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Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments

Peter J. Gentry
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Introduction

On October 31, 2003, some fifty scholars and students gathered in Leuven to congratulate J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie in celebration of the publication of their careful revision of A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, which first appeared in 1992–1996.1 All are greatly indebted to them for putting into the hands of students and scholars alike such a useful and up to date lexicon of the Septuagint, a work long overdue since the pioneering efforts of J.F. Schleusner appeared in 1820–21, almost one hundred and eighty years before. We are further indebted to the ‘Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism’ of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and their sponsors, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, for organising a symposium in which the next step in Septuagintal lexicography is to be vigorously addressed and pursued: the task of assembling a lexicon of the remains of the three Jewish revisers, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

From the beginning, my interest in the Three has been virtually as strong as my interest in the Septuagint itself. Interest in both and study of both has led me to convictions concerning interrelationship

1Symposium: Septuagint Lexicography and Beyond: Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, on the occasion of the publication of the revised one volume edition of J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Revised Edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003). I would like to express my thanks to the organisers of the symposium, Prof. Johan Lust and Dr. Katrin Hauspie, for inviting me to speak, and to the participants, for constructive comments and questions.
of the LXX and the Three. After twenty-five years of study devoted to the Septuagint, I am convinced that one cannot study the Septuagint without studying the Three and vice-versa. During my doctoral research on Theodotion in Job and the quest for the so-called \textit{kaivge} Tradition, I became aware of just how interwoven the text-history of the Septuagint is with the texts of the Three. As I attempted to locate and place the Theodotionic materials in Job within the history of the transmission of these so-called \textit{kaivge} texts and of the Septuagint, I concluded that ‘the precise line of demarcation between \textit{kaivge} and LXX has yet to be taken seriously by modern scholarship.’\textsuperscript{2} Next I spent two years analysing the translation technique of the Greek Lamentations as preparation for producing the NETS translation.\textsuperscript{3} While I did not do an exhaustive analysis of the translation technique of Lamentations, as I had done for Job, the character of the translation as well as the absence of any materials attributed to Theodotion in the Second Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition strongly suggest that the Old Greek of Lamentations might possibly be the work of Theodotion. So again I was struck by the fact that the Septuagint and the Three were deeply interwoven together.

In 1997 I was assigned the task, begun by Joseph Ziegler, of producing a critical edition of the earliest Greek Version of Ecclesiastes for the Göttingen Septuaginta Series. The first two or three years engaged in this task were entirely focused on studying the Collation Books, translation technique in Ecclesiastes, and the manuscript tradition of the Greek witnesses. Initially the critical text could be established largely from the study of the Greek witnesses apart from the witness of the daughter versions and patristic citations, although preliminary collation and study of these latter witnesses was already in hand. One daughter version, however, had to be analysed in detail before beginning the task of establishing the text, and that was the Syro-Hexapla. It is an extremely literal translation of the text in Origen’s Fifth Column and one of the most reliable witnesses to the Old Greek as Origen received it. It is also a key source for readings from the Three, frequently not preserved elsewhere. Careful study of this version over the last three years revealed once again deep interconnections between the

\textsuperscript{2}P.J. Gentry, \textit{The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job} (SBLSCS, 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), p. 496.

text history of the Septuagint and the text of the Three. In the course of my textual work, it was frequently necessary to establish the text of the Three in order to establish the original text of the Septuagint and vice-versa: the text of the Three could not be established without first establishing the text of the Septuagint.

My research on the Syro-Hexapla of Ecclesiastes intersects directly, therefore, with the interest of the sponsors of this Symposium to produce a lexicon of the Three. While my area of expertise is not in lexicography per se, this paper is entitled ‘Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three’. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word propaedeutic means ‘serving as introduction to a higher study, preliminary study.’ Here, the higher study is lexicography of the Three. I would like to show from the Syro-Hexapla of Ecclesiastes study that is both necessary and preliminary to this higher study as well as integral to it: establishing a critical text of the Three.

Several important issues are involved in establishing the text of the Three. To illustrate these I discuss problems in the text of Ecclesiastes arranged around three topics: (1) determining the text of the Three by critical use of the Old Greek, (2) the relation of the Three and the Old Latin in the text history of the OG Ecclesiastes, and (3) determining the text of the OG by critical use of the Three. This apparently circular discussion is intended to show, then, the interconnectedness of the text history of OG and of the Three, methodological issues in establishing the critical text of the Three, and the need for such a critical text.

The format of the discussion is as follows. First to be cited is the Masoretic Text as the putative parent text of the Greek Translation. Next listed is the Greek Translation of Eccl. according to Rahlfs’ Edition. If the critical text established for the forthcoming Göttingen Edition differs from that of Rahlfs, the siglum Ra designates the former and Ge (i.e. Gentry) the latter. Third, the text tradition is given using the list of Text-Groups provided by Ziegler in an article published

---


Determining the Text of the Three

Marginal Notes in Syh Indicating One or Two of the Three are

\[ \dot{o\delta\mu\iota\iota\varsigma} (\neq \dot{o\mu\iota\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \omicron) \]

In previous papers presented at IOSCS meetings in Basel, 2001 and in Toronto, 2002, I focused on one kind of marginal note almost entirely unique to the Syro-Hexapla among our sources of hexaplaric materials for Ecclesiastes.\(^8\) This is the notation that indicates that one, or two, or even all of the Three Revisers, are ‘\(\dot{o\mu\iota\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \omicron)\)’, i.e. the word or words which are marked by an index in Syh are identical to the text of the Seventy, the Fifth Column of Origen’s Hexapla. Approximately 70 notations of this type are extant according to Field’s Edition: 68 of them derive from Syh and Jerome is the main source for 2 not extant in Syh. Fifty-five of these notes contain the words ‘\(\dot{o\mu\iota\iota\varsigma \τ\omicron\iota\varsigma \omic\)’, one employs ‘\(\dot{\omic\omic\omic}\)’ instead of ‘\(\dot{o\mu\iota\iota\varsigma \omic\omic\omic\)\’, and in 14 only ‘\(\dot{\omic\omic}\)’ is used.\(^9\) A chart displays the distribution of the notes:

---

\(^7\) J. Ziegler, ‘Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes’, in D. Fraenkel et al. (eds.) Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 190; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 89-129. Two manuscripts in Ziegler’s list must be excluded because they have no text of Eccl. (334, 695). Three manuscripts belong more properly under his siglum Ol (Olympiodorus’ Commentary on Eccl.), i.e. 562, 733 and 734. Two further manuscripts are to be included as they were not available to Ziegler, but have now been collated by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen (161 and 770). Two minor changes have been made in the sigla: \(c\text{II}\) is employed instead of \(C\text{II}\) for the Catena trium patrum (\(C^\prime = C + c\text{I} + c\text{II}\)) and 766 is employed when 766\(\text{I}\) and 766\(\text{II}\) agree.


\(^9\) 2.19, 4.10, 17; 5.1, 19; 6.2, 7.27; 8.17, 9.1, 10.11, 20; 11.4, 9; 12.7. Nine of the fourteen were discussed earlier, see Gentry, ‘Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes’.© The Continuum Publishing Group Ltd 2004.
The first line of the table is $o' = \chi' \sigma' \varsigma' \neq \text{NIL}$. This means there are eleven instances where a marginal note indicates that $\chi' \sigma' \varsigma'$ are all identical to $o'$ and NIL, i.e. no contrasting reading is provided by Syh. The totals include only the instances where a contrasting reading is provided. This demonstrates how to read the table.

In the paper presented in Basel, all instances where all Three agree with the Old Greek and no contrasting reading is supplied were carefully investigated. The main result of this study was that while the text of the Syro-Hexapla is for the most part a faithful representation of the hexaplaric text, the marginal notes were probably not derived from the same source, but rather, were drawn from the margin of a different Greek manuscript whose biblical text was non-hexaplaric. The Catena manuscripts seem to be the best candidate for the putative source. The focus and purpose of the scholiast who excerpted the hexaplaric materials also differed from other traditions and this may

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Note</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \sigma' \varsigma' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>11 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \neq \sigma'$</td>
<td>3 ×</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \neq \varsigma'$</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>2 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \sigma' \neq \chi' \varsigma'$</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \sigma' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \theta' \neq \chi'$</td>
<td>7 ×</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \theta' \neq \sigma'$</td>
<td>9 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \theta' \neq \chi' / \sigma'$</td>
<td>2 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \theta' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>7 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \theta' \neq \sigma'$</td>
<td>12 ×</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \theta' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>8 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \chi' \sigma' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>3 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \sigma' \theta' \neq \chi'$</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o' = \sigma' \theta' \neq \text{NIL}$</td>
<td>2 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

explain why many of the readings of the Three are uniquely preserved by the Syro-Hexapla.

Furthermore, in preparing the Basel paper for publication, an interesting discovery was made. If the lemma of the manuscript from which the marginal notes in Syh were copied and translated differed from the ό text, the marginal note would read only ὀμοίως (indicating that α' σ' θ' agreed with the lemma, but not with the ό text). If, however, the lemma and the ό text were the same, the note would read ὀμοίως τόις ό to show that α' σ' θ' agreed with the ό text as well the lemma, or in some instances with the ό text against the lemma.

Nine of the fourteen notes in which only ὀμοίως is used were discussed previously. The remaining five notes in which ὀμοίως is used but only one or two of the Three Revisers are indicated are examined here. This analysis will demonstrate not only that the earlier proposal is correct, but also show how this proposal is critical for establishing the correct text of the Jewish Reviser in question.

2.19

The text as established by Rahlfs is sound. He rightly chose as original text the reading of A, C, the Hexaplaric text and the majority of minuscules against B-S, the Catena Group and a number of minuscules influenced by them, since the omission of the second instance of the relative pronoun ώ was not likely due to freedom on the part of the translator but rather is quite probable as an inner Greek improvement of the text.

Field’s ό text is identical to the lemma of Rahlfs and therefore the note that Aquila and Theodotion are ὀμοίως can only mean that their

8See Gentry, ‘Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes’.
9Only once in 68 instances does the particle ἢ have no corresponding equivalent in Greek and this is due to rendering a finite verb by a participle (1.11).

text is the same as the OG. Indeed the evidence may be construed this way, but the question arises, why is the marginal note only ὧμοιος and not ὧμοιος τοῖς ὧ’ when in fact the reading of Aquila and Theodotion is equivalent to that of the ὧ’ text as Field proposes?

Alternatively, we may suggest that the note originated in the margin of a manuscript such as we find in the Catena Group where the second instance of ὧ’ is omitted. In this case the note shows that the scribe wanted to indicate that the text of Aquila and Theodotion also omitted the relative pronoun like the lemma of his manuscript, but that this was not the ὧ’ text. This gives a more consistent and economical interpretation of the note ὧμοιος and fits the pattern established for these notes. It is extremely problematic that no other sources for ἀ’ and ὧ’ exist apart from the marginal note in Syh. It is also difficult to find a similar syntactic situation, with two clauses introduced by ὧ and ἅν in close proximity and joined by ἀλλά, where text is extant for ἀ’ and ὧ’ to determine whether they might or might not have omitted the second relative in their translation. I can only note that in my previous study approximately six similar instances were considered where the text proposed for the Three was the opposite of that claimed by Field and no other witnesses exist to adjudicate the matter.12

4.17 [Qr]

From the perspective of both textual witnesses and translation technique, no doubt can be cast on the text reconstructed by Rahlfs. One cannot pit the text of the Hexaplaric Group against 998 B and S* without powerful evidence from other factors—evidence which does not exist here. Indeed, the reading of the O Group is supported only by S*. The OG rendering ἐν ὧ’ ἐξήν πορεύεται is apparently based upon reading ἐν ὧ’ ἐξήν πορεύεται rather than ἐν ὧ’ ἐξήν as parent text; confusion of ὧ

126.2; 7.26; 9.1; 10.11; 11.4; 12.7. See Gentry, ‘Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes’, p. 28.
and ἐν is common in the transmission of the Hebrew text. This Greek construction is found elsewhere in Eccl. only in 3.22 where הָעֵז בָּנוֹן is rendered by ἐν ὦ ἔλας γένεται. The Hebrew construction ב plus Infinitive Construct occurs in Qohelet only in 12.4 and is not rendered by ἐν plus articular infinitive in Greek; indeed ἐν plus articular infinitive is a construction not found in Eccl. although it was increasingly popular in Hellenistic Greek. Whatever the source, the reading in the Hexaplaric Group seems certain to be a smoothing of the construction found in the entire manuscript tradition in Greek. The O Group thus has the lectio facilior.

It may not be possible to be certain as to which parent text in Greek is the source for the rendering in Syh, but we should probably classify it with the O Group. Field has assumed that the marginal note εὖ' ὀμοίως in Syh means that the text of εὖ' read ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι. If he is right, one wonders why, however, the note did not read ὀμοίως τοῖς ο'/'. On the other side, if the note came from a manuscript such as we find in the Catena Group, it would mean that εὖ' had the same text as the OG reconstructed by Rahlf, but not the ο'/ text known to the scholiast. This would explain why the note is only ὀμοίως and not ὀμοίως τοῖς ο'/'. It is plausible that the text of 998 B and S was the LXX known to εὖ' and he did not revise it. We do not know here the text of either ο'/ or σ'/'. The Bible text of Jerome's Commentary (cum vadis) follows our MT; doubtless this is a correction based directly upon the Hebrew text. Perhaps the renderings of ο'/ and σ'/—the latter so often influenced Jerome—were the same; one cannot say. I am proposing that εὖ' had ἐν ὦ ἔλας πορεύη and not the articular infinitive. It seems impossible to adjudicate between my proposal and that of Field except that the explanation proposed here makes better sense of ὀμοίως and also can fit well the proposal that the notes came from a manuscript whose lemma was different from that of the ο'/ text. Nonetheless the case does show that determining the critical text of OG and establishing a critical text of the Three are inextricably intertwined.

13 ὀμοίως may be considered by some as an error for ἔλας, but it is well attested in MT. There are 3 instances in Eccl. rendered ἐν οἷς (3.9), ἔξωθότι (7.2) and ἔξωθας (8.4). The renderings in 7.2 and 8.4 probably show that the Greek Translator construed his parent text to have the more common ἔλας. The instance in 3.9 is a clear case and rendered similarly 4.17.


15 Further examples are discussed infra.
Two problems in the text are listed for 5.19. Uncial V reads \( \text{o} \text{ou} \) for \( \text{oti} \) — a common palaeographic error in the uncial square series where \( \text{II} \) and \( \text{TI} \) are easily confused. Secondly, \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) is clearly original as a literal rendering of the Hebrew text, but this reading suffered corruption within the Greek textual transmission. The readings of \( \text{B}^* \) 998 and 534 are due to errors of sight and incorrect word division; \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) is an attempt to smooth the syntax and so is the \text{lectio facilior} along with the readings of 631 and 542. The Fayyumic omits the troublesome \( \text{polla} \) altogether and Jerome corrects the Old Latin according to the Hebrew.

Syh reflects \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) as parent text thus agreeing with the \( \text{o}^\prime \) text. For this problem, however, the Catena Group is split. If the lemma from which the marginal note is derived had \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) and \( \text{a}^\prime \) and \( \text{b}^\prime \) had the same, as assumed in the edition of Field, why not employ \( \text{oumioi} \) \( \tau\text{o}^\prime \text{is} \) \( \text{o}^\prime \) as the notation since this is also the \( \text{o}^\prime \) text? Just the opposite may be proposed as a solution which better accounts for the data. If the lemma of the scholiast was \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) and he wanted to indicate that this was also the reading of \( \text{a}^\prime \) and \( \text{b}^\prime \) but not that of the \( \text{o}^\prime \) text, this could be clearly signalled by employing \( \text{oumioi} \) \( \tau\text{o}^\prime \text{is} \) \( \text{o}^\prime \). This proposal could also explain the origin of the reading which spread in part of the Catena tradition. The data can be fitted nicely into the theory that the notes came from a different manuscript than the source of the text of Syh. This manuscript had as lemma a text like that of part of the Catena tradition. Consistent distinction between \( \text{oumioi} \) rather than \( \text{oumioi} \) \( \tau\text{o}^\prime \text{is} \) \( \text{o}^\prime \) demands that we understand \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{polla} \) as the text of Aquila and Theodotion.
Only six witnesses in the entire manuscript tradition have δ rather than ὅσα: V 253[mg] 637 1251 542 766. They represent the ὅ text and three minuscules which it influenced and as such, cannot controvert the witness of 998 and B-S with the rest of the tradition.

The Greek translator of Ecclesiastes employed ὅσος in 12 instances (in four of these plus ἄν or ἑάν) always for τίκα except for 8.17g where the construction δὲν τίκῃ αὐτός ζητήσας is rendered by ὅσα ἄν εἴπη ὅ σοφός.16 His rendering in 8.17g was probably influenced by 8.17e where δὲν τίκῃ αὐτός ὅ νικαίρως τοῦ τιμηθῆσαι: here ὅσα ἄν is actually equivalent to τίκῃ ἄν ὅ ὅνθεν although elsewhere ὅσος renders only τίκα. Thus context and translation technique can support ὅσα as OG and one can also affirm it as the lectio difficilior.

The text critic faces a dilemma in determining the parent text of Syh. Normally ὅσα is rendered by ὅμως ἀλλὰ (2.12; 3.14; 3.15; 5.3; 8.9; 9.10) or once only ὅμως (8.15). Similarly Syh has ἀλλὰ ὅμως for ὅσον (ἅτιν] twice (4.2, 16). The equivalent ἀλλὰ in 11.5 clearly demonstrates that the parent text of Syh was ὅς rather than ὅσα since O 1251 542 7667 7668 have ᾶς against the rest of the tradition. This leaves only 8.17e and 17g where Syh has ἀλλὰ ἀλλὰ and ἀλλὰ respectively. In 8.17g one can argue that Syh supports the ὅ text and had ᾶ as parent text. In 8.17e, MSS 161[mg] 253 and 637 have διοπερ, so here too one can argue that διοπερ represents διοπερ. Thus nowhere does διοπερ represent ὅσα in Syh and so translation technique supports the presumption that Syh belongs with the ὅ text in 8.17g.

162.12 ; 3.14, 15; 4.2, 16; 5.3; 8.9, 15, 17bis; 9.10; 11.5.
The index for the marginal note in Syh is over καὶ. Field assumes this to refer to καὶ γς as parent text and duly records that θ′ also had καὶ γς. Almost no variants for καὶ γς exist in the entire textual tradition. MS 155 and the Coptic omit γς. Apart from Prosper of Aquitaine whose citation is probably close to the Old Latin, the Bible text of Jerome, his two citations in Dialogue Against the Pelagians and his Vulgate all represent different revisions / translations based directly on the Hebrew. So these variants are all either insignificant or worthless. The only other note concerning καὶ γς for Eccl. is at 5.18 where according to Field Aquila has ἀλλὰ καὶ instead of OG καὶ γς; this information, however, is not from Syh but is based solely upon Nobilius. In _Les Devanciers d’Aquila_ Barthélemy demonstrates that ἀλλὰ καὶ is from σ’ and is never employed by Aquila for μ. While it is possible that α’ and σ’ varied from OG and the scholiast wished to note that only the text of θ′ was the same, this is unlikely since normally ὁμοιὸς τοῖς ’ is employed to indicate identity with not only the lemma but also the ω’ text. Was it not necessary to add τοῖς ’ because there is no variant in the tradition?

Another proposal is possible which may better account for the data. The index is over καὶ, but, as is frequently the case, may refer to the entire phrase καὶ γς διὰ τινῆς ἀν. I suggest that the marginal note came from the lemma of a manuscript in the Catena tradition which read διὰ against δ in the ω’ text.. The marginal note indicates that θ′ had the same text, but the scholiast did not add τοῖς ’ to ὁμοιὸς to indicate that agreement between the lemma and θ′ was in contrast to the ω’ text. So the evidence for 8.17g could support the theory about the use of ὁμοιὸς or, on the other hand, be considered irrelevant.

17D. Barthélemy, _Les devanciers d’Aquila_ (VTSup, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), p. 27.
Rahlfs’ text in 10.20 is based solely upon conjecture; no manuscript, patristic citation, or extant version witnesses to this text. Nonetheless, support for the proposed text is strong. Ziegler has demonstrated the high probability that ἡ θηγγανήθην was rendered by σῦν on the basis of a study in translation technique.\(^\text{18}\) This un-grammatical text was then misread as σοῦ τὴν φωνήν as in 998 and B, our earliest witnesses, or the σῦν was dropped as in the ο’ text. The majority reading τὴν φωνήν σοῦ alters the reading of B 998 d\(^{-}(342)\) al. to a word order more common for biblical Greek. Thus the original text is indirectly witnessed by the manuscript tradition.\(^\text{19}\)

Syh reads τὴν φωνήν σοῦ with the Catena Group and indeed the majority of the textual tradition. How are we to interpret the marginal note? One may propose that the marginal note came from a manuscript with the lemma of the Catena Group. As in the previous cases, the scholiast’s notation indicates that σ’ θ’ read likewise, but the note ὄμοιως shows that he knew this was opposite to the ο’ text. Between the time Origen produced the Hexapla and the time the Syro-Hexapla was translated, the majority reading was introduced into copies of the hexaplaric text. If we assume that the marginal note came from the same source as the text of Syh, we could explain properly why the note reads ὄμοιως without τῶς ο’, but some explanation is required to show why Syh does not agree with the ο’ text here.

A chart now overviews the relations between the O(ld) G(reek), the ο’ text, the bible text of the Cat(ena) mss, and the Three. The chart shows first the relation between the ο’ text and OG, the relation between the ο’ text and the lemma of Cat, the relation of the Three to both Cat and the ο’ text, and finally the wording of the marginal note in Syh. The results agree fully with the nine cases discussed earlier in which the note indicated all Three were ὄμοιως.

---


In four of the five cases discussed here (2.19, 4.17, 5.19, 8.17) as well as in six of the nine cases analysed previously (6.2; 7.26; 9.1; 10.11; 11.4; 12.7) where we have a marginal note employing only ὀμοίως, the conclusion drawn as to the text of the Three was the opposite of that proposed or suggested by Field.

