

has been playing in Afghanistan. Most Pashtuns are actually bilingual, and lexical items are transferred from one language into the other with total freedom whenever there occurs a need for such a transplantation. They often appear in poems (though not in folk poetry) and in those texts which are published with disregard for puristic ambitions. The Afghan classics did not restrain themselves from using them either.

The investigation of the process of development of the system of analytical comparison in Eastern Iranian languages is especially difficult because most of the peoples who speak those languages have no literary tradition. It does not exist in any of the languages of Pamir and inside the group of Dardic languages, Kashmiri is the only one which has its own literature, even though its literary tradition is of relatively recent origin. The Dravidian language Brahui has never had any writing and it is only now that the first steps towards creating a literature are taken. Such samples of these languages and dialects as have been collected in recent years do not prove ideal as the source of information about the actual system of comparison: they were not collected with this aim in view, and consequently all significant findings are purely accidental. The extant descriptive grammars are also very reticent on this subject, if they deal with it at all. Even the Pashto language itself does not make the task any easier, even though it possesses some literary relics. The oldest of those come from the period between the 12th and the 15th centuries. As far as earlier Pashto literature is concerned, some poems are also known which, although composed in the 8th—11th centuries, have been preserved in manuscripts of a definitely later origin⁴⁰. Nothing is known today about any writings that might have been created earlier than that. Dating the origins of the first relics is also the subject of many controversies; the 13th century and the 'Anthology of Afghan Saints' by Suleiman Maku is generally quoted as the most reliable date⁴¹. All these factors contribute to the character of present discussion which, out of necessity, must be tentative and hypothetical.

⁴⁰ Дворянков Н. А., Introduction to Асланов, М. Г., *Афганско-русский словарь (пушту)*, Москва 1966, p. 6.

⁴¹ *Большая советская энциклопедия*, Москва 1970, 2, p. 428.

BASTIAAN JONGELING

THE JOB TARGUM FROM QUMRAN CAVE 11 (11QtgJob)

1. THE MANUSCRIPT

Among the numerous manuscripts which from 1947 onwards turned up from several caves in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea¹ the Aramaic book of Job from cave 11, which was edited in 1971 with introduction, translation and notes², takes an important place.

The manuscript is in the possession of the Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem, which bought it, together with other manuscripts from the same cave, from Bedouins of the desert of Judah who discovered the cave in 1956. Another manuscript of the same lot contained not only a great number of Psalms known already from the canonical book of Psalms (but often appearing

¹ There are many general works on the finds in the desert of Judah, e.g. M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York 1955/London 1956, which has been translated into several languages; *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York/London 1958, translated into German, French and Swedish; in Eastern Europe: W. Tyloch, *Rekopisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym*, Warszawa 1963; I. D. Amusin published the first volume of *Teksty Kumrana*, Moskva 1971. A most interesting account of the beginning of the discoveries has been written by J. C. Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran*, Westwood N. J. 1965; German edition: *Das Abenteuer von Qumran*, Kasel 1967.

² J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O. P. et A. S. van der Woude (avec la collaboration de B. Jongeling), *Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumran*, Leiden 1971.

in a different order) or from Greek and Syriac sources, but also some hymns completely new to us³.

The Palestine Archaeological Museum had to pay a lot of money to the Bedouins, who, having become wise by previous experience with manuscripts, had raised their prices. The trustees of the Museum had even to trench on the Museum's foundation capital. They did, however, not hesitate to do this, in order to prevent that those precious remains of remote ages should get lost owing to unwise treatment.

Since the Jordan government of that time by decree of May 8, 1961, laid claim to the proprietary rights of all manuscripts found in the desert of Judah, the Museum trustees could not sell the scrolls. In order, however, to restore the foundation capital they offered the rights of first studying and editing the manuscripts to scientific institutions all over the world on payment of a certain amount of money. By virtue of this regulation the Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences, financed by the Dutch Organization for Pure Scientific Research, acquired the rights to edit a number of more or less fragmentary manuscripts from the eleventh cave⁴,

³ J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11* (11 QPs^a). *Discoveries in the Judean Desert IV*, Oxford 1965; *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, Ithaca N. Y. 1967.

