part of its translation of verse 33 here rather than with verse 32. According to his redivision of the textual material in verses 32 and 33, it appears that the Syriac translator chose to transform the interrogative of the Hebrew into a declarative in Syriac.

The above example shows that a prior modification (in this case redivision) may lead to the Syriac translator’s failure to represent the interrogative heh (with a resulting ‘loss’ of the question in the Syriac text). A glance at the English translation’s treatment of the interrogative through inversion, however, suggests that the representation of the interrogative is, in some translation situations, a function of the relation between a given target language and the Hebrew formulation. Szpek has shown that in the Syriac version of Job the most frequent (although not exclusive) approach to representing the interrogative heh of the Hebrew is in fact non-representation or 0. We see this exemplified in P-Job’s translation of Job 38:28:

38:28

חָלְתָּם לַשׁוֹר אָב או מֵאִי מַכִּית עַד יְמֵי יָדוֹן פַּלְאָה ָּּםֲ 11Q10

רֵאשִׁים לְמַשֵׁר אֲבָא אֵשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר דְּרָשׁי מַלָּא : RtgJob

Has the rain a father, or who has begotten the drops of dew? NRSV

347 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 114 n. 22 suggests that this redivision has occurred due to the ambiguity of the Hebrew text and/or an error on the part of the translator.

348 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 205.

349 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 204 This is not to say that the interrogative sense of a sentence is lost as was the case in 34:33, but simply that often this interrogative sense is discernible to us only through an analysis of the context and whatever guidance may be provided by the Hebrew source text. In accented texts of course (I.B. Segal The Diacritical Point..., p. 68), an interrogative intonation was marked explicitly by the scribe by the placing of the point at the beginning of the word. See also T. Noldeke, Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik, § 331 for further discussion of the interrogative in Syriac.
Here we see that the English translator again provides an inverted word order to form the interrogative and the translators of 11Q10 and RtgJob are able to represent the interrogative heh with similar markers in their respective Aramaic renderings. The Syriac translation on the other hand does not formally differentiate the interrogative from a declarative clause. Without formal differentiation it may be asked how it is possible to know that the Syriac’s non-representation has not resulted in the loss of the question. The answer is to be found in P-Job’s rendering of 38:28b where the latter part of the disjunctive question is preserved אֲלֹהֵי נָשָׁב הַיּוֹם ‘or who has begotten the drops?’ In this case, the context clearly indicates that 38:28a, while not marked as interrogative, must nevertheless be understood in this manner.350

P-Job’s frequent omission or non-representation of the Hebrew interrogative heh due to the language difference between Hebrew and Syriac brings us again to a series of omissions which, as was the case with the Qumran translation, seem to fall somewhere on the linguistic-stylistic continuum in terms of their underlying cause. As was the case with 11Q10, it is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between linguistic necessity and stylistic nicety when we come to assess the Syriac translator’s omission of a given element. Certain trends with regard to P-Job’s rationale for omitting elements in translation may nevertheless be discerned in the examples which follow.

At 30:16, it is a preposition which has been omitted by the Syriac translator:

And now my life ebbs away (_____) : days of suffering grip me. NIV
And now my soul is poured out upon me; the days of affliction have taken hold upon me. AV

350 Other instances of the O representation of the interrogative heh in P-Job are to be found at 21:22, 38:12, 39:20, 26. For a full discussion of P-Job’s treatment of the interrogative and examples which lie outside the material covered by all three Aramaic versions of Job, see H.M. Szpeck, Translation Technique, 203-14 (esp. 211 n. 19).
Driver and Gray seem correct to insist that the Hebrew suffixed preposition (אֲלֵיהּ) belongs to the idiomatic construction here provided in the Hebrew text.\(^351\) The idiomatic idea of the soul (נפש) being poured out (שְׁלָשָׁה) is seen elsewhere in the Tanakh, but in 1 Sam. 1:15 where it is also met, the construction is slightly different from the one encountered here. There we see that כְּדֹעֵב יְהוָה לָהּ נַפְשָׁה יֶתָּחֵל, “…and I pour out my soul before the LORD.” is rendered by the Syriac translator in a straightforward manner: כְּדֹעֵב מְנַפְּס יְהוָה (‘I pour/cast my soul before the LORD’). In the present context, however, the form of the idiom is apparently complicated for the translator by the presence of אֲלֵיהּ. Both the Rabbinic targumist and the Qumran translator are able to preserve their renderings of this prepositional element of the Hebrew, although their translations of the following verb suggest a certain degree of accommodation with regard to their treatment of this idiom.\(^352\) In the case of P-Job, however, we see that אֲלֵיהּ does not receive any explicit representation (אֲלָלָלָלָל) in the Syriac rendering. The other Aramaic versions’ treatment of this idiom seem to suggest that it is a linguistic or stylistic adaptation of the Hebrew which is the cause of this omission,\(^353\) but for substantial proof of this suspicion it is necessary to turn to the Peshitta rendering of Psalm 42:5—the only other place in the Hebrew Bible where this idiom is provided (complete


\(^{352}\) M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 125 notes that פֶּשַׂנ (hithpe.) is found in EA (Padua Papyrus I, recto 1.7) with the meaning ‘to be confounded, to be angry’. The fragmentary state of the Qumran text means that it is unclear whether or not it has preserved an equivalent for פֶּשַׂנ but the inflection of the verb (probably 3rd f. sg impf.) gives little reason to doubt its original inclusion. RtgJob’s rendering מְכֹלָל מְכֹלָל ‘[my soul] is vexed/troubled’ apparently represents a similar type of adjustment. At TgPsalms 42:5 (ed. de Lagarde) the translator’s modification of the idiom (‘[,] הֵלֵדְבִּי פֶּשַׂנ מָלְחִי הֶרֶשִּׁו מְכֹלָל) takes the form of an addition ‘ideas/thoughts of my heart’ rather than a divergent rendering of the verb (which is the same as that provided by 11Q10 here).

\(^{353}\) H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 163 n.83 erroneously includes this modification along with P-Job’s omission of one element of a Hebrew compound preposition in Syriac. A. Mandl, *Die Peshitta zum Hiob*, 26 notes its omission without comment while E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 192 comments ambiguously מְכֹלָל war P unbequem.
with suffixed preposition). There we see that this same idiom (נָשָׁ֨פֵּשׁ (Qal)) is rendered in a similar way with P-Job utilising the same root שָׁפֵ֖שׁ 'to be agitated' and omitting the prepositional phrase, as is the case here. While the meaning of the idiom is preserved to a large extent by the Syriac expression, the prepositional phrase (��) is a casualty of the process by which the translator provides his Syriac readers with a linguistically intelligible and acceptable text. It is perhaps not surprising that at least one representative of the English translation tradition (NIV) also shows a willingness to dispense with a formal rendering of the Hebrew in order to achieve a more idiomatic English translation.

While the preceding modification might be best understood as linguistically required by the difference between the source language (Hebrew) and the Syriac target language, the second example, drawn from the Syriac version of 36:9, is an example of an omission which seems to have arisen primarily as a result of the stylistic preference of the translator.

he tells ( _) them what they have done—that they have sinned arrogantly. NIV
then he declares to them their work and their transgressions, that they are behaving arrogantly. RSV

354 R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 334 notes that other appearances in the Hebrew Bible suggest that this verb may be used idiomatically with reference to grief (1Sam 1:15) or weakness (Lam 2:12, 4:1).
356 While failing to represent the form of the original in this respect, 'my soul ebbs away' (NIV) retains a verb ('to ebb') that nevertheless preserves the aspect of liquidity—an integral element in the Hebrew figure 'to pour'.
While both the English RSV, and the Qumran and targumic versions preserve the MT prepositional phrase יְהַלָּה 'to them' in their translations, P-Job supplies only the 3rd masc. pl. enclitic pronoun in conjunction with כָּאָם.\(^{357}\) P-Job’s use of the enclitic pronoun to represent the direct object (3 m pl.: כָּאָם) in place of the MT prepositional phrase is, it would seem, a reflection of the linguistic-stylistic difference between Syriac and Hebrew. In P-Job where a pronominal suffix is attached to the preposition ב in conjunction with the Hebrew verb יִשֹּׁר ‘to tell’ the translator usually renders with an objective suffix.\(^{358}\) However, the Syriac translator’s rendering of Job 33:23 יִשֹּׁר יְנַשֵּׁף יַרְמָלָה with כָּאָם shows that the translator may on occasion choose to preserve an equivalent of the lamedh which appears in the Hebrew. The translators of the NIV also provide an English rendering which dispenses with the prepositional phrase and makes use of the direct object.\(^{359}\) It appears then that unlike the other Aramaic versions which preserve an equivalent of the lamedh, P-Job lacks a representation of the preposition due to the translator’s linguistic-stylistic preference for the direct object construction.

Some of the difficulties involved in assessing linguistic-stylistic causes for omission are well illustrated by the following example drawn from P-Job 33:28.

---

\(^{357}\) Both 11Q10 and P-Job ‘modify’ the tense of the Hebrew consecutive imperfect by providing imperfect forms in Aramaic (נָשְׁרוּ) and Syriac (כָּאָם). The moribundity of the consecutive imperfect in these phases of Aramaic (although for Old Aramaic see V. Sasson, ‘Some observations on the use and original purpose of the waw consecutive in Old Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew’ VT 47 (1997) 111-127) means that the imperfect forms here, while formally closer to the Hebrew, do in fact represent a divergence from the MT (H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 83 n.54). This modification stems from the translators’ awareness that 36:9 stands as an apodosis clause to the protasis clause in 36:8 which makes use of participial forms (If the wicked are bound...). If the protasis contains a non-perfective verb form, the expected form in the apodosis would be a consecutive perfect form rather than a consecutive imperfect. (B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) § 38.2) The translators have maintained a non-perfective tense in their translation of this verse.

\(^{358}\) E.g. 1:15, 16, 19; 12:7. At 11:6 the rendering of the Hebrew imperfect with a Syriac participle precludes the use of an objective pronominal suffix. While the prepositional use of lamedh (to mark the indirect object) is most common with this Hebrew verb, it may on occasion take a direct object (Jb 17:5, 31:37).

\(^{359}\) An analogy to the Syriac כָּאָם in P-Job may be found in a common English equivalent: ‘to show’. Both ‘I will show it to him’ and ‘I will show him it’ constitute English constructions which would be acceptable to some (but perhaps not all) native English speakers.
He has redeemed my soul from going down into the Pit, and my life shall see the light.' RSV

While the Qumran translation supplies the Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew preposition מ, where it appears in the text before רַד, the translator responsible for RtgJob provides an alternate preposition ח to account for this element of his source text. 360 The Syriac translator, however, fails to provide any explicit representation of מ in the Peshitta of Job, leaving the direct object unmarked. The English translation’s comparable omission of this element at least suggests the possibility that it may be a difference of language (source vs. target) which has led to the Syriac translator’s adaptation of the text. This suggestion is made difficult, however, by other renderings of this Hebrew construction מ + רַד. The verb רַד, as with other Hebrew verbs of sense perception may take מ. 361 The Hebrew text of Job, however, shows this verb both with מ (3:9 מִלְּבָאֵל וּמִלְּבָאֵל יֵלְכֶא עַדֶּאָה) and without (31:26 מַרְחָא רַד מִלְּבָאֵל). At 3:9 and other instances where מַרְחָא takes מ the Syriac translator reproduces the preposition in his Syriac text (e.g., מַרְחָא מִלְּבָאֵל כַּלָּה). 362 If at other locations, the Syriac translator of Job has seen fit to follow the Hebrew in rendering the preposition, we are entitled to ask why he has not done so here. It is difficult to be certain about the cause of such variation, but it is perhaps worth noting that not only is the preposition omitted but the Syriac translation’s

360 It should be noted however that מ is also attested in some MSS despite the fact that several witnesses including Stec’s Base text (Urbinati) provide מ ‘from’ in place of Heb מ.

word order (S-V-O) is also at odds with that of the MT (S-O-V). Where the preposition is retained by the Syriac translator, the translation approach to the verses in question is very literal and preserves the word-order of the Hebrew along with both elements of the ב + ה נ ר construction (ג + א ל). The case for seeing the omission of the preposition here as being related to other language-oriented modifications derived from more idiomatic Syriac is strengthened by a similar modification two verses later at 33:30. There, where the Hebrew text appears to be slightly problematic (לָאָרְוָר הַאִירָוָר) the Syriac translation again dispenses with ב before ר ה in producing the following translation: נַו נַגַּה שִׁלֹּשָּׁה (to see the light of life). The fact that the Syriac again deviates from the Hebrew and again the preposition is omitted might be seen as corroborating the assessment of its earlier omission in v.28. While the assessment of 33:28 and 30 is complicated and not without uncertainties, it is nevertheless clear that while the Syriac translator sometimes chooses to follow the Hebrew in rendering the ב + ה נ ר construction, on other occasions the priority of preserving each element of the Hebrew text is overridden by other linguistic-stylistic considerations and the preposition is omitted as a result.

ם תיירל רה 33:29
לָאָרְוָר הַאִירָוָר xxiii, 8
א ל 11Q10
יִרְאֵהוּ הַאִירָוָר RtgJob
א ל הַאִירָוָר שִׁלֹּשָּׁה רָאֵהוּ חֲלוֹמִי נַהֲקָה רָאֵהוּ חֲלוֹמִי (___) P-Job

(____) God does all these things to a man—twice, even three times— NIV
Behold, God does all these things, twice, three times, with a man, RSV

362 See also 20:17 and 31:21.
363 For discussion of word order see Part Two.
364 S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (II), 252 suggest that this MT form may be redeemed by supposing the elision of heh ה נ ר.
While both RtgJob and P-Job provide the expected Aramaic equivalent (אַחַת) for the Hebrew exclamatory particle אָהֶל, the translator of P-Job does not supply an equivalent for this element in his Syriac version. In fact this instance of omission at 33:29 is one of eight cases in which the Syriac translator does not provide an equivalent for אָהֶל. While the translator provides the expected equivalent אַחַת in analogous situations before a quantitative at 13:1 (אָבֶּר) and a demonstrative at 26:14 (אֲבָר), the particle does not receive representation in the Syriac translation either here (אֲבָר) or at 33:12 (אֲבָר). In light of the minor semantic role played by the presentative particles and the lack of other discernible causes in the immediate context, it seems most likely that the translator’s failure to represent אָהֶל should be attributed to linguistic-stylistic preference. Support for this suggestion comes from the English translation tradition where the RSV provides an equivalent (‘Behold’) but the NIV opts to omit a rendering of this lexeme. While not always perceiving this particle as redundant, the Syriac translator is clearly not afraid to exclude it in his translation as and when the context demands.

If you are righteous, what do you give to him; or what does he receive from your hand? NRSV

---

365 H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 219 notes that in Job, Hebrew אָהֶל is apparently used both as a shortened form of אָהֶל, and as a conditional (Aramaism). These two usages account for the bulk of P-Job’s representation in Syriac with אַחַת (exclamatory) and אָהֶל (conditional).

366 The translator of P-Job shows a clear preference for positioning the demonstrative pronoun before אָהֶל in these situations (see 32:1 and particularly 42:1) and has therefore transposed the plural demonstrative pronoun אָהֶל to an initial position. For a brief discussion of the syntactic constraints with regard to אָהֶל see I. Avinery, ‘The Position of the Declined KL in Syriac’ *JAOS* 104 (1984) 333.

367 While the NIV’s customary practise appears to be non-representation of the presentative particle in Job, there are nevertheless exceptions to the rule (See 8:19 and 8:20).
While the targum translator (יִהוּד מָצָא) supplies an uncontracted form in his rendering of the Hebrew (יִהוּד מָצָא), both the targumist’s rendering and that of his Qumran counterpart (יִהוּד מָצָא) provide full representation of the formal features of the Hebrew text. The Syriac translator’s version of 35:7b on the other hand, not only diverges from the source text in terms of word order, but also in its failure to represent all the elements of the Hebrew text. As we have already seen with regard to the Qumran translation, although the Syriac ܐܢܘܡ ‘from you’ fulfils the role of the Hebrew יִהוּד מָצָא ‘from your hand’ and constitutes a semantic substitution, in terms of a formal analysis, the retention of the preposition and the 2nd masc. sg. suffix highlights the Syriac translator’s omission of an equivalent for יִהוּד מָצָא. The fact that the Syriac translation preserves an equivalent for this noun where it appears elsewhere following יִהוּד מָצָא raises the question as to why the translator has passed over it here in 35:7. Because the Hebrew expression יִהוּד מָצָא ‘from the hand’ is used virtually interchangeably with יִהוּד מָצָא ‘from’ in a variety of idiomatic Hebrew contexts, ‘to take/receive from the hand’ has obviously been perceived by the Syriac translator as unnecessarily elaborate language and the resulting Syriac translation has been preferred (ܐܢܘܡ ‘from you’). The suggestion that the Syriac translator’s provision of ܐܢܘܡ here constitutes an idiomatic adjustment would seem to receive support from the observation that, at Job 22:8b, where the translator also diverges from the Hebrew text (יִהוּד מָצָא, יִהוּד מָצָא) the Syriac translator falls back on the identical construction (ܐܢܘܡ ܐܢܘܡ ܐܢܘܡ ܐܢܘܡ ‘and a man of force takes it from him’)—namely, a suffixed preposition in conjunction with this same verb. This would suggest that ܐܢܘܡ ‘from you’ has been preferred here and יִהוּד מָצָא omitted due to stylistic

368 The parallel word order (prepositional phrase in final position) of the English and Syriac renderings here in 35:7 is, as we will see, a foreshadowing of similar agreements discussed in chapter 7.
369 An analogous example from 11Q10 (involving יִהוּד מָצָא, יִהוּד מָצָא ‘my flesh’) has been discussed above in chapter 2 (21:26).
370 See for instance 5:15, 5:20, 6:23 (2x) 10:7 and 27:22.
371 With regard to יִהוּד מָצָא specifically, examples may be found at: Nu. 21:26; 1 Sam 12:3,4; 1 Kgs 11:34, 35; 2 Kgs 13:25).
372 See BDB, יִהוּד מָצָא 5 (g) for other examples of this idiomatic use of יִהוּד מָצָא.
‘from you’ has been preferred here and "י" omitted due to stylistic preference—the element in the Hebrew text being omitted by the Syriac translator on account of his desire to produce a translation which is idiomatic and stylistically acceptable.

39:24b he cannot stand still at the sound of the trumpet. 39:25 When the trumpet sounds, he says Aha!’ RSV

39:24 he holds not back at the sound of the trumpet. 39:25 but at each (_____ ) blast he cries, ‘Aha!’ NAB

Beginning in verse 19 of chapter 39, the Hebrew poet depicts in some detail the terrifying majesty of a horse going into battle. Here in verse 24b, the shofar is sounded, presumably to signal the joining of the battle. Although, as we have discussed in the preceding chapter, the Qumran translation does not appear to have included a translation of 39:24, both the targum and the Peshitta do represent this verse in their renderings. While their treatment of the verb phrase (יָדַע מְבַזְּרָה) differs, these two translations nevertheless provide basically similar representations of the final phrase of the verse (קְלָל שַׁפָּר) ‘the sound of the shofar’. The targumist utilises the Hebrew loan-word שַׁפָּר in its translation, while the Qumran translator makes use in verse 25, of the same Aramaic noun שָׁפָר which appears in P-Job. As Sokoloff notes, later Jewish Aramaic dialects import this Aramaic representation (שָׁפָר) of the Hebrew term שַׁפָּר directly

373 For the translation of the difficult MT יָדַע מְבַזְּרָה RtgJob provides an interpretation ‘he does not stand still’ which is also adopted by various modern translations (e.g. RSV) and commentators (See E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 610 and R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 462) P-Job on the other hand appears to have resorted again to a contextual translation perhaps indicating that the Hebrew has not been clearly understood. The translator draws on the theme of the courage of the horse (v.22) in rendering מְבַזְּרָה ‘and he doesn’t fear…’
into their translations and reserve ידיע for referring to the horn of an animal.\textsuperscript{374} Tuinstra advances the suggestion that the Qumran translator has avoided providing ייעא here because this instrument (and therefore the Hebrew term) was utilised in the religious context within which the translator worked, and thus being sacred, was not appropriate for the translation of a description of cavalry in a profane war.\textsuperscript{375} Verse 25 of the Hebrew continues the description, repeating as it does so, the Hebrew term encountered at the end of v.24 (תנור). While some scholars have suggested that 11Q10's rendering of MT יברש is possibly a telescoped rendering of the end of verse 24 and the beginning of verse 25,\textsuperscript{376} both the translations of 11Q10 ידיע 'at the sound of the horn' and P-Job יברש parallel Gordis' suggestion that יברש at the beginning of verse 25 may be understood as: 'At the distant sound of the shofar'.\textsuperscript{377} Whereas both the targumist (יברנ) and the Qumran translator (ידיע) supply equivalents for both elements of יברש, P-Job's version of 39:24-25a appears to lack an element corresponding to יברש. It seems that the Syriac translator has assumed that his reader will not need reminding that it is the shofar which is responsible for the sound at the beginning of verse 25 having encountered ידיע 'the sound of the shofar' as recently as the end of verse 24. Here then the translator has consciously or unconsciously concluded that the repetition of יברש in close proximity is redundant and surplus to requirements according to the linguistic-stylistic constraints within which he worked. In

\textsuperscript{374} M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 157. In R. Hashanah. III.2 (Ib.26a) the mishnaic ruling that the ייעא may be made of the horns of all animals except that of a cow is justified by the fact that the latter is properly termed a ייעא. R. Jose challenges this by suggesting that all ייעא are ייעא.

\textsuperscript{375} E.W. Tuinstra, \textit{Hermeneutische Aspecten}, 34. Tuinstra's reference to 1QM (War Scroll) col. III suggests that the logic of this suggestion relies on the writer's use of ה'קברкер 'trumpet' rather than יונק in 1QM 3:1 ff. This suggestion while theoretically possible is essentially an argument from silence and relies on the unproven (and indeed unwarranted) assumption that the translator was in any definable sense 'sectarian'. In other words, 11Q10's non-use of ייעא may be explained equally well by the fact that the translator had no unique, technical or religious understanding of יברש but rather that ייעא was simply the generic term used by some Aramaic translators.

\textsuperscript{376} See preceding discussion of 39:24-25 passage in chapter 2.
the English translation tradition we see a similar type of variation with the RSV preserving the repetition in verse 25, while the NAB chooses to treat the text in a way which shares much with the Syriac.

To bring rain to no man's land, the unpeopled wilderness (____) NAB
to water a land where no man lives, a desert with no one in it NIV

As we have already seen in the preceding chapter, the Qumran translator has apparently seen the first of two near-synonymous phrases in this verse (שֵׁפֶהアニメ and פִּיר) as superfluous with respect to the content of the verse as he construed it. The stylistic constraints within which the Qumran translator worked have apparently allowed him to omit the latter phrase (שֵׁפֶהanimate) in his translation on account of its perceived redundancy. Unlike the Qumran text, the Syriac translation agrees with the MT in preserving equivalents for both of these Hebrew phrases (ב + תֶּחֶם and בְּאָדָם) as does the Rabbinic targumist. Having done so, however, the Syriac version deviates slightly from the MT in lacking the prepositional phrase ב (ב + 3rd masc. sg. suffix ‘in it’) which appears in the MT and is preserved in the other Aramaic translations. While, in formal terms, the suffixed preposition (ב) at the end of the verse appears to serve as a counter-balance to the verbal phrase of the first half of the verse (לְהַמַּעַל), in terms of conveying additional information, the lack of a corresponding prepositional phrase in the first half of the verse suggests that its contribution is negligible indeed. If the Syriac translator’s omission of an equivalent for ב has the incidental effect of enhancing the

---

degree of similarity between the two halves of the verse, it is interesting to note that his counterpart in the targumic tradition also performs a 'balancing act', though by quite different means. In the case of the Rabbinic targumist, the lack of a corresponding prepositional phrase in the first portion of the verse (...אֲרוֹם לְךָ בַּר vs. בָּרוּךְ הָאָדָם בְּמִי לְפָנָיו) has led not to an omission in the second hemi-stich but rather an addition in the first. There the targumist adds a suffixed preposition בַּר 'in it' in order to make explicit what is implied by the prepositional phrase in the MT at the end of the verse. Again, as was the case with the previous example, it is the NAB English translators who parallel the Syriac's treatment of this verse preferring an adjectival phrase to the NIV's explicit representation of the prepositional phrase. This then appears to be another clear example of the Syriac translator's willingness to pass over a formal representation of an element in the Hebrew text due to its perceived redundancy for a Syriac reader.

Three verses later at 38:29, the Syriac version of Job provides another example of an omission vis-à-vis the Hebrew text.

38:29 מַמְצַע מִי נָצֵא תַּמָּךְ וְכַבֵּדָה שֶׁמֶם מִן לָילָה? P-Job

ובָּן בָּתָל מִן נָצֵא נְלִיָּה שֶׁקֶף מִן לָילָה? 11Q10

מִן נָצֵא רָאֵם נָצֵא נְלִיָּה נְגָרָה מִן נָצֵא שֶׁמֶם מִן לָילָה יְהוָה P-Job

Out of whose womb came the ice? And the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it? ASV

From whose womb did the ice come forth, and who has given birth to ( ) the hoarfrost of heaven? RSV

In 38:29b, the Hebrew clause includes a pronominal suffix with the verbal form יָלְלָה (literally, '[who] has birthed it?'). Although there is nothing ungrammatical about this construction, its location in the present clause marks the 3rd masc. sg. suffixed pronoun

378 Interestingly, C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 84 does not reflect RtgJob's addition of this suffixed preposition in her English translation.
as resumptive in function. As such, this pronoun provides the reader with no new semantic information and is grammatically optional in Biblical Hebrew.\(^{379}\) Although the Aramaic dialects clearly possess the linguistic resources adequate for the representation of this construction, it is only the Rabbinic targumist and the Qumran translator who here provide the corresponding forms in their respective translations.\(^{380}\) The Syriac translator’s rendering of the Hebrew clearly shows that while יִּשָּׁפָה has been translated with the cognate Syriac root, the objective pronoun suffix has not been represented.\(^{381}\) While the loss of the resumptive pronoun in the Syriac version may mean a partial loss of emphasis, there is no appreciable effect in terms of the semantic content of the verse for כָּשֵׁם יָרְבֵּה, like יִּשָּׁפָה יָרְבֵּה still functions as the explicitly expressed direct object.

In a manner similar to previous examples, the Syriac translator has apparently considered the pronoun stylistically superfluous and omitted a rendering of it accordingly.\(^{382}\) In the English translation tradition we see a similar variation in the approach to rendering this Hebrew clause. While the ASV preserves the resumptive pronoun, its successor, the RSV modifies the Hebrew in translation in much the same manner as the Peshitta of Job.

Although examples drawn from a variety of different passages in P-Job provide a broad cross-section of textual material in which the phenomenon of omission may be examined, the Syriac version of Job also affords us the opportunity to see the application of this translation technique in a sustained manner at the beginning of chapter 39:

\(^{379}\) B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 4.7 locate their discussion of the resumptive pronoun in the context of the wider treatment of the Nominative-Absolue or casus pendens family of constructions.

\(^{380}\) RtgJob varies in its representation of the direct object, sometimes following the Hebrew in supplying a suffixed form, at other times attaching the suffix to the nota accusativi מ”. (E.g. 29:8, 30:17, 30:19, 30:27, 33:24). See M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 163 for a discussion of the one and only appearance of this form in the Qumran translation. While it occurs frequently in later Aramaic, it is interesting to note that RtgJob does not make use of it here (despite its occurrence three times in Chapter 40:1,2,6). It is unclear why, in this case, the translator of 11Q10 diverges from the normal pronominal suffix representation of the object.

\(^{381}\) Both E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 274 and G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 325 note this omission without advancing any suggestions as to how it might be explained.

\(^{382}\) H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 45 presents this case as a representative example of the category of motivation labelled ‘redundancy’.
Can you number the months that they fulfill, and do you know the time when they bring forth RSV

While the general meaning of the 39:2a is comparatively clear (i.e. Does Job know the number of months which the cows will complete/fulfill \( הָּלַמְתִּים \) before giving birth?\(^{383}\)) the lack of an explicitly represented relative pronoun in the Hebrew has apparently prompted some of its translators to provide one in their respective renderings.\(^{384}\) The targumist, like the English translators responsible for the RSV (‘that’), adds a relative pronoun \( מ_\) before \( שָׁלַמְתִּים \) ‘which they complete’ thereby marking the relative clause explicitly. The Qumran translator makes use of the same root in providing a masc. pl. ptcp. \( שָׁלַמְתִּים \) ‘are complete’ with \( וְיָרְדֵּהוּ \) ‘their months’ presumably functioning as subject.\(^{385}\) Not only does the Syriac translator fail to provide an explicit marker of the relative, the Peshitta of Job in fact lacks even a representation of the verb \( הָּלַמְתִּים \). That this type of Hebrew idiom was understood by some translators of the Peshitta is shown by the fact that where a similar idiom appears in Genesis 25:24 and 29:27, the Syriac translator of these passages renders \( שָׁלַמְתִּים \) with \( מ_ \) as the other Aramaic versions have done here. In fact, in light of the content of verse 1 ‘Do you know when the mountain

383 S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (II), 314 note that this verb \( שָׁלַמְתִּים \) is also used with reference to the completion of an allotted period of time in Gen.29:27 (ץֹּשֵׁש ‘week’) and particularly in connection with pregnancy coming to full-term (Gen. 25:24 \( נַעֲשַׁת לָּהּ אֵלֶּהָ יָרְדֵּהוּ \)).


385 M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 232. The reading of \( וְיָרְדֵּהוּ \) ‘months’ as subject of this verb (contra MT) has led the Qumran translator to modify the gender of the verb (fem. to masc.) in order to conform it to the subject. It is not uncommon for the translator of 11Q10 to add a suffix in order to make explicit what is perceived as being implied by the Hebrew. See ‘Translator’s Intervention’ (Conclusion).
goats bring forth? Do you observe the calving of the hinds? And the remainder of verse 2 which follows the clause under discussion, (…and do you know the time of their birthing?) it seems most likely that the Syriac translator has made a stylistic judgement and simply passed by this verb in his translation, perceiving that its omission would not deprive his rendering (‘Do you keep count of the number of months?’) of any significant meaning.\(^{386}\)

The Hebrew follows on from verse 2 above with a series of three short verbal phrases, consciously or unconsciously recreating the repetition and gradual progress of the birthing act itself. The targumist and the Qumran translator both provide translations which at least in formal terms correspond closely to the Hebrew text. \((V, Np + V, Np + V)^{387}\) The Syriac translator’s treatment of the preceding verse foreshadows his

\(^{386}\) H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 166 includes this instance among others classified as due to ‘intra-verse influence’. Although she does not justify her classification of this particular omission, it would seem that she has understood this omission as resulting from the translator’s desire to harmonise the two halves of the verse (perceiving that the first was unnecessarily overloaded by הָיָה). As she herself observes (p. 164) intra-verse influence and redundancy may work together to produce an omission in the Syriac rendering. In light of the explicit and almost over-loaded context, the mention of ‘counting months’ has clearly been perceived by the Syriac translator as so unambiguous as not to require the elaboration provided by this Hebrew verb.

\(^{387}\) The Qumran translation diverges from the Hebrew in a slightly different way however. 11Q10 has rendered MT הָיָה תֹּאֵר ‘they kneel/crouch’ as if it governs the direct object of the clause הָיָה תֹּאֵר whereas in the MT it is the subsequent verb which takes this direct object. This redivision of the first clause appears to have meant that the translator of 11Q10 has generalised the MT imperfect verb and translated with a participle הָיָה תֹּאֵר ‘they bear’. F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave II*, 157 describes 11Q10’s translation here as a ‘plain rendering’. E.W. Tiuintra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten*, 31 notes that the translator uses a ‘simpler idiom’ here and elsewhere in this verse.
modification of verse 3 here where the Peshitta preserves a much reduced translation. First, the Syriac translator provides both a waw conjunction and a temporal conjunction ‘when’ in order to establish a more fluent co-ordination between verse 2 and 3 in the Peshitta of Job. Because the Syriac ‘to bow, bend, kneel’ must clearly correspond to הבקעת, the two remaining sets of verbal phrases appearing in the Hebrew (והיכלתי את הנבון and התשעשעש) are apparently represented by the Syriac translator with a single verb. In grammatical terms the Syriac translator has provided a single verb phrase (without direct object) where the Hebrew possesses two verb phrases (each possessing an object). In semantic terms, the two more elaborate or explicit Hebrew clauses have been summarised by a single generic Syriac rendering. The Hebrew text’s explicit and repetitive narration of the birth of a calf has apparently been seen as stylistically unnecessary and overloaded and the Syriac version has been contracted accordingly. While this type of reductive translation tends to frustrate attempts to determine precisely which elements have or have not been omitted, it is nevertheless clear both that the Syriac translator has produced a rendering which lacks many elements of the Hebrew (and the other Aramaic translations) and that the most likely motivation would appear to be the translator’s perception that some elements in the Hebrew were stylistically redundant. While the NJB’s English translation does provide a fuller formal representation of the Hebrew than does the Syriac, the provision of an infinitival construction (‘crouch to drop’ vs. ASV) would seem to represent a stylistic contraction or reduction similar to that attested by P-Job.

388 For further discussion of P-Job’s treatment of the waw conjunction see Part Three below.
389 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 331 also observes that perceived redundancy has led the translator to omit material in his rendering of this verse. His suggestion that P-Job simply omits verse 3b due to its similarity to verse 3a. seems somewhat simplistic in light of the generic nature of .
Their young ones become strong, they grow up in the open; they go forth, and do not return to them. RSV

In verse 4, the Hebrew poet goes on to describe the process by which the newborn animals mature. While 11Q10 and RtgJob apparently make some attempt to render each element of the Hebrew text, we are again confronted with a Syriac text which is noticeably abbreviated when compared to either the Hebrew text or its sister Aramaic translations. While the Hebrew provides two clauses describing the maturation process: יתיללו / יברים יברים בכר ‘their young grow strong, they grow up in the wild’, the Syriac translator has apparently chosen instead to collapse the two statements into a single verbal phrase משלצתי חננלי משלסלי ‘their young grow up’ which once again suggests that the translator has perceived the elaboration of the Hebrew text on this topic as stylistically unnecessary. It might seem reasonable to suggest that because the Syriac translator has here provided a translation (משלים) which is cognate to the second of the two Hebrew verbs (ברֵך), it is ולֹלֵי which has been omitted, but this is difficult (and ultimately unnecessary) to prove. What seems evident, however, is that the perceived similarity of the two Hebrew phrases has led to their reduction by the Syriac translator. In the second half of the verse, we see that both the Qumran translator and the targumist have again provided translations which retain the antithetical structure of the Hebrew and represent the formal elements of the Hebrew quite closely (V + conj + neg. particle + V + Pp). P-Job’s version of the last half of 39:4 is on the other hand composed of a

---

39:4 11Q10 has however apparently rendered ברך בכר בכר ‘they grow up outside/in the field’ with a single form לשלמי ‘they (fem) send out’ (M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 152). For the Aramaisms in this verse, see R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 456.
single verb 'and (they) are weaned'. It seems quite clear that this rendering parallels that of v.4a in its telescopic treatment of the Hebrew text—obviously interpreting the antithetical 'going forth and not returning' as an overly elaborate Hebraic explanation of the weaning of the young. It seems quite clear that this rendering parallels that of v.4a in its telescopic treatment of the Hebrew text—obviously interpreting the antithetical 'going forth and not returning' as an overly elaborate Hebraic explanation of the weaning of the young. Again, the translator appears to have understood the Hebrew text quite clearly, but chosen to sacrifice a full representation of the formal elements of the Hebrew in favour of a shorter translation which conveys the desired interpretation to the Syriac reader.

In the next verse, 39:5, all three Aramaic versions of Job make use of roughly the same Aramaic idiom (Verb + מַשְׂרַתָן פָּרָה וּפָרָה וּפָרָה וּפָרָה) to render the Heb. מַשְׂרַתָן פָּרָה וּפָרָה וּפָרָה וּפָרָה ‘who set the onager free’ despite each using a different main verb. It is in the second half of the verse where we see the Syriac translator diverging from the Hebrew source text and the translations preserved in the other Aramaic versions. The Peshitta of Job understands the MT pl. מַשְׂרַתָן ‘bands, cords’ as a series of restraints which are, according to

---

391 It would seem unlikely that H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 297 is correct to see P-Job’s מַשְׂרַתָן ‘and are weaned’ as a rendering of MT מַשְׂרַתָן given that a cognate form has already been utilised in the Syriac translation of this verse. Similarly improbable is the reading of G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 331 who sees this form as a translation of מַשְׂרַתָן, on the (insufficient) grounds that the forms share two root letters.

392 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 85 notes that this Aramaic idiom is also used in Tg. Onqelos and Ps-J (Ex. 21:26, 27).
the translator, most suitably represented in the Syriac by אגננ ‘yoke’. But more interesting for the present discussion is the Syriac translator’s treatment of MT יִּפְשַׁל. In the preceding chapter, we noted that at 34:13, the Qumran translator failed to represent the second of two interrogative pronouns due to its perceived redundancy. Here we see that both the Qumran text and that of the targumist preserve equivalents to the pronoun. But, as with the Qumran translator in 34:13, the Syriac translator has here opted to omit a translation of the second יִּפְשַׁל, apparently perceiving that the first interrogative pronoun אֶת could do ‘double-duty’ according to the canons of Syriac style within which he operated. In this connection, it is also worthwhile noting the Syriac’s apparent equivalent for MT יִּפְשַׁל. While the Qumran translator and targumist provided cognate equivalents for the Hebrew, the Peshitta opts to represent יִּפְשַׁל in a different manner. Despite the fact that different lexemes are in use in the first (אֶת) and second (אֶת) stichs, the semantic difference between the two has apparently been perceived as negligible. This perceived synonymy has resulted in the Peshitta’s pronominal representation (אֶת אֵלֵא ‘let the yoke slip from him’) in an attempt to avoid the repetition of the noun. While this latter modification is best described in formal terms as a substitution, both it and the obvious omission of the interrogative pronoun in P-Job’s translation must be attributed to the translator’s tendency to dispense with elements in the source text which he perceived to be stylistically redundant. Although no single English translation provides parallels of both adaptations discussed above, the NIV provides an example of pronoun substitution for stylistic reasons while the translation preserved in

393 For H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 293, this is an example of contextual translation. While it would be unwise to always draw a hard and fast line between categories, in this case because there is some semantic connection between the source lexeme ‘bonds, cords’ and target lexeme ‘yoke’ it seems that this adjustment should be understood as a contextual specification (182).

394 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 331 notes without explanation that the pronoun has been omitted in P-Job.

395 Both BDB and KB supply ‘wild ass’ as the English gloss for קֶרֶס and יִּפְשַׁל.

396 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 331.
the BBE illustrates how English translators may be constrained in ways quite similar to their ancient Syriac counterparts.

Weitzman, in his recent introduction to the Syriac version of the Old Testament, suggests that Job 39:3-4 (along with other passages in Job) were compressed by the Syriac translator due to the difficulty of the text. While these verses are by no means the easiest within the Hebrew text of Job, the above analysis of these verses would suggest that this compression has taken place for other reasons. As we have seen, even in producing a radically reductive rendering, the Syriac translator appears to have understood the text he was translating (see e.g. 39:4b). And when viewed within the context of 39:2-5, we see that the omission/compression of material in vv 3 and 4 fits well indeed with the translator’s manifest tendency to omit material which he perceived as superfluous to an acceptable Syriac rendering of the Hebrew.

The above discussion of the Syriac rendering of 39:2-5 has treated a range of modifications—some outright omissions but others less easily classified. From this we see that the theoretical line between omission and substitution, while often clear and distinct, is on occasions rather blurred. But while some of the examples presented here from the beginning of chapter 39 have eluded strict classification in formal terms, all reflect the Syriac translator’s tendency to reduce the length and complexity of the text due to its perceived redundancy not merely sporadically but also in a sustained way.

In P-Job’s version of 34:12 we see that the Syriac translation diverges both from the Hebrew and the other Aramaic versions in its treatment of the beginning of the verse.

---

Although only the first portion of the Qumran text’s translation of this verse is preserved, it is sufficient to note that the resounding negative assertion of the Hebrew has become a rhetorical question in 11Q10.\(^{398}\) Our focus here, however, is on the Aramaic versions’ treatment of הַקְּנִיָּהָ ‘surely, truthfully (i.e., in truth)’\(^{399}\) The Qumran translation has provided a temporal particle יַכְּנַה ‘now’ in place of Heb. הַקְּנִיָּה ‘surely’ perhaps in order to differentiate its renderings of the two successive Hebrew asseveratives. The targumist responsible for RtgJob’s version of the Hebrew represents both elements of the source text in his translation (תָּכְּנַה בֵּית) adding a preposition -ב before the nominal כְּנַה ‘truth’ in order to bring the translation in line with one of the characteristic expressions of this adverb in Aramaic.\(^{400}\) The treatment of the double asseverative in the Qumran translation finds a parallel in the Syriac text in terms of the perception of its repetition. But where the translator responsible for 11Q10 opts to substitute יַכְּנַה ‘now’ for Heb. הַקְּנִיָּה ‘surely’, the Syriac translator has simply omitted the latter particle in his target text. H. Szpek, noting that Syriac כְּנַה ‘truly’ is most often en-

---

\(^{398}\) E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten*, 23 observes that this modification (substitution of interrogative he for Hebrew כְּנִיָּה) is paralleled in the LXX. Although the rhetorical question of the following verse (34:13) ‘Who appointed him over the earth...etc?’ is not retained in 11Q10’s translation, the Qumran translator has apparently attempted to relate his rendering to v.12 here.

\(^{399}\) R. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 386 suggests that this repetition is an indicator of Elihu’s passionate convictions.

\(^{400}\) G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (Darmstadt: 1905) § 42.4. The provision of a preposition (albeit a different one) is also attested in some English translations.
countered as a rendering of כִּנְךָ observes that כִּנְךָ is omitted in the Syriac translation of the double asseverative both here and at 19:4. Because this expression appears in the Hebrew Bible only here and at Job 19:4, it is difficult to determine whether this omission/reduction is to be attributed to a linguistic constraint operative in translating from Hebrew to Syriac or simply a stylistic preference of the translator. In either case, however, the evident motivation for this omission is the perception that the representation of כִּנְךָ with כִּנְךָ has made the provision of an equivalent for כִּנְךָ unnecessary. While the linguistic-stylistic constraints operative in the ASV’s translation (1901) of the Hebrew allow for a full representation in its English rendering (‘Yea, of a surety’) its successor, the RSV (1952), like the Syriac, prefers to provide an equivalent for only one of the two Hebrew terms and omits ‘yea’ accordingly.

Many scholars have found the placing of certain portions of Job 27 in the mouth of Job himself to be problematic and have thus suggested alternative attributions. Regardless of its attribution, the fragmentary preservation of the Qumran translation here at 27:17 focuses our attention perforce on the Aramaic versions’ rendering of the latter half of the verse. The Qumran translator provides Aramaic כִּנְךָ כִּנְךָ ‘the innocent, upright’

---

401 H.M. Szpeck, Translation Technique, 228. We have already seen in our discussion of 35:13 how the particle כִּנְךָ is also omitted at the beginning of the verse in P-Job’s version.

402 M. Pope, Job, 187 for instance, sees 27:8 as the beginning of Zophar’s rejoinder to Job, while S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (I), 229 see verses 11-12 as a Joban interjection in 7-23 which should then tentatively be attributed to Zophar.
as an equivalent of the absolute form יִשָּׁם in the Hebrew text. The pairing of יִשָּׁם and יִשָּׁמְרוּ in parallel stichs also takes place earlier in Job at 22:19 and there, as here, the translator of RtgJob provides the appropriate Aramaic equivalents (חָסִין and חָסִינוּ respectively). In P-Job’s version of 22:19, these same lexemes appear in Syriac guise (אֲמַרְתּוֹן and אֲמַרְתּוֹ), but here in 27:17 we see that the translator has treated this word-pair in a different fashion. In the first portion of the verse the expected equivalent (אֲמַרְתּוֹ) is provided, but in the second part פָּרְנַשׁ fails to receive representation in the Syriac translation. (Apart from the omission, the translator’s rendering of 27:17b departs but little from the Hebrew text מְלִי מַכְסָא (___) מְלַכְסָא ‘and their silver/money he divides’.)

Although the grammatical subject is made clear from the inflection of the verbal form מָלַךְ, the decision to omit a rendering of פָּרְנַשׁ means that the antecedent of this verb is now the cognate translation (אֲמַרְתּוֹ) of the first stich which parallels it. It seems most likely that the translator’s omission of the second of these two synonymous terms here results from a perception that the explicit repetition of the latter term would overload the Syriac rendering of the verse in light of the occurrence of אֲמַרְתּוֹ earlier in the verse.

The fact that both members of this word pair are preserved in the Syriac version of 22:19 is a reminder that stylistic preference is precisely that—preference—and that the search for standardisation and rigorous consistency in rendering will often be frustrated by the art of the translator. Nevertheless, the above example does substantiate and corroborate earlier illustrations of the Syriac translator’s tendency to omit elements in translation which he deemed to be superfluous in an idiomatic Syriac rendering of the Hebrew text.

403 If B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 399 is correct to see the final keh of the 11Q10 form as a marker of the emphatic form as opposed to an indicator of the 3rd f. sg form (M. Pope, Job, 192) he may also be right in suggesting that the Aramaic translator has intended to clarify for his reader, the collective sense of the reference to ‘the innocent’.
404 The addition of the 3rd masc. pl. suffix serves to reiterate the antecedent ‘evildoers’ (v.13).
405 A. Mandl, Die Peschitta zum Hiob, 26; E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta’, (1899) 40.
406 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 163.
All men have looked on it; man beholds it from afar. RSV
All people have looked on it; everyone watches it from far away. NRSV

Having exhorted his hearers to praise the work of the LORD (ָנהר) in the preceding verse 24, Elihu now in verse 25 affirms this work as universally observable. Again, as with the previous example the Hebrew employs a synonymous parallel structure in order to convey this thought. And again, the Qumran translator and the targumist supply equivalents for the subject of the first half of the verse (ןבמ) and its counterpart in the second (ןבמ). Here in v.25a of chapter 36 we see that the translator of P-Job has chosen to provide the anticipated Syriac rendering (דוקס) of Hebrew דוקס. Where its counterpart דוקס appears in the second stich, however, the Syriac translator does not provide an explicit representation of the subject, preferring to rely on the verb קלק ‘they see’ to provide the specification of subject. While this exact word pair does not appear in the same order elsewhere in Job, the pairing of terms referring to man, mankind or humans does appear frequently. The fact that in each of these instances, the Syriac translator provides representation of terms in both stichs in his Peshitta version of Job raises the question of why an equivalent has not been supplied in this case. The answer seems to lie not only in v.25 but also in the final words of

407 The interpretation of the Hebrew as a collective has apparently led to the selection of a Syriac plural equivalent. For discussion of P-Job’s treatment of collectives see H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 64-65.
408 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 305 and H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 163. The Qumran translation’s equivalent for Hebrew דוקס parallels the Syriac translation of דוקס in the 25a, as does its use of a plural verb form (דוקס).
v.24 before it. There we note that the final stich of the MT (ןַּשְׂרָא הָאָמְרֵם) ‘which men have praised’ anticipates the repeated appearance of these terms in verse 25 with the provision of the undetermined agent (םְּנַפֹּס) as subject.\textsuperscript{410} While under normal circumstances, the repetition of terms such as מְדַנֶּשׁ and שִׂמְהָב in parallel stichs was clearly not seen as requiring modification in the Syriac translation, the appearance of a substantially synonymous term (םְּנַפֹּס) at the end of the immediately preceding verse here in chapter 36 has clearly led the translator to abandon a rendering of the last of these terms in 36:25b. Here again, when the stylistic constraint of redundancy is triggered, the Syriac translator is willing and able to pass over elements which he deems to be superfluous for an adequate translation.

\textit{Summary of Unique Omissions in P-Job}

Unlike the assessment of the Qumran translation, the question of whether or not material has in fact been omitted in the Syriac version or has simply been lost in the degradation of the manuscript is not one which requires the same attention. If, however, this particular element of uncertainty is removed from the analysis with respect to P-Job, the specific reasons for a portion of text going unrepresented in the Syriac version of Job are, on several occasions, no more clear than was the case with the Qumran translation.\textsuperscript{411}

While there are instances where the cause of the omission is now obscure, it does also appear to be the case that on several occasions the Syriac translator has passed over elements in the source text as a result of the challenges posed by the Hebrew text. The

\textsuperscript{410} A misreading of the text has led the Syriac translator to include a rendering of מְדַנֶּשׁ in his version of 36:24b: מָמַר מְדַנֶּשׁ.

\textsuperscript{411} In some cases the uncertainty in assessing an omission is rather to be located in the issue of formal classification. It is the, at times, fuzzy line between substitution and omission (see discussion of Job 39:2, 5) which explains why some modifications classified as omissions by Szpek (21:7, 36:33, 39:2) have been treated as substitutions in the present discussion. Their inclusion here would however not materially alter the conclusions of our study.
important point for the present discussion is not the precise assessment of the Syriac translator’s ability to deal with the Hebrew text, but rather the fact that the translator, when confronted by a text which was perceived as problematic in some way, was willing to omit a range of elements in his Syriac translation in an attempt to ameliorate the situation.

Other examples presented from the Syriac translation of Job suggest that, like the Qumran translation, certain elements may be omitted by the Syriac translator not primarily because they themselves were perceived as problematic but because the translator’s understanding or modification of the surrounding co-text or verse as a whole has rendered their inclusion unnecessary or inappropriate in the production of an adequate Syriac text.

The quite substantial differences between Hebrew and Syriac in matters of language and style bring us again to a series of omissions which, as was the case with the Qumran translation, seem to be best located at various points along a linguistic-stylistic continuum. As with 11Q10, it is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between linguistic necessity and stylistic preference with respect to the Syriac translator’s omission of a given element, but certain trends with regard to P-Job’s rationale for omitting elements in translation may nevertheless be discerned in several of the examples which were discussed.

While some modifications are best understood as linguistically required by the difference between the source language (Hebrew) and the Syriac target language, other omissions are not as regular in their occurrence, being found in some instances but not in others. The lack of uniformity would seem to suggest that the constraint at work in these latter cases is not linguistic necessity but the stylistic preference of a translator bent on providing an acceptably idiomatic Syriac rendering.

One specific manifestation of the translator’s stylistic preferences can be seen in the comparatively large number of examples where an element in the Hebrew text fails to receive representation in the Syriac translation due to its perceived redundancy.
Whether particle, prepositional phrase, suffix or noun, the Syriac translator feels free to omit the element of the Hebrew text if it is perceived as superfluous and unnecessary for an acceptable Syriac rendering. The clearest examples of such adaptations are those in which a synonymous or nearly synonymous element precedes the one which has been omitted, thereby explaining the translator’s perception of the latter’s redundancy.
CHAPTER 4

RtgJob

Having dwelt at some length on the phenomenon of omission in the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job, we now shift our focus to the third translation, the Rabbinic targum of Job. As was the case with its sister translations, modifications of omission have received no systematic treatment in the study of the targum. Indeed, it is almost safe to say that the topic has gone entirely unmentioned when the subject of translation technique has been raised.412 This assessment seems to hold true even when more recent treatment of the targum is considered. Although Mangan, in the introduction to her English translation, deals with the question of the targum’s approach to rendering the Hebrew text, no specific attention is given to explicitly differentiating modes of representation and her discussion focuses on modification involving either substitution or addition.413 Indeed even R. Weiss’ extensive work on the targum of Job (to which Mangan’s discussion is heavily indebted) makes only slight mention of the phenomenon of omission.414 It is in the light of this lack of previous attention to omission, that we turn now to an examination of examples in the Rabbinic targum of Job.

412 E. L. Epstein A Critical Analysis of Chapters One to Twenty-six of the Targum to the Book of Job, (PhD dissertation Univ. of Chicago, 1941) 93ff. enumerates several characteristics of RtgJob’s translation. While his observation that the RtgJob modifies the number (sg. to pl. and vice versa) in relation to the MT suggests that the portion of text analysed by Epstein was scrutinised by him in some detail, no mention of omission is to be found in his discussion.

413 See C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 14.

414 R. Weiss, הרבורי והאמרים לדון אלבין, 220-9. Weiss’ reference to the omission of material with regard to the translation of recurrent phrases (220) does not seem to be supported by textual examples in the material which follows (220-9).
Verse 28 of chapter 31 sees Job admit that, had he been seduced by the worship of other gods, he would indeed be deserving of judgement. It is the second half of the verse and its representation in the Rabbinic targum which is our focus here. The Qumran translation agrees with the MT in representing the lamedh before the divine name (א"ל / נו"ל) while the translator of P-Job also provides a preposition in the same position but supplies ו in where the MT possesses lamedh. The translator responsible for the Rabbinic targum of Job, however, does not appear to provide any equivalent for this element of the Hebrew text, despite the fact that where this same Hebrew verb (חשת) is used at 8:18 with the preposition - ב (ב 'חש) RtgJob agrees with the MT in supplying Aramaic ב and ב, the cognate preposition. The key to understanding the targumist’s omission here appears to be located not purely within the targum of Job itself but also in the related targum of the Psalms. R. Weiss’ detailed study of the Tar-

---

415 For discussion of verse 27 ‘and my hand kissed my mouth’ and possible Near Eastern parallels see M. Pope, *Job*, 235.

416 See 6:28 where P-Job also makes use of this preposition in conjunction with this verb. The use of this preposition suggests that the Syriac translation should perhaps be understood as intending a ‘lack of faithfulness before God’ rather than the Hebrew version which suggests denial or lying to God. See R. Payne-Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903) (hereafter Payne-Smith) 204-5 and H. Szpek’s translation in *Translation Technique*, 216.

417 While two of the Sephardi witnesses (תיע) within the MS tradition of RtgJob preserve a variant here at 31:28 (חרביכו) it is clear that this variant owes its existence to an inner-Aramaic confusion of כ and ב. See D.M. Stec, *The Text of the Targum of Job*, 214 for full citation of variants.
gum of Job showed that substantial similarities existed between it and the Targum of Psalms in terms of lexicon and choice of translation equivalents. In the Hebrew text of Psalms the verb שָׁחַב appears in conjunction with the preposition lamedh and in all three locations, it is clear from the context that the construction must mean ‘to cringe (i.e. tremble in obedience or submission).’ In TgPsalms 66:3, where the Hebrew text reads: (ןַחַב יְהוָה) ‘your enemies will cringe before you’ the targumist faithfully reproduces the Hebrew expression: וַיִּבְרְמוּ לָּךְ. Where the expression appears in the MT at 81:16 the despisers of the LORD will cringe before him’ it is again translated in a precise and literal fashion by TgPsalms (בְּרִית לְיהוָה). As already mentioned, in chapter 8, verse 18 of Job we find the more common use of מַחְשָׂב where it takes -כ and has the meaning of ‘to deny’. When we turn to the construction at 31:28 it is also clear from the context that the meaning must be ‘to deny’ but we see that in the Hebrew here the verb nevertheless takes the lamedh. Remembering that in the Psalms ל + מַחְשָׂב refers to cringing in obedience or submission, it is easy now to see that the lamedh preposition has failed to be represented by the targumist due to the potential ambiguity which would arise if it were included here, where the expression can in no way be construed as referring to ‘cringing’ but must refer to the denial of God. In other words, for the targumist to have rendered the lamedh here in 31:28 would have introduced an unacceptable source of confusion/ambiguity in light of the understanding (‘to cringe submissively’ = מַחְשָׂב לְיהוָה = ל + מַחְשָׂב ) already established in the closely related targum of Psalms.

418 R. Weiss, תרגום חכם ותהלים, 74. See 93ff. for expressions in common between these two texts. C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 13 provides an abbreviated list in the introduction to her translation. She follows Weiss in seeing the parallel expressions as significant but not themselves necessarily requiring the supposition of a common translator.

419 Ps. 18:45, 66:3 and 81:16; BDB, חָשָׂב (3).

420 In Ps. 18:45 the MT: חָשָׂב יְהוָה is rendered by TgPsalms (ed. de Lagarde) slightly differently: יִבְרְמוּ כְּדָרְךָ.

421 The inappropriateness of this translation is exemplified by hypothetically substituting this expression in the RSV’s translation...: *‘this also would be an iniquity to be punished by the judges, for I should have been cringing before God above’.
Another example of the targumist’s apparent omission of an element which appears in the Hebrew text is drawn from the Aramaic translation of Job 42:5,

I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees thee; RSV

Although it may not be entirely clear in what way Job’s eye has ‘seen’, what is evident in Job 42:5 is the contrast between hearing and seeing. The contrast is pushed home by the use of the conjunction and the common Hebrew adverb of time הנ (“but now’). At 30:16 this same construction is rendered faithfully by the Aramaic versions with הנ (11Q10) and, רמא (P-Job). Here, however, while the Syriac and Qumran translations provide these same equivalents for the Hebrew, most witnesses within the RtgJob textual tradition fail to provide their readers with the anticipated equivalent of Hebrew הנ. While it might be reasonable to attribute the omission of such an element to error or some other incidental motivation, closer examination of the Rabbinic targum’s translation of this verse suggests that the cause for the text’s deficiency here lies elsewhere. Specifically, it is important to note that while a few witnesses to RtgJob (ח ב ד) follow

---

422 M. Pope, Job, 348 rejects Tur-Sinai’s suggestion that an earlier form of the book of Job made more of the divine self-revelation. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (I), 372 nicely summarise one view of the contrast: ‘Vision is here contrasted as direct personal experience of what a person is and does with hearing as knowledge at second-hand, knowledge of some other’s experience or report of that person, knowledge which, even if not mingled with error, as was the traditional doctrine of God, which had been passed on to Job, must at best be blurred and indistinct.’

423 Some RtgJob witnesses from Stec’s Group 2 (א ב כ) and Group 3 (ג ד) preserve the expected Aramaic equivalent (רמא). The fact that one of the Group 1 MSS (א) shows a later hand ‘correcting’ its deficient manuscript by supplying רמא suggests the possibility that some of the above manuscripts, having originally lacked this equivalent, may also have been supplied with it at some point during the textual transmission process.
the MT (שְׁפַהּ עֵינֵיִי, רָאָתָה ‘now my eyes see/have seen you’) at this point the majority reading offers a radically different suggestion: שֵׁעֲיָא לְאָה דְּמִיתָא תַּרְבּוֹ ‘my eye has not seen you’. Michael Klein, a scholar well-familiar with such adjustments presents the Rabbinic targum’s treatment of Job 42:5 as a textbook example of the ‘converse translation technique’—a modification which is effected by the translator in a variety of ways in order to ‘convert’ (i.e., reverse) the meaning of the source text.\footnote{M. Klein, ‘Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique’ Biblica 57 [4] (1976) 529 n.31. The means of achieving this end include addition or deletion of the negative particle, replacement of verb, resolution of rhetorical question etc. See also recently R.P. Gordon, ‘“Converse Translation”’.} If it is clear that some part of the RtgJob tradition has reversed the meaning of the Hebrew text such that Job’s claim is that his eye has not seen the deity, we are entitled to inquire why such a modification has taken place. In his thorough analysis of divine revelation in the Pentateuchal targumim, Chester links the use of רָאָתָה נֵרָא לְהַרְאָתָה with the theme that God cannot be seen and presents a number of renderings in the Pentateuch which demonstrate targumic awareness of and sensitivity to this issue.\footnote{Gen. 32:31, 33:10; Ex 24:10, 11; 33:11, 20, 23. As A. Chester, Divine revelation and divine titles in the Pentateuchal targumim TSAJ 14 (Tübingen : Mohr, 1986) 362 notes, ‘...PJ (Pseudo-Jonathan) has the most developed interpretation, but the various devices used by the different Targumim indicate a consistent refusal on the part of all the Targumim to allow the possibility that God can be seen.’} With respect to the targum of Job for example, at 21:27 the MT shows an active construction ‘I [Job] know your thoughts’ (וֹנֵרָא דְּמִיתָא מָחָשְׁעָתָא, נֵרָא לְהַרְאָתָה ‘your thoughts) are revealed before me’. This same treatment of verbs such asידע ‘to know’, האזין ‘to see’ or سمע ‘to hear’ in connection with primarily (but not exclusively)\footnote{The use of such constructions in contexts where the deity’s transcendence is not at stake (R. Weiss, הָעֶדֶד וּהָאָרָא מֶלֶךְ הָאָרָא וּלְנָפֵי אָראָב 209 also notes its occurrence in non-divine contexts.) may suggest a complicated history for these types of expressions.} the divine subject appears with various degrees of frequency and consistency throughout RtgJob and indeed large parts of the targumic corpus.\footnote{A. Chester, Divine revelation, 20 notes that the expression is found commonly in the pentateuchal targumim and latter prophets, primarily although not exclusively, with a divine subject in connection with verbs such as ‘to know’, ‘to see’ or ‘to hear’. It also appears in the Latter Prophets, e.g. I Kgs. 8:39; II Kgs. 8:30. In RtgJob, this equivalence also appears at 23:10 (MT Subj.: God), 30:23 (MT Subj.: Job) (although in both cases one or more Group 2 MSS read the Aramaic cognate מַיִלָא). For the use of מְרַדְדַב in the}
particular application of the converse translation technique to the targumist's theological/ideological concern to avoid Job's explicit claim to have seen the deity with his own eyes. What light then does this modification shed on our primary concern in this verse—the omission of the temporal adverb נַיְּצָה in the majority of witnesses to the targumic text of Job? As mentioned above, in the Hebrew version of 42:5 לְשׁוֹנִי אַל תִּשְׁמַעַתִו וְתִשָּׁמַעַתִו נַיְּצָה רָאָתִי by hearsay, I heard you but now my eye has seen you' the adverb נַיְּצָה functions to temporally contrast two aspects or phases of Job's perception of the divine (hearing and seeing). The targumist's transformation of the Hebrew into a negative statement ('by hearsay, I heard you but now my eye has not seen you') renders the inclusion of the expected קִדְרָן at best superfluous and at worst confusing, for the contrast emphasised by the targumist is not a temporal one (hearing then, but seeing now) but one of differing modes of perception (hearing, but not seeing). The fact that several of the witnesses which diverge from the MT in showing the negative also do not include an element corresponding to נַיְּצָה in their translation supports the link between the two modifications. The above analysis would strongly suggest that a theological/ideological constraint felt by the translator has had the knock-on effect of requiring the exclusion of an element (קִדְרָן) which would otherwise expect to receive representation in the targum translation.


428 It is worth noting that in every other instance (18x) where Hebrew נַיְּצָה occurs in Job, the Rabbinic targum supplies an equivalent expression.

429 Of the four witnesses which follow the MT and do not add the negative (K ו ב ו) the first three also represent נַיְּצָה with קִדְרָן.

430 The fact that ו preserves קִדְרָן but then adds the negative would tend to confirm the suggestion that it is not the appropriateness of קִדְרָן, but rather the issue of divine revelation which is of primary importance in this situation.
Summary of Unique Omissions in RtgJob

In retrospect, it is not surprising that commentators on RtgJob have not given much space to a discussion of omissions in their analysis of the RtgJob for there appears to be in fact comparatively little to discuss. In the first instance of omission in the Rabbinic targum of Job, we saw that the primary motivation for excluding an element of the Hebrew text was the translator’s concern for a clear and intelligible text. In the case of 31:28, the translator apparently perceived (correctly?) that the preservation of an exceptional use of a Hebrew construction ($^7 + שָׁאָל$) in his Aramaic translation would have entailed an unacceptable level of ambiguity and confusion (vis-à-vis the deity) in light of the translation of this expression in the related TgPsalms. What seems rather remarkable, however, is that this instance in 31:28 appears to be the one and only example of this type of omission in RtgJob (or more accurately, that portion of RtgJob for which parallel passages exist in both the Qumran and Syriac translations).

The targumic translation of Job 42:5 provides the present analysis with a second instance of omission in RtgJob. In this case, however, it is the addition of the negative particle for theological/ideological reasons which appears to have prompted the subsequent exclusion of the Hebrew adverbial element in the Aramaic translation of the targumist. The relationship between these two modifications in all but one textual witness to RtgJob suggests that the adverb has been omitted only because the preservation of Aramaic $^ד$ was apparently perceived by the targumist as creating an impermissible degree of confusion in light of the crucial change required by his theological/ideological perspective.

Unlike the analysis of the other Aramaic versions, the very lack of other examples of omission in the targumist’s translation of Job makes the task of classification and summary a rather tricky business. While the first modification seems to have forced itself on the translator as a linguistic necessity due to the concern to avoid ambiguity with respect to the deity, the second case of omission seems also to have been re-
quired—but required as a result of a logically prior and theologically constrained modification in the co-text.431

431 This distinction would seem to be supported by the parallel translations (Aramaic and English) of the respective passages. In the first instance, the lamedh preposition provided by the Hebrew and preserved in 11Q10 and RSV(English) may also be omitted in English (ASV) and substituted in Aramaic (P-Job: 21:10). It is not surprising to find that the omission of the temporal adverb, with its origins in a preceding extralinguistic modification, finds no parallel in the other versions, whether English or Aramaic.
CHAPTER 5

OMISSION IN THE ARAMAIC VERSIONS OF JOB

Having looked at the phenomenon of omission in the three Aramaic versions of Job in their own right, we are perhaps now in a better position to compare and contrast their approaches to the Hebrew text and to suggest some answers to the questions set forth at the beginning of this section. Clearly, the question of whether the Aramaic translators of these three versions leave elements of the Hebrew text unrepresented must be answered in the affirmative. Equally clear is the fact that this simple affirmative answer must be nuanced considerably in order to accurately and usefully reflect the similarities and differences which are evident when the Aramaic versions’ attitudes toward omission are seen in the light of each other.

In light of the substantial linguistic affinities of the three target dialects utilised by the translators of the Aramaic versions of Job it is perhaps surprising that more examples of shared omission were not uncovered in the course of the synoptic comparison. The shared omissions which were uncovered did, however, in some respects foreshadow the findings arrived at when each translation was studied in its own right. The sole instance of a minus shared by all three Aramaic versions involved the omission of a minor element functioning as a grammatical specifier (suffix) which was apparently perceived by all the translators as being incongruous within the context in which it was found. This concern with a basic level of intelligibility was reflected to varying degrees in the assessment of the individual translations which followed. The only other shared omission was to be found in common between the Qumran and Peshitta versions of Job and again it was a Hebrew suffix which was found to be lacking in these two translations. While the Hebrew text in question seemed to be, if not problematic, at least irregular,
the additional factor of a preceding modification was also seen to play a part in the common omission.

Likewise, in the assessment of unique omissions in 11Q10 and P-Job we saw that irregular or problematic Hebrew texts and modifications of the co-text were responsible for the translators’ exclusion of certain elements in translation. In light of the extremely low number of unique omissions discovered in the Rabbinic targum of Job (2) it is, in retrospect, hardly surprising that the Rabbinic targum should share no omissions with either P-Job or 11Q10. Indeed, in light of the targum’s lack of omissions it is somewhat unexpected that even a single omission was found to be shared by all three Aramaic versions.