The main point to be drawn from these five cases, as well as the nine already in publication, is that the process of establishing a critical text of the OG as well as its correlative—determining the text history—is foundational to establishing a critical text of the Three.

The Relation of the Three and the Old Latin in the Text History of the OG

Next to be considered are a series of cases concerning the place of the Old Latin in the history of the transmission of the text of the OG and in particular, the rôle played by the text of one or more of the Three in establishing a critical text of OG.

Unfortunately no manuscripts exist of the text of the Old Latin for the book of Ecclesiastes. Apart from citations in the Latin Fathers, there are three secondary sources to be noted. First is the Bible text...
of Jerome’s Commentary on Ecclesiastes which has the entire text. Rahlfs used the siglum La for this source in his Handausgabe. This contravenes the principles of the Göttingen Editions as La can only be used for manuscripts of the Old Latin. Hence the siglum Hi is employed below and will also be used in the forthcoming Göttingen Edition.

Second, approximately 26 verses of the Old Latin of Eccl. are found alongside Job and fragments of Proverbs and Canticles in Cod. 11 of the Stiftsbibliothek in St. Gallen (Eighth Century). The siglum for this text is Sang. Third, there are marginal notes in a 1577 Spanish Vulgate Bible from a lost Tenth Century Valvanera Abbey Bible, signalled by the siglum GlosV.

Significant articles published by A. Vaccari and S. Leanza, in 1958 and 1987 respectively, argue that Jerome’s work on Ecclesiastes had three stages: (1) first, he revised the Old Latin on the basis of the OG, (2) second, he made a translation that is based directly upon the Hebrew but dependent upon the Old Latin, (3) thirdly, he made a translation based upon the Hebrew showing complete independence of the Old Latin. According to Vaccari and Leanza, Sang is a witness to the first stage, the Bible text of the Commentary represents the second stage, and the Vulgate represents the third stage. Leanza differs from Vaccari in that while Vaccari treats the Bible text of the Commentary as the Old Latin corrected occasionally towards the Hebrew, Leanza sees it as a new translation however indebted to the Old Latin. At any rate, Jerome made extensive notes from the Hexapla which he used both for his Commentary and for the later translation in the Vulgate.

20M. Adriaen, S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentarius in Ecclesiasten (CChrSL, 72; Brepols: Turnhout, 1999).
22Collations for the Göttingen Edition are based upon a photograph of the manuscript. Recently I discovered that María Ángeles Márquez is preparing a critical edition of these marginal notes and has graciously shared with me a preliminary version of her text.
25I am indebted to my colleague Professor Gregg Allison for gracious and expert help in reading the Italian.
26Leanza, ‘Le tre versioni geronimiane dell’ Ecclesiaste’, p. 98.
The following analysis is based entirely upon my own inductive study. As Rahlfs took the Bible Commentary of Jerome’s Commentary to be equivalent to the Old Latin and sometimes based his text upon it against the Greek manuscript tradition, the critical text I have established differs from Rahlfs in such cases. Below the siglum Ra indicates the text established by Rahlfs and Ge the critical text as I have established it.

1.13d οὐ τινὶ ἐστὶν

οὗτος περίστασιμὸν πονηρὸν

περίστασιμὸν Dam Anast 577 Antioch 1713 Ath III 936 (-μος)

Lat Hi Ad Iovin 1.13 (distentionem) occupationem Hi = Vulg ↓

1.13e καὶ ἀναλυτικὸν ἀπὸ τῶν

ἐδώκεν οὗ τοῖς υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

1.13f ἔτι διὰ τοῦ περιστάσασθαι ἐν αὐτῷ

 Index super ἀσχολίαν

App II ὅτι περιστασιμον σ’ ἀσχολίαν 161mg 248mg 252mg (s nom) 539mg (s nom) Syh

App II τοῦ περιστάσασθαι σ’ τοῦ (> 161mg 248mg) ἀσχολεῖσθαι 161mg 248mg 252mg (s nom) Syh

Jerome: Verbum anian Aquila, Septuaginta et Theodotion περιστασιμον similiter translaturunt, quod in distentionem Latinus interpres expressit . . . Symmachus vero ἀσχολίαν, id est occupationem transtulit. Hie 258, 295-299

Field: ὅτι περιστασιμον (κ’ θ’ ὁμαίως τοῖς ο’). σ’ ἀσχολίαν πονηρὸν ἐδώκεν οὗ τοῖς υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ περιστάσασθαι ἐν αὐτῷ σ’ τὴν ἀσχολίαν τὴν πονηρὰν ἢ ἐδώκεν οὗ τοῖς υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἀσχολεῖσθαι πρὸς αὐτήν. θ’ ὁμαίως τοῖς ο’.

There can be no doubt as to the original text of the OG Ecclesiastes in 1.13. All the Greek mss and citations in the Church Fathers have περιστασιμον in 1.13d and περιστάσασθαι in 1.13f and indeed these

27This analysis was made before discovery of the articles by Vaccari and Leanza.
equivalents are stereotypically used for הָנַשׁ and יִנְנָה by the translator. The sole witness attesting occupationem instead of distentionem in the Old Latin is the Bible text of Jerome’s Commentary. The commentary clearly correlated this reading with that of Symmachus while the readings of Aquila and Theodotion agree with OG. Thus the reading occupationem represents a correction of the Old Latin on the basis of Symmachus. The down arrow is standard in the Göttingen Editions for parts of the text history of the Septuagint which have been influenced by the texts of the Three.

1.17b has an old crux in determining the critical text of the OG. Rahlfs has παραβολάς (‘comparisons’, ‘analogies’, or ‘parables’), a reading supported by all Greek manuscripts. This is contrary, however, to the translation technique of the Greek Translator. The Hebrew word being translated in 1.17 is הַלֶּחֶם (‘madness’). This is rendered by περισπασμός in 12.9 and also by περιφέρεια, a cognate noun, in 9.3. Similarly, הַלֶּחֶם (‘madness’) is rendered by περιφέρεια in 10.13 and הָנַשׁ (‘mad’) by περιφορά in 2.2. Conversely, the Greek Translator uses παραβολή for the only occurrence of הָנַשׁ (‘comparison’, ‘proverb’) in 12.9. Therefore, the original text at 1.17 was probably περιφορά for which παραβολάς represents a copyist’s error of hearing and sight occurring so early that it dominated the textual tradition that has come down to us. Earlier noteworthy conjectures are περιφοράν (Grabe,
1709) and παραφορᾶς (Gordis, 1937). The conjecture of Gordis is ώ’ according to 161ms 248ms Syh and the proposal of Grabe closer to the mark. Jerome has clearly corrected the Old Latin on the basis of πλάνας, the text of α’.

1.17c ἡ ροή τοῦ ἀνέμου
Ra.Ge ὅτι καὶ γε τοῦτο ἐστὶν προαιρέσεις πνεύματος
προαιρέσεις πνεύματος | pastio venti | aut praesumptio spiritus
Hi | προαιρέσεις | προαιρέσειν 631 | διερρωσεις 998
App II ὅτι καὶ γε τοῦτο ἐστὶν προαιρέσεις πνεύματος | α’ ὅτι πρὸς τοῦτό ἐστιν νομὴ ἀνέμου 252ms; ὅτι πρὸς τοῦτο ἐστὶν νόημα ἀνέμου 161ms 248ms (s nom; sic)
Field: (σ’) ὅτι πρὸς τοῦτο ἐστὶν νομὴ ἀνέμου (Nobil.)

The critical text is not in doubt; both text history and translation technique solidly support προαιρέσεις πνεύματος as original. τῷ ἐν ἀνέμῳ (1.14; 2.11, 17, 26; 4.4, 6; 6.9) and τῷ ἐν ἀνέμῳ (1.17; 2.22; 4.16) are both rendered προαιρέσεις πνεύματος in all instances.

Jerome’s Bible text—before the commentary—literally reads: cog-noui quia et hoc est pastio vembali, siue praesumptio spiritus. In the commentary, Jerome refers the reader to his earlier discussion at 1.14 where the Bible text has only praesumptio spiritus. The commentary is worth citing:

Routh Aquila et Theodotion νομὴν, Symmachus βόσκησιν transtulerunt. Septuaginta autem interpretates non Hebraeum sermonem expressere, sed Syrum, dicentes προαιρέσειν. Siue ergo νομὴ, siue βόσκησιν a pastione oco-balum est, προαιρέσεις melius uoluntatem, quam praesumptionem sonat Hi35 comm 259,328-260,333.

This commentary shows that at 1.17—although not at 1.14—Jerome corrected the Old Latin on the basis of the Three. This is the main point, although his commentary may help to determine the text of the Three.

Field’s Edition attributes νομὴ ἀνέμου tentatively to Symmachus, but in his Auctarium, he assigns it to Aquila, presumably on the basis

30Aquila and Theodotion render routh [i.e. ποιμή] by νομήν, Symmachus by βόσκησιν. The Seventy Interpreters, however, express not the Hebrew word, but the Aramaic, giving προαιρέσειν. Whether νομή or βόσκησις, the noun is from ‘to graze’, προαιρέσεις better denotes ‘purpose’ than presumption. (Author’s Translation).

of 252. For Symmachus, we should accept Jerome’s testimony that the text was βάσκηςας ἀνέμου. The marginal readings of 161 and 248 are without attribution. To be sure ἀνέμου is a scribal error for ἀνέμου. νόημα is an improvement over προϊέρεις as an equivalent for ἡμέρ. νόημα is found only in Sir. 21.11, Bar. 2.8 and 3 Macc. 5.30 and so far, not for the Three. Perhaps it should be attributed to Theodotion. This shows the difficulty of sorting out hexaplaric materials.

1.18a τὸν τιρ υπενθέμετα ποτάμιον Φοίνικι

οὕτοι εν πληθείση σοφίας πληθάνσας γνώσεως

γνώσεως Did 30.23 Syh] συνεσεως 766; fororis Hi (sed hab Hi

Pel 2) = m ↓ (indignatio Vulg)

Syhmsg; o ρηματικος στοιχείον

Syhmsg; o ρηματικος στοιχείον

Field: α’ θ’ θυμοῦ

Field: α’ ἂγῃ

For τὸν τιρ υπενθέμετα OG has πληθάνσας γνώσεως. This is difficult to explain although in Egyptian cursive script one might confuse ἃ and ἃ thus reading ἀνέμου or ἀνέμου. To confuse a ἃ for ἃ or ἃ, however, is implausible palaeographically. Nonetheless, context makes ‘knowledge’ the lectio facilior. Thus the rendering in OG might be due partly to palaeographic and partly to contextual factors. Not surprisingly, all Three offer a correction to OG. The Bible text of Jerome has furoris, clearly a correction of the Old Latin based upon either the reading of α’ θ’ or that of α’. Jerome’s citation in Pel 2, however, preserves the Old Latin.

2.12a τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἡμῶν

Ra,Ge καὶ οἵτινες ἑγὼ τοῦ ἦς εἰςειν σοφίαν

2.12b τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἡμῶν

Ra,Ge καὶ περιφοράν καὶ ἀφοσύνην

περιφοράν S A O−253.411 C−− a b d 68 125 H 149 161 text 248 text

252 260 296 – 311 336 – 338 339 443 534 539 542 543 547 549 645 698

706 766 H 795 Did 46.15 Didcorr 46.16 17 19 GregNy 355.5ου Co |

περιφοράν B 998 253 161 ms 248ms 602 613sup in GregNy 355.5ου(cor)

Jaeger Olcorr (περιφοράν . . . ἥ περιφοράν) = Sixt: cf 2a; επι-

φοράν GregNy 355.5ου; errores Hi = Vulg ↓

Although solid support for περιφοράν exists in the textual tradition and, as already shown, also from translation technique, at an early stage in the text transmission the lectio facilior παραφοράν replaced it. A similar situation obtains at 2.2a although the support there for παραφοράν is scant.

Field is correct to attribute πλάνας (plural) to α' and θ'. This is supported by 252 and Syh. The marginal reading in 161, 248 and 539 shows that Symmachus had the singular and only that Aquila had the same lexeme, not the singular number.

Jerome’s Bible text has errores, an obvious correction of the Old Latin based on α' and θ'.

2.12c ὁ δὲ τὸς τῆς δικηρουμένης ὁ ὀξύος ἑλέστει τῆς βουλῆς
ἐπελεύστηκεν B-S A 998 411 C'' b d 149 260 443 534' 547 602 645 698 705 GregNy 355.6 Ol' B-S 68 125 252 296' 311 336' 338 339 542 543 549 706 766 Dion GregAg 809 812 Ol' A = Compl; εἰποίησεν S; εἰπέλυσεν ὁ δὲ τῆς βουλῆς Gloss' post regem Hi = ∇ ↓

2.12d ἦν ἀποφθέγματι ἐν τῷ τάξιν καὶ τῷ ἐξήγησαν αὐτήν
 latina A B 998 253 68 149 260 296' 311 549 698 706 795 Syh Sa = Compl Gra Br | ἐπίθετον B-S A 411 C' (560 c pr m) a b d' B-S 357 125H 149 252 296 336' 338 339 443 534' 542 543 547 602 645 705 766 Did 47.25 Dion GregAg 809 GregNy 355.7 Ol Syn Arm Gloss' Pesch | αὐτήν B A 998 253 68 161 248 336' 534 Syn Pesch Syh = Compl Sixt Gra Ra | ἐπίθετον B-S A 411 C' (571st) b d 125H 149 252 296 336' 338 339 443 542 543 547 548' 549 602 613 645 698 705 706 795

Several issues in 2.12c and 12d may be considered together. First to be noted is the rendering of γνῶς ἥρα in 2.12c as ὠπίσω τῆς βουλῆς by OG. This is due to construing γνῶς in the Hebrew as equivalent to Syriac ἀλέσε (‘counsel’) rather than as ἀλέσι (‘king’).31 While GlosV supports the OG, Jerome’s Bible text has post regem and this is a clear correction of the Old Latin on the basis of the Hebrew and is also in agreement with the readings of ι and ι.

In 2.12d I have reconstructed as original text σὺν τὰ ὅσα instead of τὰ ὅσα as in Rahlfś. This is based on 637 for the O Group, a dozen minuscules including 161, 248 and 252, GregAg, Ol and Hi for witnesses, and on Ziegler’s excellent study in translation technique and is not germane to the central issues at hand.32

σ<iostream> σύν in Syh is to be construed as Pe’al Perfect 3 f.p. (extended form in ὃν(ὑ))33 plus 3 f.s. pronominal suffix and translated ‘all things.

31The former is vocalised melkā and the latter malkă; in early manuscripts this difference is indicated only by a diacritical dot. See J.B. Segal, The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 21.
that they made it (/her).\textsuperscript{34} Thus Syh does not support the O Group for the variant on the verb and goes with 253 against the rest of the O Group for the variant on the pronoun functioning as verbal complement.

Field has done an excellent job in reconstructing a critical text for the Three out of the chaos in the witnesses. On the reliable testimony of Syh and 252\textsuperscript{mg} it is \textit{x} and \textit{y} that read \textit{βασιλέως}. The testimony of Syh here is not dependent upon retroversion from Syriac since a marginal note connected to the marginal note for \textit{y} gives the word for \textit{κύριος} in Greek. 252\textsuperscript{mg} is doubtless correct and 161\textsuperscript{mg} 248\textsuperscript{mg} wrong in the attribution of the sentence to \textit{s}; 161\textsuperscript{mg} 248\textsuperscript{mg} are correct, however, in the lexeme indicated as object of \textit{παρακολούθησε}: Symmachus read ‘counsel’ and not ‘king’. Nonetheless, 252\textsuperscript{mg} and not 161\textsuperscript{mg} 248\textsuperscript{mg} have the correct case for the object.

What I have chosen as original text has the merit of best representing the translation technique of OG in corresponding formally to the Hebrew parent text. It is also the lectio difficilior. Admittedly some would argue that the original text of OG is \textit{ἐποίησεν ἀυτήν} and that this points to \textit{הָקָם} rather than \textit{הָקָםָה} as parent text. S. R. Driver, the editor of BH2, counts 68 manuscripts in support of this alternative Hebrew text\textsuperscript{35} and Horst, editor of BHS, records ‘mlt Mss’ in support. This misreads, however, the evidence furnished by De Rossi. Of the manuscripts cited by Driver, only Ms 585 and the first hand of 304 actually offer the vocalisation \textit{חִיָּה}.\textsuperscript{36} The rest have an unvocalised text \textit{חִיָּה} which may just as well be considered a defective spelling for \textit{חִיָּה}. Theodotion, perhaps the earliest of the Three, clearly read a Hebrew text with 3 person plural. Indeed, Field retroverts the marginal note in Syh for \textit{qV} as \textit{σῶν τὰ ἔσω ἐποίησεν ἀυτήν} which is surely the authentic OG. It differs from the text of Syh only in the addition of \textit{τὸ} (\textit{σῶν} was lost in the Greek transmission in prehexaplaric times as it is not in 998) and the order of the words \textit{ἐπιστρατεύουσα}.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{34}I am indebted to Prof. I. Ierusalmi of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH, who graciously provided excellent consultation on this difficult form (Private Communication, August 18, 2003). K.D. Jenner, Director of the Peshitta Institute in Leiden, also confirmed this analysis (Private Communication, October 27, 2003).

\textsuperscript{35}R. Kittel (ed.), \textit{Biblia Hebraica} (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1912).

Unfortunately the important witness 998 involves a lacuna. The edition offers εποίησεν in its text, but a glance at the photograph shows a complete lacuna for the crucial epsilon. There is also no special reason to restore the lacuna in favour of B. The editors count agreements and disagreements with the major uncials as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Against 998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>343 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (S')</td>
<td>172 (37) 208 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>171 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>177 155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is by no means impossible that 998 could have agreed with A against B here. The crucial support for εποίησεν is A 254-357 (half of the important d group), the important minuscules 161 248 and 252, the Syh and the Sahidic. Syh rather than the O Group represents the α' text. This is countered by weighty witnesses such as B-S and early patristic citations. The Catena and a and b group and minuscules influenced by B-S need not be considered weighty. So the support for the 3 s. is not as strong as one might think.

The reading of the Bible text in Jerome’s Commentary and that of the Vulgate is based upon vocalising the Hebrew as יִשָּׁב, a Qal Active Participle plus 3 m.s. suffix. The Fayyumic seems to be a free rendering, but may well attest to the difficulty of translating what I have posited as OG rather than a Greek parent text such as Rahlfs’.

The history of the textual transmission is not hard to explain. First, the nonsensical σῶv was omitted. Next, it is easy to see contextually how a 3 pl. verb would be changed to a 3 sg., but not vice versa. Finally, the accusative pronoun was construed in a variety of ways less difficult than the original wooden Greek. In addition, one may note that the O Group was contaminated or corrected by α' to read εἰσελεύσεταί instead of επελευσέταί.

Whether or not the above argumentation is considered persuasive or not, one main point is clear: while the process is by no means circular, the texts of the Three have a rôle to play in establishing the critical text of OG and in identifying correction to the Hebrew in Jerome (Hi).

Conversely, the text of OG can be significant in sorting out chaos in hexaplaric witnesses and in establishing a critical text of the Three. The Second Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition must supply accurate information as to what is in the manuscripts. There is a world of difference between this and a critical reconstruction of the text of the Three.

3.16a enever coha rht h r-

καὶ ἔτι εἴδον ὑπὸ τὸν ἅλιον τόπον τῆς κρίσεως,

3.16b enever coha r-

ἐξεῖ ὁ ἁσεβής,

ὁ ἁσεβής 1º) impietas Hi (sed hab Lucif Athan 1,35) = Vulg

3.16c enever coha r-

καὶ τόπον τοῦ δικαίου,

tοῦ δικαίου τοῦ δικαίου A 161 248* 252 = Compl; iustitiae Hi (sed hab Lucif Athan 1,35) = Vulg

App II τοῦ δικαίου) στῆς (> 161mg 248ms) δικαίουτης 161mg 248ms 252ms

3.16d enever coha r-

ἐξεῖ ὁ ἁσεβής,

ἀσεβής 2º 295-425* 609* 248* 795 = Ald Compl Gra. Ra.; iniq-

uitas Hi = Pesch Vulg; eusebh" rel (Lucif Athan 1,35)

First to be discussed in 3.16 is the problem in the text in 16d. Rahlfs chose ἁσεβής on the basis of Ald Compl and Grabe against the entire manuscript tradition. Five Greek witnesses are now known to support this text, although quite possibly secondarily so, under influence from Jerome or Aquila. There is no real reason to think that the literal translator deviated from the Hebrew parent text. The change of ἁσεβής to εὐσεβής is quite natural as an inner-Greek corruption given the context and a scribal setting that has no access to the Hebrew original.

MT vocalises ἐσα in both 3.16b and d as the noun rešā’. OG apparently vocalised these as the adjective rāšā’. MT ἐσα in 3.16c is obviously the noun and not the adjective, but OG employed an adjective to match his approach in 16b and d. In all three instances Jerome’s Bible text shows the Old Latin corrected to the same vocalisation as in MT. In 3.16c this agrees with the text of Aquila, the only reading of the Three extant for this verse. Lucifer’s text represents the original Old Latin.

4.1d καὶ ἀδέρφων τῶν συνοφροντομένων.

Although ὤρα (‘tears’) is a collective singular in Hebrew, not surprisingly, the number of the noun in the Old Greek translation formally corresponds to that in the source language. The Bible text of Jerome’s Commentary has the plural, doubtless a correction of the Old Latin based upon the Hebrew and the reading of Symmachus.