⁴ A number of fragments have provisionally been published: J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O. P., *Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumrân*, *Revue Biblique* 72, 1965, pp. 210—217; Lévi. IX, 23—X, 2 dans un texte de Qumrân, *Bibel und Qumran* (Festschrift H. Bardtke), Berlin 1968, pp. 153—155; *Fragments d'un manuscrit de Psaumes de Qumran* (11 QPs^b), *Revue Biblique* 74, 1967, pp. 408—412; *Un petit rouleau de Psaumes apocryphes* (11 QPsAp^a), *Tradition und Glaube* (Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn), Göttingen 1971, pp. 128—139.

A. S. van der Woude, *Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI*, *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14, Leiden 1965, pp. 354—373; *Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran* (11 QBer), *Bibel und Qumran* (Festschrift H. Bardtke), Berlin 1968, pp. 253—258; *Fragmente des Buches Jubiläen aus Qumran Höhle XI* (11 QJub), *Tradition und Glaube* (Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn), Göttingen 1971, pp. 140—146; (together with M. de Jonge), *11Q Melchisedek and the New Testament*, *New Testament Studies* 12, 1965—1966, pp. 301—326.

B. Jongeling, *Publication provisoire d'un fragment provenant de*

the most extensive and most important among them being the book of Job in Aramaic.

The publication was committed to the charge of professor J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O. P., of the Catholic University of Nijmegen, and professor A. S. van der Woude of the State University of Groningen, and in 1971 the publication came from the press of the well known publishing firm E. J. Brill at Leiden. An introduction of 9 pages is followed by the Aramaic text with translation and notes, the text being printed on the left page, the translation on the right, and the notes under both of them. Introduction, translation and notes are composed in French. This part runs as far as page 87 inclusive. Then follows a list of all the words occurring in the targum which numbers 10 pages, whereas finally the text is printed in facsimiles, and in addition some photographs of the neighbourhood of the place where the manuscript was found.

Unfortunately the manuscript did not come to us undamaged, which for that matter applies to almost all Dead Sea Scrolls. Large parts of it are lost because of the influence of the tooth of time, and of course we do not know to what extent it was already worn when it was left at its finding-place. The latter part of the manuscript, 109 cm in length and containing large passages of Job xxxvii 10 — xlii 11, is still a whole, in the form of a scroll, but this part is not complete either. At the beginning of the columns a line is often lacking, totally or partly, at the bottom we miss 6 or 7 lines entirely, whereas some preserved lines did not escape damage. The part which precedes Job xxxvii 10 consists of fragments, 27 in number, containing passages from Job xvii 14 to xxxvi 33. Finally there is a number of very small fragments, often containing only a few letters, some of which, however, could be put into the text.

Inquiring into the age of the scroll we have to investigate the form of the script. By the very study of the finds in the desert, of Judah scholars have succeeded in discovering a certain line of

la grotte 11 de Qumrân (11 QJérNouv^{az}), *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1, 1970, pp. 58—64; *Note additionnelle*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1, 1970, pp. 185—186.

development in the history of the Hebrew way of writing⁵. On the ground thereof our manuscript can be regarded to have been written about the middle of the first century C. E. One can never tell it exactly: a certain form of writing may have remained in use in some milieu or in some region for a longer time than elsewhere. Or an individual scribe may have retained a certain form for a longer time or have abandoned it earlier than was the case in general. But with these reservations we still have a useful criterion in the form of the script. At all events we have to think of the time before 70 C. E., when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, for towards that time the Jewish-Essene community, which had dissociated itself from the official temple circles in the capital and established itself in the desert, left its settlement and abandoned its library.