In order to helpfully answer the question of what type of elements are omitted in translation and why, it is necessary to look more closely at the ways in which the various versions’ agree and differ in their tendency to omit source text elements in translation. From the outset it is worth remembering that the fragmentary state of the Qumran manuscript means that the analysis of omissions is complicated by two factors not encountered in the Syriac and targum texts. In some cases there seems to be insufficient space in 11Q10 to contain the expected representation of the Hebrew text. While many of these suspected omissions are sizeable, determination of the cause for their absence in the translation is difficult. A second complicating factor is the very real possibility that an element in the Hebrew text which does not appear in a corresponding location in the Qumran translation (i.e., an apparent omission) may have been in fact transposed to another position now no longer preserved in the Aramaic rendering.

While the above features are unique to the Qumran translation, common ground is found between P-Job and 11Q10 in other cases. In particular, both translations present instances where an element in the Hebrew text has been passed over in translation, but the reason for the omission is not particularly clear. In comparison with the Qumran text, the Syriac translation presents more examples of omission in which the precise
cause for the deficiency is unclear, but the range of possible explanations displayed by the two versions is basically similar (error and textual difficulty, linguistic-stylistic and/or theological preferences, alternate Vorlage, inner-Aramaic textual corruption).

A more significant parallel may be suggested by the Qumran and Syriac translators’ omission of the negative particle when translating the Hebrew into Aramaic/Syriac. In neither case can we be sure of the precise motivation, but in both cases the translators of P-Job (21:4) and 11Q10 (35:13) may have omitted the negative particle in order to provide an acceptable rendering of what may have been perceived as an ideologically or theologically difficult text. In any case, although the targumist is also willing to implement the converse translation technique on ideological grounds (42:5), it is important to note that this implementation in the targum is facilitated through the addition rather than omission of the negative particle, as is the case in the Syriac and Qumran versions.

The Qumran and Syriac versions also both bear witness to the fact that their translators were willing to pass over an element in the source text because of the perceived challenge presented by a given Hebrew text. In most cases the element passed over in translation is either a small functional word or morpheme rather than a large portion of text. And in particular, it seems that prepositions and prepositional phrases (P-Job: 36:7, 37:12; 11Q10: 29:7, 34:13, 42:11) were fair game for omission by both translators when seen as contributing to a difficult Hebrew text. Again it must be remembered that the ‘problem’ which has given rise to an instance of omission may have stemmed from a lack of Hebrew linguistic competence or from a deficiency or corruption within the Hebrew text itself. The important point, however, is that when a ‘difficult’ text is encountered, both the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job may resort to omission.

432 The phenomenon of transposition in 11Q10 is discussed in chapter 6.
433 This is neither surprising nor particularly significant. It seems obvious that if similarities were assessed on the basis of what is uncertain in two texts then virtually any text could be compared favourably with any other.
While it has been suggested with respect to Chronicles that the Syriac translator’s ability to cope with a difficult Hebrew text suffers in comparison to that of his targumic counterpart,⁴³⁵ the above analysis does not provide significant substantiation of this suggestion with respect to P-Job and RtgJob. It must be remembered that omission is only one way of presenting the results of the translator’s activity [mode of representation] and that addition or substitution may also be employed by the translator when confronted by a text perceived as problematic.⁴³⁶ In light of this, we may only conclude that whereas the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job seem willing to omit elements in order to facilitate their translation of passages which they have perceived to be difficult, the targumist does not provide illustrations of this tendency.

It is quite clear that on some occasions in both 11Q10 and P-Job, a textual minus has arisen under the influence of a prior translation decision. In other words, the omission of a given element seems to follow as a result of the translator’s attempt to provide an idiomatic expression in light of a modification in the immediate co-text. The general impression suggested by these examples is that in both the Syriac and Qumran translations, certain elements may be sacrificed in the translation process for the sake of idiomatic fluency. Specifically, both translators show a willingness to pass over prepositions as a result of the perception that their inclusion would not provide the necessary sense in the re-constituted Aramaic text.⁴³⁷ As well, both translators exclude interrogative elements as a result of co-text considerations.⁴³⁸ The focus here is not the nature of the ‘prior’ modification which has necessitated a given omission. These may range from the translator’s alternative verse division to their failure to come to grips with a difficult Hebrew text. Rather the point to be emphasised is that the priority of preserving a for-

⁴³⁵ This seems to be one distinction which M.P. Weitzman, ‘Is the Peshitta of Chronicles a Targum?’, 193 makes between the targumist and the Syriac translator in their respective renderings of Chronicles.

⁴³⁶ At 38:25 for instance, although the targumist does not omit an element in his translation (like the Syriac translator), the large expansion is clearly provided as a means of making sense of a challenging text. Likewise at 42:11 where the Qumran translator resolves an irregular Hebrew text through omission, the targumist’s full representation of each element of the source text is facilitated by means of supplementation.

⁴³⁷ 11Q10: 37:18, P-Job: 35:11.
mal one-to-one rendering is overridden in the Qumran and Syriac translations not only when a given element is perceived as inappropriate or unacceptable, but even when the 'problem' has been created by a modification of the surrounding textual fabric. This would seem to emphasise that the primary priority for both of these translators is intelligibility and idiomatic fluency as well as underlining the suggestion that for them, the primary unit of translation is the phrase rather than the word.439

The topic of idiomatic fluency leads directly to another group of omissions which are found in common in the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job. In some cases it seems to be the very reconstitution of the Hebrew text into the respective Aramaic target dialects which has led to the textual minus, rather than a prior modification of the context. The reconstitution of the source text into Aramaic involves both linguistic and stylistic adaptation. In terms of these categories, elements are apparently omitted because they are perceived by the translator as either not required i.e. constrained stylistically-poetically or not permitted i.e. constrained linguistically, by the form of Aramaic into which the translation is being made. While it is often apparent that a modification is broadly linguistic/stylistic in nature, we must on some occasions be satisfied with locating a given adaptation somewhere on a continuum between the stylistic and the linguistic. Nevertheless, in a few cases, the nature of the omissions within P-Job and 11Q10 suggest that they are more likely to be related to properly linguistic constraints. It is interesting to note that in addition to the Syriac's obvious linguistic tendency to leave the interrogative he without representation, the most certain candidates for omission due to language difference between Hebrew and Aramaic/Syriac are again prepositions.440

439 M.P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament, 22-23 in discussing the issue of segmentation with respect to the relationship between the Hebrew and Syriac texts in the Peshitta, concludes that the translators of the Peshitta proceeded phrase-by-phrase and that the numerous cases of word-for-word correspondence are simply due to the similarity of structure of Hebrew and Syriac.
440 For numerous examples of the omission of interrogative heh see discussion of 38:28 in chapter 3 above. Prepositions omitted due to language difference are found in 11Q10 (34:30) and P-Job (30:16). In the case of P-Job's omission of prepositions at 33:28, 33:30 and 36:9 it is difficult to disentangle stylistic and linguistic considerations.
While a few modifications are best understood as linguistically required by the difference between the source language (Hebrew) and the target languages of 11Q10 and P-Job, other omissions which occur in these texts are not as regular in their implementation. Constraints which mean that an element is omitted in one text, yet preserved elsewhere in the Aramaic translation in virtually an identical co-text suggest that the issue is less one of linguistic constraint than stylistic preference. In other words, this type of irregularity speaks not of a linguistic constraint but rather suggests that some elements have been in some sense passed over voluntarily by the translators of the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job in an attempt to provide an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew text of Job. Specifically while the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job show a willingness to represent the Hebrew particle נק on some occasions in Job, these translators are also willing and able to leave it unrepresented in their Aramaic translations if it is perceived as stylistically superfluous. These instances clearly show that the stylistic constraint of economy of expression has in this case overridden any commitment the Qumran and Syriac translators’ might have felt to furnish an Aramaic equivalent for each element in the Hebrew text. Indeed the above analysis clearly illustrates that the perception of stylistic superfluousness in these two versions is not limited to minor particles. The breakdown of elements omitted by these two versions suggests that while both the translator of 11Q10 and that of P-Job perceive elements in the source text as redundant, they differ in terms of which type of elements are more frequently perceived as such. While the Qumran translator tends to omit more suffixes and verbs or verbal phrases than his Syriac counterpart, the Peshitta translator is willing to omit a wider range of elements as surplus to requirements and appears to do so on a more sustained

441 See for instance 11Q10 (35:14, 36:29) P-Job (34:12).
442 While some omissions are due to general stylistic preferences, the clearest examples of omissions due to redundancy are those in which a synonymous or nearly synonymous element precedes, in close textual proximity, the one which has been omitted (thereby explaining the translator’s perception of redundancy).
443 (11Q10) 36:29, 40:8, 19:17, 29:10 (P-Job) 38:29.
444 (11Q10) 33:24, 40:12, 41:9, 42:11, 42:10 (P-Job) 39:2.
445 See for instance P-Job’s perception of redundancy and resulting omission of another prepositional phrase at 38:26 and an interrogative pronoun at 39:5.
basis (39:2-5) than does the translator responsible for 11Q10. The translators, however, are roughly similar in their perception and omission of nouns or noun phrases as redundant or superfluous.

It is perhaps at this juncture that mention should be made of the two omissions found in RtgJob. On first glance, the two instances do not seem to be related in terms of motivation or cause. In one case the potential ambiguity of the Hebrew text has apparently required the omission of a preposition, while in the other case a prior addition (theological-ideological motivation) has required that an element be omitted in order to avoid the production of a nonsensical Aramaic translation in the targum text. These types of modifications do find parallels in the Qumran and Syriac versions, and might well have been discussed above, but the exceptional nature of these modifications by the targumist prompts us to search for a fuller explanation for their implementation in the targum. The fact that the targumist does not rely on omission elsewhere in order to resolve perceived ambiguities may suggest that the translator has perceived these particular instances of potential ambiguity as being particularly acute. And in fact, when consideration is given to the context of both of these examples it seems that both of RtgJob's two unique omissions are made in order to resolve a potentially uncomfortable ambiguity with respect to the deity.

Although two of the three omissions found in the targum of Job seem to be special cases concerned with the avoidance of particularly acute problems of ambiguity, it seems safe to conclude that as a rule, omission is not an adjustment utilised by the targumist in the production of the targum translation. In the Aramaic translations of 11Q10 and P-Job, on the other hand, omission seems to be employed as a means of providing their respective readers with linguistically intelligible and stylistically acceptable Aramaic renderings. Indeed, in terms of locating the Aramaic versions' use of omission

---


447 In 31:28, the targumist must omit a preposition in order to avoid supplying an Aramaic translation which would result in 'cringing' rather than 'denying or lying to' the deity. In 42:5, the adverb is removed in order to allow the Aramaic translator's theologically acceptable rendering 'but my eyes do not see you (i.e., the deity)' to make coherent sense.
within the context of general translation theory, we see that many of the omissions found in the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job can be accounted for within the framework of linguistic-stylistic adjustments. Omission due to the perceived redundancy of synonymous terms (as we have just seen amply illustrated in 11Q10 and P-Job) is a linguistic-stylistic adjustment recognised by the modern translation theorist.448 Similarly, it is recognised that translators must often take into account the fact that constraints with regard to explicitness and implicitness may vary between source and target language. Such an awareness is evident in the Qumran and Syriac translators’ omission of suffixes and nouns of reference. While there is no sign in the targum translation of any propensity toward the omission of a given element as a result of its perceived redundancy, it should be emphasised that this is not the same as saying that the targumist does not perceive redundancy in the text.449 Rather, it can only be concluded that on those occasions when a redundancy is felt to be present in the Hebrew text, it is not grounds for omission on the part of the targumist but instead, often gives rise to expansion or elaboration according to midrashic principles.450

If certain qualitative differences are evident between 11Q10/P-Job and RtgJob in terms of their use of omission, what may be said regarding quantitative assessment? A precisely accurate quantitative assessment of omission is not only a conceptually difficult task but also a largely unnecessary one in light of the dozens of examples provided by 11Q10 and P-Job on one hand and the virtual lack of instances found in the Rabbinic Tg of Job on the other.451 It is evident that in the case of the Qumran and Peshitta translations, omission is employed on a frequent basis for a variety of reasons in the attempt to produce a linguistically intelligible and stylistically acceptable translation. In

448 E. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating, 231.
450 R. Weiss, 233. For midrashic parallels to some of these verses see ad loc. in C. Mangan, The Targum of Job.
451 The uncertain nature of some omissions in 11Q10, the question of whether to count words, characters, instances of omission or indeed verses in which omission takes place are just a sample of the variables which would complicate a thorough-going quantitative assessment of omission.
contrast to the situation in these translations, the Rabbinic targum of Job presents virtually no evidence for such a practise and omits elements in translation extremely rarely and only to alleviate acute cases of perceived ambiguity.\textsuperscript{452}

\textsuperscript{452} As Lord Atkin clarified, 'A rule is not proved by exceptions unless the exceptions themselves lead one to infer a rule' (E. Gowers, [ed.] Fowler’s Modern English Usage, 176). These exceptions found in RtgJob do not of course prove the rule of targumic non-omission. They do however call our attention to, and heighten by contrast, the targumist’s lack of omission which might otherwise pass unnoticed.
PART TWO

TRANSPOSITION
CHAPTER 6

11Q10

Having looked at the phenomenon of minuses or omissions in the Aramaic versions of Job, we now turn our attention toward translation divergence of a different sort. In cases of transposition in translation, while the basic elements of the original text are preserved in the rendering(s), the order in which these elements appear diverges from that found in the putative source text.\textsuperscript{453} If the word order constraints of a target language are identical to that of the source language, or flexible enough to reproduce the source text word order without stylistic strain, then we might well be faced with a situation of zero variation. In the present case, however, the fact that Hebrew and Aramaic (of whatever dialect) are related and cognate languages does not entail that they are subject to the same word order constraints.\textsuperscript{454} It seems reasonable then that our evaluation of the Aramaic translators’ treatment of their Hebrew source text should pay particular attention to deviations from its word order. As was the case with the treatment of omission, we are concerned with the following questions:

1. Do the Aramaic versions diverge from their putative source text in terms of the order of elements presented?
2. If so, what cause may be established for these transpositions?\textsuperscript{455}

\textsuperscript{453} See E. Nida, \textit{Toward a Science of Translating}, 235 for several examples of the impact of word order constraints on modern Bible translation.
\textsuperscript{454} See C. Brockelmann \textit{Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen} (Band II) (Hildesheim, 1961) 432-3.
\textsuperscript{455} The form of this question differs from the corresponding question posed in our analysis of omission for an important reason. As will become clear in the course of the following discussion, in a case of transposition the elements of the source text will be retained (albeit dislocated) in the rendering but it is often impossible to specify which of the rearranged grammatical elements has been ‘transposed’. To take a hypothetical example, if the MT word order V-S-O is transformed to S-V-O it is possible to conclude that V has been ‘brought forward’ as to be adjacent to O. On the other hand it is equally possible that S has been ‘pulled back’ as it were, under a word order constraint which requires that S take the initial position in the clause. For this reason, while recurring patterns may be noted below, the concern to classify the
What light, if any, does the phenomenon of transposition shed on the question of the relationship between the Aramaic versions of Job?

But before proceeding with an analysis of the texts with a view to answering these questions, we must give consideration to some of the methodological issues which inform the following discussion.

While study of word order in a given language may take the approach of seeking to investigate and elucidate a range of dominant and secondary word order constraints in the target language before turning to the translation, recent investigation into word order discrepancies between the Greek versions and the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible have concluded that it is rather the supposed Hebrew source text which must serve as the starting point for any analysis. But it is of course at this point that the indeterminacy of the study of ancient versions makes its presence felt for an ancient translation’s word order ‘deviation’ may of course be merely a reflection of an already existing word order variation in the Hebrew text which lay before the translator (so long as this ‘variant’ word order does not somehow violate the word-order constraints of the Hebrew.) Alternatively, there is the possibility that at some point in the history of the translation’s transmission, a variant word order has been introduced into the text which is quite at odds with both the source text and the original literal translation. Keeping all of the above considerations in mind, it does also seem reasonable to assume that some word order discrepancies between a translation and a source text have arisen in the process of translation. Of these latter word order divergences attributable to the translator’s intervention, a distinction (if at times only a theoretical one) may be drawn between those introduced as a result of stylistic preference and others which are linguistically

456 As opposed to, for instance, beginning with the target language and noting deviations from a ‘regular’ word order. The problem with the latter approach is that in languages with a comparatively free word-order the determination of ‘normal word order’ is far from straightforward and requires an exhaustive grammatical analysis of language or literature of a non-translational nature. On this point both G. Marquis, ‘Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel’ Textus 13 (1986) 67) and S. Olofsson, ‘Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint: Questions and Possibilities’ SJOT 10 (2) 220) agree.

457 These three possible sources of word-order deviation are agreed upon by G. Marquis, ‘Word Order as a
constrained by the target language. As Oloffson makes clear, if the word order of a given target language is fixed, deviations from the source text in translation reveal only the word order constraints of the target language (properly linguistic constraints) rather than the stylistic preferences of the translator.\textsuperscript{458} While in the case of several dialects of Aramaic, the word order is generally characterised as ‘free’,\textsuperscript{459} Szpek has discovered that with this ‘freedom’ of word-order comes added complexity and the difficulty of distinguishing between linguistic and stylistic motivations. While consistency of modification throughout a text, parallels in other Aramaic texts, and conformity to ‘rules’ of Aramaic grammar are of course factors which would push a given transposition toward the ‘linguistic’ end of the linguistic-stylistic continuum, variation (particularly in close proximity) and a lack of parallels in the other Aramaic translations would speak against such a judgement and suggest that the transposition has rather resulted from the translator’s stylistic preference.\textsuperscript{460} While distinguishing between the three basic causes for word order deviation in translation may at times be difficult, certain instances will seem clearly to belong to one or another of these categories. Furthermore as Marquis has noted, a certain number of modifications best explained in linguistic-stylistic terms may shed light on others whose sources are less clearly discerned.\textsuperscript{461} While further methodological comments will be provided as appropriate, the above considerations must be

\textsuperscript{458} For S. Oloffson, ‘Studying the Word Order’, 221 only optional modifications properly belong in discussions of translation technique.

\textsuperscript{459} E.M. Cook, ‘Word Order in the Aramaic of Daniel’ Afro-Asiatic Linguistics 9 (3) (1986) 15 gives explicit voice to what may be the implied comparative element of this characterisation: ‘Compared to Hebrew, [DA’s] word order is remarkably free, although both languages have a comparable set of devices to reduce ambiguity.’ The general tendency has been to see ‘freeness’ of word order as being particularly associated with Eastern Aramaic. With regard to Syriac for instance T. Nöldeke, Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik, § 248 concludes ‘Die Stellung der Haupttheile des Satzes zu einander ist sehr frei.’ Whether BA represents Eastern Aramaic (Kutscher) or not (Rowley) the consensus is that the word order of BA is also ‘free’.

\textsuperscript{460} In light of the possibility that different books within a translation corpus (i.e. targumic, Peshitta, LXX) may have been translated by different translators (for Peshitta see M.P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament, 203) the first order comparison is made within each text before extending the search for parallel forms/treatment outside the translations of Job. On the subject of variation in Syriac translation see I. Avinery, ‘Problèmes de Variation dans la Traduction Syriaque du Pentateuque’ Semitica 25 (1975) 105-9.

\textsuperscript{461} G. Marquis ‘Word Order as a Criterion’, 68.
taken into account as we move to an evaluation of transposition in the Aramaic versions of Job.

Transposition in 11Q10

While word order in the Qumran translation has not received much attention in comparison with some other features of the text, S. Kaufman noted in his fine review article of the editio princeps that the Qumran translator ‘...was not bound to the word order of MT as is almost always the case in the later targums’. The format and focus of his treatment of 11Q10 meant that Kaufman’s illustration of this assessment was limited to the presentation of a single case, namely 11Q10’s translation of MT 21:6. In fact, Kaufman was not alone in noticing discrepancies between the word order shown in the Qumran translation and that of the MT. Takamitsu Muraoka, on turning his attention to the question of the time and place of 11Q10’s composition, made a dialectal case for the translation’s origins in the East. Suggestive of such a provenance were the several instances where the divergent word order of the Qumran translation seemed to Muraoka to reflect ‘sumero-akkadian’ word order rather than a ‘genuine Semitic’ syntactic arrangement. In support of this position, Muraoka marshalled several examples of 11Q10’s divergent word order vis-à-vis the MT. His useful contribution to the subject, however, was undoubtedly never intended as a comprehensive investigation and therefore the present study seeks to evaluate the examples cited by Muraoka alongside other instances of transposition in 11Q10 and the other Aramaic versions of Job.

462 S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, 324. Although here referring to ‘later targums’ Kaufman makes no specific reference to RtgJob in his study. His primary text (or grammar) for comparison is lQGap.
463 See discussion of the Aramaic versions’ treatment of 21:26 below.
465 Interestingly, Job 21:6, the lone example cited by S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, 324 does not appear in Muraoka’s list of examples despite seeming to admirably support his case. See discussion ad loc.
466 Indeed, a comparison with P-Job (a text composed in a language which at the very least manifests ‘Eastern’ affinities) would seem certain to shed significant light on the word order component of Muraoka’s argument.
If our investigation of omission in the Qumran translation was qualified to some extent by the fragmentary preservation of the manuscript, the same may be said for the evaluation of transposition. As was noted at the beginning of that discussion the lack of a translation corresponding to an element in the Hebrew text may be due either to its genuine absence in 11Q10 or, alternatively, to its transposition to a portion of the Aramaic version which has since been lost to the elements. Of course, if the preserved portion of 11Q10 displayed no cases of transposition, any such ambiguity would disappear and we would be safe in assuming that the absence of an element in the translation was indeed an omission rather than a transposition now lost from view. As we will see, such is not the case for the preserved portion of 11Q10 does indeed show clear cases of word order discrepancy and thus, to begin with, we must at least take up the cases where the fragmentary nature of the manuscript prevents absolute certainty.

They are gaunt with want and famine; They gnaw the dry ground, in the gloom of wasteness and desolation. ASV
Through want and hard hunger (________) they gnaw the dry and desolate ground; RSV

While the lack of a Syriac translation of this verse has already been discussed above, here our attention is focused on the treatment of the rare Hebrew lexeme תָּלָקָד, ‘hard, lifeless, barren’. If, as seems likely, [בּ] should be reconstructed as an equivalent for MT תָּלָקָד, then we are left to determine how the remainder of the Qumran translation corresponds to the Hebrew of the MT תָּלָקָד. It seems most likely that the

Qumran translator's rendering of לְעַרְבִּים 'barren' has either been transposed to the head of the verse (and now lost) or simply omitted. The main argument for such a supposition is that the following text (יָגוּר אֶת־עֵין 'they were grazing on the greenery...') seems more likely to be a rendering (albeit a none too literal one) of MT כָּפרֵךְ. The translator's selection of Aramaic 'to pasture, graze' would seem to fit with an interpretation of the Hebrew term as 'to gnaw'. In this case מֵעַרְבִּים 'greenery (of the desert?)' would constitute either an addition made by the translator in order to supply an object for his Aramaic verbal phrase or as Duhm has suggested quite independently of the Qumran translation, the original MT text read מֵעַרְבִּים in precisely this location. The Rabbinic targumist by contrast preserves an equivalent of לְעַרְבִּים in an order corresponding to the Hebrew text. The targumist's interpretation has perhaps been influenced by Job 3:7 and Isaiah 49:21 where this lexeme לְעַרְבִּים is used in contexts which connect it with maternal barrenness for the translation offered here מִלְּאֵל 'without child' is less ambiguous and more prosaic. In the case of the fragmentary Qumran translation then, we are left uncertain as to whether a rendering of the Hebrew lexeme has even taken place, let alone its particular character. It may well have been transposed to the beginning of the verse (as the English ASV translators of the Hebrew have done) but there are no solid grounds for ruling out its

468 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 546 here agrees with M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 124-5. The Hebrew root מֵעַרְבִּים may be cognate to Syriac and Aramaic roots having the meaning 'to gnaw' or alternatively be related to Syr. (pa’el) and Aramaic ‘to flee’. See E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 431; R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 330.

469 The spelling of מֵעַרְבִּים for a 3rd masc. pl. pf. verbal form is unprecedented in Aramaic. B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 548 suggests a copyist’s omission of the expected waw is due to confusion of consonantal and vocalic waw occurring sequentially.

470 B. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob, 141.

471 His interpretation of the verbal form derived from מֵעַרְבִּים as מֵעַרְבִּים כָּפָר 'the evil (ones) were fleeing' shows the provision of a 3rd masc. pl. form of מֵעַרְבִּים. This addition is parallel to that of 11Q10, but while the Qumran rendering includes a clarification of the object of the verb, the RtgJob’s text provides a clarification of the unstated subjects (here as elsewhere identified by the targumist as ‘the evil ones’); Cases such as 36: 5, 8 and others like them (e.g. 6:10, 34:26 T2) seem to suggest that the themes of ‘righteousness’ and ‘wickedness’ are of particular importance to the targumist. (See C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 33 n.11).
omission altogether or indeed its transposition to an alternate position as is the case in the English RSV.

\[
23:2 \quad \text{וא התוים כליה שותה יד יבשה על אנותיה:} 11Q10 \\
\text{אף יומת דינא? [...? מושי] (___)} \quad \text{שתור יד, (___) ר"ת [ ___]} \\
\text{לוודו ליווא מוביר מואר מחרת הѣמא על הַחֹזֵה:} \quad \text{RtgJob} \\
\text{אמר תמציה חצץ חצץ, בָּשְּׁךָ נְאֵךְ חַלְתָּהוּ.} \quad \text{P-Job}
\]

Today also (___) my complaint is bitter; his hand is heavy despite my groaning. NRSV

With the exception of one manuscript witness, the targum of Job provides an equivalent (מִרְיָם) for Hebrew ‘bitter’ in a location which corresponds to the MT.\(^472\) The translator of the Syriac version also follows the word-order of the Hebrew here, translating this sole occurrence of the Hebrew noun in Job with a verbal form מִרְיָם ‘was bitter’—perhaps in order to produce a verbal clause in parallel with v.2b.\(^473\) When we turn to the Qumran text, however, we see that 11Q10’s now only partially preserved rendering of 23:2 suggests that the translator has understood the verse not as two independent propositions but rather as a subordinate construction (causal clause) beginning with מִי מושי ‘because’.\(^474\) Again, due to the fragmentary state of the Qumran text, it is unclear whether the translator of 11Q10 has omitted or merely transposed his rendering of מִי מושי ‘bitter’. If, as the editors of DJD 23 have supposed, the lacuna preceding מִי מושי... should contain an equivalent to the Hebrew מִי מושי there may be insuffi-

\(^{472}\) The sole exception is MS ד (See D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, 157).

\(^{473}\) G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 185; H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 278 suggests that this modification stems from the translator’s confusion of nominal and verbal forms of מִרְיָם. It is difficult to adjudicate between these two alternatives and it is not impossible that both causes may have played a part in P-Job’s translation.

\(^{474}\) Variously vocalised forms of מְבוּאֲשָׁר appear in both Jewish and Christian Palestinian Aramaic. See F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 102 for other Aramaic forms of this preposition. Incidentally, R. Gordon, The Book of Job, 254 also renders this as a subordinate construction in his English translation of the Hebrew.
cient space for a rendering of יתא. Further weight is perhaps added to an argument for reconstructing an equivalent in the following lacuna by the presence of יתא following שנוה. Although it is impossible to be certain what followed this form, the appearance of the relative would obviously suggest a qualification of the preceding construction. This qualification may well have taken the form of an Aramaic equivalent of יתא, but unless further textual material is found this suggestion remains a purely hypothetical one.

Can you, like him, spread out (___) the skies, hard as a molten mirror? NRSV
With Him, have you spread out (___) the skies, Strong as a cast metal mirror? NKJ

475 The editors of F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave II, 101 have suggested reconstructing יתא (RtgJob MS 3 also supplies יתא). However, P-Job יתא might also be plausibly reconstructed.

476 In rendering MT יתא 'complaint, thought' the translator of RtgJob has substituted נמרוד. As is the case with the translations of 11Q10 and P-Job ( ethereum) the targumist's use of נמרוד in this context as an equivalent for Job's bitter complaint precludes any specific and intentional use of this term here as an anti-anthropomorphism. In other cases in RtgJob this Hebrew lexeme is most often translated with a similarly generic term (e.g. 21:4 מלח [see also 7:13, 9:27, 10:1 etc.]) and thus it seems that although the use of the word here appears to have the effect of softening the translation ('my bitter complaint'> RtgJob 'my bitter word') there does not seem to be a theological motive behind this substitution which may instead have been the result of confusion arising from semantic shift: in later usage in Hebrew and Aramaic נמרוד seemed to lose much of its plaintive denotation and has come to mean in many contexts, 'conversation'. For references to usage in Middle Hebrew see KB2 (3) 1321. E. Shoshan, The New Dictionary (Heb.) (Jerusalem, 1968) (7) 2672 (1) 17277 לשון נמרוד יתא. יתא נמרוד ביבי אלנימי, יתא עז עת ואינש, יתא עת יתא, יתא עת יתא.

477 As is clear from the NRSV's rendering, some English translators do not introduce the relative in this situation but do provide the predicate adjective following rather than preceding the qualified noun.
While the Qumran translation’s lack of a preposition before אֵלְכֵּלָה (MT: אֵלְכֵּלָה לָמָּה) has already been discussed, we are here concerned with the translator’s representation of the preceding suffixed preposition (וָאֵלְכֵּלָה ‘with him’). Although both the targum and the Syriac translation provide the expected Aramaic representation of this element in an order corresponding to that of the Hebrew text, the Qumran translation shows no text between what is clearly a rendering of an initial verbal form (וָאֵלְכֵּלָה) ‘you inflate’ and the following direct object (אֵלְכֵּלָה ‘the fog’). The question again is whether to presume that a transposition has taken place and to reconstruct an equivalent in the surrounding lacunae or to assume that the translator has failed to represent this element of the source text in the Aramaic translation. The original editors of the text clearly favour the latter option proposing [וָאֵלְכֵּלָה לָמָּה] ‘Est-ce que tu sais gonfler...’ as a reconstruction of the beginning of the line. While the editors of DJD 23 admit the possibility of such a construction, they prefer to supply the prepositional phrase [וָאֵלְכֵּלָה לָמָּה] ‘Can you, with Him, inflate the fog...’ due to its closer correspondence to the presumed Hebrew Vorlage. Without the appearance of additional fragments, confirmation of either proposal remains impossible, but in some English translations (NRSV, NKJ), the divergences from the Hebrew word order show a preference for preserving the contiguity of the main verb of the clause (‘spread out’) and the object (‘the skies’) thereby displacing the prepositional phrase which intervenes in the Hebrew. The latter editors’ suggestion of the transposition of the prepositional phrase by the Qumran translator would similarly conform to such constraints and thus, whatever force may be granted to these parallels clearly points in the direction of a dis-

478 For discussion of 11Q10’s treatment of this somewhat challenging Hebrew text see above (chapter 2, ad loc.).
479 Editio princeps, 69 as well as J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 67. This reconstruction has clearly been suggested to the editors by the Qumran translation’s treatment of v.16b (וָאֵלְכֵּלָה לָמָּה) in the preceding line (xxix, 7).
480 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 148.
481 In the case of the NRSV the prepositional phrase is allowed to split the auxiliary (‘can you’) and main (‘spread out’) verbs but not permitted to intervene between main verb and object.
placement rather than an outright omission. Again, however, the fragmentary nature of the text does not allow for firm conclusions.

\[36:30\]

\[xxviii, 8\]

Lo. He hath spread (over it) His light. And the roots of the sea He hath covered, YLT

Behold, he scatters his lightning (about him), and covers the roots of the sea. RSV

Neither the Qumran text nor the Peshitta of Job preserve an equivalent for the initial form which appears in the Hebrew text (Josh). It is possible, but by no means certain that the waw provided by the former (and some manuscripts of P-Job) is meant as a formal substitute for the Hebrew particle but there is little semantic or functional connection between the two lexemes. But this treatment of the initial lexeme in the Hebrew is not our primary focus for again here in 36:30 we are confronted by a Qumran text which does not provide equivalents for all the elements of the MT—or at least not in the same order. All three Aramaic versions provide the same cognate rendering of Hebrew שֵׁרֶשׁ, and the targumist and Syriac translator approximate the Hebrew in following their renderings with respective equivalents of the Hebrew preposition (תָּבֹא). While all three translators also provide similar equivalents for the following substantive (תָּנָא), the Qumran text presents a word order which differs from that of the MT and its fellow

482 The suggestion is certainly not that English and Aramaic/Syriac possess identical linguistic-stylistic constraints for any reader of both languages might easily disprove this assertion. Rather the suggestion here is that similar modifications in the translation of the same (Hebrew) source text into different languages may reflect some degree of overlap in terms of linguistic-stylistic constraints. Indeed, in light of the comparatively limited number of linear word order variations possible, it is not surprising that word-order parallels may be detected in otherwise quite dissimilar languages (G. Kahn, Studies in Semitic Syntax [Oxford: 1988] 226).

483 This modification is perhaps not surprising in light of these translators’ treatment of the beginning of 36:29 where סַר again fails to receive representation. H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 229 suggests that inter-verse influence may be at work here in verses 29 and 30.
Aramaic translations, with this direct object immediately following the verbal element. It is clear that a modification has taken place but there is little certainty regarding whether the Qumran translator has transposed the equivalent of the preposition or simply eliminated it. On one hand, it is worth remembering that the translator felt free to omit this same preposition in his renderings of Job 29:7 and 34:13 where they could not be integrated into an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew. But it is equally possible that an Aramaic equivalent was simply transposed to the portion of the text lost in the lacuna. Clear transpositions (see 36: 25, 28 below) do occur in the textual vicinity and the parallel English renderings here show that the MT can prompt divergences of word order in translation without appreciable loss of meaning. Although the previous example is equally fragmentary, it too shows the loss of a preposition which, in the Hebrew, occurs between a verb and its corresponding direct object. Despite the fact that there is a clear divergence from the Hebrew here, there is little concrete evidence to support a transposition as opposed to an omission (or indeed vice versa).

Another dies in bitterness of soul, never having tasted of good. RSV

Both the translator of the Syriac version and the targumist responsible for RtgJob follow the MT (be'an) in concluding their translations with Aramaic renderings ‘of good’ (סחיימה/כתרה). The partially preserved Qumran translation clearly shows a representation of at least part of 21:25b, but the Aramaic element which precedes the beginning of verse 26 (כתרה על-ם כות יメントה) is the verbal component of the clause
Clearly, if the Qumran translator has represented Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל equivalent must have been transposed to that part of the manuscript preceding the preserved portion. What would suggest a transposition here rather than an omission? First, the translator may have been influenced by the numerous instances of verb-final word order in the verses preceding this one. On the other hand, we have seen in our discussion of the verse immediately preceding this one (21:24 [chapter 2]) that the translator appears to avoid a verb final word order and this certainly complicates any suggestion that the transposition here stems from a uniform preference for verb-final word order. It is of course slightly simplistic to assume that because it is the verbal form יִשְׂרָאֵל which happens to be preserved in the fragmentary text, it is necessarily this form which is the prime cause of the apparent transposition. Indeed, of the three places where יִשְׂרָאֵל is employed in the Hebrew text of Job, the Qumran translator shows divergent word order in both places where a rendering is preserved. Although these other transpositions of יִשְׂרָאֵל do not seem to shed much light on the present case, their very existence may suggest that, lacking a more fully preserved text, the supposition of a transposition of the missing ‘good’ in the Qumran version here is at least not unreasonable.

What man is like Job, who drinks scorn like water? NIV

484 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 96 read what would seem to be the alaph of the negative particle.
486 In the same way, while T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 440-441 is correct to point out the (O)-V (vs. MT V-O) order here in verse 25, the existence of an apparently reverse modification (V-S/O) vs. (MT S-V) in such close proximity would seem to problematize suggestions of a pervasive tendency in 11Q10 toward a post-positioning of the verb in the clause.
487 See discussion of 36:11 below for the relationship between these renderings and 21:13 (not preserved in 11Q10).
Although at 34:7 the Qumran text again presents a fragmentary text, there seems to be good reason to assume that a transposition has in fact taken place. Where the targumist and Syriac translators follow the Hebrew in providing the expected Aramaic equivalents for the comparative particle (אֲפָךְ/ֵבַל) and the vehicle of the simile (ותָּמִים/לָיָן), the Qumran translator supplies a different text. Because commentators have agreed that the Qumran version has translated MT לָיָן 'contempt, scorn' with a more generic Aramaic equivalent, מַשְׂחָט 'sins' it seems likely that the preceding alaph should be seen as the final character in מַשְׂחָט. This suggestion would mean that while the Qumran translator has preserved the basic form and content of the simile present in the Hebrew, the Aramaic equivalent of the simile is presented in the Qumran text in an inverse order (כָּלִים...). The Hebrew of Job does in fact provide examples of preceded rather than following the tenor of the simile and, in the case of one of these (27:20), the Qumran translator apparently feels no qualms about reproducing this 'inverted' word order in his Aramaic translation. (כִּן וַתְּשַׁלַּח כָּלִים בַּלֵּזָה...). Further weight is added to the suggestion of a transposition here by another instance of this 'inverted' order. In fact the latter portion of Job 15:16 (שְׁמַעְתָּה כָּלִים בַּלֵּזָה) (a man) who drinks like water, sin’ bears such a striking resemblance to what seems likely to have been 11Q10’s translation, that the similarities of verb and vehicle (כָּלִים 'like water') may have prompted the translator to harmonise his rendering here with that of 15:16.  

As was the case with the examination of omission in the Qumran translation, we are, in the above cases, at the mercy of the elements in terms of the preservation of the text. In other cases the investigation is made more straightforward by the fact that con-

---

488 F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 134. This Aramaic lexeme is also used to translate Heb. כָּלִים in the previous verse (34:6). On the Hebrew of this verse see E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 466.

489 כָּלִים would of course be an entirely suitable and quite likely translation for לָיָן at 15:16.
crete textual evidence for a transposition is provided by the manuscript. But while this may facilitate greater certainty regarding the existence of the transposition, it does not necessarily imply greater clarity with respect to the source of the discrepancies.

Despite the fact that 11Q10 follows the MT quite closely in its rendering of Job 42:1-2 and 4, an Aramaic translation of Job 40:5 has taken the place of 42:3 in the Qumran manuscript. Although 11Q10’s translation preserves only the last word of 40:5 in situ (i.e. between 40:4-6) it seems likely that the translator of the Qumran version has included a translation of 40:5 both at its present location in the Hebrew text and here where the Hebrew text preserves the expected 42:3. On the grounds that LXX Job is apparently unaware of a divergent Hebrew text, Tuinstra concludes that the translator of the Qumran

---

490 Editio princeps, 84.
text has preferred a less categorical admission of error ("One thing I have spoken which I will not repeat") in place of the Hebrew text here (42:2 ‘...Indeed I have spoken without understanding, of things too wonderful for me which I did not grasp’) in order to preserve the integrity of Job.\textsuperscript{491} The later editors of the text present two possible causes for the divergence (alternate Vorlage or the translator’s ideological/theological objection to the Hebrew text) without preference.\textsuperscript{492} Both the size of the unit transposed and the nature of the transposition make it extremely unlikely that linguistic-stylistic preference has played a role in the present case. However, in addition to the Vorlage and ideological/theological explanations a third ‘middle’ proposal might also be put forward as a possibility. Various scholars have questioned the authenticity of 42:3 as an original element here in Job chapter 42\textsuperscript{493} and the possibility that 11Q10’s Vorlage did possess occasional lacunae\textsuperscript{494} make it certainly conceivable that the Aramaic translator of the Qumran text has encountered a Hebrew text deficient at this point and in filling this lacuna has had recourse to material gleaned from earlier in Job. Reconstructing the process by which the translator has imported 40:5 into its present context here in chapter 42 is a necessarily speculative task but it is interesting to note that in 42:4b (which follows the verse in question) the pair of verbal clauses \( ^{\text{הניא}} \text{חניא} \) finds an exact parallel earlier in Job at both 40:7 and at 38:3. It is possible that the translator made good the deficiency he found in his text by comparing the verse following the lacuna with others displaying these verbal links \( ^{\text{הניא}} \text{חניא} \). By working back from 40:7 and 38:3 to the preceding verses in these respective contexts, the translator would then be left with the choice of including either 40:5 or 38:2 here between verses 2 and 4 of chapter 42. But if faced with only a lacuna between verses 2 and 4, it is quite easy to see how the translator might well have inserted 40:5 rather than 38:2.\textsuperscript{495}

\textsuperscript{491} E.W. Tuinstra, \textit{Hermeneutische Aspecten}, 44.
\textsuperscript{492} F. Martinez \textit{et al.}, \textit{Qumran Cave 11}, 169.
\textsuperscript{493} It is virtually identical to Job’s response at 38:2.
\textsuperscript{494} See M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 6-7.
\textsuperscript{495} E. Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}, 645 notes that just as 42:1 is parallel to 40:3, so verses 2-6 of chapter 42 are the counterpart of 40:4-5: ‘Just as 40:3-5 formed the conclusion of the first speeches
While in the present instance it seems clear that textual difficulty has not been an issue in influencing a transposition, the following case offers no such certainty.

Do you know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of the one whose knowledge is perfect, 37:17 you whose garments are hot when the earth is still because of the south wind? 37:18 Can you, like him, spread out the skies... NRSV

The targum and Syriac versions of Job follow the Masoretic text in providing equivalents for verses 16-18 in an order which corresponds to the Hebrew text. This does not appear to be the case, however, in the Qumran text where the original editors noted considerable discrepancies between the Aramaic text and its presumed Hebrew Vorlage. The beginning of 11Q10’s translation of 37:16 is identifiable as such though the Hebrew phrase (לְ-דבָּרָיָה בְּכֶסֶרִים) has apparently proven as challenging to the ancient translators as it has to later exegetes. RtgJob, for its part, apparently derives its translation (‘the innermost parts [of the fog] of the cloud’) from a reading of (‘to penetrate to the end’)—a derivation found also in Rabbinic...
texts. The Qumran version provides לֶדֶתְּכֵם (do you know how) to clothe his cloud...’ apparently under the influence of the following verse 17 where the Hebrew makes mention of garment (בְּגֵרָה) and the translator makes use of the same Aramaic root (לְבָשָׁה). But whereas the targarist and Syriac translator provide their renderings of verse 16b following verse 16a (דְּבָשָׁי) the equivalent of this portion of text in the Qumran version (אֲרוֹר תַּדָּע מִתָּמִית) is to be found following what appears to be a translation of the beginning of verse 17. The translator appears to transform the MT adjectival phrase בְּגֵרָה ‘perfect in knowledge’ into a full blown verbal clause (‘because/behold it is he who has knowledge’). Supplying the first three words based on the context, the translator then concludes with a rendering of MT דִּבָּשׁ. The fact that the translator makes use of the same Aramaic root (לְבָשָׁה) in the now contiguous 16a and 17b may suggest that the translator is simply attempting to make sense of what he found to be a difficult text. Indeed, the relative pronoun at the beginning of the Hebrew text of 37:17 (אֶת הַבְּגֵרָה בְּגֵרָה הַמִּתָּמִית) may represent the addressee (‘Do you know...’) or the clouds referred to in v.16 or, alternatively, it may be a temporal reference ‘when’. While this potential for ambiguity and confusion has presumably led the translator of P-Job to omit it in translation, 11Q10 has provided a substitution/addition בְּרִאֵל ‘since/because’ in order to more clearly delineate the syntactic relationship with the preceding. The seemingly insufficient space for a rendering of the latter half of 37:17 may also be related to this transposition but offers little in terms of explanation. Thus, while there is little doubt that a dislocation has

499 This is suggested by the similarity evident between the Aramaic versions at this point (11Q10: מִתָּמִית RtgJob: אֲרוֹר P-Job: מִתָּמִית).
501 The lacuna at the beginning of the line prevents confirmation of this latter suggestion. See M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 145 for discussion of the significance of this Aramaic conjunction in terms of the history of Aramaic.
taken place here, there is no decisive evidence which will allow us to be certain of the reasons for this divergence from the Masoretic text.

As with the previous cases, the examples which follow are clearly instances of transposition. In some of the cases, the causes which have led to the transposition are comparatively clear-cut but in other instances the new word order is more likely to have been the result of a more complex interaction of causes which are not easily disentangled.

As commentators have noted, the Qumran translation appears to have preserved a substantial amount of textual material between renderings of verses 29 and 30 which does not correspond to anything in the ancient versions at this point. More interesting for our purposes is the Aramaic versions' treatment of the last half of verse 29 and, in particular, the idiom at its conclusion (‘when evil happens [to] (lit. finds) him’). Although the Aramaic versions show a wide variety of approaches in their treatment of the matter, they are able to basically reproduce the formal and semantic qualities of the original in their translations. While RtgJob T3 (אחרי המ.define) seems to have preserved a proximate rendering of the MT

502 Is it possible that 11Q10 'my curse and he hears...' may have resulted from the transla-
form (גָּכַשׁ) ‘(If) I was stirred up [with joy?]’, the Qumran translation (לָעַל ה ‘I praised, exulted’), along with P-Job (אֹזַח ‘I exulted’) and the first tradition preserved by the targum (יִבְשַׁלֶּכְתָו ‘I shouted and I praised’) have all provided renderings which appear to refer directly to rejoicing rather than a more ambiguous verb denoting general emotional excitement. When we come to the idiom (כַּלֶּכְתָו) which completes the verse, however, more substantial modifications are required on the part of the Syriac and Qumran translators. While the translator responsible for RtgJob (T3) produces an Aramaic translation which reproduces the Hebrew form and content with particular precision (גָּכַשׁ) the remainder of the targumic traditions simply substitute an Aramaic lexeme (כַּלֶּכְתָו) which has the specific meaning intended by the Hebrew (to meet or occur). It is worthwhile to note that in any case the form of the Hebrew (verb + object suffix) is preserved in the targumists’ versions. In the Syriac version, the translator diverges from the more conventional Syriac rendering in producing כַּלֶּכְתָו אִם הַנְּחָל ‘when evil was to him’. In this case, while there seems to be little attempt to reproduce the Hebrew idiom, the suffix is nevertheless maintained in a

---

503 This root appears in Gap 21:2 with this meaning. See J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 117; Editio princeps, 48.

504 The rendering of RtgJob (T2) כַּלֶּכְתָו seems likely to be an inner Targumic textual corruption of כַּלֶּכְתָו.

505 It is difficult to determine whether one or more of the translators have read a hithpə‘l form of כַּלֶּכְתָו ‘to shout in triumph’ instead of the form preserved in MT. It seems to have been assumed by S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (II), 227 and R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 352 that RtgJob’s reading here has presupposed a Hebrew form of this sort. It may also be that one of the translators has simply provided a contextual rendering of this Hebrew lexeme based on the obvious meaning of the parallel verbal form in 29a (כַּלֶּכְתָו). RtgJob (T1) has clearly provided a double rendering here presumably due to the uncertainty or ambiguity of the Hebrew form under consideration. F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 125 understands 11Q10’s translation as representing a variant in the Hebrew text.

506 In other places in the Hebrew Bible where כַּלֶּכְתָו is used in this sense, the Syriac translators make use of כַּלֶּכְתָו (Ps. 116:3; Dt. 31:17; Job 34:11; 37:13) or כַּלֶּכְתָו (Ps. 119:143; Dt. 4:30; 31:17,21; 2 Kgs. 7:9) (Ps. 116:3; Dt. 31:17; Job 34:11; 37:13) or כַּלֶּכְתָו (Gen. 44:34, Jos. 6:13).
post-verbal position with the substantive following. An even more radical adaptation of the Hebrew idiom appears in the Qumran translation where the prepositional phrase follows directly on from the main verb of the clause. הָלַל ו... XIX, 4 'I praised/exulted about his misfortune/evil'. The temporal conjunction ('כ') is apparently passed over along with the verb of the Hebrew idiom (מֶלֶךְ ו). It is clear that unlike the other versions, in 11Q10, the translation of the suffix has been displaced and attached to the following substantive in order to allow for an intelligible Aramaic rendering (בַּאְשָׁרָה ‘his evil, misfortune’). The fact that this same translator has also offered a divergent translation of a similarly idiomatic use of this same verb at 37:13 would lend weight to the suggestion that it is either a misunderstanding or linguistic-stylistic constraints which have prevented the translator from providing a closer rendering of the Hebrew. In either case the displacement of the suffix would seem to be a result of the translator’s adaptation of the source text as a means of producing an idiomatic translation.

Therefore, hear me, you who have sense, far be it from God that he should do wickedness, and from the Almighty that he should do wrong. NRSV

---

507 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 97 n.88.
508 In fact at 37:13 the Qumran translator, like the Syriac translator here, diverges from the MT by providing הָלַל in conjunction with a suffixed preposition.
Although all three translators provide the standard Aramaic equivalent (ד"ל) for the Hebrew adverb 'חכם 'far be it (from X)...' the manner in which they approach the remainder of Job 34:10 differs. In particular, it should be noted that while both the targumist and Syriac translator manage to preserve the order of the MT (divine subject + prepositional phrase) the Qumran text shows an inverted word order (lit. 'and from doing evil the Lord') with the Aramaic rendering of the divine name being located later in the clause. To understand this modification it is necessary to give some consideration to the Hebrew idiom and its treatment in the Qumran and Syriac versions. It is important to note that the Hebrew expression rendered in English as 'far be it from...' usually (see for example Job 27:5) takes a dependent clause which includes a verb. As noted here, the text as pointed in the MT diverges from normal usage in providing nouns in place of an infinitive. In the first instance the targum and Qumran translation appear to understand (ד"ל) as preposition + substantive and render accordingly (לעב/שיש / נב). The Syriac translator on the other hand, makes an addition to the Hebrew 'Far be it from God to do evil...' thereby supplying the expected verbal component. While the targumist faithfully follows the pointing of the MT in the parallel clause, P-Job too main-

509 Reading the slightly fuller text provided by F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 133 at this point, it seems clear that 11Q10 has probably rendered MT (divine name) 'almighty' with (as at 34:12; see also page 96 above). A strong case can be made for the suggestion that the substitution here and at 34:12 of 'Lord' for Hebrew 'Almighty' is due to an attempt on the part of the translator to avoid the repetition of which appears in the first half of both 34:10 and 34:12. That this is the case is indicated by the fact that both at 22:3 and 22:17 the translator renders with the generic divine name (which is usually preferred by this translator. These unexpected substitutions at 34:10 and 12 are readily explicable in this light and seem to illustrate the translator's willingness to sacrifice consistency in the face of a potential repetition.

510 See S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *The Book of Job* (II), 254. For this Hebrew idiom see B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, § 40.2.2 c. The verbal clause is usually composed of either (or ) plus infinitive or (or ) plus prefix form.

511 It is difficult to determine whether the Syriac translator has read the Hebrew as an infinitive and rendered accordingly or 'understood' the Hebrew as preposition + substantive and simply adjusted his text according to the expected idiom. H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 274 classifies this translation as a paraphrase.
tains a high degree of consistency by again providing the verbal complement which the translator has seen as required or implied by the Hebrew (םָּשֶׁךָ לָה֯ דַעְסָה סִיָּלָה).

While the Qumran translator’s approach parallels that of the targum in the first instance, here, in the parallel clause, his treatment shares more with the Syriac rendering, for 11Q10 provides the expected infinitival expression וְנָלַבַל ‘from doing wrong’. The translator’s positioning of the lamedh before the infinitive rather than the divine name (לָאָלָה) shows that the Aramaic rendering, while making use of the infinitive, does not parallel the first clause syntactically. It seems likely then that this idiomatic use of the Aramaic infinitive has led to the post-positioning of the subject (וֹמַת לָה֯בַל וָאָ מָלְרָ). The translator’s use of transposition in the production of an idiomatic translation is also illustrated by the following example drawn from Job chapter 36:

While the word order of the MT (Rel – V – S) is preserved by the targumist (捍ָלוֹתָהוּ נְשַׁקָּא וְרַסָּהוּ דֵעֵשָּל/דֵאָסָל/מֲעַ חוֹלוֹתָהוּ בַּרְמַר וָבִּ: NIV which the skies pour down, and drop upon man abundantly. RSV

512 The translator of P-Job has, for his part, replaced the divine name with a suffixed preposition (מֶלְ). which suggests that the translator has perceived the explicit repetition of the divine name here as redundant.

513 For another example of the relationship between the infinitive and word order see 29:11 below.
the Hebrew, the Qumran text presents an inversion of this order. The translator’s representation (׳לֶכֶת יָרַע ‘his clouds’) of the Hebrew substantive (יָרַע) precedes the Aramaic verbal form which has been supplied as an equivalent for ׳לֶכֶת. The key to understanding this transposition seems to lie in understanding the differing syntactic realisations of the source text and its Aramaic translation. Whereas the targum and Syriac renderings preserve the Hebrew relative pronoun רָעָן at the beginning of the verse (א‎) the translator of 11Q10 opts to transform the Hebrew subordinate construction into a co-ordinate clause in Aramaic. (‘and his clouds send down...’).\(^{514}\) It seems clear that it is this prior syntactic decision on the part of the translator which has lead to the transposition for elsewhere, when a verse is initiated by a \emph{relative + finite verb} sequence the translator does not hesitate to reproduce it in his Aramaic translation.\(^{515}\) But here, as at 37:17, the translator has modified the \emph{relative-initial} verse and being thus freed from the constraints of the subordinate construction, he clearly saw fit to produce a more idiomatic word order (‘and his clouds send down’).\(^{516}\) The plausibility of this suggestion is enhanced when other typical linguistic-stylistic modifications are also to be found in the rendering supplied by the Qumran translation. The addition of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} masc. sg. suffix in 67 יָרַע ‘his clouds’ for instance seems to have resulted from the translator’s desire to grammatically reaffirm divine control of the clouds and his previously discussed tendency to make explicit what is merely implied in the Hebrew.\(^{517}\) Likewise in representing Hebrew 67 ‘cause to flow/shower down’, both the Qumran text (יָרַע)\(^{518}\) and the Syriac translation (מָכַב) provide more general and prosaic translations from

\(^{514}\) This same modification is attested in P-Job e.g. 22:10.


\(^{516}\) For discussion of 37:17 see \textit{ad loc.} (page 179) above.

\(^{517}\) For the addition of suffixes in 11Q10, see below n. 957. H.M. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique}, 102 n.109 lists more than 25 instances where P-Job’s addition of a suffix has been motivated by a desire for clarity and explicitness.

\(^{518}\) See M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 141 for this form whose correction shows the dissimilation of nun.
the same root (יִהְיוֹ). When placed alongside these other modifications, the inversion of the verb and subject in 36:28 seems to have been a linguistic adjustment related to the transformation of the Hebrew subordinate clause.519

And if it be not so now, who will prove me a liar, And make my speech nothing worth? ASV
If it is not so (___), who will prove me a liar, and show that there is nothing in what I say? RSV

The representation of if not then, who will prove me false’… in the Aramaic versions suggests that the translators have found the Hebrew to be in some way problematic or challenging. The Syriac translator for instance understands or reads Hebrew יָפָא (vocalised in MT as an adverb יָפָא) as referring to ‘his anger’520 and the resulting translation bears little resemblance to the Hebrew יָפָא. It seems possible that RtgJob’s translation of this Hebrew text - רְבֵּךְ יָפָא וּמָה נַשְׂרָה ‘...then, there is the one (who) ...’ has also stemmed from the ambiguity of the preceding Hebrew יָפָא. While in fact functioning here as an adverb, this lexeme closely resembles the interrogative ‘where’ as demonstrated by Job 4:7 (וַיֵּבֶר יָפָא אֲנִי נַשְׂרָה יָפָא ‘who was there that was innocent, but perished and

519 The fragmentary preservation of the Qumran text prevents us from knowing whether the translator has, like his English counterpart in the NIV, supplied the object (their moisture) which would seem to be required by the transformation of the subordinate clause. The RSV’s preservation of the subordinate clause (‘which the skies pour down...’) implies that such a supplementation is not necessarily required.

520 This misidentification is evident again at 9:24. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 179-80 for other examples of P-Job’s rendering of this lexeme.
where were the upright...?). Thus it seems likely that the targumist has provided both אדיב and אֶל as a rendering of אָדָא וּאֵל and that some of the same ambiguity which resulted in P-Job’s divergent rendering has been exploited/resolved by the targumist through the use of this double translation.\textsuperscript{521} While the targumist’s modification of the Hebrew in translation requires some measure of supplementation (דיכר הָאֵל והַלֵּא מַל מְל ש) it is important to note that the sequence of the Hebrew is faithfully reproduced in the Aramaic. Such is apparently not the case with the Qumran translation where we see (if the consensus reconstruction can be trusted) that 11Q10 presents a word order at odds with MT—transposing its rendering of the adverb to a position following the interrogative pronoun. It is interesting to note that the two instances where the Syriac translator has understood אָדָא as anger (here and 9:24) are the only two occasions where the adverb precedes the interrogative/verb to which it is related.\textsuperscript{523} While the Qumran translation of 9:24 is unfortunately not preserved, the translator’s rendering of 17:15 (דם עָאָבֵר אֲפֶרֶךְ וְאַחַז) shows that the inverted sequence (interrogative + adverb) which is found here in 11Q10 was willingly reproduced where it appeared in the Hebrew text. Further light is shed on the present passage by the Qumran text’s treatment of 21:4 (תַּאֲרַי מָלֵד לָאֹרָל תַּגָּרַר רְחֵן). In transforming the Hebrew interrogative into an Aramaic declarative, the Qumran translator produces a rendering which supplies the adverb under consideration (לֵא אָדָא יָרֵא לָא [רְחֵן] תַּגָּרַר רְחֵן) ‘Behold then, you shall not’. The post-positioning of this same adverb in a translation which bears other marks of idiomatic license would strongly suggest that the word order here in 24:25 (בְּלַא [ל ...ו] ‘who then...’) is a result of the translator’s linguistic-stylistic modification of the Hebrew.

\textsuperscript{521} Targ.Job renders אָדָא more consistently (exception: 19:6 אָדָא מְל ש ‘now’).

\textsuperscript{522} While here it is the targumist alone who appears to produce the double rendering, the practice is not restricted to the Targum. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 154-5. Whether or not the creation of the doublet is the work of the translator (See J. Joosten, ‘Doublet translations in Peshitta Proverbs’ in P.B. Dirksen, A. van der Kooij (eds.) Peshitta as a Translation (Brill: 1995) 72) or that of a later editor, the goal would seem to be largely the same: the preservation of alternate renderings.

\textsuperscript{523} 9:24, 17:15, 19:6, 19:23, 24:25.
When the ear heard, it called me blessed, and when the eye saw, it approved; RSV

In their renderings of Job 29:11, both the targumist (ensus נרה) and the Syriac translator (닐ועה נרה) follow the Hebrew in providing a conjunction followed by first a substantive and then a related verb form. Because the translator of P-Job understands Hebrew כ as a causal conjunction (כ שמה) he may have felt it necessary to provide a relative pronoun (dalath) in order to make the sentence flow more smoothly in Syriac (i.e., ‘For the ear which heard, praised me’).524 Although the Qumran text provides substantially the same translation in terms of meaning, the rendering differs from the other Aramaic versions in representing נרה工作人员 in reverse order to that of the Hebrew. The editors of DJD 23 have favoured reconstructing נרה工作人员 despite the fact that their English translation of this reconstruction ‘[(When) an ear [h]eard…’ reflects the fact that the Hebrew text in fact possesses a conjunction כ ‘when/because’525 Clearly a reconstruction which is able to explain both the initial character now lost and the transposition evident in the Aramaic is to be preferred over such a suggestion. In fact the original editors’ suggestion to reconstruct a preposition + substantive construction would seem to fit the bill nicely.526 Muraoka’s citation of Targum

524 The insertion of a relative pronoun in a similar grammatical context in the preceding verse 10 suggests that this is part of the translator’s general linguistic-stylistic restructuring of the Hebrew text. H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 76 n. 26 suggests that this addition has resulted from a concern for explicit exegetis.

525 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 115. The editors also acknowledge another difficulty, namely, that the evidently perfective verbal form following שמה does not sit comfortably after the non-perfective form they reconstruct.

526 Editio princeps, 39.
Jon. 2 Sam. 22:45  לא Notícias אהדר (where the expression is used with temporal force) and Zuckerman’s reference to a similar construction in TgPs.18:45 would seem to support such a suggestion. 527 M. Sokoloff’s otherwise promising suggestion to reconstruct בָּלָהֶנֵד on the basis of 42:5 is made less likely by the fact that there seems to be insufficient space for two characters to be restored between the fragment and the margin. Whether the lacuna is to be reconstructed as בָּלָהֶנֵד or בָּלֶהְנֵד most commentators seem convinced that a harmonisation has taken place either with Psalms, Samuel or Job 42:5. And, regardless of which of these two reconstructions are preferred they have the benefit of explaining the Qumran Aramaic version’s inverted representation of Hebrew לא Nunes. 528

4QJob

[461x758]

527 T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’,441; B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 497. The difference between 11Q10 here and the targumic renderings in Psalms and Samuel being of course that whereas the Qumran translator is here diverging from the MT, the targumic renderings are clearly following the Hebrew לא Nunes with expected attentiveness.

528 As noted by B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 497. Neither the preposition + infinitive nor the preposition + substantive (hearing) would be conducive to the ante-positioning of ‘ear’. It is of course as Zuckerman notes, difficult to determine whether this harmonisation has taken place in the Vorlage or been implemented by the translator himself.

529 The variant (הָלַל) preserved in some MSS (ת”ר ד כ) represents a divergence from the majority reading (‘to hear’). In RtgJob, this root (הָלַל) is used to render MT לא Nunes primarily when this verb takes an objective suffix or lamedh preposition. (See for example: 5:27, 13:17, 21:2,15:17, 22:27, 27:9 ב, 29:21, 31:35, 32:10, 33:31, 33:33, 34:10, 34:34). When this is not the case, the meaning of the verb is perceived as being more related to ‘accept or obey’ (which in the present context must refer to the previous correction or punishment’ of verse 10). It may be that this term is being used as a technical translation for the reception of halakah (See R. Hayward, The Targum of Jeremiah, AramBib 12 (Wilmington: Glazier, 1987) 49, n.3). Most of these same MSS omit the prepositional phrase הָלַל ‘(hear/accept) him’ which has been added by the majority of witnesses as an attempt to make good a perceived inadequacy in the source text (that is the lack of a prepositional phrase ‘to him’). The translator of RtgJob provides an Aramaic participle in place of the Hebrew imperfect form due to language difference and a similar transformation occurs with the following verb form (הָלַל).
If they hearken and serve him, they complete their days in prosperity, and their years in pleasantness. RSV

If they listen and obey God, then they will be blessed with prosperity throughout their lives. (________) All their years will be pleasant. NLT\textsuperscript{530}

The MT of Job 36:11 preserves two sets of parallelisms (listen/obey//days in prosperity/years in pleasantness) within the structure of a conditional clause. While the Syriac translator does not represent the Hebrew conditional,\textsuperscript{531} all three Aramaic versions represent the initial verbs present in the Hebrew ('If they hear/obey and serve him...'). As Sokoloff has noted, because the Aramaic/Syriac 'לעבל/דרק' means 'to do' rather than 'to serve' as in Hebrew, the translators responsible for both P-Job and 11Q10 fall victim to an erroneous translation through linguistic interference.\textsuperscript{532} The parallel apodosis of verse 11 '(then) they shall complete their days in prosperity and their years in pleasantness' finds close representation in the targumic and Syriac versions. With respect to the Qumran translation, a small lacuna in the middle of the line prevents us from determining what if any verb form has preceded the preserved portion, but it is clear that the Aramaic shows a word order not found in the MT nor in the other Aramaic

\textsuperscript{530}The New Living Translation is a revision of K. Taylor’s English paraphrase of a text which had already been translated into English. D. Robinson, ‘Pseudo-Translation’ in Mona Baker (ed.) Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (London : Routledge, 1998). Despite later revision toward the Hebrew, its basic status as a pseudo-translation means that its witness to the Hebrew text is mediated and indirect. It does nevertheless show that English linguistic-stylistic preference may impinge upon a rendering of this verse in a way similar to that attested by the Qumran translation.

\textsuperscript{531}While in the MT verses 11 and 12 are parallel conditional units, the Syriac translator has rendered v.11 as part of the apodosis whose protasis occurs in verse 9 ('If they are bound in chains...'). The motivation for this deviation from MT is likely to be found in the semantic link between verses 10 (וְנִבְשָׁם לְאָדָם לָטְמֵא | “and he opens their ear to correction and says...”) and 11 (וַיֵּשְׁמַע וַיַּעַן | ‘if they hear...’). This semantic link will then have overridden the constraint of the Hebrew word order preserved in MT with the result being a substitution.

translations. Where RtgJob and P-Job follow the Hebrew in presenting the object before the adverbial qualifier (pp), the Qumran text shows an inversion of these two elements (בּוּלָּהְוָאָרִים בַּלָּהְוָאָרִים). What has motivated this divergence from the strict parallelism of the Hebrew (i.e., ‘their days in prosperity, their years in pleasantness’)? Part of the explanation may lie two verses earlier in the Hebrew of Job 36:9. There the Hebrew shows parallel substantives bearing 3rd masc. pl. suffixes in a central, adjacent position in the verse. The fact that this pattern is replicated by the Qumran translator there, and then apparently reproduced here (בּוּלָּהְוָאָרִים) two verses later may suggest some type of inter-verse influence. The case for some type of inter-verse influence is strengthened (and complicated at the same time) by the evidence of Job 21:13. There the Hebrew text presents a close parallel to the relevant portion of Job 36:11: בִּלְטָהְוָאָרִים בִּלְטָהְוָאָרִים יָאָרִים בַּלָּהְוָאָרִים יָאָרִים. Although the existing MT reads a verbal form from בַּלָּהְוָאָרִים יָאָרִים ‘to wear out’ it seems quite likely that this has resulted from a confusion of וְתָל and כַּפּ. In any case the presence of בַּלָּהְוָאָרִים

---

533 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 143 and J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts, 30 follow the original editors in reconstructing שלום (on the basis of RtgJob).


535 The fragments of a Hebrew text of Job found at Qumran (4Qjob2) are relevant here. Although the official edition of the text fragments was, at the time of writing, still being prepared for publication (forthcoming DJD XII, see E. Ulrich, ‘The biblical scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: A Progress Report of their Publication, RQ 14 (1989) 226) some of the editor’s work may be inferred from an ‘edition’ of the text prepared for the recently issued annotated translation of the biblical MSS from the vicinity of the Dead Sea (M. Abegg, P. Flint, E. Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999) 590-93. In addition, the relevant PAM photos (41294, 41786, 42638, 43096) have been consulted by the present author (T.H. Lim [ed.] The Dead Sea Scrolls [CD-ROM]. (OUP and Brill, 1997). Here, the fragments show a preservation of the word order found in the Masoretic Text. This would suggest that the positing of 11Q10 as a literal translation of 4Qjob2 is insufficient to explain the modifications in the Aramaic translation which find no correspondence in the Qumran Hebrew fragments.

in an order which deviates from the MT of 36:11 and parallels the inversion appearing in the Qumran translation must be given serious consideration in an assessment of this modification. It would be unnecessarily artificial to consider the respective influences of 36:9 and 21:13 as mutually exclusive and therefore it may be that the modification has resulted from a combination of influences. Finally it is worth remembering that the fragmentary Qumran text has elsewhere suggested a possible transposition involving

that the mirth of the wicked is brief, the joy of the godless lasts but a moment. NIV

All three Aramaic versions preserve translations of the final portion of Job 20:5. The targumist responsible for RtgJob follows the MT scrupulously, providing an equivalent for the preposition (על) before supplying the equivalent for עַל consistently offered elsewhere. While the Syriac translator too provides a translation which suggests a clear understanding of the Hebrew text, the rendering of P-Job diverges considerably from the form of the Hebrew. A Syriac representation (מְמַלֵּל) of the Hebrew preposition is provided, but both an enclitic pronoun, ꝡ, and an adjective qualifying the length of time (תַּקְנִי ‘brief’) are added for the sake of creating an idiomatically explicit Syriac

537 See discussion of 21:25 above. The fact that in both cases this adverbial expression has been moved to an ‘earlier’ position in the clause may suggest that these inter-verse influences may have been accompanied by a stylistic predisposition of the translator.