Determining the Text of the OG by Critical Use of the Three

In a paper presented in Toronto, 2002, I re-examined the predominant thesis of the past one hundred years that the Greek Ecclesiastes is in some way the work of Aquila by considering the point of view of the scholiast who produced the marginal notes now found in the Syro-Hexapla.\textsuperscript{38} Nine notes from the scholiast claimed identity between θ’ and the α’ text and a different reading in α’; one note claimed identity between α’ and the θ’ text and a different reading in θ’. Three of the nine were inconclusive and the one claiming to show that α’ agreed with OG against θ’ did not, in fact, prove this. The net result of this study suggests that the OG Ecclesiastes is in the καίγε tradition and almost certainly not Aquila. These conclusions form the basis for analysis of the following problems in the text history of the OG. Regarding 2.21c:

38See Gentry, ‘The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes’.
In 2.21a Rahlfs goes against the entire manuscript tradition in proposing *où* as original text. He is apparently influenced by *cui* in the Bible text of Jerome’s Commentary which he considered a reliable source for the Old Latin. The fact that he employed the siglum La for Jerome’s Bible text is mute witness to the weight he attached to this source. The only real support for *où* is found in Fa and Sa. The text I have established follows the manuscript tradition and considers Jerome’s text a correction based upon the Hebrew and the Coptic witness translational rather than textual. From the viewpoint of translation technique, we must not always choose a Greek text identical to the Hebrew. The OG translator did follow an approach of formal equivalence, but is capable of more dynamic renderings.

In 2.21c why did Rahlfs choose *δζ* instead of *δ* based only on *O cH b alii* vs. *B-S C’ a d rel*? Note that it is also the reading of Aquila. Probably Rahlfs chose this reading since he believed that the original text was the text closest to Aquila and closest to MT. Nonetheless, it is almost impossible to propose plausible reasons why scribes would change *δζ* to *δ*, while the reverse is easy to explain: a difficult text is improved by correcting towards MT on the basis of the Three. The lemma of the ms from which the marginal notes in Syh derive probably had *δζ*. The scholiast knew that the reading of the *o’* text was *δ* and added *τοις o’* to the *ὁμοιώς* note to show that *θ’* agreed with the *o’* text but not his lemma. In the text of Syh *δ* is the lemma. If Origen’s text had *δζ*, this was due to a correction towards the Hebrew on the basis of Aquila in the period before Origen.
Here Field has $\delta$ as his $\alpha'$ text, so one would surmise from this that $\gamma'$ also had this text. This is correct, but not due to the methodology followed by Field. This is another case where OG and $\gamma'$ are identical against $\alpha'$. Knowing the relationship between OG, $\alpha'$ and $\gamma'$ helps to establish a critical text both of the OG and $\gamma'$.

2.25

Rahlfs (1935) reconstructs $\varphi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota$ as OG, as did Grabe before him (1709). His apparatus gives as support $OLa\delta$, meaning Origen’s recension, the Old Latin and at most not more than one additional manuscript. While we do not know all the reasoning behind Rahlfs’ reconstruction, we can safely say that he chose $\varphi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota$ because the reading better corresponds to the Hebrew parent text, it better approximates Aquila (and he thought the OG Aquila or Aquilanic) and it is supported by both Jerome’s Old Latin and the text of the Syro-Hexapla—the latter being a strong witness for Origen’s text.

One of the most enlightened treatments of this crux criticorum is that of Jan De Waard in 1979.39 While he is concerned with establishing the Hebrew text, he provides excellent insights and a good summary of previous solutions. For the reading $\varphi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\varepsilon\tau\iota$ he lists Origen’s recension, Vetus Latina, Aquila and Symmachus as witnesses, also noting parceland Jerome. This looks like five witnesses to the two listed by Rahlfs.

The reading *parcet* is, in fact, the Vetus Latina of Rahlfs. So, aside from *ζ* and *σ*, he has only the same two witnesses as Rahlfs. Indeed, since 1935, no further witness for *φείσται* has come to light.

Both readings must be considered paleographically: *τικείκεται* versus *τικείκεται*. If we were to assume a dittography of the sigma, an *σπι* could have been read as *φι*. This would have occurred in the period of the uncials. It assumes that *πίσται* is the *lectio difficilior* and arose solely as an inner-Greek development. Yet this does not explain how *πίσται* dominates the text tradition, and it is a real stretch to confuse the two words on this basis alone.\(^{40}\)

One might assume *πίσται* arising as an inner-Greek development as it more naturally goes with *φάγεται*, and *φείσται* is contextually odd. So *φείσται* would be the *lectio difficilior*. Yet *πίσται* may be considered just as possibly based upon the same parent text as *φείσται*.\(^{40}\)

De Waard is worth citing in full here:

There is no serious reason whatsoever to believe that this reading goes back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* yiṣṭeḥ. In fact, it can be explained in three different ways: (a) as a *Verlegenheitslesart* and an introduction of the pair ‘kl – šīḥ from verse 24b; (b) as a specific rendering of MT yāḥūs, taken in the generic sense of ‘enjoy’; (c) as the rendering of a Hebrew verb which got lost in Hebrew, but which still exists in Arabic (ḥasa – to drink). Possibilities (a) and (b) are the more probable ones and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive, since the existence of the word pair ‘kl – šīḥ in verse 24b may have inspired the specific rendering. It should at least be noted here that possibility (b) did not get the attention it deserves. Anyway, text-critically one can retain the important conclusion that in none of these cases the reading goes back to a different *Vorlage*.\(^{41}\)

If, as I have argued, OG Ecclesiastes is closer to the *καληγε* tradition than to Aquila, the first proposal would fit the translation technique well. I deem it likely that the OG Translator had difficulty with the verb, whether read *ἐπιστεν* or *ἐπτεν*, and provided a contextually based rendering. It also makes sense that Theodotion retained this text in his revision.

\(^{40}\)An ingenious solution is proposed by McNeile who suggests that an original *φείσται* could explain both *πίσται* and *φείσται* and could be based upon *שַׁב* understood according to the meaning in Aramaic and Post Biblical Hebrew ‘feel pain’ > enjoy. See A.H. McNeile, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1904), p. 158. Positing an intermediate step in the process, however, which has no attestation whatsoever, is just too ingenious.

As I have maintained, the marginal notes in the Syro-Hexapla come from a different manuscript than the manuscript which was the Vorlage for the text. Fifty-five notes have ὀμοίως τοῖς ὅ', one employs ὃς instead of ὀμοίως (ὡς οἱ ο’ 3.10), and fourteen have just ὀμοίως. Only 2.25 has ὑσχύτως. Normally ὀμοίως indicates sources having a text identical to the lemma and ὀμοίως τοῖς ὅ' indicates sources having a text identical to the o’ text. The scholiast doubtless had πιέσται in his text and noted in the margin that ‘Aquila and Symmachus in like manner had φεισεται, while Theodotion had πιέσται.’ He had to add φεισεται because it was not his lemma and did not add τοῖς ὅ' because theirs was not equal to the o’ text. According to the Colophon for Ecclesiastes in Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus, the parent text for the text of Syh was corrected by Eusebius and Pamphilus. This can explain why it is not the o’ text and why it is different from the O Group. It also assumes a different meaning for ὑσχύτως from ὀμοίως: why should we assume that the two words are used with identical intent or meaning?

The readings of the Three must be carefully sorted out in this passage as well. Field gives φεισεται for α’ σ’ and πιέσται for θ’ based upon the marginal note in Syh. The reading ἀναλώσει attributed to σ’ in 248 appears to be ignored. The evidence of 248 and Syh is as follows:

248  Ind ad φάγεται. Margin: α’ φεισεται σ’ ἀναλώσει.
Syh Ind ad φεισεται. Margin: α’ σ’ ὑσχύτως φεισεται θ’ πιέσται.

When one considers the text in Hebrew and the equivalents normally used by LXX Translators, it is probable that in 248 ἀναλώσει is for φάγεται and that φεισεται is for LXX πιέσται. Thus Aquila may have read τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς φεισεται while Symmachus had τίς ἀναλώσει καὶ τίς φεισεται. We may thus assume that the note is correct in both 248 and Syh: both α’ and σ’ are similar (ὑσχύτως): ‘Who will spend/eat and who will be thrifty?’, whereas OG and θ’ have ‘Who will eat and who will drink?’ For proof that this is the correct meaning of ὑσχύτως in the marginal note of Syh, see a similar case in 3.11. As an aside, it should be noted that a lexicon of the Three would have to assign different meanings for φεισεται in the cases of Aquila and

42For a discussion on the colophon and its significance, see Gentry, ‘Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes’, pp. 6-7.
433.11 employs ὃς (κυα) whereas 2.25 uses ὑσχύτως (κομμ).
Symmachus (the context requires ‘spare’ for Aquila and ‘be thrifty’ for Symmachus) and that this could not be done without first reconstructing a critical text of the Three.

As for the Latin reading parcet, the probability that Jerome corrected the Bible text of his commentary on the basis of Aquila is strong. GlosV has bibet (supported by the citation in Pseudo-Ignatius) and this is much more likely to be the Old Latin.

We can now summarise as follows. The reading πίστα is based upon the same parent text as φειστα. It has better claim to fit the translation technique of the OG since OG is not Aquila and closer to Theodotion. Jerome’s Bible text is not the Old Latin and Syh is probably not Origen’s recension here, but a correction of it based upon Aquila. Rahlfs’ supports for φειστα are removed and we should adopt the reading of the entire Greek manuscript tradition including the Old Latin as in GlosV. Not only does Aquila help us to reconstruct the true OG, but the reconstruction of the OG helps us sort out our hexaplaric witnesses and reconstruct α’ and σ’ for the entire verse once we understand the original lemma of the marginal note and the correct meaning of ὑσπύτως.

Conclusions

One might argue that the difficulties faced by the student of Ecclesiastes in determining the text of OG or the texts of the Three are due to the fact that we have as yet no critical edition in the Göttingen Septuaginta Series. Yet, as Bas ter Haar Romeny and I have shown in our Oslo Congress Paper reporting on a new edition of hexaplaric fragments for Genesis, the situation may not be much better when we do have a Göttingen Edition.44 True, we have the excellent work of Prof. Wevers in establishing the critical text. Yet much new material for the Second Apparatus has come to light since the publication of the Göttingen Edition and, more importantly, the purpose of the Second Apparatus is to provide only the evidence from the manuscripts. The Göttingen Edition, on principle, does not offer a critical reconstruction of the texts of the Three.

Thus, what is propaedeutic to a lexicon of the Three is a new critical edition of the hexaplaric fragments. If this is accepted, perhaps scholars who are interested in working on a lexicon of the Three could collaborate on the new edition of Field as they would have to do this work in order to have accurate materials for the lexicon, and in working on a critical edition of the remains of the Three for a particular book would have automatically gathered the materials for the lexicon and wrestled with lexicographical issues. We must explore ways in which those involved in the Hexapla Institute can co-operate with those interested in a lexicon of the Three to accomplish these important projects.
The question of the faith of the Peshitta translators, whether Jewish or Christian, has of course been intensively pursued. Among the earlier papers, that of Bloch\(^1\) gives a brief summary of the literature up to the early years of the twentieth century; the more recent authoritative work on this topic includes discussions by Gelston, Van der Kooij, de Moor and Sepmeijer, Morrison, Owens, Taylor, Weitzman, Winter, and, in this volume, Van Peursen.\(^2\)


In brief, two principal views are held by these authorities. In the one group are those who believe that the Peshitta translators were Christian and that this faith is evident in the translation of certain verses: there are some passages at which, they believe, only a Christian would have rendered the Hebrew as has been done at a number of passages in the Peshitta. In addition to these passages which in their view are conclusive, they adduce others as supporting evidence, though acknowledging that in these latter areas the evidence of Christian input is rather less certain. Putting together these two groups of passages, these authorities maintain that the cumulative weight of evidence is sufficient to constitute proof of Christian translators.

In the other group of authorities are those who believe that the translators were Jews. While agreeing with those in the first group that there are certain passages at which it can be argued that the difference between Hebrew and Syriac is compatible with a Christian interpretation, they maintain that compatibility is no more than compatibility, and that these passages, even taken all together, do not amount to proof: they accept that there is a considerable number of passages which can be interpreted as proof of Christian input, but add that there are none or only a minute number which can only be interpreted in such a way. The suggestion presented in this paper is another interpretation which is built on the work of these and other scholars.

This interpretation has developed during a study of the translation technique in the Peshitta to Isaiah. Within Isaiah, the obvious areas

---

3Weitzman, ‘The Origin of the Peshitta Psalter’, in Rapoport-Albert and Greenberg (eds), From Judaism to Christianity, pp. 90-113, suggested a further construction, that the work was begun while the community in which the translators were based was still Jewish and finished after the process of evangelisation had begun. This paper was first published in 1982. Weitzman’s later view, expressed for instance in ‘From Judaism to Christianity’ (pp 21-24) which first appeared in 1992, may have been that the whole Peshitta was the work of non-rabbinic Jews, members of a prayer-cult whose values smoothed an eventual path into Christianity.

4Some Christian elements have entered the text during its transmission: these are not strictly relevant to the present discussion of the faith of the translator himself.
for study of the faith of the translator are the ‘Apocalypse’ of chapters 24-27, and the ‘Servant Songs’ of Deutero-Isaiah. Discussion in the present paper is restricted to the ‘Servant Songs’, which seem to be a propitious area for the investigation of this question, having been so intensively studied both by those who believe that their significance lies in their presence in the Hebrew Bible, and by those who see them as directly relevant to Christianity. A Christian translator of the Peshitta to Isaiah could well have taken the latter view, and this might be detectable in his work. There is, though, a possible paradox: since later Christian exegetes have found so much in the Hebrew of these passages to convince them of their importance to Christianity, it could be argued that a Christian translator would not have felt the need to emend his Vorlage in any way. Absence of Christian nuance would not then suggest a non-Christian translator, but simply a translator who was content with the wording before him. Indeed it is difficult for today’s reader to assess these texts, and the translations, independently of modern western perceptions.

Loewe, in his Prolegomenon to Neubauer on Isaiah Chapter 53, discusses the difficulty from the Jewish point of view: it is essential for the reader to clear his mind of his knowledge of exegesis from whatever source, and to approach the texts afresh. The meshing of the Jewish and the Christian themes is emphasised by Morgenstern discussing the suggestion that the Gospel narrative may have been influenced by the mt reading which refers to the rich man. Rajak expressing the problem in a different context: ‘One slips

---

5The literature on the authorship of these texts, on whether or not they really form a distinct corpus, and on the identity of the Servant, is of course enormous; see for instance the discussions in J.N. Ostwalt, The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66 (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 107-15 and passim; T.N.D. Mettinger, A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom (Scriptora Minora, 13; Lund: Gleerup, 1983). For present purposes, however, these problems are not relevant and will not be considered further in this paper.

6A thorough analysis of P-Isaiah from this point of view is in progress, but for the purposes of this paper the texts discussed have been limited to those presented at the LISOR congress in 2003.


readily into Christianizing this history (of martyrdom), to make much of anticipations of Christian developments... It is surprising how few are the commentators who have managed to react to the record on its own terms’. Also in a different context, de Boer\textsuperscript{11} wrote ‘but I underestimated the force of the printed text’: indeed it is difficult to overestimate the effect of the printed word.

Because perceptions of an input by a Christian translator naturally focus on passages at which there are differences in meaning between the Masoretic Text (\textit{mt}) and the Peshitta (P), the prevalence of such areas in the Peshitta as a whole is relevant to the present discussion. This prevalence is not high. There is strong evidence that the \textit{Vorlage} from which the translator of the Peshitta worked was close to, though not identical with, the Masoretic Text, and the translator of the Peshitta almost always strove to preserve the meaning of that \textit{Vorlage}.\textsuperscript{12} Sometimes he failed to understand the meaning of a passage of particularly difficult Hebrew, and made small errors in consequence; often, he made small additions to increase the precision of the text; but the balance of evidence overall strongly suggests that he aimed, successfully, to achieve a meticulous rendering of the sense of his \textit{Vorlage}. Throughout the Peshitta to the Servant Songs, the closeness between the Hebrew and the Syriac is indeed remarkable, particularly considering the difficulty of the task of translation. The Hebrew is extraordinarily dense


\textsuperscript{12}See for example: A. Gelston, \textit{The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 111-18, who assesses the evidence suggesting that there were differences between the \textit{Vorlage} of the Peshitta and \textit{mt}, examining Hebrew variants, passages in which the Peshitta seems to presuppose a different vocalisation or word-division of the same Hebrew consonantal text as that of \textit{mt}, and the evidence of the other ancient versions, and concludes that ‘It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} of the Peshitta was very nearly identical with \textit{mt}’; G. Greenberg, \textit{Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah} (MPIL, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), pp. 26-31. Clearly, however, the Peshitta is not a slavishly literal rendering; M.D. Koster, ‘The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta’ in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), \textit{Targum and Peshitta} (Targum Studies, 2; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, 165; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 15-54, who argues that the scribes unconsciously introduced changes, for instance breaking the constraints of quantitative literalism and adjusting the syntax to fit the Syriac idiom. Nonetheless it is nearer the ‘literal’ than the ‘free’; see for instance Weitzman, \textit{The Syriac Version}, p. 15, who says ‘For the most part, P stands close in sense to the Hebrew of \textit{mt}’.
and complex: Baltzer, for instance, writes even of Isa. 42.1, 3 as including terms which in their precise context are ‘hardly translatable’.

Nonetheless, there are differences between MT and P, and those discussed below include a number that are compatible with a Christian input. Even in this small corpus, amounting at the broadest definition to hardly more than the length of a single long biblical chapter, there are at least ten verses which include phrases of interest in the present context. This is a substantial number, particularly bearing in mind the potential paradoxical effect noted above which could tend to reduce the number of passages whose meaning was deliberately modified in translation. The picture is not simple, however. In eight of these ten passages the translation differs from the MT by presenting a nuance which could be seen to be Christian, or by introducing a messianic theme absent from the MT. However, in the ninth the difference


14For comprehensive discussions of the individual verses to be presented in this paper, see of course Van der Kooij, Die alten Textzeugen; J. Goldingay J. and D. Payne, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40-55 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, forthcoming).

15Commentators differ, of course, in the boundaries they set on these songs; see for instance C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948); Ostwalt, Isaiah; Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah. A broad definition is: First Song Isa. 42.1-4, possibly 7-9; Second Song Isa. 49.1-6, possibly 7-13; Third Song Isa. 50.4-9, possibly 10-11; Fourth Song Isa. 52.13-53.12.

16The ten selected passages are, in canonical order, Isa. 49.1, 4, 5, 6, 7; 50.10; 53.3, 5, 8, 9. The points of interest in Isa. 49.7; 53.3 are clear but small, and these two passages have been included not for their intrinsic interest but to illustrate the contribution of individually insignificant items to the body of cumulative evidence. Isa. 53.2, where the MT ‘he had... no appearance that we should desire him’ is rendered by P (there are some variants, but none that bears directly on the point in question here) ‘we saw that he had no (impressive, pleasing) appearance and we deceived him’ is authoritatively cited as evidence of Christian input: see Van der Kooij, Die Alten Textzeugen, p. 277. It is not included here because, in the light of Weitzman’s suggestion (The Syriac version, p. 243) that it could result from a scribal error, writing not an intended ‘(that) we desire him’ but the close ‘we saw that he had no appearance and we deceived him’, it does not fit well into the overall theme of the present paper. It does, however, suggest an interesting comparison between the scrupulous work of the translator (see below) and the less impartial work of some of those involved at a later time in the work on the Peshitta.

17This is not to imply, of course, that there was no messianic theme in the Hebrew Bible. See for instance W. Horbury, Messianism among Jews and Christians, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2003) p. 5: ‘perhaps the major insight of the second half of the twentieth century in the study of ancient messianism [is] a regained

between the Hebrew and the Syriac may give a less, rather than more, anti-Jewish sense. The tenth example would have provided an excellent opportunity to a translator wishing to introduce a Christian nuance: yet, arousing much interest in later Syrian commentators, the translator has scrupulously resisted any such temptation, giving a text in which the outstanding interest lies not in any differences between the Hebrew and the Syriac, but in the similarities.

Given this complexity, it is not surprising that a number of different aspects of the translation feature in the analysis. The ten verses mentioned above may be grouped as follows:

1. The group of eight passages.
   a. the plain meaning of a phrase of clear Hebrew has been reversed: Isa. 49.4.
   b. the choice of lexical equivalent or perception of the root meaning can be seen to introduce a messianic theme: Isa. 49.6; 50.10; 53.5.
   c. the possible change in meaning depends on the perception of punctuation within the verse: Isa. 49.1.
   d. the relevant features are grammatical, together with a possible error at the stage of translation in one: Isa. 49.6 (there is a small grammatical difference between MT and P in this verse, so it should be considered in this group too); Isa. 53.8.
   e. the characteristics of the Servant himself are subtly affected, in the first by changing a preposition and giving a Syriac plural for a Hebrew singular, and in the second by the choice of lexical equivalent: Isa. 49.7; 53.3.

2. An anti-Israelite sense present in the Ktib is eliminated by rendering the Qere: Isa. 49.5.

3. the outstanding feature of the translation is its closeness to the Hebrew despite an obvious possibility of introducing a Christian theme: Isa. 53.9.

1. First, the eight verses in which a Christian or messianic nuance appears in P but not in the MT.

   a. the plain meaning of a phrase of clear Hebrew has been reversed: Isa. 49.4.

   recognition that messianic hope belongs to the stream of interpretative tradition which accompanies the Jewish scriptures throughout antiquity'.


The context is the Servant’s reference to his call, and to God’s statement in the preceding verse: רַעַיָּא בְּרֵאשֵׁי אַרְיָא קֵלָה בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַּחֲיָא ‘You are my servant, Israel, and in you I will be glorified’. In the MT this is immediately followed by the Servant’s lament, given above. In LXX καὶ ἔχω ἑαυτόν and Tg יָתָנָטָנָנָנָn this is closely represented; but in the Peshitta שָׁם גַּבַּלְוָה לֹא חָלִיתָנָנָנָn בְּרֵי יָרָא לְהָרָא בְּרֵי יָרָא ‘for I did not say ‘I have laboured in vain’; Goldingay and Payne describe this as ‘an uncharacteristically frank and confrontational expansion’.