Quite another question is when the Aramaic translation itself was made. The present text may very well be a copy of a much older manuscript. In order to determine the age of the translation we have to investigate the idiom. In comparing the idiom of the Qumran Job targum with that of the Aramaic parts of the Old Testament, one can conclude that the targum language dates from a later time. On the other hand the editors made a comparison between the Aramaic of Job and that of the Genesis Apocryphon from cave 1. From this comparison it appears that the Aramaic of Job dates from an earlier period⁶. More detailed research has made it plausible that the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon

⁵ N. Avigad, *The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents*, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4), Jerusalem 1958, 1965², pp. 56—87 (in modern Hebrew in *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik*, Jerusalem 1961, pp. 107—139); F. M. Cross Jr., *The Development of the Jewish Scripts*, The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of W. F. Albright, Garden City N. Y./London 1961, pp. 133—202.

⁶ In the Job targum the *nota relationis* is always *dy*, just like in Daniel and Ezra; in the Genesis Apocryphon the younger *d-* occurs beside the more frequent *dy*.

The causative verbal aspect in the targum is more often formed by *h-* than by *'-*, which also goes for biblical Aramaic, whereas the Genesis

belongs to the first century B. C. E.⁷. So the Aramaic translation of the book of Job must be located about the end of the second or the beginning of the first century before our era.

As to the vocabulary we can state that the text contains some words of Persian origin, which had already been found previously in Aramaic texts, e.g. the book of Daniel. There is one Persian word, *dhšt*, meaning „steppe, desert”, which occurs here for the first time in an Aramaic text (Job xxxix 6, rendering *'rbh*, and perhaps also Job xxx 3, rendering *syh*), but was already known in Syriac⁸. There are for that matter more words in our text which do not as yet occur in the Aramaic dictionaries but must be interpreted with the aid of other languages. According to the targum in Job xli 13 it is said concerning the crocodile: „its throat belches forth glowing coals”. The verb in question, *gs'*, was not known in Aramaic up to now, but it was in Syriac. Another word, *shr*, denoting the neighing of a horse (Job xxxix 20), had to be explained from Arabic. The verb *h'n*, used in Job xli 9 for the clasp of the scales of the crocodile, is probably cognate with Arabic *hḍn* and with Akkadian *ḥaṣanu* „to embrace”⁹.

2. TARGUMS

The Qumran Job targum is the oldest targum in our possession. Now it is well known that „targum” is the common denomination Apocryphon has always *'-*; the same applies to the reflexive forms (*ht-*/*'t-*).

In the *Genesis Apocryphon* *'n* is used beside *hn* („if, whether”), the targum and biblical Aramaic have the latter form only.

The Genesis Apocryphon has *kmn* beside *km'* („how”), *tmn* instead of *tmh* („there”), whereas targum and biblical Aramaic read *km'* (*kmh*) and *tmh*. It is true that the targum has the demonstrative pronoun *dn*, which is younger than *dnh*; the Genesis Apocryphon has mostly *dn*, biblical Aramaic has *dnh*.

⁷ E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language of the „Genesis Apocryphon”*, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4), Jerusalem 1958, 1965², pp. 1—35.

⁸ C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, Halle 1928², p. 169b.

⁹ Cf. B. Jongeling, *Contributions of the Qumran Job Targum to the Aramaic Vocabulary*, Journal of Semitic Studies 17, 1972, pp. 191—197.