When we come to the Qumran translator’s representation of the end of 20:5 we note that here too the general meaning of the Hebrew seems to have been understood: הָעֵצָהּ חֹרָה ‘[the joy of the wicked] quickly passes’. It seems likely that the translator, whether mistaking the MT preposition for a verb, or simply choosing to render it this way, has represented עַבְרֵי הָעֵצָהּ meaning ‘to pass away’. It seems likely that the translator has understood the meaning of עַבְרֵי and supplied with adverbial force, ‘quickly’. If all this is relatively obvious, there then remains the question of why the translator has chosen to deviate from the Hebrew by representing the adverbial form עַבְרֵי before the verb, rather than after. Lacking as we are in immediate textual clues as to the motivation for this transposition, it is understandable that T. Muraoka has included this transposition as one of his examples of how ‘sumero-akkadian’ influence in Eastern Aramaic has made its presence felt in the Qumran translator’s deviations from the word-order of the Hebrew. While it is by no means clear that linguistic necessity has compelled such a word order, it is interesting to note that another Aramaic text from Qumran shows the ante-positioning of the verb in relation to this adverb. Although it would not be wise to rule out Aramaic linguistic considerations altogether, it may be that the answer lies closer to home. In this connection it is interesting to note that the three other times that עַבְרֵי appears in the MT of Job, it is used adverbially (7:18, 20:5, 34:20) as is the case here in 11Q10’s translation. While none of these others are preserved in the Qumran translation, it is perhaps signifi-
cant that all three of these adverbial uses of נבזג show a word order Adv-V as we see here in the Qumran translation (לטכם והדר). It seems quite possible then that either linguistic-stylistic preference or the influence of other similar constructions (or perhaps some combination of the two) have played a part in the word order divergence of the Qumran translation.

11Q10

When I think of it I am dismayed, and shuddering seizes my flesh. RSV
When I think about this, I am terrified; trembling seizes my body. NIV

It has already been noted that the Qumran translator fails to represent ‘flesh’ (בשר) in providing a more generic pronominal reference (ל).\(^{544}\) It is also interesting to note that both the Qumran and Syriac translators introduce a syntactic change into their renderings of this clause, taking Hebrew穰 as the object and marking their translations with a lamadh to indicate its objective status.\(^{546}\) Where the Qumran translation differs from both the Syriac and targumic versions is in its order of representation. All three translators represent Hebrew תַּלְפָּש with the cognate Aramaic equivalent albeit with P-Job providing a 3rd pl. rendering בְּאָשֶׁר in place of the singular in MT.\(^{547}\) But while the targum and Syriac versions follow the Hebrew in preserving a

\(^{544}\) See chapter 2 above.

\(^{545}\) R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 228.

\(^{546}\) For further discussion of 11Q10’s use of the lamadh as marker of the object see B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 155; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 188. For representation of the object in Syriac see T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac, § 97.

\(^{547}\) This may be attributed to the intra-verse influence of the erroneous plural rendering of Hebrew תַּלְפָּש with which this verb is then made to agree. H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 65 n.7 correctly attributes the change in number of the noun to an error (67) but she seems to erroneously attribute the change in
verb-initial sequence (V-O-S), the Qumran translation positions the verb medially in the clause לש הָא רָאָה וְשָׁם חַדַּל (S-V-O) ‘amazement seizes me’.\(^{548}\) Lacking any suggestion of a misunderstanding or influence from the context, it seems most reasonable—particularly in light of the other clearly linguistic-stylistic modifications already discussed—to attribute this word order discrepancy to linguistic or stylistic considerations. It is not surprising then that Muraoka has included this instance amongst the examples marshalled in support of his suggestion that divergences like these represent the translator’s reversion to a word order more reflective of the idiom of Aramaic in which he was most at home.\(^{549}\) Because the order of verb (דַּעֲח) and object (לָל) is maintained here and attested elsewhere,\(^{550}\) the crucial relationship in this case appears to be between that of subject and verb. As with most English translators of this verse, the Aramaic translator seems in this case to have preferred to ‘front’ the subject (והָא) on stylistic grounds.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{We have already encountered Job 34:13 in connection with the Qumran translation’s omission of the prepositional phrase (חתָם) and here our attention is again focused on the Aramaic versions’ rendering of the beginning of the verse. In order to make} \\
\text{number in the verb (65, n.7) to language difference where it seems clear that the motivation is intra-verse influence (as is suggested B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 155).}\end{align*}
\]

\(^{548}\) 11Q10’s rendering of MT יָשֶׁר ‘a shudder’ with the more general (and less corporeal)


\(^{550}\) See 11Q10’s translation of 33:10 where this exact same construction is provided.
The targumist has clearly filled out the syntax of the Hebrew text by means of an infinitival form (מְפָרְס מַעָּלַהוּ 'to make'). This modification involves the relegation of the main verb of the Hebrew clause (יִכְפָּר אֲשֶׁר 'who appoints...') to an auxiliary role in the targum translation (מַעָּלַהוּ לְמַעָּלַהוּ 'who appoints [someone] over him to make...'). In 42:2 (ךְָרָבָּל הַורְכִּיל 'that you are able (to do) all things' the Syriac and Qumran translators also supply an infinitival expression to fill out what is perceived as a laconic Hebrew text (חָלְסִי סֵפִּי, נָּתַן סֵפִּי לְמַעְתַּךְ/כַּלּא תַּחַל לְמַעָּלַהוּ) and it is therefore clear that all three Aramaic translators were able to add elements which they felt to be implied but unexpressed by the Hebrew text. In the present instance, while the targumist supplements the text, the order of presentation in RtgJob is the same as that of the Hebrew being translated.(MT: יִכְפָּר אֲשֶׁר לְמַעָּלַהוּ; RtgJob: פֶּפֶר הַרְכִּיל לְמַעָּלַהוּ) The Qumran version shows a roughly similar understanding of the Hebrew text and as the editors of DJD 23 have noted, 11Q10’s rendering of MT מְפָרְס מַעָּלַהוּ ‘(who) appointed him over the earth?’ with מְפָרְס מַעָּלַהוּ אֲשֶׁר מְפָרְס מַעָּלַהוּ ‘He made the earth...’ is paralleled by the Greek version of Job. But here our concern is not primarily with the possibility of a shared exegetical tradition but rather with the Qumran translation’s treatment of the Hebrew. Whereas the targumist provides the new element (לְמַעָּלַהוּ) by means of supplementing an Aramaic translation whose word order corresponds to the Hebrew, the Qumran translator prefers to introduce מַעָּלַהוּ through a substitution for מְפָרְס. More interesting for our purposes is the fact that this new verb form takes the final position in the clause. The apparent lack of potential influences in the context which might explain this transposition may lend support to Muraoka’s citation of this example as another instance of the translator’s preference for Eastern word order. Furthermore, evidence of other linguistic-stylistic modifications (e.g. the ap-

551 See discussion of the difficulties in chapter 2 (34:13) above.
552 (ὦ ἐποίησεν τὴν γῆν) F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 134.
553 T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 442. This instance is included along with 36:27, 39:25
parent transformation of the Hebrew interrogative into an Aramaic declarative and the omission of the suffixed preposition) would certainly lend a certain degree of credibility to the suggestion that the transposition found here in the Qumran translation may be attributed to stylistic-linguistic preferences.554

While the targumist prefers to render Hebrew בְּכָל־וֹ, with the well known Aramaic expression שֶׁנֶּה, both the Qumran and Syriac translators supply the Aramaic cognate שֶׁנֶּה. The Syriac translator, however, like the targum, follows the MT in supplying the prepositional phrase "בְּכָל־וֹ" as the final component of the sentence. In the MT and these versions, the numerical element (twice, three times) which functions adverbially, intervenes between the verb-subject cluster (קִנְיָן) and the latter prepositional phrase.555 The fragments of Hebrew Job found at Qumran appear to parallel the

and 40:5 as examples of post-positioning of the verb where the translator 'took a certain measure of liberty with the Hebrew text'.

554 In the Qumran translation of this verse, the principal verbs of each main clause are now conjoined in the 'centre' of the verse (קִנְיָן), as seen frequently elsewhere in Job (e.g. 3:23, 19:9, 24:22, 25; 26: 11, 27:10, 30:9 etc.).

555 Both M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 133 and F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 132 conclude that 11Q10's addition of מִן 'time' represents an elliptical expression 'one time, two (times), three (times)'. At 40:5 RtgJob adds מִן to a cardinal number in order to create a multiplicative. Support for the idea that מִן 'times' (omission of the initial numeral) is rather unusual is provided by a similar series of multiplicatives at 33:14 which does contain the initial numeral. The perceived awkwardness of the present case for the Syriac translator is signalled by P-Job's interpretation of מִן 'two times' here as the plural rather than the dual in its translation. RtgJob provides an additional word in its translation (וֹלָדָה).
word order preserved in the MT and there seems to be little in the surrounding context which has influenced this transposition in 11Q10.\textsuperscript{556} It may well be that the transposition was made in order to eliminate the intervention of the graded numerical sequence between the more basic syntactic construction V-S (numerical sequence)-P.\textsuperscript{557} The two English translations cited above may provide an analogy to the situation in Aramaic. Apparently the linguistic-stylistic constraints operative in the production of both the English RSV, and the Aramaic targum and Peshitta versions are such that the word order of the source text takes priority over any perceived stylistic preference. On the other hand, in the case of the NIV’s English translation and that of the Qumran translator, it seems that a perceived linguistic-stylistic constraint has overridden the priority of fidelity to the word order of the Hebrew with the result that both English and Aramaic translators have transposed the prepositional phrase to the same place in their renderings—leaving the numerical sequence to the end of their translations.

\textit{And now, in me my soul poureth itself out, Seize me do days of affliction. YLT}

\textit{And now my soul is poured out within me; days of affliction have taken hold of me. NRSV}

\textit{The Syriac translator’s omission of the Hebrew suffixed preposition has already}

due to the linguistic constraints of Aramaic in expressing the multiplicative. (See G. Dalman, \textit{Grammatik}, 134) It seems quite likely that the original editors of 11Q10 (\textit{Editio princeps}, 57) have suggested that the Qumran text should be understood as two times’ under the influence of the similar targumic rendering (see however M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job}, 133).

\textsuperscript{556} For general discussion of the Hebrew fragments see footnote 535 above.

\textsuperscript{557} See A. Steinmann, ‘The Graded Numerical Sequence in Job’ in A. Beck \textit{et al.} (eds.) \textit{Fortunate the Eyes that See} (1995) 288-297. Steinmann has suggested in a private communication that the interposing of the numerical sequence in 33:29 is unusual and syntactically ambiguous, particularly when contrasted with the standard format of the graded numerical sequence (cola 1: x / cola 2 : x +1) which appears elsewhere in Job (e.g. 5:19, 33:14; 40:5) For discussion of graded numerical sequences in the Hebrew Bible generally see M. Haran, ‘The Graded Numerical sequence’ VTSup 22 (1972) 238-67.
been noted in a previous discussion, but here we turn to the latter half of the verse where it is the Qumran translator who diverges from the Hebrew text. While all three Aramaic translators have provided renderings which correspond recognisably to the Hebrew text (‘days of affliction seize me’), the Qumran text shows a reversal of the word order preserved in the MT and followed by the other Aramaic translators. Instead of MT V(-O)-S [N+N], the Qumran translator presents a word order which leaves the verb in the final position and the construct phrase at the beginning (‘days of affliction seize me’). Muraoka has included this instance of transposition among the cases which suggest to him that the translator of the Qumran text is displaying the influence of Eastern Aramaic word order. While Muraoka’s perspective on this transposition is plausible, the case is complicated by the translator’s treatment of a syntactically identical construction in the vicinity. Eleven verses later, at Job 30:27, the translators are confronted with a very similar Hebrew text (‘days of affliction confront me’. If the transposition in 30:16 was the result of a pervasive linguistic-stylistic constraint, a similar modification might well be expected shortly later in verse 27. But the Qumran translation shows no such modification, providing a rendering (‘days of affliction confront me’) which seems to preserve the word order of the Hebrew. This type of variation in close proximity would seem to exclude any suggestion that the transposition found in 30:16 has resulted from a necessary linguistic constraint of Aramaic. But if the similarities between verses 16 and 27 are striking, it may in fact be the differences between them which shed light on the transposition in the present case. While in 30:27 the translator is apparently willing and able to provide a proximate rendering of the Hebrew, in verse 16 above, both 11Q10 and P-Job show divergent render-

558 While F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 119 reconstruct a space at the beginning of the line which may be sufficient for a literal equivalent for יָנוּחַ, most commentators appear to favour the transposition theory (See for example, *Editio princeps*, 42; J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) *A Manual of Palaestinian Aramaic Texts*, 24; K. Beyer, *Die Aramäischen Texte*, 289).


560 The partially preserved word beginning [ם] may be reconstructed as לְבָנָה or לְכִי (See F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 121).
ings of מַעֲמַלְתִּי. Although they have not utilised the same root, both translators ("וְעָמַלְתִּי/מעמלתי ‘[days of affliction] surround me’) have provided semantically similar renderings which suggest that the figurative language of the Hebrew text ("וְעָמַלְתִּי/מעמלתי ‘days of affliction have seized me’) has been considered stylistically unacceptable to the translators. The conjunction of word order divergence and other contextual linguistic-stylistic modifications would seem to suggest that the transposition evident here is also to be attributed to such causes. The Qumran translator’s reproduction of the Hebrew word order in 30:27 shows that his target language, Aramaic, unlike English in this case, can tolerate and accommodate the word order. But the translator’s rendering here in verse 16 suggests that an inverted word order may be preferred—particularly when the translation is more idiomatic in any case. This phenomenon of stylistic variation in close proximity has been well documented in the Peshitta by Iddo Avinery and indeed while P-Job preserves the word order of the Hebrew in both cases under discussion, it preserves other variations of its own here. English again provides a parallel: because the preservation of the Hebrew word order results in a contorted English translation (as exemplified by YLT) virtually all English renderings of this verse implement the transposition seen above in the NRSV.

561 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 297 classifies P-Job’s rendering as a contextual one. E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 192 suggests that a variant Hebrew form such as מַעֲמַלְתִּי ‘to encircle, surround may lie behind the Syriac rendering.

562 Because the preservation of the Hebrew word order results in a contorted English translation (see YLT above), virtually all English renderings of this verse implement a transposition (e.g. NRSV).

563 One of the chief examples of variation presented by I. Avinery, ‘Problemes de Variation’, 107 is the alternate representations of the genitive. Interestingly although the Syriac translator of Job does not supply the variation we meet here in 11Q10, he does provide yet another instance to add to Avinery’s catalog: the construct genitive of v.16 (םְעָמַלְתִּי/מעמלתי) is replaced with the analytic form in v.27 (םְעָמַלְתִּי/מעמלתי).
All men have looked on it; man beholds it from afar. RSV

In its representation of Job 36:25, the Qumran rendering presents a word order at odds with the MT not once, but twice. In the first instance, where the targumist and Syriac translator basically follow the word order of the Hebrew נְמָשׁ הָאָדָם וְעָלָיו (S-V-O[Pp]) in their renderings, the translator responsible for 11Q10 reverses the order of the Aramaic equivalents so that the prepositional phrase precedes the verbal element (עַלְדֹּלְיוֹת הָוָי). Muraoka again sees this post-positioning of the verb as a tell-tale sign of sumero-akkadian linguistic influence, and his case would seem to be strengthened by the adjustment found in the Qumran text’s representation of the latter, parallel portion of the verse. Again, the translator of 11Q10 presents the Aramaic reader with a rendering which inverts the word order of the Hebrew. Again the prepositional phrase ([... פ]ס) is placed earlier in the clause, while the verb (יֹבָק) takes up the final position. Because adjustments are made in each half of the verse the parallelism of the unit survives intact. But in both cases, as Muraoka has already noted, the verbal element appears later in the clause. There appears to be little in the immediate context which should have motivated such an adjustment of the verse, but in Job 28:24, verbs of vision (ראה נֵבָט) similar to those found here, also appear in separate stichs and in that case they

564 The targumist approximates the Hebrew but the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job have chosen to provide alternate renderings of MT נְמָשׁ הָאָדָם וְעָלָיו. P-Job has provided an objective suffix (מַשְׁלֵהוּ) while 11Q10 has opted for an alternate prepositional phrase (עלדוות). The lack of similar Hebrew constructions in Job prevents confirmation that these respective modifications should be attributed to language difference.

do take the final position in the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{566} Another possible influence may be found at Job 39:29 where (לאعقلות ענני יבשה) shows a Hebrew word order which is comparatively similar to the one found in 11Q10 here(ברוח). These may well be sources of inter-verse influence which have impinged on the Qumran translator’s rendering, but they seem insufficient to explain a double modification such as we find here. Lacking any other clear reasons for such transpositions, Muraoka’s suggestion of linguistic-stylistic influence may well be a more suitable explanation.\textsuperscript{567}

In the preceding example we encountered two parallel transpositions in the same verse. This is perhaps not entirely unexpected in the case of Hebrew poetry where parallelism is often an important structure. In the following example, we are likewise provided with two examples of transposition, but the verse in question is drawn not from a poetic passage but from the prose ‘epilogue’.

\begin{quote}
42:10
ולאף יבשה...ישבית והזה בחקל

11Q10 ויהי יבשה...ישבייה והזה בחקל

RtgJob ממלל תפוחיה ואפרים וידיה כי כל דורות לארוב בכומ팔א

P-Job \{על הור חתינו\}
\end{quote}

And (the LORD) (restored) the fortunes of Job, when he had prayed for his friends; and the LORD gave Job \textit{twice} as much as he had before. RSV

\textsuperscript{566} While the present verse presents \textit{11Q10}'s renders both \textit{36:25} and \textit{42:5} (39:29, 8, 33:26, 28, 40:11 etc.) with Aramaic \textit{11Q10}. While the Syriac translator does show a transposition of the verb in 28:24, the Qumran translation of this verse is unfortunately not preserved.

\textsuperscript{567} Again, the Hebrew fragments from Cave 4 of Qumran provide no parallel for the Qumran translation, maintaining, insofar as it is preserved, the word order found in the MT. See PAM 43.096.
All three Aramaic versions follow the Hebrew in beginning 42:10 with the waw conjunction, but while each translator represents the tetragrammaton, the manner in which they do so differs significantly. The Qumran translator’s provision of the generic divine name אֱלֹהִים for the tetragrammaton here and elsewhere\(^{568}\) contrasts notably with the various witnesses within the MSS tradition of RtgJob which have preserved the supplementary phrase -ד הַאֲדָמָה יִצְטַעְתָּם prior to its distinctive rendering of the divine name יי.\(^{569}\) Different again is the translation of P-Job which does not follow the Qumran translation in using the generic (אֱלֹהִים) but prefers to provide יי. The issue here, however, is not how the Aramaic translators have represented the tetragrammaton but where they have done so in their respective renderings. Both the targumist (וֹלִית אֱלֹהִים יי) and the Syriac translator (אֱלֹהִים יי) take their cue from the Hebrew text in following the waw conjunction with their rendering of the divine name. The Qumran text, however, shows a discrepancy vis-à-vis the MT, for although providing a semantically similar translation, it shows an inverted order in the Aramaic אֱלֹהִים. T. Muraoka recognises that the Qumran text’s transformation (V-S-O) of the MT word order (S-V-O) must be admitted as a counter-example to his argument for Eastern Aramaic influence on 11Q10’s word order, and indeed, at first blush, such would seem to be the case.\(^{570}\) An examination of the context, however, suggests that certain other constraints may be operative in this situation. Lying as it does at the heart of the prose epilogue, it is not surprising that this verse is preceded by one (42:9) which contains no less than three verb-initial clauses (…אשך/…ותֵימָת/…כְּשָׁם). While the Qumran translation does not preserve a rendering of 42:9 in its entirety, its rendering also employs verb-initial clauses exclusively (…אשך). Similarly in the verse which follows (42:11)

\(^{568}\) See for example 40:6 and particularly 42:9 and 11. In M. Sokoloff’s retroversion (M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 168) of the putative ‘Hebrew’ Vorlage of the translator the Hebrew tetragrammaton is preserved.

\(^{569}\) See Appendix I: Memra in 11Q10.

\(^{570}\) T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 441. This case is acknowledged but not treated in any
the verb-initial ($waw$ + prefix conjugation) clauses again carry the main narrative line ($וֹאָרְאָתָן/וֹאָרְאָתָן$). Here in 42:10, however, while the main narrative line is supported by the appearance of $יִה_{2}כָּה$ in 42:10b, the verse begins with the subject (tetragrammaton) fronted instead of the verb ($תֵבָּת יִשָּׁב$). T.O. Lambdin has described how the sequence disjunctive $waw-S$-Verb can serve to interrupt or break into the main narrative to supply information perceived as related to, but also somehow background to the main narrative line.571 Whether or not the interruption of the sequence here should be interpreted in such a manner or not is unclear, but what is obvious is that $waw$ + subject interrupts the otherwise unbroken series of main narrative verbs.572 It is also clear that the targumist and Syriac translator have reproduced the word order preserved in the MT. In the case of the Qumran translator, the linguistic-stylistic priority of syntactical harmonisation with the surrounding environment has overridden any consideration of the disjunctive nature of 42:10. The consequence of this tendency toward syntactical harmonisation appears to have been the creation of an Aramaic verb-initial sequence and a divergence from the MT word order.573

The second transposition in this verse is to be found at the tail end of the Qumran text’s rendering. All three Aramaic versions follow the Hebrew in expressing the narrative fact that Job received double ($וֹאָרְאָתָן$) the amount of possessions that he’d had before his trials. While the Syriac translator provides an expected equivalent ($ר^{	ext{<}}<^{	ext{<}}$), the type of Aramaic multiplicative preserved in the Qumran text ($וֹאָרְאָתָן$) is included alongside an alternative form ($בַּכָּדְאֵל$) in the targumic translation.574 The Qumran text

detail.

571 T. Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, 164.

572 While it might be argued that verse 10 serves to provide parenthetical material pertinent to the narrative of Job’s rehabilitation and social re-integration, an equally viable interpretation would include Job’s prayer and the restoration of his material in the main narrative line.

573 With respect to the position of T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 441-2 the above discussion would seem to require that any linguistic-stylistic tendency for the post-positioning of the verb has in this case been overruled by a desire for syntactic harmonisation with the context.

574 The labelling of $וֹאָרְאָת$ with the rubric $ד$ alongside the other translation marks this double...
locates its equivalent not at the end of the verse—as do the targum and Syriac texts—but immediately following the verbal form which appears in the clause. In the earlier example of transposition in this verse, we saw that a stylistic preference for grammatical harmonisation was the primary motivator for diverging from the Hebrew word order. Here, however, the discrepancy appears to result from a properly linguistic constraint. While the lexeme הָרִיצָהָה is relatively free in terms of its positioning vis-à-vis other grammatical elements in a Hebrew clause, not all languages display this same flexibility. The usual English equivalent, for example, is less flexible in terms of its positioning as may be seen by a cursory examination of English versions of Genesis 43:12 and 15. In verse 15 (Masoretic masorah) the Hebrew qualifier precedes both the object and the verb and while the verb tends to take initial position in English renderings, the translators are happy to reproduce the word order of the Hebrew with respect to קָמָה (e.g. So the men took the present, and they took קָמָה double the money...NRSV). Three verses earlier, however, where the Hebrew presents the exact same information in a different order (Masoretic masorah) English translations must invert the order to create an idiomatic translation (e.g. Take קָמָה double the money with you...NRSV). What light this sheds on the present discussion may be seen when it is noted that here in Job 42:10, these same constraints are operative in the English rendering. The priority of the English idiom has required the translators to position their rendering of קָמָה before the clause which is qualified by it. (‘...the LORD gave Job twice as much as he had before.’) When we turn to the rendering of the Aramaic translator of the Qumran text we see that the translation (רָכָּב הָלָה וְהָרִיצָהָה בֶּכֶל רָאִי הָיוֹדָה) shows an identical rendering of ‘double’ as an ‘editorial’ doublet. The fact that this rubricated version appears in the margin of the Qumran text might lend support to the theory that the multiple translations in RtgJob are due largely to a process of integrating editorial work. (See C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 11 and R. Weiss, סדר יד וצ, xvii).

575 For Hebrew see e.g. O-m-V (Gen. 43:12), m-O-V (Gen. 43:15) V-O-m (Exod. 16:22), V-m-O (Jer 16:8).

576 Where the object being qualified is provided, idiomatic English seems to prefer that the qualifier ‘double’ or ‘twice’ precede the qualified object. For other examples of this see e.g. Ex 16:22 and Jer 16:18.
adjustment with the modifier taking up a position between the dative and the following clause. Whether this adjustment reflects, as it seems to in English, a consistent linguistic constraint of 11Q10’s Aramaic dialect or whether the adjustment is simply an optional stylistic preference of the translator, it seems quite reasonable to locate this modification at some point on the linguistic-stylistic continuum.

**Summary of Transposition in 11Q10**

In light of the foregoing discussion of various examples in the Qumran translation, we are now in a better position to offer some tentative answers to the questions posed at the beginning of the chapter. In the above analysis, we have encountered several instances where confirmation of a possible transposition in the Qumran translation is precluded by the poor state of the manuscript. In most of these examples, the case for the dislocation of the element to a portion of the manuscript now lost must be weighed against the very real possibility that the form was never included in the translation. While this uncertainty inevitably complicates any assessment of the possible motives for these ‘transpositions’, one of the cases (34:7) seems quite likely to have been a genuine dislocation resulting from a desire to harmonise the word order with other comparable texts.

But even in the unlikely event that each instance identified as a possible transposition could be shown to be an omission rather than a mere dislocation of the text, the Qumran translation nevertheless provides numerous examples of clear and unequivocal divergences from the word order attested in the Hebrew text of the MT. Again, as with omissions in 11Q10, the manifest existence of a transposition in no way guarantees that its cause may be easily identified.

In a few cases, where larger blocks of material (i.e. verses or multiple clauses) are concerned, it seems quite conceivable that the transposition of text may have already

---

578 A possibility which must be taken seriously in light of chapter 2.
taken place in the translator’s Vorlage. However, in these instances there are also other explanations possible and a variant Vorlage is by no means certain. Indeed several other dislocations clearly evident in the text of the Qumran translation seem to defy easy explanation and are more likely to have been the result of a relatively complex interaction of causes which are not easily disentangled. Such causes may include adjustment of a particularly idiomatic Hebrew expression, a preceding modification in the context, or an attempt to come to terms with a Hebrew text perceived as ambiguous or challenging. In all cases, what seems to remain constant is the translator’s willingness to sacrifice the word order of the source text as a means of creating a more fluent and intelligible reconstitution of the Hebrew text in Aramaic.

The Qumran translation also presents instances where its divergence from the word order of the MT seems to be related to the presence of a text, in the nearer or more remote vicinity, which is semantically similar but presents a different word order. Of course, the judgement that a given transposition is due to inter-verse influence is complicated by the possibility that the translator’s Aramaic linguistic-stylistic preferences may have led to the divergence in word order quite independently of any harmonising tendencies. It is not surprising therefore that the Qumran text presents some cases which would seem to defy any strict classification in terms of purely inter-verse influence or entirely linguistic-stylistic preference.

Finally, the Qumran Aramaic translation presents several instances in which it seems that the translator has diverged from the word order in order to produce a more fluent and idiomatic Aramaic text for the reader. This suggestion is made plausible by the range of linguistic-stylistic adjustments which the translator has implemented along-

---

579 E.g. 40:5, 37:16-18.
580 31:29, 34:10.
582 24:25, 34:10.
583 29:11, 36:11.
584 20:5, 36:25.
side the transposition. Although invariable adjustments of word order across the breadth of the textual sample are rare, the translator seems willing to override the default priority of adherence to the word order of the Hebrew in those cases when transposition will result in a rendering which is stylistically preferable. Although the limited size of the sample restricts any wide-sweeping conclusions, the lack of clear consistency and the presence of variation in proximity would seem to suggest that most of these transpositions should be understood as resulting from a conscious or unconscious stylistic preference on the part of the translator, rather than an inflexible linguistic constraint. This observation does not mean, however, that Muraoka is necessarily incorrect to suggest that these syntactic divergences from the Hebrew are somehow related to linguistic influences on the Aramaic of the translator, but further discussion of the sustainability of his thesis must be postponed until an analysis of the other Aramaic versions is undertaken.

It is a happy coincidence that one of the last verses to be found in the Qumran translation (42:10) preserves examples of transposition due to harmonisation and linguistic-stylistic preference. The occurrence of both in a single verse would seem to highlight the possibility that transposition is simply one part of the translator’s overall strategy for creating an Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew which would be acceptable to the intended readership. But, in light of previous examples which suggest the possibility that a variant Vorlage may lie behind the transposition, is it not possible to also attribute probable harmonising transpositions to a Hebrew scribe rather than the Aramaic translator? Perhaps, but the clear willingness of the translator to diverge from the word order in other instances for linguistic-stylistic reasons means that it is perfectly reasonable to assume that the harmonisations evident in the Qumran text may also be attributed to the translation process. And, if these adjustments of word order are to be seen as the work of the translator, it should also be recognised that a desire for harmonisation is, in and of itself, a stylistic preference of the translator.586

586 Of course this conclusion in turn raises other questions: what has caused the harmonising translator to prefer one word order rather than the other (i.e., why harmonise word order x with y rather than word order y with x)? Is the desire for harmonisation the result of an ideological concern or simply a stylistic one (and is it possible to entirely separate the former from the latter)?
CHAPTER 7

P-JOB

Having prefaced our analysis of transposition in 11Q10 with a brief discussion of word order in Aramaic, we now turn our attention to the subject of transposition in the Syriac versions, and more particularly, the Syriac version of Job. While it is true that the issue of the Syriac translators’ divergence from the word order of their putative Hebrew Vorlage has received some treatment by scholars, much work remains to be done in this area.\(^\text{587}\) With regard to the Syriac translation of Job, while Mandl noticed early on that the Peshitta translation displayed deviations from the word order of the MT, these were largely and uncritically attributed to the Vorlage of the Syriac translator.\(^\text{588}\) In his treatment of the Hebrew book of Job, Eduard Dhorme also made passing reference to the Syriac translations’ divergence from the word order evident in the Hebrew text of the MT.\(^\text{589}\) While this initial documentation of the phenomenon was useful, it fell to H. Szpek to undertake a more concerted and systematic approach to transposition in the Syriac version of Job.\(^\text{590}\) According to Szpek, ambiguity/error, intra-verse influence and


\(^{588}\) A. Mandl, \textit{Die Peschitta zum Hiob}, 24. In his defence, Mandl does tend to focus his discussion of transposition more at the level of the letter or character rather than words or clauses. The present study is primarily concerned with a more typically syntactic type of transposition, namely ‘word order’.

\(^{589}\) E. Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}, ccxviii 2:5, 10:11, 12:19, 16:22, 31:35, 32:3, 38:36. None of these examples falls within the textual material represented in all three Aramaic versions of Job.

\(^{590}\) H.M. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique}, 108-112. This is not to suggest that in their own verse-by-verse treatment of P-Job, Baumann and Rignell were not aware of these transpositions, but rather that neither attempted any type of systematic or intensive analysis.
language difference were the three primary factors which led to transposition, with the latter category vastly outnumbering the occurrences of the first two combined. While Szpek’s classification and cataloguing of transposition in P-Job is useful, the scope of her study did not allow her the space to dwell on anything more than a handful of examples and the largest category, that of ‘language difference’ remains largely undifferentiated and unanalysed. The following discussion will give consideration to the instances of transposition found in that portion of P-Job’s text which corresponds to the preserved manuscript of 11Q10. For this reason, it would be overly optimistic to assume that Syriac Job’s deployment of transposition will be comprehensively explained below, however, it is hoped that this closer look at word order divergence in the Syriac version will not only clarify the nature of P-Job’s deviation from the MT, but will also shed light on transposition in the other Aramaic versions.

Whereas the Qumran translation presents only one example of transposition (36:28) which has resulted from a previous modification in the co-text, the Syriac version shows several such instances.

\[
\begin{align*}
34:12 & \quad \text{אַחַר-אֲמֶסֶת אָלַכְּלָא-א-יְשֵׁשּׁי לֶא-יְשֵׁשּׁי מַשְׁפֹּט} \\
\text{[...]} & \quad \text{אַהֲנַמְמוֹרֶא} \quad \text{xxiv, 7} \\
11Q10 & \quad \text{דַּגִּים זַעַמְנַא אֲלָדָּא [...]} \\
\text{רְגָּנָּא} & \quad \text{בּוֹרָא בּוכַּשְׁפּוֹת אֲלָדָּא לֶא דַּחַבְּשַׁר לֶא יִמְרָאְלַי לְרַדָּא} \\
P-Job & \quad \text{Yea, of a surety, God will not do wickedly, Neither will the Almighty pervert justice. ASV}
\end{align*}
\]

We have already met Job 34:12 and the Syriac translator’s version of it in our discussion of omission in P-Job, but here we are concerned with the second half of

---


592 The notable exception to this rule is Szpek’s extensive discussion (108-9) of the formulaic phrase ‘and N1 answered N2 and said’. On this topic see chapter 9 below (42:1).

593 See chapter 3 ad. loc.
the verse where both the translator of the Qumran text (\[...\] אֱלֹהִים) and that of the targum ("רָאשׁ") follow the Hebrew of the MT in providing a rendering of the divine name.\(^{594}\) In the case of the Syriac translation, however, the rendering of the divine name (אֱלֹהִים) is to be found not at the beginning of 34:12b but rather following the negative particle which is supplied by the translator as an equivalent for אֱלֹהִים. The apparent explanation for the Syriac translator’s dislocation of the text is provided by the occurrence of the particle אָדַם (whether it has taken the place of the Hebrew waw conjunction or has simply been added to the Syriac rendering for the sake of clarity or fluency). This seems likely because we see elsewhere in P-Job that Syriac linguistic-stylistic constraints dictate that the negative particle (אָדַם) follow directly on the heels of אָדַם when it is supplied. This is clearly illustrated by the Syriac version of MT 35:13 ( النهائيים לני יִגְלִי נֶפֶשׁ יָרָא) where P-Job again requires that the negative immediately follow the supplied particle (אָדָם רַעָם אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי נֶפֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים)\(^{595}\) This separation of the normally adjacent negative particle from its corresponding verbal form (and the resultant interposing of the divine name) is seemingly a linguistic-stylistic modification which has followed on necessarily from the translator’s addition of the particle אָדַם. The Syriac translation of 38:29 also shows a transposition resulting from a preceding modification in the context, but the antecedent adjustment as we will see below is different.

Out of whose womb came the ice? And the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it? ASV
From whose womb did the ice come forth, and who has given birth to the hoarfrost of heaven? RSV

\(^{594}\) For the Aramaic versions’ rendering of the divine name here see discussion above (page 184).

\(^{595}\) For other examples of this constraint see 2:10, 11:2 and 32:9.
The Hebrew text shows a word order which begins with a prepositional phrase (מִיִּן), follows with a unit containing interrogative + verb (ךָּלֵל, וַיִּמְסַיְּדֻ) and concludes with the object of the verbal phrase (לֹא אִם). It is clear that both the targumist and the Qumran translator follow suit by providing Aramaic translations which resemble the Hebrew and each other in many respects, including word order. With regard to their respective translations of לֹא אִם for instance it is evident that the equivalents supplied in 11Q10 (וַיַּמְסֵדוּ) and RtgJob (וַיִּמְסַיְּדוּ) take up final positions in their respective clauses. While the Syriac version provides the same lexeme as is supplied by the Qumran translator, its position in the overall structure of 38:29a is very different, coming as it does near the beginning of verse 1 (לָא אִם וְלָא אִם). In fact the observation that לָא אִם does not take the initial position but is preceded by לָא אִם seems to be crucial for understanding the motivation for such a modification. While the end of MT 38:28 reads לֹא אִם the Syriac presents this material (vv. 28 and 29) in such a manner that the final word of verse 28 (MT לֹא אִם) has become the first word of the Syriac verse 29 (לָא אִם). Whatever the reasons for this redivision and inclusion of לָא אִם at the beginning of verse 29 in the Syriac, it seems clear that the arrival of an object which shares some semantic components with לָא אִם has ‘attracted’ the latter to the beginning of the verse where it is conjoined (לָא אִם לָא אִם) to לָא אִם. Again it is the preceding modification, in this case, redivision, which has led to what would otherwise be an inexplicable transposition.

We have seen from the above examples that the Syriac translator apparently feels free to adjust the word order of the Hebrew in order to create intelligible Syriac out of a

596 P-Job 39:28b: לָא אִם לָא אִם. E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 273 has suggested the possibility that א (לָא אִם) was originally the marker of the genitive relationship (ך) between the two lexemes which appear in construct in the Hebrew. This redivision is also noted by H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 114.

597 In the English translation of the RSV, the provision of an auxiliary ‘did’ has necessitated the post-positioning of the main verb of the clause ‘come forth’. The ASV preserves the final position of ‘ice’ but must invert the interrogative pronoun and ‘whom’ in order to produce a more idiomatic brand of English.
previously modified text. The Syriac version of Job also presents cases where the perceived difficulty or ambiguity of the Hebrew has forced the translator to deploy transposition alongside other adjustments in an attempt to produce a fluent Syriac translation. At 37:12 the translator resorts to the inversion of adjacent forms as a means of resolving the difficulty of the source text.\(^5\) Another case is found in the Syriac version of Job 39:10:

Can you bind him in the furrow with ropes, or will he harrow the valleys after you? RSV

Can you bind the wild ox in a furrow with ropes? Or will he harrow the valleys after you? NAS

Because the syntax of Job 39:10 has seemed problematic, it has long been the object of emendation at the hands of the commentators.\(^6\) Both English translations above seem to follow Hahn and Stickel in reading Hebrew \(\text{VnOV} = \text{VnOV} \text{Vn} \text{Vn} \text{Vn}\) as an accusative of the instrument (‘in the furrow with his cord’). Other commentators (including Siegfried and Budde) have found this option appealing but have resorted to emending the text (\(\text{VnDVSH}\)) rather than stretching the grammar. Long before it was suggested by Dillman, the majority of the witnesses to the targum tradition understood the relationship between the last two lexemes in the clause as a genitival one—the dalath supplied by the targumist in

\(^5\) MT: \(\text{mikhrš-rɪm bëṭšm ëbəl ṯəfər nəm-rɪšer ūmkšm ḥə erót}: \) P-Job: \(\text{mikhrš-rɪm bëṭšm ëbəl ṯəfər nəm-rɪšer ūmkšm ḥə erót}: \) Like the immediately preceding case in 38:29, the Syriac translator has apparently taken the 3rd masc. sg. suffix of \(\text{bëṭšm}\) as a resumptive reference to the preceding ðəfər. Again the translator has simply produced a simpler version based on the equivalence of \(\text{bëṭšm} = \text{bëṭšm} \text{bëṭšm} \text{bëṭšm} \text{bëṭšm}\).

order to make sense of the text.\textsuperscript{600} It seems clear that the Syriac translator’s solution to the perceived syntactic problem was to transpose its renderings of שִׁים and מִיָּם with the result that in the Syriac אָפָה is connected to שָׂנִיר ‘upon (his) neck of’\textsuperscript{601} and מִיָּם becomes the direct object of the verb. (‘Will you bind the yoke upon the neck of the wild ox?’)\textsuperscript{602} While modern commentators demonstrate that there are other ways of making sense of the Hebrew text, the translator of P-Job has clearly seen a deviation from the word order of the MT as being the preferred means of creating a fluent translation.\textsuperscript{603}

The Syriac translator’s deviations from the word order of the Hebrew may stem not only from preceding modifications or problematic source texts, but also from the influence of Hebrew texts in the vicinity which share some features with a given text, but present a different word order. As the following examples make clear, the proximity at which this influence is exerted may vary considerably.

\textsuperscript{600} According to C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 84 the 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition of the Rabbinic Bible supplies beth.

\textsuperscript{601} Because P-Job provides a proximate equivalent in 36:28, the translation here of MT שִׁים ‘to a furrow’ as שֵׁנִי ‘upon his neck’ suggests that the translator has felt the awkwardness of the Hebrew construction and sought to provide a smoother contextual rendering. Interestingly, E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 602 without apparent reference to the Syriac, favours an emendation of the Hebrew which results in נַעְשֶׂה לֶבֶן ‘Will you bind a rope about his neck?’ Either the translator of P-Job has read a different Vorlage or has anticipated the conclusions of the modern text critics.

\textsuperscript{602} The independent suggestion of B. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob, 190 that the original Hebrew text may have read: מֵאֲרֵי נְעָשַׁה לֶבֶן provides some interesting parallels to P-Job’s modification, but the willingness of both Duhm and the Syriac translator to diverge from the MT word order should certainly not be taken as necessarily signifying an alternate Vorlage.

\textsuperscript{603} An example of a transposition arising from a preceding error or misreading is found at 41:11. Because the Syriac translator willingly reproduces virtually the same word order (Pp - S - V) of the MT in the following verse 12, the new word order of the Syriac verse 11a (V - Pp - S) (عراقך יpesan יָנוּר יָנוּר) might well be a result of the translator’s misreading of the first two characters of יָנוּר as the comparative particle ‘like’. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 241 for a similar case of P-Job’s creation of a simile through incorrect word-division.
Can you lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season, or can you guide the Bear with its children?

Each of the respective Aramaic versions seems to have provided an equivalent for the final Hebrew verb in the verse מָנַח. While the Qumran translator supplies a form of מָנַח ‘to give up’ it is difficult to know how this is related to the Hebrew of the source text. The Syriac translator seems to have understood מָנַח as being derived from either מָנַח or מָנַח ‘to comfort, console’ rather than מָנַח. Interestingly, as both Gordis and Rignell have noted, the rendering supplied by P-Job אֲנָא כּוֹמָה ‘(will) you be a protector’ would seem to be paralleled by the understanding of this verse in the Talmud. Our concern here, however, is the position of the respective renderings. It is clear that the Qumran and targum translations follow the Hebrew in supplying the verb in the final position, but in the Syriac version, מָנַח comes not at the end but instead at the beginning of 38:32b. But how is this discrepancy in word order vis-à-vis the MT to be best explained? At least part of the solution seems to lie in the surrounding

---

604 E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 591 understands this form as a hiphil derived from מָנַח but see P-Job’s translation to this verse for another interpretation of this form.

605 *Editio princeps*, 73; F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 155, M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 151. It may simply be a contextual translation in parallel with מָנַח ‘will you bring out’ of the first clause.

606 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta’, (1900) 274 suggests that the P-Job’s Hebrew Vorlage contained a form of this verb.


608 As suggested in F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 155.

609 Payne-Smith, 494.


611 P-Job’s tendency to translate Hebrew imperfects with Syriac participle (+ independent pronoun) is dis-
co-text where other signs of divergence are evident. Because P-Job’s translation suggests Hebrew rather than MT ‘over her sons’ it seems quite likely that the Syriac rendering has resulted from either a variant or misreading of for . Working on the seemingly safe assumption that the Syriac translator has rendered the prepositional phrase it then seems equally clear that the rendering has seen the 3rd sg. suffix of the Hebrew as referring retrospectively to . The natural collapse of this construction into therefore explains the transposition of from the beginning of the sentence to a position following the prepositional phrase. While this analysis seems to adequately account for the dislocation of it does not explain why the Syriac translation’s verb appears at the beginning of the verse, rather than at the end as in the Hebrew. It seems most likely that the Syriac translator has been influenced in his word order choice in v.32b by the presence of a 2nd masc. sg. verbal form in the first half of the verse ( ). This stylistic preference for harmonised word order in parallel stichs will be a recurring theme in the examples which follow.

Hide them all in the dust together; bind their faces in the world below. RSV

cussed and amply documented by H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 80-1 (n 36).

612 P-Job’s translation here is the expected equivalent of this Hebrew construction. (See Syriac rendering of Job 1:11).

613 E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 274 favours the former.
Apart from incidental discrepancies, the three Aramaic versions of Job present substantially similar translations of the Hebrew text of 40:13a. The targum and Qumran translations follow the Hebrew text by preserving the sequence V – Pp – Adv in their respective translations (תַּנֶּן כְּעִנָּה יְדָרָה/מערר [ר] מֻּלַּח [ר] כְּעִנָּה/מערר). In the Syriac version on the other hand, the positions of the verb and adverb have been reversed with נֶאֶשֶׁר עַשָּׁה now closing the clause and עַשָּׁה begining it. But the question remains whether it is a preference for post-positioning of the verb which has led to this transposition or rather the ante-positioning of the adverb. It seems that it is the latter element—the adverb עַשָּׁה—which provides the key to understanding this adjustment in the Syriac translation. We see that this adverb (נֶאֶשֶׁר) appears predominantly toward the beginning of Hebrew clauses in Job and therefore it is perhaps not surprising that here where it appears in the final position in the Hebrew it has been transposed to the beginning by the Syriac translator. Even more importantly for the present case is the fact that where the expression ‘upon the dust together’ appears elsewhere in Job the Hebrew presents Adv – Pp, the very word order which has been reproduced by the translator’s inversion of the Hebrew here. It seems most likely that the present case is to be best explained on the basis of the translator’s harmonisation of the word order here with that of similar passages in Job.

614 Both 11Q10 and P-Job provide an initial waw conjunction and both represent the 3rd masc. pl. objective suffix of the Hebrew with equivalent independent pronouns [ר] מְלֹא/עַשָּׁה. While this latter type of modification would seem initially to be a result of language difference (H.M. Szpeck, *Translation Technique*, 97) in 40:11 above the imperative + objective suffix is rendered using a grammatically similar Aramaic/Syriac structure and therefore it would appear that the use of the independent pronoun here is either a usage restricted to the rendering of the Hebrew 3rd pl. objective suffix or more likely simply a parallel stylistic preference of both the translator of 11Q10 and P-Job.


616 MT 17:16 יְהֹוָה נַעֲנוּיָוָהוֹ/לְיָי בּוֹ. P-Job: תַּנֶּן כְּעִנָּה יְדָרָה MT 21:26: יְהֹוָה נַעֲנוּיָוָהוֹ/לְיָי בּו. P-Job: תַּנֶּן כְּעִנָּה יְדָרָה That an Aramaic translator might be particularly amenable to such a harmonisation is suggested by evidence from IQGap where this adverb precedes prepositional phrases at 21.21 and 22.1 (J. Fitzmyer, and D.J. Harrington, (eds.) *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*).
My brethren from me He hath put far off. And mine acquaintances surely have been estranged from me. YLT

He has alienated my brothers from me; my acquaintances are completely estranged from me. NIV

While all three Aramaic versions provide *aphel/haphel* forms of הָרַע/ם in rendering the *hiphil* form of the cognate Hebrew verb, only RtgJob follows the MT in understanding the verb as a direct causative. Instead of understanding ‘brothers’ as the object of the verb, as is the case in the targum רִתָּא, P-Job and 11Q10 appear to interpret ‘brothers’ as the subject of the verb which is then understood as a plural form of an indirect causative ‘they are distant…’.⁶¹⁷ Although 11Q10 is not entirely preserved here, it seems quite likely that both the Qumran translator and the targumist parallel the word order of the MT (O-Pp-V). The Syriac version on the other hand displays a different word order, presenting the verb before the prepositional phrase אֵלָה תְּשׁוֹב. A comparison of the two halves of this verse suggests that the word order of 19:13b in general, and the existence of the prepositional phrase אֵלָה תְּשׁוֹב in particular, has led to the transposition of אֵלָה תְּשׁוֹב in the Syriac translation אֵלָה תְּשׁוֹב.⁶¹⁸ Thus we see that while the preceding example represented the influence of a more remote text, the present instance shows that transposition may take place under the constraints of a more immediate influence (i.e. within the same verse). A similar situation seems to obtain in the English ver-

---

⁶¹⁷ While this modification may reflect intra-verse influence (the subject of the following clause is plural), it may well be the case that the readings of 11Q10 and P-Job should be attributed to an underlying Hebrew variant. See B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 88-9 for a discussion of this possibility.

⁶¹⁸ The failure of the Syriac translator to provide a rendering of רִתָּא in 19:13b seems then to be a result of his perception of its redundancy in light of the provision of אֵלָה in v.13a.
sions of the Hebrew text where we see that retention of the Hebrew word order creates an unnatural and unidiomatic English rendering (YLT). A post-positioning of the prepositional phrase (‘from me’) on the other hand results in a more fluent translation (NIV).\textsuperscript{619}

\begin{align*}
\text{Hebrew:} & 38:6 \\
\text{YLT:} & \text{On what were its bases sunk, or who laid its cornerstone, RSV} \\
\text{NIV:} & \text{What supports its pillars at their bases? Who laid its cornerstone NJB}
\end{align*}

While all three Aramaic translators of Job seem to have generally understood the meaning of MT הָרִים ‘its bases’ (11Q10 הָּוֶשׁ ‘its foundations’ RtgJob סְמוֹכִיאֹת ‘its bases, sockets’) the equivalent provided by the Syriac translator אֶבָּה ‘its ends/limits’ may perhaps be seen as a shorthand allusion to a fuller, more idiomatic understanding, אֶבָּה אֶבָּה ‘the ends of the earth’\textsuperscript{621} In any case it is not the precise character of the respective renderings which is our primary interest but rather their location vis-à-vis other elements in the translation. The Qumran and targumic translations approximate the Hebrew in following their renderings of הָרִים with סְמוֹכִיאֹת and אֶבָּה respectively. While this leaves the verb to the final position in their renderings, in the case of P-Job the verb is not to be found at the end of the clause. The $S - V$ word order of the Hebrew is abandoned by the translator of the Syriac version who prefers to invert the two forms in his rendering (אֶבָּה אֶבָּה). The basic synonymous parallelism of the two

\textsuperscript{619} Of course where the Syriac tolerates the object in the initial position, the English of the NIV places it after the verb.

\textsuperscript{620} F. Martinez et al., \textit{Qumran Cave 11}, 149-50 claim to clearly read the \textit{waw} and identify the nunation (\textit{n}) as an irregular form of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} masc. pl. perfect.
halves of the verse is evident and it is not surprising that the generic verb supplied by the Syriac translator (אָנָּה) in v.6a is derived from the same root as that which is provided by the Qumran translator (בְּרֵית) when faced with Hebrew הֶלְלָנֹת. In light of the semantic similarity then, the transposition of the Hebrew (Interrog - S - V) encountered in the first half of the Syriac rendering (אָנָּה אְלֹהִים אֲנָא לְפַלָתָה לְתוֹחַ תֵּבָא עַל [Interrog - V - S]) is quite intelligible as a harmonisation of the word order found in the latter portion (Interrog - V - O).

Is the wild ox willing to serve you? Will he spend the night at your crib? RSV

As in the above example, here at 39:9 the Hebrew text presents its readers and translators with a parallel disjunctive question. Whereas there, the disjunctive Hebrew particle is provided and followed by the Aramaic translators of all three versions, here the Qumran and Syriac translators provide the Aramaic disjunctive particle נָי/אֵכָּ in order to explicitly mark in their respective renderings this feature which on this occasion has not been supplied in the Hebrew. As well, all three Aramaic versions derive their equivalents for the following Hebrew verb נָי/אֵכָּ from the same Aramaic root and, set-
ting aside minor orthographic and morphological differences, each translation presents the same rendering of the prepositional phrase which follows in the Hebrew.\(^625\) The difference between the three versions is again to be found in the order in which their translation is represented. While the targumist and Qumran translator follow the Hebrew, P-Job diverges from the MT word order (\(V - Pp\)) by presenting the verb in the final position in the clause.\(^626\) The word order of the reconstituted Syriac clause (\(\text{Interrog} - \ Pp - \ V\)) is similar to that of the first half of the verse (\(\text{Interrog} - \ \{\text{aux}\} - \ S - \ V\ \{\text{main}\}\)) in terms of the post-positioning of the verb and once again it seems reasonable to assume that this similarity represents the influence of the syntax of the first half of the verse on the word order of the latter.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{He draweth out the afflicted in his affliction, And uncovereth in oppression their ear.} & \quad \text{YLT} \\
\text{He delivers the afflicted by their affliction, and opens their ear by adversity.} & \quad \text{RSV}
\end{align*}
\]

Although it seems obvious that 11Q10 diverges to some extent from the text provided in the MT, it is not entirely clear how the Qumran translator has dealt with 36:15b.\(^627\) All three versions have provided equivalents of \(יִשְׂרָאֵל\), ‘their ears’ but both

---

\(^{625}\) (MT: \(\text{IplDK} - \alpha\) 11Q10: \(\text{bvpTlK} \text{by} \text{RtgJob:} \ \text{'jnTniK} \text{by} \text{P-Job:} \ \text{'mn\} \text{RtgJob preserves an alternate translation to the final word of the verse under the usual rubric:} \text{'mn\}. \text{See D.M. Stec,} \text{The Text of the Targum of Job,} \text{283.} \text{626} \text{H.M. Szpek,} \text{Translation Technique,} \text{108.} \text{627 The lack of preserved context does not allow a reconstruction of 11Q10’s motive for adding} \text{r\} \text{(whether relative pronoun or indicator of the genitive). See M. Sokoloff,} \text{The Targum to Job,} \text{‘Morphology’ (Appendix II). While both the Editio princeps,} \text{64} \text{and F. Martinez et al.,} \text{Qumran Cave 11,} \text{140}\))
the targum translation and that of the Syriac text present interesting divergences. Here as elsewhere in RtgJob (28:22, 36:10) the targumist provides י"ו 'their hearing' as opposed to supplying an equivalent anatomical term. In none of these cases does either the Qumran translation or the Syriac version of Job provide anything similar and it seems most likely that with regard to the 'ear' at any rate, this type of substitution of an abstraction (i.e. hearing) for the part of the body which is responsible for an activity (i.e. ear) is unique to RtgJob amongst the Aramaic versions of Job. As for P-Job, it seems that the translator of the Hebrew has either read or mis-read ו"ט as והי and rendered accordingly 'םותחכ 'their way'. What is interesting to note is that in the case of the Hebrew of the MT and the Aramaic of the targum (and probably 11Q10), the text representing 'their ears' appears in the final position in the verse. On the other hand, the Syriac version does not place its erroneous equivalent for this Hebrew term at the end but instead post-positions the prepositional phrase (י"ט א"לכ) which corresponds to MT ו"ט. While the translator's provision of 'םותחכ 'their way' for 'their ears' means that the semantic parallelism between v.15a and 15b is disturbed in the Syriac version, it is nevertheless useful to examine the preceding half of the verse for suggestions as to the cause of this transposition. In the Hebrew text of the MT the word order of v.15a (V - O - Pp) is at odds with that of the second half of the verse (V - Pp - O). The literal English translation of YLT—like RtgJob—follows the Hebrew in preserving this final position of the object ('...And uncovereth in oppression their ear') in P-Job and most

---

628 Usually however the translator prefers to render with the Aramaic cognate (See 4:12; 12:11;13: 1, 17;15:21; 29:11; 33:8, 16; 34:3; 42:5).
629 See however 36:32 and particularly 39:27 for signs of this treatment with regard to (mouth/speaking) in the Aramaic versions. There can really be no question of the circumlocution in this case being an anti-anthropomorphism for here at 36:10 and 15 the ears are those of humans.
630 Noted by E. Baumann, 'Verwendbarkeit der Peshita', (1899) 44; G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 300.
631 The minute fragments provided by 4QJob⁷ seem to confirm the order of the MT in v.15b at least. (PAM 42.638).
other English translations, however, the constraints of intra-verse influence have apparently been felt more strongly, with the resultant translations of the same Hebrew text mirroring the word order of v.15a ($V - O - Pp$).

The Hebrew text of Job 40:10 provides a fine example of synonymous parallelism—the meaning of the two clauses of the verse being not identical, but substantially the same. Despite the lexical variations of the translations, it is clear that all three Aramaic versions follow the word order of the Hebrew ($V-O^1 \text{ conj } O^2$) in the first portion of the verse. But in the second half of the verse, the order of the elements is reversed in the Hebrew text such that the verb is supplanted by the noun phrase (ךַּפֶּרֶשׁ יָדָה), and, instead of assuming the initial position, takes its place at the end of the verse (ךַּפֶּרֶשׁ). A glance at the translations found in the Qumran and targum texts shows that the translators have employed the cognate verbal forms (ךַּפֶּרֶשׁ) in their respective renderings and that they have also followed the Hebrew in placing their verbal equivalents in a final position in v.10b. In these two versions, the rendering of the noun phrase also follows the Hebrew with�ַפֶּרֶשׁ יָדָה and taking up their

---

632 The stylistic pressure to conform the word order of v.15b to v.1 may have been increased by the fact that the prepositional phrases in question both involve beth (ךֵּבָשׁ).  
633 11Q10 has provided a doublet יָדָה יְדָה in rendering MT יָדָה presumably as a result of the fact that these two words are commonly associated both in Hebrew and in Aramaic (both in translation and original composition). See M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job*, 159; F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 162. As at 39:20 and 38:8, this double rendering here appears to be related to the translator’s willingness to include double renderings as part of his translational repertoire.
respective initial positions in the clause. With regard to the Syriac version, however, it is clear that the verbal (אֲבָא) and nominal (אֲבָא) equivalents have been inverted in the translator’s rendering. It is equally clear that the most likely motivation for such a divergence from the source text is the word order of the first half of the verse (verb-initial) which is, as we have seen, willingly reproduced by the Syriac translator there and successfully imitated here in the second half of the verse. While the English version of Young parallels the Qumran and targum translations in its faithful replication of the Hebrew (verb-final) word order, the RSV and some other English versions of the Hebrew prefer to modify the word order in much the same manner as the Syriac translator has done here.

Dost thou put a reed in his nose? And with a thorn pierce his jaw? YLT
Can you put a rope in his nose, or pierce his jaw with a hook? RSV

In this parallel couplet describing the impotence of humankind in the face of Leviathan, the poet challenges the reader to take the sea beast captive. In the second half of the verse, where the MT provides the potential means of Leviathan’s capture בִּאֵשׁ ‘with a brier, hook, thorn’ the Aramaic translators follow suit with appropriate equivalents. While the Qumran translation shows דִּירָדָה ‘thorn’634—a borrowing from Persian

634 From کُرْتُکا  meaning ‘thorn’. See J.C. Greenfield and S. Shaked, ‘Three Iranian Words’, 37-45. Although this form does not appear with this precise meaning until relatively late, Sokoloff’s suggestion (M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 162; see also Editio princeps, 81) that this is a nominal form from דִּירָדָה with 2nd masc. sg. suffix added in order to conform it with the verb in the clause (2 masc. sg.) seems difficult in light of the fact that the most likely source of influence for a harmonisation of this sort (i.e., the
lexical stock—P-Job’s translation מַתָּן which, as Rignell has noted, makes little sense as ‘in his leap’ or ‘in his navel’, appears to possess an admittedly rare idiomatic meaning not dissimilar to that of the Hebrew.635 It may be that the various RtgJob witnesses which preserve a double rendering here (בֵּסָלַת אֲבַשָּׁר ‘and with a thorn and with a hook/ring’) do so because of the ambiguous nature of the Hebrew.636 If it is clear then that each of the Aramaic versions does make an attempt to represent the prepositional phrase מָלַכְבָּר it is also evident that the location of their respective equivalents vis-à-vis their translation as a whole is radically different. The Qumran and targum representations of the prepositional phrase appear at the beginning of the stich as in the Hebrew. The Syriac version, however, deviates from the word order of the Hebrew by fronting the verbal form (אֶת תַּכְמָא).637 Again it seems that the influence of the word order in the first half of the verse has led to this reshuffle in the Syriac version. While the Hebrew text of 40:26 displays semantic parallelism, the word order is far from balanced ([Int] – V – DO – Pp / Pp – V – DO). The influence of the word order in v.26a on the translation of v.26b, is as clear in the Syriac version מַתָּן מַתָּן מַתָּן מַתָּן (V – DO – Pp) as it is in the English of the RSV (…or pierce his jaw with a hook?).638

635 C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*. [2nd ed.] (Halle: 1928) 802a. G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job*, 345 in fact favours an even more unlikely rendering: ‘in his wall’ (of the mouth?). What does seem clear is that the translator has added a 3rd masc. sg. suffix to the end of his rendering in order to harmonise it with his translation at the end of v26a.

636 (מַתָּן מַתָּן מַתָּן מַתָּן) give numerous glosses which perhaps reflect the uncertainty surrounding the rare use of מַתָּן ‘thorn, thornbush’ as a fish-hook (elsewhere only at 2 Chron. 33:11; see KB). Because the two words (בֵּסָלַת אֲבַשָּׁר) occur without an intervening rubric מַתָּן (see R. Weiss, 152 and D.M. Stec, *The Text of the Targum of Job*, 325 [n.237]) it would be unwise to rule out an original doublet created by the translator, but the occurrence of each of the two lexemes as a marginal reading (ל) reminds us of the possibility that this double rendering has resulted from later textual conflations.

637 On the Syriac tendency to translate the Hebrew imperfect with a participle see note to 38:32 above.

638 Again Young’s Literal Translation follows the Hebrew word order in the second half of the verse like
Has the rain a father, or who has begotten the drops of dew? RSV

At 38:28 we encounter a transposition involving the Syriac existential particle ܐܪܡܐ. The Hebrew particle שֶׁ is provided with its expected Aramaic equivalent by all three translators while the interrogative receives explicit representation only in the Qumran and targum versions.639 These latter two translations also reproduce the order of the Hebrew text by supplying virtually identical renderings (דְּרַכִּים / דֲרַכִּים אֲבַד). The Syriac version by contrast diverges from the Hebrew source text in inverting the possessor (רֵעֵט) and thing possessed (רֵעֵט). Because, as we will see below, the ‘normal’ Syriac construction sees אֲרַמָּא followed immediately by † (+ suffix) it is somewhat surprising to find the Syriac translator inverting the source text in the manner clearly evident in his rendering. While in the case of the Peshitta and Old Syriac versions of Matthew the appearance of an explicit noun phrase (represented in the present instance by רֵעֵט) almost never precludes the use of the full possessive expression ‘(+ suffix) † אֲרַמָּא’, here in Job the Syriac idiom of the translator apparently allows for a mimicking of the Hebrew form (if not, in this case, the order).640 But if the basic structure is reproduced why has the transposition occurred in the Syriac render-

---

639 For P-Job’s treatment of the interrogative see above 38:28 (chapter 3).
640 Rather than for instance אֲרַמָּא אֲרַמָּא אֲרַמָּא. For an exception to this rule see J. Joosten, *The Syriac Language of the Peshitta and Old Syriac Versions of Matthew* Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 22 (Leiden: 1996) 102 where however the possessor (אֲרַמָּא אֲרַמָּא אֲרַמָּא) takes its expected place immediately following אֲרַמָּא.
The answer would seem again to lie in the context. Whereas the second half of the verse begins with the question of who generates the moisture (אֶפְרַא מים) and then concludes with a description of the precipitation (רְפָאִים בְּרָעָה), the first half of the verse (28a) in Hebrew reverses the order by beginning with the rain (רְפָאִים בְּרָעָה) and ending with its originator/father (אֶפְרַא מים). The transposition evident in the Syriac translation of v.28a (אֶפְרַא מים בְּרָעָה) [lit. ‘is there a father for the rain?’] would appear to remedy the perceived imbalance in this verse.

The Syriac translator’s decision to omit the interrogative pronoun (אָ) has already been discussed thoroughly in our discussion of omission, but here the focus is instead on an accompanying modification implemented by the translator. While the targum and Qumran translations represent the construct expression of the Hebrew (םָשְׁלָמִים מְדַרְדַּר אָ) with genitive constructions of their own (םָשְׁלָמִים מְדַרְדַּר אָ),

641 Where a similar question is asked in Genesis 44:19 (תִּשְׁלֶם לֹקְסֶה אָ) (See also 43:7: תִּשְׁלֶם לֹקְסֶה אָ) the Syriac translator there follows the word order attested in the Hebrew.

642 The case of consecutive verses at 28:25a (םָשְׁלָמִים מְדַרְדַּר אָ) and 28:26a (םָשְׁלָמִים מְדַרְדַּר אָ) presents an interesting parallel to the present instance. While 28:26a might well be explained with reference to harmonisation within the verse, v.25a lacks any such explanation. It seems safe to say that the appearance of the Hebrew word order (V[or exist. predicator]-lamedḥ+Substantive – Substantive) in certain contexts prompts the Syriac translator to invert the latter two elements such that the translation presents (V[or exist. predicator] – Substantive – lamedḥ+Substantive). Interestingly, although English translations of 38:28 (e.g. RSV) are content to follow the word order of the Hebrew, some English versions (e.g. NIV) modify the word order of 28:25 and 26 in the same way that the Syriac does. As we will see below the demarcation of harmonisation and stylistic preferences is not always easily discerned.
the Syriac translator accompanies his omission of the interrogative pronoun with a less precise rendering of the Hebrew (אנה ינש "[who has loosed] from him the yoke").

The relevant aspect of the Syriac translator’s rendering here, however, is that while the Hebrew expression (and equivalents in 11Q10 and RtgJob) comes at the beginning of the clause, P-Job’s translation appears at the end. As with the preceding example, it seems that the first half of the verse has been the source for the modification in the Syriac version. While the MT displays non-parallel word order in v.5a ([Int] – V – O – Adj) and v.5b (O – [Int] – V), the text of the Syriac translator shows an inversion of the second clause presumably under the influence of the V-O word order evident in the parallel clause. (אנה ינש [ﬂ] () v.5a [Int] – V – O – Adj; v.5b V – Pp – O. Again, as with the previous example, we see that this same inversion resulting from intra-verse influence is also found in one English translation tradition (RSV), while the other attempts to preserve more closely the word order of the MT (YLT).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{אנה ינש} &:\text{שָׁפָרֵה בָּעִרְבָּה יִהְיֶה בְּמַשֵּׁכְנֹתָיו} \\
\text{דְּיַשֵּׁת דְּחֶשְׁת בְּרִיחְתָּה} &:\text{גֵּרְדֵּר בְּאַרְּבָּא יָלִילָה} \\
\text{דְּיַשֵּׁת מִרְיָה בְּרִיחְתָּה} &:\text{מַרְיָה בְּמַשֵּׁכְנֹתָיו וְאֶרֶי צַדִּיא} \\
\text{דְּיַשֵּׁת מִשְׁכְּנָה בְּרִיחְתָּה} &:\text{מַרְיָה בְּמַשֵּׁכְנֹתָיו} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Whose house I have made the wilderness, And his dwellings the barren land, YLT

to whom I have given the steppe for his home, and the salt land for his dwelling place? RSV

In continuing the description of the wild ass, the Hebrew poet follows 39 verse 5 with another set of parallel stichs in verse 6. The Aramaic versions all provide fairly close representation of the Hebrew text, but again our attention is focused on the second half of the verse. The use of נֶפֶל in the Hebrew text has prompted minor adjustments on the part of the respective translators, with each providing some form of supplementa-

---

643 See above chapter 3 (39:5).
tion. In each, MT הָרָעָב וְלוֹא לֹא כָנָא 'saltiness' has been contextualised (in parallel with MT הָרָעָב 'desert-plain, steppe'), with the targum and the Qumran translation providing יָד 'land' and the Syriac translator supplying נְחָל 'place'. The tTEI6n6m diverges from the other two Aramaic translators in interpreting MT הַרְעָב וְלוֹא כָנָא as יָד הָרָעָב 'the desolate land', but in terms of word order it is again the Syriac version which parts company from the Hebrew source text and the Qumran and targum versions. While the equivalents of MT יָד הָרָעָב 'his dwelling(s) found in 11Q10 (רִחְמָד) and RtgJob (רִחְמָד רָעָב) are similarly located immediately following the conjunction, the Syriac version inverts the order of the source text supplying נְחָל last. As with the preceding verse, the determining factor in this inversion seems to be the word order displayed in the parallel stich. While the order of objects in the two stichs in the Hebrew is not parallel (ザーֵO' / O' -O') the modified Syriac translation imposes uniformity on the text (נְחָל = נְחָל). Again the same English versions line up in a manner which closely parallels the Aramaic translations. Whereas the RSV’s stylistic preference for parallel word order has resulted in the same adjustment evident in the Syriac version, a

644 It is difficult to determine whether this modification was made because the Aramaic/Syriac dialects in use lacked the lexical resources to provide a single-word equivalent (as has been suggested at this juncture for 11Q10 by M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 153 and for P-Job by H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 161) or simply because the respective translators all perceived the MT to require further specification. As Sokoloff notes, RtgJob’s and 11Q10’s choice of ‘land’ may have been influenced by the occurrence of this very same Hebrew construction in Jeremiah 17:6. (|| with רַחְמָד). Szpek’s apparent misreading of P-Job’s text as נְחָל leads her to suggest this as a factor which has influenced P-Job’s translation as well.