The technique of ‘converse translation’, discussed for instance by Klein in Targumic tradition, is an unlikely explanation. This technique is occasionally used in the Peshitta for the sake of perceived logic, for instance at Josh. 23.4 where the Hebrew reads ראיַיָא הַלָּכָה בְּרֵאשֵׁי יִרְיָא בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַּחֲיָא ‘See! I have apportioned to you the remaining nations’, but P, slightly redrafted, renders שָׁם גַּבַּלְוָה לֹא חָלִיתָנָn בְּרֵי יָרָא לְהָרָא ‘So, see - I have not apportioned to you these nations that have remained’ going on to distinguish the nations west of the Jordan; or at Gen. 41.54-55, where the Hebrew reads יִרְיָא בְּרֵאשֵׁי קַרְדּוּ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַּחֲיָא ‘but in all the land of Egypt there was bread;
and when there was famine in all Egypt...’ but P, here too slightly re-drafted, gives ‘there was famine in all the lands, and in all the land of Egypt there was no bread...’. Weitzman\textsuperscript{22} cites a number of other passages, but Isa. 49.4 is of a different ilk, for here there is no problem in the logic of the Hebrew.

There are at least four reasonable explanations. First, the change was deliberate, introduced by the translator because he found it unthinkable that the Servant should speak of his labours as useless. If he saw the Servant not as a fallible weak human being, but rather as Jesus, the simple addition of the negative would have protected the reader from the dreadful implication that the sufferings had been in vain, and this has been seen by some authorities as a clear demonstration of Christian input. However, as Dr Gelston and Dr Goldingay\textsuperscript{23} have commented, other than Christian translators could well have found the implication of the Hebrew difficult to accept.

Second, the negative entered the text as a simple error, occurring either in the translator’s reading of the Hebrew \textit{ynaw}, misreading it as \textit{alw}; or in a scribe’s reading of his Syriac exemplar, giving \textit{alw} as a corruption of \textit{anaw}.\textsuperscript{24}

Third, the context may be the stimulus: following God’s wonderful and amazing words to Israel in the previous verse, cited above, and preceding God’s account of the breadth of the Servant’s call, the translator could easily have intended to emphasize the Servant’s uniqueness:

\textit{ûtwyhm lqn yt[w/c141y twyhl µywg rwal ûyttnw by/c141hl lar/c141y yryxnw bq[y yfb/c141 ta µyqhl db[yl Årah hxq d[...: it is too slight (a thing), your being my servant,\textsuperscript{26} to raise up the tribes of Jacob, to return the preserved\textsuperscript{27} of Israel; so I will make you a light to the nations, to be my salvation\textsuperscript{28} to the ends of the

\textsuperscript{23}A. Gelston, personal communication, 2002; J. Goldingay, personal communication, 2002.
\textsuperscript{24}A. Gelston, personal communication, 2002; S.P. Brock, personal communication, 2002. Dr Brock also notes that the translator could have intended a rhetorical question here, though this in itself would open up the possibility of yet further speculation ‘Why’? 5ph1 is unfortunately illegible at this point. The use of the rhetorical question in the Peshitta is inconsistent even when such a form is present in the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage}, so its introduction here is at any rate doubtful.
\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ktib}; \textit{Qre}.\textsuperscript{26}‘since you are my servant’
\textsuperscript{27}Or ‘shoots’; see p. 183 (b).
\textsuperscript{28}Or ‘so my salvation may reach...’.
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earth'; perhaps it was unacceptable to the translator that the Servant 
should be represented as lamenting a failure that had led up to the time 
represented. Either the failure itself could have been unacceptable, or 
the fact that the Servant is heard to bemoan the failure.

Assimilation is a fourth possibility. Certainly the translator did 
assimilate passages, sometimes to texts from other books, sometimes 
to texts from earlier or later verses in the same book, but not usually 
if by doing so the meaning was distorted.

In summary, there are a number of more or less convincing expla-
nations of the presence of the negative in P: but it remains true that 
this dramatic difference between the Hebrew and the Syriac could have 
seemed, to a Christian translator, essential.

b. The choice of lexical equivalent or perception of the root meaning 
can be seen to introduce a messianic theme: Isa. 49.6; 50.10; 53.5.

The idea of ‘sprout, offshoot’ enters the translation at Isa. 49.6 as 
the result of an atypical perception of the Hebrew root in this verse. In 
the MT \(\text{לְאָרָאָר} \) the root I \(\text{לְאָרָא} \) ‘to watch over, to 
preserve’ is usually perceived, either in the adjectival form of the Ktib, 
or in the Qal passive participle of the Qre, referring to the preserved 
remnant of Israel. LXX however has \(\text{ἀποστάσις} \) ‘dispersion’ and Tg 
\(\text{אָרְסָל} \) ‘exiles’.\(^{30}\) P \(\text{וְיִתָר} \) \(\text{וְיִתָר} \) ‘to restore the shoot of 
Israel’ implies that the root was instead II \(\text{לְאָרָא} \) ‘sprout, offshoot’, as for 
instance at Isa. 11.1 \(\text{יִתָר} \) \(\text{יִתָר} \) ‘a rod will come 
forth from the stem of Jesse and a shoot from his roots will bear fruit’. 
This seems likely to be a deliberate decision: the root \(\text{לְאָרָא} \), including 
both roots I and II, occurs elsewhere in Isaiah eleven times, though in 
Deutero-Isaiah only indubitably here and at Isa. 48.6;\(^{31}\) the translator 
usually understood it, arriving at a generally accepted interpretation in 
nine of these contexts,\(^{32}\) and rendered it with flexibility and sensitivity.

---

\(^{29}\) Van der Kooij, \textit{Die Alten Textzeugen}, pp. 277-78, points out that the closeness 
of this wording to Isa. 45.19, \(\text{בֵּית} \) \(\text{בֵּית} \) ‘I did not say to the seed of Jacob’; 
Isa. 65.23, \(\text{בֵּית} \) \(\text{בֵּית} \) ‘they shall not labour in vain, is another possible source.

\(^{30}\) Morgenstern, ‘The Suffering Servant’ translates ‘to bring back the scattered 
ones of Israel’, reading the root \(\text{יִתָר} \), ‘to scatter’ as at Ezek. 6.8; 36.19, at the first 
of which P has the root \(\text{וְיִתָר} \), and at the second the root \(\text{וְיִתָר} \), both meaning ‘to 
suffer’.

110.

\(^{32}\) There are four possible occurrences of the root I \(\text{לְאָרָא} \), in the Qal ‘to keep watch 
over’ in Deutero-Isaiah, at 42.6; 48.6; 49.6, 8; North, \textit{The Second Isaiah}, p. 110,

\(\text{© The Continuum Publishing Group Ltd 2004.}\)
In Isa. 50.10 the picture is complicated: the presence of a messianic theme not expressed in the Hebrew is interesting but unlikely to indicate deliberate Christian input. The MT is clear: יִהְיֶה יִתְרוּחֶה בָּחֲדָהוּ ‘... let him trust in the name of the Lord, and rely upon his God’ and the parallelism is preserved in LXX καθιστάτηκεν ἐν τῷ ονόματι τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀνεγερθηκεν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. Tg. תְּפִלֵּי יִתְרוּחֶה וְיִתְרוּחֶה עָזִּיר however, introduces the theme of redemption in addition to that of trust,33 as does P אֲנָoseconds אֲנָCONDS אֲנָCONDS אֲנָCONDS אֲנָCONDS ... let him trust in the name of the Lord, and he will be redeemed by his God’. P does not render the precise parallelism of MT, which would have given a clear indication that the second verbal root was יָשְׁנָא ‘to support oneself on, to depend on’ in which the theme of ‘help’ extends to that of deliverance and salvation. In other contexts, P usually recognizes the root יָשָׁנָא and translates correctly.34

notes that only at Isa. 48.6 and 49.6 is the use indisputable. At Isa. 42.6 יָשָׁנָא, probably יָשְׁנָא ‘I will keep you’ P may have had difficulty, and was perhaps influenced by LXX καθιστάτηκεν σε. ‘I will strengthen you’, he uses לַחֲמָא, the derivative verb from the substantive, ‘to strengthen, comfort’, perhaps having understood either the root I יָשָׁנָא, metaphorically ‘a refuge, a place of protection’ or יָשָׁנָא, ‘to gird’; Tg. has לַחֲמָא ‘I will establish you’. At Isa. 48.6 the sense of MT requires the root I יָשָׁנָא; P understood, using the root יָשָׁנָא ‘to guard, watch, keep’. At Isa. 49.8 the MT similarly seems to imply the root I יָשָׁנָא, though Koehler and Baumgartner in HALOT note that the root I יָשָׁנָא ‘to shape, form’ is a possible choice. Here too P understood, and gives נוֹמָה לָא, from the root נוֹמָה, to form’. LXX (some MSS only, see Rahil, II, p. 633) has καθιστάτηκεν σε. ‘I have formed you’; Tg. as at Isa. 42.6, has לַחֲמָא. In Isaiah, the relevant verses are 1.8; 26.3; 27.3 bis. Outside Deutero-Isaiah, at Isa. 1.8 MT יָשָׁנָא may be the Niphal of the root יָשְׁנָא, ‘to surround, bind’ here ‘to lay siege to’ though HALOT also suggests the Qal of the root I יָשָׁנָא; P has the passive of the root נוֹמָה, ‘to besiege’, which could have been reached from an understanding of either. LXX πάλαις παλαισκουμένη, and Tg. לַחֲמָא יָשָׁנָא ‘a besieged city’ are along similar lines. At Isa. 26.3; 27.3 bis, the root I יָשָׁנָא is clear, and is understood by P, using the root נוֹמָה. The use of II יָשָׁנָא ‘sprout, offshoot’ is clear at Isa. 11.1 and 60.21, and at Isa. 14.19 it is the only reasonable understanding; at each P gives נוֹמָה ‘sprout’. At Isa. 65.4, where the meaning seems to be reached through ‘watch over’ to ‘secret place’ P has נוֹמָה, ‘caverns’, from the root נוֹמָה, root-meaning ‘to descend into an enclosed valley or into the ground’, suggesting influence from LXX σπηλαγίδοις, ‘caves’.

33I am grateful to Dr Willem Smelik, who drew my attention to this.
34P makes the same choice at Ps 18.19 יִתְרוּחֶה יִתְרוּחֶה יִתְרוּחֶה ‘the Lord was my support’, where he gives נוֹמָה, ‘saviour’. This is a particularly interesting example, for at the parallel passage in 2 Sam. 22.19, where the MT יִתְרוּחֶה יִתְרוּחֶה יִתְרוּחֶה is almost identical to that in the psalm, P gives נוֹמָה, ‘helper’. The balance of evidence suggests (G. Greenberg, ‘The Peshitta to 2 Samuel 22 and Psalm 18: One Translation or Two?’, JAB 2 (2000), pp. 15-23) that the Peshitta to the psalm was written.
P to Isa. 53.5 evokes a similar theme. Here the MT reads אֶתְנָא אֱלֹהֵי אַמּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל. אֶתְנָא is a Niphal perfect, possibly ‘we were healed’. LXX ῥῶμος ἀποκρίσις ὑμεῖς ἐπισκευηθεν, ‘by his bruises we were healed’ suggests the understanding of a perfect in MT. However, P אָטְנָא אַלָּמָו הָעָוָה, ‘by his scars we will be healed’ and Tg אָטְנָא אַלָּמָו הָעָוָה ‘our wrongdoing will be forgiven’ both render imperfects, indicating that healing is for the future.

Both emendations, that in Isa. 50.10 and that in Isa. 53.5, are suggestive; yet neither independently introduces a new nuance, for both are close to Tg, and it is possible that both translators were representing one exegetical tradition. A further complexity is, of course, that this does not prove Jewish rather than Christian authorship, for such a tradition might well have persisted after a conversion of the Peshitta school to Christianity.

c. The possible change in meaning depends on the perception of verse division: Isa. 49.1.

The focus here is on the reference of וָדַרְכָּה, ‘far-off, distant’ in the MT. The whole verse reads וָדַרְכָּה לְחֵמַת מִיַּמַּיִם מַעֲבָדֶת אָבוּל אָבָד וַתִּקְרָא אִישׁ מִיהוֹוָה וַתִּשְׁמֹר שֵׁם בֹּטֶן וַתִּתְנַה אַשְׁרֵי בְּיָדוֹ. ‘Listen, O isles, to me; pay attention, O peoples, from afar off: the Lord called me from the womb, from my mother’s belly he made mention of my name’. The MT punctuation, with athnäh under וָדַרְכָּה, links וָדַרְכָּה with Isa. 49.1b, but וָדַרְכָּה is part of 1a, with a geographical meaning, and Tg וָדַרְכָּה אַלָּמָו מִיַּמַּיִם וַתִּקְרָא אָבְדֶת אִישׁ מִיַּהוָה, ‘hearken, O kingdoms, from afar’ is similar; however LXX διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στρατηγεῖ, λέγει Κύριος, ‘after a long time it will come to pass, says the Lord’ links וָדַרְכָּה rather with Isa. 49.1b, as does P אָטְנָא אַלָּמָו הָעָוָה, ‘pay attention, O peoples: the Lord called me from afar’ so that

first, and that the rather few differences between that and P-2 Sam. result from light editorial work by the translator of the latter: this is apparently one of the points which he considered needed emendation.

35 Though the Syriac imperfect is used to convey more than the English ‘future’; it may be modal (T. Muraoka, Classical Syriac: A Basic Grammar with a Chrestomathy [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997], §82).
37 Of course this knowledge of Jewish tradition suggests that the translator, if a Christian as I shall argue below, was a Jewish- rather than a gentile-Christian (using the terms not to indicate praxis but origin); nor would gentile Christians been likely to have had his competence in Hebrew.
in these latter two the term has been understood to refer to distance in time rather than distance in place, and so perhaps to Jesus.\textsuperscript{38}

d. the relevant features are grammatical, together with a possible error at the stage of translation in one: Isa. 49.6; 53.8.

In Isa. 49.6 the Hebrew plurals in 
\( \text{לדברות } \text{מהם } \text{ישב יבש } \text{בראשה } \text{זור זור } \text{ליישב} \) (see p. 183) are rendered as singulars in Syriac, 
\( \text{ftar } \text{tribe' and } \text{hbrwn } \text{‘shoot’ again raising the possibility of a reference to Jesus.} \textsuperscript{39} \)

In Isa. 53.8 P differs from MT in several grammatical points that might have been intended better to fit the passion narrative, but might simply have been introduced in an attempt to make good sense.\textsuperscript{40} The MT 
\( \text{מַעְשֶׁה } \text{מעי } \text{ Nombre } \) ‘for the transgression of the people to whom the stroke was due’ becomes in P 
\( \text{טמס } \text{מצא } \text{ Diagnosis } \) ‘some of the wicked ones of my people touched/approached him’.\textsuperscript{41} There may also be an error at the stage of translation: the final verb may have baffled the Peshitta translator,\textsuperscript{42} who substituted a translation of 
\( \text{יָשָׁם } \text{‘to approach’, which he had already misread for } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{‘to search’ in the previous verse; alternatively, he had simply read his Vorlage as } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{with final shin rather than sin. LXX } \text{ἐπὶ τῶν } \text{ἀνομίαν } \text{τοῦ } \text{λαοῦ } \text{μου } \text{ἡκάθι } \text{εῖν } \text{θάνατον. ‘because of the iniquities of my people he was led to death’ seems to diverge sufficiently from MT to suggest a difficulty in translation; Tg } \text{מִדַּמֵּשׁ רֵדֵב } \text{עוּ } \text{פָּרֹק } \text{לְחוֹתְיוֹ } \text{בַּע } \text{הַשָּׁם } \text{‘the sins that my people sinned, he will attribute (transfer) to them’ differs too much from MT to be helpful.} \textsuperscript{43} \)

e. the characteristics of the Servant himself are subtly affected, in the first by changing a preposition and giving a Syriac plural for a Hebrew

\textsuperscript{38}\text{Van der Kooij, } \text{Die alten Textzeugen, p. 277, notes that 1 Jn. 1.1; 1 Pet. 1:20, are evoked.} \textsuperscript{39}\text{Van der Kooij, } \text{Die Alten Textzeugen, p. 278.} \textsuperscript{40}\text{Weitzman, } \text{The Syriac version, p. 241.} \textsuperscript{41}\text{See C.F. Whitley, ‘Textual Notes on Deutero-Isaiah’, } \text{VT} \text{11} (1961), pp. 457-61, who notes that } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{implies that God is speaking, but that the context implies first person plural speakers. The phrase is sometimes emended to } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{‘our transgressions’, as in v. 5; M. Dahood, ‘Isaiah 53.8-12 and Massoretic Misconstruction’, } \text{Biblica} \text{63} (1982) pp. 566-70 (566) suggests that } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{is an example of the third ms possessive suffix, as at Mic. 3.5. The difficulty is increased by the problem of the last word; for instance, Whitley suggests } \text{יָשָׁם. Dahood postulates that } \text{יָשָׁם } \text{includes a byform for ‘water’; and see G.R. Driver, ‘Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text’, } \text{Textus} \text{1} (1960), pp. 112-31 (129); G.R. Driver, ‘Once Again Abbreviations’, } \text{Textus} \text{4} (1964), pp. 76-94 (94).} \textsuperscript{42}\text{Gelston, ‘Peshitta of Isaiah’, pp. 577-78.}
singular, and in the second by the choice of lexical equivalent: Isa. 49.7; 53.3.

In Isa. 49.7 the MT reads לְהוּא נָצָ֑פ לָמוֹשֶׁ֑ב נָיֵֽלְבָּר מָשִׁלָּה, ‘to him whom man despises, to him whom the nation abhors, to a servant of rulers’. LXX τὸν βδελυγμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν δούλων τῶν ἄρχωντων, ‘him that is abhorred by the nations that are the servants of princes’ is close to MT, as is Tg הלפטרהין מונ פעולה למשלתין בו מחלשות להדיע, ‘to those despised among the nations, to those cast out among the kingdoms, to those who are servants to rulers’. P however has את המשליות למשליות, ‘...to the rejected by the nation, and by the servants of rulers’. The change, achieved by using a different preposition and by giving a Syriac plural for a Hebrew singular, emphasises the Servant’s humble status: everyone may be ‘a servant of rulers’, but not everyone is ‘despised by servants of rulers’.

In Isa. 53.3 a similar effect results from the choice of lexical equivalent. MT reads בֵּית וַיָּדֵ֑ש אַשֶּׁר, ‘despised and most frail’: the point of interest is the root יָדֵ֑ש, usually ‘to cease, forbear, refrain’. Koehler and Baumgartner give the passive ‘abandoned’ for the form in this passage. P renders עַדָּה יָדֵ֑ש וַיִּהְמָ֑ל, ‘despised and humbled’. Elsewhere in Isaiah, at Isa. 1.16; 2.22; 24.8 where the Hebrew root is used with the more usual meaning, P gives the root יָדֵ֑ש, ‘to cease, desist’, so the root יָדֵ֑ש in the passive as here ‘humble, meek’ is not P’s usual approach and may perhaps evoke the use in Mt. 5.5 for those who will inherit the earth. Alternatively, it may simply be a guess at a reasonable translation where the nuance is unusual. Neither LXX ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος κύριος άτύχων ἐκλείπων παρὰ σάντας ἀνθρώπων, ‘But his form was ignoble, inferior to that of men’ nor Tg בֶּרֶךְ לְיַלְם וַףֶּסְכָּא, ‘...Then the glory of all the kingdoms will be despised and cease, they will be faint and mournful’ are close to the MT, but nor do their interpretations closely resemble P. P’s choice may emphasise not the rejection of the Servant by man, but the Servant’s presentation of himself, and man’s consequent perception of him.

43Goldingay and Payne, Isaiah 40-55, understand the root יָדֵ֑ש ‘to cease, cease doing’ here, as at Ps. 39.5 יָדֵ֑ש אֲנִי, perhaps ‘make me know my end’ (but see C.A. Briggs, The Book of Psalms (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), I, p. 349), taking it to mean ‘transient’; in this verse, P understands similarly, using the root יָדֵ֑ש ‘to remain’. They also note the possibility that the adjective is turned into a superlative by the subsequent plural.

44HALOT, p. 293.
2. An anti-Israelite sense present in the Ktib is eliminated by rendering the Qre: Isa. 49.5.

MT reads תְּפֹאָבָא יָשָׁב אֲלֵיהּ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵל אִשָּׁה ‘to turn Jacob back to him, to stop Israel withdrawing’ (Qre רָא). The Ktib is difficult, perhaps indicating its originality, and has a possible negative connotation, implying the resistance of Israel. Goldingay and Payne follow the Ktib but give the translation cited above, a reflexive sense as at Isa. 60.20 והָיְתָה לְךָ יָבֵא רָני כַּהֲנִי ‘nor shall thy moon withdraw itself’. P מְלָא יִשָּׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל, ‘that I might return Jacob to him, and gather Israel’ is based on the Qre, avoided the possible anti-Israel sense of the Ktib. This understanding is shared by LXX ἵνα συνάγῃ ὁ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραήλ, πρὸς σὺντόν, ‘to gather Jacob and Israel to him’ and Tg בָּרָט יִשֶּׁרֶץ יִשָּׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשָּׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל, ‘to bring back the house of Jacob to his service, and that Israel should be brought near to his fear’.

3. The outstanding feature of the translation is its closeness to the Hebrew despite an obvious possibility of introducing a Christian theme: Isa. 53.9.