of Aramaic Bible translations. The term originates from Akkadian (or, according to Ch. Rabin, *Hittite words in Hebrew*, *Orientalia* 32, 1963, pp. 113—139, esp. pp. 134 ff., from Hittite), and has also been adopted in Hebrew. Biblical Hebrew already knows the verb *trgm* „to translate” in Ezra 4:7, where it is said about a letter to the Persian king that it was written in Aramaic *umeturgām*, which probably means „to be translated”. In the answer of the king (vs. 18) we read: „... the letter which you sent to us has been read before me *mefāraš*”. This word means „clearly, plainly”, but must have here the sense of „translated”, since it was the court habit that the letters sent to the king in the language of the chancellery (Aramaic!) were read before him in Persian by a court-official. The term *mefōraš* (Hebrew) is also found in Nehemiah viii 8, meaning „translated, in translation”. According to Rabbinic tradition the origin of the targums is to be found in what is related there¹⁰. The targums were intended to make the Biblical text comprehensible, since the Hebrew language had become less known to the Jews and they used Aramaic as their vehicular tongue. This intention means that the targums are often rather paraphrasing renderings than translations in the proper sense. That's why they often contain digressions which are not to be found in the Hebrew text, and in addition often display theological ideas in vogue.

The most commonly known targums are that on the Pentateuch which in the Babylonian Talmud is attributed to Onkelos, and that on the prophets which is attributed to Jonathan ben Uzziel¹¹. In the Jerusalem Talmud a corresponding tradition is to be found, which, however, attributes a Greek translation to a certain Aquilas¹². And we also know that a man called Theodotion made a Greek Bible translation. Now the Babylonian Talmud unjustly connected the two targums with the names Onkelos and Jona-

¹⁰ *Megillah* I, 1. 2 (fol. 3a).

¹¹ *Megillah loco citato*: „Rabbi Jeremiah (according to others Rabbi Hiyah bar Abba) said: The targum of the Torah has been made by the proselyte Onkelos on the authority of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua. The targum of the Prophets has been made by Jonathan ben Uzziel on the authority of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi”.

¹² *Megillah* I, fol. 71c.

than, Onkelos being none other than Aquilas and Jonathan being the same name as Theodotion¹³.

The two targums mentioned got some official authority among Jewry all over the world. The extant Palestinian material was adapted in Babylon to the theological conceptions which were dominating there, and in addition the text was more closely brought into accord with the Hebrew original. Their final redaction was probably brought about in the fifth century C. E.

Apart from these Babylonian targums we have Palestinian targums, the Jerusalem targum I and the Jerusalem targum II (also called Fragmentary Targum), a number of Pentateuch fragments found in the Cairo genizah in the nineties of the last century¹⁴, and last but not least a complete Torah targum found in 1956 by the Spanish scholar A. Díez Macho in the Vatican library¹⁵.

In addition there are targums on the third part of the Jewish Bible, the *Ketūbīm*, with the exception of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, obviously because those books contained already large Aramaic parts (originally Ezra and Nehemiah formed only one book). Job also was included but a mere superficial comparison of this targum with that found at Qumran shows that they are totally independent¹⁶.

¹³ Cf. P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, pp. 117f; Oxford 1959², pp. 191ff.; D. Barhélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, Leiden 1963, pp. 148ff.; R. le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique* I, Rome 1966, pp. 78ff. and 124ff.

¹⁴ Cf. P. Kahle, *opus citatum*. The first Jerusalem targum has been edited by M. Ginsburger: *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Uziel zum Pentateuch)*, Berlin 1903; photomechanical reprint, Hildesheim/New York 1971; the second Jerusalem targum has been edited by the same scholar: *Das Fragmententhargum. Thargum Jerushalmi zum Pentateuch*, Berlin 1899; photomechanical reprint, Jerusalem 1966. The Cairo fragments have been edited by P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* II, Stuttgart 1930; photomechanical reprint, Hildesheim 1967.

¹⁵ So far the books of Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus of this targum (commonly called Neophyti 1) have been edited by A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1. Targum Palestinense, MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Tomo I Génesis*, Madrid/Barcelona 1968; *Tomo II Éxodo*, 1970; *Tomo III Levítico*, 1971; a facsimile edition was published in Jerusalem (1970).