645 The targum translation is a logical interpretation of a land rendered infertile and inhospitable by salination.

646 11Q10 and P-Job do not preserve the plural form of the Hebrew יָדִים 'his dwelling(s) which appears to be primarily limited to poetic texts in the Hebrew Bible. (See BDB, 1015 [3]). Both translators include the suffix but transform the plural into a singular, harmonising this with the preceding singular יָד. While H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 66 attributes this modification to language difference noting this same phenomenon in P-Job at 17:1, she recognises that language difference and intra-verse influence need not be mutually exclusive motivators in the modification of number.

647 Although dissimilar in terms of their treatment of word order, it is interesting to note that both 11Q10 (דהיון רִחְמָד) and P-Job (דהיון דִּניִּים) choose to supply the same preposition דִּני 'in' as a means of making sense of the text.
concern for fidelity to the source text has overridden any such stylistic preferences in both Young’s literal translation and the other two Aramaic versions.

He doth laugh at the multitude of a city. The cries of an exacter he heareth not. YLT
He scorns the tumult of the city; he hears not the shouts of the driver. RSV

Here in verse 7 of chapter 39, an examination of the last half of the verse yields yet more evidence of transposition in the Syriac version of Job. All three Aramaic translators opt to represent the Hebrew נַפְשֵׁת מִשְׁפֹּתָן with genitive expressions of their own. The targumist provides a dalath as a means of expressing the genitive analytically (ךְָּלֶלֶתָא רַעַרַרַרַרַר) while both 11Q10 and P-Job show construct forms. Some commentators suggest that the Qumran rendering of MT נַפְשֵׁת ‘shouts’ as נַנּוֹ הָ’ is most likely to be an ad hoc rendering of the following word in the Hebrew.648 Hence, contextually 11Q10’s reading might be understood as, מֵן נַפְשֵׁת שִׁלְיוֹ ‘the rulings of the rulers’. P-Job renders the MT more generally with מַלְאָה ‘voice’ but understands the following word in a similar manner to 11Q10 (魄לִימוֹ).649 When we turn to look at the

648 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 157. This type of contextual rendering would seem logical in a Semitic language in which it is stylistically permissible to utilise differing forms of a single root in close proximity (e.g. the cognate accusative B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 10.2.lf-g). M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 153 tentatively suggests a root פִּנַּת ‘to beat’ (outside of Job, this Hebrew lexeme is found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible only in Isa. 22:2 and Zech. 4:7).

649 While the translator of P-Job would seem to have understood the basic meaning of the MT, the finer nuances may have escaped him and thus prevented anything more specific in terms of the provision of translation equivalents. P-Job’s similarly vague rendering (פִּנַּת) of this lexeme at 36:29 tallies well with the conclusion of H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 174 that the Syriac translator’s generalisation of rare or difficult Hebrew terms is contextual and therefore lacks consistency. The fact that both RtgJob and P-Job render their equivalents (ףִּנַּת) of sg. MT פִּנַּת ‘driver (e.g. livestock to mar-
verbal element of the clause we see that the targum and Qumran translations (נָשָׁה הָאֹדָם) provide identical Aramaic cognates as equivalents of MT שַׁקָּר. P-Job, on the other hand, contextualises its translation of this term through the selection of a participle form of Syr. דוע ‘to fear/be afraid’. For the third time in as many verses, however, we see that whatever the general similarities between the Aramaic versions, they are divided when it comes to the order in which they represent the elements of the source text. Here again the verb-initial word order of the first stich in the Hebrew has been followed by the Syriac translator not only in his rendering of the first half of the verse (טָבַר תַּשְׁמִית), but also in the second (טָבַר תַּשְׁמִית) where the Hebrew does not reproduce this order. And once more, we see that the treatment of the Hebrew text at the hands of the Aramaic translators finds a parallel in the adjustment (RSV) or lack thereof (YLT) in the English versions.

Earlier in our discussion of word order divergence resulting from intra-verse influence we encountered an example in Job 39:9. When considered alongside the above three cases (39:5, 6 and 7) in its textual vicinity, and the many others discussed above, this example highlights a sustained effort on the part of the Syriac translator to harmonise the word order of verses where the semantic parallelism within the verse is not reflected in the arrangement of the words.651

ket/labour), ruler’ in the plural suggests that these translators understood the Hebrew singular as a collective. At the same time, the Qumran and Syriac versions’ choice of an equivalent based on אַלָּמָה ‘to rule’ implies that it is this aspect of the polysemous MT noun which makes the most sense in the context (i.e., shoutings of the ruler [vs. donkey-driver] || tumult of the city) See G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 331.

650 In conjunction with this substitution the translator was required to add the preposition ב (to be afraid) of. In light of the previous stich’s reference to the beast’s contempt for the noise/crowd of the city, the translator of P-Job apparently inferred a more specific meaning and rendered the general Heb. verb עָשַׁר ‘to hear’ accordingly as ‘to be afraid’. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 186 for other examples of this specification and contextualisation of a common Hebrew lexeme.

651 One final example of such harmonisation is to be found in the Syriac version of Job 29:8. Whereas the Hebrew בָּשׁוּר נַגְּרוּ חֲלְוָתַי יְשֵׁי יַעֲשֶׂה יָם לַעְצָר displays an unbalanced word order (V - S - V/S - V - V) the Syriac translation modifies the word order of the second stich such that balance is achieved (S [V] בָּשׁוּר [S] נַגְּרוּ [V] חֲלְוָתַי [V] יְשֵׁי [V] יָם [V] לַעְצָר).
Finally we turn to cases of transposition in the Syriac version of Job whose origins are not to be discerned in a neighbouring stich, preceding modification or problematic text but rather in the rendering of the Hebrew text and its reconstitution according to the linguistic and stylistic canons of the Syriac dialect used by the translator. Again, distinguishing between optional and involuntary modifications will not always be possible, but those cases which do not fall into the category of necessary linguistic adjustments will of necessity be attributed to the stylistic preference of the translator.

Although the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the final phrase in MT Job 38:7 (‘sons of God’) would seem to disclose a shared discomfort with the concept of the Deity having sons rather than angels, the respective translators seem to adjust the source text in differing ways in translation.652 The fact that the Qumran translator includes וְתִהְדָּרֵד ‘together, in unison’ under the influence of the first stich, v.7a,653 raises the question of whether the Syriac translator’s transposition in the second stich might

652 In order to introduce the idea of angelic beings, the Qumran translator substitutes מִלְעַלָכִּים ‘angels’ for MT ‘sons’ but allows the divine name to remain unchanged (כָּל־אֲלֶהָם). For the Syriac translator the preferred course of action is the preservation of ‘sons’ but the substitution of מִלְעַלָכִּים ‘angels’ for MT ‘God’.

Finally RtgJob makes two substitutions, providing כָּל מִלְעַלָכִּים ‘bands of angels’ as an equivalent to the MT. See the Aramaic versions of Job 35:10 as well in this connection. P.S. Alexander, ‘The Targumim and Early Exegesis of “Sons of God” in Genesis 6’ JJS 23 (1972) 60-71 suggests that R. Simeon b. Yo-hai’s condemnation of reading קָדוֹשׁ אֲלָלָה in Genesis 6 (and subsequent preference for terms such as כֵּסֶף or כֵּן מֵי רַבִּינוֹ) is a reaction against an earlier angelological interpretation (מִלְעַלָכִּים) found in TgNeofiti (mg).

653 M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 147; F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 151.
also be attributed to the influence of the first half of the verse. A cursory examination reveals that such is not the case here. In the preceding examples of intra-verse influence we saw the tendency of the Syriac translator to harmonise the word order of the second stich with that of the first. In many of these cases, the Syriac translator—under the influence of the first stich—transformed the verb-final word order in the Hebrew into verb-initial word order in the Syriac rendering. Here at 38:7, we see that the Hebrew text presents basically parallel word order: \( ([\text{conj}]V - [\text{Adv}] - S / [\text{conj}]V - S) \) and in light of this harmony it is surprising to note that the Syriac translator has taken it upon himself to implement an inversion in the translation. Unlike the equivalents of MT וּלְמַעַרְבָּנִים provided by the Qumran and targum translations (\( [\text{conj}]V \) וּלְמַעַרְבָּנִים), the Syriac translator’s representation of this Hebrew lexeme is located at the end of the clause מָלַלְתֵּךְ (\( וּלְמַעַרְבָּנִים \)) thereby displacing the noun phrase to the initial position. As there are no discernible clues as to the source of this transposition here in P-Job there seems little alternative to the attribution of this modification to the stylistic preference of the translator. It is worth noting that the post-positioning of the verbal element here corresponds to Muraoka’s suggestions that such modifications in 11Q10 may be the result of sumero-akkadian influence in Eastern Aramaic dialects. While this may be mentioned as a tentative hypothesis, a meaningful assessment must be postponed until the analysis of all the relevant passages in P-Job is completed.

---


655 With regard to the English translations here, the fact that Young’s literal translation implements a transposition (like RSV) attests to the virtually obligatory nature of this English word order constraint. A reproduction of the Hebrew word order \( V - S^* \) (shout for joy all sons of God) would probably lead most English readers to understand an imperative (shout for joy, all [you] sons of God) rather than an indicative.
Who gave him charge over the earth and who laid on him the whole world? RSV

We have already discussed the Qumran version's omission of the interrogative pronoun (ם) in a previous chapter, but here our interest is directed toward the end of the respective translations of Job 34:13. The Hebrew text, like the example cited above, also contains the quantifier ל, but here this lexeme lies at the heart of the Syriac translations' divergence from the word order of its source. If the Qumran translation has in fact preserved a rendering of MT רֵאֵשׁ, this equivalent will, of necessity, have appeared after מָצַה, the beginning of which is still visible on the manuscript. Similarly the word order adopted in the targum translation (חָכָה יָרֵא) mirrors the Hebrew, with the quantifier following, rather than preceding, the noun it qualifies. But when we turn to the Syriac rendering we see that these two elements are inverted חָכָה יָרֵא by the translator.656

The answer to the question of why this transposition has taken place here is to be found in Syriac syntax. In his examination of the Syriac of the Peshitta Pentateuch, I. Avinery has concluded that ל always precedes the nucleus unless certain criteria are met.657 Because none of these conditions are fulfilled in the present case, it seems clear that this transposition has taken place as a result of the linguistic constraints within which the Syriac translator rendered his Hebrew source.658

656 As a result of the transposition, the suffix of the quantifier, which in Hebrew follows the noun (re-sumptive), becomes a Syriac anticipatory suffix.

657 I. Avinery, 'The Position of the Declined KL in Syriac', 333. With very few exceptions, the quantifier may follow the nucleus only when: a) the nucleus is a genitive construction in which member b is also a genitive construction or a relative clause. b) the nucleus is composed of a substantive and the demonstrative pronoun c) the nucleus is the demonstrative pronoun.

658 See also 17:7, 34:19 and 38:18 for other cases in which the Syriac translator transposes a rendering of
And these three men cease from answering Job, for he is righteous in his own eyes, YLT
So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own eyes, RSV

Although the Qumran rendering of Job 32:1 is only partially preserved there is no particular reason for supposing that the translator has not followed the Hebrew in terms of its word order.659 Judging from the text as it is preserved, the demonstrative pronoun provided by the translator (יְהַלְוָא) as an equivalent for הַלְוָא takes its rightful place before the Qumran text’s representation of רַע הַלְוָא.660 This is clearly indicated by the fact that the targum translator provides a rendering (דְּלַבַיָּה) of this Hebrew lexeme which differs from the Qumran translation (דְּלַבַיָּה) only in terms of dialectal variation.661 When we examine the Syriac translator’s version of this verse we see, however, that the demonstrative pronoun does not appear where we might expect it on the basis of the Hebrew, but instead at the beginning of the noun phrase which it specifies (דַּלְוָא דְּלַבָּה ‘these three men’). Once again, we need look only as far as

660 Both E. Baumann, ‘Verwendbarkeit der Peshitta’, (1900) 196 and G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 260 suggest that the translator of P-Job has misunderstood Hebrew לא (‘from answering’) (this is the only appearance of either של or the infinitive of של in the book of Job). Instead, these scholars suggest other readings (של or לשל ‘to pervert’ [Baumann] or a form of של ‘iniquity, guilt’ [Rignell]) in order to produce the rendering as it stands של (‘to condemn him’). Language difference may, however, also have played a factor (See chapter 2 [33:24]).
661 For the distribution of haphellaphel see S.A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, 324 and espe-
Avinery’s study of Syriac syntax to discover that this modification should be attributed to the linguistic constraints of the target language. While in most cases, the demonstrative pronoun follows a qualified substantive, the appearance of a numeral in the noun phrase alters the default word order.\footnote{Avinery, ‘The Position of the Demonstrative Pronoun in Syriac’, 125.} In fact when the Syriac translator(s) of P-Deut. 19:9 (ed. van Vliet) and P-Exod (ed. M. Koster) 21:11 encounter(s) אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל and אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה respectively, the inversion found here in Job is also apparent in the Syriac translations of these verses. Likewise, as Avinery has noted, Ex 4:9 and Deut. 3:21 also display the exact same transformation of word order as has been noted here.\footnote{Avinery, ‘The Position of the Demonstrative Pronoun in Syriac’, 127.} Again it seems that the above modification is a linguistic-stylistic adjustment which was virtually obligatory for the translator to produce what he perceived to be an intelligible Syriac rendering of the Hebrew. Such is apparently also the case in English where even a very literal translation (YLT) is required to diverge from the word order to avoid creating a translation (‘Three men these stopped answering...’) which would be rejected by even the most accommodating of English readers.

Continuing on through chapter 32, we now arrive at two examples which are drawn from P-Job’s translation of consecutive verses (vv. 15,16).

\[
\text{They are discomfited, they answer no more; they have not a word to say. RSV}
\]
Although it is by no means certain because the end of the preceding line is not preserved, most commentators have assumed that 11Q10 'they were silent' corresponds to Heb. יאֵּֽהָדָּר 'they did not answer again'. As might by now be expected, the translator of P-Job makes explicit the object of 'they did not answer' by providing a 3rd masc. sg. suffix 'they (did not) answer him'. Not only does the targum differ from the Syriac version in supplying a different verbal root in its rendering (בור), it also parts company with P-Job by sticking faithfully to the word order preserved in the Hebrew. The Syriac translation on the other hand, inverts the order of the verbal and adverbial elements in its rendering, providing (MT יאֵֽהָדָּר). Before coming to any conclusions regarding this transposition here in verse 15, we first turn to the verse which immediately follows it.

And shall I wait, because they do not speak, because they stand there, and answer no more? RSV

If 'they were silent' does in fact correspond to Heb. יאֵֽהָדָּר 'they did not answer again' then it is not entirely clear why the Qumran translator here in verse 16 provides יאֵֽהָדָּר for the 3rd pf. pl. form of Heb. עָנָה 'to answer'. In this case it is

664 Editio princeps, 53; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 208; B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 88. If so this is an example of 11Q10 opting for an interpretative translation much like P-Job utilised in 32:11 (interpreting יאֵֽהָדָּר 'I waited' as meaning 'I was silent').

665 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 145 n.43.

666 This rendering may have been influenced by the Hebrew earlier in this verse where a verbal form of יאֵֽהָדָּר is rendered with יאֵֽהָדָּר by P-Job and RtgJob. As this portion of 11Q10's translation is however
clear that the Qumran translator, like his counterpart in the targumic tradition, follows his rendering of the verb with a translation of נָתַן. Again the Syriac translator also supplies an objective suffix in rendering רָאֵשׁ לָהֶם ‘they did not answer’ with מִתְנַשֵּׁה ‘they (did not) answer him’ but as in the previous verse, the translator of P-Job chooses to transpose his rendering (מָנַה) of Heb. נָתַן, to the beginning of the clause. When two such modifications are located in successive verses it is tempting to assume that this is yet another example of properly linguistic constraints making their presence felt. The temptation grows even stronger when רָאֵשׁ is the subject of the same transposition in the Syriac translation of Job 34:23.667 But because the Syriac version of Job 7:10 twice follows the MT word order in locating its translation of רָאֵשׁ following a negative verbal form, it is clear that the translator is quite free to follow the Hebrew text when it suits him. In light of this, the modifications here in 32:15 and 16 must represent an adjustment of the text which is in some sense a stylistic option for the translator.668

For I deliver the afflicted who is crying, And the fatherless who hath no helper. YLT
because I delivered the poor who cried, and the fatherless who had none to help him. RSV

not preserved, the motivation for this adjustment remains uncertain, as does the translator’s preference for the imperfect over against the Hebrew perfect form.

667 This transposition is made alongside others in the Syriac translator’s re-writing of the Hebrew text 34:23. לֹא לֹא אַשְׁתָּן נַעֲמוֹר לֹא נַעֲמוֹר אֲנָה הֵחָיָה לֹא לֹא כִּי לֹא לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי לֹא כִּי L:

668 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 108 n.11 attributes this modification to language difference, but it seems to be rather a function of the stylistic preference of the translator.
While the meaning of the Hebrew (ר"ל נ"ל) is basically clear, the representation of this clause in the Aramaic versions shows a degree of variation. While the targum reproduces the MT form scrupulously, both P-Job and the Qumran text show minor discrepancies. Although it seems that the Qumran targum has supplied the relative pronoun (מ"ס) it is debatable whether the Aramaic supplied has been intended as a verbal clause or a nominal one. Whether the understanding of the Qumran text is more similar to that of Rtg Job or the Syriac version, it is clear that P-Job here shows a negated nominal clause. In the process of formulating this rendering, the translator has apparently opted to present the suffixed preposition in a position adjacent to the negative particle (ס"ל). We are better able to understand this word order discrepancy when we notice that a similar construction appears elsewhere in Job. At 33:9 (ר"ל נ"ל ס"ל), the Syriac text again diverges from the word order of the source text in the same manner in an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew (ס"ל ס"ל ס"ל). Further clues that the transposition here is a result of linguistic-stylistic considerations are found in the Syriac versions of Job 10:22 and 15:3 where the translator adds suffixed prepositional phrases to ס"ל. Because neither prepositional phrase is attested there in the MT, the fact that the translator supplies them in a position immediately adjacent to ס"ל rather than allowing another form to intervene would seem to confirm the suggestion that here and

669 It is difficult to determine whether the translator of 11Q10 has provided the 3rd masc. pl. suffix on the preposition because of the occurrence of a plurality of references earlier in the verse ('the poor' and 'the orphan') or whether the translator was influenced by the Hebrew of 30:13 (where, in a virtually parallel expression, he renders Heb. ס"ל with the form which occurs here) B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 508 seems justified in rejecting Sokoloff's suggestion that the reading of the plural suffix necessitates the assumption that the translator rendered a plural form of MT ס"ל.

670 The editors read ס"ל as an imitation of the Hebrew participle-as-substantive. While M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 123 prefers to understand the Qumran text as intending a verbal clause, the thorough analysis of B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 506-7 follows T. Muraoka, 'Notes on the Old Targum', n.33 in seeing the Qumran text as a probable imitation of the Hebrew.

671 In fact M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 123 appeals to the Syriac version as evidence that the Qumran translator has not intended a nominal clause. See B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 507.
at 33:9, linguistic-stylistic constraints have required the translator to diverge from the word order of the Hebrew text in order to provide an acceptable Syriac rendering.672

Doth he make a covenant with thee? Dost thou take him for a servant age-during? YLT
Will he make a covenant with you to take him for your servant for ever? RSV

The targumist attempts to recreate in Aramaic the well-known Hebrew covenantal idiom מִקַּחְלַחַת בְּרֵיתִי ‘he will cut a covenant/pact’, whereas both the Qumran and Syriac translators have modified the idiom by rendering the Hebrew verb with לָכֶם and מַעַלְךָ respectively (both having the meaning ‘to establish, fix’).673 Our focus here is, however, not on the verb but on the cognate accusative and preposition which follow in precisely that order both in the Hebrew text (ברית בְּרֵיתִי) and in the Qumran (לָכֶם לָכֶם) and targum (לָכֶם לָכֶם) renderings of it. As may be seen above, the Syriac version presents these particular elements in an inverted order (כֶם לָכֶם כֶם לָכֶם). When this idiom (ברית בְּרֵיתִי) includes כֶם, it is the preposition rather than הבָּרַיתוֹ which is more likely to immediately follow the verb.674 However, at Genesis 26:28 (ברית בְּרֵיתִי) where the Syriac translator encounters the word order which is also present here in Job there is no sign of deviation (כֶם לָכֶם כֶם לָכֶם). Furthermore at Job 22:4 (כֶם לָכֶם כֶם לָכֶם)


673 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 87 notes that the retention of the idiom is also attested in Tg. Onqelos and Ps-J (Gen 21:27; Deut 5:2).

674 See for instance, Deut 4:23, 5:2, 29:11; 24 IKgs. 8:21; Neh. 9:8; 2 Chron 6:11.
and 42:11 (יהוּדָה כָּלִים בְּכִיָּהוּ) the translator of P-Job shows a willingness to implement exactly the opposite transposition in his rendering of these two verses (22:4

\(22:4 \text{ and } 42:11\)) While the above analysis suggests that it is again the stylistic preference of the translator which lies behind some transpositions, the discussion also reveals that the precise motivation for his deviation from the Hebrew word order may be elusive.675

If he heap up as dust silver. And as clay prepare clothing, YLT

Though he heap up silver like dust, and pile up clothing like clay; RSV

Despite the lack of conjunction between the stichs in 11Q10’s rendering of 27:16, it is clear that קָרָנִים ‘coins, money’ is intended as an equivalent for MT קֹט.676

While the targum opts for an alternate, but equally appropriate, rendering in סֵין, the Syriac text opts to represent this Hebrew lexeme with the cognate form כָּזֶב. Because the Qumran text is fragmentary at this point it is impossible to determine how the translator has rendered בּוֹטֶל, but it is clear that if it was included in the Aramaic representation of the verse it must have preceded קָרָנִים in the clause. While in the case of the Syriac (כָּזֶב כִּרִים) and targum (מְדִיר עָשֵׁר ידַר) texts we see that the cognate substantives

---

675 Other examples include P-Job’s translation of 40:30 (יַעֲמַד חָלֶת, חָלֶת, עָמַד עֲמָד) and 33:28 (וְיְהַלְלֵנִי כִּי שָׁלוֹחַ וַתְּכַלָּם כֶּלֶם).

676 For the loss of conjunction see 11Q10’s treatment of מַאֲט in Part Three below. See B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 392 for discussion of קָרָנִים, also provided by the Qumran translator in the rendering of the following verse (27:17).
have been supplied in order to complete the simile, the order in which the respective translators represent the source text in Aramaic differs. The targum text reproduces the word order of the Hebrew, but the Syriac text presents a word order at odds with the MT by following its rendering of the verb with first the tenor of the simile ($\text{כִּבְשָׁן}$) and then its vehicle ($\text{סַעַט}$). Here again the English translation tradition represented by the RSV shows a similar modification to that found in the Syriac version.677

A similar modification appears four verses later in P-Job’s version of 27:20,

\[
\text{תַּשְׁבִּיתָהּ בְּלִיוֹן בְּלִיוֹן לְלִי הָֽעָבָרָה סְמָךְ}
\]

\[
\text{[...]} \quad \text{11Q10}
\]

\[
\text{תָּרָבְקֲנֵהוּ וְדַרְכּוֹ הַמָּיִם אֵצְלֵיהֶם לְלִי הָֽעָבָרָה יְדָהָ}
\]

\[
\text{11Q10} \quad \text{RtgJob}
\]

\[
\text{תָּרָבְקֲנֵהוּ וְדַרְכּוֹ הַמָּיִם אֵצְלֵיהֶם לְלִי הָֽעָבָרָה יְדָהָ}
\]

\[
\text{P-Job}
\]

Overtake him as waters do terrors. By night stolen him away hath a whirlwind. YLT

Terrors overtake him like a flood; in the night a whirlwind carries him off. RSV

Again here we see that the Syriac translator diverges from the word order of the Hebrew text ($\text{כִּבְשָׁן בְּלִיוֹן לְלִי הָֽעָבָרָה}$) which is duly followed by the other two Aramaic translations ($\text{לְלִי הָֽעָבָרָה וְדַרְכּוֹ הַמָּיִם}$). As in 27:16, the Syriac version here shows an inversion of the simile with the tenor ($\text{כִּבְשָׁן}$) again being positioned before the vehicle ($\text{סַעַט}$). In following the word order of the Hebrew precisely, the literal English translation of Young is distorted well beyond the range of normal idiomatic use. In the same connection, the Syriac translator again presents an alternate word order to that of the MT in his rendering of Job 38:30,

---

677 The more proximate translations of the Qumran and Targum text parallel Young’s Literal Translation in reproducing the word order of the MT.
As a stone waters are hidden, And the face of the deep is captured. YLT

The waters become hard like stone, and the face of the deep is frozen. RSV

Here the Hebrew poet opens the line with the vehicle of the simile (ךָשִׁכְנה תּוֹקָה, ‘like stone’) and all three Aramaic versions follow suit in providing entirely adequate equivalents (ךָשִׁכְנה תּוֹקָה / בֵּן תּוֹקָה / כָּשִׁכְּנָה תּוֹקָה). 678 Similarly, all the translators supply the expected rendering of Hebrew מִים although the targum and Syriac versions supply emphatic forms instead of an absolute form as does the Qumran text. 679 When the two examples drawn from chapter 27 are considered alongside the present case in 38:30, it is clear that the Syriac translator of Job has felt free to deviate from the word order in the Hebrew text when he encounters a simile in his source. But is the translator merely free (that is, constrained only by his own stylistic preference) or is he rather obliged by a definable linguistic constraint of his target language? While 27:16 and 20 display the identical transposition (MT: V – ‘like’ + vehicle – tenor P-Job: V – tenor – ‘like’ + vehicle) the Syriac translation of 38:30 (MT: ‘like’ + vehicle – tenor – V) > ‘like’ + vehicle + V + tenor) does not display the same treatment. What is common between the three adjustments is the tendency to ensure that the verbal form (V) is followed by the tenor, regardless of their position vis-à-vis the vehicle. While this explanation would suggest that a linguistic constraint has resulted in the transpositions in these passages, the Syriac translator’s treatment of 27:18—a verse quite clearly in the vicinity of vv 16 and 20—calls this assumption into question. There the translator has no qualms about

678 P-Job renders the MT singular. Although H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 65 sees P-Job’s rendering of the Hebrew singular בֵּן ‘stone’ with the Syriac plural כָּשִׁכְּנָה ‘stones’ as resulting from language difference, it seems more likely that P-Job has harmonised the grammatical number of this noun with that of the other noun and verb in the clause.
lls this assumption into question. There the translator has no qualms about reproducing the word order of the Hebrew (יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׁבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי YLT

And Jehovah answereth Job out of the whirlwind, and saith: — YLT

Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind (____): RSV

Here in Job 40:6, various witnesses within the MSS tradition of RtgJob have preserved the addition/substitution אִיִּדְרֵי הָיָה prior to its rendering of the divine name אִיִּדְרֵי. As opposed to the use of this term by both 11Q10 and RtgJob in 39:25, the appearance of memra here is probably an example of a developmentally late usage. While it is dif-

---


680 While Young's adherence to the Hebrew creates what might kindly be described as non-standard English, the more idiomatic English translations of these verses (such as RSV) tend to parallel the Syriac in preferring the adjacent positioning of V and the tenor. Another linguistic-stylistic adjustment is apparently made by the translator at 31:30 where he deviates from the word order of the MT (יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי יִרְשָׂ הָבִי YLT

681 See Appendix I: Memra in 11Q10.
cult to determine the content or extent of its theological signification when used in conjunction with the divine name, the appearance of this more developed usage of this term provides a substantive link between RtgJob and classical targumic literature.682 While all three Aramaic translators make the necessary adjustment of the verbal form at the end of Job 40:6 (רֹאָשָׁה).683 When we turn to the Qumran rendering we see that the same verb has been provided in a final position in the Aramaic translation but also that a suffixed preposition הִלּוֹ 'to him', has been supplied following the verb. Finally, while the Syriac version joins the other Aramaic renderings in providing סַהְכָּא, the provision of this equivalent is made not at the end of the verse but medially instead. In the Syriac translation the direct object (בֵּן אָמֶרְנָהְו) of the initial Hebrew clause (בֵּן אָמֶרְרָנָהוֹ) becomes a prepositional phrase סַהְכָּא which is then dependent on the newly relocated verb (סַהְכָּא נְסָרֵא). Although it is clear that the Qumran translator has added an element while the Syriac translator has opted for transposition, the alternate modes of representation should not obscure the fundamentally similar approaches to the Hebrew text. The Qumran translator has supplied a suffixed preposition הִלּוֹ 'to him' following the verb in order to clarify and reiterate the identity and of the addressee: 'God answered Job from the wi[nd] and the cloud and he said to him לַלֵּוֹ רָנוֹב הָאָנָא). Whereas the Qumran translator expands his text in order to produce an idiomatically explicit rendering of the Hebrew, the Syriac translator prefers to contract the Hebrew text into a more concise Syriac form by failing to represent the addressee (בֵּן אָמֶרְרָנָהוֹ) as direct object. In the Syriac, the addressee (Job) is instead represented by the prepositional phrase סַהְכָּא (11Q10: הִלּוֹ) and the verb which appears at the end of the other versions is then brought

---

682 As A. Chester, Divine Revelation, 293-313 brings out in his lucid discussion of this term, the issue (by no means easily resolved) is not merely what the theological significance of memra is ('hypostasis', 'metonymy' etc.) but at what point did this theological significance emerge and what were its sources (e.g. 'word theology').

683 For discussion of the Aramaic versions treatment of the waw + prefix conjugation see Part Three below.
into relationship with it through transposition (וַיָּדֶרֶךְ וַיָּדֶרֶךְ). It is clear that despite their different modes of representation, the Qumran and Syriac translators demonstrate the same sensitivity to the Hebrew text and adjust their renderings accordingly. Having detected this same transposition elsewhere in the Syriac version of Job (see for instance 1:7, 9; 2:2, 4, 38:1, 40:1, 3; 42:1) H. Szpek also discovers that in all but five instances of this type of Hebrew construction throughout the Hebrew Bible, the Syriac translator makes a similar syntactic adjustment. When considered alongside the Qumran translation’s evident parallel, these other instances of a similar syntactic transformation would seem to lead to the conclusion that the transposition here in 40:6 is to be attributed to the linguistic constraints of the translator’s Aramaic target language.

Earlier in our discussion we encountered numerous examples of transposition which have clearly arisen as a result of the translator’s tendency to harmonise the word order of a given text with an alternative word order found within the verse or in the vicinity. On other occasions we discovered instances of word order deviation in P-Job which seem connected to the linguistic-stylistic preferences of the translator. As the final two examples below will demonstrate, however, not all examples of transposition are so easily placed in discrete, hermetic categories.

Therefore I have said: Hearken to me, I do shew my opinion—even I. YLT

Therefore I say: Listen to me; I too will tell you what I know. NIV

684 See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 109-11 for extensive discussion of the Syriac treatment of this construction. In fact, of these five cases, the lack of modification in three is readily understandable when the particular syntactic structure and surrounding context are taken into account.

685 Like the rendering provided by P-Job, the NIV’s translation supplies the indirect object ‘(to) you’.
In 32:10, Elihu pleads with Job and ‘the friends’ for a hearing on the subject of Job’s predicament.⁶⁸⁶ Although the Hebrew verb does not of course require the reiteration of the subject, a desire for emphasis on Elihu’s inclusion in the group has led to its provision here along with the particle.⁶⁸⁷ Although the targumic tradition preserves variation in terms of the actual lexeme provided (תִּנְתָּה קְנָּה), all three Aramaic versions represent both the independent pronoun and its accompanying particle.⁶⁸⁸ But whereas the Hebrew and its Qumran and targum translations display the pronoun-particle cluster at the end of their rendering of 32:10, the Syriac version locates its rendering not in a final position but rather at the beginning of the clause (אֲנִי יִנְתָּה קְנָּה) where the others show the verb. As with virtually all transpositions, there is no change of meaning discernible as a result of the dislocation and furthermore there seems to be little in the first half of the verse which might have motivated it. The appearance of a related modification below in 32:17 may serve to shed some light on this modification and it will suffice at this point to note that the word order of the new Syriac translation (particle + pronoun – V[indir obj] – O) differs from that of the MT (V – O – particle + pronoun).

---

⁶⁸⁶ A. Caquot, ‘Un écrit sectaire’, 16 has suggested that 11Q10’s use of a generic term כלע ‘my words’ in place of MT יִנְתָּה ‘my opinion, knowledge’ both here and in an identical clause (32:17b below) should be understood as the translator’s attempt to downgrade the discourse of Elihu from ‘knowledge’ to mere ‘words’ (in contrast to the upgrading of Job’s image). While this may be possible, it is worth noting that both here and in v. 17, the sense of the Hebrew (BDB, 395) may indeed be ‘opinion’ rather than ‘knowledge’ and if this is indeed the case, then this modification may be more innocuous than Caquot supposes. Alternatively, the translator may have been influenced by the appearance (twice) of references to ‘words’ in the following verse.

⁶⁸⁷ For discussion of pronouns accompanied by ‘particles of interest’ see B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 16.3.5b.

⁶⁸⁸ The Aramaic versions reflect the varied functions of the Hebrew particle כלע by providing more than one equivalent: 11Q10: כלע, יִנְתָּה; RtgJob: כלע, יִנְתָּה קְנָּה, קְנָה; P-Job: , (omission). For examples see 32:10, 32:17, 35:14, 36:29, 37:11, 40:08.
The repetition in 32:17 of structures analogous (v.17a) and identical (v.17b) to that found earlier in verse 10 (see above) affords an opportunity to shed some light on the attitude of the translator. Here again the Qumran (ע"ש ב'א) and targum texts (אא אָבָּר) follow the Hebrew in preserving particle and pronoun at the end of the clause and verse, but the Syriac translator once again diverges from the source text by locating this cluster between verb and object (אא אָבָּר) in his rendering. In light of the structure of the first half of the verse, it seems obvious that the modified word order in the Syriac (V - particle + pronoun - O) is a direct result of the influence of v.17a (אא אָבָּר) which has been duly reproduced in P-Job. But if the answer here is purely one of intra-verse influence, what are we to make of the example seven verses earlier (32:10). Not only do we see no parallel structure on hand there to influence the Syriac rendering, we also see that the exact same Hebrew text has been modified in a different way (אא אָבָּר) with the particle pronoun cluster being transposed to an initial position. The answer to the problem of such variation in close proximity is to be found through an examination of other cases in the Syriac version of the OT where this same cluster is rendered. While in Leviticus 26:24 we find the word order of the Hebrew (דַּעְתָּן הַיְּשׁוֹף מִיִּתְּכֹן יָפְעֵם בְּן) being followed by the Syriac version, only four verses later (26:28) the translator of P-Leviticus diverges from the
Hebrew text where these same elements follow the object (יְהֵימֹתִה יָאָבֵב אֲלֵר). The possibility that the Syriac translator may represent the particle + pronoun cluster before or after the verb, but not following the object of the verb, seems to be confirmed when we turn to the instances of transposition here in Job 32. In verse 10 whereas the Hebrew poet is free to position יְהֵימֹתִה אֲלֵר following the object (יְהֵימֹתִה) the Syriac translator relocates it to a position preceding not only the object but the verb as well (םַעַד-יְהֵימֹתִה אֲלֵר). In 32:17, the Syriac translator is again required to transpose the יְהֵימֹתִה cluster to a pre-object position in his rendering, but here, instead of placing it in the initial position, he is influenced by the first half of verse 17 where the order is V – particle + pronoun – O, as we have seen. Whereas above (v.10) we see the translator deviates from MT on purely linguistic-stylistic grounds, here in verse 17 the influence of the immediate context has prevented the translator from replicating the word order which the purely linguistic-stylistic constraints dictated in verse 10.

And an arm like God hast thou? And with a voice like Him dost thou thunder? YLT
Have you an arm like God, and can you thunder with a voice like his? RSV

Here in 40:9 we encounter in the Hebrew the possessive construction which makes use of the preposition lamedh. While the targum translation follows the He-

---

689 The analysis of the Syriac text is made difficult by the fact that the translator seems to have contracted his rendering, but the transposition of the particle + pronoun to an initial position (םַעַד-יְהֵימֹתִה אֲלֵר) seems likely to be partially related to linguistic-stylistic constraints. In other passages such as Gen 40:16, Lev 26:16, Ps 89:28 (ed. Walter) the Syriac translator(s) follow the order of the Hebrew text.

690 Interestingly, the constraints for most English translators are even more restrictive than those which constrain their ancient Syriac counterparts. The particle + pronoun cluster ‘I too’ almost always precedes the verb because the English verb here requires an explicit pronoun ‘I (I, too) will tell…’

691 See B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 11.2.10d.
brew in reproducing only the suffixed preposition (יֵלֵ֑ו) both the translators of P-Job and 11Q10 have provided the existential particle 'דַּ֔י/ Canucks in an attempt to make this distinctive Semitic genitive construction more explicit than it is in the Hebrew here. Where these renderings differ, however, is in the location of this particle within the respective clauses. As may be easily seen, the Qumran translator simply supplies the particle before the preposition (יֵלֵ֑ו) while otherwise retaining the word order of the Hebrew. The Syriac translator again diverges from the Hebrew by transposing this unit (ךֹ֑נִי) to the beginning of the clause in his rendering. Similarly in the latter half of the verse we see that the translator of P-Job again deviates from the word order which is displayed in the MT and followed by 11Q10 and RtgJob. Here the Syriac version inverts the order so that the verbal form (ךֹ֑נִי) now precedes, rather than follows, the comparative construction 'םָ֔פֵנה וּניֵ֑לָד. 'with a voice like his/m'. In light of previous discussions involving the non/existential particle (see above 29:12) it is not entirely surprising to find that the translator has supplied Canucks in his quest for idiomatic fluency. The provision of this particle does not, however, explain the word order deviations which appear not only in the first half of the verse, but also in the latter portion. In fact one of the keys to understanding the transposition seems to lie in recognising the influence of the preceding verse (40:8) on the Syriac rendering of this one. There the Hebrew text (ךֹ֑נִי וּניֵ֑לָד וּניֵ֑לָד), prompts the translator to offer (ךֹ֑נִי יִ֑נְשִׁיתוּל וּניֵ֑לָד) as an adequate Syriac rendering.694

693 While M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 158 provides evidence (Gap 22:22, TgOnqelos Gen 43:6, 32:4) that Aramaic as a language requires the explicit representation of the particle as opposed to the Hebrew, we cannot overlook the obvious fact that at this juncture RtgJob does not add this particle. This is a clear example of the difficulty faced when trying to derive idiomatic Aramaic ‘usage’ from Targumic Aramaic materials.
694 It also worth noting in this connection that the Syriac translator seems to have transposed his rendering of Canucks (v.9) to verse 8 (ךֹ֑נִי). This adjustment serves to transform verse 8 into the protasis of a conditional construction whose apodosis takes the form of a rhetorical question (verse 9). Another transposition of a rendering of Canucks is evident at 40:27 where Hebrew (ךֹ֑נִי וּניֵ֑לָד וּניֵ֑לָד וּניֵ֑לָד) is rendered
Having begun both halves of 40:8 with 2nd person participial verbs in translating the Hebrew, we are not entirely surprised to observe that the translator seems set on continuing the same line of questioning with a rendering of 40:9 which parallels the word order of the preceding verse. In the event, this clearly requires a transposition of both כַּרְכֹּרֹת and כְּרִאָיִם to initial positions within the respective verses and indeed this exact same modification has already been seen in the Syriac version of Job 38:32 where the 2nd person verbal element is likewise transposed (MT: דָּחֲא דָּחֲא חַיִּים חַיִּים). While it may be possible that the transpositions present in this verse are entirely due to the factors discussed above, the presence of a simile in both stichs here in 40:9 at least raises the possibility that linguistic-stylistic preferences may also be at work. In fact, as we have seen above, the Syriac translator of 27:16 and 20 prefers to leave the comparative elements (רָכֹר + vehicle) to the final position in his rendering despite the fact that the Hebrew word order is quite different. So too here, the translator's adjustments result in כְּרִאָיִם 'like God' and כְּרִאָיִם 'like H/him' being left in the final position in their respective stichs.

**Summary of Transposition in P-Job**

We have seen from the above examples that the Syriac translator apparently feels free to adjust the word order of the Hebrew in order to create intelligible Syriac out of a previously modified text. The Syriac version of Job also presents cases where the perceived difficulty or ambiguity of the Hebrew has forced the translator to deploy transposition alongside other adjustments in an attempt to produce a fluent Syriac translation.

The above discussion also shows that the Syriac translator's deviations from the word order of the Hebrew may stem not only from preceding modifications or problem-
atic source texts, but also from the influence of Hebrew texts in the vicinity which share some features with a given text, but present a different word order. While occasionally this tendency toward harmonisation may involve a more distantly related text or texts (40:13), the majority of examples suggest that the pressure to harmonise is most keenly felt at close range, that is within the verse itself, where the Syriac translator will modify the word order of one clause in light of the syntax displayed in another. The fact that in some, but not all, cases we see a similar tendency toward harmonisation of word order in some traditions of English translation (RSV, NIV) suggests that the desire for syntactic balance between stichs often transcends linguistic boundaries and should in these cases be properly ascribed to the stylistic preferences of a biblical translator.

In addition to the above examples of word order harmonisation, the Syriac version provides numerous cases of transposition whose origins are not to be discerned in a neighbouring stich but simply in the process by which the Hebrew text is rendered and then reconstituted according to the linguistic and stylistic canons of the Syriac dialect used by the translator. While it seems most appropriate to locate some of these adjustments toward the linguistic end of the linguistic-stylistic continuum, other modifications are made by the translator only inconsistently (despite similarity of content and close proximity) and should probably be considered as optional for the Syriac translator. Such linguistic-stylistic constraints are particularly evident in the Syriac translator’s treatment of comparative constructions as well as clauses involving the expression אֱלֹהִים/אֱלֹהִים.

---

696 37:12, 39:10.
698 19:13, 36:15, 40:10, 26, 39:5, 6, 7.
700 32:15, 16, 40:28.
701 27:16, 20 and 38:30.
702 29:12, 40:9.
The final few examples illustrated the complex interaction of factors which may need to be considered in the assessment of the Syriac translator's rendering.\textsuperscript{703} While some examples discussed appear to be more straightforward in their analysis, these others caution us against the dangers of rigid classification and artificial atomisation. What is crystal clear in any case, is that intra-verse influence and/or linguistic-stylistic factors, although at times not easily distinguished, are primary contributing causes of transposition for the Syriac translator of Job.

\textsuperscript{703} 32:10, 17; 40:9.
CHAPTER 8

RtgJob

Having looked at the phenomenon of transposition in the Syriac and Qumran Aramaic versions of Job, we now turn our attention to the Rabbinic targum. Although R. Weiss does not seem to have provided a systematic treatment of the topic of transposition in his work on the targum, he does supply some examples of transposition in the text.\(^704\) These will be discussed below in addition to any examples which may have escaped his attention. While Weiss was free to draw upon the entire text of the targum in his work, we are necessarily restricted to those portions of RtgJob for which parallel passages exist in P-Job and in the lowest common denominator of our study, the fragmentary Qumran text.

\[...\text{RtgJob...} \quad 37:15\]

Dost thou know when God doth place them, And caused to shine the light of His cloud? YLT

Do you know how God lays his command upon them, and causes the lightning of his cloud to shine? RSV

\(^704\) R. Weiss, \textit{התרשモン הארמי לפש אירוס}, 221.
Although the Qumran text's rendering (ס?2) of MT וְחִוָּעַת (חִוָּעַת) is quite uncertain, the remainder of the Aramaic translation of 37:15b (חִוָּעַת וְנַעַרְנוּ) follows the Hebrew text. The translator of the Syriac version offers an alternative verbal equivalent (גֶּמֶל) and makes use of the analytic genitive common to his idiom. While he also supplies a plural noun (מַעֲנָהוֹ הָאָרְעָא ‘his clouds’) in place of the Hebrew singular, the translator responsible for P-Job’s rendering dutifully follows the word order attested in the Hebrew source text (V – DO [N1 gen. N2]). So too the targum tradition preserved in RtgJob b) where the MT is followed with scrupulous precision. The Aramaic translation supplied by the majority of the RtgJob text traditions [a]), however, presents a text which is quite different from the shorter version supplied in b). Particularly interesting for our purposes here is the fact that RtgJob a) displays a word order which differs from the one found in the MT—providing its equivalent of immediately following the verb (יְהִי הָאָרְעָא) rather than as the last word of the verse as in the Hebrew. It is apparently this last word (יְהִי הָאָרְעָא ‘light’), or rather the targumist’s rendering of it (טְעִלָא הָאָרְעָא ‘his rain’) which holds the key to understanding this instance of transposition. While this unexpected rendering of the common Hebrew word for light is paralleled in Rabbinic

705 F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 147.
706 T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac, § 73.
707 For fuller discussion of the Syriac translator’s modification of the verse as a whole see G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 314.
708 The translation tradition of 37:15 b) is preserved by T R, all of whom are members of the Sephardic family of MSS labelled Group 2 in Stec’s tentative stemma. D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, 75 notes that Group 2 texts tend to prefer the absolute form of the divine name הָאָרְעָא over the emphatic form הָאָרְעָא.
709 While the substitutions provided by 11Q10 (אֲמִי ‘what’) and P-Job (אֲמִי הָאָרְעָא ‘that which’) substitute for an apparently ‘temporal’ (וְחִוָּעַת וְנַעַרְנוּ) ‘(do you know) when God places/about God’s placing…’), S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (I), 321 eliminate the unexpected preposition and provide the object [‘his works’] which seems to be missing from the Hebrew. RtgJob (a) is able to preserve a proximate translation of the MT by supplying the direct object explicitly (אֲמִי הָאָרְעָא ‘command’) (As Mangan, The Targum of Job, 81 n.10 notes LXX also provides an object here אֶפֶרֶק אֲמִי הָאָרְעָא ‘his works’ but unlike RtgJob, the remainder of the LXX version of this verse corresponds only very loosely with the MT.)
sources, it is found more immediately, four verses earlier at 37:11b. There, the Hebrew text has also given rise to two translation traditions in RtgJob, but in both cases the latter portion of the source text (יהה והשך ותענ) has prompted the targumists to render (והשך והשך ותענ) ‘and the wind scatters the cloud of his rain.’ In light of the proximity and the striking similarity between the targumic renderings of 37:11b (והשך והשך ותענ) and 37:15b (והשך והשך ותענ) in terms of both semantic divergence (‘rain’ in place of Hebrew ‘light’) and word order, it seems most likely that this instance of transposition in 37:15b should be attributed to a harmonisation on the part of the translator or the transmitter of his Vorlage. This harmonisation has the added benefit of explaining the addition of the 3 masc. sg. suffix (והשך והשך ותענ) here in 37:15—having resulted from (והשך והשך ותענ) (37:11) and (והשך והשך ותענ) (37:15). Although not decisive grounds for preferring translator intervention over an alternate Vorlage, it is interesting to note that this transposition in RtgJob is found not in the ‘literal’ translation tradition of RtgJob (b) but instead within a translation which, as we noted above, shows a greater tolerance for other adjustments in the rewriting of the Hebrew into an Aramaic version.

710 See C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 81 n. 17. Elihu’s mention of ‘light’ is understood as signifying ‘rain’ according to one part of the Rabbinic tradition (Gen. Rabba 26.7). See R. Weiss, החוכם והאותר תמיב ראב, 276-77 for a more extensive discussion of the Rabbinic parallels.

711 See also RtgJob 37:21.

712 R. Weiss, החוכם והאותר תמיב ראב, 221 attributes the modification to the translator rather than the Vorlage from which he worked.

713 Another example of transposition cited by R. Weiss, החוכם והאותר תמיב ראב, 221 (18:4) is unfortunately only poorly preserved in 11Q10. While this prevents comparison of RtgJob’s treatment with the other Aramaic versions at this point, it is clear that the RtgJob translator deviates from the order of the Hebrew text at 18:4b (Veen אופק רוחאון) providing the subject in the initial position in the targum (והשך והשך ותענ) rather than supplying it after the verb as is the case in MT. As Weiss indicates, this transposition seems to be quite clearly related to Job 14:18 where the Hebrew displays a text identical in all respects to that of 18:4 apart from the order of S and V. (ברד יבשכ ותענ). While 14:18 (T2) supplements its rendering with references to the patriarchs (See C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 45 n.13) both T2 and T1 (והשך והשך ותענ) follow the order of the Hebrew in their renderings and apart from the use of the participle (vs. prefix conjugation) are identical.
Every high thing he doth see, He (is) king over all sons of pride. YLT
He beholds everything that is high; he is king over all the sons of pride. RSV

Although all three Aramaic versions present translations which largely approximate the meaning of the Hebrew,\(^\text{714}\) only two closely related witnesses (ד ב) to RtgJob join the Qumran (ד מלך הודו) and Syriac (ד מלך כמא) versions in preserving the MT word order throughout this verse.\(^\text{715}\) The remaining traditions present an order which is the inverse of the MT bipartite nominal clause ד מלך הודו 'he is king', providing instead the Aramaic translation ד מלך. While the only other transposition encountered thus far in RtgJob has clearly arisen as a result of the tendency to harmonise similar texts which display

\(^{714}\) The exception to this general assessment is to be found at the end of the verse. The RtgJob textual tradition (see D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, 303 for complete list of variants) preserves numerous variant translations of Heb. ד מלך הודו ‘sons of pride’ (i.e. proud creatures). Some MSS preserve ד מלך כמא, הב מוב, הרמ, הניא all of which refer to water creatures which F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11 suggests may have been derived from reading the Hebrew as ד מלך ‘to swarm or teem’. Another interpretation represented by some MSS is ד מלך הב ‘lion’s whelps’ which has clearly been influenced by the RtgJob’s contextual translation at 28:8 (ד to ד מלך). (b.T.Sanh 95a presumably works on the same assumption when it includes this Hebrew lexeme as one of 7 names for the lion. See R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 307). A final reading preserved by the tradition is ד מלך מניא ‘men of violence’. Are the origins of this reading to be found in the root ד מלך ‘to slaughter, beat’ or is perhaps the influence of Ch 4 (vv 7-8 where ‘lions’ and their whelps are a metaphor for the ‘guilty man’) being felt here? Both 11Q10 and P-Job provide ד מלך for Heb. ד מלך ‘sons of pride’ (i.e. proud creatures). This highly idiomatic and very rare expression (only appearing here and at Job 28:8—where both RtgJob and P-Job provide contextual translations) has prompted a contextual translation. (So conclude R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 490; H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 293 and G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 357.) In light of the vast number of variants generated and preserved in the RtgJob textual tradition, it is interesting to note that both 11Q10 and P-Job have arrived at a single, identical contextual translation.

\(^{715}\) For one view of the relationship between ד (=Rabbinic Bible 1517) and ב (=MS Nürnberg [Solger Codex]) see D. Shepherd, ‘Before Bomberg’.
differing word orders, here no such influence presents itself and the motivation, if one is to be found, must lie elsewhere. It is worth noting that while neither P-Job nor the Qumran translation display the same word order discrepancy, the translators responsible for these translations do nevertheless make some adjustment in their rendering of the Hebrew at this point. The translator of P-Job, for his part, has transformed the Hebrew nominal clause into a verbal clause by his substitution of the 3rd masc. sg. independent pronoun ְַּּה in favour of a 3rd masc. sg. form of the verb 'to be.' 716 It is clear, furthermore, that both these translators (דרקא לוח / הך פגע הך קֶזֶנֶגְ) have supplied the waw conjunction between stichs where it is neither provided by the Hebrew nor supplied by the targum translator. 717 As we will see in Part Three, the addition of the conjunction by the Aramaic translators of the Syriac and Qumran texts is related to a linguistic-stylistic preference for marking the conjunction of stichs rather than merely leaving them apposed, but the question remains: what is the motivation for the targumist's transposition here? Although the Hebrew of Job presents examples of the independent pronoun (יהוּד) being used as a reiterated subject only following the participle (e.g. 15:22, 23) Hebrew certainly allows for the use of יהוּד with non-finite verbs. 718 Although the word order pronoun + verb is more common, the reverse order (verb + pronoun) is also attested in Hebrew. 719 Armed with this knowledge, and an awareness that the pronoun may also be used as the subject in verbless clauses, we see that the Hebrew text (יהוּד נָחַל הֶלְבָּא צֵרַף ַּּה הֶנַּּבֶּל הֶלְבָּא יְרָאֵה ַּּה הֶלְבָּא נָבֵּל הֶלְבָּא כּוּר) may provide a potential source of ambiguity for its reader/translator. Without the conjunction supplied by P-Job and 11Q10, the independent pronoun might be construed as a reiterated subject of יהוּד, rather than the subject of the latter stich (יהוּד). But while the transposed

716 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 357 suggests that this transformation is a result of the inner-Syriac corruption of an original independent pronoun. In its other occurrences, the translator of P-Job (and the SAVJ in general) renders the independent pronoun with its Aramaic cognate. (21:22, 28:23, 31:11, 32:1, 37:12).

717 For further discussion of shared additions of the waw in the Aramaic versions see Part Three below.

718 See B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 16.3.2 for the emphatic and non-emphatic use of independent pronouns with finite verbs in Hebrew.

719 See B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 16.3.2.
text presented by the targum might avoid the ambiguity of the pronoun’s reference, it is difficult to see how the resulting ambiguity (מַלְיֵרָה הָאֵל vs. הָאֵל מַלְיֵרָה) would be any great improvement on the existing order. It is at this point that D Golomb’s work on the syntax of nominal clauses in TgNeofiti may shed some light on our targum text here in Job. Although sentences whose subject is a personal pronoun display a word order in which the pronominal subject precedes the predicate (MT: מַלְיֵרָה הָאֵל TgN: קֹלֵלַע אֲבָרִים) Golomb has provided a few examples where the predicate is fronted and the pronominal subject follows. According to Golomb these are to be analysed as cleft sentences, despite the fact that the pronominal copy (הָאֵל) expected in nominal cleft sentences (e.g., TgN 38:25: כְּצָא מִדְּתֵי תּוֹפְתִּי מַלְיֵרָה ‘As for Tamar, righteous is she [lit. righteous is she Tamar]’) does not appear. According to Golomb, in such cases (whether in expansive passages or following the Hebrew Vorlage) the targumist effects the cleft sentence simply by means of fronting the predicate (MT: מַלְיֵרָה הָאֵל TgN: קֹלֵלַע אֲבָרִים ‘Behold, little am I and not...’). When we turn back to the case presented by the targumist’s transposition in Job 41:26, we see that the predicate is indeed fronted (מַלְיֵרָה הָאֵל מַלְיֵרָה ‘king is he over all the...’) and thereby set into relief or highlighted. In light of the above considerations, it may well be that the emphasis attainable through the use of a cleft sentence was simply too tempting for a targumist also aware of the potential grammatical ambiguity involved in following the Hebrew word order.

723 It is interesting to note that while the material presented by Golomb (186) shows clear evidence of the addition of the pronoun to emphasise and exploit an existing cleft sentence in the Hebrew (P-A-S), in none of the instances where Neofiti is translating does it rearrange the Hebrew text to this end.
Summary of Transposition in RtgJob

It is perhaps quite obvious from the outset that our ability to usefully characterise the targum translator's use of transposition is severely limited by the lack of examples furnished by the RtgJob. It is also important to note that neither of the two word order divergences found in the targum translation are attested across the entire MS tradition—in both cases a minority of MSS do preserve the word order of the Hebrew text. This inconsistent attestation does not of course preclude the possibility that the transpositions found are the work of the original translator, but it does caution against simplistic assumptions to that effect.

Although falling outside the scope of the sample examined in our study, the word order harmonisation found by R. Weiss in 18:4 would suggest that this same adjustment explored above in 37:15 is not entirely anomalous.\textsuperscript{724} The clarity of the examples, however, and their likely attribution to the translator should not obscure the fact that within our sample, only one instance of word order harmonisation was detected in the targum translation. The second instance of transposition (41:26) is less easily assessed but may have arisen in some parts of the Job targum tradition as a result of the perceived syntactic ambiguity of the Hebrew text being translated. If disambiguation has been the motivation of the translator, this goal seems to have been facilitated by the transposition which has resulted in a cleft sentence.

\textsuperscript{724} See note to the discussion of 37:15 above.
CHAPTER 9

SHARED TRANPOSITIONS

Having already examined the manner in which each of the respective Aramaic versions uniquely departs from the word order of the Hebrew text presented by the MT, the only task which remains is the assessment of instances where two or more of the versions appear to agree in their syntactic divergence.

A1. Transpositions shared by all three Aramaic versions

The sample failed to yield any word order divergences which were attested in all three versions.

A2. Transpositions shared by RtgJob and 11Q10

The sample similarly failed to provide any divergences of word order which were attested at the same juncture in the targum and Qumran translation.

A3. Transpositions shared by P-Job and RtgJob

The sample similarly failed to provide any divergences of word order which were attested at the same juncture in the targum and Qumran translation.

A4. Transpositions shared by P-Job and 11Q10

In light of the number of word order divergences unearthed in both of these texts, it would indeed be somewhat surprising if there was no overlap between the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job with regard to transposition. The fact that both versions present cases of word order harmonisation and transposition resulting from linguistic-stylistic constraints is at least an initial suggestion that the respective translators share some common concerns regarding word order divergence. One particular example is
provided by the treatment of the comparative constructions in the Qumran and Syriac texts. While the Qumran translation shows a transposition at 34:7 (MT: נ"ל לועז קמיה) the Syriac version (ע"ל קמיה) follows the order of the Hebrew. As we saw in the discussion of transposition in P-Job, the Syriac translator felt the need to transpose elements within the comparative constructions at 27:16, 20 and 38:30. Particularly interesting is 27:20 where a construction involving the same vehicle (‘like water’) is supplied by the Hebrew (MT דנה בלקה) in an inverted order. While the Qumran translator here finds no impediment to reproducing the Hebrew word order (Daniel בלקה), it is instead the turn of the Syriac translator (ע"ל קמיה) to diverge from the Hebrew. From the above discussion we see that the Qumran translator reproduces the ‘like’ water + tenor construction when it appears in this order in the Hebrew (27:20) and adjusts it by means of transposition when it does not (34:7). In the Syriac version by contrast, it is the order tenor + ‘like’ water which is adopted even when the reverse is found in the Hebrew (27:20) and followed where the Hebrew does present such an order (34:7). While our initial assessment of 11Q10’s divergence in 34:7 suggested that the most likely cause of the divergent word order was a harmonisation with Job 15:16 (‘one who drinks like water sin’), the treatment of the comparative construction by the Syriac translator complicates this assumption. Although these two sets of modifications might be best termed complementary rather than parallel, they suggest at least the possibility that the translators may be responding to their Hebrew source text in distinct but related ways according to stylistic preferences. While this is an initial suggestion that the Qumran and Syriac versions may share some common ground with regard to transposition, more solid evidence is provided by word order divergences which occur in the respective versions of one and the same Hebrew verse.
Because of thy reverence Doth He reason {with} thee? He entereth with thee into judgment: YLT
Is it for your fear of him that he reproves you, and enters into judgment with you? RSV

As with several cases already encountered in our discussion of transposition and omission in the Qumran version, the fragmentary state of 11Q10's translation of 22:4 precludes definitive conclusions. All three Aramaic versions produce generally proximate translations of Hebrew MT נבּו, with both the Qumran and Syriac versions supplying imperfect forms of מֶלֶךְ and מָךְ respectively and the targumist providing מַתִּיאוֹ. 725 While this verbal form is immediately followed in the Hebrew by the prepositional phrase עָבָדַת, only RtgJob (תִּמְלֶךְ עָבָדַת) and 11Q10 (תָּמִּלֶךְ עָבָדַת) adopt this same word order. The translator of P-Job instead prefers to invert the order of the prepositional phrases in arriving at his Syriac rendering of the Hebrew מִתְחָנֵךְ עַל־כֶּלֶךְ. As we saw in our discussion of P-Job's unique transposition at 40:28, the Syriac translator is not afraid to diverge from the word order of the Hebrew text where מִתְחָנֵךְ is concerned. But what light does this shed on the fragmentary Qumran translation? Because the beginning of lines three and four of column vi are now lost it is impossible to determine whether the translator has followed the Hebrew word order by providing an equivalent (ברדַת) at the beginning of line four or deviated from it by supplying a rendering before the verb. 726 While the Qumran translator may well have reproduced the word order of the Hebrew,

725 All three versions recognise that Heb נבּו may mean both 'to come' and 'to enter' (See B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 215-216) and usually differentiate their translations accordingly. In 19:12 and 42:11 all utilise מֶלֶךְ, while in 41:8 all three versions supply forms of מָהלָה.
726 It is of course possible that the translator did not for whatever reason provide an equivalent for מִתְחָנֵךְ.
the divergence of the Syriac translator in the same stich at least raises the possibility that a transposition has also taken place in the Aramaic translation found at Qumran.\textsuperscript{727}

\textsuperscript{727} As was often found to be the case in chapter 3, the RSV's idiomatic English translation displays an adjustment which finds a parallel in the Syriac version.

Here the focus of our attention is the prepositional phrase which appears near the beginning of the clause, both in the Hebrew of the MT and in its targum and Syriac translations. It is clear that the Syriac and targum translations preserve morphologically identical renderings (\textit{בכוןתא/בכוןתא} \textsuperscript{31:15} xxxvi, 8 [\ldots] \textsuperscript{11Q10} [\ldots] \textsuperscript{RtgJob} \textsuperscript{לולא בכוןתא יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין יבדרין\\nilde}\textsuperscript{P-Job} Did not \textit{____} he who made me \textit{in the womb} make them? And did not \textit{one} fashion us \textit{in the womb} \textit{____}? NRSV

\textsuperscript{728} For the Qumran Hebrew fragments see discussion of 36:11(chapter 6) above.

\textsuperscript{729} G.W. von Nebe, ‘\textit{Qumranica I: Zu unveroffentlichten Handschriften aus Höhle 4 von Qumran’ ZAW'
apparent dislocation in the fragmentary Qumran translation: (... ’Did not the one who made me in the womb make him and did he not fashion us in the womb[...’] is indeed suggestive. It seems obvious that this correlation is circumstantial evidence in favour of transposition rather than omission, but a further question then remains: has this transposition taken place in the Vorlage (4Qjob?) of 11Q10 or should these divergences in both Hebrew and Aramaic texts of Job from Qumran be seen as resulting from a shared indisposition toward the word order of the MT? Certainly the presence of such an inversion in an ancient Hebrew MS of the same immediate provenance (albeit Cave 4 as opposed to Cave 11) shows that such an inversion would not constitute ungrammatical Hebrew in the eyes of the scribe responsible for 4Qjob. But a correlation as apparently striking as the one offered by 4Qjob deserves closer scrutiny. In particular our attention is drawn to the end of the verse where the Qumran text is again preserved. Whereas 11Q10 corresponds to the MT in placing the numeral in the final position, we note that the Syriac translation diverges from the word order of the MT in the second half of the verse. Furthermore, the Syriac translator’s modification would seem to shed light on the modifications discussed above. Remembering that the Qumran text (and 4Qjob) has apparently modified the word order in v.15a (V-Pp...) under the influence of the semantically and syntactically parallel v.15b...יִרָאָה מִיִּכְרָה (V-Pp...), we see that the Syriac text shows a sensitivity to the same constraints by doing precisely the opposite—modifying v.15b in the light of the first half of the verse. A glance at P-Job’s translation (סָמַךְ שָׁנָךְ) shows a word order (Pp – V) which diverges from the MT of v.15b (V – Pp) and parallels that of v.15a. Although the modifications evident in the Syriac and Qumran translations are at opposite ends of the verse, this superficial difference between their

---

730 Here reading רְלִי with F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 122.

731 Faced with the ambiguity of MT יִרָאָה P-Job clearly prefers to see the numeral as qualifying יִרָאָה (i.e., ‘one [and the same] womb’) rather than functioning as subject of the verbal clause (i.e., ‘and [didn’t] One [and the same God] fashion us...’). See S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (II), 225 for
respective treatments of the text should not be allowed to obscure the underlying commonality of approach (harmonisation). In addition we see that both the Qumran and Syriac translations have, at the beginning of their renderings (\(\text{תָּמִינ} / \text{κατὰ} \cdot \text{for'...}\)), created a positive assertion in place of the negative rhetorical question attested in the Hebrew and preserved in the targum. This type of stylistic preference for declaratives in place of interrogatives is already well attested in the Qumran and Syriac translations and is a clear indication of linguistic-stylistic modification.\textsuperscript{732} If it is theoretically possible that 11Q10 reflects a Vorlage similar (or indeed identical) to 4Qjob\(a\) at this juncture, then it should also be acknowledged that it is not a sufficient explanation for the Aramaic translator’s presentation of the Hebrew. In terms of translation approach (both intra-verse influence and more importantly, the transformation of the rhetorical negative question into a positive assertion) the Syriac and the Qumran Aramaic translations betray a profound similarity which makes it not at all unlikely that the transpositions have been imposed by the translators. It is safe to say that 4Qjob\(a\) does furnish good evidence of 11Q10’s transposition (as opposed to omission) here and suggests the possibility that it may be dependent on a prior inversion in the translator’s Vorlage. Methodological rigour demands, however, that this be qualified by the observation that the connection between the two texts is not necessary for there is evidence that the self same intra-verse word order constraints were felt in the Syriac translation as well. In addition, the translator’s possible reliance on a divergent Vorlage is not sufficient to account for the translation divergences which would be unexpected in the Hebrew but entirely anticipated in light of the particular stylistic constraints that we have seen to be operative in P-Job and the Qumran translation.\textsuperscript{733}


\textsuperscript{733} In English translations of this verse (e.g. RSV) idiomatic phrasing clearly requires that the negative interrogative be followed immediately by the verb rather than the prepositional phrase. As we have seen in previous chapters, this is not the first instance of parallel linguistic-stylistic constraints in English and
You have given no water to the weary to drink, and you have withheld bread from the hungry.