The Hebrew יָרָן אֵל שָׁמֶשׁ יְשֵׁם יִשָּׁה יִשָּׁר וּרְאוּ יִשָּׁר אל ‘He was given his tomb with the wicked, his burial mound with a rich person’ (Goldingay and Payne) is difficult, both word by word and in understanding the sense as a whole: Whitley, for instance, describes Isa. 53.8-9a as ‘perhaps the most perplexing passage in Deutero-Isaiah’; Goldingay and Payne say of the fourth Song as a whole that the Hebrew is ‘a highpoint of unclarity’. This verse is clearly evocative of a Christian theme, but as it stands is no more than evocative. To bring it close to a text which could be used in a Christian context subtle changes are needed, yet what we see in the Peshitta הֶרְטַבְתָא תַּלֶּה יָשֶׁם יִשָּׁר אֵל יָדָא ‘The wicked gave his grave and the rich (gave) in his death’ (Bundy) is a close rendering: incidentally, this is perhaps a good passage to support the perception of the Peshitta as a translation worked out in very small sections, word by word or phrase by phrase, rather than in larger portions. The Peshitta translator has ignored the Hebrew יָרָן so

45 Analysis of P to the 135 Ktib/Qre differences in Jeremiah has shown that it is impossible to be sure whether or not the translator of that book was influenced by a reading tradition: Greenberg, Peshitta to Jeremiah, pp. 209-17.
46 For instance, מָרְאַה יָדָא where Dahood ‘Isaiah 53.8-12’, p. 568, proposes a redivision of the words to מָרְאַה יָדָא ‘makers of strife’.
48 Goldingay and Payne, Isaiah 40-55.
making the wicked man and the rich man the subjects, but that is all that he has done. Bundy says that the Peshitta version of this verse presented a ‘peculiar problematic for those Syrian exegetes who sought to make the Old Testament a Christian book and to that end would use that rendition of the text as a basis for a christological interpretation’, and shows how the Syrian commentators were forced by this passage to choose: they could emend the text, they could apply the ‘inversion of passages’ technique, or they could even invoke scribal error, but they could not base a Christian understanding on the Peshitta text. LXX καὶ δώσω τοὺς παρειούς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς κυτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλούσιους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου κυτοῦ, ‘And I will give the wicked for his burial and the rich for his death’ is sufficiently different from mt to be unhelpful in this discussion, as is Tg andbad atwmb wsnad ayskn ’And he will give the wicked to Gehenna and those rich in possessions to the death of the corruption’.

In summary, then, the passages discussed above present an inconsistent picture. In eight, the difference between the mt and P is compatible with input by a Christian translator. Added to the other examples instanced earlier by, for instance, Van der Kooij, it is possible to argue that the weight of the cumulative evidence is conclusive. This translator read the Old Testament as the fore-runner of the New and he interpreted accordingly, taking many opportunities to insert a Christian nuance into the text before him.

However, in one of the passages discussed above the Syriac text may be less anti-Jewish than the Hebrew; and in one a text which is readily patient of Christianizing has not been so treated by the Syriac translator. This inconsistency makes it less likely that the differences between the Hebrew and the Peshitta that have been discussed here were deliberately introduced, in pursuit of an agenda; and one other point, a clear pervading theme, argues against such a deliberate change: the translator has scrupulously avoided strident anti-Jewish emendations. His approach contrasts markedly with that of certain of the church fathers. Perhaps his attitude reflects the peaceable multicultural society of the mid-second century CE in Edessa, before the anxiety that Jewish


50See the forthcoming paper by Bas ter Haar Romeny ‘Hypotheses on the Development of Judaism and Christianity in Syria in the Period after 70 CE’, in H.
Christians might revert to Judaism became a serious force generating anti-Jewish propaganda.

It seems probable that a text of such importance as Isaiah would have been assigned to one of the most distinguished scholars of any school of translators. If the group of colleagues working on these renderings was already Christian, such a man would have been able to make his input completely convincing: working in a group of like-minded people he would have had no need to defend every nuance. Yet no clear and consistent picture emerges; in these passages, the translator appears not to show his usual care to preserve the sense of the Hebrew, yet nor does he apparently make a consistent attempt to make a Christian input. Instead we see the scattered examples that have been identified, with an overall impression of randomness.

So the evidence that the translator of Isaiah was a Christian is suggestive but inconclusive; yet if we take the alternative view, that the translator was a Jew, with no Christian themes present in his conscious or subconscious mind, this raises the focal question, that of the cumulative weight of the examples: if this is the work of a Jew with a wholly Jewish background, why are there so many passages where Christian interpretation may be perceived, at some of which, for instance the well-known phrase in Ps. 2.11-12, the Peshitta is alone among the ancient versions in opting for a rendering with possible, occasionally probable, Christian overtones?

The inconsistency and restrained nature of the possible Christian input could however be reconciled with the presence of Christian nuances if we postulate a Christian translator whose approach to the work was scrupulously honest. He attempted to put his own convic-


51 The MT יִהְיֶה הָיוֹשֵׁב, perhaps ‘kiss sincerely/worship in purity’ is rendered אֶחֶד אֶחֶד, ‘kiss the son’. A Hebrew phrase difficult in itself is rendered using a Syriac word of similar sound, and the passage could indeed be read as a reference to Jesus. Weitzman, The Syriac version, p. 242 points out that the possibility remains that this is a word-by-word rendering forced on the translator in this difficult passage, rather than a reflection of his conscious beliefs.

52 The question of the community use of the Peshitta, exclusively Christian, with no Jewish tradition at all, does not bear constructively on the argument, for extraneous factors must be considered: one reason for the rejection of the Peshitta by Jews may have been that it had, like the LXX, become the Bible of a church. Another may have been rabbinic objection to its apparent simplicity, in comparison with rabbinic interpretations (Weitzman, The Syriac version, pp 261-62).
tions, and his literary and liturgical background, to the back of his mind, and to play completely fair by the Vorlage, but his attention sometimes wandered so that his subconscious thoughts influenced his rendering perhaps without his even being aware of the change he had introduced; and at a few passages perhaps he simply could not resist the temptation to emend the text. To suggest that the translator deliberately modified a biblical rendering to conform to a different religious tradition is a serious accusation; but the suggestion given here does not impugn the integrity of our translator: rather, it shows him as a well-intentioned, honest, but fallible human being. The cumulative weight of the examples then becomes significant - we have not a collection of examples where compatibility with a Christian input is arrived at only more or less at random, nor a translation made by a Christian who took such opportunities as he reasonably could to introduce his own themes, but the work of a Christian translator who tried his best to stick to his Vorlage but who sometimes failed and let his own beliefs and background show through. Such a man could also have been responsible for the impassioned Peshitta to parts of Chronicles, notably verses included in David's prayer (1 Chron. 29.10-19) joyful in the Hebrew but desperately sad in the Peshitta. Weitzman argued convincingly that the depth of the translator's own grief, his evident participation in Jewish suffering, is shown by his rendering of parts of Chronicles at which the Vorlage was illegible: at these passages the impossibility of reading the Hebrew forced the translator to guess and so to reveal his own attitudes, or at the least loosened the constraint of the text and allowed him to express his own feelings. Our sensitive and scrupulous Christian writer, though, could have put himself in the place of a Jewish author, and written what he judged an exiled Jew would have felt, particularly if he harked back without bitterness to his own Jewish ancestry.

Perhaps such a translator worked at an early stage in the sequence of the work of the Peshitta school: Weitzman noted the difficulty of placing P-Isaiah in his implicational table, and Gelston suggests that this might result from the translation having been made early,

53 See de Moor and Sepmeijer ‘Joshua’, p. 176, who describe ‘the deliberate self-effacing of the ancient translator’.
56 A. Gelston, personal communication, 1999.
outside the canonical order,\textsuperscript{57} in response to the needs of the religious
community, before the approach to the work had become formalized
by the ‘Peshitta School’, the group of colleagues responsible. An early
date for the translation of Isaiah, at a stage when the evangelization of
the community in Edessa responsible for the translation had only just
begun, would fit well with this care to keep anti-Jewish themes out
of the work, and contrasts with more evident main-stream orthodox
Christian themes, for instance those that Winter has suggested underlie
the alterations made to the Peshitta to Ben Sira in the latter part of
the fourth century.\textsuperscript{58} As an illustration of the workings of religion in a
pluralistic society, this translation is praiseworthy in its careful fairness.

\textsuperscript{57}See also R. Beckwith, \textit{The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church}

\textsuperscript{58}Winter, ‘Ben Sira’, \textit{passim}; see however R.J. Owens, ‘The Early Text of Ben
with Winter that there are Christian features but argues (pp 47-48) that there is
no evidence for a link between any elements in the text and the Arian controversies
in the 4th century; that all ‘Ebionite’ doctrines in P-Ben Sira can be shown either
to be compatible with mainstream Christianity or Judaism, or to be based on an
arguable interpretation of textually problematic passages (p. 65 n. 48); and that the
basic P text of Ben Sira, including at least some of these features, was in existence
certainly by A.D. 300 and possibly earlier (p. 75). See also W.Th van Peursen in
this issue, par. 4.6, who refers to Owens’ argument in his discussion of P-Ben Sira
against the background of the plurality of both the Jewish and Christian religions
of the time.
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1. Introduction

We have already heard quite a bit about the merits and problems of the dictionaries that we have at our disposal. So it will be nothing new to ask yet again, in brief, what we do, in methodological terms, to unravel the meaning of a word. Apart from the obvious, and probably the most important, which is to go back to the literary source or sources from which the word has been culled and look at it in context, we usually start with our dictionaries. We might also check for cognates in other languages if these exist, which is another round of looking in other dictionaries. In the case of the MT and rabbinic literature we also have a long tradition of commentary which can be found in the Tosefta, Talmudim, medieval commentaries and more. These are all valuable resources and are, on many occasions, useful to the lexicographer. Yet, at the same time, each of these sources has its pitfalls. We know, for instance, of some cases where a medieval commentary or a dictionary entry can spark off a tradition of understanding that can be misleading or even just totally wrong. A good example is the understanding of the term יָם in 2 Sam. 22.35. The LXX and the Peshitta are consistent with the Hebrew as both employ words that mean copper. Radak

∗This article is a reworking of a paper presented at 'Aramith, a Conference on Aramaic Lexicography' that took place at the University of Sheffield from July 23-25 in 2002.
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(R’ D. Kimhi, France, 1160–1235), however, considered in his commentary that this term in fact means ‘a very hard type of iron’. This might explain why the King James Bible translates יָשָׁן as ‘steel’.

When it comes to technical terms, in our case relating specifically to metallurgy, then we have another level of investigation that has to be carried out. We must make sure that our term makes sense in regards to the specific aspect of technology as we currently know it to be, and secondly, that the aspect of technology that we have decided the term is describing is appropriate to the period of time and geographic location that the source it comes from belongs to; a context that is provided by archaeo-metallurgy. Additionally, one must not neglect to consider the fact that a particular term might acquire new shades of meaning as time goes by and technology changes or develops. Even this is not always the end of the story. There is another aspect that might, to a certain extent, be illustrated by a famous quote from Wittgenstein, who pointed out that:

if a lion could talk, we could not understand him.  

One might expect, that with the ancients - who have left a rich literary legacy, evidence for the fact that, indeed, they could talk and write a language that we can just about understand - we would not have the problem that we have with lions, even though, of course, we are of the same species. Nevertheless, in some ways Wittgenstein’s statement has some relevance to what lexicographers do. While translating one language into another, they have also to take into account, especially in terms relevant to technology, the difference in the way that we, in the present, understand, view and conceptualize our environment compared to the way the ancients did in the past. Let us consider, for instance, the contemporary use of the words ‘light’ and ‘colour’. Contemporary science has an added conceptual level that effects the way the relationship between these two words is understood, that is now forever embedded within the ideas these words represent. We have the colour wheel with primary and complementary colours that relate to pigments, as well as the colour spectrum scheme that relates to light. One can find words for blue and red in Aramaic, but not for cyan and magenta. This does not mean that they did not exist and were not observed. Rather it is that our language and that of the


ancient Aramaic or Hebrew speakers reflect different knowledge from a different era so that a different set of concepts are appropriately associated with each of them.

This principle is, of course, also relevant to issues that go beyond technology and can be related to various aspects of life. Yet, within the context of metallurgy, at least, it is appropriate to say that our language is linked to modern scientific and technological concepts, whereas the ancients derived theirs from what was a hands-on experience, a familiarity with what at that time people knew about materials and what they observed about technique around them. For instance, a smith refining silver did not know about all the elements he was dealing with, and often even got rid of several which he did not even know existed in the piece of material he was refining. When we talk about copper ore, for instance, we know that as a substance it is made up of smaller particles that we call atoms. We know that this ore consists of copper particles (atoms) that are joined to particles of oxygen, sulfur, and others. Although most people might not know the exact chemical structure, or not even know it at all, they are likely to have some idea of the fact that materials are made of various types and combinations of atomic particles. So when we, even as lay people, think of smelting, that is extraction of metal from ore, we think of a process that results in the separation of the copper particles from all other non-metallic ingredients of the ore.\(^2\)

Even though the ancients, already from before the onset of written language, had the ability and knowledge, gained by a very long process of trial and error, to extract various metals from rock ores, something of the way in which they rationalized this process is naturally encapsulated in the way their language was formed. As such, the associations and concepts that are linked to their words will be different from those that are attached to ours. It is worth recalling that there is no word for ore in Aramaic, nor for that matter a generic term for metals in any of the Middle and Late Aramaic dialects, Biblical Hebrew or Classical Greek.\(^3\)

\(^2\)The primary copper smelting product often also contains unwanted metal, like iron, which after smelting has to be separated from the copper by a refining process.

\(^3\)For a discussion relating to the appearance of the Hebrew term צִירָה in the Mishna, and Deut. 31.22, 23 as a lexical definition of ‘metals’ see D. Levene and B. Rothenberg, "צִירָה—A fundamental Aspect of the Nature of Metal", Journal for the Aramaic Bible 2 (2000), pp. 75-87.
As our work has been concerned with the OT, its Aramaic Versions and late antique to medieval rabbinic literature, there has been an overlap within it between Hebrew and Aramaic. In this paper we shall present two cases. The first will concentrate on certain meanings of the Hebrew term חַּגֶּשׁ in Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew with some reference to its Aramaic and other cognates. This is a case where we can trace and define the changes in the word’s use and try to explain its semantic evolution. The second case relates to the term חַּגֶּשׁ that occurs in Amos. This case illustrates in more extreme form some of the problems we have just discussed. Yet, here there are shifts in the term’s meaning that are more difficult to explain.

2. חַּגֶּשׁ

In the MT חַּגֶּשׁ appears in 22 instances as a verb,\(^4\) 10 of which are specifically connected with silver.\(^5\) One of the first things that we have asked ourselves is why the dictionary entries include ‘smelt’ in their definitions of this verb.\(^6\) Our problem with this definition is simple, since what we find described in the Biblical texts is cupellation as a refining process and not smelting. Furthermore, we know of no evidence of silver smelting in the whole of the Levant. As we shall see from looking at this process of cupellation, it is understandable why it was favoured as a simile. The best Biblical example, which in fact describes cupellation, is Jer. 6.29-30:

\[

כִּי מְפֶשׁ מַעַּשֶּׁהָ נֵעְשֶׁה לַשָּׁמָּל יָרִךְ וּרְעָהּ וּרְעָה יָרִךְ וּרְעָה לֹא מַעַּשֶּׁה לְאִיזוּרְעָה לְאִיזוּרְעָה לֹא מַעַּשֶּׁה

29 'The bellows puff, the lead is consumed by fire, the cupellation/silver refining is to no avail, the impurities/dross is not removed.
30 Call them ‘reject silver’, for YHWH has rejected them.

Jer. 6.29-30 is one of those rare instances where we have a clear technical description of what the verb in question, i.e., חַּגֶּשׁ, means.

\(^4\) Judg. 7.4; 2 Sam. 22.31; Isa. 1.25; 48.10; Jer. 6.29; 9.6; Zech. 13.9; Mal. 3.2.3; Ps. 12.7; 17.3; 18.31; 26.2; 66.10; 105.19; 119.140; Prov. 30.5; Dan. 11.35; 12.10.
\(^5\) Isa. 48.10; Jer. 6.29; Zech. 13.9; Mal. 3.2.3; Ps. 12.7; 66.10; Dan. 11.35; 12.10.
\(^6\) For example Koehler-Baumgartner (HALAT, p. 1057) consider the meanings of the verb חַּגֶּשׁ to be ‘smelt, refine’ or ‘sift’; BDB, p. 864a consider it to mean ‘smelt, refine’ or ‘test’. In dictionaries, such as Jastrow (M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature [New York: Horeb, 1903], p. 1393), that cover later forms of Hebrew, there also occur the meanings ‘melt’ and ‘smelt’ which are both questionable.
Cupellation
For this process a special vessel called a ‘cupel’ is used, that is, by the way, called יָדַע in Biblical Hebrew and אָרָף in Aramaic (see below). The material that requires cupellation, i.e. a process of separation from unwanted elements and impurities, which could be silver that has been alloyed with copper and other metals, or scrap metal that might include silver inlay or shavings from fettling, is put into a cupel. To this a considerable amount of lead, that acts as a collector of silver, is added. When this mixture is subjected to high temperatures, the molten lead and silver combine and many of the impurities rise to the surface and can be literally skimmed off. The lead containing silver, that is by now molten, is subjected to a stream of air over its surface that causes the lead, and other base metals present as impurities, but not the silver, to oxidize. The liquid oxidized lead, called ‘litharge’, is run off or is absorbed by the cupel material, whilst the silver remains in the cupel. This process is still used, even today, by silversmiths in various countries. The process is well described by H.E. Wulff in his ‘The traditional Crafts of Persia’, from 1966:

... crucibles are used that are lined with a mixture of wood ash, sand and ground potsherds. Lead is melted into the precious metal, and the dross that forms on the surface and contains all the base metal impurities is continually removed by scraping it over the edge of the crucible until the molten precious metal shows a brightly shining surface.

The verse in Jeremiah, that we have quoted above, describes this very process. However, and this is the main point of the metaphor, even though the lead is consumed, the יָדַע, the unwanted impurities, are not separated from the silver. The use of cupellation as a metaphor implies quite clearly that this technique was well and widely known. We can see, by the way, that in the Syriac of the Peshitta and the Aramaic of the Targum the use of the root s.r.p is not as extensive as it is in the Hebrew of the Bible. It seems that in many of the references the original metallurgical simile had lost some of its prominence and

A ‘cupel’ is a crucible-like vessel made of clay mixed with bone- or wood ash, or a shallow hearth, lined with ash. The ash was needed to make the vessel/hearth porous enough to absorb the oxidized lead (‘litharge’). Two examples of images of cupellation are: 1. from early in the second millennium BCE in Egypt in the tomb of Beni Hassan and 2. from the 20th century India, see W. Foy, *Ethnologica* (Leipzig: K.A. Hiersemann, 1900), p. 109.

was replaced by more general terms that the translators considered as relevant to the theological sense of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Targum</th>
<th>Peshitta</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסֶף</td>
<td>כֶּסֶף</td>
<td>כֶּסֶף</td>
<td>silver/goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תַּנּוּק</td>
<td>תַּנּוּק</td>
<td>תַּנּוּק</td>
<td>the use of cupellation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְפֶר</td>
<td>מְפֶר</td>
<td>מְפֶר</td>
<td>cupel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that the word כֵּסֶף in Hebrew, כֶּסֶף in Aramaic, that occurs only twice in the MT (Prov. 17.3, 27.21), is not simply a ‘crucible’ as the dictionaries cite it to be,\(^{10}\) but, in fact, a ‘cupel’. It would have been recognized as distinct in the material it was made of, its shape and function.

In Mishanic Hebrew we find that the verb כֵּסֶף, in a metallurgical context, comes also to mean the consequence of the process that we refer to as ‘case-hardening’ or ‘low steel-making’. We find its meaning, literally defined, in a statement in a baraita in b. Yom. 34b:

If the high priest was old or of delicate health etc. It was taught: R. Judah said: Lumps of iron were heated on the eve of the Day of Atonement and were cast into the cold water to mitigate its coldness. But was [one] not thereby [case-hardening] them?

The iron object is placed in a high temperature carbon rich environment for a number of hours – in this case from the eve of the Day of Atonement. The surface of the iron absorbs a small amount of carbon that becomes, in essence, a skin of steel. One of the properties of this kind of steel is that when heated to a certain temperature, that can be identified by the colour of the metal, and then quenched in water – in the case of our baraita being cast into the cold water – it becomes a much harder steel surface. This technique was used for producing more effective edges for knives and daggers, ends of chisels, pick-axes and the like.\(^{11}\) This process was correctly identified and described in the medieval lexical Gaonic commentary to Tohorot ascribed to Hai Gaon, that states in regard to the same term that occurs in m. Mach.


5.7 ‘If a nail was taken out into the rain in order to quench it’:

ם מצחדרר סמביק לשמה פיקח וא כסן וא כל כל ופיי שמחי ורשע סמהיא;
ונוש נבשנה מתניה רמא ודי ירוחא.

When the iron-smith wished to make a sword or a dagger or any other utensil, when he had heated it and made it (so to speak) in the charcoal, he would take it with tongs and put it in water, and that is [case-hardening].

Another occurrence of the use of the term רעך is found in m. Ket. 7.10. In this passage a number of male professions are listed. The text states that a woman married to a man who is occupied in one of these professions has the right to demand a divorce. The implication of the text is that these professions carry with them serious side-effects that can have a detrimental effect upon marital life and its consummation. The profession that is of interest to us is the רעך. The Mishna does not elaborate further on the exact nature of this occupation, nor does it employ this term again. Other sources provide more in terms of explanation; in t. Ket. 7.11 we are told, anonymously, that the רעך נוחה is one who melts copper (טחנה נוחה יי"ע); b. Ket. 77a provides two opinions; attributed to R. Ashi is the opinion that it is a fabricator of pots or kettles ( $('#'+data.page+').html() )); whereas, in y. Ket. 7.10 31d Samuel is attributed with stating that the רעך נוחה is one who ‘melts copper from its source’ (טחנה נוחה יי"ע). Lieberman suggested that one can understand this to refer to a copper smelting worker, as the high sulfur content in many of the ores causes a powerful and unpleasant smell that inevitably attaches itself to him. Such mines where the copper ore is rich in sulfur are known to be very pungent, even decades after they are abandoned. We might add, also, that intensive work with copper ores can, on occasion, cause impotence – another good reason for a wife to demand a divorce.

14Rashi explains the repugnance of this trade as relating to its pungent odour (אף ראתו מדבריה).
15A very good example is the mine of Rio Tinto, SW Spain, which still has a bad smell from roasting sulphuric ores many generations ago (B. Rothenberg and A. Blanco Freijeiro, Studies in Ancient Mining and Metallurgy in South-West Spain (London: IAMS, 1981), pp. 96-108).
16Personal communication, Prof Tim Shaw, Imperial College London.

a divorce. As smelting was mainly done at the site of the mines themselves, which we know existed only outside the borders of Israel, either at Feinan or in Capadocia, the implication would be, if we accepted this interpretation, that there were Jewish communities active in those areas in that industry.