¹⁶ The targums on the *Ketūbīm* have been edited by P. de Lagarde: *Hagiographa Chaldaice*, Leipzig 1873; photomechanical reprint,

In his edition of the targum on Isaiah Stenning sums up the characteristics of the targumic translation. Its chief feature, according to its aim to make the text intelligible to the people, is the use of paraphrase. But the translator was also concerned to avoid any rendering which might be in conflict with later religious ideas. So he enlarged the distance between God and man by insertion of words like 'Mēmra' (= Word), 'Yeqārā' (= Glory), 'Shekinā' (= Presence), when God is described as coming into relation with man; by insertion of the preposition 'before' or 'from before' after verbs denoting anger, hate, fear etc., and in cases where man is speaking to God; not: 'And he spoke to God...'; but: 'And he spoke before God...', and the like; expressions as 'God's hand(s), arm(s), eye(s), face' are avoided and rendered by 'God's might, presence etc.'. Further the translator avoided to render figures of speech literally, whereas condemnatory pronouncements of prophets against their contemporaries often are modified or even applied to Israel's enemies. In the introduction to their edition of the targum of Chronicles Le Déaut and Robert give a largely concurrent description of the targumic methods¹⁷. The targumic translation methods bring about that the targums often contain more or less large digressions. The final redactions of targum Onkelos and Jonathan show a more close adaptation to the Masoretic text. But there are also older targums which render the original rather faithfully, as is proved by our Qumran Job targum. We may assume that with this targum the targumic

Osnabrück 1967. A separate edition of the targum on Chronicles was edited by R. le Déaut and J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques*, Tome I, *Introduction et Traduction*; Tome II, *Texte et Glossaire*, Rome 1971.

The most recent edition of Targum Onkelos and Jonathan is that by A. Sperber: *The Bible in Aramaic*. I. *The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos*, Leiden 1959; II. *The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden 1959; III. *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden 1962. The fourth volume of this edition contains the targums on Chronicles, Ruth, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and one of the three extant targums on Esther (Leiden 1968).

Finally we mention a separate edition of the targum on Isaiah by J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949.

¹⁷ Cf. also R. le Déaut, *Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: le „targumisme”*, *Biblica* 52, 1971, pp. 505—525.

translation process or the targumic translation tradition was in the beginning of its development.

We do not know why the book of Job, which was not read in the synagogue cult, was translated into Aramaic at such an early stage. There is an old tradition which mentions Moses as the author of the book of Job¹⁸, and there are Syriac Bible manuscripts in which the Pentateuch is followed by the book of Job; this fact probably witnesses the same tradition. There is also another indication of the respect shown to the book of Job. In several Qumran manuscripts we meet the name of God, YAHWEH, written in ancient-Hebrew characters, which must be a sign of reverence. Now there have also been found fragments of books which in their entirety are written in these characters. This happens to be the case with Pentateuch fragments and with fragments of the Hebrew book of Job. Obviously the book of Job was held in high esteem among the Jews, next to the books of Moses.

A Jewish tradition, to be found in the Talmud, witnesses the early existence of a targum of Job. In the Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat XVI, 1 (fol. 115a) we read:

R. Jose said: Once upon a time my father R. Halaphta came to R. Gamaliel Berabbi at Tiberias; he found him sitting at a table with Johanan the excommunicated one, and reading in a Job targum which was in his hands. Then he said to him: „I remember that your grandfather R. Gamaliel, when he stood on a terrace of the temple mountain, and a targum of the book of Job was brought to him, said to a bricklayer: Put it under a course of bricks; and at this command the bricklayer hid it“. Thereupon he (Gamaliel the younger) also had it hidden.

The grandfather Gamaliel, Gamaliel the elder, was Paul's teacher. So in the first half of the first century C. E. there existed a written Job targum. The tradition mentioned means that this targum was withdrawn from circulation, but we do not learn the reason thereof. Did it happen because the targum originated from a circle, sectarian to Gamaliel, perhaps the Qumran community? It is possible but not provable that the targum in Gamaliel's hands was a copy of the text now found at Qumran.

¹⁸ Bab. Talmud, Baba Bathra, fol. 14b.