Thou causest not the weary to drink water, And from the hungry thou withholdest bread. YLT

Although the first stich of Job 22:7 presents the reader with a somewhat unorthodox word order by utilising אֵל to negate an item (נַפְּלָא) rather than the entire clause (נַפְּלָא-אֵל), the fragmentary preservation of the Qumran text does not provide evidence that אֵל and nafel have been disassociated in translation. Some commentators have argued that Hebrew דָּמַי can have the meaning ‘to be weak /faint from hunger or thirst’ and that 11Q10’s rendering נחר ‘thirsty’ is therefore a faithful and proximate rendering. On the other hand it does seem quite possible that 11Q10’s נחר ‘thirsty’, which finds a semantic parallel in the LXX δυσφωτωσε has arisen from the translator’s contextualisation of the MT lexeme נַפְּלָא ‘weak, faint’ in light of the obvious reference to nafel ‘water’ in the same clause and מְפִיכָא ‘the hungry’ in the one which follows. Whatever the precise meaning of the Qumran Aramaic equivalent, it is clear that the Hebrew lexeme which has given rise to it follows not only the negative, but also the sub-

734 For other examples of the negative being used as an item adverb see BDB, 518 b. See B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 39.3.2 for fewer examples but a rather more sophisticated analysis.

735 Only the extreme left edge of the column is preserved and a translation of נַפְּלָא may indeed follow the negative on the following line. Whatever other divergences of word order are visible in the Syriac version, neither it, nor the Targum rendering give any indication that this less common use of the negative has presented any problems of comprehension.


737 As noted by E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 12; Editio princeps, 23; B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 50.
stantive which it negates ...ןכמ ינ※וולד. Such is not the case in the Qumran version where the translation of the negative follows immediately on the heels of אתך. Both Syriac and targum versions also provide equivalents for יבר supplying לא and והמשלא respectively, but the former translation departs from the Hebrew in the order in which it represents the elements of the clause. While the Hebrew text presents יבר before the final, verbal element (יבר) in the stich, its equivalent לא appears in the final position in the Syriac translation, displacing the verb. On the basis of Latin and Hebrew parallels, Zuckerman assumes that it is the Hebrew’s rare use of אתך to negate an item (see above) which has prompted the Qumran translation’s divergence from the word order displayed in the MT. This may well be the case, but as we have seen, there are no grounds for assuming that the form which would have followed on the line below was in fact the verb as opposed to the substantive. The other Aramaic versions would seem to suggest that such an assumption is not warranted and it is slightly surprising that Zuckerman makes no reference to the Syriac version’s own deviation from the MT. On one hand, if Zuckerman’s assessment is accurate, the Qumran translator’s primary concern has been the ‘correction’ of the unusual usage of the negative השך אתך לא ל недоף. On the other hand, P-Job’s inverted translation (לאשך לאכ) suggests the possibility that the Qumran translator has shared the same priorities אתך לא ל недоף. Whether the former or the latter, it seems clear that both the Qumran and Syriac translators have responded to the perceived irregulari-

738 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 109 has noted this transposition but her analysis consists only in the inclusion of this displacement amongst a large group of examples which are unified by the translator’s desire ‘to ‘standardise’ or present a more prosaic word order as against the MT.’


740 Although Zuckerman is quite correct that the other instances of item negation are not translated in the preserved portion of 11Q10, P-Job’s rendering of MT 13:16 אתך לא ל недоף and a divergent translation of another at 34:23 provide some circumstantial corroboration for his case.
ties of the Hebrew word order by providing new ones which were perceived as being better able to meet the linguistic–stylistic expectations of their respective readerships.

He withdraweth not from the righteous His eyes, And from kings on the throne, And causeth them to sit for ever, and they are high, YLT

He does not take his eyes off the righteous; he entrones them with kings and exalts them for ever. NIV

He does not withdraw his eyes from the righteous, but with kings upon the throne he sets them for ever, and they are exalted. RSV

Our previous discussion of the Aramaic translations of Job 36:7 centered on the Syriac and Qumran translators’ omission of the suffix in their rendering of וַיַּשְׁכֵּר,741 As we saw there, the irregular structure of Hebrew 36:7b has prompted considerable innovative activity on the part of the Aramaic translators.742 Both 11Q10 and P-Job appear to have understood the preposition in MT לְכַלְכֵּים ‘with kings’ as the nota accusativi and rendered the phrase accordingly as the direct object of a verb ([P-Job] כָּלָהוּוּ לְכַלְכִּים / [11Q10] כָּלָהוּ לְכַלְכִּים) 743 While all three Aramaic versions have provided a form of Aramaic לְכַלָּהוּוּ ‘to sit’, the translators of 11Q10 (יְדַלְלָהוּוּ) and P-Job (כָּלָהוּוּ) have apparently intended their rendering of וַיַּשְׁכֵּר ‘and he seats them’ to refer to 7b and have

741 See above chapter 1.
742 יְדַלְלָהוּוּ ‘and he sits them’ seems to be related to the preceding clause (וַיָּקָם לְכַלָּהוּוּ) despite the occurrence of the waw. R. Gordis, The Book of Job, 414 attributes this irregularity to the metrical requirements of the poet.
743 See G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 299 (P-Job); M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 137;
thus diverged from the word order of MT in moving their translations of this verbal form toward the front of their respective Aramaic clauses. The targumist has also provided a form of this verb (ַלַּחַת) in response to the perceived problem at hand but any misconceptions regarding the order of the Hebrew are prevented by the provision of an appropriate equivalent (וֹתֶרֶךְ) in a location which corresponds to that of the MT. At the root of the adjustments evident here in the Aramaic translations of Job 36:7 is a text which was perceived as difficult or irregular by all three translators. Whereas the targumist adds elements (and in this case repeats an element) in order to overcome this difficulty, the Qumran and Syriac translators transpose elements in such a way that their respective translations are sufficiently coherent and fluent.744

The final clauses of Job 42:11 describe Job’s former acquaintances presenting their restored host with gifts. Although we have already encountered some divergences on the part of the Qumran and Syriac translators in our discussion of omission and transposition in this verse,745 the Aramaic versions of these last clauses provide no great de-

744 Unique among the Aramaic translators but paralleled by the English NIV (‘...and exalts them forever.’), the Syriac translator inverts verb and adverb in his rendering (ܡܪܝܐ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ) of the final portion of the verse (וָתְרֶכָּה). This is again to be attributed to the syntactic irregularities evident in the Hebrew source text.

745 See chapter 2 (11Q10) and chapter 7 (P-Job).
partures from the Hebrew text apart from the treatment of נַעֲרָיָא. Here in 42:11, the Hebrew lexeme נַעֲרָיָא is being used distributively and the targum and Qumran versions follow suit by providing בֵּית and שֶׁבָּא respectively. The Syriac translator’s rendering suggests that נַעֲרָיָא has been intended to function as a substantive while the repetition of the numeral (רַעֲרָא רַעֲרָא) in conjunction with the substantive (רַעֲרָא) the Syriac would seem to correspond to נַעֲרָיָא נַעֲרָיָא. While the other Aramaic versions follow the Hebrew in supplying their respective equivalents of נַעֲרָיָא following the noun, the Syriac text diverges from the word order of the source by ante-positioning the numeral equivalents רַעֲרָא רַעֲרָא. When we turn to the final clause of the verse we see that the Syriac translator again deviates from the word order of the Hebrew, but here his Qumran counterpart also positions the equivalent of the numeral in a position not reflected in the MT. In the latter rendering the נַעֲרָיָא is again provided, but the use of the analytic construction allows for the numeral to be interposed in the genitive construction רַעֲרָא נַעֲרָיָא (רַעֲרָא נַעֲרָיָא) ‘each a/one ring of gold’. This alternative word order supplied by the Qumran translator is not entirely surprising, for the interposing of the numeral in such constructions constitutes good idiomatic Aramaic in Syriac dialects of the lan-

746 11Q10: נַעֲרָיָא; P-Job: נַעֲרָיָא; R. Weiss, The Text of the Targum of Job, 173-4 shows links between the Aramaic versions’ understanding of נַעֲרָיָא as ‘lamb, sheep’ and the exegesis of the Rabbis (e.g. Gen. Rabba 79.7) but with respect to RtgJob in particular, C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 91 n.7, observes that the three renderings are those of the pentateuchal targumim to Gen. 33:19. (C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 91 n.7 נַעֲרָיָא ‘piece of money’ [TgNeof, FT] נַעֲרָיָא מַדוִּים ‘pearl’ [Ps-J] נַעֲרָיָא [TgOnq]). Weiss suggests the probability that נַעֲרָיָא מַדוִּים ‘pearl’ was derived from the root שֵׁלֶש ‘to adorn’ (see for example, Num. Rabba. s.2 where ‘precious stone’ (וְזִיכָרָה [מַדוִּים]) and this verb occur together). In the base text (P) of D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, the meta-linguistic indicators נַעֲרָיָא נַעֲרָיָא and נַעֲרָיָא נַעֲרָיָא possess supralinear dots which presumably indicate that the words marked should not be read.

747 See Gesenius-Kautsch, § 139 b.c.

748 T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac, § 91 c. For distributive use of רַעֲרָא in Syriac see Payne-Smith, 59.

749 רַעֲרָא has been supplied in the RtgJob text cited above because although Stec’s base text (P) lacks it, the vast majority of witnesses to RtgJob preserve it in a position which corresponds to MT.

750 For the greater flexibility of the analytic genitive construction see T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac, § 73 f.).
But in light of this, it is rather unexpected that the Syriac here opts not to interpose the numeral but to reproduce the word order of the preceding clause by again ante-positioning the numeral ُّ. T. Muraoka has argued that the ante-positioning of the numeral ُّ in Syriac often emphasises ‘the notion of unity or oneness’ (e.g., ُّ ُّ ‘one flesh’ [union of marriage]). The translator may well have had this particular intention in mind in the present context, but the advantage or significance of such a nuance (ُّ ‘even/only one gold ring’) is not entirely obvious. What is clear, however, is that while all the Aramaic versions of Job have preferred the analytic genitive to the construct of the Hebrew, only the translator of the targum (پرسهدنامه) has followed the word order of the Hebrew text (نزن نیب مانی). On the other hand, the translators of P-Job and 11Q10 have seen fit to diverge from this word order in different ways in order to provide stylistically acceptable and adequately nuanced Aramaic renderings for their readers. Similar constraints are of course visible in the English renderings of the Hebrew (‘one ring of gold’), where the numeral is not permitted to follow the substantive.

They mar my path, they set forward my calamity, they have no helper. KJV
They break up my path, they promote my calamity; no one restrains them. RSV

---

751 E.g. Matt. 5:36: ُّ ُّ Syriac ُّ ُّ (See T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac, § 91(c)).
752 T. Muraoka ‘Some types of Noun Modifier in Syriac’, 192-94. Muraoka’s assessment of the post-positioning of ُّ as ‘equal to the simple ‘one’, often approaching in force the English indefinite article ‘a/an’ has already been illustrated in the present verse by ُّ ُّ.
753 While in the case of English, this seems to be a properly linguistic constraint, the positioning is technically more free in Aramaic and accordingly, the latitude for stylistic preference is greater.
When we turn to the Aramaic versions of Job 30:13c we see that not only have all three translators provided a semantically proximate rendering of the Hebrew, but each has similarly provided an explicit *waw* conjunction at the beginning of the clause.\(^{754}\) While the versions do share these features, the respective translations nevertheless display some differentiating features. The targumist’s rendering
\[לֶחַל הָעָשֵׁר לַחֹדֶשְׁנַים\]
represents a minor accommodation of the Hebrew to Aramaic idiom— the substitution of the negative existential particle (* Damascus *) and the provision of *dalath* (relative) before the participle form. As we have seen, this modification is not found in the targum text at 29:12 where a virtually identical Hebrew text (נִבְרָרֵךְ לָךְ) yields לֶחַל. Whatever the discrepancies between the targum’s translations of the similar texts here and at 29:12, it is clear that in both cases, the targumist adheres to the word order presented in the Hebrew source text. The *copula* supplied in the Syriac version (אִירְךְ אֲנָא) seems likely to have been supplied in order to harmonise the temporal setting of the final clause with that of antecedent clauses.\(^{755}\) In addition to this adjustment, we note that the Syriac translation substitutes a depersonalised noun (אִירְךְ ‘help, succour’) in place of the participle and more interesting for our purposes here, diverges from the word order of the MT by moving the prepositional phrase (אֲנָא) to the initial position in the clause. Just as we observed that the targum maintained the word order of the Hebrew both here and at 29:12, so too the Syriac version treats these two passages in the same manner, implementing a transposition in both locations (29:12 MT: בְּדַעַת וְנַפְשָׁתָם/P-Job: אֲנָא אֲנָא אֲנָא). While the temporal harmonisation outlined above means that the Syriac translator has diverged from the Hebrew word order differently here in 30:13, the transposition which is found in the Qumran version here

\(^{754}\) For the *waw* conjunction see chapter 11 below.

\(^{755}\) Both RtgJob and P-Job show signs of temporal harmonisation in their renderings of 30:13. In translating Hebrew לֶחַל with a participle לֶחַל, the targum translator opts to harmonise its form with the implied temporal context of the following verbless clause. His Syriac counterpart instead takes his lead from the initial Hebrew perfect form (לֶחַל) and harmonises accordingly (אֲנָא אֲנָא אֲנָא).
(1) xvi, 2 אָלֹהַ (כְּפָא) may provide a more striking parallel with the Syriac at 29:12. Although the Qumran text is quite obviously fragmentary, the editors of DJD 23 suggest reconstructing |]虚假איהִי perhaps on the basis of similar constructions at 22:5 (Alias איה) and 32:12 (see following example). This would fit well with the clear evidence that an equivalent of MT (עִנָּר) has been placed before the negative in the Qumran translation אָלֹהַ (כְּפָא פְּחָנ ‘no deliverer’ [for them].

Despite deviating from the Hebrew word order in different ways, it seems quite clear that the Qumran and Syriac translators have felt free to diverge from the source text in order to accommodate it to their respective target dialects. On the other hand, the translator responsible for the targum shows no signs of such a tendency.

Yea, I attended unto you, and, behold, there was none of you that convinced Job, or that answered his words: KJV

I gave you my attention, and, behold, there was none that confuted Job, or that answered his words, among you. RSV

I gave you my attention, but there was in fact no one that confuted Job, no one among you that answered his words. NRS

Although all the Aramaic versions of Job represent the suffixed Hebrew preposition מִּמִּסְמָן ‘among you’ with the expected target language equivalents (מלְכַּל), the location of the respective equivalents within the verse is far more variable. Like the English translators responsible for the RSV, the translator of the targum faithfully fol-

---

756 For whatever reason, this same divergence is not encountered in the Qumran translator’s treatment of 29:12.
lows the Hebrew text in presenting its equivalent suffixed preposition in the final position in the verse ...מְסַמְּכְּרֶדֶר מְסַמְּכְּרֶדֶר ...his words, among you. In the case of both the Qumran and Syriac versions, however, the recognition of the relationship between the negation particle and prepositional phrase (מְסַמְּכְּרֶדֶר) ‘there are none among you’ appears to have led to deviations from the word order preserved in each. While the NRSV English translation differs from the Syriac version in its reiteration of the negative ‘no one’ in the latter half of its rendering, it does agree with P-Job in preserving its equivalent (‘among you’) in the latter portion, but not final position, of the verse (אַל אֵלָה יְהוָה מִכְּכָּר [lit.] who gives to him, among you, an answer’). Finally when we turn to the Qumran translation, we see that the position of the suffixed preposition differs not only from its source text but also its Aramaic sister translations. In this case it is the Authorised Version which provides the word order parallel with both English and Aramaic translations repositioning their equivalents of the prepositional phrase directly following their respective negative constructions (...לָא לָא יְהוָה מִכְּכָּר/there was none of you). While the correspondence of the three Aramaic versions with three different English translations of the same text in different eras is indeed a coincidence, it should come as no particular surprise that a construction such as מְסַמְּכְּרֶדֶר has prompted the Qumran and Syriac versions to implement transpositions. As we saw above, the translator of P-Job has already displayed in his translation of 29:12, a willingness to deviate from the word order where אַל is concerned. With regard to the Qumran translation, the relocation of the prepositional phrase to a position immediately following the negative particle (לָא לָא יְהוָה מִכְּכָּר) might also be expected when we remember that at 40:8, this same translator has provided the existential particle immediately adjacent to the preposi-

757 In omitting the 3rd masc. sg. suffix from מְסַמְּכְּרֶדֶר, the translator of P-Job reveals that this lexeme does not render רָקַפְּקָא ‘his words’ but is rather part of the Syriac idiom ‘to answer’ and thus is equivalent to MT רָקַפְּקָא ‘to answer’. This leaves רָקַפְּקָא to be represented by אַל ‘him’. See E. Baumann, ‘Verwendungbarkeit der Peshita’, (1900) 198.

758 The Qumran text’s divergence from the MT was noted by the editors of F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 128.
tional phrase where it is lacking in the MT (רַל לְ) . It seems clear that while the targentmic translation of Job is content to follow the word order of the Hebrew, the linguistico-stylistic preferences of both the Qumran and Syriac versions have led to a reordering of the text in order to achieve a more fluent and fluid target text rendering.

In semantic terms, the Aramaic versions provide a largely proximate rendering of 29:10b. All three provide the Aramaic cognate of Hebrew לֵ֙בָנָּה, and both the targum and Syriac versions likewise supply the cognate of Hebrew לֵֹלָטֵנ. The omission of the 3rd masc. pl. suffix on the Qumran translator’s rendering (לֵ֙בָנָּה) of the Hebrew source le-xeme לֵ֙בָנָּה has led Zuckerman to suggest that the occurrence of this same Hebrew lexeme in the absolute form at Job 12:11 and 34:4 may be a contributing factor. The Syriac translation, for its part, provides a small addition (אֲנָמְחֶּ), perhaps in order to be more anatomically precise in its rendering of the Hebrew לֵֹלָטֵנ ‘to the roof of the palate.’ If Muraoka is justified in his assumption that the Qumran translator has in fact

---

759 In the case of 11Q10, the equivalent form is of course lost in the lacuna, but at 40:25, the translator has no qualms about representing another suffixed form of the same lexeme (לֵֹלָטֵנ) with the expected equivalent (לֵֹלָטֵנ).

760 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 493 is encouraged in this suggestion by the fact that לֵ֙בָנָּה appears in close proximity both here (29:11a) and in 12:11 and 34:4.

761 As G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 228 rightly points out, this seems to be an example of the translator’s attempt to provide a more explicit rendering that is found in the Hebrew text. Whereas the YLT preserves a single word equivalent for the Hebrew at this point (i.e. ‘palate’), the English translation tradition represented by the RSV instead favours a slight modification of the Hebrew ‘roof of the mouth’.

The voice of leaders hath been hidden, And their tongue to the palate hath cleaved. YLT

the voice of the nobles was hushed, and their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth. RSV
supplied an equivalent of הָדַע in the lacuna which now exists at the end of the line, then 11Q10 displays a word order at odds with its Hebrew source text.762 In his study of the language of the Qumran text, T. Muraoka includes this modification (Pp-V-[S]) as a possible example (along with 42:10 and 41:13) of the restoration of 'genuine Semitic' word order (i.e., a relocation of the verb toward the beginning of the clause).763 As Zuckerman has noted, however, the Qumran translator is not alone in deviating from the Hebrew text. Instead of supplying the equivalent of Hebrew דַע in a medial position where it appears in the source text, the Syriac translator has supplied כַּדָּע as the final component of the rendering.764 If the Qumran translator has indeed employed a transposition at this point it seems clear that he and his Syriac counterpart have not arrived at a common word order for their respective translations (11Q10: Pp-V-S / P-Job: S-V-Pp). What also seems evident is that when compared with the word order of the Hebrew (S-Pp-V), the common feature of the two modifications is the adjacent association of subject (S) and verb (V). While the less idiomatic, more formally literal English translation of Young does not display this modification, we are by now, not surprised to note that the constraints of English as seen in the RSV parallel this tendency. Although in and of itself, this example is far from conclusive, it does give rise to a question regarding Muraoka's explanation of this transposition in the Qumran text. Does it seem likely that the Qumran and Syriac translations of Job would agree as they do here, not when the Qumran text is displaying word order which betrays the 'sumero-akkadian' in Eastern Aramaic, but rather when they are restoring the genuine Semitic word order as Muraoka would argue is happening in the Qumran text here?

762 T. Muraoka, 'The Aramaic of the Old Targum', 441. B. Jongeling, 'Contributions of the Qumran Job Targum to the Aramaic Vocabulary', JSS 17 (1972) 196 suggests the possibility that the 3rd masc. pl. suffix may have been omitted from the reconstructed form.

763 T. Muraoka, 'The Aramaic of the Old Targum', 441.

764 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 494 notes that the Syro-Hexapla displays a word order similar to that of P-Job. The only major variation is to be found in the rendering of the initial genitive construction. (טוענ הかない רכזש איה תוחכ).
Thus far we have considered instances where the Qumran and Syriac translators of Job have diverged from one and the same Hebrew source text in rendering this original into idiomat Aramaic. Although in these cases, both texts show signs of transposition, the exact nature of the respective deviations may differ substantially. In other words, the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job seem to display the same discomfort (linguistic, stylistic, or otherwise) with the source text yet manage to achieve satisfactory fluency in their translations by diverging from the word order of the Hebrew in different ways. In the examples below, however, we see that the two texts also provide some divergences which show the translators appearing not only to implement transpositions at the same location, but also with the same result.

His breath setteth coals on fire, And a flame from his mouth goeth forth. YLT
His breath kindles coals, and a flame comes forth from his mouth. RSV

As in the preceding example from 29:10, the Aramaic translators of 41:13b have provided their respective readerships with a semantically proximate rendering. While it is not entirely clear what has motivated the translator of 11Q10 to provide עפר ‘sparks’ in rendering Heb. לעב ‘flame, blade’,765 it does seem quite likely that both the Syriac and Qumran translators have sought to harmonise the plural number of their respective renderings (לطبع/◮) with the parallel form (ל-basket) in the preceding clause.766 The effect of this harmonisation of plural substantives leads in turn to a modification of the

765 The Qumran translator’s only previous encounter with this lexeme (39:23) was explicitly related to its denotation ‘blade, sword’. It is possible that the alternate denotation here has confused the Qumran translator.
766 G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 352; H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 67 n. 11.
verbal forms (מַעֲשָׂה) with which they must, according to the linguistic-stylistic convention followed by these translators, agree in number. 767 Most interesting for the present discussion is the parallel word order displayed by the Qumran and Syriac translations. While the targumist follows the word order of MT נָאָה יִפְאֶר יִתְּנַה (S-Pp-V) both the Qumran and Syriac translators deviate from this source text in precisely the same manner, presenting the prepositional phrase at the end of their respective translations while locating the verb in the medial position following the subject (דַּעְשָׂה). Interestingly, we encounter here the same word order presented by the preceding example of Job 29:10b (S-Pp-V), where we saw that the Qumran and Syriac translators both felt the need to diverge from the source text (albeit in different ways). Here, the fact that both translators present one and the same word order (S-V-Pp) in diverging from that of the source text would add further weight to the suggestion that it is a desire for the adjacent placement of subject and verb which has motivated the shared transposition. Like the adjustment in 29:10, the modification here in 41:13 has been presented by T. Muraoka as a counter-example to his own suggestion that the Qumran translator tends to favour an Eastern flavour of Aramaic which displays a sumero-akkadian influence on the word order. 768 Again we observe, however, that it is precisely at this juncture—and comparatively few others—that the Qumran adjustment finds a parallel in the Syriac translation offered by P-Job. It is also worth noting that the English translation (RSV) which at 29:10 above provided a parallel to the transposition of the Syriac rendering, here manifests this same tendency—in this case paralleled by not merely P-Job, but 11Q10 as well.

---

767 In terms of the verbal tenses chosen here by the respective translators, both the Targum and Syriac translators represent the Hebrew imperfect verbal form נָאָה with participle forms (RtgJob: נֶפֶשׁ P-Job נֶפֶשׁ) despite the difference in number.

Those saying to God, 'Turn aside from us,' And what doth the Mighty One to them? YLT
They said to God, 'Depart from us,' and 'What can the Almighty do to us?' RSV

While the targumist preserves the 3rd pl. suffixed preposition ל, both the Qumran and Syriac translators have opted to render MT ל, 'to them' with 1st c. pl. forms (לך/לך) under the influence of מְנַגֵּן earlier in verse 17.769 Both of these latter translators have also rendered the MT divine name יְהֹוָה here with אלָהָא, while the targumist preserves the form of this Hebrew term by providing its Aramaic 'cognate'.770 It is also interesting to note that both 11Q10 ([...א[ויי אלָהָא]) and P-Job (א[ויי א[ויי) diverge from the syntax of MT (לך לך) by inverting the subject of the verb and the prepositional phrase which appears in the final position in Hebrew.771 The lack of contextual clues for such a transposition, when considered alongside the fact that the Greek version of Job shows a similar transposition (ὁμιν ῥαντοκράτωρ) has led Zuckerman to conclude that this common divergence from the word order of the Hebrew should be attributed to a shared Vorlage at variance with the MT.772 While this is indeed quite possible, the examination of transposition presented in this study suggests that it would be unwise to rule out the possibility that the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job have shifted the word order under the influence of linguistic-stylistic constraints. What is abundantly

769 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 238. It seems likely that the underlying Hebrew form was in fact the 3rd pl. which has been subsequently modified by the translators.
770 As noted by B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 240.
771 The word order divergence was noted by H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 108 n.11.
772 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 240 argues that this word order divergence shared also by LXX, reflects a variant Hebrew tradition. See also F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 100.
clear is the fact that while these latter two translations have diverged for whatever reason from the word order of the MT, the targum faithfully represents both the 3rd pl. suffix and the word order presented in the Hebrew text.

And Job answereth Jehovah and saith: — YLT
Then Job answered the LORD ( ): RSV

For the most part, the Aramaic versions of Job 42:1 present no great divergences from the Hebrew text of the verse and the deviations which do appear have already been examined in our discussion of the Syriac version of Job 40:6. As was the case there, here the Syriac translator diverges from the word order of the MT by positioning its equivalent (אַלּוֹ הָעָם) immediately following rather than at the end of the verse, as in the Hebrew text. Again as in the Syriac translation of 40:6, the addressee which, in the Hebrew text, is presented as the direct object of the initial verbal phrase becomes instead the object of a preposition which is related to the repositioned Syriac verb (כָּלָה). When we turn to the Aramaic version from Qumran we see that this same adjustment (מֵאָלְמָרָם אֵלָה) has been implemented by the translator in preference to the word order presented by the MT. As in the Syriac version, the addressee (in this case the deity) has become the object of a preposition but unlike P-Job the preposition chosen is מִבְּרֶךְ rather than מִבְּרֶךְ. E. Tuinstra suggests that the

773 See above ad loc. For 11Q10’s omission of waw see chapter 11 below and for discussion of the targum’s use of see Appendix I.

774 For the Aramaic versions rendering of the divine name here, see above page 184.
Qumran translator’s use of הָּנָּה ‘before’ where Job addresses God—as opposed to the use of הָּנָּה at 40:06 (where God addresses Job)—indicates that the translator was sensitive to issues of reverence toward the deity which were current in the 2nd Temple period.775 While Tuinstra seems correct in pinpointing deference or reverence as the crucial factor which distinguishes between the use of הָּנָּה and הָּנָּה, his restriction of the object of deference to God seems less well founded.776 Given that the Syriac translator has deviated from the word order of the Hebrew for precisely the same linguistic-stylistic reasons both here and at 40:6 (and indeed elsewhere throughout Job777) it seems fair to ask why the Qumran translator yields to these same linguistic-stylistic constraints here but fails to transpose in 40:6. A look back at the Qumran rendering of 40:6 provides at least part of an explanation. In the Syriac translation of 40:6 (as in both versions here), the addressee is represented by the prepositional phrase יָאַשֵּׁר and the verb which appears at the end of the other versions is then brought into relationship with it through transposition (אַשֵּׁר יָאַשֵּׁר). But we also saw that the Qumran translator, instead of transposing, supplied a suffixed preposition following the final verb (הָּנָּה) which in turn resulted in a functionally similar construction: ‘God answered Job from the wind and the cloud and he said to him [רָאִים רָעָה].’ Whereas in 40:6, these two translators identify an undesirable syntactical situation and adjust it by different means, here in 42:1, this same construction is again identified but results in both translators implementing a transposition. Why the Qumran translator saw fit to accomplish the same end by different means in 40:6 and 42:11 remains to some extent inscrutable, but it seems clear from the above

775 E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 42; See M.L. Klein, ‘The Preposition QDM (‘before’).
776 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 292 points out that הָּנָּה also appears in BA (Da. 5:17 and 6:14) as a formula for introducing speech. While in Job the only clearly defined hierarchical relationship is that of deity to humanity, the fact that in Daniel 5:17 and 6:14 socially and hierarchically inferior subjects speak הָּנָּה the king suggests that its use is not restricted to divine deference but to inferior-superior relationships more generally. See S.P. Brock, ‘A Palestinian Targum Feature in Syriac’, 271-272. For a discussion of the closely related expression הָּנָּה see D. Shepherd ‘MN QDM: Differential Treatment in 11QarJob and the Aramaic of Daniel’ VT forthcoming 2000.
777 See discussion above at 40:6.
that this linguistic-stylistic constraint which Szpek found so firmly entrenched in the Peshitta translation of the Hebrew Bible is also attested in the tradition of Aramaic translation which produced the Qumran version.778

Summary of Shared Transpositions

Given the paucity of examples of transposition furnished by the Rabbinic targum, it is no surprise that the Aramaic versions of Job display no instances of shared word order deviation. Neither is it unexpected that the targum doesn’t appear to share any common divergences with either the Syriac or Qumran version. These latter two versions, however, do present several instances where both translators have deviated from the word order of the Hebrew within the same verse. Those examples drawn from fragmentary portions of the Qumran text do not allow definitive conclusions, but the Syriac translator’s clear willingness to diverge from the word order of the Hebrew suggests the strong possibility that the Qumran translator has done likewise (22:4). In particular both translators show a willingness to diverge from the word order of the Hebrew text in order to harmonise the order of elements in a given stich with that of a neighbouring parallel (31:15) and to create an idiomatically acceptable Aramaic word order when that of the Hebrew is perceived as being in some way unusual or irregular (22:7, 36:7). In still other cases, both the Qumran and Syriac translations display word orders which differ from one another but seem also to reflect departures from the MT which are only readily explicable as an attempt to create a more fluent and idiomatic Aramaic/Syriac word order.779

Although in the cases mentioned above, both Syriac and Qumran texts show signs of transposition, the precise manner of these dislocations may differ substantially. That is, the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job seem to display the same discomfort (linguistic, stylistic, or otherwise) with the source text yet manage to achieve satisfactory

---

778 Again, see discussion above at 40:6.
779 42:11, 30:13, 32:12, 29:10.
fluence in their translations by diverging from the word order of the Hebrew in different ways. On other occasions, however, both translations diverge from the Hebrew at the same place and in the same manner. Whereas at Job 29:10, the Qumran and Syriac translators both felt the need to diverge from the source text word order (S-Pp-V) in different ways, at 41:13, this same Hebrew word order prompts both translators to diverge in the same way by producing an S-V-Pp word order in Aramaic. Another identical deviation from the Hebrew word order at 22:17 may or may not be related to the Qumran and Syriac versions’ common dependence on a variant text tradition, but at Job 42:1 it is abundantly clear that the respective translators’ divergence from the Hebrew word order is a result of the common linguistic-stylistic constraints within which both Aramaic translators worked.

While it is clear from our assessment of shared transpositions in the Aramaic versions, that the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job provide numerous instances of shared sensitivity to, and adjustment of, the Hebrew word order, it is equally obvious that the targum translator is conspicuous in his absence from the discussion. Again, as was the case with omission, it should not be inferred from the targumist’s fidelity to the Hebrew word order, that the translator did not sense the same irregularities within the text. Rather, it seems to be the case that whatever irregularities were detected were almost always dealt with by other means (36:7). With respect to the question of a preferred word order amongst the Aramaic translations, it is perhaps worth noting that on three different occasions (29:10, 22:7, 41:13) both the Qumran and Syriac translators diverge from the source text word order when it displays the verb in the final position.
CHAPTER 10

TRANSPOSITION IN THE ARAMAIC VERSIONS OF JOB

Having looked at some length first at the phenomenon of transposition in each of the respective Aramaic versions of Job and then in terms of shared divergences from the Hebrew word order, we now return to the question of how these versions relate to one another in terms of word order deviation.

To begin with, we saw that the fragmentary state of the Qumran translation complicated the discussion of transposition in this text in a manner which was not paralleled in its largely intact counterparts in the Syriac and targum traditions. Nevertheless, the presence of bona fide instances of word order deviation made it likely if not certain that several portions of text lost in the numerous lacunae of 11Q10 were dislocated by the translator, rather than simply omitted.

The analysis of transposition in the Qumran Aramaic version suggested the possibility that certain larger portions of displaced text were transposed not by the Aramaic translator but by the antecedent activity of either a copyist or the transmitter of his Hebrew Vorlage. Likewise, the possibility of the Qumran and Syriac versions’ common dependence on a variant textual tradition was suggested by their identical treatment of 22:17. While the potential role of underlying textual variation as an explanation of word order deviation should not be neglected, the example of the Qumran translator’s transposition at 31:15 should be a reminder that even minor word order deviations need not necessarily be attributed to a variant Vorlage. In addition it might also be noted that the number of divergences which seemed most likely to be attributed to transpositions al-

\[^{780}\text{E.g. 40:5, 37:16-18.}\]
ready extant in the Hebrew source text was relatively small in comparison with other causes. In the case of the targum of Job, there was no evidence of the translator’s deviation from the Hebrew text of the MT as a result of an alternative Vorlage.

The vast majority of transpositions found in the Aramaic versions of Job were seen not to be related to existing deviations in the Vorlagen, but rather stemmed from the respective translators’ intervention. For instance, both the Qumran and Syriac versions displayed a willingness to depart from the word order of their Hebrew source text in order to fashion an intelligible and idiomatic Aramaic translation of a verse which showed signs of logically prior modification at the hands of the translator.781

A Hebrew source text which was perceived by the Aramaic translators as in some ways difficult or irregular was also seen as a potential stimulus for transposition. While the Qumran and Syriac versions displayed instances where they employed this type of ameliorative transposition independently of one another,782 these two renderings also presented examples where both translators seemed to be responding to the same irregular Hebrew text by rearranging the elements of the Hebrew in their translations.783 In addition, one of the two instances of transposition presented by some witnesses to the targum of Job seemed most likely to be attributed to the translator’s concern for avoiding potential ambiguity (41:26). In all cases, what seems to remain constant is the translators’ willingness to sacrifice the word order of the source text as a means of creating a more fluent and intelligible reconstitution of the Hebrew text in Aramaic. As we saw in connection with our discussion of omission, the simple fact that the Rabbinic targum resorts less frequently to transposition when encountering difficult or ambiguous texts should not be taken as an indicator that the targumist was necessarily less sensitive to the difficulties or irregularities of the Hebrew, but rather that transposition was not often the means by which he altered his source text.784

781 (11Q10) 36:28 (P-Job) 34:12, 38:29.
782 (11Q10) 24:25, 34:10 (P-Job) 37:12, 39:10.
784 The targumist’s neglect of these types of adjustments is clearly illustrated by the comparative brevity of
All three Aramaic versions provide evidence which suggests that the presence of a text in the near or more remote vicinity, which is semantically similar but presents a different word order, may lead to a divergence from the Hebrew word order. But this point of agreement requires some clarification. While the Qumran translator seems more likely to be influenced by the word order of more distant texts, the majority of examples found in the Syriac translation suggest that for this translator, the pressure to harmonise is most keenly felt at close range, that is within the verse itself, where the Syriac translator will modify the word order of one clause in light of the syntax displayed in the other. Again while both of these versions display transpositions which are unattested by the other Aramaic versions at the same location, the Syriac and Qumran translations also appear to show a common susceptibility to harmonisation of word order within the same verse. While the second of the two instances of transposition provided by RtgJob is also to be attributed to a tendency to harmonise different word orders when two clauses share other salient (in this case semantic) features, this tendency is clearly less pronounced in this text than in the Syriac and Qumran versions. The harmonising of word order between verses, or within a single verse, should probably be understood as a stylistic constraint which places a premium on uniformity and syntactic parallelism.

The Qumran and Syriac versions also provide numerous instances where the respective translators have diverged from the sequence of the Hebrew because of a desire to provide a word order which is more in line with the linguistic-stylistic constraints of the Aramaic dialects in use. While the Qumran version provides several unique examples of divergence from the Hebrew word order for linguistic-stylistic reasons, the Syriac version shows an even greater number of these type of word order adjustments. Of the modifications found in P-Job, some should likely be located toward the linguistic

---

785 29:11, 36:11.
787 31:15.
end of the linguistic-stylistic continuum,789 while other modifications seem to have been made by the translator only inconsistently (despite similarity of content and close proximity) and should probably be considered as optional, stylistic preferences of the Syriac translator.790 Such linguistic-stylistic constraints are particularly evident in the Syriac translator’s treatment of comparative constructions,791 as well as clauses involving the expression λ ḫāw.<792

As well as providing instances of linguistic-stylistic transposition which are unattested in the other Aramaic versions at the same location, the Qumran and Syriac versions also diverge from the word order of the Hebrew at the same juncture.793 While these shared divergences from the Hebrew suggest the translators’ collective discomfort with the word order of the source text, it is interesting to note that they do not necessarily choose to rearrange the elements in the same manner. For instance, we saw that at Job 29:10, the Qumran and Syriac translators both felt the need to diverge from the source text word order (S-Pp-V) but did so in different ways (11Q10: Pp-V-S / P-Job: S-V-Pp). However, it is interesting to note that on other occasions, this same dissatisfaction with the Hebrew word order could lead the translators to both produce the same reconstituted Aramaic word order. This is illustrated by the Qumran and Syriac versions’ of Job 41:13, where the word order that was found in the Hebrew text of Job 29:10 prompted both translators to diverge in the same way by producing an S-V-Pp word order in their respective Aramaic renderings.794 The final piece of evidence which sug-

790 32:15,16; 40:28.
792 29:12, 40:9.
793 42:11, 30:13, 32:12, 29:10.
794 While the clear relationship between the modifications at 29:10 and 41:13 makes their attribution to the linguistic-stylistic preference of the Qumran and Syriac translators virtually assured, an interesting methodological point is raised by this example. Initially it would seem that instances where both Syriac and Qumran translators produce the same word order in diverging from the word order of a given Hebrew text would provide the clearest evidence of common linguistic-stylistic preference. However, without the linguistic-stylistic connection displayed between 29:10 and 41:13, as we have seen, the fact that two independent translations would present the same divergent word order might be explained by a shared Vorlage. Ironically, less equivocal evidence is actually provided by those instances where the two translators
gests a degree of overlap in the linguistic-stylistic preferences of the Qumran and Syriac translators is found in the respective versions of Job 42:1. As we saw, it is abundantly clear that the respective translators’ divergence from the Hebrew word order is a result of the common linguistic-stylistic constraints within which both Aramaic translators worked.

In light of the fact that the Qumran translation (understood by most to have originated in the West795) displays some of the same linguistic-stylistic concerns as the Syriac version of Job composed in an Eastern dialect of Aramaic, it is well worth considering what light, if any, the present study sheds on T. Muraoka’s suggestion that the Qumran translator has worked in an idiom which shows signs of Eastern influence.796

While 11Q10 does indeed display some instances where the verb appears to be positioned later in the Aramaic clause than in the Hebrew clause being translated, two factors are perhaps worthy of note. Texts in the neighbouring vicinity of two of these instances (30:16, 21:25) suggest that if verb post-positioning was a linguistic-stylistic preference of the translator, it was a preference which was inconsistently attested.797 While inconsistent attestation of this tendency does not necessarily undermine Muraoka’s suggestion (see below), it is interesting to note that two other examples of verbal post-positioning (20:5, 36:25) may be understood as harmonisations with other texts rather than modifications arising from purely linguistic-stylistic influences.798 Furthermore, it may be that the verbal element only appears to be post-positioned whereas in

---

795 See above Introduction ‘Language’. Although E.M. Cook’s typically lucid discussion of Qumran Aramaic in terms of Middle Aramaic dialect continuums (E.M. Cook, ‘Qumran Aramaic’) raises some interesting questions, it still seems to presuppose a Palestinian locus for Qumran Aramaic (8, n. 30).


797 While 30:16 reveals a transposition, eleven verses later, at Job 30:27, the translators are confronted with a very similar Hebrew text (‘לעבש-מא, ליבש ‘days of affliction confront me’). In this latter text, the Qumran translation shows no such modification. In the case of 21:25, while Muraoka is correct to point out the (O)-V (vs. MT V-O) verb post-positioning, the existence of an apparently reverse modification (V-S/O) vs. (MT S-V) in such close proximity (v.24) might seem to problematize suggestions of a pervasive tendency toward a post-positioning of the verb in 11Q10.

798 See ad loc. in chapter 6.
fact it is the ante-positioning of another element in the text which has led to the dislocation of the verb (21:25). On the other hand there are instances where the context seems to offer no obvious explanation (34:13) for the post-positioning of the verb. While Muraoka admits that the ante-positioning of the verb in the Qumran version of 42:10 presents a counter-example to his case, our analysis has suggested on the contrary, that this transposition has occurred as a result of the translator’s concern for grammatical harmonisation and is no obstacle to Muraoka’s suggestions that the translator favoured verbal post-positioning under Eastern Aramaic influence.

While the above discussion nuances Muraoka’s case for the Qumran translator’s tendency toward verbal post-positioning in 11Q10, it certainly throws up no major obstacles to it. However, our study of the relationship between the Qumran version and P-Job, a version composed in an ‘Eastern’ dialect of Aramaic, would seem to problematise Muraoka’s position somewhat. We remember that Muraoka sees the preference for verbal post-positioning as a manifestation of ‘sumero-akkadian’ word order which Kutscher had seen as having exerted influence through Official Aramaic and, by extension, Eastern Aramaic. Notwithstanding the fact that the Syriac in which P-Job was composed is undoubtedly considerably later than the Eastern Aramaic dialects which Kutscher had in mind, we might expect the Syriac version of Job to shed some light on Muraoka’s suggestion of Eastern influence in terms of word order. As it happens, however, while P-Job presents considerably more instances of transpositions which should attributed to linguistic-stylistic concerns than does 11Q10, not one of the Qumran version’s transpositions which Muraoka saw as betraying the influence of Eastern Aramaic finds a parallel in the Syriac version. When we turn from the unique transpositions to those which

---

799 One instance of transposition cited by T. Muraoka, ‘The Aramaic of the Old Targum’, 440 in 36:27 is difficult to pin down to this verse for according to him,  יַּעַל (v.28) is to be understood as representing יְשֵׁל from the end of verse 27. See chapter 6 however for our discussion of 36:28. If our analysis of 36:28 is correct, the transposition has resulted from the restructuring of the relative clause.


were shared by the Qumran and Syriac versions, we see that it is in fact Muraoka's counter-examples of verbal ante-positioning (i.e. the restoration of genuine Semitic word order as opposed to that of Eastern Aramaic) in the Qumran translation which find a parallel in the Syriac version (29:10, 41:13). It is important to note that whereas the present discussion has for its subject the phenomenon of transposition, a methodologically rigorous exploration of word order in the Qumran version would of course not be restricted to transposition (i.e. the translator's rearrangement of elements which appear in a given order in the source text) but would need to take into account the entire range of word orders displayed in translational and non-translational passages. Until this task has been undertaken, however, the lack of parallels between the Qumran and Syriac versions in places where an Eastern influence has been posited would certainly deprive Muraoka's suggestion of some expected support. Furthermore, when this lack of positive support is combined with the Syriac versions' parallels in Muraoka's counter-examples, it would seem hazardous to assume that the Qumran translator's word order preference reflects any discernible Eastern influence until such time as this can be established by a broader study of the text.

Having provided a relatively detailed discussion of the Aramaic versions' use of transposition, we now seem to be in a position to speak of what light the phenomenon of word order deviation sheds on the question of the relationship between the Syriac, Qumran and targum versions of Job. When we look at the motivating factors which have led to transposition in the Aramaic versions, we see that the targum translator has only deviated from the word order of the Hebrew text for the purposes of harmonisation on the one hand, and in order to clarify what seems to have been perceived as an ambiguous text on the other. The Qumran and Syriac translators may both employ transposition for these same reasons and in fact show far more evidence of this tendency (see quantitative discussion below). It is at this point, however, that the Qumran and Syriac translations part company with the targum, for both of the former translations display a willingness

802 While the addition of יָעַרְבָּמ before אַסֵּפָה in the Qumran version of 40:5 (MT: אַסֵּפָה is in the final position) is not a case of transposition, it is still relevant for a discussion of the translator's word or-
to depart from the word order of the Hebrew in order to create an intelligible translation in the light of previous modifications. While this concern for linguistic-stylistic intelligibility leads to a wide range of transpositions in the Qumran and Syriac versions, the targum translator apparently feels that divergence from the word order of the Hebrew is unwarranted. This translator’s lack of deviation from the Hebrew suggests that either he deemed divergence to be linguistically and stylistically unnecessary or alternatively, that these deviations would indeed have been natural in his idiom of Aramaic, but were constrained by a translation philosophy which bound him to the order of the Hebrew text he was translating.

The clear example of the Qumran and Syriac translators shared willingness to diverge from the Hebrew word order in an attempt to provide what they perceived to be more idiomatic Aramaic (42:1) raises a further question. Given that both these translators display the same concern in their treatment of Job 40:6, why does the Qumran translator not agree with his Syriac counterpart in employing transposition there as well, instead of accomplishing the same end through an addition to the text? It is at this point that the true nature of stylistic preference becomes clear. Because idiomatic Aramaic permits a range of word orders, it should not be surprising if on one occasion, a translator follows the Hebrew word order, while on another, he chooses to rearrange these elements in translation. Recognition of this irreducible resistance to the scholar’s systematic analysis informs Avinery’s work on the Syriac version and it is worth reiterating here:


803 While the presence of MT: הַדָּוָאֶל נָלַג (11Q10: [supralinear]) in 40:6 differentiates this formulaic sentence from the one in 42:1, the translator of P-Job clearly did not see the inclusion of an equivalent for this prepositional phrase (סְדָּבֵּל הָאָדָם) as in any precluding his deviation of the word order.
Dans la syntaxe de la langue syriaque on trouve plusieurs notions syntaxiques qui peuvent être exprimées de deux ou même de trois façons. Cet ‘embarras du choix’ n’est pas toujours réglé par des conditions définies, surtout dans les cas ou deux structures syntaxiques différentes se trouvent l’une à côté de l’autre. Ce phénomène ne peut pas être expliqué sinon par la notion... de ‘variation’ ou bien ‘variation de voisinage’. 

The admitted inscrutability of the Syriac and Qumran translators’ decision to deviate from the Hebrew word order in certain passages, but not in others, should not, however, be allowed to obscure the fact that whereas the targum translator does not employ transposition for linguistic-stylistic purposes, his counterparts in the Qumran and Syriac translation traditions display a clear willingness to diverge from the Hebrew word order as and when linguistic and stylistic constraints dictate.

In terms of quantitative assessment, the broad outlines of the relationship between the versions will by this point be clear. When the number of unique and shared instances of transposition found in the Qumran and Syriac versions are combined, the former version shows more than thirty cases while P-Job boasts more than forty. When we remember that the targum translation shows only two instances of transposition, neither of which are shared with the other two versions, it is not difficult to see the emergence of a clear distinction between the three versions in terms of their employment of transposition. Again, as was the case in our exploration of omission in the Aramaic version of Job, we are left with the impression that in both qualitative and quantitative terms, the Syriac and Qumran versions display a considerable affinity to one another in terms of their divergence from the word order of the Hebrew text of Job. In the case of the targum translation, however, such divergence is so rarely found that transposition can hardly be understood as a tool employed by the translator in his rendering of the Hebrew text.

---

805 See Part Two above. In the case of the Qumran translation, this figure includes some instances of transposition in fragmentary contexts. P-Job: 35; 11Q10: 21; 11Q10 and P-Job: 11.
806 A particularly clear illustration of this point is provided by 34:13 where both 11Q10 and RtgJob supply וְהַנְתִּיעַ in order to ‘clarify’ the Hebrew. While the Qumran Aramaic translator appears to re-arrange the
order of elements in the process of incorporating לָמַע into his rendering, the Targum translator carefully preserves the order of the Hebrew as he integrates an infinitival form (לָמַע) of the same verb into his translation.
CHAPTER 11
THE WAW CONJUNCTION IN THE ARAMAIC VERSIONS OF JOB

Previous research on the present topic—the Aramaic translators' treatment of Hebrew waw—has been for the most part limited to independent treatments of the respective Aramaic versions. If noted at all in commentaries or studies of these versions, the omission, addition or substitution of the waw is primarily cited on a case by case basis often without explanation or further discussion. E. Tuinstra was the first to look at the phenomenon in the Qumran targum, providing select examples of the translator's addition, omission and substitution of waw in an early dissertation on the text. It is, however, obvious that it was never Tuinstra's goal to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the translator's treatment of the waw but rather to provide several representative examples for each category.

Heidi Szpek in her work on the Peshitta of Job introduced a degree of sophistication and systematisation into her analysis of the Syriac translator's treatment of

807 A preliminary study of this same subject on a more restricted textual sample (Columns I-IX; XX-XXXVIII) is to be found in D. Shepherd 'Will the Real Targum Please Stand Up? Translation and Coordination in the Aramaic versions of Job' JJS 51 [1] (2000) 88-116. While the analysis of the complete sample included here has provided several additional examples and affords a greater nuancing of the relationships between the respective Aramaic versions, the basic findings of the preliminary study remain substantially unaffected.


809 E.W. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 49 includes, in a list of various divergences from MT, a number of instances where 11Q10 adds (29:24, 29:25, 30:13, 32:16, 34:15, 36:15, 36:25, 39:8, 39:26, 41:16) and omits (19:15, 21:25, 24:12, 25:1, 26:14, 27:12, 27:16, 27:18, 29:10, 29:11, 34:29, 36:7) the waw. He also includes examples of the translator's substitution of his own Aramaic expression in place of the Hebrew waw (21:4, 25:3, 32:2, 36:26) as well as locations where he has apparently replaced an MT expression with a waw: (21:7, 27:11, 36:30). S.A. Kaufman, 'The Job Targum from Qumran', 318 also provides a small list of additions (II.4, IV.3,4, V.5, VIII.2, X.5, XI.2, XIV.2) and omissions (e.g. XIV,
the waw. While Szpek too made use of the same general categories of addition, omission, and substitution she went beyond Tuinstra to consider the motivation for the various modifications—that is, in a given case, why does the Syriac translator of P-Job diverge from the Masoretic text in his use of the waw? Szpek’s study does indeed inform the discussion which follows, but the inclusion of two additional Aramaic versions means that although the categories of omission/minus, addition/plus, and substitution provide the structure for our study, the conclusions arrived at below will not only deepen our understanding of the Syriac translation’s treatment of waw, but also place it within the context of the other Aramaic versions. On the other hand, because the sample is limited to material which is paralleled in the Qumran translation, the present study is of course not able to take account of the entire range of data analysed by Szpek.

As an exhaustive study of even the present topic would require a far more extensive treatment than may be justified here, the discussion will be orientated by the following two questions:

1. How do the translators responsible for the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew book of Job treat and represent the waw conjunction in their respective renderings?
2. How do the various Aramaic versions relate to each other in terms of their treatment of this conjunction?

In attempting to come to grips with these two questions, the discussion, as in the previous chapters will be based on a series of examples drawn from the texts themselves. Both the comparatively large number of relevant passages and the fundamental similarities displayed by many of these instances make a full citation of each case both unnecessary and unjustified. Nevertheless, in order to avoid the distortions that may occur when select examples are drawn from a larger body of material these examples

9; XXIV, 9; XXVII, 9; XXIX, 5).

810 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 117.

811 Categories: Omission: Error, Redundancy; Addition: larger addition, implicit to explicit exegesis, intra and parallel verse influence but primarily language difference). H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 includes 11Q10 in her study of the possible influences of the targumic tradition on P-Job, but does not appear to have extended her comparison of the treatment of the waw to the Qumran text (n. 20).
will be supplemented with some graphical representations of the data under consideration. Again, as in earlier sections, although the discussion proper will be limited to the ancient Aramaic versions, parallel examples may be drawn from English versions where relevant in order to illustrate a particular issue or phenomenon.

It is neither possible nor necessary here to rehearse the multitude of functions assigned by modern grammarians to the Hebrew conjunction waw. In addition to the well known (but only partially understood) role that waw plays in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system,\(^8^{12}\) waw serves a wide variety of both co-ordinative and non-co-ordinative syntactic functions.\(^8^{13}\) In the examples below consideration will be given to the particular function of waw in both the Hebrew text and its Aramaic renderings. However, an exhaustive analysis of co-ordination in either the Hebrew book of Job or its Aramaic versions is not intended. Rather, the following discussion will again focus on the representation of the waw in the Aramaic translations as an index of the respective translators’ attitude toward the Hebrew text.

A. Modifications unique to the respective Aramaic Versions

While we will eventually turn to the question of possible parallels in the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the conjunction, it seems wise to deal first with the cases in which one of the three shows a divergence from the Hebrew text which is not attested in the other two at the same location.

---

\(^8^{12}\) See for instance B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 29.0 for a balanced evaluation of competing (and to some extent mutually enriching) theories of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. Despite some evidence of the waw-contrastive in Old Aramaic (V. Sasson, ‘Some observations’, 111-127) the present study finds no such evidence in the dialects of Aramaic utilised by the three translators of Job.

A1. 11Q10

A1. a) Minus/Omission

The Aramaic translation found at Qumran lacks an equivalent for Hebrew waw both when it appears in the middle of a Hebrew verse and when it is found at the beginning of a verse. The following example drawn from Job 29:10 is an illustration of a medial minus:

\[
\text{גֶּלֶּ֔ה} \text{בֵּ֙ןֵי יִשְׂרָאֵ֣ל וְלָשׁוֹן} \text{לָחֵ֔ם רְבָּ֔יָּ֖הוּ 29:10}
\]

\[
[... \text{כְּלֵיָ֖ים} \text{הָֽשָׁמְרָּֽים} (אֶלְּחָ֑נָה דִּבְּרִ֖ים לֶשַׁ֑נָּ֖ו) 11Q10
\]

\[
\text{כָּל} \text{אֵרְבָּנָֽיִם} \text{אָסָפָ֤ר} \text{(וְלִשְׁנֵֽהוּ לָמָ֣רָהּ)} \text{לֶשַׁ֣נָּ֑ו אֵרְבָּֽךְ:} \text{P-Job}
\]

The voice of leaders hath been hidden, and their tongue to the palate hath cleaved. YLT

The voice of the nobles was hushed, and their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth. RSV

We have already discussed the Aramaic versions' employment of transposition in this verse, but here our attention is focused on the Qumran translator's treatment of the waw conjunction. It is clear that, whereas the targum and Syriac translations have followed the Hebrew in linking the parallel stichs of Job 29:10 with the conjunction, the Qumran translator appears to have left the two clauses in apposition rather than providing the waw as an explicit grammatical marker of their relationship. The lack of a conjunction here does not materially alter the meaning of the Aramaic translation and its omission here seems most likely to have resulted from the translator's perception that it was stylistically unnecessary.\(^{814}\) A second example is provided by the Qumran version's rendering of 27:12,

\[^{814}\text{Other medial minuses occur at 26:14b (between clauses) and 29:8 (between verbal forms). Medial minuses occur at 19:15 and 21:5 but in both cases the fragmentary state of the text complicates the determination of the cause of their absence.}\]
Lo, ye — all of you — have seen, And why is this — ye are altogether vain? YLT
Behold, all of you have seen it yourselves; why then have you become altogether vain? RSV

Notwithstanding minor variations, the Aramaic versions’ employ a form of the interrogative (א/אמל/א/אמל) which is cognate to that which appears in the Hebrew text they are rendering (א/אמל). It is quite clear, however, that while the targum and Syriac versions preserve a representation of the Hebrew waw, the Qumran translation shows no equivalent at this location. While the inclusion of the conjunction before an interrogative appears elsewhere in the Hebrew of Job (e.g. Job 17:15), the Qumran translator has apparently perceived it here as being superfluous and to some extent incompatible with idiomatic Aramaic style.\(^{815}\) A partial parallel is provided by English versions in which we see that a more literal rendering (YLT) will preserve a conjunction in a location corresponding to the Hebrew, while a more idiomatic translation (RSV) diverges from the source text to a minor, yet perceptible extent.

Unique initial waw minuses occur in 11Q10 only at the beginning of a particular type of verse, illustrated here by 23:1:

---

\(^{815}\) The Qumran translator also shows a willingness to pass over the Hebrew waw in his translation when it occurs medially before the comparative particle. E.g. 27:16 (MT: קַשְׂף הַרְשָׁע הָיָה 11Q10: התולה לאומיתך( ) אֲנָא הָלָה[ ... ] and 27:18 (MT: קָנָבָא בַּעֲדֵי 11Q10: אֲנָא הָלָה[ ... ]). Interestingly, in 11Q10’s translation of 24:24 the waw has apparently not been omitted but instead replaced with a marker of alternation (ך/ך) before the comparative particle. (See below A1c [11Q10 substitution] below).
And Job answereth and saith: -- YLT
Then Job answered: RSV

While a *vacat* in the text clearly indicates that the Qumran translator has understood that a new section in the text is beginning, the translation lacks the initial *waw* present in the MT and the other Aramaic versions. Similarly at 25:1, 40:6 and 42:1, where the translator of 11Q10 has encountered this same introductory phrase, the conjunction is also lacking. Bruce Zuckerman has noted that the lack of conjunction in this type of introductory sequence in 11Q10 (*לַעֲשֹׂהוּ*...*עֵין...אֲמֵם*) is paralleled by the introductory expressions in the Imperial Aramaic of Daniel and Ahiqar where the conjunction is similarly lacking. As may be seen from the treatment of *וּרְכַּב* in this same verse, none of the Aramaic translators require *waw* in order to preserve the Hebrew narrative tense. That *waw* is nevertheless lacking not only here but in identical contexts in three other locations suggests that the translator has omitted it, having perceived it as superfluous to an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the verse.

A1. b) Plus/Addition

There are also instances where the translation from Qumran diverges from the MT in providing a *waw* where the conjunction is neither attested in the Hebrew nor in

817 B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 292 nn. 51,52. See for example, Daniel 2:5, 8, 15, 20, 26, 27, 47 etc and Ahiqar 110,118 etc.
818 B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 236 notes that 11Q10 translates the Hebrew *waw* + imperfect with this form.
the other Aramaic versions. One instance of such an addition may be seen in the Qumran version of Job 42:6,

While לשון occurs numerous times (7:13, 16:2, 21:34, 29:25, 42:11) in Job, it is only here that it has the meaning 'to repent' whereas in other contexts it denotes 'to comfort or be comforted'. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, RtgJob takes the form here as referring to 'comforting' and produces the corresponding Aramaic translation (אֲבָרָהַם). In the face of the ambiguous Hebrew, the translator of P-Job makes sense of the source text by interpreting the Hebrew root in the light of a Syriac homograph (אֵשׁ) (in Syriac this verb refers to being awakened, raised or resuscitated (even, resurrected). The Qumran translator deals with the challenge posed by the Hebrew by

---

819 BDB, 636-7.

820 As noted by C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 91. A contributing factor may be that only 5 verses later (42:11) this same verb appears in conjunction with the same preposition לַעֲכֹד 'concerning' (the only other example in Job) with reference to Job's consolation regarding all the 'evil' which he had suffered. The transformation of the Hebrew active 'I repent' to a passive in RtgJob facilitates the new interpretation of the translator.

821 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 286 simply classes this modification as an error (due to linguistic interference) but this adjustment does not strike one as any more erroneous than those effected by the other translators. G. Rignell, The Peshitta to the Book of Job, 360 is convinced that the use of this root is a reference to Job's resurrection, and on the basis of a less equivocal example at 30:23:

(now I know that Thou wilt bring me back from death, to the meeting place of all the living) M.P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament, 223. also sees מְאֹס as here signifying resurrection (rather than Job's being 'raised' upon the dust and ashes).
understanding the form as being derived from ‘to be heated’. This derivation is facilitated by the context (following ‘concerning/upon ashes and dust’) which fits well with the concept of heating or burning.

It is notable that in 30:15, 33:25 and 39:21 where waw has been supplied as part of a translation which diverges from the MT considerably. At 39:23 the waw is added by the translator due to an error in recognition or interpretation of two Hebrew terms in construct.

Such medial pluses occur at 30:2, 32:15, 35:10, 39:3 and 39:4 (where the addition is partially due to intra-verse influence). Such asyndetic co-ordination is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry (See J.C.L Gibson, ‘Co-ordination by Vav in Biblical Hebrew’, 278).
In verse 15 of Job, chapter 32 where Elihu upbraids Job’s ‘friends’ the MT does not include any linking conjunctions (‘They are shattered, they’ve stopped answering, they are lost for words’[lit. words are removed from them]) preferring rather to link the clauses asyndetically. Although the Qumran translation of 32:15 is not preserved in its entirety\(^8\) sufficient material remains to see that 11Q10 includes a waw conjunction which serves to explicitly mark the co-ordination between the Aramaic rendering of these clauses ‘and they were silent...and I withheld from them [words?]’ While the syntax of the Hebrew seems unambiguous and neither RtgJob nor P-Job show the addition of the conjunction, the Aramaic translator appears to have provided the conjunction as a means of making the relationship between the clauses utterly clear.\(^8\)

On other occasions the Qumran translation has a waw plus at the beginning of a verse where it is lacking both in the MT and in the other Aramaic versions of Job. The following instances, drawn from Job 39:6, 7 and 8 illustrate this type of modification.\(^8\)

\(^8\) Although it is by no means certain (because the end of the preceding line [XXI,6] is not preserved) most commentators have assumed that 11Q10 'they were silent' corresponds to Heb. 'לן.ע.ר.ן.כ.ר.ד.ו.ר' ‘they did not answer again’. (See for example, Editio princeps, 53; M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 208; B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job, 88). If so, this is an example of 11Q10 opting for an interpretative translation much like P-Job utilises in 32:11 (interpreting 'I waited' as meaning 'I was silent'). Whatever the correspondence in the first stich, the addition of the conjunction medially seems indisputable.

\(^8\) While neither of the English versions cited provide the waw between the latter two clauses as does the Qumran text, the NIV translators have chosen to supply a conjunction between the first two clauses.

\(^8\) Medial waw phrases such as those which appear in these verses will be dealt with below.
Szpek, in her analysis of P-Job’s treatment of the *waw*, has suggested that when a *waw* plus occurs in the Peshitta of Job at the beginning of a verse, it serves either to initiate a new unit of meaning (e.g. P-Job 1:16) or to continue a semantic unit begun in the preceding verse (e.g. P-Job 1:17, 18). All of the unique *waw* pluses in 11Q10 appear to belong to the latter category illustrated above. In Job 39:5-8, the so-called Voice from the Whirlwind poses a series of rhetorical questions which are used to emphatically press home the point that it is God, and not man, that ultimately rules and provides for the animal kingdom:

(39:5 Who has let the wild ass go free? Who has loosed the bonds of the swift ass,)  
39:6 to whom I have given the steppe for his home, and the salt land for his dwelling place?  
39:7 He scorns the tumult of the city; he hears not the shouts of the driver.  
39:8 He ranges the mountains as his pasture, and he searches after every green thing.

831 Initial pluses include 39:7, 8, 25; 40:30 and 41:16. A *waw* also appears in 11Q10 as an initial plus at 32:16 but the text’s fragmentary state of preservation precludes an unequivocal decision regarding its function.
The Qumran text shows initial conjunctions in verse 7 (‘and he laughs at the tumult...’) and verse 8 (‘and he chooses mountains for himself as [his] pasture’). While neither the MT nor the other Aramaic versions possess the conjunctions at these points, these pluses in 11Q10 apparently serve to provide the Aramaic reader of the translation with explicit markers of co-ordination in this passage.833

A1. c) Substitution

While the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job shows several unique waw pluses and minuses, substitutions found only in this text are comparatively rare. In the example from 32:2a below, 11Q10’s use of ידוע ‘then’ in place of the Hebrew conjunction serves not to link what follows with the preceding material but, on the contrary to emphasise the beginning of a new section (marked מָאֵת in the Masoretic text).


32:2

[... ידוע | [... (vacat preceding line) 11Q10

ןָּחַת רָאִיתָה (רַּעְּלָה) רְחֵיק (וּלָּי) RtgJob

P-Job

and burn doth the anger of Elihu son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram; against Job hath his anger burned, because of his justifying himself more than God; YLT

Then Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram, became angry. He was angry at Job because he justified himself rather than God; RSV

832 Both 11Q10’s translation of MT רָאִיתָה, ‘to seek out (select), spy out, explore’ as בָּרֵא בִּךְ ‘he selects’, and its addition of a suffixed preposition לָּי ‘for himself’ suggest that the translator has incorrectly understood this occurrence of the Hebrew verb in the light of its usage in passages such as Nu 10:33, Dt 1:33 and Ezek. 20:6 where this Hebrew lexeme takes the lamedh as preposition with the meaning ‘choose/select’. F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 157 are thus not entirely correct in suggesting that RtgJob (‘He explores the mountains...’) and 11Q10 share a common interpretation. See KB ידוע 1.573-4).

833 Although the Aramaic translator of 11Q10 has similarly added a waw at the beginning of his translation of 39:25, F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 159 have neglected to render it in their English translation. If not accidental, this omission of the Aramaic waw in English translation is a testimony to the pressure which may be exerted by English stylistic preferences even in a scholarly translation of an ancient text.
While this text division is marked in P-Job by at the end of the preceding verse (32:1), the Syriac translation itself has not been altered in the light of this textual division as appears to be the case in 11Q10. Of the Aramaic translations it is only 11Q10 which has chosen to explicitly mark the beginning of this new section with an alternative lexeme in his translation.\textsuperscript{834} The other unique substitution occurring at the beginning of a verse is found at 36:28 where the Qumran translator provides a where the Hebrew text begins with the relative pronoun (\textit{חָלַל}).\textsuperscript{835}

\textbf{A2. P-Job}

\textbf{A2. a) Minus/Omission}

Like the Qumran Aramaic translation, P-Job shows unique \textit{waw} minuses both at the beginning of a verse and at various points medially. At 17:15, near the beginning of the synoptic Aramaic Job material, we see that P-Job shows a \textit{waw} minus at the beginning of the verse where the other Aramaic versions follow the MT in providing the conjunction:

\footnote{Although the \textit{waw} here does not function as a 'true' disjunctive in the Hebrew \textit{[ ] + non-verb}; See T. Lambdin, \textit{Introduction to Biblical Hebrew} (Macmillan: 1971) 162, it is apparently perceived as such by the Aramaic translator as its consecutive-contrastive function is no longer operative. The Aramaic adverb now serves the function of the disjunctive, that is, it refers to new participants or announce a shift of scenery [for Hebrew see B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, § 39.2.3]. It is of course here at the beginning of Job, chapter 32 that the much debated Elihu speeches begin.}

\footnote{The translator of 11Q10 opts to substitute the \textit{waw} conjunction for the Hebrew relative pronoun thereby transforming the Hebrew subordinate construction (‘he distils his mist in rain, which the skies poor down’ into a co-ordinate one (‘...he forms the blasts of rain. \textit{And} his clouds send down...’). While this same modification is attested elsewhere in P-Job (e.g. 22:10) 11Q10’s proximate translation of the relative pronoun in the initial position elsewhere (22:16, 34:27, 37:17, 39:6) suggests that the motivation for this adjustment here is probably the stylistic preference of the translator rather than linguistic necessity. 11Q10 uniquely substitutes Aramaic \textit{חָלַל} ‘or’ for the Hebrew \textit{waw} at 25:3 and 24:24 (fragmentary) and \textit{חָלַל} for the same at 28:23 (also fragmentary).}
P-Job, along with most modern English versions, does not include the conjunction following 17:13-14 (‘If I look for Sheol as my house, if I spread my couch in darkness; if I say to the pit, ‘You are my father,’ and to the worm, ‘My mother, or My sister,’ Where [Heb. רַק] then is my hope...’). As was the case with the Qumran translation at 27:12 (see above) it appears to be the case that the Syriac translator has perceived the \textit{waw} which appears before the interrogative (in this case, \textit{רַק}) to be stylistically surplus to requirements and not worthy of representation in his target text. Furthermore, it may be that the Syriac translator has seen the Hebrew adverb \textit{יְדִיקָה} (rendered by all three versions) as marking the apodosis ‘If... where \textit{then} is my hope?’ despite the fact that it may here be functioning merely disjunctively. This, then would be an additional motivation for omitting the conjunction.\textsuperscript{836} As we saw in the case of Job 27:12, the English translation tradition also provides an illustration of more (YLT) and less (RSV) proximate formal renderings which find a parallel in the variation attested to by the Aramaic traditions.