The connection between the term הָלְמוֹן in the OT that means ‘silver cupellation’ and חֵמָן in Ketubot that might mean ‘copper smelter’ is, perhaps, not too difficult to surmise, as the concept inherent in the Biblical term might have been appropriated to also represent the extraction of the desired metal from the rock ore. There is, however, another possible interpretation that we can suggest for the term חֵמָן that affords a somewhat closer connection with the refining of silver by cupellation, namely the refining of the primary product of copper smelting that is a very rough ‘ingot’, that is of no use otherwise. Such a rough ingot would contain a lot of slag, iron and if smelted from a sulfuric ore a certain amount of sulfur. Likewise this process would impart to its practitioner a bad smell that was difficult to get rid of, and may also have caused impotency. Such refining could have been done at the mining site, however, there is evidence that such rough ingots of copper were traded to Palestine, probably mainly from Feinan. One such primary ingot was found near Ain Yahav in the Arabah, perhaps lost on the way to Palestine. Although this kind of refining is different from cupellation, represented by the Biblical הָלְמוֹן, it is nevertheless a process of extracting a pure metal from a metallic mixture.

The concept of case hardening, that we have seen in b. Yom. 34b, is a bit more complicated to explain in terms of its connection to silver and copper refining. We would, however, argue that there is a connection between these concepts, that reflects the way the ancients understood and rationalized the material properties of the metals they applied this term to. This connection is not immediately obvious to us as we form our understanding of material properties according to the modern sciences of chemistry and physics. To the ancients, on the other hand, cupellation, a pyrotechnic process, that resulted with pure silver is, in a way, comparable to the harder iron, that we know is a steel casing, that also occurs after another type of pyrotechnic process. We assume that the Jewish community of the time of the Mishna considered that this pyrotechnic process brought forth the purer, superior, form of iron. This concept of a purer form of material is, by the way, well

17The ingot was found in the 50s at Ain Yahav, a spring in the Arabah, and was cut into several pieces by the person who found it and presented to Ben Gurion and other public personalities as ‘Copper from King Solomon’s Copper Mines’. Some pieces of the ingot reached the Antiquities Authority in Jerusalem, one section of the ingot is exhibited in the Nehushtan Pavilion at the Eretz Israel Museum, Tel Aviv.

18For, as we know, there is no word for steel in Hebrew or in Jewish Aramaic till
known from ancient Egyptian, where various minerals and materials have, in addition to their common form, a true or real ‘maa’ form. To conclude we would say that the basic meaning of ≪rx is any kind of change/improvement in the quality of a metal, that is achieved by a pyrotechnic process. This term can, however, have different detailed meanings in the different periods and for the different metals.

For the purpose of comparison we provide the reader with some dictionary entries with meanings of the verb ≪rx in metallurgical contexts and others that seem relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary Source</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koehler-Baumgartner</td>
<td>To smelt; To refine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Yehuda (Hebrew)</td>
<td>To purge; To fit tightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jastrow (Biblical Hebrew)</td>
<td>To smelt, melt; refine, purify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jastrow (Aramaic)</td>
<td>To smelt, refine, try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, George, Postgate (Akkadian)</td>
<td>To burn, fire; dye (red); smelt and refine metal; fire, bake; clay tablet, brick; dye textiles, ivory, leather, mountain with red (colour), blood etc. ‘Burn (up)’ drug, person in fire; of stomach ‘give burning pain’; of cheeks ‘burn’ with tears; ‘torture’; ‘dye (red)’; ‘make’ stone ‘glow’, ‘be fired; reddened’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. ≪nx

The second term that we want to look at is ≪nx in the context of the OT, where it occurs four times, all within two verses in Amos. This case is interesting for a number of reasons. It is a hapax legomenon in Biblical Hebrew and occurs in Late Antique Hebrew literature only once again in t. Kel. B. Meš. 1.3 (Zuckerman ed. and 1.2 in the Lieberman ed.). Its meaning is contested in the commentaries of both the medieval period. They knew about steel, but refer to it as a type of iron, Indian iron etc (see Levene and Rothenberg, ‘Early Evidence of Steelmaking’, pp. 105-27). Steel to them would have been the product of some kind of iron refinement.

20 The Akkadian term in its wider meanings has been added for comparison.
21 HALAT, p. 1057.
23 Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, p. 1303b.
24 Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, p. 1304b.
texts. For the purpose of this paper we have decided to look at some of the lexical commentaries that have led this term’s occurrence in Amos to be understood at different times in different ways. Regarding this difficult term, we shall show some of the variety of interpretations that has been applied to it.\textsuperscript{26} We provide the verses from Amos with two possible translations:

\begin{verbatim}
(ûna + plumb line)
This is what He showed me: He was standing on a wall checked with a plumb line and He was holding a plumb line. And the Lord asked me, ‘What do you see, Amos?’ ‘A plumb line’, I replied. And my Lord declared ‘I am going to apply a plumb line to My people Israel; I will pardon them no more’.\textsuperscript{27} (JPS)

(ûna + tin)
This is what He showed me: He was standing on a wall of tin and He was holding tin. And the Lord asked me, ‘What do you see, Amos?’ ‘Tin’, I replied. And my Lord declared ‘I am going to put tin within My people Israel; I will pardon them no more’.
\end{verbatim}

Being a hapax legomenon ûna has, in modern commentary, been considered in the light of its older cognates, most importantly the Akkadian anâku(m), in the context of which the Sumerian anag and Indian nāga are also always mentioned.\textsuperscript{28} There are also cognates in Aramaic, namely ḫną in Syriac and ‘nk’ in Mandaic. The Arabic cognate apparently means ‘lead’. The Ethiopic means either ‘lead’ or ‘tin’.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline

Biblical Hebrew & Akkadian & Syriac & Mandaic \\
\hline
ûna & anâku(m) & ḫną & ’nk’ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{27}Tanakh, a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985)


One of the problems is that there is a considerable history of debate concerning whether the Akkadian *anāku(m)* should mean ‘tin’ or ‘lead’, or indeed whether one should see it as being tin in some contexts and lead in others. Landsberger’s notes seem, to our mind, very convincing in that he argues that apart from a very small number of unusual references the term means tin.\(^{30}\) Landsberger also mentions our verses in Amos, stating his opinion that tin is a relevant concept in this context as it is in fact a symbol of ‘(a) softness, (b) uselessness, unless alloyed with another metal [and] (c) perishability’.\(^{31}\) More recently Moorey recounts Landsberger’s ‘magisterial’ article, with the cautionary note that there are still questions concerning the meaning of the Akkadian term, but only in respect to the period of the second half of the second millennium BCE.\(^{32}\) This would discount the period of Amos as it is supposed to have been composed in the first half of the first millennium BCE. It is worth noting that another cognate, largely ignored in this context, exists in Egyptian.\(^{33}\) This too is a hapax legomenon and is found in an inscription from Kawa (Upper Egypt) that states that in his 5th year, Taharqa, the Kushite pharaoh of the 7th century BCE (25th dynasty 690-664 BCE),\(^{34}\) made a tribute to the temple of Gematen of (amongst other things) a mineral named m\(\text{m}^{35}\) being the qualifier commonly added to the names of what were considered as the ‘pure’ form of minerals. This is an interesting attestation as it illustrates how the names of commodities traded over long distances often traveled with the commodities themselves.

It is clear, already from the early versions of the OT, that this term was problematic even then. \(\text{\textchar'26}\) was translated in the LXX as \(\text{\textchar'26}\) which was loaned directly into the Pesh. as \(\text{\textchar'26}\).\(^{36}\) It is worth not-

---


\(^{31}\)Landsberger, *Tin*, p. 287.


\(^{34}\)Taharqa is mentioned twice in the Bible, 2 Kgs 19.9 and Isa. 37.9, as the king of Kush who came in aid of Hezekiah against Sanherib. In the Bible his name is misspelled Tarhaqa.


ing in this context that the meaning of the word ‘admws, like ‘nk, is not quite clear. Liddell & Scott provide two material possibilities: 1. the hardest metal, prob. Steel; and 2. diamond.\textsuperscript{37} The Syriac สาธาร is used in early Syriac literature and is often equated with stone rather than steel. For instance, Ephraem uses it in the sense of ‘stone’ as one of the representations of Christ with specific reference to our verse in Amos.\textsuperscript{38} On the other hand we have a Syriac magic bowl that was published by Naveh and Shaked (bowl no.1) in which the term ยาוס appears, which they argue means ‘wall of pure steel’.\textsuperscript{39} Their argument hinges mainly on two facts: 1. the occurrence in another bowl (Montgomery 4.6\textsuperscript{40}) of the expression  ‘a great wall of copper (alloy)’, which points to สาธาร being like אשר, i.e. a metallic substance; and 2. the Manichean Middle Persian term ‘rm’s that means ‘steel’. We would note that the Greek term άυδαμας is cited in Liddell Scott-Jones in texts that go back to the 8th century BCE, and would thus hesitate to assume a meaning of steel for such an early date. Although the evidence of case hardening begins to appear at this period,\textsuperscript{41} it is well over a millennium before steel is produced in the West. Furthermore, Greek has a separate word for ‘case hardening’ στομομομι.\textsuperscript{42} A meaning of tin-bronze as the hard metal that .allocas stands for might be more appropriate.\textsuperscript{43} Indeed, Daniel Alqumsi, the Medieval Karaite exegete, understood the term יָם to be suggestive of

\textsuperscript{37} LSJ, p. 20a.
\textsuperscript{40} J.A. Montgomery, \textit{Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur} (The Museum, Publications of the Babylonian Section, 3; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania., 1913), p. 133.
\textsuperscript{42} Levene, ‘Early Evidence’, p. 119.

The medieval commentators Rashi and Radak cite the Arabic cognate to 'nk, to suggest the meaning plumb line. Needless to say that their commentary has been, and still is, very influential. One might argue that an understanding of the Akkadian cognate in the sense of ‘lead’ could be taken in support of their interpretation of the Biblical term. Though, as Williamson points out, the occurrence of אֹרְבָּא in Zech. 4.10 could be used to support the meaning of ‘plumb-line’ in Amos as הָרָם = tin = וּנָא.45

The evidence we have cited suggests that our term had a ‘lexical vulnerability’ in that it shows, at least in terms of our understanding, different meanings that manifest themselves over time and across language barriers.

The principle of hardness that links all the meanings of ajdavma~ and its cognates at all times and in all languages, might have a semantic connection with ‘nk as meaning ‘tin’, in that tin was the metal that mixed with copper produced bronze, a metal that became the hardest in its time; an alloy that was incredibly versatile in the ways that it could be manipulated; and also a metal that was much more resistant to corrosion than copper or iron.

4. Conclusion

It was our intention to present in this article an insight into the lexicographical aspects of our investigations of the metallurgically related material in the biblical and early to Medieval rabbinic literature. We chose two different terms, נֵר and וּנָא, to exemplify more acutely some of the difficulties inherent in this endeavor. These examples were selected to illustrate the need for a cross-disciplinary approach, in this case philology and archaeometallurgy, as a prerequisite for dealing with this type of terminology. In the case of the terms derived from the root נֵר, that we have looked at, it is important to note that the bridge between the various meanings that are found amongst its various cognates (see table above), and meanings that are possible in terms of archaeometallurgical probability, is not always clear. We have shown that, technically speaking, the meaning of the term in b. Yom. 34b and

44D. Alqumsi, מְכַבַּהּ יָנַע תֶּשֶׁר הָוָא תֶּשֶׁר הָוָא (ed. I. D. Markom; Jerusalem: מְכַבַּהּ יָנַע תֶּשֶׁר הָוָא, 1947), p. 37. Alqumsi suggests that the allusion in Daniel is to an impregnable wall and that נֵר is ‘hard lead’ (נֵר שְׁעָר), or ‘lead and tin’ (נֵר שְׁעָר וַעֲנָא) - possibly a type of pewter.

Hai Gaon’s commentary to Machsh. 5.7 is ‘case-hardening’; whereas, in Jer. 6.29-30 it means ‘cupellation’. A note of caution must be drawn from the fact that both ‘case-hardening’ and ‘cupellation’ are modern terms. The meanings of the term šrp, in its oldest cognates (see table above) do, however, include ‘heat’, ‘fire’, ‘burning’, ‘baking’ and the colour ‘red’ - meanings that are well suited to describe aspects of the processes of ‘case-hardening’ and ‘cupellation’ as they would have been known to the contemporaries of the authors of the texts we have investigated, and are fitting associations with the aforementioned metallurgical processes, that might explain the reason why šrp evolved to describe them. The term ẑrā, as it is used in Amos, presents a different kind of problem. It is a unique attestation in Biblical Hebrew in a text that does not give a clear indication of its precise meaning. Indeed, there is a long tradition of disagreement about this issue, starting from the early versions, through to Medieval and modern commentaries. The difficulties with deciphering this term are exacerbated by the fact that there is even controversy about the meaning of its older cognates in the various Akkadian dialects. Although uncertainty prevails as to its specific meaning in Amos, we can, nevertheless, observe, through its investigation, how a technical term can traverse various languages and generations. One might add that tin, one of the possible meanings of ẑrā, was a metal that, though common enough, was not regularly used on its own. Rather, it was used within alloys or as a coating of other metals. Thus, direct contact with it would have been relatively rare. These considerations might explain some of the confusion surrounding this term’s various possible meanings.
Notes on a Recently Published Magic Bowl

Matthew Morgenstern
University of Haifa
Dedicated to Prof. Joseph Naveh on the occasion of his 75th Birthday

1. Introduction

Scholars of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic have recently been presented with two editions of an interesting magic bowl from the British Museum Collection (BM 135563). The first edition to appear was published by C. Müller-Kessler and Th. Kwasman (from hereon MKK), anticipating by several months the appearance of the ‘official’ edition by J.B. Segal (from hereon Segal). In the opinion of Müller-Kessler and Kwasman, the bowl is unique in reflecting an Aramaic idiom close to that found in the majority of the Talmudic tractates. A detailed discussion of linguistic variation in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts will be provided in a future article. However, it seems that both available editions of this bowl may be improved upon, and accordingly I

∗The body of this article was written in the summer of 2002. The appearance of M. Sokoloff’s A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2002; from hereon DJBA) has enabled me to provide further examples for some of the phenomena discussed, and to improve my interpretation of the text at several points. It will be noted, however, that my interpretation does not always agree with that presented in the dictionary. The text of the bowl has been collated in the British Museum with kind permission of the trustees.


present here my own reading and translation. Overall, the readings of MKK have been preferred, but it seems to me that their many textual emendations require reconsideration. Needless to say, I have benefited greatly from both the available editions.

For the sake of comparison, I shall begin by presenting my collation of the text accompanied by an apparatus listing MKK’s and Segal’s readings. Detailed discussion of their interpretations will follow in my commentary. My own edition is presented schematically, to highlight the repetitive structure of the text which often enables us to improve the readings. I hope to show that while not free of difficulties, the bowl presents a text that is more cogent and better structured than either of the existing editions suggest.

2. Transcription and translation

hna anbty ybba –1”
A
atja tb tkwdznwg

anymd atylbbl –2”
B
hna anbty ypwsab
tja –3”

 tkwdznwg
anymd atypsrwbl

hna atyttp a[rab

B

ylpyk al ynad

3
yl

yfm al ynad

hna atryrm apyzrh

ynym –5”
ylyka al ynad

hna yrrm rhn

ynym yt[ al ynad

Åyjr ytyb

C

amyrm ytpwqsya

y[ y[ rj –6”
yla wta

D

atllmw yqp y[gp
tja tb tkwdnwg

anllm anqpn whypal

E


3The scribe originally wrote ‘yxm ‘overcome’ (see Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 700 s.v. 2# yxm), but altered the text to yfm ‘reach’. Compare line 9.
The kaph is malformed, and the reading is according to the context.

The reading should be מַרְשָפָּה.

The ה of this word has intruded on the מ of מָלַי ה at the start of line 8.

A false start for the next word, מָרָא, which is written at the start of the next line.

Correct to: מַנִּיכָה. The extended head of the third letter lends it the appearance of a kaph rather than a nun, which lacks a left-protruding upper stroke in script on this bowl.

For the interpretation of these letters, see commentary.
Previous readings: ¹
(2) Segal: סיכמ [Mkk: סיכמ] MKK: ד בשבה. || ¹

3. Translation

1. I sit at my gate, I, Gušnazdukht daughter of Ahat,
2. I look like the Babylonian. I sit at my vestibule, I, Gušnazdukht daughter
3 of Ahat. I look like the Borsippean. I am on the wide Earth, that
no man can overpower me,
4. I am the high heavens, that no man can reach me. I am the bitter
harzipa, that no man can eat me,
5. from me. I am the Merari River, that no man can drink from me.
My house is secure, my threshold is raised. The evil sorcerers came
to me.

Indeed, met normal. See commentary.

Both MKK and Segal present their transcriptions in transliteration. I have
rendered their versions into the Hebrew script, which naturally involves the
employment of final letters which their transcriptions do not distinguish.
6 Pag’i, Paqi and Mallalta. I, Guşnazdükht daughter of Ahat go out
to them, I speak and say to them,
7 to the evil sorcerers, Paqi Pag’i Paqi and Mallalta: ‘Go eat from
what I eat, and go drink from what I drink, and go anoint from
what I anoint.
8 The evil sorcerers, Pag’a, Pag’i, Paqi and Mallalta, said thus: ‘How
can we from what you eat and drink from what you drink and
anoint from what you anoint? For
9 you are the wide Earth that no man can compel, and you are the
high heavens, that no man can reach. You are the bitter Harzifa-
herb from which no man can eat. You are the
10 Merari River that no man can drink. Your house is secure, your
threshold raised!’ ‘If not, ... to your practitioner, to your sender, to
your trays (?) of flour.
11 Go and put it in his breadbasket that he may eat from it and be
sickened, in his water barrel that he may drink from it and be
sickened, in his trough/flask of oil that he may anoint with it and
be sickened’.
12 In the name of Tiqos YHWH Sebaoth Amen Amen Selah.

4. Commentary

1. The idiom אבּ תִּבְנָי ‘to sit at the gate’ is found in the
Babylonian Talmud, e.g. תַּאֲרֵי הָבֶּסּוֹמִים הַגֶּשֶׁמִים וַיָּקָם יָהֳוֶ הָאָלֶּה (b. B. Bat. 58a [ms Hamburg]) ‘since he is so clever, let him sit at the gate
2.'postico': The interpretation ‘portico’, suggested by MKK, is clearly
superior to Segal’s ‘rubbish’ (apparently based upon Hebrew גַּם),
and provides a parallel with עַבּ.
3. MKK and Segal agree that the reading קלח is the
result of dittography. The correct reading, קלח, is found in line 9. It
seems likely that the error occurred as a result of the scribe’s breaking
off after the letters פֵּס to refill his pen. Segal translates ‘crumbling’,
but it seems that MKK ‘wide’ is to be preferred. MKK overlook the
preposition בְּ, presumably in the light of the parallel in line 9.
Certainly, assuming a scribal error here produces a smoother reading.
See also our comments on קלח.

12See further Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 183, s.v. קלח.
ylpyk: Segal translates ‘restrains’, while MKK prefer ‘bend’. However, ¹pkÖ¹wk often has the meaning in Babylonian Aramaic of ‘overcome, force’. ¹

4. amrd ym yh: Segal reads amrd ym wh and translates ‘It is I myself that cast’, but this interpretation cannot be supported in the light of line 9, nor does it fit the context. MKK do not relate to the first two letters in their translation or discussion. Prof. J. Naveh has suggested (oral communication) that it may be a presentative particle. We may think of a form such as JBA ‘behold’ or Mandaic ¹ or ¹. Although MKK’s translation of ‘the high heaven’ is adopted here, it is not without problems, most notably the unusual form ³ for regular ³. In favour of the interpretation ‘heavens’ stands the statement ³/³ ‘whom no man can reach’. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that this form represents metanalysis of compound /samayadrâma/, ¹⁵ and that the particle ³ was pronounced /ad-/ as it is in the Mandaic reading tradition. ¹⁶ The rarity of the /-ayy¯a/ ending in this dialect might have encouraged such a metanalysis. Alternatively, the spelling may reflect an early attestation of the neo-Aramaic plural form /ˇsimme/, found in the Jewish Aramaic dialects of Northwestern Iraq. ¹⁷

atryrm apyzrh: MKK’s reading, based on the Talmudic parallel from b. Pes 39a, is clearly superior to Segal’s bizarre atdyrm apyz dj ‘an offensive eyebrow’. A form identical to that in the magic bowl is found in the Columbia manuscript of Pesahim. ¹⁸

4-5. ynym ylyka: MKK assume here dittography, and correct the text to read ³/³, with the apocope of the lamed of the participle /akil/. The apocope of a final consonant is a marked feature of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and is widely attested in manuscripts

¹³Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 597.
¹⁴Th. Nöldeke, Mandäische Grammatik (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875), §72.
¹⁵My reconstruction of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic phonology is based upon the detailed study of the earliest manuscripts. A full description will be published shortly.
¹⁸Noted in Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 390 s.v. ³simme/, with literature.
demonstrating phonetic orthography.\textsuperscript{19} The comparison with lines 9 and 11 supports this correction. It would seem likely that the extraneous \textit{ל} resulted from the forms \textit{מֶסַח} (line 3) and \textit{ל} (line 4). An alternative explanation is that \textit{ל} here appears here instead of \textit{ל} for the reading \textit{/le/}, and is the so-called 'ethical dative'.\textsuperscript{20}

5. \textit{הָרֶהוֹר} (MKK) is superior to Segal's, both in terms of the material reading and the context (see the following 'from whom no man can drink'). MKK translate 'I am the bitter river'. However, the emphatic form implies that this is perhaps a proper noun. Compare \textit{יְרַמ לְרַק} b. M. Qat. 4b, \textit{בֹּרִי} b. B. Mes. 24b, \textit{יְרַמ לְרַק} b. 'Abod. Zar. 39a. It is feasible that this was the name of a river that would have been familiar to the readers and writers.