The Septuagint also witnesses the early existence of a Job targum. At the end this translation contains and addition which begins as follows: „This (man, vid. Job) is interpreted (*hermèneue-tai*) from the Syriac (= Aramaic) book”, whereupon Job's origin is described both in a geographical and genealogical sense; then a list of kings of Edom, and among them Job, is given, and finally Job's friends are presented as princely persons. The expression „to be interpreted” also occurs in Hebrews vii 2 with regard to Melchizedek: this Melchizedek „is interpreted”, „first being king of righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is king of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy”. The term „to be interpreted” seems to mean that the author procures genealogical and other personal data about a person (which in the case of Melchizedek turns out negatively). Now the Septuagint did not find those data about Job in the Masoretic text but borrowed them from a targum. We do not know what targum that was. The addition is not found in our manuscript. We have, however, to add that our text ends with chapter xlii 11. There is the end of a paragraph and then the column breaks off. It is possible that the remaining part of chapter xlii has followed in the same column, but it is also possible that that part never occurred in the scroll. Next to the last column there is still space for writing, but it is a vacant „page”.

There are some correspondences between our targum and the Septuagint, sometimes even striking ones, but we cannot say with certainty whether „the Seventy” knew this targum, nor do we know whether the two of them had the same Hebrew text as their *Vorlage*.

3. TARGUMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN 11Q^tgJOB

Though the Qumran Job targum is a relatively faithful rendering of the Masoretic text, it shows unmistakable targum characteristics. We mention some of them here:

1. Col. XXXVII, 3 (Job xlii 1) says: „Job answered and said before God...”, whereas the Biblical text has: „Then Job answered Yahweh and said...” (the name Yahweh is always avoided).

2. A cognate use of the preposition „before” is to be found in col. XI, 4 (Job xxvii 13). The Biblical text reads: „This is the portion of the wicked man with God, and the heritage of the oppressors which they receive from the Almighty”. The state of the targum text is very poor here, but we read very clearly „the wicked”, and further on, towards the end of the verse, „carry away before Him”, where no doubt „from” is to be added in the lacuna preceding the word „before”.

3. Elimination of figurative speech is to be found in col. XXX, 4—5 (Job xxxviii 7): „When the morning-stars shone together and all the angels of God exulted together”, where the Biblical text has: „When the morningstars sang together, and all the sons of God exulted”. Perhaps the targumist avoided the personification of the stars because the heavenly bodies were often objects of worship in the Ancient world. In addition he changed „sons of God” into „angels of God”, probably in order to avoid that the distance between God and the angels be diminished.

4. In col. XVIII, 3 the targumist left out the final part of Job xxxi 10, which obviously was shocking to his ethical sense. The Biblical text reads: (9) „If my heart has been enticed by a woman, or if I have laid wait at my neighbour's door, (10) then let my wife grind for another, and let others bow down upon her”. The final part of the sentence („and let others...”) was omitted by the targumist. Apparently he did not interpret the expression „let my wife grind for another” in a sexual sense, as is done by the Septuagint, cf. Genesis Rabba 48 and Bab. Talmud Sotah, fol. 10a.

5. The most striking difference between the Biblical book of Job and the targum, however, is the way in which the person of Job is depicted. In the Bible Job is described as repentant because, in spite of the righteousness of his case, he failed to recognize God's overpowering sovereignty: „Therefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes” (Job xlii 6). The targum, however, reads: „Therefore I am poured out and I fall to pieces, and I am dust and ashes” (col. XXXVII, 8). Job complains of his being troubled and tormented, of his being doomed to death, though he has not deserved that. Obviously the targumist, who

esteemed Job highly and considered him to be an extremely pious man, could not find it in his heart to say that Job did penance. To him Job was probably as the rich young man of Matthew 19, who said: „All these things I have kept from my youth up” (verse 20). The targumist’s theological conviction about a pious, righteous man could not bear that Job was depicted as a sinner who repents of what he said and did in the presence of God.

4. OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 11tgJOB AND THE MASORETIC TEXT

It is impossible to give here a complete translation of the Job targum and to compare the whole of its text with that of the Hebrew book. I only call attention to some remarkable deviations, apart from those which have already been mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

1. In coll. II the verses 13 and 14 of Job xix have a much shorter form than they have in the Bible. Though the targum text is very lacunar we can state this on the basis of the space left between the words „my acquaintances” and „my house” (verse 15). Probably the targumist’s eye skipped from the Hebrew *wəyōdē’ay* („my acquaintances”, verse 13) to *ūmeyudā’ay* („my familiar friends”, verse 14), which caused the interjacent words to be omitted.

2. In the same column (II) the sense of verse 17 has been altered. The Hebrew text reads: „My breath is disgusting to my wife”, but the targumist took the word *ruaḥ* in the sense of „spirit” and translated: „I have humiliated my spirit before my wife”.

3. The first line of column IV, rendering the latter part of Job xxi 2, contains only two words and the last letter of the preceding word. The Masoretic text has: „Hear diligently to my speech, and let this be your consolations”. Job aims to say that up to now he did not receive many consolations from his friends, but that it may be a consolation to him from their part when they attentively listen to his words. Now the targum reads „for me”, which is lacking in the Biblical text but is found in the

Septuagint, which reads: „Hear, hear my words, lest there be the same consolation for me from your part”. The Aramaic „for me” is followed by *lhwt*, whose meaning is somewhat enigmatical, and is preceded by the letter ’, which may be the final letter of various words. It is possible that *lhwt* is to be connected with the root *lh* „to be tired”. It is true that the Aramaic has no substantive *lhwt*, but in Syriac, where the root has the form *l*’, the substantive *l’wt* (construct state *l’wt*), meaning „tiredness”, exists. The verb *l*’ also occurs in Aramaic, and a substantive *ly’wt*. Hebrew has the roots *l’h* „to tire, to lose courage”, and *lhh* „to faint”. Now one can suppose that in the targum *ly* was preceded by *dy lm*’ (the last letter is extant), and that Job according to this text said something like: „lest there be for me tiredness (because) of your words”.

4. At the end of column IV (line 9) we read: „their pregnant calves”, which is said of a cow. The Masoretic text has (xxi 10): „His bull mounts and fails not, his cow calves and does not miscarry”. The singular suffixes are somewhat strange since there are always plural suffixes in the context. The targumist smoothed the text according to its environment. It is also somewhat strange that the targumist altered the common word *pārāh* „cow” into „pregnant” (feminine participle), which is also the case in the Septuagint (*en gastri echousa*). It is probable that both translations considered the Hebrew word to be the participle of *prh* „to be fertile, to bear fruit”.

5. In column V Job xxi 23—25 has a much shorter form. The Biblical text has: „This one dies... That one dies...” (*zeh yamūt... wezeh yamūt...*), which may have given rise to confusion.

6. In Job xxiv 24 the Biblical text reads according to the usual translation: „they are bent down (or: they shrink) as all (other)”, whereas the targum has: „they shrink like Bermuda-grass”. The Septuagint has also the name of a plant. Perhaps the word *kōl* here is a homonym of *kōl* „all”, but not identical with it.

7. We meet a most interesting question in column XIV, 1. The Biblical text reads here (ch. xxix 7): „When I went out to the gate, up to the city...”. The Septuagint reads „in the morning” (literally „morningly”), interpreting *š’r* „gate” as *š’hr* „dawn”.

The targum has both readings. Perhaps the translator found one of them in the text of his *Vorlage* and the other in the margin and put both in his translation.