Unlike 11Q10, however, which primarily shows its unique minuses initially, the Syriac translation of Job provides the majority of its unique minuses medially. An example from 38:3, also cited by Szpek, provides an illustration of this phenomenon:

\textsuperscript{836} H.M. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique}, 118-19 offers the following as the first of 5 constraints on P-Job’s perception of the redundancy of \textit{waw}: ‘the \textit{waw} conjunctive is unnecessary in conjoining the apodosis to the protasis in a conditional proposition.’
Here the Hebrew composer of the divine speeches uses waw to conjoin three clauses ('Gird up', 'so that I may question you' 'Make known to me').

While the conjunctions are preserved in RtgJob and 11Q10, the Syriac version omits these in its rendering of the Hebrew. Confirmation that the Syriac translator has a preference for leaving simple verbal clauses such as these without an explicit Syriac conjunction is provided by 40:7, 11 and 42:4. Where the waw is used conjunctively in these locations, it is also omitted by P-Job.

The literal YLT version preserves both conjunctions while the RSV rendering provides a partial parallel to the adjustment found in the Syriac text.

A2. b) Plus/Addition

As is the case with 11Q10, P-Job shows unique waw pluses both initially and medially. The addition of an initial conjunction reflects the translator’s perception that a given verse is related to that which precedes it and its provision serves to make explicit this linkage:

---

837 The syntactic sequence in the Hebrew appears to be: Volitional form (Imperative) + [1 + prefix conjugation] + Volitional form (Imperative). B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 39.2.2a ; 2.5 define the function of the conjunctive waw as joining ‘…two clauses which describe interrelated or overlapping situations not otherwise logically related.

838 Other English versions such as ASV, NIV, and NRSV also retain only the latter waw in translation.

839 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 119 n.29 provides a list of such omissions across the entire text of P-Job. At 36:7, P-Job omits the waw due to difficulties in its rendering of the verse as a whole, while at 40:5, the omission seems to result from the translator’s perception of the waw as functionally superfluous.
In Chapter 41 of Job, the composer of the divine speeches paints a vivid and memorable portrayal of the great sea creature Leviathan. After focusing on the beast’s fierceness, the poet depicts its formidable armament, (v.10) ‘His sneezings flash forth light, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn. (v.11) Out of his mouth go flaming torches; sparks of fire leap forth.’ As we have seen above in the Qumran translator’s rendering of 39:6-8, here P-Job’s translation reflects an attempt to provide an explicit marker of coordination between verses in order to delineate the unit of meaning as he has perceived it and to make this unit clear to the reader of the Syriac translation. The addition of this conjunction at the beginning of verse 11 [אַשְׁרֵי נַפְשְׁךָ](a) ‘and from his mouth, lamps come forth…’] reflects and, when added in the Syriac version, emphasises the semantic connections between verse 11 and the preceding verse.840

Even more common than initial pluses are the unique medial pluses found in the Syriac version of Job.841

---
841 See for instance P-Job at 23:6, 26:23, 29:7, 31:40, 33:15, 35:9, 36:29, 37:16, 38:8, 23, 39:23, 40:23, 41:9, 15. See also Szpek’s list for the total picture in P-Job. I am unable to agree however with Szpek’s analysis of 24:15: although the Hebrew infinitival construction יַאֲבָד ‘saying’ does not appear often in the predominantly poetic book of Job, it is treated in 24:15 (אָמַרְתָּהוּ) in the same fashion as it is in other parts of the Peshitta (i.e., provision of a conjunction followed by a verb of the same root in a form determined by its grammatical context. See for instance in the Pentateuch: Gen. 37:15, Exod. 7:16, Lev. 23:23, Num. 20:7, Deut. 27:1). Other locations where P-Job adds the waw medially include 37:13 and 40:24.
to bring rain on a land where no man is, ( ) on the desert in which there is no man; RSV

As is the case with 11Q10, the bulk of P-Job’s unique waw pluses occur between two independent stichs. Here it seems that the Syriac translator is reproducing in his Aramaic target text, a use of the conjunction common in Hebrew verse. While two more or less synonymous propositions may be co-ordinated asyndetically (i.e. without the conjunction) in Hebrew poetry, it is often the case that the two stichs may be joined through the use of the so-called epexegetical waw.\(^\text{842}\) Here in 38:26, where the Hebrew stichs are merely apposed, the Syriac translator appears to have replicated this epexegetical use by providing the waw as an explicit marker of co-ordination. Although as a rule, the waw is supplied in P-Job in response to linguistic/stylistic demands, on rare occasions the Syriac translator does make use of the conjunction to incorporate additional material into his translation.\(^\text{843}\)

A2. c) Substitution

As is the case with the Qumran translation, the Syriac translation of P-Job occasionally shows a substitution of the MT conjunction which is otherwise unattested in the

\(^{842}\) B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, § 39.2.4 suggest that the function of the epexegetical conjunction is ‘problematic’ in verse, but note that the waw may in these circumstances function to intensify the poetic language. Should the waw which is provided by the Syriac translator of P-Job in these circumstances be seen as also fulfilling an epexegetical function?

\(^{843}\) This use of the waw also appears in 11Q10 (see B2a below) but is relatively rare in both the Syriac and Qumran versions when compared with uses dictated by language difference. While H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 122 has suggested that P-Job’s addition at the beginning of 38:29 is similarly motivated by the inclusion of extra material in this verse, 11Q10’s addition at the same point suggests that P-Job may well have added the conjunction even without the addition of supplementary text.
Aramaic versions. Here in 25:4 we see an example of the Syriac translation representing the *waw* with the Syriac conjunction *ore*:

\[
\text{כָּתוּבָּהְוֹ רִיבָּיֶךָ אֲנִיִּשׁ שָׁם} \text{ זְמָא} \text{ לִרְדוֹת} \text{ לִד} \text{下车}
\]

\[
\text{כָּתְבוּ הָאָדָם רֵיחַ} \text{ שָׁם} \text{ לִרְדוֹת} \text{ לִד} \text{下车}
\]

\[
11Q10
\]

\[
\text{כָּתוּבָּהְוֹ רִיבָּיֶךָ אֲנִיִּשׁ שָׁם} \text{ זְמָא} \text{ לִרְדוֹת} \text{ לִד} \text{下车}
\]

\[
\text{כָּתְבוּ הָאָדָם רֵיחַ} \text{ שָׁם} \text{ לִרְדוֹת} \text{ לִד} \text{下车}
\]

RtgJob

P-Job

How then can man be justified with God? (or) how can he be clean [that is] born of a woman? AV
How then can man be righteous before God? ( ) How can he who is born of woman be clean? RSV

As Szpek has noted, P-Job has chosen to render the Hebrew *waw* (which may be used to indicate ‘or’) \(^{844}\) with another co-ordinating conjunction (*ore* ‘or’) used by the Syriac with the expressed purpose of joining alternatives. While the Syriac translation of the two stichs exhibits slight deviations from the MT (‘How then is a man found/able \(^{845}\) to be just with God or how can one born of a woman be pure’) it is clear that through the substitution of Syriac *ore* for the Hebrew *waw*, the translator of P-Job has made the ‘alternative’ aspect of the two Hebrew stichs more explicit in his Syriac translation. \(^{846}\) It is interesting to note that the Aramaic translation from Qumran makes this exact same substitution (* الشمال* for *waw*) in the preceding verse, where Bildad’s first pair of rhetorical questions emphasise the might of God. It seems that while both the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job have sensed the need for some type of explicit marking of the two pairs of rhetorical questions in vv 3-4, each chose to mark a different pair. \(^{847}\)

\(^{844}\) For the so-called ‘alternative’ function of the *waw* see R. J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, 71.

\(^{845}\) For the former understanding see *Payne-Smith*, 115; for the latter see G. Rignell, *The Peshitta to the Book of Job*, 202.

\(^{846}\) See H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 129 for a discussion of this phenomenon throughout P-Job.

\(^{847}\) The question of why one translator chooses one pair while one prefers another would appear to be dif-
A3. RtgJob

A3. a) Minus/Omission

We now turn to a consideration of the last remaining Aramaic version—the Rabbinic targum of Job—with respect to its particular use and treatment of the waw in rendering the Hebrew text. It is slightly surprising to note that, unlike the other two versions which omit the conjunction comparatively often, RtgJob presents not a single, unequivocal example of an omission of the Hebrew waw which is unattested in the other Aramaic versions. The following example drawn from the Rabbinic targum’s translation of Job 40:10 is one of only three possible locations where it might be argued that an omission has taken place.

Adorn yourself with eminence and dignity; And clothe yourself with honor and majesty. NAS
Deck yourself with majesty and dignity; ( ) clothe yourself with glory and splendour. RSV

Although most MSS within the RtgJob textual tradition appear to have omitted the epexegetical waw which occurs between the two stichs of 40:10, some witnesses (א ב) do preserve a conjunction at this point. Setting aside for a moment the fact that such an omission would certainly constitute an exception to the targumist’s usual treatment of the waw, it should be noted that the similarity of ְ (i.e. the first character of
and 1 may well have led to the omission of the conjunction through haplography at some point in the transmission of the targum text. While the evidence of recent English versions provides some evidence that the translation of this verse from Hebrew into another language may indeed allow for an omission of the conjunction, the strong possibility of a textual error here makes any such conclusion rather tentative. Because all three examples of unique omission provided by RtgJob are only partially attested in the textual tradition, it seems safe to conclude that if waw omission exists at all in RtgJob it is very much an exception to the rule and may have given rise to considerable textual confusion amongst copyists. Given the particular circumstances of the texts involved, it seems more likely that these apparent omissions of the conjunction have been erroneously imported into the targum text.

A3. b) Plus/Addition

While the evidence of the omission of waw in RtgJob’s translation is questionable due to textual variants, there are indisputable additions of the waw in the Rabbinic targum text which do not appear in the other Aramaic versions. The number of locations where such additions are present are, however, relatively few in comparison with the Qumran and Syriac versions and occur primarily in passages of a type illustrated by this example from Job 25:2.849

848 The other possible minuses found in RtgJob are also unevenly attested in the MSS and both involve the confusion of similar characters (י and צ). At 26:11, some witnesses to RtgJob lack the waw conjunction and render with an Aramaic imperfect, while others [ץ י נ ל י נ י] preserve a participle and retain the conjunction (י נ ל י נ י). The rendering of the preceding verbal form with an Aramaic participle by RtgJob suggests that the waw has been mistaken for a yodh at some point during the transmission process and that the following verbal form has then been understood as an imperfect. Similarly at 33:27, although several MSS (Stec י נ ל י נ י) have omitted the waw conjunction before the verb form (י נ ל י נ י) the majority of witnesses do preserve the conjunction (with both perfect and imperfect forms represented). See D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, ad loc.

849 Unlike the cases described below where the addition of the waw appears to be linked to other ‘prior’ concerns, RtgJob’s addition of the waw at 40:12 appears to be a genuine (albeit rare) plus which is also supplied in many English versions (e.g. NIV: ‘Look at every proud man and humble him...’).
Dominion and fear are with God; he makes peace in his high heaven. RSV

RtgJob in addition to providing a proximate rendering of 25:2 in T1, also provides a divergent interpretation (T2) which results in a radically expanded version. On closer scrutiny, however, it appears that the expanded T2 includes the supplementary material along with a formally literal rendering of the Hebrew. The translator renders the first MT term קְמֵשַׁל ‘dominion’ with the expansion מִכָּלָא מִנִי יִמְּדִיעָה ‘Michael on his right and he is of fire...’ and later in the same verse with a second more literal equivalent בְּשֵׁלֲמַתְמוּת ‘and with his dominion’. The second term in MT מִמְּדָא ‘and fear’ is understood by the RtgJob translator first as מִכָּלָא מִשְׁמַאֲלָה ‘and Gabriel on his left and he is of water...’ and then again later as מִכָּלָא מִשְׁמַאֲלָה ‘and his fearfulness’. It is not the content of the expansions which interests us at this point. Rather, our concern here is with the translator’s use of the waw.\(^{850}\) All the Aramaic versions, including RtgJob, preserve the phrasal waw

---

\(^{850}\) C. Mangan, *The Targum of Job*, 16 n. iv has observed that the introduction of references to angels is not uncommon in RtgJob. In addition to Michael and Gabriel, Sammael is also mentioned by name in RtgJob (28:7); R. Weiss, *תֵּינוֹ מְנַנִּים* (Tanhuma י’פ, 6; Zohar (Leviticus) 12b; for further citations see 253 n.117) Interestingly the correspondences of ‘Michael’ with ‘fire’ and ‘Gabriel’ with ‘water’ attested to by the targum are reversed in much of the Rabbinic material. Again it is difficult to determine whether the targum is the source of the material or whether the translator has drawn on rabbinic sources or traditions common to both.
which links the first two Hebrew terms (enclosed in ( )). In RtgJob’s case, both proximate and supplemented translations are linked with \textit{waw}. But while 11Q10 and P-Job represent only the phrasal \textit{waw} which appears between the two initial terms in the MT, the translator of RtgJob provides several additional conjunctions unrelated to the ‘translation’ of the Hebrew. The inclusion of interpretative material has led the translator to introduce these additional conjunctions (enclosed in \{\}) which facilitate the integration of this ‘supplementary material’ and the ‘translation’ into a single unit. \footnote{At 24:24 RtgJob also provides an additional \textit{waw} where an interpretative rendering is offered. A \textit{waw} is also added by this translator in his rendering of 33:29 where the divergence of all three Aramaic versions is probably due to a shared (i.e., linguistic) inability to provide a proximate rendering of the Hebrew.}

A3. c) Substitution

The translator of RtgJob does not show any otherwise unattested substitutions of \textit{waw}.

\textbf{A4. Summary of \textit{waw} modifications unique to the respective Aramaic versions}

The material presented thus far enables us to at least begin to answer the first question posed in the introduction, namely, ‘How do the translators responsible for the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew book of Job treat and represent the \textit{waw} conjunction in their respective renderings?’

While both the Qumran and Syriac translations show otherwise unattested omissions both at the beginning of verses and medially, the Qumran translation specifically tends to uniquely omit an initial \textit{waw} (A1a) when it appears at the beginning of a new section of Hebrew text. Both 11Q10 and P-Job show a willingness to omit an equivalent for Hebrew \textit{waw} when it immediately precedes an interrogative (A1a, A2a). The majority of P-Job’s unique omissions (A2a) come where the Hebrew text uses the \textit{waw} to conjoin simple verbal clauses. In stark contrast to these versions, RtgJob shows signs of \textit{waw} omission in only three locations and all three seem most likely to be attributed to the translation’s transmission history rather than the translator himself (A3a).
With respect to the addition of the conjunction, both 11Q10 and the Peshitta of Job provide numerous unique examples of the waw being supplied where it is not present in the MT. Both supply the waw medially (A1b, A2b) in order to establish an explicit co-ordinative link between two or more stichs as well as adding it verse-initially to facilitate a linkage with a preceding verse or verses. While the Qumran and targum translators are more likely to supply the conjunction in order to integrate supplementary material than their Syriac counterpart, it is important to note that in the case of 11Q10, this use of the waw accounts for only a small part of the total number of additions. On the other hand, the targumist (unlike the other two translators) is almost entirely restricted to this ‘integrative’ use of the waw and virtually never provides the conjunction at the beginning or medially in order to explicitly enhance the conjunction of two units which in Hebrew show no grammatically marked linkage (A3b).

Analysis of the Aramaic versions’ unique substitutions with respect to waw shows that the Syriac translation (A2c) and that of Qumran (A1c) occasionally provide a contextually appropriate substitution for the MT conjunction and will also replace an element in the Hebrew with the Aramaic waw under the influence of linguistic and stylistic constraints. The Rabbinic targum of Job, however, shows no evidence of either type of substitution with respect to this conjunction (A3c).

A glance at Figure 1 below shows that 11Q10 and Peshitta Job display far more unique divergences in each category than does the Rabbinic targum of Job. An asterisked figure has been used for RtgJob’s total omissions (3*) to highlight the partial attestation of the modification in the textual witnesses. The total number of additions (6*) has also been provided with an asterisk, but in the case of pluses this asterisk is to point up the fundamental difference between the nature of the additions made by RtgJob (being primarily in non-translational material) and the other two Aramaic versions (primarily a translational response to linguistic/stylistic constraints).
gory, but it is important to note that the nature of RtgJob’s additions differs significantly in that the \textit{waw} appears to be added almost exclusively when the targumist is in ‘supplementary mode’ and not when he is, strictly speaking, ‘translating’ the Hebrew. In fact, when the lack of even a single substitution and the dubious nature of the Rabbinic targum’s three possible examples of omission are both taken into account, it may be suggested that in its treatment of the \textit{waw}, the Rabbinic targum is scrupulously \textit{literal} in comparison with the other Aramaic versions.

![Figure 1: Unique Treatment of the 1-Conjunction in the Aramaic Versions](image)

**B. Modifications Shared by Two or More Aramaic Versions**

Having looked at the way in which the three Aramaic versions of Job treat the \textit{waw} in different textual locations, it now remains to examine the relationships which obtain between the respective versions in this regard. We turn therefore to instances where two or more of the Aramaic versions appear to treat or represent the \textit{waw} in the same manner in relation to the Masoretic Text.

**B1. Modifications common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job**

In light of RtgJob’s demonstrated lack of unique deviations, it is perhaps not entirely surprising that the number of instances where the treatment of the \textit{waw} is similar in all three Aramaic versions is quite low. In fact, the pair of shared omissions and total lack of common substitutions amongst the three versions, parallels RtgJob’s preference for addition as opposed to omission or substitution.
B1. a) Minus/Omission common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job

For the ear heard, and declareth me happy, And the eye hath seen, and testifieth (to) me. YLT
When the ear heard, ( ) it called me blessed, and when the eye saw, it approved; RSV

We have already encountered the Aramaic versions’ rendering of 29:11 in connection with our discussion of the Qumran translator’s inverted representation of אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה) in his Aramaic rendering (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה). What interests us here is of course the observation that whereas the Hebrew text possesses a waw conjunction in the middle of 29:11a (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה), none of the Aramaic translators appear to provide an equivalent at this location in their renderings.853 Whereas in the Hebrew, the waw allows the perfective value of the suffixed form (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה) to be preserved by the waw + prefix conjugation (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה/אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה), the Aramaic translators clearly have no need of such a construction and prefer instead to provide Aramaic suffix forms (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה/אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה).

But this explanation, in and of itself, does not adequately account for the loss of the waw as the translators might well have preserved the waw along with these perfective forms.854 More crucial in this case is the presence of the temporal-causal form at the beginning (אַל֥וֹן שַמִּשְׂכֶּה), and the fact that all three Aramaic translators seem to have understood 29:11a as a subordinate construction rather than a co-ordinate one.855 As Zuckerman has pointed out, the omission of the conjunction here by all three translators represents a

853 Only one MS witness to RtgJob (2) shows the more formally precise representation המַלָּא.
854 The English translation of YLT provides a parallel whereby the conjunctions are explicitly preserved in the rendering.
855 That the temporal-causal conjunction ‘for/when’ is not decisive in this respect is shown by the co-ordinate and subordinate clauses of the YLT and RSV respectively.
common attempt to provide a smoother more idiomatic translation of the Hebrew text as they perceived it.\textsuperscript{856}

A second omission shared by all three Aramaic versions is found at Job 36:26:

\begin{verbatim}
Behold, God is great, and we know him not; the number of his years is unsearchable. RSV
Lo, God \textit{(is) } high, And we know not the number of His years, \textit{Yea, there \textit{(is) } no searching. YLT
\end{verbatim}

As is the case at 34:24, where this same Hebrew expression also occurs, all three Aramaic versions here provide renderings which deviate from their Hebrew source text. In the final clause of the Hebrew text of Job 36:26, the \textit{waw} conjunction appears to introduce the predicate\textsuperscript{857} (so RSV, NRSV etc.) and thus understood serves no purpose in the Aramaic renderings—all of which show a negated verbless clause.\textsuperscript{858} All three Aramaic translators seem therefore to have omitted this \textit{waw} in an attempt to come to grips with an unusual Hebrew text and create an intelligible target text for their readers/hearers. While both P-Job and the Qumran translation omit the conjunction on numerous occasions, this sole instance of a common omission amongst the three Aramaic versions constitutes the only certain example of omission of the conjunction in the Rabbinic targum.

\textsuperscript{856} B.E. Zuckerman, \textit{The Process of Translation}, 498.
\textsuperscript{857} S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, \textit{The Book of Job (II)}, 282.
\textsuperscript{858} At 5:9 and 9:10 \textit{יִתְנָ} is negated with the expected particle Hebrew particle (\textit{לִלְתַנִי}) and rendered accordingly by both RtgJob (\textit{יִתְנָ}) and P-Job (\textit{אֱלָא}). At Job 34:24 (\textit{רָע} הַיָּד) however the cognate verbal negation particle in Aramaic is employed with no variation in the renderings of RtgJob and P-Job.
B1. b) Plus/Addition common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job

When we turn to the subject of shared pluses in the Aramaic versions, the three translations provide several instances which seem to illustrate a common concern:

![Hebrew text]

I laugh unto them ()— they give no credence, And the light of my face cause not to fall. YLT
I smiled on them when they had no confidence; and the light of my countenance they did not cast down. RSV

While the Hebrew text of 29:24a merely apposes the first verbal phrase (אֶלֶף יִשְׁרֵי מַלֵּא) with the second (אֶלֶף יִשְׁרֵי מַלֵּא), the Aramaic versions differ from the source text in their respective renderings. The appearance of the waw conjunction in all three versions, as well as other versions and medieval MSS has led Zuckerman to suggest that a variant Hebrew Vorlage once preserved the conjunction where the text preserved in the MT now lacks it.859 This is, of course, impossible to rule out but it is equally possible that the translators supplied the conjunction themselves in order to introduce the negative verbal phrase which follows. Whereas the second part of the verse (v.24b) represents a single clause and thus does not require a waw conjunction prior to the Aramaic rendering of יִשְׁרֵי מַלֵּא, the translators of the RSV do suggest that some explicit marking of the relationship between the two verbal phrases in the first half of the verse is also required by some English readers. Were this the only example of waw addition in all three Aramaic versions, there would be little means of deciding between the two explanations offered above. On this occasion, however, other instances do offer some guidance.

It is interesting to note that three of the four other examples of waw addition shared by all three versions, occur within the space of three verses in chapter 32. While the fragmentary nature of 11Q10’s rendering of 32:15 complicates any comparison with both the MT and the other versions, the following verse 16 of the same chapter provides ample illustration:

And I have waited, but they do not speak, For they have stood still, ( ) They have not answered any more. YLT
And shall I wait, because they do not speak, because they stand there, and answer no more? RSV

While the MT merely juxtaposes the positive and succeeding negative propositions, all three Aramaic versions provide the waw which then serves to explicitly co-ordinate the phrases in translation. (‘...they stand there, (and) answer no more?’) Similarly in 32:13, where a positive verbal clause is followed by a negative clause in the MT (‘אלא ימלולו ידיע: ‘God will/may vanquish him, not man’) all three Aramaic versions of Job again provide the waw conjunction. And, as already mentioned, a similar situation seems to be behind the shared addition of the conjunction at 32:15. Although in verse 15, 11Q10 does not preserve the actual negative particle in its Aramaic rendering, the

---

860 All three versions do provide a waw between 37:11a and b, but in the case of RtgJob it is apparent from the MSS (See D.M. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job, 259) that the addition of the conjunction is directly linked to a supplementation of the Hebrew text (יִדָּע *and the wind* (scatters the cloud of its/his rain) by the translator. This further illustrates the tendency outlined above: whereas 11Q10 and P-Job will provide waw frequently to conjoin independent propositions, RtgJob primarily uses it in situations where the Hebrew text has been supplemented or altered for other reasons. At 39:1 where both 11Q10 and P-Job add the waw between the two halves of the verse, RtgJob provides a different conjunction (*ותי*).

861 The odd verse out in this sequence, 32:14, also contains negative propositions but these are both introduced by waw in the MT.
MT behind the translation (תֵּאָמָר לָא רַעַיָּהוּ רַעַיָּהוּ ‘they are discomfited; they do not answer’) is again a positive verbal clause followed by a negative one. The fact that the usually conservative translator of RtgJob has joined the other two versions in providing the conjunction here may perhaps be taken as an indication that the normal constraints of fidelity to the Hebrew text have for whatever reason been overridden by a desire for idiomatic Aramaic.\textsuperscript{862} One caveat must nevertheless be raised with regard to RtgJob’s additions in all three of these verses: the fact that these additions, as was the case with the targum’s unique omissions, are not found uniformly across the MS tradition of RtgJob raises questions regarding the originality of the additions. When viewed in the light of the other Aramaic versions, however, the weight of the textual evidence does seem to support RtgJob’s divergence from the MT here in chapter 32.\textsuperscript{863} In light of the situation in chapter 32, it will be no surprise to find that at 30:13 (the only other instance of waw addition attested by all three Aramaic versions at the same textual location) the conjunction is again supplied between a positive verbal phrase and a negative one (לֵאמָר לָא רַעַיָּהוּ רַעַיָּהוּ). Having seen a rather clear pattern emerge with regard to the Aramaic translators’ shared linguistic-stylistic preference for adding the conjunction in a particular context, it seems likely that the first instance discussed (29:24) should be attributed not to a variant Vorlage but rather to the same linguistic-stylistic constraints which have influenced the additions elsewhere.

B2. Modifications common to 11Q10 and RtgJob

B2. a) Plus/Addition common to 11Q10 and RtgJob

Again we find that it is only in their addition of waw (rather than substitution or omission) that the Qumran translator and Rabbinic targum translator find any common

\textsuperscript{862} Also interesting is P-Job’s tendency to provide the conjunction in the context outlined above, while nevertheless omitting the waw between simple verbal clauses (See A2a above).

\textsuperscript{863} 32:13-majority reading = waw plus; exceptions (נ י נ); 32:15-majority reading = waw plus; exceptions (נ י); 32:16-majority reading = waw plus; exception (נ).
ground which is not also attested in P-Job. In fact, only one such addition occurs, and it does so in the respective translations of 37:13:

\[
\text{37:13} \\
\text{RtgJob} \\
P-Job
\]

Whether for correction, or for his land, or for love, he causes it to happen. RSV

This verse, coming at the end of a section detailing divine sovereignty over water in its various states (ice, rain etc), suggests the various reasons for God’s orchestration of the rain clouds. While P-Job provides co-ordinating conjunctions before the latter two alternatives as is the case in English (‘or’), both the Qumran translation (2x) and RtgJob (3x) show their addition of conjunctions not in parallel with the Syriac translation but instead in sections which deviate (in RtgJob’s case, substantially) from the Hebrew. For instance in RtgJob’s expansion of Hebrew MT ‘for (the good of) the land’ (מַעֲשֶׂה רוּחַ לְאָרֵי נַחַלֶּה נַגָּלֶה), the targumist supplies a waw to co-ordinate the final two nouns. Similarly in the translation of MT מַעֲשֶׂה רוּחַ with

\[
\text{37:13} \\
\text{RtgJob} \\
P-Job
\]

...‘or soft [rain] of charity/kindness for the fields and the vineyards and fruit.’ RtgJob provides two conjunctions which serve the same purpose. We see that in RtgJob’s rendering of each Hebrew clause, the waw has been provided at least once. However, the additions have come not between clauses as in P-Job but in the midst of phrases which form part of the targumist’s expanded translation.

---

864 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 81 n. 9.
The Qumran version's double rendering of MT '7D)T~0N 'or for mercy/love' with לֶמֶךָ וַתַּחְדֹּרְנָה 'or for a famine and for its want'\(^{865}\) also shows the use of waw to co-ordinate supplementary material with translation. The following words in 11Q10 ḫוֹדֵי וְפַסְח מֶנֶס 'and if (i.e., or) a case of law-breaking'\(^{866}\) have no equivalent in the MT and the motivation for their addition is unclear. Again, as is the case in RtgJob, the waw is here being used in the Qumran translation to introduce material with no correspondence in the Hebrew.\(^{867}\) While this example of a modification shared by 11Q10 and RtgJob shows that the Qumran translator may also use waw to incorporate material and divergent interpretation into his translation, the fact that this is the sole instance to be found in the sample confirms that unlike RtgJob, this is not the primary cause for the Qumran translator's introduction of the conjunction across the version as a whole.

**B3. Modifications common to RtgJob and P-Job**

There are no instances of modifications of the waw shared by these two versions alone.\(^{868}\)

**B4. Modifications common to 11Q10 and P-Job**

B4. a) Minus/Omission

At three locations within the sample, both the Qumran and Syriac translations appear to omit a waw which is present in the MT and also preserved by the Rabbinic tar-

---

\(^{865}\) Editio princeps, 68 suggests that the translator here has provided a double rendering based on רֹאַי 'lack, want'. It is difficult to determine whether the translator has made an erroneous identification here or alternatively has seen the 'reading' of resh for daleth as a means of making sense of the verse.

\(^{866}\) Reading here with F. Martínez et al., Qumran Cave 11, 145, 46. These later editors garner support for this reading from TgOnqelos Exod 22:8. (equiv. to MT דָּבָר שֶׁנֶּשֶׁר).

\(^{867}\) 11Q10's final addition does show some similarity to the usage in P-Job, however the waw introduces a clause rather than a phrase.

\(^{868}\) This conclusion substantiates the suggestion of H.M. Szpek 'On the Influence of the Targum', 144 that RtgJob tends to follow the MT more closely in its representation of the waw than does the Peshitta of Job.
At 21:25, for example, both versions fail to represent the *waw* which appears at the beginning of the verse in the MT:

\[
21:25 \text{ רָדֶּ֥ת בָּ֑נוּתָּן יָמָ֖וָת לַאֹֽלֶל \text{ (11Q10) RtgJob}
\]

\[
21:25 \text{ רָדֶּ֥ת בָּ֑נוּתָּן יָמָ֖וָת לַאֹֽלֶל \text{ (P-Job)}
\]

And this (one) dieth with a bitter soul, And have not eaten with gladness. YLT

( ) Another dies in bitterness of soul, never having tasted of good. RSV

Verses 23-25 of chapter 21 come at the end of a sustained argument offered by Job: divine justice which allows the wicked to live long and prosper while deferring their punishment to their children is no justice at all. Verse 23 and 24 describe the demise of the prosperous evildoer (‘One dies in full prosperity, being wholly at ease and secure... etc’) while verse 25 brings home the full force of Job’s complaint. One commentator has suggested that the translator of 11Q10 may have omitted the *waw* before the demonstrative due to the Qumran translator’s preceding omission of v.23. However, P-Job’s similar omission of the conjunction here suggests that it is more likely that the *waw* has been considered stylistically unnecessary by the Qumran translator irrespective of the presence or absence of verse 23 in the Qumran version. Again at 21:4, neither the

---

869 At 34:29, both 11Q10 and P-Job lack the conjunction where it occurs in MT before an apodosis (MT: (טַ֣שַׁה יָמָ֑וָת לַאֹֽלֶל) and also omit a subsequent occurrence of the *waw* in this verse. As we have seen above (B2) this treatment of the conjunction before an apodosis has already been documented in P-Job. English translations such as ASV, NIV, RSV and NRSV also omit this conjunction in their renderings of the Hebrew text.

870 The conjunction is however preserved by revisions of the KJV up to, and including, the ASV.

871 B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 197 notes that were a rendering of verse 23 indeed missing from 11Q10, there would be no need for ‘a contrasting conjunction at the beginning of the latter verse [i.e., 25]’. P-Job however does not appear to require the conjunction, despite maintaining vv 23-25.

872 H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 121 notes that ‘often in [P-Job] where both stichs of a verse begin with the *waw* conjunctive, the second will almost universally be preserved—indicating that the translator viewed it as an immediate continuation of the previous stich—but the first *waw* will only be preserved if that verse begins a new topical unit or if the entire verse is a direct continuation of the previous one.’
Qumran nor Syriac translator includes the *waw* where it appears between stichs in the Hebrew verse (תנינא אַלְמָא שֶׁיֵּאָהּ אָסָא מִדְּבָּרָה לָא תֵּקֵּר רַחֲנוֹ). Many English versions based on the MT similarly omit this conjunction in translation (i.e. RSV ‘As for me, is my complaint against man? ( ) Why should I not be impatient?’) despite its presence in the source text.

**B4. b) Plus/Addition**

While the Qumran and Syriac translations share only a few common omissions, such is not the case with additions made by both translators at the same juncture in their translation of the Hebrew text. As both the Qumran and Syriac translators show the addition of the *waw* in verse-initial positions independently, it is not entirely surprising that both also provide the conjunction at identical locations in their respective Aramaic target texts. One example is to be found at 23:5 where Job responds to Eliphaz with a plea that his case might be heard,

![Job 23:5](image)

The motivation for such an addition is to be found in the semantic and structural links between verse 5 and the preceding verse 4 (‘I would lay my case before him and fill my mouth with arguments’). Clearly both Aramaic translators have concluded that the addition of a *waw* is stylistically required in order to reflect the perceived relationship between the sets of stichs. In three other verses within the sample, both the Qumran and Peshitta translators provide the *waw* at the beginning of the verse where the MT does not attest it and the Rabbinic targum does not supply it.\(^{873}\) Even more common,

\(^{873}\) See also 33:27, 38:29 and 40:13.
however, are the instances where both the Qumran and Syriac translators appear to have felt the need to supply the *waw* conjunction medially in verses—primarily between successive stichs in a single verse. This shared response to a perceived lack of explicit conjunction in MT is illustrated by Job 33:11:

He doth put in the stocks my feet, ( ) He doth watch all my paths. YLT
... he puts my feet in the stocks, and watches all my paths. RSV

While English versions such as YLT (and AV, ASV and NIV etc.) do not diverge from the MT in their translations of this verse, the revisers of the RSV and NRSV illustrate that the Aramaic translators are not alone in providing the *waw* in order to conjoin two functionally synonymous stichs which in the Hebrew are left merely apposed.874 In fact at more than a dozen other locations both the Qumran and Syriac translators provide the conjunction at the same place vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text.875 When combined with the initial pluses discussed above, these shared medial additions would seem to constitute a rather substantial agreement of approach between the Qumran and Peshitta translators.

---

874 Both 11Q10 and P-Job diverge from the MT in not preserving an imperfect in their Aramaic/Syriac translations. The translator of 11Q10 however—in his translation of MT יבּל, ‘he kept, guarded, observed, restrained etc.’—provides a more specific rendering *בּכּר* ‘he blocked’ under the influence of the semantic environment (feet withheld in stocks) in order to smooth out a rare Hebrew construction. For more extensive discussion regarding the renderings in the respective versions see F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 130. For P-Job particularly see H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 182-83.

875 See 33:9, 25; 36:25, 26, 27; 38:24; 39:7, 21, 25, 26; 40:8, 30; 41:26. At 37:14, both 11Q10 and P-Job show a medial addition of the conjunction which reflects an uncertainty about the precise division of the verse into stichs.
B4. c) Substitution

Substitutions shared exclusively by 11Q10 and P-Job also occur, but with less frequency than common additions and their analysis is often less clear-cut. One instance of such a common substitution appears in the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job 29:12:

For I deliver the afflicted who is crying, And the fatherless who hath no helper. YLT
because I delivered the poor who cried, and the fatherless who had none to help him. RSV

We have seen in the previous chapter that the Syriac version departs from the word order of the Hebrew in the final portion of its rendering of Job 29:12 (לַאֵלָאֶלְדָּר לִלְדָּר). While the treatment of the conjunction is our concern here rather than the translators’ word order preference, our attention is again focused on the latter half of the verse. As mentioned in our previous discussion of this passage, it is debatable whether the Qumran Aramaic translator has intended לַאֵלָאֶלְדָּר לִלְדָּר as a verbal clause or a nominal one (participle-as-substantive).876 However, the various commentators have understood the Qumran translator’s intention with regard to the last clause, it is widely agreed that the relative pronoun לַא should be reconstructed at the beginning of the clause.877 While the targum translator follows the Hebrew in preserving a waw conjunction, it is quite clear that the Syriac translator has also provided the relative pro-

876 For לַא see discussion of 29:12 (chapter 7).
noun (א). While Zuckerman is right to acknowledge the possibility Qumran and Syriac translators' provision of the relative may reflect their common use of a *Vorlage* which already lacked the conjunction, he also seems to be correct in favouring a simpler explanation of this agreement. It seems quite likely that both translators have recognised the subordinating function of the *waw* at this point and supplied the appropriate Aramaic relativising particle as a means of producing a more idiomatic translation.\(^{878}\) The Qumran translator’s rendering of מַגִיא יְהוָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל חָכַּם in 36:26 shows that he was quite willing and able to provide the Aramaic relative in place of the *waw* when it would facilitate a more intelligible rendering of the Hebrew.\(^{879}\)

At 21:7 both translators provide a *waw* in place of the Hebrew מִן:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{11Q10} & \quad \text{מִן} \quad \text{רַשֵׁיָתָה} \quad \text{חָכַּם} \quad \text{(סמ)} \quad \text{מִן} \quad \text{רַשֵׁיָתָה} \quad \text{חָכַּם} \\
\text{P-Job} & \quad \text{מֶה} \quad \text{רַשֵׁיָתָה} \quad \text{חָכַּם} \quad \text{אַחֲרוֹנִיָּה} \quad \text{(לְוָדִי)} \quad \text{כּוֹנֶנְיָה}: \\
\text{RtgJob} & \quad \text{סְחַלַּת} \quad \text{סֵנַח} \quad \text{סֵנַח} \quad \text{סֵנַח} \quad \text{סֵנַח} \quad \text{סֵנַח} \quad \text{סֵנַח}.
\end{align*}
\]

Why do the wicked *still* live, **Continue on**, also **become** very powerful? NAS

Why do the wicked live, reach old age, **and** grow mighty in power? RSV

While both the targumist and the English translator of the NAS provide their standard formal equivalents (**לְוָדִי,** 'also') of the Hebrew particle מִן, 11Q10 and P-Job prefer instead to restructure the second half of verse 7 through the use of a conjunction (in P-Job before the preceding verbal form 'grow old'). Although capable of serving in different capacities, this Hebrew particle here appears to function as little more than a

\(^{878}\) For *waw* relative see B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, § 38.1.

\(^{879}\) For further discussion of parallels in other ancient versions see B.E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation*, 506-7. Both Qumran (מַגִיא יְהוָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל חָכַּם) and Syriac (מַגִיא יְהוָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל חָכַּם) translators provide the relative (**לְוָדִי**) in translating 34:24.

...
co-ordinator and it is hardly surprising that it has also been rendered as such by the English translators of the RSV. The fact that both Aramaic translators have performed the same substitution here (waw for □) is evidence that both Qumran and Peshitta translators have understood the nuance of the Hebrew and provided the waw conjunction as a means of rendering the source text into an idiomatically acceptable form of Aramaic. Other shared substitutions are prompted by an interest in the idiomatic Aramaic rendering of exclamatory particles and indicators of alternation.

B5. Summary of waw modifications common to two or more Aramaic versions

What light does the preceding analysis shed on the question of how the various Aramaic versions relate to each other in terms of their treatment of this conjunction?

While all three Aramaic versions do, on rare occasion, modify their source text in the same manner at the same location, the number of such occurrences is comparatively low.

---

880 B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, Hebrew Syntax, § 39.3.4a Example #12 (Isa 14:7-8). The other major Hebrew adverbial co-ordinator, נָא may also function purely as a co-ordinator (Isaiah 41:10).

881 36:30.

882 Both translators provide waw for Hebrew □ at 39:10 where it introduces an alternative following an interrogative. While both translators deviate from MT in marking alternatives at 40:9 and 40:25, the manner in which they do so is not strictly speaking identical and therefore although they are obviously responding to the same "problem" in the Hebrew, they are not included in the total for this category.
The pair of shared omissions (B1a) appear to reflect, in the case of the first, a shared concern for a linguistically intelligible translation, and in the second instance, a common response to a difficult Hebrew text. The handful of shared pluses (B1b) occur under a specific set of circumstances (*positive clause + negative clause*) in the source text. In these cases, the priority of fidelity to the formal features of the MT so readily apparent in RtgJob has been overridden by the demands of a linguistically intelligible Aramaic rendering. While the modifications shared by all three Aramaic versions are not terribly numerous, they do indicate a basic level of perception amongst the translators that, despite the overlapping constraints in the use of *waw* in Hebrew and Aramaic texts, the rendering of the former into the latter does necessitate some adjustments. Although this common concern for Aramaic idiom has resulted in some omissions, the main consequence of this shared linguistic-stylistic perception has been the supplementation of the source text through the addition of *waw*.

Given that, apart from the examples shared with 11Q10 and P-Job, the targum shows little signs of supplying *waw* when actually rendering the Hebrew text, it is not surprising that the single instance of a plus being shared by the Aramaic translation from Qumran and the targum (11Q10 and RtgJob) is found where both translators are incorporating supplementary material or doublets into their translations. Neither is this single shared plus unexpected when we remember that these two translators presented more unique instances of this use of the conjunction than did the Syriac translator (A4). In terms of assessing the respective translators’ attitudes toward the Hebrew text they were rendering, it is important to note that while the Qumran translation shows occasional ‘integrative’ use of *waw* alongside its primarily ‘translational’ use of *waw* which also predominates in the Syriac version, the targumist is seemingly steadfast in almost entirely restricting the addition of the *waw* to integrative use.

The lack of a single agreement between the Syriac translation of Job and the Rabbinic targum of Job suggests that except in the extremely isolated cases discussed above, the Rabbinic and Syriac translators have little in common in their treatment of the *waw* conjunction in Job. By contrast, however, the Qumran translation and the Peshitta
of Job show a significant number of shared modifications. While the number of common omissions (3) and substitutions (3) are significant in the light of the other relationships shown in Figure 2, it is the shared pluses which constitute by far the single largest category (19). In fact, a comparison of Figures 1 and 2 show that, of the total number of waw additions made by the Qumran translator, more are shared with the Peshitta of Job than are unique to 11Q10.883

As with the comparison of the unique treatment of waw, an analysis of the Aramaic versions shared treatment of the conjunction strongly suggests that it is the Qumran and Syriac translators who line up together in their willingness to omit, substitute and, most frequently, add the waw conjunction in order to produce an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew.884 The Rabbinic targum of Job by contrast shows a quite extraordinary fidelity to the Masoretic text in its representation of the waw. The restriction of RtgJob’s addition of the conjunction to what might be called ‘non-translational’ passages, when coupled with the almost complete lack of substitutions and omissions of the waw leads to the inevitable conclusion that it is particularly scrupulous in its representation of the minutiae of the Hebrew text.

Before concluding this assessment of the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the waw, we would do well to first consider a methodological question which has been touched on in previous chapters, but postponed in the present discussion until now.885 It will have been noted that the foregoing discussion has continued to alternate indiscriminately between two sets of terminology in describing the network of relationships between the respective Aramaic versions and their putative Hebrew Vorlagen. It is obvi-

883 The combined totals of Figures 1 and 2 are as follows: Minus: 11Q10-17, P-Job-12, RtgJob-5; Plus: 11Q10-44, P-Job-50, RtgJob-13; Substitution: 11Q10-7, P-Job-13, RtgJob-0. The figures for RtgJob (both plus and minus) should be understood in the light of the discussion of Figures 1 and 2.

884 Although the doctoral work of P.J. Williams was unfortunately not yet available for consultation at the time of writing, an abstract of the dissertation (P.J. Williams ‘Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings’ [diss. Abstract] Tyndale Bulletin 49.1 (1998) 183-186) suggests that, as in P-Job, the Syriac translator of 1 Kings adds (more frequently) and omits (less frequently) the waw as a means of producing an idiomatic rendering. It is anticipated that his study, being devoted specifically to syntactic issues, will give a more nuanced account of the Syriac translator’s use of waw than may be provided here.

885 See ‘Vorlage’ (Introduction).
ous that theoretically neutral terms such as ‘plus’ and ‘minus’ need not necessarily reflect the translator’s activity suggested by ‘addition’ and ‘omission’. To unpack this statement and rephrase it in the form of a question: what is the likelihood that it is the respective Vorlagen which are largely to blame for the Qumran and Syriac translator’s common divergence from the MT? Is a recent commentator correct when he suggests that it is impossible to determine whether the omission of the waw has any text critical significance? It is hoped that the material provided thus far has shown that we have grounds for a slightly more optimistic view of the situation. It seems evident that the similarities in the divergence of 11Q10 and P-Job from MT in terms of the minus and plus of waw stem primarily from translator intervention. For methodological reasons, however, consideration must be given to the question of whether or not the strong affinity between P-Job and 11Q10 over and against RtgJob with regard to the waw is the result, not of common linguistic/stylistic constraints but rather of a largely similar Hebrew Vorlage. Notwithstanding scholarly reservations regarding the utility and significance of the variants preserved in the Kennicott and De Rossi collections, the 18th century collations do apparently provide ample evidence of the lack of uniformity in the transmission history of the text. And interestingly, it is the modifications which are shared by all three Aramaic versions (e.g. addition before negative phrases: 32:13, 15, 16; omission of waw at 36:26) which are also supported by the Hebrew MSS. Other parallels such as P-Job’s double omission of the conjunction between simple verbal phrases at 38:3 (MS Ken. 196) do occur, but whereas the Syriac translator is quite consistent in omitting the conjunction in similar linguistic contexts (40:7, 11 and

886 Apart from a single instance (see above e.g. RtgJob 40:10) in which it is quite possible that the modification of the waw stems from a copyist’s error (i.e., during the history of the Aramaic text), the present study finds no evidence that the divergent treatment of the waw has resulted from errors or alterations made during the copying of the present Aramaic texts from previous Aramaic Vorlagen. Therefore the use of Vorlage is restricted to the putative Hebrew texts which lay before the respective translators.

887 B.E. Zuckerman, The Process of Translation, 351. It should be noted that this conclusion might well have been altered had Zuckerman’s exhaustive treatment of the Qumran ‘targum’ been extended beyond the first 15 columns.


889 Ken. 18, 80, 166 et al. also supply the waw; of these only MS 18 also omits at 36:26.
42:4) the Hebrew MSS show no similarly systematic deviation from the MT. In general then, the sporadic nature of the parallels in the medieval Hebrew MSS provides a stark contrast to the more extensive, systemic agreements found in 11Q10 and P-Job. Furthermore, the fact that substitutions of *waw* seem to lack parallels in the Hebrew MSS would seem to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that it is the translators' flexibility with regard to the representation of the conjunction which is responsible for their deviations from the MT.890

---

890 These substitutions, as we have seen, take two forms: 1) Aramaic ‘x’ for Heb. *waw* and Aramaic *waw*
CONCLUSIONS

11Q10 as an Aramaic Version of Job

The Representation of the Hebrew text in the Aramaic versions of Job

Having devoted considerable space to an exploration of the Aramaic versions’ representation of their Hebrew source text on the basis of three indices, we are perhaps now in a position to unpack some of the implications of this investigation. In terms of the respective translations’ willingness to omit source text elements in their renderings, we have seen evidence to suggest that the Aramaic versions divide along fairly well defined lines, with the Qumran and Syriac texts lining up together on one hand and the targum on the other. 891 The Qumran and Syriac translations showed a shared tendency to pass by, or omit elements in their Hebrew source text for a variety of reasons ranging from perceived source text irregularity and prior modification within the translation to, most prominently, a perception of the linguistic-stylistic redundancy of certain source text elements. In terms of breaking down this linguistic-stylistic category into constituent parts, we saw that in the Qumran and Syriac versions, elements are apparently omitted because they are perceived by the translators as either not required, i.e. constrained stylistically-poetically or not permitted, i.e. constrained linguistically, by the form of Aramaic into which the translation was made. While it is sometimes the case that a modification is broadly linguistic/stylistic in nature, we must on some occasions be satisfied with locating a given adaptation somewhere on a continuum between the stylistic

---

for Heb. ‘x’.
and the linguistic. In stark contrast to the situation which obtained in 11Q10 and P-Job, the targum translation displays virtually no evidence of the omission of source text elements. While there is no sign in the targum translation of any propensity toward the omission of a given element as a result of its perceived redundancy, it should be emphasised that this is not the same as saying that the targumist does not perceive redundancy in the text.\textsuperscript{892} Rather, it can only be concluded that on those occasions when a redundancy is felt to be present in the Hebrew text, it is not grounds for omission by the targumist but instead, often gives rise to expansion or elaboration which find parallels in other Rabbinic texts.\textsuperscript{893}

While it is worth noting that the omissions which were recorded in RtgJob seemed to have been implemented as a means of avoiding cases of acute ambiguity, the number of omissions furnished by RtgJob was seen to be insignificant in purely statistical terms when compared with the Qumran and Syriac versions.\textsuperscript{894}

A similar situation obtained when we turned to the subject of transposition.\textsuperscript{895} While certain cases of larger textual dislocation in 11Q10 and P-Job were seen to be possible candidates for attribution to underlying textual variation, the vast majority of transpositions found in the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job were seen not to be related to putative deviations in the Vorlagen, but rather stemmed from the respective translators' intervention. With respect to this intervention, prior modification and the perception of an irregular or difficult source text were again seen as occasional motiva-

\textsuperscript{891} See chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{893} R. Weiss, "Arammim to Semitic Interpretation", 233; For midrashic parallels to some of these verses see the appropriate notes ad loc. in C. Mangan, The Targum of Job.
\textsuperscript{894} This fits well with R.P. Gordon's perspective on omission ("The Syriac Old Testament: Provenance, Perspective and Translation Technique" in The Interpretation of the Bible [ed. J. Krashovec] Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998 355-70) as differentiating targumic and peshitta approaches to translation: 「...while [omission] may be typical of the Peshitta translation method, it is not so with the targums generally... they offer some attempt at translation or at least transliteration, so that nothing is left unrepre¬sented.」 (364).
\textsuperscript{895} See Chapter 10.
tions, but a more significant contributing factor was the tendency to harmonise the word order within the immediate or more distant textual proximity. When we look at the motivating factors which have led to transposition in the Aramaic versions, we see that the targum translator only deviates from the word order of the Hebrew text for the purposes of harmonisation or in order to clarify what seems to have been perceived as an ambiguous text. The Qumran and Syriac translators also employ transposition for these same purposes and in fact do so no less frequently. It is at this point, however, that the Qumran and Syriac translations part company from the targum, for both of the former translations display a willingness to depart from the word order of the Hebrew in order to create an intelligible translation in the light of previous modifications. While this concern for linguistic-stylistic intelligibility leads to a wide range of transpositions in the Qumran and Syriac versions, the targum translator apparently feels that divergence from the word order of the Hebrew is, for whatever reason, unwarranted. This translator’s lack of deviation from the Hebrew suggests that either he deemed divergence to be linguistically and stylistically unnecessary or, alternatively, that these deviations would indeed have been natural in his Aramaic idiom, but have been ruled out by a philosophy of translation which bound him to the order of the Hebrew text he was translating. Clear examples of the Qumran and Syriac translators’ shared willingness to diverge from the Hebrew word order in an attempt to provide what they perceived to be more idiomatic Aramaic raises a further question. Given that both these translators display precisely this same concern in their treatment of certain texts, why do the Qumran and Syriac translators not always agree in employing transposition? It is at this point that the true nature of stylistic preference is made clear. Because idiomatic Aramaic permits a range of word orders, it should not be surprising if on one occasion, a translator follows the Hebrew word order, while on another, he chooses to rearrange these elements in translation. The obscurity of the Syriac and Qumran translators’ decisions to deviate from the Hebrew word order in certain passages, but not in others, should not, however, be allowed to obscure the fact that whereas the targum translator makes virtually no use of transposition, his counterparts in the Qumran and Syriac translation traditions display a
clear willingness to diverge from the Hebrew word order as and when linguistic and stylistic constraints dictate.

In terms of quantitative assessment, the broad outlines of the relationship between the versions will by this point be clear. When the number of unique and shared instances of transposition found in the Qumran and Syriac versions are combined, the former version shows more than thirty cases while P-Job boasts more than forty.896 When we remember that the targum translation shows only two instances of transposition, neither of which are shared with the other two versions, it is not difficult to see the emergence of a clear distinction between the three versions in terms of their employment of transposition. Again, as was the case in our exploration of omission in the Aramaic version of Job, we are left with the impression that in both qualitative and quantitative terms, the Syriac and Qumran versions display a considerable affinity to one another in terms of their divergence from the word order of the Hebrew text of Job. In the case of the targum translation, however, such divergence is so rarely found that transposition cannot be considered a bona fide tool of the targumist responsible for RtgJob’s rendering of the Hebrew text.897

The final index by which we may assess the Aramaic translators’ perception and treatment of their Hebrew source text is their representation and use of the waw conjunction.898 As we saw in the preceding chapter, it is the Qumran and Syriac versions, and not the targum which seem to share the most ground in terms of their treatment of waw. While it is no surprise then that the modifications shared by all three Aramaic versions are not terribly numerous, those which do exist suggest a basic level of perception amongst the translators that despite the overlapping constraints in the use of waw in Hebrew and Aramaic, the rendering of Hebrew into Aramaic does necessitate some adjust-

896 In the case of the Qumran translation, this figure includes some instances of transposition in fragmentary contexts. P-Job: 35 instances; 11Q10: 21; Both 11Q10 and P-Job: 11.
897 For the importance of segmentation and word order as criteria for assessing literalism in a translation see J. Barr, The Typology of Literalism in ancient biblical translation. MSU 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht) and S.P. Brock, 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity' Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 20 (1979) 81-84.
ments. Although this common concern for Aramaic idiom has resulted in some omissions, the main consequence of this shared linguistic-stylistic perception has been the supplementation of the source text through the addition of *waw*. A rare instance of overlap between the concerns of the Qumran and Rabbinic translators was suggested by their willingness to deploy *waw* as a means of integrating supplementary material into the translation. In terms of assessing the respective translators’ attitudes toward the Hebrew text they were rendering, however, it is important to note that while the Qumran translation shows occasional ‘integrative’ use of *waw* alongside its primarily ‘translational’ use of the conjunction (which, as we have seen, also predominates in the Syriac version) the targumist is seemingly steadfast in restricting his addition of the *waw* to the fulfilment of this integrative function. This analysis of the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the conjunction strongly suggests that it is the Qumran and Syriac translators who line up together in their willingness to omit, substitute, and most frequently, add the conjunction in order to produce an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew. The Rabbinic targum of Job by contrast shows a remarkable fidelity to the Masoretic text in its representation of the *waw*. The restriction of RtgJob’s addition of the conjunction to what might be called ‘non-translational’ passages, when coupled with the almost complete lack of substitutions and omissions of the *waw*, suggests that the targumist responsible for RtgJob displays a concern for reproducing the minutiae of his Hebrew source text which is not evident in the translators responsible for the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job.

In terms of their overall representation of the Hebrew text, the distinction between the Qumran and Syriac translations, on one hand, and the targum, on the other, are quite clear. The former renderings present a large number of systematic agreements in terms of omitting, and transposing elements of the source text, and in terms of their representation (including *zero* representation) of the *waw* conjunction. RtgJob, on the other hand, shows a scrupulous preservation of source text elements and a similar retention of the word order of the Hebrew text in its reconstituted Aramaic version. While these

---

898 See chapter 11.
conclusions constitute a significant step toward meeting the desiderata set forth in the introduction, it may be useful to unpack some of the implications of these conclusions for 11Q10’s classification and its significance in the study of the ancient Aramaic versions generally.

**A Question of Vorlage**

While the material presented thus far is perhaps quite suggestive, the mere fact that the Syriac and Qumran versions often agree in diverging from the MT in the same manner and often in the same textual location (whereas RtgJob more closely represents the Hebrew) does not of course adequately explain the cause of this agreement. As we saw, there is a possibility and indeed a likelihood that both Qumran and Syriac versions may, at a few points, be reliant on textual traditions which are not identical with the tradition preserved in the MT. When seen in the light of the increasing recognition of textual pluriformity in the Hebrew Bible during the Second Temple Period, this observation demands that we give consideration to the possibility that the common (and common types of) divergences attested in 11Q10 and P-Job derive not from their translators’ shared linguistic-stylistic preferences but rather a similar type of Hebrew Vorlage. While we saw in the preceding chapter that the medieval Hebrew MSS (Kennicott, DeRossi etc.) could not adequately explain the Qumran and Syriac versions’ shared attitude toward the waw conjunction, we did see that the Hebrew texts of Job found in Qumran cave 4 are not only of demonstrable antiquity and relevance, but also provide at least one parallel to the kind of adjustments found in both 11Q10 and P-Job. On the basis of this observation, it might reasonably be suggested that all or many of the common linguistic-stylistic divergences found in these latter two versions were already to be

---


900 See chapter 9 (31:15).
found in their respective *Vorlagen* and then simply imported by their translators into these two Aramaic versions. Were this to be the case, we would have in fact discovered very little regarding the respective Aramaic translators' attitudes toward their Hebrew source text for the Syriac and Qumran translators would, according to this hypothesis, have been no less faithful in their representation of their Hebrew *Vorlage* than their targumic counterpart. In fact a possible precedent for Aramaic versions' reliance on a so-called 'vulgar' or 'vernacular' version seems to have been provided by the Qumran texts themselves in the form of the great Isaiah scroll (*lQIsa*). Already in the 1950's, no less an authority than M.H. Goshen-Gottstein was of the opinion that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Syriac version of Isaiah differed from the Hebrew text of the MT not because of the translator's wayward tendencies, but because it was dependent on a text not dissimilar to the great scroll of Isaiah from Qumran.\(^{901}\)

Although Goshen-Gottstein's study was a useful first step, his comparison of *lQIsa* with the targumic and Syriac versions of Isaiah was to be eventually superseded by E.Y. Kutscher's magisterial work, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*.\(^{902}\) Unlike the approach of Goshen-Gottstein, Kutscher's broader aims did not allow him to focus in any systematic way on the overall relationship between the Isaiah scroll and the targumic and Syriac versions of Isaiah. However, his typical thoroughness in cataloguing parallels between these texts across a variety of categories affords an opportunity to briefly explore the implications of the marked agreement (in kind) between the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job on one hand, and the striking difference between these two versions and the targum of Job on the other.

As part of his study of *lQIsa*, Kutscher catalogues instances where the Isaiah Scroll lacks words which are present in the MT.\(^{903}\) He finds that of the 100 cases where


an element of the MT is not found in the Isaiah Scroll, the Syriac version of Isaiah also lacks an element twelve times. While an agreement of 12% between P-Isaiah and a vernacular Hebrew text does not appear overly large, the 2% agreement Kutscher found between the Targum of Isaiah and the latter does cast the Syriac-1QIsa total in a rather different light.\footnote{P-Isaiah = 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} 3:24, 5:27; 7:23; 8:9, 14:18, 24:4, 26:5, 6; 30:15; 35:8; 41:11, 52:6; TgIsaiah = 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} 14:19* 56:12*. Both Aramaic versions appear to treat 38:11 in a similar fashion, but its analysis is uncertain; (See E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll}, 551).}

The 12% agreement between the Syriac version and 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} did not evoke Kutscher’s comment, but it is interesting to note that he saw ‘the reading in the Scroll… often paralleled by the Targum…’ despite the fact that the Targum’s agreement rate with the vernacular Isaiah text stood at only 2%.\footnote{E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll}, 555.}

In light of the Syriac version’s far higher correspondence rate, the Targum’s 2% does seem comparatively negligible, but Kutscher casts even this correlation into doubt by reminding his readers that even in these parallels, there are always targum MSS which preserve the text found in the MT.\footnote{E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll}, 555.}

While a judgement regarding the source of the correspondence between P-Isaiah and the vernacular Hebrew version is not necessarily possible at this point, it is at least clear that these two texts are far more likely to agree in omitting MT elements when compared with the Targum version of Isaiah whose preservation of MT is virtually complete.

Although there are comparatively few instances of transposition in 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} (17), nearly 30% (5) of these find a parallel in the Syriac version of Isaiah.\footnote{E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll}, 563-564. P-Isaiah = 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} 36:12; 37:1, 48:3; 49:25; 62:8.} When we turn to the Targum, however, we find that only a single word order deviation in the vernacular Hebrew scroll finds a correspondence in the Targum (6%).\footnote{E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll}, 564 (55:13).} Furthermore, as was the case with omissions, even this solitary instance of correspondence between Tg-Isaiah and 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} is not unequivocal for again, some MS witnesses to the targum tradition retain the word order of the MT. Although the total number of cases does not constitute an
ideal sample size, the picture conveyed by the correspondences again speaks quite clearly. The vernacular version of Isaiah found at Qumran displays numerous instances of word order divergence from the MT. While the Syriac version also diverges on almost a third of these occasions, the situation in the targum is once again quite different for it shows but one (inconsistently attested) parallel with the vernacular text, and instead follows the word order of the MT virtually without fail.

With respect to the treatment of the waw conjunction, Kutscher provides a list not only of instances of the copula’s omission, but also its addition vis-à-vis the MT.909 In his investigation of the Isaiah Scroll, Kutscher found that on 70 occasions a waw which appears in the MT is not displayed by the vernacular text 1QIsa.910 Of these 70 minuses or omissions present in the Isaiah Scroll, 22 (31%) were paralleled in the Syriac version of Isaiah.911 This correspondence appears rather more striking when seen in the light of the 4 instances (6%) in which Targum Isaiah agrees with 1QIsa. As is the case with respect to omission, the Syriac version is five times as likely as the Targum to agree with 1QIsa in lacking the copula where it is present in MT. Here again, the Targum shows its fidelity to the MT in comparison to a Syriac version which frequently parallels the Isaiah scroll which has been updated to conform with a vernacular dialect of Hebrew.

Even more frequent are the instances in which the Hebrew vernacular scroll of Isaiah provides a waw copula which is not found in a corresponding location in the MT.912 Of the more than 200 cases found in 1QIsa by Kutscher, only 10 find parallels in the Targum of Isaiah.913 On the other hand, the Syriac version was found to agree with the vernacular Isaiah scroll in supplying the waw copula no less than 110 times when it does not appear in the corresponding location in the MT! Thus, while the Tar-

909 S.P. Brock, ‘Text History and Text Division in P-Isaiah’, 61-62 also suggests that P-Isaiah displays considerable fluidity in its representation of the waw in relation to the Hebrew.
910 MT waw-1QIsa 0 (E.Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll, 425-427).
gum shows only a 5% agreement with 1QIs\(^a\), the Syriac version’s correspondence rate is more than ten times (55%) that of the Targum version. In fact, so sizeable (and apparently) suggestive is this correspondence between 1QIs\(^a\) and P-Isaiah, that Kutscher is at pains to point out that the parallel need not necessarily entail a direct relationship between the Hebrew scroll from Qumran and the Syriac version.\(^{914}\)

While certain caveats must be kept in mind regarding the use of Kutscher’s work in this regard,\(^{915}\) a relatively clear picture nevertheless emerges of some aspects of the respective relationships between the vernacular Hebrew version of Isaiah and its Syriac and Targum versions. In the case of omissions, transpositions and also with respect to the treatment of waw, the Syriac version of Isaiah displays a far greater affinity to the vernacular Hebrew text of Isaiah found at Qumran, whereas the Targum of Isaiah exemplifies in these respects, a far greater fidelity to a MT text which has not been adjusted to take account of the vernacular of the Hebrew copyist.\(^{916}\)

While the point of the above is not to ‘prove’ the dependence of P-Isaiah on 1QIs\(^a\), it is meant to illustrate the basic plausibility of the theory that the Syriac version of Isaiah might be dependent upon a vernacular Hebrew version of Isaiah displaying

---


\(^{914}\) Kutscher’s questioning of the assumption of dependence is three-fold: 1) a lower (30%) rate of correspondence between the two texts with respect to the omission of the copula (see above). 2) The textual tradition of P-Isaiah itself displays considerable variation with respect to the addition of the copula. 3) Kutscher notes that the Syriac translator of Isaiah is linguistically pre-disposed to supply the copula independently of the additions found in 1QIs\(^a\) [emphasis mine].

\(^{915}\) Like Szpek, Kutscher is unable to provide a full representation of the relationship between the Aramaic versions, focusing as he does on an analysis of the Qumran Isaiah scroll. Furthermore, while Kutscher was clearly aware of the importance of the respective textual traditions, he did not yet have at his disposal, either a critical edition or a systematic analysis of the text of P-Isaiah, both since provided by S.P. Brock (S.P. Brock, *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version: Isaiah* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987; idem., ‘Text History and Text Division in Peshitta Isaiah’ in P. Dirksen and M. Mulder (eds.) *The Peshitta: its Early text and History* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989) 49-80). A thorough-going evaluation of the relationship between the Aramaic versions of Isaiah and the Qumran scroll will be possible when A. Houtman’s work on the text of TgIsaiah reaches fruition. (See most recently, A. Houtman, ‘Targum Isaiah according to Felix Pratensis’ *JAB* 1 [2] (1999) 191-202).

\(^{916}\) This conclusion corroborates that of A. van der Kooij, *Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* OBO 35 (1981) 175: ‘…der Verfasser des Targ eine hebräische Vorlage benutzte, die im Wesentlichen mit MT (Ketib) identisch ist.’
similar adjustments to the one found at Qumran.\textsuperscript{917} When we consider the nature of the fragments of Hebrew Job found at Qumran, it may be nothing more than a historical accident that more extensive vernacular versions of Job similar to 1QIsa have not yet been found. In light of the rather striking parallels between the types of adjustments found in the Targum and Syriac versions of Isaiah on one hand, and the three Aramaic versions of Job on the other, we would do well to consider some of the possible implications for our study.

Clearly, on this ‘vernacular Vorlage’ hypothesis, RtgJob like Targum Isaiah will have been comparatively careful to preserve the Hebrew elements of Job in the order in which they appear in the MT. The Qumran and Syriac versions would on the other hand have been dependent not on MT-Job but rather on vernacular versions of Job in which a variety of adjustments had already been made under the influence of later Hebrew linguistic-stylistic preferences.