\textit{בֵּית מִי}: Segal's translation, 'my house is secure', is to be preferred over MKK's assumption of an Akkadian loanword 'to flood, rinse'; there is no reason to follow them in rejecting the Aramaic root in this context. Up to this point, the speaker has declared her strength and might: she sits firm in her home, she is like the unconquerable earth and heavens, the inedible bitter herb, and the undrinkable bitter river. Finally, she declares 'my house is secure, my threshold high', emphasizing her security and impenetrability. This line, breaking the sequence of the previous four statements that are all formulated in the identical pattern ('I am... whom no man can...'), concludes section B in my schematic presentation of the text. It is reflected again in section B'.

6. \textit{יסנִי פֶּסַח}: MKK are correct in assuming that these are the names of evil forces, rather than imperative verbal forms as Segal suggests. It is possible that these words are in apposition with \textit{דִּבְרֶי}, and should be translated as though they are personal names. MKK consistently (lines 6, 7, 8) 'correct' the reading \textit{פסכ} to \textit{פסכ}. Since the

\textsuperscript{19}Although phonetic orthography is found to a certain degree in all Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts, its widespread use is characteristic of certain groups of manuscripts, particularly early Eastern manuscripts and Yemenite texts. For an important preliminary description of manuscript groups, see S.Y. Friedman, 'The Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud: a Typology Based upon Orthographic and Linguistic Features', in M. Bar-Asher (ed.), \textit{Studies in the Hebrew and Jewish Languages Presented to Shelomo Morag} (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1996), pp. 163-90.

\textsuperscript{20}The elision of the final he of the 3rd masculine singular pronoun is quite widespread in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts, for example in the common form \textit{מֶסַח} = \textit{מֶסַחְת}. See Y. Kara, \textit{Babylonian Aramaic in the Yemenite Manuscripts of the Talmud} (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983) pp. 75-76.
form ʢפ is repeated three times in this text, while ʢפ is never attested, the suggested correction would not appear to be justified. The names ʢפ and ʢפ may have sounded almost identical to the scribe. The Babylonian Geonim attest to the dropping of the 'ayin in the form ʢפ. The names ʢפ and ʢפ may have sounded almost identical to the scribe. The Babylonian Geonim attest to the dropping of the 'ayin in the form ʢפ. (Harkavy, *Responsa*, p. 22 lines 29-30). Interchanges of qof and gimel are less common in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, though not unknown, particularly in loan-words. Compare, for example, the spellings ʢפ and ʢפ 'gum Arabic', or ʢפ and ʢפ 'club'.

Segal and MKK both read as a participle, with MKK 'correcting' the reading to ʢפ. The form in the bowl would appear to reflect haplology or the assimilation of the participle morpheme to the first root letter. A similar phenomenon is attested in the Yemenite manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud:

5.

7. This reading is derived from Segal’s ʢפ and MKK’s ʢפ. While the first letter is malformed, MKK’s reading of a dalet is clearly superior to Segal’s suggestion of an aleph. However, Segal’s reading of two words is supported by the subsequent ʢפ, for which the reading ʢפ is hard to justify. The use of the -ד to introduce direct speech is widespread in the Aramaic dialects.

The apocopation does not affect the form ʢפ, in which the ending was derived from an original diphthong and was certainly stressed. For the form in the Babylonian Talmud, see ʢפ (b. B. Bat. 22a [MS Hamburg]), ʢפ (b. Ber. 25a [MS Oxford 366]). The form ʢפ bears the prosthetic aleph, which is attested on both perfect and imperative forms, e.g. ʢפ (b.


Compare Sokoloff, *DJBA*, p. 176 s.v. ʢפ.
‘Erub. 54a [ms Vatican 109]) ‘eat quickly (and) drink quickly’. An imperative form with the prosthetic aleph appears in a magic bowl: \[ \text{hymd ÷m yat\textasciitilde{y}aw hyr\textasciitilde{y}yb ÷m ylwkya yhwl} \] (Naveh-Shaked 7:8). Sokoloff notes that this verb is often found together with \( \text{a\textasciitilde{y}a} \), as in the citation from b. ‘Erub. brought above, and \( \text{wwrw wt\textasciitilde{y}w wlkad} \) ‘for they eat, drink and get drunk’ (b. Meg. 13b [ms Columbia]).

It seems preferable to read \( /\text{midd\textasciitilde{a}}\text{\textasciitilde{k}\textasciitilde{n}}\text{\textasciitilde{a}}/ \), given the defective spelling of \( \text{m\textasciitilde{a}r\textasciitilde{h}\textasciitilde{a}\textasciitilde{h}} \) in line 8 and the parallels in lines 9 and 11. MKK’s suggestion to read the prefix as equivalent to the Talmudic \( \text{m\textasciitilde{a}c\textasciitilde{a}} \) is not impossible. However, in that case, we would have to assume that the form \( \text{m\textasciitilde{a}r\textasciitilde{h}\textasciitilde{a}\textasciitilde{h}} \) is either a scribal error or reflects the contraction of \( /\text{mayd\textasciitilde{a}}/ > /\text{me\textasciitilde{d}}\text{\textasciitilde{a}}/ \). The interchange of \( \text{m\textasciitilde{a}c\textasciitilde{a}} \) and \( \text{m\textasciitilde{a}c\textasciitilde{a}} \) is found in Babylonian Aramaic in the interrogative particle. However, given the parallels of line 11, it would seem preferable to view the form \( /\text{midd\textasciitilde{a}}/ \) in this text as reflecting \( /\text{midd\textasciitilde{a}}/ \) and I have translated accordingly here.

8. \( \text{y\textasciitilde{y}b y\textasciitilde{y}rj lylm} \). This is the reading of the bowl. MKK suggest correcting the text to \( \text{y\textasciitilde{y}b y\textasciitilde{y}rjl ?anl\textasciitilde{a}ylm?m\textasciitilde{a}} \), but such a drastic emendation is unnecessary, and significantly alters the sense of the narrative. Segal correctly identifies the form \( \text{lylm} \) as verbal predicate of the subject \( \text{y\textasciitilde{y}b y\textasciitilde{y}rj} \), but assumes that the content of the evil sorcerers’ speech is contained in the words \( \text{atllmw yqp y\textasciitilde{g}p} \), while I assume, as mentioned in my commentary upon line 6, that these are evil spirits themselves. The form \( \text{lylm} \) for the plural reflects the apocopation of the final unstressed vowel.

25For the imperative, see J.N. Epstein, A Grammar of Babylonian Aramaic (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1960), p. 96, and Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, §51, 176D. The perfect forms are well attested in the Aramaic dialects, e.g. Biblical Aramaic \( \text{y\textasciitilde{y}m\textasciitilde{a}t\textasciitilde{a}} \), Dan 5.3,4, and Targ. \( \text{y\textasciitilde{y}m\textasciitilde{a}t\textasciitilde{a}} \), see A. Dodi, ‘The Grammar of Targum Onkelos According to Geniza Fragments’, PhD Thesis Submitted to the Senate of Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel, 1981, p. 69. For other forms in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic see Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, pp. 281-83.


27Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 1184, s.v. \( \text{\textasciitilde{a}c\textasciitilde{a}} \) 1c.

28Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 661 s.v. \( \text{\textasciitilde{a}c\textasciitilde{a}} \) and endnotes.

29See E.Y. Kutscher, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), pp. 243-45 (Hebrew Section), Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, pp. 144-45. For possible attestations of such forms in the magic bowls, see Jusola, Magic Bowls, pp. 164-69.
Segal reads \( \text{wkyn ykyj ykah} \) and translates `[and the spell was] thus. How? ‘We shall eat’`. However, as noted, he did not identify the names of the demons and his translation is fragmented and forced. MKK read \( \text{wkyn ykyh ykah} \) ‘Thus my palate will eat’, and translate all of the nun-prefixed forms in the third person singular. But this reading does not suit the statement \( \text{tpy} \text{dm} \text{¹w} \text{ynw} \), as the palate does not anoint. Moreover, the ‘justification’ section, which begins with \( \text{драре} \text{н} \text{фате} \text{ам} \) and continues to line 10 (B’ in our schematic presentation), is clearly addressed in the second person to the speaker in the opening of the text, Gušnazdukht daughter of Ahat. MKK’s ascription of these words to Gušnazdukht herself depends upon their emendation of the text in line 8 and cannot be justified from the text itself.

The simplest reading may be gained by assuming that the direct speech begins with the words \( \text{wkyn ykyh} \), ‘how can we eat?’. Graphically reading \( ÷kah \) is marginally better than the reading \( ykah \), though it assumes the use of a medial nun in a final position.

8-9: Here we find the demons’ explanation for their inability to partake of the delights that Gušnazdukht enjoys, repeating her words from the opening section.

10. \( \text{wkynrd³d} \text{m} \{\text{a}\} \{\text{a}\} \) : The material reading here is difficult. Segal reads \( \text{wbynd³ma} \text{wbyn dba andyz ûytalya} \) and translates ‘your entry haughty’, taking \( \text{wbyndba} \) and \( \text{wbynd³ma} \) as proper names. This suggestion has little to recommend it. MKK read \( \text{wkyndba} \text{andyz ûytalya} \text{wkynr³dÀd³m} \{\text{a}\} \), and translate ‘your upper room is inundated; your practitioners of (a ritual), your scatterers’, but this interpretation also depends upon the assumption that \( \text{Åyjr} \) in line 5 means ‘flooded, rinsed’. The key to the passage seems to lie, as they suggest, in the parallels from similar magic bowls. MKK cite three parallels:

1 British Museum 91776, first published by Gordon in 1941 and presented according to Müller-Kessler’s collation: אכלי הר יתי ראמתני אמגנסוס. The key to the passage seems to lie, as they suggest, in the parallels from similar magic bowls. MKK cite three parallels:

30So Sokoloff, \textit{DJBA}, 377b, s.v. ykyh.
you and to the sender who sent you; go and fall into his bread basket, into his cask of water, and into his flax of oil, and let him [eat bread and ], drink water and be harmed, and anoint oil and be pained¹.

2 A bowl published by Gordon in 1978³¹ (Zion Research Library, Boston, no. 48) lines 8-9: Return by the path on which you came, and enter the house from which you left, and fall into the bread basket that he may eat and not be satiated, and the water vessel that he may drink and ...³³ and into the oil vessel that he may anoint and be pained.⁷

3 A text published by Gordon: The parallels would suggest that the reading should be: return by the path on which you came, and enter the house from which you left, and fall into the bread basket that he may eat and not be satiated, and the water vessel that he may drink and ...³³ and into the oil vessel that he may anoint and be pained.³⁴

The parallels would suggest that the reading should be: return by the path on which you came, and enter the house from which you left, and fall into the bread basket that he may eat and not be satiated, and the water vessel that he may drink and ...³³ and into the oil vessel that he may anoint and be pained.³⁴

The interpretation of the letters between בְּקֵנָה and בְּקֵנָה is very uncertain, and the text may be corrupt. Repeated inspections of the bowl in the facsimile and in the original have not provided a wholly


³²The scribe initially wrote a kaph, but erased it and wrote a qoph. This may reflect a shift of q > k, which, while rare, is not unknown in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts. Note, for example, the Persian load-word *azybkÖazypq* (Sokoloff, *DJBA*, p. 1032), or the personal name *arbq* (San. 29b [MS Yad Harav Herzog]), that appears in Geonic literature as *arbq* (*Sefer Halachot Pesuqot*, Codex Sassoon 263 [Facsimile Edition, Jerusalem: Makor Publishing, 1971], p. 134 line 15, parallels *Hilchot Reu*, ed. Schlossberg [Versailles: Cerf et fils, 1886], p. 61 line 28). For the shift q > fricative k in modern Arabic, compare Iraqi Arabic *waqt* (< *waqt*), ‘time’.

³³The reading בְּקֵנָה is probably incorrect. Perhaps in the light of BM 91776 cited above, we should read בְּקֵנָה.

³⁴C.H. Gordon, ‘Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums’, *Archiv Orientalia* 6 (1934), pp. 319-34. I have slightly extended the citation here and made a minor correction to Gordon’s reading (in place of בְּקֵנָה I read בְּקֵנָה).
satisfactory material reading. From the parallels we would expect to find here imperative forms meaning ‘to back’ or ‘return’. It is tempting to assume that the letters that appear as הַדְּרִי (line 3). Instead of MKK’s הַדְּרִי‘your upper room is inundated; your practitioners’ we get הַדְּרִי, ‘if not, go back to your practitioner’. This reading and interpretation both suit the context and is paralleled in meaning (though not in precise formulation) by the other magic texts, but is based on emendation.

Following MKK’s suggestion, on the basis of Gordon (see the previous footnote), we have emended the form הַדְּרִי to הַדְּרִי. However, the interpretation suggested here does not require the deletion of the initial aleph. Rather, it is to be taken as the phonetic equivalent of the Standard Aramaic הָדְּרִי found in Gordon’s text.

MKK translate the whole expression, according to their reading הָדְּרִי ‘your practitioners of (a ritual), your scatterers concerning the spreading of your flour’, and convincingly link הָדְּרִי to the use of Akkadian epēšu ‘to practice witchcraft, perform a divination, ritual’ (CAD E 191 b s.v. epēšu and 207b s.v. dullu). However, their attempt to link the word הָדְּרִי to an Akkadian apotropaic ritual mentioned in the Maqlû texts is less convincing. הָדְּרִי in Aramaic means ‘one who sends’, and the root רד is not used for scattering.

In Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, we find כְּפִי used with this meaning, including in a magic context: כְּפִי הָדְּרִי ‘and cast [the earth] before him or on the threshold of his house’ (Harba de-Moshe 42.10). The verb רד is also employed in this meaning: רד הָדְּרִי ‘who would cast dust from it and it would become swords’ (Ta’an. 24a [MS Yad Harav Herzog]), and in a magic context: הָדְּרִי כְּפִי לְשׁוֹמֵר. The Continuum Publishing Group Ltd 2004.

36 The reference is to Y. Harari, Harba de-Moshe (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1997).
37 This example is drawn from Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 195 s.v. כְּפִי.
38 כְּפִי is to be taken as the verbal predicate of כְּפִי. It is either a graphic error for כְּפִי (influenced by the following correct form כְּפִי), or the result of attraction to the plural complement כְּפִי.
and if you want to bind them [wild animals] recite from [magic words in the Harba text] over the earth under your left foot and cast it before them'. Compare also the less specific use of ṣm'h נודע תינכת יריית הנגד לאר졌ה (Ber. [ms Oxford 366] 6a) ‘Whoever wants to know (about the demons) should bring sifted ash and put it around his bed, and the next day it will look like chicken feet’. These usages would appear to reflect closer parallels to Babylonian magic practices than the use of מָשֵׁר הָאָדָם here.

Our text is better translated ‘Go back to your practitioner, to your sender’. Moreover, as I have tried to demonstrate above, the aleph on אָמַסְדָּרַכְתָּרָו should not be deleted, but is paralleled by the aleph of אֲמָדְרוֹאַרְדָּר.

As noted above, the motif of sending spirits back to the sender is quite common in the magic texts. Indeed, the frequent opening תָּבֵי, which is often translated ‘overturned’, may also be translated ‘turned back’, as in Aramaic the root וַתַּפְרָא has both meanings.

11. The meaning of this verb has not been clearly established. Segal translates it ‘be spoiled’, based on his incorrect reading לְבָא. MKK leave it untranslated. Sokoloff has tried to connect it to Syriac וַתַּפְרָא, ‘to cease’, and suggested reading the form here as an ithpe’il, meaning ‘and it will be left over’. The interpretation suggested here relates the root וַתַּפְרָא to JBA וַתַּפְרָא, which can mean ‘to become sick’. The shift of לְ to is quite well attested in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and is attested elsewhere in this bowl in the form לְהָאָדָם ‘of bread’ (line 11), which is derived from Standard Aramaic לְהָאָדָם. It is also found in verbal prefixes, such as לְאָדָם ‘Come let us all be one people’ (b. San. 39a [ms Yad Harav Herzog]). In verbal roots, it occurs in root-initial position in the common Talmudic form לְאָדָם. In root-final position there is apparently one other example, לְאָדָם (b. B. Bat. 12a [ms Hamburg, Harkavy, Responsa, p. 26 line 11]), which appears also as לְאָדָם in the Geniza fragment TS G 2.25.

39I owe this suggestion to Prof. J. Naveh, who also drew my attention to Sokoloff, DJBA, p. 426 s.v. וַתַּפְרָא, where this meaning of וַתַּפְרָא is well recorded.
40See Epstein, Grammar, p. 19.
41See further Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, pp. 151-52, 167.
43Published by S. Assaf, Responsa Geonica (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1942), p. 143.
Furthermore, it is possible that the root יבשת is found in line 8 of bowl 11 from the Mousaieff collection. Shaked, who published the bowl, transcribed this line הוהיה עלים חנול ומלכיא חנול נישק צוות מ accidental יבשת, and translated ‘and I brought upon you an unjurer that may injure you, and may cause you to leave the house of this Abuna son of Hatpoi’. However, Shaked’s reading of יבשת relies on an emendation, and also produces a plural verb in a context where a singular verb is required. Accordingly, it seems preferable to read יבשת, involving only the minor change of Shaked’s material reading from a waw to a yod and requiring no change in translation. The form is a pa‘al imperfect 3rd masculine singular. The verbal root יבשת appears in the Mousaieff bowl where the root יבשת is employed in a parallel text, Montgomery 9 lines 7-8: יבשת להב הוהיה עלים חנול ומלכיא חנול נישק צוות מ accidental יבשת יבשת. If the verb in the Mousaieff bowl is indeed in the pa‘al, it seems likely that the verb in our bowl is in the itpa‘al, an assumption that would suit the defective spelling of יבשת.

The word יבשת thus reflects the other similar curses cited from the magic bowls mentioned above, many of which relate to bodily pains caused by bewitched food. We may note that the idea that demons dwell within food is also found in the homilies of Aphrahat, the scholar of the early fourth century, wherein we read:

גזרה כל אחד לא מצא לא ימצא וどこו ימצא לא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ولا ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא וどこו ימצא ולא ימצא V

And he says: ‘All foods are sanctified by the word of God and by prayer’ (1 Tim 4:4). So when somebody has need of one of God’s creatures, before he eats he invokes and praises and blesses the name of the creatures’ creator, and prays, and then they are sanctified, and the evil spirit flees from within them.46

11. ajyymd hytwnab: The reading hytwnab was suggested in MKK, explained in a separate article, and preferred over Segal’s reading hytwxb in Müller-Kessler’s review. In the light of the parallel materials that Müller-Kessler has cited, it seems likely that hytwnab is indeed the correct reading. However, the right-hand stroke that lends the letter the appearance of a sade may be clearly discerned on both the original bowl and in the photographs, and is written in the same ink as the remainder of the text. The scribe may have begun to write a different letter before breaking off to write the nun, without erasing the previous pen-stroke. As the text stands, the reading hytwxb cannot be definitively excluded.

hls ÷ma ÷ma: A common closing formula, based on the doubled use of ÷ma already found at the end of the books of Psalms and used further in Second Temple liturgical settings. Its use in the magic texts is widespread.

5. Conclusion

The interpretation of this magic bowl presented here requires far fewer textual emendations than found in MKK’s edition, and proves a far more coherent text than provided by Segal.

The narrative is based around a simple structure. The opening section (A) sets the scene, and introduces the ‘heroine’ of the bowl, who is presumably the client. In (B), she declares her invincibility, culminating in her proclamation (C) that her house is secure and threshold raised. (D) reports the arrival of the demons, while (E) reports the heroine’s approach. The demons’ names are listed again in (D’). The heroine challenges the demons in (F), and they respond (D”) saying

48See note 1 above.
50The formula תהלים פסניא פסניא appears in the Babylonian Talmud, Yoma 84a, as noted by Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts, p. 63. It has now also been found in Palestinian amulets, such as J. Naveh and S. Shaked, Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1987), amulets 1.12, 2.11, 4.23, Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993), amulets 16.24-25, 17.32-33, 19.33, 29.5,9.

c⃝ The Continuum Publishing Group Ltd 2004.
that they cannot take up the challenge (F’) on account of her invincibility (B’), which they recount, culminating in the proclamation in (C’). Since the demons have failed to meet the challenge, they are sent back against their sender (G), who must now face the dangers he sought to impose upon the heroine; in effect, meet her challenge.

The text has been carefully crafted. It contains an opening in which the heroine is presented and her identity clearly established by repetition. The main part of the narrative is told through repeated stanzas, which themselves are structured around a series of parallelisms. The word אֱלַי indicates that the text is drawing to a close. The denouement of the final lines, in which the three verbs of eating, drinking and anointing are repeated once again in curses against the demons’ sender, provides the dramatic climax, while the post-script אֶל יִבְּרָא לְךָ signals that the text is complete.51

51 The formula also appears in magic texts signaling the end of a section. I shall return to the literary aspects of the magic bowls in a future article.
Three Harsh Prophets:  
A Targumic Tosefta to Parashat Korah

Harry Sysling
Theological University of Kampen

1. Introduction

The collection of Palestinian Targumim to the Pentateuch, known as the Fragmentary Targums, belongs in all likelihood to the festival-liturgical genre.\(^1\) This is especially true for one of its primary sources, MS Paris – Bibliothèque nationale Hébr. 110, in which, as M.L. Klein states, ‘the parasot of the annual cycle are marked by several words in square majusculae...’.\(^2\) The fifty-four weekly sabbath readings of the annual cycle are all indicated in this manner,\(^3\) although quite often the

---


\(^3\) See the list of parasiglot in N. Fried, ‘Haftara’, *Talmudic Encyclopedia* (in Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1961), 10.1-31, 702-724; according to Fried (p. 709) the haftara reading for parashat Korah is 1 Sam. 11.14–12.22. In MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targum, the beginning of the second verse of a parasha is sometimes marked (see for instance Exod. 30.12, 35.2, Lev. 12.2, 14.2). Alternatively, not only the beginning of the first verse is marked, but also that of the second (see Num. 13.1, 2, 25.10, 11). It is to be assumed that the majusculae in Gen 49.3 were written down by mistake.
lemmata are not followed by an Aramaic translation of the rest of the verse. Apart from this outward aspect, the liturgical character of MS Paris is clearly visible in the midrashic expansions (toseftot), which are added not only to the festival readings but also to the weekly sabbath readings.