8. A similar occurrence of two alternative translations is probably to be found in column XXIII. Unfortunately the text is badly damaged, but the extant part may lead us to some conclusions. Elihu is speaking here (Job xxxiii 24f.). In the preceding passage he says that God, who is greater than man, may chastise a man, without accounting for His deeds. But then it may be that God is gracious to him (verse 24) and says: „Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom. (25) His flesh will be fresher than (it was in his) youth; he returns to the days of his youngness”. The targum has: „and He says: Deliver him from destruction (lacuna) of fire, it chokes him. Then he will be filled (lacuna) than (that of) a boy, and he returns to the days of (his) youth”. It is clear that the targum text is longer here than the Biblical text, and this is also the case in the Septuagint which contains: „He will take care that he does not fall into death, He will renew his body as plaster on a wall, He will fill his bones with marrow, He will make his flesh smooth as that of a child...”. We cannot go into all the differences between the texts, but we call attention to two points: 1. The Septuagint has the verb „fill” and so has the targum; perhaps the latter contained: „his bones will be filled with marrow”; 2. the form *yšnqn̄h* „it chokes him” may be explained as follows: apart from the root *n̄r* „to be young etc.” the Hebrew has another root *n̄r* which means „shake off, shake out”; it occurs in Ex. xiv 27: „and Yahweh shook off the Egyptians in the midst of the sea”, which practically means: „and Yahweh drowned the Egyptians...”; now Targum Onkelos has here a form of the verb *šng*: „and Yahweh choked the Egyptians”; in my opinion the targumist rendered the Hebrew form *mn̄r* twice, taking it first as the participle piel of *n̄r* „to shake off”, and then as the combination of the preposition *mn* and the substantive *n̄r* „boy”. The preceding word *’šh* cannot be the subject of the verbal form, since *’šh* is feminine and the verbal form has a masculine prefix, so the construction of the phrase must have been more complicated.

9. Job xxxvi 14 reads: „Their soul must die in youth, and

their life among the male prostitutes” (*qdšym*). The Septuagint probably took the word *qdšym* as *qdwsym*, rendering it by „angels”, which must mean here „angels of vengeance”. In our targum the beginning of the verse is lacking, then we read „their city” which is followed by *bmmtyn*. This form is composed of the preposition *b* and the active or passive participle of the afel of *mw* „to die”. Thinking of the latter possibility one can translate: „their city (dwelling-place) is among the slain”. Now we read in Job xxxiii 22 exactly the same consonantal combination as here, apart from the Hebrew plural ending: *mm̄tym*, preceded by the preposition *l̄*: „to the destroyers”. In the Septuagint this is rendered by „in the netherworld”. Since the targumist probably took the word of xxxvi 14 in the sense of „holy ones, angels (of vengeance)” and the Masoretic text of Job xxxiii 22 has the active participle I prefer to read the form of the targum (col. XXVII, 8) in the same sense.

10. Finally I mention Job xxxvii 13 which is very difficult. The Masoretic text reads: „Whether for a rod, or for his earth, or for favour — He causes it to gain its object”. I am not able to explain in this context the words „for his earth” (the same applies to many commentators). The targum reads (col. XXIX, 3—5): *hn lmk̄š hn l̄r̄, hn lkpn whsrnh whn ptgm t̄b lhw̄ ’lyh*. The *editio princeps* considers *mk̄š* to be the infinitive of *k̄š* „to afflict”, and takes *’r̄* as the infinitive *afel* of the verb *r̄* „to break, to shatter”. One can translate the whole sentence as follows: „either to batter or to shatter or to (cause) famine and penury or to bring about something favourable on it” (vid. on the face of the earth, verse 12). Not without some reserve I suggest another possibility. One can take *mk̄š* as a substantive, meaning „rod” -which is more in agreement with the Hebrew text-, and *’r̄* as originating from the root *’r̄* „to meet with”, which in targum Onkelos begins with *’* but in the Palestinian targum with *’* (see the dictionary of Jastrow), and this is also the Syrian orthography. The targum on Ruth (ii 3) has a substantive of this root which means „(casual) occurrence”, and according to the dictionaries of Jastrow and Levy there is a Palestinian targum text which contains this word in the plural in Deut. xxviii 60: „diseases”. The text speaks of the diseases of Egypt, and it is striking that