As Goshen-Gottstein’s early study clearly illustrates, the idea that correspondences between ‘vernacular’ Qumran MSS of portions of the Hebrew Bible and the Syriac versions might reasonably imply a dependence of the latter on non-MT texts is not a new one to scholars studying the Peshitta. R.P. Gordon, in responding to an essay by Y. Maori on distinguishing between variant Vorlage and exegesis in the Peshitta Pentateuch, places particular emphasis upon the testimony of Qumran texts such as 1QIsa, 4QSam, 2QExod in identifying non-Massoretic readings in the ancient versions (including in this case the Syriac).\textsuperscript{918} While it is important to remember that the Gordon-Maori dialogue is primarily concerned with exegetical variants (as opposed to non-exegetical variants such as we have examined in the present study) the likelihood of

\textsuperscript{917} A. van der Kooij, \textit{Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches}, 297 concludes that the Syriac translator treats his text in ways quite similar to the translators/scribes responsible for LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa and as a result this scholar is reluctant to ascribe such features in P-Isaiah to a Vorlage of the type represented by the Qumran Scroll.

non-exegetical agreements between the versions being attributable to variant Vorlagen is equally if not more deserving of consideration.\footnote{Y. Maori, 'Methodological Criteria', 18.} Nevertheless with respect to the broader question of ‘Vorlage vs. translator’ as a means of explaining Peshitta divergences from MT, the recent paradigm shift toward seeing the gradual ‘Syriacisation’ of an originally more literal Peshitta translation is beginning to take on the appearance of a consensus.\footnote{For the most recent discussion of both corroboration and implication of his theory of textual development see M. Koster, ‘The Copernican Revolution’.} But the question which this consensus naturally prompts is, of course, how literal was this original translation?\footnote{See for instance the conclusion of S.P. Brock, ‘Text History and Text Division in Peshitta Isaiah’ 78 ‘...the early textual history of P-Isaiah evidently follows the pattern discerned by Koster and Hayman for books of the Pentateuch, with a gradual move away from the Hebrew towards a more idiomatic and fluent Syriac text (not, it should be emphasised, that P-Isaiah was, even in its original form, a very literal translation from the Hebrew).} Without presuming to suggest an answer here, it should be made clear that the ‘vernacular Vorlage’ interpretation of the phenomena uncovered in this study, while not necessarily calling into question the fidelity of the Syriac translators, would certainly complicate and contest the assumption that they worked from MT as opposed to a Hebrew source already displaying significant deviations from it.

With respect to the Qumran translation, the positing of a ‘vernacular Vorlage’ would likewise clearly entail a radical reassessment of the widespread consensus that the Qumran Aramaic translator was working from a largely MT-type text.\footnote{See introduction (Vorlage).} Instead, the Qumran Aramaic translator ofJob will have made use of a text which may be like, but not necessarily identical with, 4QJob\footnote{...the early textual history of P-Isaiah evidently follows the pattern discerned by Koster and Hayman for books of the Pentateuch, with a gradual move away from the Hebrew towards a more idiomatic and fluent Syriac text (not, it should be emphasised, that P-Isaiah was, even in its original form, a very literal translation from the Hebrew).}—that is, a vernacular Hebrew text which contained many if not all of the deviations from MT which have been documented in this study.

While we would not wish to overemphasise the similarities between the Qumran and Syriac versions, our study has documented substantial areas of overlap in terms of omission, transposition and the treatment of the waw conjunction. Were the ‘vernacular Vorlage’ hypothesis outlined above to be adopted, one implication not easily avoided.
would be that the underlying similarities between the respective Vorlagen of the Qumran and Syriac versions would be little short of striking. In other words, while it would certainly not be accurate to suggest that the translators of the Qumran and Syriac texts had worked from the same Vorlage, the similarities found between these two versions in the areas of omission, transposition and the treatment of the conjunction, would certainly require the positing of respective Vorlagen which were not only significantly different from the MT, but also significantly and systematically different from MT in recognisably similar ways.

Indeed, M. Weitzman is well aware of the potential implications of vernacular Hebrew texts for the overall task of characterising the work of the Syriac translators of the Old Testament. But in considering the likelihood of the Syriac translators’ extensive use of vernacular Hebrew texts, he demurs, arguing at a general level that ancient biblical translators would be most likely to seek out ‘model’ versions of the Hebrew Bible rather than working from vernacular texts. Furthermore, Weitzman suggests that the lack of such popular copies in the East (i.e. the presumed provenance of the Syriac version of the OT) is suggested by the lack of their mention in the Babylonian Talmud. In the first place, the demonstrated affinity between P-Job and 11Q10 and the latter version’s assumed Palestinian provenance would seem to undermine Weitzman’s second suggestion. In addition, the assumption that ancient Aramaic translators of Isaiah (or Job) would have necessarily possessed the requisite discrimination or textual resources to restrict themselves to pristine (‘model’) texts as opposed to those of the vernacular variety, is rather difficult to prove. Although these suggestions may be less than convincing, Weitzman’s case for rejecting the ‘vernacular Vorlage’ hypothesis is, as is often

---

925 Weitzman (55) cites Josephus’ description of the origin of LXX in which the High Priest sends a copy of the Hebrew text to be returned upon completion of the translation (*Antiq.* 12.2.6 [56]). Not only does Weitzman himself admit that this account of LXX origins is ‘idealised’, but even if it were to be considered accurate in certain detail, a Greek translation made in Egypt from a Hebrew text often at odds with the MT would seem to be a less than firm basis for positing the use of ‘a model text’ of the Hebrew Bible by Aramaic translators in Palestine and still less so in the East.
the case, more persuasive when he turns his attention to particular examples of apparent parallels between 1QIsa and P-Isaiah.\textsuperscript{926} Weitzman takes up two (5:24, 8:11) of the numerous examples of agreement which presumably led Goshen-Gottstein to suggest P-Isaiah’s dependence on the vernacular Isaiah scroll, but follows Kutscher in explaining the correspondences as resulting not from a similar Vorlage but rather from the Qumran scribe and Syriac translator’s similar response to a text which was substantially identical with MT.\textsuperscript{927} While it may be doubted that Weitzman’s brief discussion of these two examples constitutes particularly close scrutiny of the agreements between 1QIsa and P-Isaiah, his general preference for explaining agreements between texts as resulting from similar scribal and translational adjustments (rather than similarity of underlying Vorlage) is not uncommon amongst Peshitta scholars.\textsuperscript{928}

A Question of Translators’ Intervention

Although, in the light of our brief study of the Isaiah texts, it seems premature to dismiss the ‘vernacular Vorlage’ hypothesis as a means of accounting for the divergences found in P-Isaiah, it is nevertheless worthwhile to consider to what extent agreements between the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job might be attributed to a similarity of translational preferences/constraints rather than a similarity of vernacular Vorlage. The best evidence that it is the linguistic-stylistic preferences of the translators rather than their respective (and in this case, similar) Vorlagen which are responsible for the divergences from MT is of course those modifications which would not be reasonably anticipated in even vernacular Hebrew texts. Modifications which must be attributed to

\textsuperscript{926} M.P. Weitzman, \textit{The Syriac version of the Old Testament}, 56.

\textsuperscript{927} In the case of 5:24 (MT: \( \text{ננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננננn

Aramaic linguistic-stylistic preferences generally, or either of these two particular Aramaic realisations of the Hebrew (i.e., 11Q10 and P-Job) would in this case constitute *bona fide* evidence of translator intervention.929

While certain identical modifications might possibly be attributed to common reliance on an already modified *Vorlage*, other modifications common to 11Q10 and P-Job such as that found at 40:6 (and reflected in 42:1) find their most reasonable explanation not in variant *Vorlagen*, but in the common linguistic-stylistic inheritance of Aramaic.930 In addition, both Qumran and Syriac versions display examples of both omission and transposition which are clearly related to and dependent on prior modifications, or adjustments which have been already made within their Aramaic translations.931 It is not at all easy to see how such version-specific omissions and transpositions are to be explained on the basis of a ‘vernacular *Vorlage*’ hypothesis.

Furthermore, while one may find a surprising number of parallels between the types of adjustments found in the Qumran Aramaic/Syriac translations and vernacular Hebrew texts such as 1QIsa9, even a measure of Aramaic influence in these vernacular texts seems insufficient to account for the frequency and variety of adjustments which appear in these Aramaic versions. In her extensive cataloguing of adjustments in P-Job, Szpek begins with a list of departures which are ‘characteristic of the Syriac language of the Peshitta’—that is, expected correspondences which ‘...should not be deemed as evi-

---

929 Even this apparently clear principle of differentiation is not without its complications however. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, ‘Die Jesaia-Rolle’, found in 1QIsa certain deviations (including the appearance of □ at 36:11 [67 n.2] and an addition at 63:16 [70 n.3]) which suggested to him some form of Aramaic linguistic influence. Given Kutscher’s particular expertise in Aramaic it was not surprising that he devoted considerable energy to an elucidation of the Aramaic influence on the vernacular (characterised by him as ‘Aramaic-Hebrew’) in which the Isaiah Scroll’s version was produced (E.Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, 23-29; 187-215). While Kutscher discusses and copiously illustrates Aramaic influence in the areas of spelling, verbal substitutions, nominal pattern preference, pronouns and pronominal suffixes, prepositions and particles, neither omissions, nor transpositions nor the treatment of the *waw* are included in Kutscher’s discussion of the Aramaic influence on the vernacular.

930 See chapter 9.

931 See chapters 5 and 10 respectively.
dence of a different Vorlage...’. Szpek includes the translator’s freedom with regard to omission, transposition, and the treatment of the waw conjunction, amongst the numerous modifications which would be expected in any Syriac translation. Other translator adjustments found in P-Job are assessed by Szpek as being text specific, that is, modifications which have resulted from the unique demands of P-Job’s specific realisation of the Hebrew text of Job, as opposed to universal linguistic-stylistic constraints of Syriac. Szpek’s conclusions confirm that adjustments in areas such as omission, transposition and the treatment of the waw constitute only a portion of a far wider constellation of adjustments (including addition and substitution) which were normally implemented by Peshitta translators in order to render their Hebrew text into Syriac. In light of this, it is eminently reasonable to suggest that the Syriac text’s deviation from MT with regards to omission, transposition and the treatment of the waw, may be explained quite adequately with reference to the Syriac translator’s adaptation of the MT, rather than by positing a vernacular Vorlage which may explain some, but not all of the modifications present in the Syriac version of Job. The similarity between the adjustments seen in the Qumran and Syriac translations would seem to suggest that the linguistic-stylistic constraints of Aramaic, rather than shared vernacular Vorlage, are likely to be the most straightforward explanation for 11Q10’s divergences from MT in these areas. In light of this, an assessment of the findings of the present study in the context of Szpek’s initial and partial comparison of the Aramaic versions of Job will hopefully provide a broader perspective on the overall relationship between the respective Aramaic translations.

Szpek’s search for signs of dependence of P-Job on the Qumran and targumic versions led her to examine grammatical adjustments in the versions. The most striking aspect of her findings is the initially surprising fact that when compared with the

---

932 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 260.
933 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 260-63.
934 H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 263-66.
targum, the Syriac version shows a far greater number of divergences from the MT across every one of the eight grammatical categories documented by Szpek.\textsuperscript{936} For instance, of the 300 times where the Syriac translation shows a linguistically expected adjustment of the Hebrew verbal tense (e.g. Hebrew imperfect > Syriac ptcp.\textsuperscript{937}) only 20 (7\%) are paralleled by RtgJob. Again, with respect to the addition and omission of pronouns, the Syriac version displays 154 adjustments while only 21 (14\%) of these are found in the Rabbinic targum.\textsuperscript{938} While it must be remembered that Szpek’s search for dependence caused her to begin with adjustments found in the Syriac version, and cite the Qumran and targum versions only when they agreed with a P-Job departure, it does seem basically clear from Szpek’s analysis that the Syriac translator is far more willing to make a wide variety of grammatical adjustments in rendering the MT, than is the translator of RtgJob. But what of the Qumran translation? While the utility of Szpek’s comparison of P-Job with 11Q10 and RtgJob is, as we have noted previously, somewhat limited by its methodological approach, her assessment of the Qumran Aramaic version’s relationship to P-Job is further compromised for our purposes (albeit not her own) and requires reassessment.\textsuperscript{939} While a comprehensive analysis of grammatical modifications in the Aramaic versions is beyond the scope of the present study, an analysis of adjustments in the grammatical categories of ‘person’ and ‘number’ from a synoptic perspective may shed further light on the relationship between the Aramaic versions in this respect.

Within the synoptic sample preserved by all three Aramaic versions, the Syriac translator diverges from the MT in its representation of the inflectional category of ‘per-

\textsuperscript{936} For complete picture see H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 (Table 1).

\textsuperscript{937} For P-Job see H.M. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique}, 80 n.36.

\textsuperscript{938} Szpek examined the following types of pronouns: independent, relative, enclitic, copula function. For more detailed discussion of P-Job’s adjustment of the pronoun see H.M. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique}, 74-78.

\textsuperscript{939} Perhaps because it was not deemed to be particularly crucial for her study, Szpek’s total number of adjustments (i.e., congruencies with P-Job) found in 11Q10 does not appear to have been adjusted to take account of the fact that the Qumran version preserves only 15\% of the total quantity of text preserved by RtgJob and P-Job.
son’ (e.g. first, second or third) on a half-dozen occasions. The Qumran Aramaic version displays a similar number of divergences with regard to grammatical person (30:14, 32:13, 32:14, 32:15, 38:8, 39:3) and given the prevalence of harmonisation in 11Q10 and P-Job, it is perhaps not surprising that several of these adjustments are to be found in the same general vicinity. In fact, on one occasion both translators provide precisely the same adjustment of person (33:27). In contrast to the adjustments displayed by both the Qumran and Syriac versions, RtgJob shows no instances of modification of ‘person’ within the synoptic sample.

While the Aramaic versions of Job as a group show comparatively few instances of departure from the MT with respect to ‘person’, such is not the case when we turn to the grammatical category of ‘number’. In terms of divergences found uniquely in one Aramaic version, the Qumran and Syriac versions present 27 and 24 instances respectively where the grammatical number does not correspond to that of the MT. The targum version on the other hand presents only a handful of cases where it does not reproduce the number of the MT. As was the case with the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the waw conjunction, the areas of overlap, that is, those adjustments which are found in two or more of the respective versions at the same location, enhance and confirm our existing understanding of the relationships between them. Once again the number of occasions where all three of the Aramaic versions diverge from the number attested in the MT, is rather low (4). This is quite understandable given that, as was the case

940 23:1, 30:18, 31:8, 32:11, 34:9, 39:6 (The relevant parts of speech in a discussion of grammatical number are verbs, pronouns, and suffixes. Cf. See H.M. Szpek, Translation Technique, 70);
941 This is hardly surprising given that H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 finds only two of P-Job’s 60 adjustments of ‘person’ to be paralleled in RtgJob.
942 This agrees with the assessment of the situation provided by H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 144 where we see that the Syriac version is more than four times as likely to modify ‘number’ (252) as it is to adjust ‘person’ (60).
945 30:17, 19, 35:10, 39:7.
with the treatment of *waw*, RtgJob presents few independent examples of divergence, and rarely agrees with either the Qumran (2) or Syriac (1) versions in deviating from the number of the MT.\(^{946}\) Again, however, when we turn to agreements between the Qumran and Syriac versions, we see that 11Q10 and P-Job both diverge from the number found in the MT on no less than 23 occasions.\(^{947}\) Of the total number of divergences from the MT in the Qumran and Syriac versions with respect to number, approximately half are made at the same juncture in their respective translations of the Hebrew text.

How does the above contribute to our understanding of how the respective Aramaic versions represent the form of the Hebrew text? Unlike omission and transposition, grammatical adjustments such as the modification of number and person do not often result in a loss or dislocation of the source text. Rather these modifications are effected in the translation by means of substituting one element in the Aramaic translation for another as a means of representing a corresponding Hebrew element (be it verbal, pronominal or suffix etc.) without actually omitting, transposing, or adding to the text being translated.\(^{948}\) In this sense substitution tells us comparatively little regarding the Aramaic versions’ formal representation of the Hebrew text. However, while semantic substitutions are to be found in all three Aramaic versions, this sampling of grammatical adjustments in 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job suggests that even where formal representation of the elements of the Hebrew is maintained, the Qumran and Syriac versions are more likely to diverge from the MT than is the targum, which preserves the grammatical landscape of the Hebrew it translates.\(^{949}\)

If the Qumran and Syriac versions’ divergence from, and the targum’s fidelity to, the form of the Hebrew text seems to find a measure of corroboration in terms of the

---

\(^{946}\) (RtgJob and 11Q10) 37:17, 38:25 (RtgJob and P-Job) 39:7.


\(^{948}\) On substitution see H.M. Szpek, *Translation Technique*, 32-33.

\(^{949}\) The Aramaic versions, like any other translations, show an abundance of semantic substitutions. See H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 145-9 where issues such as *faux amis*, cognates, and Syriac borrowing from W. Aramaic are explored with reference to the Aramaic versions of Job.
respective translations' use of grammatical substitution, what may be said regarding Szpek’s assessment of addition in the Aramaic versions of Job? Szpek observes that P-Job shows a marked tendency to supply certain elements in its Syriac rendering which are implied, but left unexpressed in the Hebrew source text. Examples provided by Szpek show that such elements, implicit in the Hebrew, but explicitly supplied in the Syriac include relative pronouns, suffixes, prepositions, conditional particles and even words or short phrases. Noting that the targum, by contrast, shows a far greater reluctance to supply such elements in its Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew, Szpek concludes that unlike the Syriac version, the targum resorts to explicitly supplying grammatical elements merely implied by the Hebrew only when ‘...failure to do so would result in ambiguity or misunderstanding of the MT.’ In fact the present study supports the importance of ambiguity as a motivating factor in the targumist’s divergence from the form and order of the MT. Of the very few cases of omission and transposition to be found in RtgJob, several appear to stem from the targumist’s concern for avoiding what has clearly been perceived as potentially acute levels of ambiguity. Whatever the possible causes of these differing attitudes toward the addition of implied elements, this much is clear for Szpek: in comparison with the Syriac version, the targumist is extremely reluctant to supply additional elements, such as suffixes, unnecessarily in its Aramaic translation of the MT, even when they have been perceived as implied by his counterpart in the Syriac tradition.

An examination of the respective Aramaic versions’ addition of suffixes provides some perspective on where the Qumran version might line up with respect to the addition of implied elements. The Syriac version again leads the way with 25 instances of the addition of a suffix which is unattested both in the MT and in the other Aramaic versions at the same point in the text. While the Qumran version presents 14 such cases,
the targum again shows a remarkable correspondence with the MT by restricting its addition of otherwise unattested suffixes to two instances. With regard to shared additions, the number of additional suffixes provided by two or more of the Aramaic versions is relatively low, but the general picture furnished is by now, hardly surprising.

Compared to RtgJob, the Qumran version and to an even greater extent, the Syriac translation, are far more likely to explicitly supply grammatical elements which are perceived as implied by the Hebrew.

We have seen above that, in comparison with the targum of Job, the Qumran and Syriac versions display a far greater willingness to deviate from the MT both in the area of grammatical substitutions and in their tendency to supply grammatical elements in Aramaic, which are merely implied by the Hebrew of the MT. The subject of supplementary material in the Aramaic versions, however, must be extended beyond the boundaries of the linguistic and stylistic, for when it comes to larger 'midrashic' interpolations, Szpek finds that it is RtgJob which provides far more material and does so far more frequently than the Syriac or Qumran versions. As was mentioned in the introduction, the content of the supplementary material provided by the targum and included within the translation is often only loosely related to the immediate context of Job in which it is found, but draws on the broader literary-ideological tradition in including themes such as the study of Torah, Eretz Israel, Gehenna and the Garden of Eden, and the Eschatological day of judgement. Szpek’s assessment of more substantial additions counts for a sizeable proportion of these instances.


955 (11Q10 and P-Job) 21:5, 34:29, 38:4, 29:25 (final element may be either a suffix or the marker of the emphatic state) (P-Job and RtgJob) 34:28, 30:16; (11Q10 and RtgJob) 36:10.

956 H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 154-58. It is important to clarify the distinction which is being drawn between RtgJob on one hand, and P-Job and 11Q10 on the other. It is often (but not always) possible to connect the targumist’s sometimes radical expansion of his translation with a particular ‘textual’ irregularity or issue perceived by the targumist. Textual phenomena will often give rise to expansions and elaborations which go well beyond (certainly for the Syriac and Qumran translators) what would presumably be considered the linguistic-stylistic ‘requirements’ of an idiomatic, acceptable Aramaic rendering. In her dependence on Weiss, Szpek seems to operate with a similarly broad understanding of ‘midrashic’ (see above ‘A history of comparison’ [Introduction]).
in P-Job on the other hand, revealed that they could not be classified in the same manner because the majority were explanatory comments dependent on the immediate context.\footnote{H.M. Szpek ‘On the Influence of the Targum’, 157.} Furthermore, she found that the Qumran version was in fact quite similar to P-Job in this respect.

While the emphasis of the present study is on modes of modification such as omission and transposition, the above discussion of addition and substitution in the Aramaic versions allows us to at least begin the process of constructing a more broadly-based profile of the relationships between the Qumran, Syriac and targum versions of Job.\footnote{This profile should be understood as tentative and suggestive. To complete the overall picture, a thorough tri-lateral comparison of the three versions with respect to addition and substitution should be undertaken.} A synoptic assessment of omission, transposition and the treatment of the \textit{waw} conjunction in the Aramaic versions has shown that whereas the Qumran and Syriac versions are quite willing to diverge from their Hebrew text under the influence of linguistic-stylistic constraints operative in their Aramaic target languages, the targum translation of Job shows virtually no willingness to omit or transpose elements in the MT.

While the Qumran and Syriac versions supply the \textit{waw} conjunction with great frequency in order to adapt the Hebrew text to the linguistic-stylistic constraints of the Aramaic, the Targum version shows virtually no tendency to augment its translation of the Hebrew text through the provision of even this smallest of Hebrew conjunctions. On the other hand, the willingness of all three Aramaic versions (especially pronounced in the Targum) to supply the \textit{waw} conjunction when \textit{supplementing} the translation, rather than when \textit{translating} the Hebrew text itself, points toward the importance of building a total profile based not merely on omission and transposition, but also on substitution and addition.

In terms of a willingness to diverge from the MT by means of substitution, we saw that the Qumran and Syriac versions were far more likely than the Targum to make linguistic-stylistic modifications in their translations with respect to grammatical catego-
ries such as ‘person’ and ‘number’. In terms of addition, we saw that while the Targum was more prone to making larger interpolations within its translation of the Hebrew text, its use of minor grammatical additions (supplied in 11Q10 and P-Job in order to explicitly express in Aramaic what was perceived as being linguistically and stylistically implied by the Hebrew text) was greatly restricted. These latter versions’ use of addition on the other hand, was primarily devoted to the production of a linguistically and stylistically acceptable Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text, while the provision of supplementary material not related to the immediate context was far less common in 11Q10 and P-Job than in the Targum translation.

The realities of translation and the data which support the above profile do not lend themselves to absolute, or categorical pronouncements regarding the character of the respective Aramaic versions. In fact the comparative structure of the study itself perhaps suggests the most useful way forward in terms of characterising the Qumran, Syriac and Targum versions of Job. With respect to their use of addition, substitution, transposition and omission, the Qumran and Syriac versions show a far greater willingness than is evident in the Targum of Job to adjust and modify the Hebrew text in order to accommodate it to the linguistic-stylistic constraints of their Aramaic target languages.\textsuperscript{959} While the Targum version of Job incorporates greater quantities of supplementary, interpretative material, its translation of the MT shows far less evidence of linguistic-stylistic accommodation of the sort witnessed in the other Aramaic versions of Job.

If the Targum translation shows far less evidence than 11Q10 and P-Job of linguistic-stylistic substitutions and additions, it is nevertheless true, as was mentioned above, that even RtgJob makes some linguistic-stylistic accommodation to Aramaic idiom. The substitution of Aramaic participles for Hebrew imperfect verbal forms, and the relatively frequent addition of the relative pronoun (\textit{dalath}) are but two examples of

such accommodation. The fact that substitution and addition are present, to a greater or lesser extent, in all ancient versions (including the Aramaic translations of Job) means that while their assessment may be important in the construction of an overall profile of a translation, it may be less helpful in identifying what is unique to a particular translation approach or school. This was, of course, seen by Weitzman with reference to the Peshitta and Targum versions of Chronicles. According to Weitzman, early authorities such as Nöldeke, Fraenkel and others were mislead into identifying the Syriac version of Chronicles as a ‘targum’ largely as a result of their focus on the additions, embellishments and paraphrastic and midrashic elements which were apparently seen by them as the distinguishing and characteristic feature of the targumic approach. Weitzman’s reading of Fraenkel and Tötterman and his own study of Peshitta and Targum led him to focus not on what was common to these two Aramaic versions of Chronicles, i.e. the expansions and material supplementary to the respective translations, but rather on what differentiated or distinguished them from each other, that is, their respective attitudes toward, and representation of, the minutiae of the Hebrew text which lay before them. As we saw in the introduction, it is this feature, this critical dependence on, and scrupulous representation of, each Hebrew element in the order in which it appears in the MT, which is the more fundamental, defining characteristic of ‘targum’ for both Weitzman and Samely. The mention of these latter two scholars brings us at last to questions of definition and nomenclature amongst the Aramaic versions and we now turn to explore some of the implications of the present study for the classification of the Qumran Aramaic version as ‘targum’.

**Locating 11Q10 amongst the Aramaic versions.**

As we saw in the introduction, the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job has been known from the time of its discovery (and editorial classification) as a ‘targum’. While some scholars recently have suggested rescinding this title, an early article by B. Jonge-

---

ling ran precisely counter to these suggestions in emphasising the ‘targumic’ quality of 11Q10. While he admitted that the Qumran ‘targum’ was totally independent of its Rabbinic cousin in the targum family, he nevertheless presented a series of features in 11Q10 which he took to be targumic characteristics of the Qumran translation. Unfortunately, in asserting the targumic character of 11Q10, Jongeling did not avail himself of RtgJob, surely the most logical candidate for isolating targumic features in the Qumran version. In fact, an examination of the features Jongeling identified as targumic in 11Q10 shows that these features are rarely even provided with parallels from the targums themselves. Indeed, when we attempt to reconstruct Jongeling’s understanding of ‘targumic’ from the examples of features identified as such in the Qumran translation, we find that it is LXX Job which furnishes parallels at least as often as Aramaic targum versions (whether RtgJob or another targum version). It is not surprising then that while some of the other features in 11Q10 identified by Jongeling as ‘targumic’ may well be found in the targums, Jongeling provides neither evidence nor suggestion that these features are restricted to the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew preserved in the Rabbinic tradition and known as ‘targums’. It is clear from the above that for Jongeling,

964 B. Jongeling, ‘The Job Targum’, 190-96. The targumic characteristics found in 11Q10 are: deferential use of 1) בְּרֵעַ and 2) מִלַּן (for which see below) 3) elimination of figurative speech (the transformation of MT ‘stars singing’ to 11Q10 ‘stars shining’ [Job 38:7] is seen as a quintessentially targumic adjustment of demythologization (this may well be the motive behind the adjustment, but the idea that this type of adjustment is limited to the targum is unsubstantiated; in any case, the targumist responsible for RtgJob reproduces the ‘mythologizing’ Hebrew with no hesitation בָּלוּם דִּבְרֵי אֲדָמָה ‘בְּרֵעַ מִלַּן דִּבְרֵי אֲדָם מִלַּן; see discussion of 38:7 in chapter 7 above). 4) The ‘euphemistic’ translation of Job 31:10 ‘let my wife grind for another’ = 11Q10 ‘let others bend over...’ is seen as characteristic of the targum. Given the fragmentary context and the choice of verb the ‘euphemistic’ quality of the Qumran translator’s rendering is rather dubious. In any case, the targumist responsible for the Targum of Job, far from employing a euphemistic translation, actually clarifies the sexual nature of the admittedly ambiguous Hebrew (see above page 53). 5) The ameliorization of Job’s character and piety at the hand of the Qumran translator is seen as characteristic of a targumic translator. E. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspekte, 63-64 argued that this translational rehabilitation of the figure of Job was a feature which both LXX Job and 11Q10 shared. 965 See preceding note.
the ‘targumic’ character of a translation is to be located in a general willingness to diverge from the Hebrew text primarily it seems, by means of addition or substitution.966

The fact that the Qumran translation displays ‘targumic characteristics’ which are also to be found in LXX Job suggests that for Jongeling, a Greek version might equally be classified as a targum.967 From this we see that Jongeling’s use of the term ‘targumic’ is comparatively broad, and might be understood as including any ancient versions which display interpretative features which are to a greater or lesser extent, common to ancient Jewish versions of the Hebrew Bible, irrespective of language.968 The point here is not to refute Jongeling’s classification of the Qumran translation of Job as a ‘targum’ but only to show that on the basis of his broad understanding of the term, most if not all the ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible displaying signs of Jewish interpretative influence might legitimately lay claim to being more or less ‘targumic’.969

---

967 The conclusions of A. Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch JSS Monograph 15 (Manchester: 1991) 297 regarding the Greek translator Symmachus’ translation approach and use of Rabbinic exegesis lead her to refer to the version as ‘a Greek Targum, or Tannaitic Septuagint’. On the basis of her own study, Salvesen would seem to be operating with a view of ‘targum’ as ancient translation which reflects specifically Rabbinic exegetical concerns as opposed to those of broader, more generic, 2nd Temple Judaism. In fact as P.S. Alexander, ‘Targumim’ Anchor Bible Dictionary VI (Doubleday, 1992) 321 points out, while previously used in other Semitic languages to denote ‘translation’ generally, the verb בָּנָה refers in Rabbinic Hebrew to translating the biblical text from Hebrew into both Aramaic and Greek (see yKidd. 59a and yMeg. 71c, where Aquila’s version is the reference). Not surprisingly the corresponding noun ‘targum’ was similarly non-specific with regard to the target language in which the Hebrew Bible was rendered (nMeg. 2:1 and bSabb. 115a).
968 B. Jongeling, ‘The Job Targum’, 186. Despite defining ‘targum’ as ‘Aramaic bible translation’, Jongeling draws upon the work of R. Le Déaut and J. Robert, in characterising the targumist’s approach with reference to the use of ‘buffer’ expressions such as shekina, yeqara, and memra and most importantly, the inclusion of digressions. Indeed, R. Le Déaut, ‘Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: le ‘targumisme’ Biblica 52 [1971] 505-525 outlines his expanded use of the term as follows: ‘Nous appelons ‘targumisme’, en prenant le mot targum, non dans sa signification technique de traduction de la Bible en araméen, mais dans le sens qu’on lui donne couramment dans le monde juif: une traduction de l’Écriture destinée à l’usage liturgique. En ce sens, LXX, Peshitta et Vulgate sont des targums et nous verrons que le targumisme y est bien implanté.’
969 Of course, as with terms such as midrash and midrashic, apocalypse and apocalyptic, the use of ‘targumic’ only complicates matters for even if ‘targum’ can be supplied with an adequate definition, the classification of texts which don’t fall within the precise parameters of the definition as ‘targumic’ points back to the question of which are the fundamental, defining features of the genre.
While Jongeling's understanding of 'targumic' seems to be rather broad, his citation of דָּרִי (Job 42:1) and דָּרִי מְרָא (Job 27:13) in the Qumran Aramaic translation, as being characteristic of 'targum' points to a more closely circumscribed understanding of 'targum' as referring specifically to Aramaic versions. It is not clear whether Jongeling is operating on the assumption that the use of these particular Aramaic expressions is otherwise restricted to the classical targums preserved in the Rabbinic tradition, but the quintessentially Aramaic (as opposed to Greek) realisation of these expressions clearly hints at another, linguistic aspect of the definition of 'targum'. Klaus Beyer's introductory comments to his treatment of the Qumran Aramaic translations nicely illustrate this more linguistically oriented definition of 'targum':

By Targums one means Jewish Aramaic translations of the Old Testament, in the broader sense also the Christian Aramaic ones. There are Jewish Aramaic Targums to all the books of the Old Testament with the exceptions of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The Samaritan Targum includes only the Pentateuch, the Syrian Bible translation, the entire OT. [Author's trgm.]

While Beyer is seemingly reluctant in practice to bestow upon the 'Syrian Bible translation' the title of 'targum' he nevertheless initially appears to extend the term to include 'Christian Aramaic' translations alongside the Jewish Aramaic versions.

In fact, more recent research on דָּרִי מְרָא suggests that the appearance of this expression in the Qumran version of Job is a preservation of an idiomatic deferential (rather than specifically anti-anthropomorphic) construction attested already in the Aramaic of Daniel. As such, its use in subsequent Aramaic sources (e.g. Qumran and targumic Aramaic) is simply a testimony to these sources' shared Aramaic heritage and can be construed as specifically 'targumic' only if 'targum' is defined primarily or partly

971 K. Beyer, Die Aramäischen Texte, 273. One wonders whether the inclusion of the Qumran translations in the category 'targum' has perhaps prompted Beyer's wider definition of the term.
972 D. Shepherd, 'MN QDM'.
as any Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Bible. In his study of other ‘distancing mechanisms’ such as שְׁמָא אוֹדָה and מַרְפֵּא מִנָּה. Sebastian Brock has likewise shown that the appearance of these expressions in a variety of sources including Targum, Peshitta and Qumran Aramaic texts should likewise be understood as shared phraseology inherited from a common Aramaic translation tradition. While in the case of Beyer, we have seen that it is precisely this shared Aramaic heritage which serves to define ‘Targum’, for Brock, as for both Weitzman and Samely the definition of ‘targum’ is still further circumscribed so as to exclude the Syriac and Qumran Aramaic translations.

The question of whether or not the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job is a ‘targum’ is, as we have seen, at base a definitional one and therefore any answer to this question will be necessarily dependent on a particular understanding of the term ‘targum’ itself. Although this is neither the time nor the place for a thorough-going survey of the various meanings which have been assigned to the term ‘targum’, the above discussion has at least illustrated that this term may be stretched or contracted depending on who is using it. Armed with this knowledge and remembering that Weitzman and

973 The definition provided by P.S. Alexander, ‘Targumim’, 321 seems to represent a combination of the two views expressed for he limits the term ‘Targum’ to early Jewish Aramaic translation of the Bible. See his article for a concise but typically illuminating summary of the terminological issues.


975 S.P. Brock, ‘A Palestinian Targum Feature in Syriac’, 274-75. Brock’s position on the terminological issue is clarified when he explicitly denies that 11Q10 should be called ‘...a targum’ in the normal sense of the word, and to give it this name (as is usually done) simply invites confusion, and accordingly should be avoided.’

976 Raphael Weiss’ monograph on RtgJob (תַּרְגּוֹמְתָּן הָעָרָמִי לַטְבֵּרָה יֹאָב) may perhaps offer a clue to one source of terminological ‘confusion’: While C. Mangan’s English translation and annotation of the text is entitled simply The Targum of Job, the English summary of Weiss’ work in Modern Hebrew is more specifically The Aramaic Targum to Job. Because in modern Hebrew יָדְּמַר may denote generic ‘translation’ (e.g. Septuagint יָדְּמַר) as well as the traditional Rabbinic Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew text, Weiss apparently felt the need to provide more specific information in his modern Hebrew title (i.e. not just any targum, but יָדְּמַר הָעָרָמִי לַטְבֵּרָה יֹאָב).
Samely see the representation of MT as perhaps the primary defining characteristic of ‘targum’, we turn now to consider some possible answers to the question of 11Q10’s ‘targumic’ status.

The present study of omission, transposition and the treatment of the conjunction in the Aramaic versions of Job has shown that the Targum of Job displays a remarkable fidelity to the Hebrew source text and is quite scrupulous in its preservation of the form and order of MT Job. Of course, the targum’s precise, often one-to-one, relationship with the Hebrew text admits of more than one explanation. S.P. Brock’s discussion of literalism in connection with classical schoolboy crib finds a parallel in the theory that the targum too originated as an Aramaic crib used by students in the Bet Ha-Sepher in order to learn to read Hebrew (then no longer a vernacular).977 A. Samely, on the other hand, sees in the targum’s formal proximity to the Hebrew text, an attempt to ‘pin the targumic shadow to the Hebrew text’ thereby highlighting (and ‘indexing’ with their Hebrew lemmata) the non-translational interpolations for which the targum is famous.978 In fact, the explanations of Alexander and Samely need not necessarily be mutually exclusive.979

By comparison, the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job have displayed a far greater degree of deviation from MT Job in terms of their omission and transposition of elements, and in their willingness to supply, substitute or dispense with the conjunction. While this much seems incontestable, the attempt to explain 11Q10 and P-Job’s shared divergence from the MT in these areas led to the positing of two competing hypotheses:

978 A. Samely, ‘Scripture’s Segments and Topicality in Rabbinic Discourse and the Pentateuch Targum’ JAB 1 (1999) 118.
979 For a seemingly neglected suggestion as to the social-cultural context in which this formal literalism and radical expansiveness came to be fused, see R. Kasher, ‘The Aramaic Targumim and their Sitz im Leben’ in M.H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.) Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem: Magnes Press-Hebrew University, 1988) 75-85. Kasher sees the literalism as originating in the Beth Ha-Sepher, the expansions in the Beth Ha-Midrash and Beth Ha-Talmud, and their fusion or convergence in the liturgical context of the Synagogue (82-83).
1) The shared divergences of the Qumran and Syriac versions are a result of their dependence on 'vernacular' Hebrew texts of Job which already displayed many, if not all, of the omissions, transpositions and treatment of the conjunction which now appear in 11Q10 and P-Job.

2) The shared divergences of the Qumran and Syriac versions are a result of the shared and partially overlapping Aramaic linguistic-stylistic constraints and preferences of the two translators.

1) Similar 'vernacular Vorlage'

The hypothesis that both the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job are reliant on a vernacular Hebrew Vorlage was explored with reference to the relationship between the Targum and Syriac versions of Isaiah and the vernacular Hebrew version of Isaiah found at Qumran (1QIsa). While P-Isaiah was found to closely parallel the vernacular Hebrew scroll of Isaiah in terms of its omissions, transpositions and the treatment of waw, the Targum of Isaiah presented a comparatively low degree of correspondence to 1QIsa and did not generally present the same adjustments as were found in the vernacular version. That Targum Isaiah displays no systematic agreement with the vernacular version of Isaiah in terms of its divergence from MT is hardly surprising, however, for the targumic and Rabbinic preference for MT as opposed to vernacular texts is acknowledged by Emmanuel Tov:

The connection between [these] proto-Masoretic texts and Pharisaic circles is evident, and some scholars even call the proto-Masoretic texts 'proto-rabbinic'. When the biblical text is quoted in the Talmud and midrashim, it is that of the MT, and when the rabbinic circles produced an Aramaic translation [i.e., Targum], it is again based on a text that is more or less identical to the MT. 980

This latter assertion would seem to require a measure of qualification lest it appear to claim too much. It is clear that at certain points, various texts within the Rabbinic targum tradition suggest the possibility and indeed probability that the text being rendered by the targumist was not identical with MT. 981 In the present context, however, the rele-

980 E. Tov, 'A New Synthesis', 300.
981 For a brief discussion of non-MT readings in the targums and a considerable list of pseudo-variants which have been supported with reference to targumic texts, see R.P. Gordon, 'The Citation of the tar-
vant point is that the Targums do not display any reliance on Hebrew Vorlagen which systematically deviate from the MT in terms of omissions, transpositions, the treatment of the conjunction or other features commonly found in texts which Tov classifies as having been written in 'Qumran practise'. The obvious implication of such a distinction, however, is that according to the similar 'vernacular Vorlage' hypothesis, the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job will have been basically literal renderings of texts similar or identical to those written in Tov's 'Qumran practise'. Were this to be the case, there would be no differentiating between the Aramaic translators responsible for 11Q10, P-Job and RtgJob in terms of their representation of the Hebrew text (i.e., formal literalism would prevail amongst all translations). This conclusion, however, carries with it a necessary corollary: if it is maintained along with Tov that Targum is by definition dependent on MT or a proto-Masoretic text, then the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job clearly cannot lay claim to the title of 'targum'.

---

982 E. Tov, 'A New Synthesis', 295-6 'The great majority of these texts reflect a free approach to the biblical text that manifests itself in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections, and sometimes in negligent script.'

983 Preliminary work by E. Ulrich (M. Abegg, P. Flint, E. Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible, 590) on the few Hebrew fragments preserved (4Qjob) shows precisely the types of modifications which one might expect of a vernacular Hebrew text: 'Most of the variants are quite minor: singular for plural, transposition of word order, presence or lack of small words that add no meaning or are implicit... more familiar form of the word God (i.e., ٌא in place of אלוהים, xi) but rather that by and large, the Vorlage of the translator was very close to MT.

984 M.P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament, 128 even extends this targumic reliance on MT to its vocalisation. In both The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums, and 'The Background of Speech: Some Observations on the Representation of Targumic Exegesis' JJS 39 (1988) 251-60 Samely appears to assume the MT to be the source text rendered by the targumists.
2) Similar linguistic-stylistic constraints

While not all scholars operate with identical understandings of the defining characteristics of ‘targum’, Weitzman and Samely search for features which define and differentiate the ‘targumic’ approach from other versions with reference to their representation of MT.\footnote{The investigation of ‘converse translation technique’ (i.e. a modification resulting in a translation conveying the opposite meaning of the source text) provides an example of a feature which was originally described as distinctively targumic (M. Klein, ‘Converse Translation’) but has since been documented in a variety of other ancient versions (R.P. Gordon, “‘Converse Translation’, 3-21).} On the basis of their work in Syriac and Targum respectively, both of these scholars came to the conclusion that the Targum’s primary distinguishing feature over and against other versions (including the Syriac) was its faithful and conspicuous preservation of the formal features of the MT in the order in which they are preserved in this textual tradition. Although the studies of addition and substitution presented by Szpek, and supplemented by further tentative explorations above, served to differentiate the Targum of Job from the Qumran and Syriac versions on the basis of the latter’s preference for linguistic-stylistic adjustments, the more crucial task of assessing the Aramaic translators’ representation of the MT was undertaken through an evaluation of omission, transposition and the treatment of the \textit{waw} conjunction. On the basis of these criteria, the translators of the Syriac and Qumran versions of Job have shown that the priority of fidelity to the MT, so clearly illustrated by the targumist, was overridden by, among other factors, the perceived linguistic-stylistic demands of their Aramaic target languages. It seems clear from the present study that if the targumist’s approach is to be defined fundamentally in terms of his formal preservation of Hebrew elements in the order in which they appear in MT, then the translators responsible for the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job should not be credited with the production of a ‘targum’.

\textit{What’s in a Name? Targum, translation and 11Q10}

We have given consideration to the two possible explanations for the types of divergences encountered in the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job, but not discovered
in the Targum. While, in theory, it has been useful to discuss each explanation in turn and without reference to the other, in practise, these explanations need not, and indeed probably are not, mutually exclusive. Although it is theoretically possible that 11Q10 and P-Job's common divergences from MT are exclusively due to either similarity of Vorlage or similarity of linguistic-stylistic preference, it seems on balance more plausible to assume that a certain proportion of their shared divergences will be a result of shared translator preferences while others may be related to common dependence on a text which displays vernacular features not found in MT. While the type of modifications which appear in 4Qjoba point toward the plausibility of a vernacular Vorlage, it is important to note that the idiomatic Aramaic character of the Qumran and Syriac versions of Job suggests that reliance on such an already modified text is neither a necessary nor a sufficient explanation for their divergence from MT. Ultimately, the determination of which hypothesis should be made to carry the greater burden of explanation takes us beyond the confines of the present work and into the prospects for future study.

While this study has focused on literary and formal issues and is properly preliminary to a historical assessment, a few tentative comments on the implications of the present work are perhaps warranted. In his recent outline of theoretical possibilities and probabilities in the relationship between Peshitta and Targum, P. Dirksen draws a distinction between theories which root the Peshitta in the targum tradition and those which see the Peshitta as an independent rendering of the Hebrew which is more loosely related to the targum tradition through consultation, common tradition or influence.986 While the present study has virtually nothing to say on the subject of theological or exegetical traditions held in common by Targum and Peshitta, our characterisation of the respective translation approaches does speak to the question of origins. The fundamental line, as demarcated in the present study, dividing the Qumran and Syriac versions from the Targum in terms of translation approach would certainly imply that the Pe-

shitta and Qumran translation traditions are clearly and unequivocally independent of the targumic tradition. This fundamental ‘non-targumic’ status of both Qumran and Syriac versions would clearly rule out their share in a hypothetical ‘proto-targum’ which appears to be presupposed by theories which see the roots of the Peshitta in a Targum tradition.987 This is not to rule out the existence of a proto-targum from which the later targums were to derive, but rather to suggest that were such a creature to have existed, it would by definition bear more resemblance to these later targums in terms of translation approach than to more linguistically-stylistically oriented versions such as are found in the Qumran and Syriac traditions.

The answer to the question of whether these non-targumic translation traditions should be considered ‘pre-targumic’ is ultimately dependent not on the dating of 11Q10 (for which 70 CE is an unshakeable terminus ad quem) but on the dating of the Rabbinic targum tradition.988 If the Palestinian ‘targum’ tradition reaches back into the 1st century CE or even earlier, as Diez-Macho and his followers have contended, then the two Aramaic traditions (targumic and non-targumic) will have been contemporary.989 If, on the other hand, the origins of the ‘targum’ translation tradition are to be located closer to the dates of the preserved manuscripts (how much closer may be debated) then the non-targumic approach to which 11Q10 and P-Job attest will clearly antedate the targums and should thus be considered ‘pre-targumic’. It hardly needs to said that the above suggestions regarding the questions of the relationships amongst the Aramaic versions as corpora, are valid only to the extent that the findings of the present study are found to hold for the Targum, Peshitta and Qumran translation traditions more generally. Further

988 For methodological considerations see the still useful article by A. York, ‘The Dating of Targumic Literature’, 49-62.
989 For a recent, even-handed evaluation of the current debate on the relevant sources of Aramaic in the 1st century CE see L. Stuckenbruck, ‘An Approach to the New Testament Through Aramaic Sources: The Recent Methodological Debate’ JSP 8 (1991) 3-29. So long as some measure of continuity is seen with respect to the Pharisaic and later Rabbinic traditions, pushing the origins of the ‘targum’ tradition back into the 1st century C.E. or earlier might justify seeing the ‘targum’ and ‘proto-targum’ as being associated with Rabbinic and Pharisaic traditions respectively. (See J. Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture [Cambridge: CUP, 1969] 40-42, 36 n.1).
comparative study of other Aramaic versions will, we hope, determine how representative the present conclusions are.

The present study has been restricted to issues of form and approach not because questions of dating and provenance are unimportant or irrelevant, but because they are too important to take up without continuing to explore the questions of genre and definition with respect to the Aramaic versions. It is hoped that the present study has played a small part both in clarifying the use of the term ‘targum’ and in illuminating some of the issues at stake in its application, or mis-application, to the Qumran version of Job. Still greater clarity regarding the relationships amongst the various Aramaic translation traditions and the wider world of ancient versions will depend on comparative studies which pay close attention not only to the theological and ideological traditions embedded in the versions, but the very rendering of the source text itself, and the extent to which linguistic and stylistic constraints impinge, or do not impinge, on this rendering. This type of comprehensive approach will allow us to identify not only those features, approaches and techniques which transcend the boundaries of individual translations (and even schools of translation) but also those features and approaches which differentiate and distinguish one version from another. While the significance of the present study can only be determined through more widespread comparative work, at least one implication is relatively clear: in terms of its relationship to, and representation of the MT, the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job is no more deserving of the title ‘targum’ than is its counterpart in the Syriac translation tradition.

990 Whatever the supposed status of an ‘early core’ of tradition in RtgJob, the incontestably late date of this targum in its present form (See C. Mangan, Some Observations on the Dating of Targum Job’ in K.J. Cathcart and J.F. Healey (eds.) Back to the Sources: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Dermot Ryan (Dublin: Glendale Press, 1989) 67-78; reiterated in C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 5-8) makes it even more urgent that studies similar to the one attempted here be undertaken with respect to Aramaic versions from a variety of dates and provenances.

991 While there is much to be commended in R.P. Gordon’s exhortation (R.P. Gordon ‘Dialogue and Disputation in the Targum to the Prophets’ JSS 39 [1994] 7-17) to adopt a ‘trans-versional’ approach, the present study would suggest that the construction of individual translation profiles must include, whenever possible, an assessment of linguistic-stylistic constraints on the translation along with ‘translation features of a higher level of significance’ (17).

992 While the recently published edition of 11Q10 (F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave II) and F. Martinez,
While some have suggested the possibility of 11Q10’s use of *memra* as early evidence of the avoidance of anthropomorphism, other commentators have sought to differentiate 11Q10 from RtgJob and the classic Jewish targumim on the basis of the reduced frequency and divergent usage of this term in 11Q10. Although not directly related to the main subject of the present study, this issue has a bearing on our assessment of the relationships between the Aramaic versions and the ‘targumic’ quality of the Qumran text. Although there is not sufficient space to discuss every instance of this expression in RtgJob, the two occurrences in 11Q10 warrant a closer look:

\[ \text{By two palms He hath covered the light, And layeth a charge over it in meeting, YLT} \]

By two palms He hath covered the light, And layeth a charge over it in meeting, YLT

He covers his hands with the lightning, and commands it to strike the mark. RSV

---

*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [2nd ed.] (Brill-Eerdmans, 1994) retain the official title ‘11QtargumJob’ assigned by Editio princeps. G. Vermees, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin: 1998) 431 assigns 11Q10 the rubric of ‘11Qar[a][maic]Job’ in his English translation of the DSS. This title has the incidental benefit of locating 11Q10 within its appropriate dialectal classification, that is, Qumran Aramaic.


994 J. Fitzmyer, ‘Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament’ in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) 94-95 in his case for the antiquity of 11Q10, and against RtgJob for instance, notes that these are God’s words addressed to Job (and consequently not an appropriate context in which to speak of maintaining reverence toward God) and that *memra* only occurs twice in 11Q10 and not in conjunction with its usage in RtgJob (the present verse being the sole exception to this rule). A. Diez-Macho, ‘Le Targum Palestinien’ sees this difference as resulting not from different periods of origin but rather the ideological context from which the ‘Qumran-Essene targum’ and the Pharisaic targumic literature emerged.
Although it is unfortunate that the remainder of the Qumran translator’s rendering is not preserved, it seems likely that 11Q10 ‘at/because of his command’ is intended as a representation of MT יבלס ‘upon his palms (?). While the original editors suggest that this rendering has been motivated by the Qumran translator’s desire to avoid the use of anthropomorphic language in connection with God, this assessment is far from obvious.995 E. Tuinstra agrees with this verdict citing the use of memra as an equivalent for the divine ננה in TgOnqelos Exod. 33:22.996 This may well be the case, but several factors complicate the situation considerably. The first thing to note is that the Hebrew is, at this point, quite difficult.997 Presumably in response to this textual difficulty, RtgJob, rather than supplying memra, has provided an addition here מימיו דומק ויריא מעית ‘because of thieving hands he restrains...’ which facilitates a retention of a literal rendering of the Hebrew and allows its integration into the rendering of the verse.998 When we turn to 11Q10’s rendering (על יאמור), we see what appears to be a different approach. At the outset, given the Qumran translator’s susceptibility to harmonisation within the verse, it seems likely that the parallel in v.32b רג ‘and he commands/ed’ has provided the translator with a contextual reference point for his translation of the corresponding location in v.32a ‘on/because of his command’).999 Another possible consideration in assessing 11Q10’s translation is the similarity be-

995 Editio princeps, 67.
996 E. Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten, 86 n. 172; B. Grossfeld, Targum Onkelos to Exodus AramBib 7 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988) 94 n. 18. notes that this reading is also to be found in Ps-J, but not in TgNeof.
997 If the actual form יבלס is apparently straightforward in terms of lexical gloss ('palms') its meaning in the present context is mysterious indeed. The interpreter’s ingenuity is stretched to the limits when attempting to determine the relationship between v.32a ‘The covering of the hands/palms’ and v.32b. ‘and commands it against the mark/target’. For various attempts to do so see S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job (I), 316 and R. Goudis, The Book of Job, 422.
998 As noted by C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 81 n.17, Elihu’s mention of ‘light’ is understood as signifying ‘rain’ according to Rabbinic tradition (Gen R. 26.7). See R. Weiss, הרדס וארמיא יאמורן, 276-77 for a more extensive discussion of the Rabbinic parallels. He notes too that TgLamentations 3:41 also connects ‘thieving’ with the occurrence of ננה.
999 In fact, J. Fitzmyer, ‘Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament’, 94-95 suggests that 11Q10 may not be rendering the prepositional phrase in v.a, but rather the ‘parallel’ verbal form in v.b.
tween the translator’s rendering here (על המאמרה) and that at 39:27 (11Q10: על המאמרה) MT: עלי פתי). The occurrence of פתי with the prefix kaph is found twice in the text leading up to chapter 36 (30:18 עלי and 33:6 עלי; see also 39:27 עלי). It seems quite possible that when confronted by the phrase עלה עלי here in parallel with 'and he commands/ed', the similarity between עלה and occurrences such as עלה (and especially 39:27 עלי) has led to the present translation.

Is it at your command that the eagle mounts up and makes his nest on high? RSV
At thy command goeth an eagle up high? Or lifteth he up his nest? YLT

Whatever factors have contributed to the provision of על המאמרה in 11Q10’s rendering of 36:32, the explanation of its occurrence here is comparatively straightforward. While all three versions understand the Hebrew use of פתי ‘mouth’ as referring to ‘that which comes out the mouth (i.e., command)’ and provide appropriate specification in their respective translations, the manner in which they do so differs. While 11Q10 simply substitutes pamięta ‘your command’ for the Hebrew פתי ‘your mouth’, RtgJob supplies a similar noun ורה ‘word/command’ but prefers to place it in construct with a more semantically proximate rendering שלך ‘your mouth’.

1000 E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 610 provides other examples of this usage in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Gen. 45:21).
riac translation provides a parallel to that of RtgJob, for P-Job shows Syriac ܐܠܗܐ ‘word’ in construct with ܡܠܐ, its translation of Hebrew ‘your mouth’.\textsuperscript{1002}

While the above two passages are the only two in which memra appears in 11Q10, C. Mangan follows Weiss in documenting the extensive and varied use of this term in RtgJob. C. Mangan sees the development of the use of this term as follows: The expression was first used pronominally with reference to humans (\textit{[i.e., my memra = me]} 7:8; 19:18; 27:03; 30:20; 34:2). This pronominal use was then extended and applied to the divine (1:10,11; 2:3, 5; 13:9; 15:30 (var.); 21:15), with the result that memra over time, came to function first as a title (see 1:21;2:9; 4:9; 29:5; 42:9,10,12) and then eventually to replace terms such as ‘spirit’ (15:30), ‘breath’ (4:9; 32:8; 33:4; 37:10) and as we saw here in 39:27 ‘mouth’.\textsuperscript{1003} How does 11Q10’s use of this expression fit in with this hypothetical reconstruction of the development of memra? As we have seen, the Qumran translation’s use of memra is restricted to functioning as an equivalent for Hebrew ‘mouth’ at 39:27 (and at 36:32, either ‘hand, palm’ or ‘mouth’). As such, it is unexpectedly in the position of manifesting the final stage of Mangan’s hypothetical line of development despite being clearly the earliest extant Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Bible. The merely unexpected becomes slightly awkward when it is noted that at locations such as Job 40:6, 42:1 and 42:10 where a substantial proportion of textual witnesses to RtgJob preserve memra in connection with the divine name (according to Mangan, a prior stage in the use of the expression i.e. ܐܠܗܐ ܢܗܪܝܢ), neither the Qumran nor Syriac translators parallel this usage.

The retention of this hypothesis as a viable explanation would seem to require that one posit either: a) the ‘earlier’ usage pattern reflected in the association with the divine name has been edited out of the Qumran ‘targum’ leaving only the final stage of development, or b) 11Q10’s use of memra cannot be accounted for within developmental theories of this term’s usage within classical targumic literature. While either of

\textsuperscript{1002} Elsewhere in Job (41:11, 13) the Aramaic translators render נֵפֶן consistently with its Aramaic cognate.
these suggestions are at least theoretically possible, the lines of discontinuity marked out by the present study between the Qumran and Rabbinic 'targums' might favour the latter. In fact, however, Walter Aufrecht, realising the importance of 11Q10 as an early witness to Aramaic translation of Scripture, has postulated a line of development which seeks to place 11Q10's use within the context of wider targumic usage and in doing so, effectively stands Mangan's suggested theory of development on its head. Aufrecht posits a line of development which begins with memra as a standard translation for וֹ and שֵׁ, whether divine or human. Tracing the development through Onkelos and Ps-J to the Palestinian Targums, Aufrecht presents evidence which suggests that over time this term tended to be reserved more and more for the divine 'mouth' and 'voice'. This theory at least has the benefit of locating 11Q10's use of memra at an earlier phase vis-à-vis the later RtgJob. The Syriac parallel (_survey) to 11Q10 and RtgJob here, while not making use of memra, lines up well with Aufrecht's suggestion that at least the origins (if not the later development) of the use of this expression are to be explained in linguistic-stylistic terms rather than theological-ideological ones.

1003 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, 6. See also C. Mangan, 'Some Observations on the Date'.
1004 W. Aufrecht, 'Aramaic Studies', 62-66. See A. Chester, Divine Revelation, 293-313 for an evaluation and criticism of the theories of Munoz Leon and Hayward which suggest that memra is a creative theological concept in the targum. Chester (311) rightly sees this theologically significant use of memra as being a secondary development of its original exegetical-translational function. See also V. Hamp, Der Begriff 'Wort' in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen (Munich: 1938).
1005 W. Aufrecht, 'Aramaic Studies', 65. 'The term memra, which was used initially as a simple equivalent of Hebrew שֵׁ, came to be used as a means of designating those passages which referred to God's voice alone. This is most fully and consistently developed in the Palestinian Targums, where memra is used only in relation to the divine שֵׁ.
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is completely ignored. It was a theological research student, George Wieland, currently Minister of the Abbeyfield Baptist Church in Edinburgh, who first drew my attention to the occurrence of *exarchein* in the LXX. Great thanks are due to him for suggesting the line of enquiry here pursued.

To conclude: in the ninety or so years since the discovery of the *exarchon* epitaphs, no explanation satisfactory to all has been offered for this uniquely Jewish title. Although considerable attention was given early in the century to the function and meaning of *exarchon* and related words in literary sources post-dating the epitaphs, the literary antecedents of *exarchon* were never examined. That was a great pity, for, as this paper has demonstrated, it is the earlier literary material that indicates with considerable clarity the probable meaning of the title. For centuries ‘pagan’ Greek writers used *exarchein* predominantly in the literal sense of leading out singing. The authors of the LXX, although employing the word in a different cultural context, did not alter significantly either its basic sense or its function. That does not mean, however, that the word underwent no development in Jewish hands. As we have seen, sometimes it was used in different ways (one thinks here of Philo’s figurative use of *exarchos* and *exarchein*) and on occasion it spawned new forms—the title *exarchon* at Rome, subtly different from the pagan Greek term *exarchos*, being the main example. Critical for these developments was the high standing of the LXX among Greek-speaking Diasporan Jews and its use of ξειράρχησεν at the very climax of the Exodus narrative, the Song of the Sea (Exodus 15:21).85 Regular users of the LXX cannot have failed to notice that verb there, given the centrality of the Exodus episode to Jewish ritual and self-identity, and those with a modicum of linguistic ability will not have been slow to recognise its potential usefulness. What word could be more appropriate for furnishing a title for the leader of contemporary congregational antiphony than that used of the Israelite leadership at the Red Sea, when it led out the nation’s first recorded antiphonal song of praise and thanksgiving to God?

85 On the importance of the Song of Moses to Diaspora Jews, see M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh, 1995), p. 229. n. 6. I am grateful to Professor Horbury for drawing my attention to this reference.
Will the Real Targum Please Stand Up?
Translation and Coordination in the Ancient Aramaic Versions of Job*

DAVID SHEPHERD
New College, Edinburgh University

If the seventeenth-century English playwright and poet Ben Jonson was never destined for the fame which his contemporary William Shakespeare enjoys in modern times, his slender volume on English grammar published posthumously provides a succinct definition which may serve as a suitable starting point for the present study: 'A conjunction is a word without number, knitting divers speeches together.' While Jonson lacks the precision of a modern linguist, his definition of the syntactic category known as 'conjunction' nevertheless captures the essence of the matter: conjunctions tie things together. For readers of Biblical Hebrew, it is perhaps merely a happy coincidence that Mr Jonson's reference to 'conjunction' as a '... word without number' suggests familiarity not only with a Hebrew idiom (לְעַנְנֵי אַף) but also the great frequency with which waw, that most famous of Hebrew conjunctions, appears in prose passages of the Tanakh. Questions of Jonson's knowledge of Hebrew aside, it is immediately evident to even beginning students in Biblical Hebrew that the Hebrew waw not only possesses a bewildering array of functions but also reappears with—from an English perspective at least—almost mind-numbing regularity in Hebrew narrative. It is not surprising then that English translators, when confronted by a Hebrew text which, by Germanic standards, appears far too well-coordinated, have introduced modifications into their translations in order to produce a stylistically acceptable English rendering.

* The author would like to thank Drs Timothy Lim, Peter Hayman (Edinburgh University) and Willem Smelik (University College London) for their constructive comments on the present study. Whatever defects remain in what follows are of course the sole responsibility of the author.

1 Ben Jonson, English Grammar (approx. 1637), p. xxii.

2 See for example, the definition found in a recent introduction to linguistics: 'A functional category that joins together two or more categories of the same type', M. Dobrovolsky and W. O'Grady, Contemporary Linguistic Analysis: An Introduction (1992), p. 588.

3 The English expression 'without number' corresponds precisely to the Hebrew phrase (לְעַנְנֵי אַף) which occurs on numerous occasions throughout the Hebrew Bible, e.g. Gen. 41:49; Ju. 6:5, 7:12; Jer. 2:32; Joel 1:6; and three times in Job (5:9, 9:10, 21:33). While translators since have provided a variety of English paraphrases for this expression, the AV (1611) most often renders this Hebrew with its literal English equivalent. It may well have been that Jonson's use of this English expression was unconsciously reinforced by his familiarity with the English versions of the Bible current in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. Although somewhat dated, C. S. Lewis, The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version (1950), pp. 11–20, provides a brief but nuanced discussion of the different ways in which the KJV has influenced English literature and speech, finding the greatest impact in the area of imagery and preservation of vocabulary for archaic or poetical use and—to a lesser extent—in terms of style and rhythm.

4 This point is well expressed by, for example Millar Burrows in his contribution to the Intro-
Neither is it surprising that the translators of antiquity too have been faced by this same problem in their attempts to render the Hebrew text into intelligible and acceptable Greek, Latin, Armenian, Aramaic, Syriac etc. The following paper then is an attempt to explore the ways in which translators working in three dialects of Aramaic have treated the conjunction \textit{waw} in their respective versions of the Hebrew book of Job. It is hoped that such an analysis will shed light not only on the relationship between the Aramaic versions but also on the wider question of the ancient Aramaic translators' attitude toward the Hebrew text they were translating.

\section{Preliminary Considerations}

While other Aramaic versions of the Book of Job do exist, the following study necessarily focuses on three unmediated translations of a Hebrew source text into Aramaic: (1) the Qumran targum of Job, (2) the Rabbinic targum of Job, and (3) the Syriac Peshitta of Job.\footnote{The Hebrew texts which ultimately lie behind both the Syro-hexaplaric version and the CPA lectionary fragments of Job have been mediated by the LXX translation of Job, whose influence is evident by virtue of the literal translation approach adopted by the Syriac translators. For a brief bibliography of the Syriac versions, see S. P. Brock `Syriac Versions', \textit{Anchor Bible Dictionary} (1992), VI, pp. 794-99.} The question of the nature of this Hebrew source text may well impinge on the present discussion, but it is perhaps more useful to postpone any treatment of this issue until the textual material has been presented. As part of our working hypothesis then, we simply note the general scholarly consensus that the Peshitta, Rabbinic Targum and Qumran Targum have all been translated from a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} which basically resembles the Masoretic Text.\footnote{See for example: (RtgJob) C. Mangan, \textit{The Targum of Job}, AramBib 15 (1991), p. 14; R. Weiss, \textit{Arboard \textit{Le} \textit{s}īrēh \textit{Le} \textit{Arūb} \textit{Arūb} \textit{Arūb} \textit{Arūb} \textit{Arūb}} (1979), p. 114ff; (P-Job) H. Szpek, `On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta', \textit{CBQ} 60 (1998), p. 255; G. Rignell, \textit{The Peshitta to the Book of Job} (1994), p. 363; (11Q10) E. W. Tuinstra, \textit{Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit Grot XI}, PhD dissertation (1970), p. 48; J. P. M. Van der Ploeg and A. S. Van der Woude, \textit{Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumran} (1971), p. 6.} Although the study of these Aramaic versions has obviously not generated the same volume of scholarly output as the Masoretic Text(s) of Job, considerable ink has been spent on the elucidation of both general and more specific features of the texts in question.\footnote{For a relatively recent bibliography of work on 11Q10 and RtgJob see W. E. Aufrecht, `A Bibliography of the Job Targumim', \textit{Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies}, Supplement 3 (1987). For P-Job see P. Dirksen, `Supplement to Annotated Bibliography, \textit{The Peshitta as a Translation} (1995), pp. 221-36. The Aramaic texts utilised in the present study are (unless...
constraints of space do not allow for a full discussion of the characteristics of these versions, it is sufficient for our purposes to observe that recent research has led scholars to the conclusion that the Peshitta, Rabbinic targum and Qumran targum constitute independent renderings of the Hebrew text and furthermore, that no substantial evidence of any mutual or reciprocal influence amongst the versions exists.\(^8\)

Previous research on the present topic—Aramaic Job translators’ treatment of Hebrew waw—has been for the most part limited to independent treatments of the respective Aramaic versions. If noted at all in commentaries or studies of these versions, the omission, addition or substitution of the waw is primarily cited on a case by case basis often without explanation or further discussion.\(^9\) E. Tuinstra was the first to look at the phenomenon in the Qumran targum, providing select examples of the translator’s addition, omission and substitution of waw in an early dissertation on the text in Dutch.\(^10\) It is, however, obvious that it was never Tuinstra’s goal to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the translator’s treatment of the waw but rather to provide several representative examples for each category. In an attempt to avoid conclusions which reflect a merely anecdotal assessment of the Aramaic versions, the following study will be based on a systematic comparison of their treatment within a defined textual sample. As Cave I1 has preserved the Qumran targum of Job only partially, this text is necessarily the lowest common denominator among the three versions, and any synoptic comparison must be necessarily restricted to the approximately 15% of the 42 chapters of the text of Job preserved in the Qumran text’s 39 columns.\(^11\) Of the 39 columns otherwise noted) 11Q10: M. Sokoloff (1974); RtgJob: D. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job (1994) (MS Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Urbins I=2; for sigla of other MSS listed in this study see Stec) (RtgJob); P-Job: L. G. Rignell, The Old Testament in Syriac (Leiden edition, 1982) (MS B. 21, Milan, Ambrosian Library=7a1). Sokoloff’s text is augmented by the inclusion of the additional fragment published originally by B. E. Zuckerman and S. A. Reed, ‘A Fragment of an Unstudied Column of 11QJob: A Preliminary Report’, The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Newsletter 10 (1993), pp 1–7. H. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta’, p 25, notes that the text tradition of P-Job lacks the earliest text phase of the Peshitta identified by M. Koster (see most recently ‘The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta’, Targum Studies 2, ed. P. V. M. Flesher (1998), pp. 15–54). While 7a1 is then a representative of the earliest available stage of the text of P-Job, we unfortunately lack the evidence which would allow us to speak of earlier translators’ (or transmitters’) treatment of the waw.

\(^8\) Both J. Wilson, ‘11QJob and the Question of the Essene–Edessa Connection’ (paper delivered at the 1997 Jerusalem Congress marking the Fiftieth Anniversary of the discovery of the DSS), and H. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Targum on the Peshitta to Job’, in Targum Studies (1998), pp. 141–57, have apparently arrived at the same conclusions independently.


\(^10\)Tuinstra, Hermeneutische Aspecten... (1970), p. 49, includes, in a list of various divergences from MT, a number of instances where 11Q10 adds (29:24, 29:25, 30:13, 32:16, 34:15, 36:15, 36:25, 39:8, 39:26, 41:16) and omits (19:15, 21:25, 24:12, 25:1, 26:14, 27:12, 27:16, 27:18, 29:10, 29:11, 34:29, 36:7) the waw. He also includes examples of the translator’s substitution of his own Aramaic expression in place of the Hebrew waw (21:4, 25:3, 32:2, 36:26) as well as locations where he has apparently replaced an MT expression with a waw (21:7, 27:11, 36:30). S. A. Kaufman, ‘The Job Targum from Qumran’, p. 318, also provides a small list of additions (II, 4; IV, 3, 4; V, 5; VIII, 2; X, 5; XI, 2; XIV, 2) and omissions (e.g. XIV, 9; XXIV, 9; XXVII, 9; XXIX, 5).

\(^11\) The previous total of 38 (Editio Princeps) was augmented by the discovery and, in 1993,
extant, a total of 29 serve as the sample for the present study. While such a sample would undoubtedly be insufficient to support certain types of analyses, the frequency with which the \textit{waw} appears in these texts allows us to place some confidence in the validity of the conclusions reached.

In her work on the Peshitta of Job, Heidi Szpek introduced a degree of sophistication and systematisation into her analysis of the Syriac translator’s treatment of the \textit{waw}. While Szpek too made use of the same general categories of Addition, Omission, Substitution she went beyond Tuinstra to consider the motivation for the various modifications— that is, in a given case, why does the Syriac translator of \textit{P-Job} diverge from the Masoretic text in his use of the \textit{waw}? While Szpek’s study does indeed inform the present paper, the inclusion of two independent Aramaic translations means that her framework and set of categories have inevitably required a measure of adjustment in order that the present analysis take account of all the data relevant to the present discussion. Because the sample is limited to material preserved in the Qumran translation the present study is of course not able to take account of the entire range of data analysed by Szpek.

As an exhaustive study of even the present topic would require a far more extensive treatment than may be provided here, the discussion will be orientated by the following three questions:

1. How do the translators responsible for the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew book of Job treat and represent the \textit{waw} conjunction in their respective renderings?

2. How do the various Aramaic versions relate to each other in terms of their treatment of this conjunction?

3. What light, if any, do the answers to the above questions shed on the wider question of the definition of ‘targum’ and the classification of the Aramaic versions of Job?

In attempting to come to grips with these three questions, the discussion will be based on a series of examples drawn from the texts themselves. However, in order to try and avoid the distortions that may occur when select examples are drawn from a larger body of material these examples will be supplemented with some graphical representations of the data under consideration. Although the discussion proper will be limited to the ancient Aramaic

\textbf{References:}

12 Columns I-IX; XX-XXXVIII.

13 Because it is the latter portion of the dialogues and the epilogue which are preserved in translation by 11Q10, the sample is drawn from both poetic and prose material.


15 Categories: Omission, Error, Redundancy. Addition: larger addition, implicit to explicit exegesis, intra and parallel verse influence but primarily language difference. \textit{H. Szpek, ‘On the Influence of the Targum…’;} p. 144, includes 11Q10 in her study of the possible influences of the targumic tradition on \textit{P-Job}, but does not appear to have extended her comparison of the treatment of the \textit{waw} to the Qumran text (n. 20).
versions, parallel examples may be drawn from modern Bible versions where relevant in order to illustrate a particular issue or phenomenon.16

It is neither possible nor necessary here to rehearse the multitude of functions assigned by modern grammarians to the Hebrew conjunction waw. In addition to the well known (but only partially understood) role the waw plays in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system,17 the waw serves a wide variety of both coordinative and non-coordinative syntactic functions.18 In the examples below consideration will be given to the particular function of the waw in both the Hebrew text and its Aramaic renderings. However, an exhaustive analysis of coordination in either the Hebrew book of Job or its Aramaic versions is not intended. Rather, the following study will focus on the representation of the waw in Aramaic translation generally as an index of the respective translators’ attitudes toward the Hebrew text.

II. Modifications Unique to the Respective Aramaic Versions

While we will eventually turn to the question of possible parallels in the Aramaic versions’ treatment of the conjunction, it seems wise to deal first with the cases in which one of the three shows a divergence from the Hebrew text not attested in the other two at the same location.

A. 11Q10

A1. Minus

While the Aramaic translation found at Qumran occasionally lacks a waw where it appears in the middle of a Hebrew verse, the majority of the otherwise unattested minuses are found at the beginning of a verse.19 In fact these unique initial waw minuses occur in 11Q10 only at the beginning of a particular type of verse, illustrated here by 23:1:

16 As most modern translations are based primarily on the MT, their treatment of the waw can in most cases be safely attributed to translator’s intervention rather than an alternate Vorlage. Unless otherwise noted, the English translations which appear in the present study have been drawn from the following sources: MT: Revised Standard Version, F. Martinez et al., DJD 23 (11Q10); C. Mangan, The Targum of Job (RtgJob); author’s own translation (P-Job).

17 See for instance B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (1990), 29.0, for a balanced evaluation of competing (and to some extent mutually enriching) theories of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. Despite some evidence of the waw-contrastive function in Old Aramaic (V. Sasson, ‘Some Observations on the Use and Original Purpose of the waw Consecutive in Old Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew’, VT 47, pp. 111–27), the present study finds no such evidence in the dialects of Aramaic utilised by the three translators of Job.


19 Medial minuses occur at 19:15 and 21:5, but in both cases the fragmentary state of the text contributes to the difficulty with which a motivation can be detected.
While a *vacat* in the text clearly indicates that the Qumran translator has understood that a new section in the text is beginning, the translation lacks the initial *waw* present in the MT and the other Aramaic versions.20 Similarly at 25:1, 40:6 and 42:1, where the translator of 11Q10 has encountered this same introductory phrase the conjunction is also lacking. Bruce Zuckerman has noted that the lack of conjunction in this type of introductory sequence in 11Q10 (וְאָּבָּא... וּפּוּד) is paralleled by the introductory expressions in the Imperial Aramaic of Daniel and Ahiqar where the conjunction is similarly lacking.21 As may be seen from the treatment of *רָּגָּיָא* in this same verse, none of the Aramaic translators ‘need’ the *waw* in order to preserve the Hebrew narrative tense.22 That the *waw* is nevertheless lacking in identical contexts in these four locations suggests that the translator has omitted it, having perceived it as superfluous to an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the verse.

A2. *Plus*

There are also instances where the translation from Qumran diverges from the MT in providing a *waw* where the conjunction is neither attested in the Hebrew nor in the other Aramaic versions. As may be seen below in 32:15, where this type of plus occurs medially, it often serves to link two propositions which are merely juxtaposed in the Hebrew:23

32:15

In verse 15 of Job, chapter 32, where Elihu upbraids Job's 'friends', the MT does not include any linking conjunctions ('They are shattered, they've

22 B. E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation...*, p. 236, notes that 11Q10 translates the Hebrew *waw*+imperf. with this form. For the Aramaic use of the *waw*+imperfect form see note 17 above.
23 Such medial plusses occur at 32:15, 35:10, 39:3 and 39:4 (partially due to intra-verse influence). Such asyndetic coordination is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry; see J. C. Gibson, ‘Coordination by *Var* in Biblical Hebrew’, p. 278. Two interesting exceptions to the rule are preserved in 11Q10’s translation of 33:25 and 39:21, where the translator has supplied the *waw* as part of a translation which diverges from the MT considerably. Here it is used to integrate interpretative material into the translation. At 39:23 the *waw* is added by the translator due to an error in recognition or interpretation of two Hebrew terms in construct.
stopped answering, they are lost for words’ [lit. words are removed from them], preferring rather to link the clauses asyndetically. Although the Qumran translation of 32:15 is not preserved in its entirety,24 sufficient material remains to see that 11Q10 includes a waw conjunction which serves to explicitly mark the co-ordination between the Aramaic rendering of these clauses ‘and they were silent . . . and I withheld from them [words?]’. While the syntax of the Hebrew seems unambiguous and neither RtgJob nor P-Job show the addition of the conjunction, the Aramaic translator appears to have provided the conjunction as a means of making the relationship between the clauses utterly clear.

On other occasions the Qumran translation has a waw plus at the beginning of a verse where it is lacking both in the MT and in the other Aramaic versions of Job. The following example, drawn from Job 39:6, 7 and 8 illustrates this type of modification:25

\[
\text{In her analysis of P-Job’s treatment of the waw, Heidi Szpek has suggested that when the waw plus occurs in the Peshitta of Job at the beginning of a verse, it serves either to initiate a new unit of meaning (e.g. P-Job 1:16) or to continue a semantic unit begun in the preceding verse (e.g. P-Job 1:17, 18).26 All of the unique waw plusses in 11Q10 appear to belong to the latter category.}
\]

-----

24 Although it is by no means certain (because the end of the preceding line, XXI, 6, is not preserved), most commentators have assumed that 11Q10 רוחיה, ‘they were silent’, corresponds to Heb. דֶּרֶךְ דַּאֲלִי, ‘they did not answer again’; see, for example, Edito Princeps, p. 53, M. Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran, p. 208, and B. Jongeling, Een Aramees boek Job uit de Bibliotheek van Qumran (1974), p. 88. If so, this is an example of 11Q10 opting for an interpretative translation much like P-Job utilises in 32.11 (interpreting mbnih, ‘I waited’, as meaning stqt, ‘I was silent’). Whatever the correspondence in the first stich, the addition of the conjunction medially seems indisputable.

25 Medial waw plusses appearing in these verses (and shared by P-Job and 11Q10) will be dealt with below.

illustrated above. In Job 39:5–8, the so-called Voice from the Whirlwind poses a series of rhetorical questions which are used to emphatically press home the point that it is God, and not man that ultimately rules and provides for the animal kingdom:

(39:5) ‘Who has let the wild ass go free? Who has loosed the bonds of the swift ass,)

39:6 to whom I have given the steppe for his home, and the salt land for his dwelling place?

39:7 He scorns the tumult of the city; he hears not the shouts of the driver.

39:8 He ranges the mountains as his pasture, and he searches after every green thing.

The text of 11Q10 shows conjunctions at the beginning of verse 7 (וְלָכֶם ‘and he laughs at the tumult . . .’) and verse 8 (וְלָכֶם ‘and he chooses mountains for himself as his pasture)). While neither the MT nor the other Aramaic versions possess the conjunctions at these points, these plusses in 11Q10 apparently serve to provide the Aramaic reader of the translation with explicit markers of coordination in this passage.

A3. Substitution

While the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job shows several unique waw plusses and minuses, substitutions found only in this text are comparatively rare. In the example from 32:2a shown below, 11Q10’s use of מִנִּי, ‘then’, in place of the Hebrew conjunction serves not to link what follows with the preceding material but, on the contrary to emphasise the beginning of a new section (marked as מִנָּה, ‘open’, in the Masoretic text).

32:2 (וְלָכֶם ‘and he laughs at the tumult . . .’) 11Q10

RtgJob

P-Job

27 Initial plusses include 39:7, 8, 25:40:30; and 41:16. A waw also appears in 11Q10 as an initial plus at 32:16, but the text’s fragmentary state of preservation precludes a decision regarding its function.

28 Both 11Q10’s translation of MT מִנִּי, ‘to seek out (select), spy out, explore’, as מָצַב, ‘he selects’, and its addition of a suffixed preposition לָל, ‘for himself’, suggest that it has incorrectly understood this occurrence of the Hebrew verb in the light of its usage in passages such as Nu. 10:33, Dt. 1:33 and Ezek. 20:6, where this Hebrew lexeme takes the lamedh as preposition with the meaning ‘choose/collect’. F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave II* . . . , p. 157, are thus not entirely correct in suggesting that RtgJob (‘He explores the mountains . . .’) and 11Q10 share a common interpretation. See KB3 מִנִּי, pp. 573–74.

29 Although the Aramaic translator of 11Q10 has similarly added a waw at the beginning of his translation of 39:25, F. Martinez et al., *Qumran Cave II* . . . , p. 159, have neglected to render it in their English translation. If not accidental, this omission of the Aramaic waw in English translation is a testimony to the pressure which may be exerted by English stylistic preferences even in a scholarly translation of an ancient text.
(Then) Eli'hu the son of Bar'achel the Buzite, of the family of Ram, became angry. He was angry at Job because he justified himself rather than God; (RSV)

While this text division is marked in P-Job as well by • at the end of the preceding verse (32:1), the Syriac translation itself has not been altered in the light of this textual division as appears to be the case in 11Q10. Of the Aramaic translators it is only 11Q10 who has chosen to explicitly mark the beginning of this new section with an alternative lexeme in his translation.30 The other unique substitution occurring at the beginning of a verse is found at 36:28 where the Qumran translator provides a waw where the Hebrew text begins with the relative pronoun (הָשָׁם).31

B. P-Job
B1. Minus

Like the Qumran Aramaic translation, P-Job shows unique waw minuses both at the beginning of a verse and at various points medially. At 17:15, near the beginning of the synoptic Aramaic Job material, we see that P-Job shows a waw minus at the beginning of the verse where the other Aramaic versions follow the MT in providing the conjunction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>17:15</th>
<th>11Q10</th>
<th>RtgJob</th>
<th>P-Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ . . . ] הַיְשָׁם אָבִי (יִשָּׁהֵל)</td>
<td>[ . . . ] הַיְשָׁם אָבִי (יִשָּׁהֵל)</td>
<td>הַיְשָׁם אָבִי (יִשָּׁהֵל)</td>
<td>() 'Where then is my hope?'... (ASV, RSV, NIV, NRSV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-Job, along with most modern English versions, does not include the conjunction following 17:13–14 ('If I look for Sheol as my house, if I spread my couch in darkness; if I say to the pit, “You are my father”, and to the worm, “My mother, or My sister”, Where [Heb. הָשָׁם] then is my hope ...'). It appears to be the case that both Syriac and English translators have perceived the waw to be stylistically surplus to requirements and not worthy of repre-

30 Although the waw here does not function as a ‘true’ disjunctive in the Hebrew (+non-verb; see T. Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew (1971), p. 162), it is apparently perceived as such by the Aramaic translator as its consecutive-contrastive function is no longer pertinent. The Aramaic adverb now serves the function of the disjunctive, that is, it refers to new participants or announce a shift of scenery (B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 39.2.3). It is of course here at the beginning of Chapter 32 that the much debated Elihu speeches begin.

31 The translator of 11Q10 opts to substitute the waw conjunction for the Hebrew relative pronoun, thereby transforming the Hebrew subordinate construction ('he distills his mist in rain, which the skies pour down') into a coordinate one ('... he forms the blasts of rain. And his clouds send down ...'). While this same modification is attested elsewhere in P-Job (e.g. 22:10), 11Q10’s proximate translation of the relative pronoun in the initial position elsewhere (22:16, 34:27, 37:17, 39:6) suggests that the motivation for this adjustment here is probably the stylistic preference of the translator rather than linguistic necessity. 11Q10 also uniquely substitutes Aramaic הָשָׁם, ‘or’, for the Hebrew waw at 25:3.
sentation in their respective target texts. It may be that the Syriac translator has seen the Hebrew adverb תָּק (rendered by all three versions) as marking the apodosis ‘If . . . where then is my hope?’ despite the fact that it may here be functioning merely disjunctively. This, then would be an additional motivation for omitting the conjunction.

Unlike 11Q10 however, which primarily shows its unique minuses initially, the Syriac translation of Job provides the majority of its unique minuses medially. An example from 38:3 also cited by Szpek provides an illustration of this phenomenon:

נָדְרַךְ נַגְדֵ֣ב עַל־עִמָּךְ (טַחְרֵ֣י) (חָ֑יּוֹתֵ֥י) בְּיָדֶ֖יךָ 38:3
[float]
אסֶר נָתַ֣ן חָרָ֑צִים יִשְׁלָמָ֥ה יְדֵ֖יךָ (חָ֥יִים) (חָֽלְדוֹת) 11Q10
[float]
זָהְדְּבָּ֣א יִשְׁלָמָ ֑ה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה (חָ֑לְדוֹת) RtgJob
[float]
זָהְדְּבָ֣א יִשְׁלָמָ ֑ה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה יִשְׁלָמָה (חָ֑לְדוֹת) P-Job

Gird up your loins like a man, ( ) I will question you, (and) you shall declare to me. RSV

Here the Hebrew composer of the divine speeches uses the waw to conjoin three clauses (‘Gird up’, ‘so that I may question you’ ‘Make known to me’). While the conjunctions are preserved in RtgJob and 11Q10, the Syriac version omits these in its rendering of the Hebrew. Confirmation that the Syriac translator has a preference for leaving simple verbal clauses such as these without an explicit Syriac conjunction is provided by 40:7, 11 and 42:4. Where the waw is used conjunctively in these locations, it is also omitted by P-Job.

B2. Plus

As is the case with 11Q10, P-Job shows unique waw plusses both initially and medially. The addition of an-initial conjunction reflects the translator’s perception that a given verse is related to the one(s) which precedes it and its provision serves to make explicit this linkage:

מקים בִּעֲדֵּ֥ד תּוּכֵּד פַּ֖רְדוֹד אֶֽֽעָשְּנֶֽֽנּוּ (֑) 41:11
(float)
מקים בִּעֲדֵ֥ד תּוּכֵּד פַּ֖רְדוֹד אֶֽֽעָשְּנֶֽֽנּוּ (֑) 11Q10

32 H. Szpek, Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job . . . , pp. 118–19, offers the following as the first of five constraints on P-Job’s perception of the redundancy of waw: ‘the waw conjunctive is unnecessary in conjoining the apodosis to the protasis in a conditional proposition’.

33 The syntactic sequence in the Hebrew appears to be: Volitional form (Imperative)+(!+prefix conjugation)+Volitional form (Imperative). B. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax . . . , 39.2.2a, 2.5, define the function of the conjunctive waw as joining . . . two clauses which describe interrelated or overlapping situations not otherwise logically related.

34 Other English versions such as ASV, NIV, and NRSV also retain only the latter waw in translation.

35 H. Szpek, Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job, p. 119, n. 29, provides a list of such omissions across the entire text of P-Job. At 36:7, P-Job omits the waw due to difficulties in its rendering of the verse as a whole, while at 40:5, the omission seems to result from the translator’s perception of the waw as functionally superfluous.
In Chapter 41 of Job, the composer of the divine speeches paints a vivid and memorable portrayal of the great sea creature Leviathan. After focusing on the beast's fierceness, the poet depicts its formidable armament (v. 10): 'His sneezings flash forth light, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn. (v. 11) Out of his mouth go flaming torches; sparks of fire leap forth.' As we have seen above with the Qumran translator's rendering of 39:6–8, here P-Job's translation reflects an attempt to provide explicit markers of coordination between verses in order to delineate the unit of meaning as he has perceived it and to make this unit clear to the reader of the Syriac translation. The addition of this conjunction at the beginning of verse 11 ('\( wn\)nqyn mn pwmn hmp\’d', 'and from his mouth lamps come forth ...') reflects and, when added in the Syriac version, emphasises the semantic connections between verse 11 and the preceding verse.36 Even more common than initial plusses are the medial plusses which are unique to the Syriac amongst the Aramaic versions of Job:37

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{He is \( w-n-p \) in the desert ...} & \quad \text{38:26} \\
\text{... \( n-n-p \) to bring rain...} & \quad \text{11Q10}
\end{align*}
\]

As is the case with 11Q10, the bulk of P-Job's unique waw plusses occur between two independent stichs. Here it seems that the Syriac translator is reproducing in his target text, a use of the conjunction common in Hebrew verse. While two more or less synonymous propositions may be coordinated asyndetically (i.e. without the conjunction) in Hebrew poetry, it is often the case that the two stichs maybe joined through the use of the so-called epexegetical waw.38 Here in 38:26, where the Hebrew stichs are merely apposed,

36 Other unique initial plusses in P-Job occur at 23:4, 25:3, 33:7, 35:14, 36:29, 39:4, 40:11, 41:10. See H. Szpek, Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job ..., p. 126 n. 43, for other initial plusses.

37 See for instance P-Job at 23:6, 31:40, 33:15, 35:9, 36:29 37:16, 38:8, 23, 39:23, 40:23, 41:9, 15. See also Szpek's list for the total picture in P-Job. I am unable to agree however with Szpek's analysis of 24:15: although the Hebrew infinitival construction "\( n-n-p \) ...", saying, does not appear often in the predominantly poetic book of Job, it is treated in 24:15 (\( w-m\)ryn) in the same fashion as it is in other parts of the Peshitta (i.e. provision of a conjunction followed by a verb of the same root in a form determined by its grammatical context). See for instance in the Pentateuch: Gen. 37:15; Exod. 7:16; Lev. 23:23; Num. 20:7; Deut. 27:1. Other locations where P-Job adds the waw medially include 37:13 and 40:24.

38 B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax ..., 39.2.4, suggest that the function of the epexegetical conjunction is 'problematic' in verse, but note that the waw may in these circumstances function to intensify the poetic language. Should the waw which
the Syriac translator appears to have replicated this epexegetical use by providing the \textit{waw} as an explicit marker of co-ordination. Although as a rule, the \textit{waw} is supplied in P-Job in response to the linguistic/stylistic demands, on rare occasions the Syriac translator does make use of the conjunction to incorporate additional material into his translation.\footnote{This use of the \textit{waw} also appears in 11Q10 (see n. 23 above) but is relatively rare in both the Syriac and Qumran versions when compared with uses dictated by language difference. While H. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job} . . ., p. 122, has suggested that P-Job’s addition at the beginning of 38:29 is similarly motivated by the inclusion of extra material in this verse, 11Q10’s addition at the same point suggests that P-Job may have added the conjunction in any case.}

B3. \textit{Substitution}

As is the case with the Qumran translation, the Syriac translation of P-Job occasionally shows a substitution of the MT conjunction which is otherwise unattested in the Aramaic versions. Here in 25:4 we see an example of the Syriac translation representing the \textit{waw} with the Syriac conjunction ‘\textit{w}:’

\begin{align*}
\text{How then can man be justified with God?} \\
\text{(or) how can he be clean [that is] born of a woman? (AV)} \\
\text{How then can man be righteous before God?} \\
\text{( How can he who is born of woman be clean? (RSV)}
\end{align*}

As Szpek has noted, P-Job has chosen to render the Hebrew \textit{waw} (which may be used to indicate ‘or’)\footnote{For the so-called ‘alternative’ function of the \textit{waw}, see R. J. Williams, \textit{Hebrew Syntax} . . ., p. 71.} with another coordinating conjunction (‘\textit{w}, ‘or’) used by the Syriac with the expressed purpose of joining alternatives. While the Syriac translation of the two stiches exhibits slight deviations from the MT (‘How then is a man found/able\footnote{For the former understanding see J. Payne-Smith, \textit{A Compendius Syriac Dictionary} (1957), p. 115 (\textit{zk}); for the latter see G. Rignell, \textit{The Peshitta to the Book of Job}, p. 202.} to be just with God or how can one born of a woman be pure’) it is clear that through the substitution of Syriac \textit{w} for the Hebrew \textit{waw}, the translator of P-Job has made the ‘alternative’ aspect of the two Hebrew stichs more explicit in his Syriac translation.\footnote{See H. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job} . . ., p. 129, for a discussion of this phenomenon throughout P-Job.} It is interesting to note that the Aramaic translation from Qumran makes this exact same substitution (\textit{IN} for \textit{waw}) in the preceding verse, where Bildad’s first pair of rhetorical questions emphasise the might of God. It seems that while both the translators of 11Q10 and P-Job sensed the need for some type is provided by the Syriac translator of P-Job in these circumstances be seen as paralleling the function of the Hebrew epexegetical conjunction?}
of explicit marking of the two pairs of rhetorical questions in vv. 3-4, each chose to mark a different pair.43

C. RtgJob

C1. Minus

We now turn to a consideration of the last remaining Aramaic version—the Rabbinic Targum of Job—with respect to its particular use and treatment of the waw in rendering the Hebrew text. It is slightly surprising to note that, unlike the other two versions which omit the conjunction comparatively often, RtgJob presents not a single, unequivocal example of an omission of the Hebrew waw which is unattested in the other Aramaic versions. The following example drawn from the Rabbinic turgum’s translation of Job 40:10 is one of only two possible locations where it might be argued that an omission has taken place.

40:10

Deck yourself with majesty and dignity; ( ) clothe yourself with glory and splendour. (RSV, NRSV)

Although most Mss within the RtgJob textual tradition appear to have omitted the epexegetical waw which occurs between the two stichs of 40:10, some text witnesses (ב ו) do preserve a conjunction at this point. Setting aside for a moment the fact that such an omission would certainly constitute an exception to the targumist’s usual treatment of the waw, it should be noted that the similarity of † (first character of אִנָּהֳ) and † may well have led to the omission of the conjunction through haplography at some point in the history of the targum text. While the evidence of recent English versions provides some evidence that the translation of this verse from Hebrew into another language may indeed allow for an omission of the conjunction, the strong possibility of a textual error here makes any such conclusion rather tentative.44 Because the only two examples of unique omission provided by

43 The question of why one translator chose one pair and one the other would appear to be difficult, if not impossible, to answer with any kind of certainty. While the Authorised Version has rendered the conjunction with a wooden ‘and’, the more recent English version chooses to omit the conjunction altogether. Other Syriac substitutions for Hebrew waw occur at 34:12 (ן) and 42:11 (ץ). P-Job also shows a tendency to replace various Hebrew prepositions and particles with the simple Aramaic waw when either the Hebrew text or its Syriac translation render the waw more contextually appropriate. See 32:11, 33:13, 36:24, 37:11.

44 The other possible minus occurs at RtgJob 33:27. Although several Mss (Stec ס ב מ נ) have omitted the waw conjunction before the verb form (יָשָׁב), the majority of witnesses do preserve the conjunction (with both perfect and imperfect forms represented). While the confusion surrounding the function of the consecutive imperfect in this and surrounding passages (see 33:24 and 26), when coupled with P-Job’s addition of an imperfect verb here, should caution against dismissing the possibility that the translator has intentionally omitted this conjunction, the pos-
RtgJob are only partially attested in the textual tradition, it seems safe to conclude that what little evidence there is of waw omission in RtgJob is of a dubious nature.

C2. Plus

While the evidence of the omission of waw in RtgJob’s translation is questionable due to textual variants, there are indisputable additions of the waw in the Rabbinic targum text which do not appear in the other Aramaic versions. The number of locations where such additions are present are however relatively few in comparison with the Qumran and Syriac versions and occur primarily in passages of a type illustrated by this example from Job 25:2.

\[ \text{which Rendered with waw} \]

RtgJob in addition to providing a proximate rendering of 25:2 in T1, also provides a divergent interpretation (T2) which results in a radically expanded version. On closer scrutiny however it appears that the expanded T2 includes the supplementary material along with a formally literal rendering of the Hebrew. The translator renders the first MT term `המשלח' (waw omission) and later in the same verse with a second more literal equivalent, `עביד `ושלח' (waw). The second term in MT, רמיה, ‘fear’, is understood by the RtgJob translator first as \( \text{waw} \) and then again later as \( \text{waw} \), ‘and his fearfulness’. It is not the content of the expansions which interests us at this point. Rather, our concern here is with the translator’s use of the waw. All the Aramaic versions, including RtgJob, preserve

sibility of confusion between waw and yodh suggests that this may be an erroneous omission on the part of one portion of the RtgJob textual tradition. For full list of variants see D. Stec, The Text of the Targum of Job. 45 Unlike the cases described below where the addition of the waw appears to be linked to other ‘prior’ concerns, RtgJob’s addition of the waw at 40:12 appears to be an isolated (i.e. ‘genuine’) plus which is also represented in many English versions (e.g. NIV: ‘Look at every proud man and humble him …’).

46 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, p. 16 n. iv, has observed that the introduction of references to angels is not uncommon in RtgJob. In addition to Michael and Gabriel, Sammael is also mentioned by name in RtgJob (28:7). R. Weiss, הדרה, עתים מפורש אינן, p. 253, provides evidence that the understanding of these two Hebrew terms as angels is well attested in Midrashic sources and Rabbinic literature in general. See for example Tanhuma שן, 6; Zohar (Leviticus) 12b; for further citations see Weiss, p. 253 n.117. Interestingly the correspondences of ‘Michael’ with ‘fire’
the phrasal *waw* which links the first two Hebrew terms (enclosed in { }). In RtgJob's case both proximate and supplemented translations are linked with the *waw*. But while 11Q10 and P-Job represent only the phrasal *waw* which appears between the two initial terms in the MT, the translator of RtgJob provides several additional conjunctions unrelated to the 'translation' of the Hebrew. The inclusion of interpretative material has led the translator to introduce these additional conjunctions (enclosed in { }) which facilitate the integration of this 'supplementary material' with the 'translation' into a single unit.\footnote{At 24:24 RtgJob also provides an additional *waw* where an interpretative rendering is offered. A *waw* is also added by this translator in his rendering of 33:29 where the divergence of all three Aramaic versions is probably due to a shared (i.e. linguistic) inability to provide a proximate rendering of the Hebrew.}

C3. **Substitution**
The translator of RtgJob does not show any otherwise unattested substitutions of *waw*.

D. **Summary: Modifications unique to the respective Aramaic Versions**
The material presented thus far enables us to at least begin to answer the first question posed in the introduction, namely, 'How do the translators responsible for the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew book of Job treat and represent the *waw* conjunction in their respective renderings?'

Although both the Qumran and Syriac translations show otherwise unattested omissions both at the beginning of verses and medially, the Qumran translation tends to uniquely omit an initial *waw* (A1) when it appears at the beginning of a new section of Hebrew text. The majority of P-Job's unique omissions (B1) however come where the Hebrew text uses the *waw* to conjoin simple verbal clauses. In contrast to these versions, RtgJob provides only two possible cases where the *waw* may have been omitted (C1).

With respect to the addition of the conjunction, both 11Q10 and the Peshitta of Job provide numerous unique examples of the *waw* being supplied where it is not present in the MT. Both supply the *waw* medially (A2, B2) in order to establish an explicit coordinative link between two or more stichs as well as adding it verse-initially to facilitate a linkage with a preceding verse or verses. While 11Q10 and P-Job supply the conjunction in divergent translations in order to integrate supplementary material only on rare occasions, RtgJob's fewer additions of the *waw* occur almost exclusively in precisely these situations (C2). Furthermore, on the basis of the material studied, it appears that the Rabbinic targum (unlike the other two versions) virtually never provides the conjunction at the beginning or medially as a result of purely linguistic/stylistic considerations.

Analysis of the Aramaic versions' unique substitutions with respect to *waw* and 'Gabriel' with 'water' attested to by the targum are reversed in much of the Rabbinic material. Again it is difficult to determine whether the targum is the source of the material or whether the translator has drawn on rabbinic sources or traditions common to both.
shows that the Syriac translation (B3) and that of Qumran (A3) occasionally provide a contextually appropriate substitution for the MT conjunction and will also replace an element in the Hebrew with the Aramaic waw under the influence of linguistic and stylistic constraints. The Rabbinic Targum of Job however shows no evidence of either type of substitution with respect to this conjunction (C3).

A glance at Figure 1 below shows that 11Q10 and Peshitta Job show far more unique divergences in each category than does the Rabbinic Targum of Job. While the number of omissions in the Qumran and Peshitta texts is nearly identical, P-Job provides significantly more instances of addition and substitution than does 11QTargumJob. It is RtgJob however which seems to stand apart from the other two in terms of its unique treatment of the waw conjunction. As is the case in the other Aramaic versions, additions make up the largest single category, but it is important to note that the nature of RtgJob’s additions differs significantly in that the waw appears to be added almost exclusively when the targumist is in ‘supplementary mode’ and not when he is strictly speaking ‘translating’ the Hebrew. In fact, when the lack of even a single substitution and the dubious nature of the Rabbinic targum’s two examples of omission are both taken into account, it may be suggested that in its treatment of the waw, the Rabbinic targum is scrupulously literal in comparison with the other Aramaic versions.49

Figure 1: Unique Treatment of the w-Conjunction in the Aramaic Versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Total number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 An asterisked figure has been used for RtgJob’s total omissions (2*) to highlight the partial attestation of the modification in the textual witnesses. The total number of additions (6*) has also been provided with an asterisk, but in the latter case it is to point up the fundamental difference between the nature of the additions made by RtgJob (primarily in non-translational material) and the other two Aramaic versions (a translational response to linguistic/stylistic constraints).

49 The significance of this finding will be examined in part IV below.
to instances where two or more of the Aramaic versions appear to treat or represent the waw in the same manner in relation to the Masoretic Text.

A. Modifications common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job

In light of RtgJob’s demonstrated lack of unique deviations, it is perhaps not entirely surprising that the number of instances where the treatment of the waw is similar in all three Aramaic versions is quite low. In fact, the single shared omission and total lack of common substitutions amongst the three versions, parallels RtgJob’s preference for addition as opposed to omission or substitution.

A1. Minus common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job

The only omission shared by all three Aramaic versions is found at Job 36:26:

11Q10

RtgJob

P-Job

Behold, God is great, and we know him not; the number of his years (is) unsearchable. (RSV)

As is the case at 34:24, where this same Hebrew expression also occurs, all three Aramaic versions here provide renderings which deviate from their Hebrew source text. In the final clause of the Hebrew text of Job 36:26, the waw conjunction appears to introduce the predicate (so RSV, NRSV etc.) and thus understood serves no purpose in the Aramaic/Syriac renderings—all of which show a negated verbless clause. All three Aramaic translators have therefore omitted this waw in an attempt to come to grips with an unusual Hebrew text and create an intelligible target text for their readers/hearers. While both P-Job and the Qumran translation omit the conjunction on numerous occasions, this sole instance of a common omission amongst the three Aramaic versions constitutes the only certain example of omission of the conjunction in the Rabbinic targum.

A2. Plus common to 11Q10, RtgJob and P-Job

It is interesting and of some significance perhaps, that the three clear examples of an addition shared by all three versions, occur within the space of three verses in chapter 32. While the fragmentary nature of 11Q10’s rendering of


51 At 5:9 and 9:10, רון is negated with the expected particle Hebrew particle (пар) and rendered accordingly by both RtgJob (פייו) and P-Job (די). At Job 34:24 (פייו-פייו), however, the cognate Aramaic verbal negation particle is employed with no variation in the renderings of RtgJob and P-Job.

52 All three versions do provide a waw between 37:11a and b, but in the case of RtgJob it is apparent from the Mss (see D. Stec, p. 259) that the addition of the conjunction is directly linked to a supplementation of the Hebrew text רון, ‘and the wind (scatters the cloud of its/his rain)’, by the translator. This further illustrates the tendency outlined above: whereas 11Q10 and P-Job will provide waw frequently to conjoin independent propositions, RtgJob primarily uses it...
32:15 complicates any comparison with both the MT and the other versions, the following verse 16 of the same chapter provides ample illustration:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{32:16} & \quad \text{joined the exception above, while nevertheless (וֹמָה} \text{. (וּלָּא} \text{כָּבֵר בְּלָא} \text{עַמָּדָה}} \\
\text{11Q10} & \quad \text{to the weight of the textual evidence does not mean the} \\
\text{RtgJob} & \quad \text{MBNIFL, (interpreting the example of an example of an}} \\
\text{P-Job} & \quad \text{most commentators' 'they were both introduced with the} \\
\end{align*}
\]

When I had waited, for they spake not, but stood still, ([and]) answered no more; AV

And am I to wait, because they do not speak, because they stand there, (and) answer no more? (NRSV)

While the MT merely juxtaposes the positive and succeeding negative propositions, all three Aramaic versions provide the waw which then serves to explicitly co-ordinate the phrases in translation ("... they stand there, (and) answer no more?"). Similarly in 32:13, where a positive verbal clause is followed by a negative clause in the MT (אַתְנִיהוּ לָא תִּהְיֶה לָא אֱלֹהִים מָנָא), all three Aramaic versions of Job again provide the waw conjunction. And, as already mentioned, a similar situation seems to be behind the shared addition of the conjunction at 32:15. Although in verse 15, 11Q10 does not preserve the actual negative particle in its Aramaic rendering, the MT behind the translation (וָאֵלְכָנָה, 'they are discomfited; they do not answer') is again a positive verbal clause followed by a negative one. The fact that the usually conservative translator of RtgJob has joined the other two versions in providing the conjunction here may perhaps be taken as an indication that the normal constraints of fidelity to the Hebrew text have for whatever reason been overridden by a desire for idiomatic Aramaic.

One caveat must nevertheless be raised with regard to RtgJob's additions in all three of these verses: the fact that these additions, as was the case with the targum's unique omissions, are not found uniformly across the Mss tradition of RtgJob raises questions regarding the originality of the additions. When viewed in the light of the other Aramaic versions however, the weight of the textual evidence does seem to support RtgJob's divergence from the MT here in chapter 32.

in situations where the Hebrew text has been supplemented or altered for other reasons. At 39:1, where both 11Q10 and P-Job add the waw between the two halves of the verse, RtgJob provides a different conjunction (לָא).

53 The odd verse out in this sequence, 32:14, also contains negative propositions, but they are both introduced by waw in the MT.

54 Although it is by no means certain because the end of the preceding line is not preserved, most commentators (see for instance Editio princeps, p. 53) have assumed that 11Q10 רדס 'וּלָּא כָּבֵר, 'they were silent', corresponds to Heb. רָדַּס שָנָא, 'they did not answer again'. If so, this is an example of 11Q10 opting for an interpretative translation much like P-Job utilised in 32:11 (interpreting רדס, 'I waited', as meaning שָנָא, 'I was silent').

55 Also interesting is P-Job's tendency to provide the conjunction in the context outlined above, while nevertheless omitting the waw between simple verbal clauses (see B1 above).

56 32:13—majority reading=waw plus; exceptions (ן ג יז כ ל ק); 32:15—majority reading=waw plus; exceptions (ב נ); 32:16—majority reading=waw plus; exception (י).
B. Modifications unique to 11Q10 and RtgJob

B1. Plus common to 11Q10 and RtgJob

Again we find that it is only in their addition (rather than substitution or omission) of waw that the Qumran translator and Rabbinic Targum translator find any common ground which is not also attested in P-Job. In fact, only one such addition occurs and it does so in the respective translations of 37:13:

11Q10

RtgJob

P-Job

Whether for correction, or for his land, or for love, he causes it to happen. (RSV)

This verse, coming at the end of a section detailing divine sovereignty over water in its various states (ice, rain etc.), suggests the various reasons for God's orchestration of the rain clouds (v. 12). While P-Job provides co-ordinating conjunctions before the latter two alternatives (w'n l'hsyd', w'n l'r') as is the case in English ('or'), both the Qumran translation (2x) and RtgJob (3x) show their addition of conjunctions not in parallel with the Syriac translation but instead in sections which deviate (in RtgJob's case, substantially) from the Hebrew. For instance in RtgJob's expansion of Hebrew MT l'xnx-DX, 'for (the good of) the land' (XmiB ^X1? *rn XHTD Xna,i7n, 'gushing rain for the trees of the mountains and the hills') the targumist supplies a waw to co-ordinate the final two nouns. Similarly in the translation of MT TOnV-DX with 'or soft [rain] of charity/kindness for the fields and the vineyards and fruit', RtgJob provides two conjunctions which serve the same purpose. We see that in RtgJob's rendering of each Hebrew clause, the waw has been provided at least once. However, the additions have come not between clauses as in P-Job but between phrases which form part of the targumist's expanded translation. The Qumran version's double rendering of MT l'xnx-DX, 'or for mercy/love', with 'or for a famine and for its want', also shows the use of waw to co-ordinate supplementary material with translation. The following words in 11Q10, 'and if (i.e. or) a case of law-breaking', have no equivalent in the MT and the motivation for their addition is unclear.

57 C. Mangan, The Targum of Job, p. 81 n. 9.
58 Editio princeps, p. 68, suggests that the translator here has provided a double rendering based on 100ח, 'lack, want'. It is difficult to determine whether the translator has made an error here or alternatively has seen the exchange of resh for daleth as a means of making sense of the verse.
59 Reading here with F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11, pp. 145, 146. These later editors have support for this reading from Tg Onk Exod 22:8 (equiv to MT 1018 רדב תּוּשׁ הָוָה).
Again, as is the case in RtgJob, the *waw* is here being used in the Qumran translation to introduce material with no correspondence in the Hebrew.\(^60\)

While this example of a modification shared by 11Q10 and RtgJob shows that the Qumran translator may also use *waw* to incorporate material and divergent interpretation into his translation, the fact that this is the sole instance to be found in the sample confirms that unlike RtgJob, this is not the primary cause for the Qumran translator’s introduction of the conjunction across the version as a whole.

C. Modifications unique to RtgJob and P-Job

There are no instances of modifications of the *waw* shared by these two versions alone.\(^61\)

D. Modifications unique to 11Q10 and P-Job

D1. *Minus*

At three locations within the sample, both the Qumran and Syriac translations appear to omit the *waw* which is present in the MT and also preserved by the Rabbinic Targum.\(^62\)

Verses 23–25 of chapter 21 come at the end of a sustained argument offered by Job: divine justice which allows the wicked to live long and prosper while deferring their punishment to their children is no justice at all. Verse 23 and 24 describe the demise of the prosperous evildoer (‘One dies in full prosperity, being wholly at ease and secure … etc’) while verse 25 brings home the full force of Job’s complaint. One commentator has suggested that the translator of 11Q10 may have omitted the *waw* before the demonstrative due to the Qumran translator’s preceding omission of v. 23.\(^64\)

However, P-Job’s similar

\(^{60}\) 11Q10’s final addition does show some similarity to the usage in P-Job, however the *waw* introduces a clause rather than a phrase.

\(^{61}\) This conclusion substantiates the suggestion of H. Szpek, ‘On the influence of the Targum on the Peshitta …’, p. 144, that RtgJob tends to follow the MT more closely in its representation of the *waw* than does the Peshitta of Job.

\(^{62}\) At 34:29, both 11Q10 and P-Job lack the conjunction where it occurs in MT before an apodosis (MT: *וְאָלָּלָה אֲלֵךְ*), and also omit a subsequent occurrence of the *waw* in this verse. As we have seen above (B2), this treatment of the conjunction before an apodosis has already been documented in P-Job. English translations such as ASV, NIV, RSV and NRSV also omit this conjunction in their renderings of the Hebrew text.

\(^{63}\) The conjunction is however preserved by revisions of the KJV up to and including the ASV.

\(^{64}\) B. E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation …*, p. 197, notes that were verse 23 indeed
omission of the conjunction here suggests that it is more likely that the waw has been considered stylistically unnecessary by the Qumran translator irrespective of the presence or absence of verse 23 in the Qumran version. 65 Again at 21:4, neither the Qumran nor Syriac translator includes the waw where it appears between stichs in the Hebrew verse (תָּנַכָּה לָאֹתָם שְׁתי (הָאָמָּה-מְדוּרָת) לָא תְּכַפֵּר דְּרָה). Many English versions based on the MT similarly omit this conjunction in translation (i.e. RSV ‘As for me, is my complaint against man? ( ) Why should I not be impatient?’) despite its presence in the source text.

D2.  Plus

While the Qumran and Syriac translations share only a few common omissions, such is not the case with additions made by both translators at the same juncture in their translation of the Hebrew text. As both the Qumran and Syriac translators show the addition of the waw in verse-initial positions independently, it is not entirely surprising that both also provide the conjunction at identical locations in their respective Aramaic target texts. One example is to be found at 23:5 where Job responds to Eliphaz with a plea that his case might be heard,

I would learn what he would answer me, and understand what he would say to me (RSV)

The motivation for such an addition is to be found in the semantic and structural links between verse 5 and the preceding verse 4 (‘I would lay my case before him and fill my mouth with arguments’). Clearly both translators have concluded that the addition of a waw is required to reflect the perceived relationship between the sets of stichs. 66 In three other verses within the sample, both the Qumran and Peshitta translators provide the waw at the beginning of the verse where the MT does not attest it and the Rabbinic targum does not supply it. 67 Even more common however are the instances where both translators appear to have felt the need to supply the waw conjunction medially in verses—primarily between successive stichs in a single verse. This shared response to a perceived lack of explicit conjunction in MT is illustrated

65 H. Szpek, Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job . . ., p. 121, notes: ‘often in [P-Job] where both stichs of a verse begin with the waw conjunctive, the second will almost universally be preserved—indicating that the translator viewed it as an immediate continuation of the previous stich—but the first waw will only be preserved if that verse begins a new topical unit or if the entire verse is a direct continuation of the previous one.’

66 For P-Job’s unique additions of this type, see p. 97 above.

67 See also 33:27, 38:29 and 40:13.
by Job 33:11:

\[\text{33:11} \quad \text{עשת באה רוחה (ו) ישמר על-ארחות.} \]

[... 11Q10

ישיר בשנה רוחה (ו) ישמר על שערים.

\text{P-Job}\]

... he puts my feet in the stocks, (and) watches all my paths. (RSV, NRSV)

While many English versions such as the AV, ASV and NIV do not diverge from the MT in their translations of this verse, the revisers of the RSV and NRSV illustrate that the Aramaic translators are not alone in providing the \textit{waw} in order to conjoin two functionally synonymous stichs which in the Hebrew are left merely apposed.\(^6\) In fact at more than a dozen other locations both the Qumran and Syriac translators provide the conjunction at the same place vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text.\(^9\) When combined with the initial plusses discussed above, these shared medial additions would seem to constitute a rather substantial agreement of approach between the Qumran and Peshitta translators.

D3. Substitution

Substitutions shared exclusively by 11Q10 and P-Job also occur but with less frequency than common additions and their analysis is, in any case, less clear-cut. At 21:7 both translators provide a \textit{waw} in place of the Hebrew \textit{כִּ}.\(^9\)

Why do the wicked live, reach old age, (and) grow mighty in power? (RSV, NRSV)

Neither 11Q10 nor P-Job include the Heb. particle \textit{כִּי}, 'also', in their translations, preferring instead to restructure the second half of verse 7 through the use of a conjunction (in P-Job before the preceding verbal form \textit{מִתְקָנָה}, 'grow old'). Although capable of serving in different capacities, this Hebrew particle here appears to function as little more than a co-ordinator and is in

\(^6\) Both 11Q10 and P-Job diverge from the MT in not preserving an imperfect in their Aramaic/Syriac translations. The translator of 11Q10 however—in his translation of MT \textit{ישמר}, 'he kept, guarded, observed, restrained etc.'—provides a more specific rendering, \textit{רָכַב}, 'he blocked', under the influence of the semantic environment (feet withheld in stocks) in order to smooth out a rare Hebrew construction. For more extensive discussion regarding the renderings in the respective versions, see F. Martinez et al., \textit{Qumran Cave 11} (DJD 23), p. 130. See H. Szpek, \textit{Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job} . . . , pp. 182-83.

\(^9\) See 33:9, 25; 36:25, 26, 27; 38:24; 39:7, 21, 25, 26; 40:8, 30; 41:26. At 37:14, both 11Q10 and P-Job show a medial addition which reflects an uncertainty about the precise division of the verse into stichs.
fact translated as such by some English translators. The fact that both translators have performed the same substitution here (waw for נ) is evidence that both Qumran and Peshitta translators have understood the nuance of the Hebrew and provided the waw conjunction as a means of rendering the source text into idiomatic Aramaic/Syriac. Other shared substitutions are prompted by an interest in the idiomatic Aramaic rendering of exclamationary particles and indicators of alternation.

E. Summary: Modifications Shared by Two or More Aramaic Versions

What light does the preceding analysis shed on the question of how the various Aramaic versions relate to each other in terms of their treatment of this conjunction? (See Figure 2.) While all three Aramaic versions do, on rare occasion, modify their source text in the same manner at the same location, the number of such occurrences is comparatively small. The single shared omission (A1) appears to be a common response to a difficult Hebrew text, while the handful of shared pluses (A2) occur under a specific set of circumstances (positive clause+negative clause) in the source text. In this case, the priority of fidelity to the formal features of the MT so readily apparent in RtgJob has been overridden by the demands of a linguistically intelligible Aramaic rendering.

The single instance of a plus being shared by the two 'targums' (11Q10 and RtgJob) indicates that the Qumran translator may also on rare occasion use waw to incorporate divergent interpretations into his translation. It is significant to note that this agreement does not reflect an alteration of RtgJob's policy towards the addition of the waw, but represents a departure from the Qumran translator's primary linguistic/stylistic motivation for supplying the conjunction.

The lack of a single agreement between the Syriac translation of Job and the Rabbinic targum of Job suggests that except in the extremely isolated cases discussed above, the two Rabbinic and Syriac translators have little in common in their treatment of the waw conjunction in Job.

By contrast however, the Qumran 'targum' and the Peshitta of Job show a significant number of shared modifications. While the number of common omissions (3) and substitutions (3) are significant in the light of the other relationships shown on Figure 2, it is the shared pluses which constitute by far the single largest category (19). In fact, a comparison of Figures 1 and 2 show that, of the total number of waw additions made by the Qumran translator,

70 B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 39.3.4a, Example no. 12 (Isa. 14:7–8). The other major Hebrew adverbial coordinator, נְנַח, may also function purely as a coordinator (Isaiah 4:10).

71 36:30.

72 Both translators provide waw for Hebrew נ at 39:10 where it introduces an alternative following an interrogative. While both translators deviate from MT in marking alternatives at 40:9 and 40:25, the manner in which they do so is not strictly speaking identical and therefore, although they are obviously responding to the same 'problem' in the Hebrew, they are not included in the total for this category.
more are shared with the Peshitta of Job than are unique to 11Q10.

Figure 2: Modifications of ν-Conjunction shared by Two or more Aramaic Versions

![Diagram showing the number of agreements between different versions of Job]

As with the comparison of the unique treatment of waw (Section II), an analysis of the Aramaic versions shared treatment of the conjunction strongly suggests that it is the Qumran and Syriac translators who line up together in their willingness to omit, substitute and, most frequently, add the conjunction in order to produce an idiomatic Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew. The Rabbinic targum of Job by contrast shows a remarkable fidelity to the Masoretic text in its representation of the waw. The restriction of RtgJob's addition of the conjunction to what might be called 'non-translational' passages, when coupled with the almost complete lack of substitutions and omissions of the waw leads to the inevitable conclusion that it is by this measure at least, the most 'literal' of the Aramaic versions of Job.

Before turning to a discussion of the possible implications of the above conclusion, we would do well to first consider a methodological question which has been postponed until now. It may have been noted that the foregoing discussion has alternated indiscriminately between two sets of terminology in describing the network of relationships between the respective Aramaic versions and their putative Hebrew Vorlagen. It is obvious that theoretically neutral terms such as 'plus' and 'minus' need not necessarily reflect the translator's activity suggested by 'addition' and 'omission'. To unpack this statement and rephrase it in the form of a question: what is the likelihood that it is the respective Vorlagen which are largely to blame for the Qumran and Syriac translator's common divergence from the MT? Is a recent commentator correct when he suggests that it is impossible to determine whether the

---

73 See 'Preliminary Discussions' above.
74 Apart from a single instance (see above, e.g. RtgJob 40:10) in which it is quite possible that the modification of the waw stems from a copyist's error (i.e. during the history of the Aramaic text), the present study finds no evidence that the divergent treatment of the waw has resulted from errors or alterations made during the copying of the present Aramaic texts from previous Aramaic Vorlagen. Therefore the use of Vorlage is restricted to the putative Hebrew texts which lay before the respective translators.
omission of the *waw* has any text critical significance. It is hoped that the material provided thus far has shown that we have grounds for a slightly more optimistic view of the situation. It seems evident that the similarities in the divergence of 11Q10 and P-Job from MT in terms of the minus and plus of *waw* stem primarily from translator intervention. For methodological reasons however, consideration must be given to the question of whether or not the strong affinity between P-Job and 11Q10 over and against RtgJob with regard to the *waw* is the result, not of common linguistic/stylistic constraints but rather of a largely similar Hebrew Vorlage. While it is beyond the scope of the present study to present all the relevant evidence, a few considerations make the similar Vorlage theory unlikely. A comparison of linguistic/stylistic modifications in 11Q10 and P-Job present many other shared phenomena. Both 11Q10 and P-Job show numerous shared modifications of other minor functional units (apparently required in Aramaic but not in Hebrew), thus the addition and omission of the *waw* fits within the general translation profile of both versions. In addition, in the area of syntax the texts also display syntactical and word order divergences which may or may not alter the meaning but often result in considerable textual dislocation. It seems to stretch the limits of credulity to suggest that the common grammatical adjustments, shared syntactic modifications and similar treatment of the *waw* could have already been made in both the Hebrew Vorlagen of these two independent Aramaic versions. The fact that many of these modifications would not necessarily be expected in Biblical Hebrew but coincidentally happen to produce entirely acceptable Aramaic in both versions lends further weight to the argument against the positing of a common Vorlage. All in all, it seems most

---

75 B. E. Zuckerman, *The Process of Translation…*, p. 351. It should be noted that this conclusion might well have been altered had Zuckerman’s exhaustive treatment of the Qumran targum been extended beyond the first 15 columns.

76 Notwithstanding scholarly reservations regarding the utility and significance of the variants preserved in the Kennicott and De Rossi collections (see, for instance, E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd edn (1995), pp. 40–41), the 18th-century collations do apparently provide ample evidence of the lack of uniformity in the transmission history of the text. Interestingly, it is the modifications which are shared by all three Aramaic versions (e.g. addition before negative phrases: 32:13, 15, 16; omission of *waw* at 36:26) which are also supported by the Hebrew MSS (Ken. 18, 80, 166 et al. also supply the *waw*; of these only MS 18 also omits at 36:26). Other parallels such as P-Job’s double omission of the conjunction between simple verbal phrases at 38:3 (MS Ken. 196) do occur, but where the Syriac translator is quite consistent in omitting the conjunction in similar linguistic contexts (40:7, 11 and 42:4) the Hebrew MSS show no deviation from the MT. In general then, the sporadic nature of the Hebrew MS modifications provides a stark contrast to the more extensive, systemic agreements found in 11Q10 and P-Job. Furthermore, the fact that substitutions of *waw* (both Aramaic X for Heb. *waw* and Aramaic *waw* for Heb. X) seem to lack parallels in the Hebrew MSS would seem to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that it is the translators’ flexibility with regard to the representation of the conjunction which is responsible for their deviations from the MT.

77 See for example 37:13 (omission of suffix), 37:17 (modification of relative pronoun), 39:4 (substitution of gender), 39:6 (modification of number), etc.

78 See for instance 21:6, 27:2, 32:12, 33:12; transpositions e.g. 22:17, 42:1.

79 Even if—against the run of evidence—one maintains that the differences between 11Q10 and P-Job are due to Hebrew source text variation, we are then still faced with the obvious implication that 11Q10 and P-Job stand apart from the Rabbinic Targum in terms of the type of Vorlage used. Assuming this unlikely scenario, the Rabbinic targum will have been based on a
likely that the demonstrated affinity of 11Q10 and P-Job over and against the Rabbinic Targum stems from a common response to the linguistic/stylistic demands of the Qumran and Peshitta translators' similar (but not identical) Aramaic dialects.

IV. Wider Implications: the Aramaic versions of Job and the Definition of ‘Targum’

The remaining portion of this paper will be given over to a consideration of the final question posed in the introduction, namely: What light, if any, does the present analysis shed on the wider questions of the definition of ‘targum’ and the classification of the Aramaic versions? The field of targumic studies has benefited recently from Alexander Samely’s attempt to come to grips with questions of form and genre in the Pentateuchal targumim.80 While the present study deals with neither translations of the Pentateuch nor targumim exclusively, the preceding comparison of Aramaic versions may provide a useful testing ground for some of the conclusions Samely arrives at with regard to the literary form of ‘targum’.81 According to Samely, the priority of the preservation of the original wording of the Hebrew leads the targumist to overwhelmingly favour the presentation of exegesis in his translation text through additions to the text as opposed to omissions.82 Because ‘Targum is an Aramaic narrative paraphrase of the biblical text in exegetical dependence on its wording’, the targumist is careful to preserve as much of the Hebrew original as possible, while at the same time presenting the results of his exegesis of the original text largely through expansions in the Aramaic text.83 If we turn to the conclusions arrived at here with regard to RtgJob, we see that the basic characteristics of ‘targum’ arrived at in the Pentateuch by Samely seem also to hold true for the Rabbinic Targum of Job. As we have seen, RtgJob deviates from the MT in its representation of the waw almost exclusively in situations where it is incorporating divergent material into its Aramaic text rather than, as is primarily the case with the other two versions, in response

---


81 A. Samely, The Interpretation of Speech..., p. 159, in fact suggests as much when he tentatively notes: ‘I deliberately avoid the label “targum” in connexion with the Qumran Job, because on the basis of the characteristics of targumic form established in this study, it seems to belong to the group of translations mentioned [LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate] and not to that of the targumic texts [Ps-J, N, M, O, F and C]’.

82 A single example of omission amongst the 100 passages analysed by Samely does not prevent him from stating this tendency in particularly strong terms: ‘... the purposeful omission of parts of the Hebrew ... is practically never employed’ (p. 74).

to the stylistic-linguistic demands of translating Hebrew into Aramaic. As well, the omission of the waw—that smallest of lexemes in Hebrew—is virtually unattested in the Rabbinic targum of Job. This too seems to corroborate Samely’s conclusions regarding targum’s preservation of the formal features of the Hebrew text in Aramaic translation. On the other hand, Samely’s observations seem not to apply to either the Qumran or Peshitta translations of Job. It is readily apparent that although these translators may retain a waw present in MT on a given occasion, it is often the case that both translators feel free to add, omit or substitute the conjunction in order to create an Aramaic translation which meets the linguistic-stylistic expectations of their intended audiences.

While Samely’s treatment of the issues is limited to questions of literary form among the targumim—and more specifically the pentateuchal targumim, the present discussion of both Aramaic and Syriac versions may perhaps be brought into still greater focus by the late Michael Weitzman’s comparison of the Targum and Peshitta of Chronicles. In explaining what he sees as Peshitta Chronicles ‘loose’ relationship to the MT he cites factors which may have been anterior to the translation (such as deficiencies in either the Hebrew Vorlage or in the translator’s own knowledge of Hebrew) as well as subsequent considerations, such as inner-Syriac corruption. But, according to Weitzman, the difference between the Peshitta and Targum of Chronicles is, in fact more fundamental:

In the latter [i.e. the Rabbinic Targum of Chronicles], in principle, every element of the Hebrew source has a counterpart in the Aramaic rendering. It is true that the Jewish targums often present additional matter, which may relate in various ways to the Aramaic elements that have direct counterparts in the Hebrew text. It remains however, a basic characteristic of the Jewish targums that every element of the original is expounded, normally in the original order. The semantic link between each element in the original and its Aramaic counterpart in the targum is almost always clear: exceptions are so few that we should rather attribute them to our ignorance of the underlying exegetical process than deny that any semantic link ever existed.

Although Weitzman’s specific treatment of the Aramaic versions of Chronicles may not be explored here in any detail, his comments regarding the classification of Peshitta Chronicles suggest that the above distinction is fundamental to his conclusion that ‘one cannot maintain that P[eshitta] is a “pure Jewish targum” without having to revise drastically the definition of targum’.

With respect to the Aramaic versions of Job, it seems fair to say that up

---

84 A. Samely, The Interpretation of Speech..., p. 174: ‘A number of additions take the form of additional clauses, usually preceding the original sentence. In these cases, the new text is cohered with the parts reflecting the original by use of a conjunction like waw, thus imitating the style of the Hebrew text.’


87 M. P. Weitzman, ‘Is the Peshitta of Chronicles a Targum?’, p. 192. Of all the material presented by Weitzman in favour of maintaining a firm distinction between Targum and non-Targumic versions of Chronicles, it is this formal distinction which is by far the most compelling.
until now the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job has usually been contrasted with the Rabbinic targum of Job (and the targumic tradition in general) as representing a more 'literal' rendering of the Hebrew text—more specifically: 11QtgJob lacks the substantial expansions which are found in the latter.88 While the present paper does nothing to contest this distinction, it does offer a rather different perspective in suggesting that although RtqJob may indeed be more 'expansive' in the sense just outlined, it is, at the same time, far more 'literal' than either 11Q10 and the Peshitta of Job in terms of its consistent and scrupulous rendering of the Hebrew source text in 'translation' mode.89 Although it would be incautious to forget that the assessment of translation approach must be undertaken on the basis of a broad range of indices, it is hoped that this analysis has provided evidence which strongly suggests that, in terms of its representation of the Hebrew text, the Aramaic translation from Qumran shares more with the Peshitta of Job than it does with its nominal cousin the Rabbinic Targum of Job.90

To conclude then, we would wish to pose here a variant of the question Michael Weitzman has asked of the Peshitta of Chronicles: 'Is the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job a "targum"?' The question is of course at base a definitional one and therefore any answer to this question will be necessarily dependent on a particular understanding of the term 'targum' itself. Although this is neither the time nor the place for a thorough-going survey of the various meanings which have been assigned to the term 'targum', it is clear that this may be stretched or contracted depending on who is using it.91 Klaus Beyer's introductory comments to his treatment of the Qumran

---

88 See for instance M. Delcor, 'Le Targum de Job et L'Araméen du Temps de Jésus', RevSeRel, p. 237: 'Il ne contient pas encore les paraphrases ou amplifications des targums postérieurs.' And most recently B. Zuckerman in a brief article for the Anchor Bible Dictionary (p. 868, III): 'By and large, the Cave II Targum seems to adhere to its Heb Vorlage quite closely, certainly far more closely than turgums of the Palestinian tradition preserved by the early rabbis...'. See also Editio Princeps, p. 7, and J. Gray, 'The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the light of the Qumran Targum', ZAW 86 (1974), pp. 335-39.

89 What would in normal usage constitute something of a paradox is entirely feasible as long as 'literal' and 'expansive' are not taken as polar opposites, but as complementary approaches which correspond to, in the first case, approach to translation, and in the latter, integration of additional textual material. This combination was identified as an essential feature of targumic rendering by at least the end of the nineteenth century (C. H. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel (1886), p. 125: 'Also selbst bei der grössten Freiheit und bei der ungebundensten Wilkuer dem Geiste gegenüber die sklavischste Treue gegen den Buchstaben—das ist die Signatur des Targum!').

90 It is hoped that a doctoral dissertation, nearing completion under the direction of Drs Peter Hayman and Timothy Lim (Edinburgh University), will provide further material to support the suggestion being advanced in the present paper.

91 P. Alexander, 'Targumim', Anchor Bible Dictionary VI, p. 321, provides a concise but typically illuminating summary of issues of terminology. While Alexander seems to favour the limitation of the term 'Targum' in biblical studies to early Jewish Aramaic translation of the Bible, the conclusions of A. Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch (1991), p. 297, regarding the Greek translator Symmachus' translation approach and use of Rabbinc exegesis lead her to refer to the version as 'a Greek Targum, or Tannaitic Septuagint'. Raphael Weiss's monograph on RtqJob (רְתַגוּמ) may perhaps offer a clue to one source of terminological 'confusion': while C. Mangan's English translation and annotation of the text is entitled simply The Targum of Job, the English summary of Weiss's work in Modern Hebrew is more specific: The Aramaic Targum to Job. Because in modern Hebrew תרגום may denote generic 'translation' (e.g.
Aramaic translations nicely illustrate this semantic elasticity:

By Targums one means Jewish Aramaic translations of the Old Testament, in the broader sense also the Christian Aramaic ones. There are Jewish Aramaic Targums to all the books of the Old Testament with the exceptions of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The Samaritan Targum includes only the Pentateuch, the Syrian Bible translation, the entire OT. [Author's trgm.]

While Beyer is seemingly reluctant in practice to bestow upon the 'Syrian Bible translation' the title of 'targum' he nevertheless initially appears to extend the term to include 'Christian Aramaic' translation alongside the Jewish Aramaic versions. As we have seen however, recent work by Weitzman and Samely in the Aramaic versions has led them to limit the English term 'targum' to a particular—essentially Rabbinic93—mode of bible translation which uniquely combines a high degree of 'word for word' translation with an often radical expansion of the Hebrew text.94 If this latter, more narrowly conceived definition of 'targum' is to be adopted, it is suggested that the Qumran translation of Job might be more appropriately included with the Peshitta of Job under the rubric of 'Aramaic translation', leaving the title of 'targum' to its counterpart in the Rabbinic Aramaic translation tradition.95

---

92 Klaus Beyer, Die Aramaischen Texte vom Toten Meer (1984), p. 273. One wonders whether the inclusion of the Qumran translations in the category 'targum' has perhaps prompted Beyer's wider definition of the term.

93 A. Samely, 'Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew?', p. 99, further limits his definition of 'targum' as being (among other things) '... based on rabbinic reading assumptions'.

94 Although P. V. M. Flesher, 'The Targumim in the Context of Rabbinic Literature', in J. Neusner (ed.), An Introduction to Rabbinic Literature (1994), pp. 611-29, is correct both in his drawing of a distinction between the translation approach of the two targums of Job and in his characterisation of the 'Rabbinic' targum as somewhat similar to the Palestinian pentateuchal targums in its mixture of 'literal translation' and 'expansive material', his subsequent assessment of the 'Qumran' targum as 'highly literal with practically no additional material' would appear to require some revision in light of the present study.

95 An excerpt from Celine Mangan's introduction (1992) to her excellent translation of the Rabbinic targum of Job (C. Mangan, The Targum of Job) suggests that terminology may not be irrelevant even in the scholarly reception of a given text. In the introduction to her translation, she suggests that if LXX Job's mention of a 'Syrian book of Job' refers to an '... aggadic elaboration rather than to a targum proper ... it shows that such midrashic elaborations were already connected with the Book of Job, as distinct from the Qumran targum which is surprisingly literal' (italics mine). While a reference to 11Q10 as 'literal' is not unexpected, the use of 'surprisingly' is, frankly, surprising. If in this case 'surprise' has involved a frustration of expectations, then we are entitled to enquire of Mangan as to where these expectations that the Qumran Aramaic text would contain midrashic or aggadic (i.e. Rabbinic) elaborations have come from? One suspects that the lack of midrashic and aggadic elaborations in the Qumran text would have been far less 'surprising' to Mangan had 11Q10 been known as simply the 'Qumran Aramaic translation of Job' rather than 'the Qumran Targum of Job'. While the recently published edition of 11Q10 (F. Martinez et al., Qumran Cave 11), and F. Martinez, The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated (1994), 2nd edn, retain the official title '11Qtargum Job' assigned by Editio Princeps, G. Vermes, The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English (1998), p. 431, provides a possible alternative when he assigns to 11Q10 the rubric '11Qr[a]maic Job' in his English translation of the DSS.
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