As an example of such a targumic tosefta I adduce the lengthy introduction to Parashat Korah (Num. 16.1ff.) in MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targums. This midrash, unknown to the other targumim, speaks about three prophets who denied their own prophecies, namely Moses, Elijah and Micah. The story, as we shall see, is of special interest not least because it contains several quotations of scriptural verses from the Prophets which are at variance with the official targum on the Prophets, targum Jonathan.

2. Text and Translation

The text of this tosefta, in the edition of Klein, reads as follows:

Why the editor chose to include these 'empty' markings remains unexplained. Another unsolved question is why the Fragmentary Targums do not follow the Palestinian triennial cycle. See R.M. Campbell, 'Parashiyot and their Implications for Dating the Fragment-Targums', in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), Targum and Scripture. Studies in Aramaic Translation and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2002), pp. 105-14.

In 90 per cent of the cases these expansions are in line, as regards content, with (one of) the other Palestinian targums (most often Neofiti, see e.g. FragTg/TgNeof Gen. 18.1, 28.10, 44.18, Lev. 1.1, Deut. 1.1); an exception is FragTgExod. 13.17, which corresponds with TgPsJ.

Hereafter FragTg. Other abbreviations for the targumic sources I shall be using in this article are FragTg (MS Vatican Ebr. 440 of the Fragment-Targums), TgNeof (Codex Neofiti I), TgNeof [M] (Marginal Glosses in Neofiti), TgNeof [I] (Interlinear Glosses in Neofiti), TgCG (Cairo Geniza Fragments), TgPsJ (Pseudo-Jonathan), PTg (Palestinian Targum), TgOnq (Onqelos).

A large number of targumic quotations that are not identical with the extant targums have been collected in M. Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments of Lost Targumim (2 vols; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1983, 1989). For quotations of a targum on the Prophets in the Palestinian Targums, see FragTgNum. 16.1 (1 Kgs 18.37, 21.19, 22.28), PTg Deut. 32.1 (Isa. 1.2, 51.6, 65.17), PTg Gen. 40.23 (Jer. 17.5, 7). See for these quotations Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments, II, pp. 19-21, 25-26, 27-28. The following are not mentioned in Goshen-Gottstein: TgCG/FragTgExod. 13.17 (Ezek. 18.13), TgPsJ Gen. 30.25 (Obad. 18), TgPsJ Deut. 31.16 (1 Sam. 25.19).

After this lengthy introduction the lemma is repeated, followed by its Aramaic interpretation:

And Korah took: Three harsh prophets prophesied in their anger, and denied their (own) prophesies because of the meanness (with which they were treated): Moses, Elijah and Micah.

[A] Moses prophesied in his anger and said: ‘If these men die according to the death that the sons of man die, and by the decree that is decreed against the sons of man, then the memra of the Lord did not speak with me, and I am not among the Lord’s prophets, nor was the Lord’s Torah brought down by me’. A heavenly voice came forth, and said: ‘Moses son of Amram, just as the tribe of Levi petitioned before you, but you had no compassion for them, nor did you have mercy upon them, so ultimately you will petition before Me; and just as you exalted yourself over them, so <1> will exalt Myself over you. You said to


9I mainly follow Klein’s translation (Fragment-Targums, II, pp. 69-70), but at some points I deviate from his rendering.

10Klein, Fragment-Targums, II, p. 69, translates ‘denied their own prophesies [sic] in despair’. On the meaning of anyrp wgb, see below.

them: “(It is) enough for you, sons of the tribe of Levi.” So, you will be told: “Enough for you, do not speak any more.”

[B] Elijah prophesied in his anger and said: ‘Answer me, O Lord, answer me, so that all these people may know that You are their God, first God and last God; and that all the gods they worship in Your presence are false gods. And if You do not answer me, and display the miracles of Your might in this hour, then it will have been You who stiffened their necks, and turned their faces about and swayed their hearts backwards’. A heavenly voice came forth, and said: ‘Elijah, Elijah, why have you allowed the creditor to collect his debt? That prayer has (already) been received before Me’.

[C] Micaiah son of Imlah prophesied in his anger, and said: ‘If Ahab does return safely, then I am not among the Lord’s prophets, and the memra of the Lord has not spoken to me’. A heavenly voice came forth, and said: ‘Micaiah son of Imlah, I have fulfilled your decree, but I have (also) accepted Ahab’s repentance: (...) I have fulfilled your decree, that Ahab shall not return safely; and I have accepted his repentance, so as not to bring about the evil things in his days; and I have fulfilled the word of my mouth. Just as the dogs have eaten the blood of Naboth, so shall the dogs eat the blood of Ahab in the plot of ground of Jezeel’.

End.

And Korah took counsel and was at strife.

3. Three Harsh Prophets: Form and Development of a Story

In the other recensions of the Fragmentary Targums and in the rest of the Palestinian Targums, there is no reference to this story about three harsh prophets. Ginsburger may be right in seeing it as originally belonging to Num. 16.29 (the first scriptural quotation in this midrash).

12That is: You have gone too far. See Num. 16.7.
13Deut. 3.26.
14See 1 Kgs 18.37.
15See 1 Kgs 22.28, 2 Chron. 18.27.
16Reading הַמֶּלֶּחֶץ instead of הַמֶּלֶּחַ.
17Here the text wrongly adds ‘so as not to bring about the evil things in his days; and I have fulfilled the words of my mouth just (as)... and it (the decree?) was not made void’. It is partly marked with a superlinear line for deletion.
18A conflation of various scriptural verses, cf. 1 Kgs 21.19, 23; 2 Kgs 9.10, 36-37, and see below.
19Or: was divided.
20M. Ginsburger, Das Fragmententhargum (Thargum jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch) (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1899), p. 52 n. 3: ‘Dieses Stück... bildete wol ursprünglich das Thargum zu V. 29 wurde aber dann allem Ansccheine nach als Einleitung zu סְרֵפָּה verwendet...’.

It is reasonable to assume that the targumic rendering of this verse in the introduction (‘If such and such happens, then the memra of the Lord did not speak with me, and I am not among the Lord’s prophets, nor was the Lord’s Torah brought down by me’) is an expansion of the ‘traditional’ targumic rendering of the phrase ‘then the Lord did not send me’ (Num. 16.29). If this is so, it is another example of the transfer of toseftot in festival-liturgical collections from their original place, so as to form the introduction to the weekly sabbath reading.21

Prior to a more detailed examination of our story, I shall make some general observations:

1. The story gives no direct answer to the problem confronting both ancient and modern readers of the Korah story: What is the object of the sentence jrq jqyw? What did Korah and his cohorts take?22 There is hardly any connection with the lemma jrq jrw jywl. It is therefore not surprising to see that at the end the lemma is repeated, followed by its targumic explanation: jrq glpw afy[ bysnw ‘and Korah took counsel and was at strife’. With minor variants, our targum shares this interpretation with MS Venice of the Fragmentary Targum and with the marginal glosses in targum Neofiti.23 It is beyond doubt that this is

21See Klein, Fragment-Targums, I, pp. 21-23.
22For modern solutions of the problem that a direct object to jqyw is missing, see B.A. Levine, Numbers 1-20 (AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 410-11. In rabbinic literature there are divergent explanations: He [Korah] took people by persuasion (Num. R. 18.2); he took a bad bargain for himself (b. San. 109b); his heart took control of him (Num. R. 18.16); he took his fringes of blue (mentioned in Num. 15.38, see Num. R. 18.3; y. San. 10.1, 27d; TgPsJ); he created discord (Tanh. B., Korah p. 86, Num. R. 18.3). For a survey and for other possibilities, see I. Drazin, Targum Onkelos to Numbers. (New York: Ktav, 1988), p. 176 n. 1; see also B. Grossfeld, The Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and Numbers (Aramaic Bible 8; Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1988) p. 115. I am not convinced that the equation of wayyiqah and discord (‘wayyiqah cannot but signify discord’) is due to metathesis (reading jwl for jwl) as Berkowitz in his commentary on Onqelos, Simlat Ger, p. 18 states (included in B. J. Berkowitz, Lechem We-Sinla [Wilna, 1850-1855]). Thus also R. Le Déaut and J. Robert, Targum du Pentateuque. III Nombres. (SC, 261; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1979), p. 149 n. 2. It can be explained sufficiently by the use of the hermeneutical device סֵא ... סֵא; on this formula, see W. Bacher, Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur (repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965), I, pp. 4-5; S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: Feldheim, 1950), pp. 49-51; I.B. Gottlieb, ‘Formula Comparison in Midrash Research’. JQR 70, 1979-80, pp. 32-38.
23Instead of ספב, FragTsg and Neof [M 2] read ספב, Neof [M 1] is the most elaborated of the Palestinian Targums: ספב מְשֶׁרֶת הַלְּבָנָה עָלָיו שֵׁלָה, ‘and they took evil counsel and Korah quarrelled’. On the reflexive form we-ippeleg in On-
the original targumic reading of the first verse, and that, as we have already seen, the story of the three prophets was transferred from its original position, to precede the traditional reading.

2. The story of the three prophets who 'denied' their own prophecies is essentially a reflection of the prophet's ambivalent attitude towards his prophetic mission: 'did the Lord send me or not', or to put it otherwise: can I maintain the claim that God sent me to deliver his message and to perform acts on his behalf. Do I still want to be one of the Lord’s prophets?24 This ambivalence is the theme that connects the three scenes of the story. Two of the three scenes (A&C) are linked together by the formula 'If X happens..., then I am not among the Lord’s prophets'. The third one (B) deviates from this pattern with 'If... not..., then it will be You'. The three scenes are built up along the same lines:

A (Moses) and C (Micah)

X prophesied in his anger

argument with scriptural quotation: If such and such happens..., then I am not among the Lord’s prophets (Num. 16.29 / 1 Kgs 22.28)

A heavenly voice came forth, and said...

refutation with scriptural quotations
(Num. 18.18 / 1 Kgs 21.19, 23)

B (Elijah)

X prophesied in his anger

argument with scriptural quotation: If you do not (answer me)..., then it will have been you... (1 Kgs 18.37)

A heavenly voice came forth, and said...

refutation without scriptural quotation

qelos and Peshitta, see Drazin, Targum Onkelos to Numbers, p. 176 n. 1. TgNeof renders יָרֵץ יַעֲשֵׂה which could either mean ‘Korah divided’ or ‘Korah was at strife (with)’. TgPsJ translates ‘Korah... took his (prayer) cloak which was entirely purple’; on this rendering see A. Shinan, The Aggadah in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch (2 vols.; in Hebrew; Jerusalem: Makor Publishing, 1979), I, p. 128.

24 On the image of the prophet as reflected in the targums, see J. Ribera, ‘Prophecy according to Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch’, in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums (Targum Studies, Vol. 1; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 61ff. Ribera describes the characteristics given in the Palestinian Targums of Moses’ prophetic mission (p. 69), but the fact that Moses is allowed to question his own prophetic task is neglected.

Will it be wide of the mark to suppose that the section about Elijah once formed an independent tradition? This seems to be supported by the fact that the same interpretation of 1 Kgs 18.37, isolated from the Moses and Micah traditions, can be found in b. Ber. 6b, 9b. 25

The story as a whole, with the three witnesses, has only a few parallels in rabbinic literature, in y. San. 10.1, 28a, Num. R. 18.12 (75a) and Tanḥ. B., Additions to Parashat Korah, p. 96. The latter two are practically identical. Let us first look at the text of y. San. 10.1, 28a:

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish 26 said: “Three (prophets) have denied their own prophecies because of the meanness (with which they were treated), and these are: Moses, Elijah and Micah...

Moses said: ‘If these (men) die by the (common) death of all men’ etc.
Elijah said: ‘Answer me, O Lord, answer me, that this people may know...
and if they do not: For You have turned their hearts backward’.
Micah said: ‘If (Ahab) does return in safety, then the Lord has not spoken to me’.”

Compared with our tosefta, this parallel in the Yerushalmi shows a very concise form. It is merely a concatenation of three scriptural verses, preceded by a short introduction. It seems to allude to a well-known tradition. Does this mean that it is to be seen as an abridgement of a more fully developed midrash, like the one we have in the prologue of MS Paris? Or should we consider the lengthy midrash in the Fragmentary Targum as an elaboration of the tradition handed down by Resh

25 Especially the latter part of 1 Kgs 18.37 (‘and that you have turned their hearts backward’) is frequently quoted in rabbinic sources. See for instance b. Ber. 31b-32a (‘Rabbi Eleazar also said: Elijah spoke insolently toward heaven, as it says: For you have turned their hearts backward. Rabbi Samuel bar Isaac said: Whence do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave Elijah right? Because it says: And those I have treated harshly [Mic. 4.6]’). See below.

Lakish? In the lines preceding this passage, Korah challenges Moses’ authority:27

At that hour Korah said: ‘There is no Torah from heaven, and Moses is no prophet, and Aaron is not a high priest’. At that hour Moses said: ‘Lord of all the worlds, if from the six days of the beginning the earth was formed with a mouth, then it is well and good, and if not: Let him create a mouth for it now!’ (For it is said:) ‘If a created thing... (Num. 16.30).’ 28

In Num. R. 18.12 and Tanh. B., Additions to Parashat Korah, p. 96, this tradition is combined with that of the three prophets. Unlike MS Paris and the Yerushalmi-fragment, it changes the order of the prophets: Elijah is mentioned first, to be followed by Micah and finally Moses. In the case of Moses, these sources do not emphasize the theme of the prophet’s indignation (‘then the Lord has not sent me’), but rather Moses’ plea to create a ‘mouth for the earth’ in order to swallow Korah and his followers and send them down to Sheol (cf. Num. 16.30). Num. R. 18.12 (75a):29

He (Moses) was one of the three prophets speaking in this way: Elijah, Micaiah, and Moses. Elijah said: [1 Kgs 18.36-37] ‘God of Abraham,


28 See also b. San. 110a.

29 There are minor differences between this text and Tanhuma Buber. In Tanhuma Buber the name Micah is used as against Micaiah in Num. R.
Isaac, and Israel! Let it be known today that You are God in Israel and that I am Your servant, and that I have done all these things at Your bidding. Answer me, O Lord, answer me, that this people may know that You, Lord, are God; for You have turned their hearts backward’. (He implied:) If You do not answer me, I shall say: ‘You have turned their hearts backward’.

Micaiah, in a similar way, said to Ahab: [1 Kgs 22.28] ‘If you do return in safety, then I shall also say that the Lord has not spoken to me’. And so Moses also said: [Num. 16.30] ‘If a created thing…’ (meaning:) ‘If you have already created a mouth for the earth, then it is good. But if not, then “The Lord will create”’, ‘Let him create a mouth for it now’. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him: [Job 22.28] ‘You shall also decree a thing, and it shall be established for you, and light shall shine on your ways’.

4. Analysis of the Tosefta in the Fragment-Targums (Ms. Paris)

Returning now to the prologue of Num. 16.1 in the Fragmentary Targum, we see that the introduction of our story speaks of ‘three harsh prophets’. The qualification ‘harsh’ is lacking in the parallel just quoted in y. San. 10.1, 28a, which simply speaks of ‘three (prophets)’, and also in Num. R. 18.12 and Tanhuma Buber. The number three was not chosen arbitrarily. The enumeration of things and people is a popular hermeneutical device, and enumeration patterns are well-known in the targums; they are also widely found in rabbinic sources, often combined with the enumeration of scriptural examples.

30 So literally the Hebrew text: ‘If the Lord creates a creation’. Also translated as ‘If the Lord works a miracle’ (see REB).

31 To restrict ourself to FragTgP: Five miracles (Gen. 28.1), Four Keys (Gen. 30.22), Three Branches (Gen. 4.12), Three Baskets (Gen. 40.18), Four Groups (Exod. 15.3; cf. Mek., Beshallah 3.128-36), Four Nights (Exod. 15.8), Four Legal Cases (Lev. 24.12), Three Angels (Gen. 18.1), Three Leaders (Exod. 40.12), Three Righteous Patriarchs and Four Righteous Matriarchs (Exod. 17.12).

32 On the origin and history of these exegetical enumeration patterns, see W.M.W. Roth, *Numerical Sayings in the Old Testament* (VTSup 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985) (Roth includes examples from Pirq Avot); W.S. Towner, *The Rabbinic ‘Enumeration of Scriptural Examples’* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973) pp. 95-117. With the story of the three prophets one may compare the tradition of the two prophets, Moses and Isaiah, who arose to bear witness against Israel (PTg Deut. 32.1); see also the tradition of ‘the three righteous men’ (Jacob, David and Moses) in TgPsJ Deut. 31.14. Examples from rabbinic literature are given in A. Wünsche, ‘Die Zahlensprüche in Talmud und Midrasch’, *ZDMG* 65 (1911), pp. 57-100, 395-421; 66 (1912) pp. 414-59; see esp. pp. 66-100 (‘Pforte der Drei’).
The story says that the three prophets prophesied ‘in their anger’ and denied their own prophecies. The latter phrase is perhaps best understood as ‘they questioned their own prophetic utterances’. Each of them formulates a restriction, thus narrowing the effect of their prophetic abilities. Difficult to explain is the expression נמה נב, which I have translated as ‘because of the meanness (with which they were treated)’. The meaning of נמה נב is disputed. It is seen as a distortion of אנה נב, which we find in the Yerushalmi text just quoted (y. San. 10.1, 28a). But the meaning of אנה נב is equally questioned. According to Jastrow and Dalman, the word is taken from the Greek πανηγίζω, ‘baseness’ or ‘meanness’. Levy relates it to φανερά, φανερώσας, ‘clarified, (made) manifest, clear explanation’, and Krauss derives it from paenuria, ‘poverty’. But the solutions offered by Levy and Krauss are contextually out of place and therefore not very attractive. The meaning ‘baseness’ or ‘meanness’ still seems the best interpretation of this enigmatic word.

33 That Moses became angry as a result of the fact that Korah and his followers challenged his authority is easy to understand and is underlined in Num. 16.15. The Fragmentary Targums formulate this in even stronger terms: Moses was deeply aggrieved (FragTgP, FragTgV, and cf. TgNeof).


35 One would expect, however גב or גב ל for Hebrew גגב instead of גב.


38 S. Krauss, Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrash und Targum (2 vols.; Berlin: S. Calvary, 1898-1899; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1987), II, p. 429. But this interpretation as well as that given by N. Brüll (who suggested φανερώσας) have been criticized by I. Löw in his annotations to the book of Krauss (‘Paenuria ergibt gar keinen Zusammenhang, aber auch φανερώσας ist unbefriedigend’).

39 I do not see on what grounds Klein translates ‘in despair’ (Fragment-Targums, II, p. 69). In the concordance of Greek and Latin loanwords appended to his book (p. 255), he translates the Greek word with ‘distress’, ‘cowardice’. The latter is one of its possible meanings, cf. H.G. Liddell et al., A Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961 [1843]), p. 1447, but it does not fit very well.

4.1. Moses

Moses (scene A) is the first of the three prophets questioning their own prophetic mission. The targumist adduces a proof text from Num. 16.29. One may compare this text from the introduction of Parashat Korah with the PTs linked to Num. 16.29. I will give them in a synoptic presentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FragTg P</th>
<th>Num. 16.1</th>
<th>FragTg v</th>
<th>TgNeof</th>
<th>TgNeof [M]</th>
<th>TgOnq</th>
<th>TgPsJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first line, MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targum corresponds with MS Venice (apart from the use of antwm as against atwm and some minor variants; MS Paris lacks hb), but it differs from the other Palestinian Targums, which add lk to an–a" ynb, in accordance with the Hebrew text. In the second line, however, its use of the more idiomatic rzg and hryzg for Hebrew dqp/hdwqp is in agreement with targum Neofiti (but Neofiti is more paraphrastic in its wording), whereas the other

---

40See Goshen-Gottstein, *Fragments*, II, p. 53 on the use of these words. In Tg-Neof [M] one should read אֲנָי מַהְדִּדְךָ (cf. TgNeof, TgPsJ) instead of אֲנָי מַהְדִּדְךָ instead of אֲנָי מַהְדִּדְךָ in the third line.

41TgNeof is the only text using hyyrb instead of anya ynb. The use of מַהְדִּדְךָ meaning ‘person’ is quite common in Palestinian texts, see Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 113.

Palestinian Targums use the literal equivalents µks and wmks. In the last line, MS P differs from all the other Palestinian Targums by its threefold rendering of the Hebrew aleh ad nanach. Here the targumist departs from the more traditional targumic rendering. The first two reasons adduced (1. the memra of the Lord did not speak to me; 2. I am not among the Lord’s prophets) seem to be chosen to connect what is said of Moses (A) to the passage about Micah (C). There we find the same arguments, but in another sequence. The third reason brought forward underlines that Moses disavows his bringing down of the divine words.

This argument of the prophet in anger is followed by the refutation, in each of the three passages with the conventional formula ‘A heavenly voice (ה’ל וּכְפָר) came forth, and said’. Moses is addressed by his full name, Moses son of Amram, as is Micah later on, but unlike Elijah. Moses is confronted with his attitude towards the tribe of Levi who petitioned him and Aaron not to take too much work on their shoulders (see 16.3, ר יב לָבֵן ‘enough for you’) and reproached them for their haughtiness (‘Why do you set yourselves up above the assembly of the Lord?’). Moses will eventually be punished for his lack of compassion and his reproof of the tribe of Levi (see 16.7 ר יב לָבֵן מְלֹא יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘enough for you, sons of Levi’): he will be silenced (see Deut. 3.26 ywl ywb µkl br ‘enough for you, do not speak any more to me...’). In a similar way, but with another metaphor, this is told in Num. R. 18.18:

The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: ‘You have smitten them with a rod; with that which you have used for smiting (others), you will

42 See Sokoloff, Dictionary, pp. 125-26, 378. For µkfsy in TgNeof [M] one should read µksy. On the use of ה superficate (itpa.) for Hebrew וּכְפָר in Onqelos, see Goldin-Gottstein, Fragments, II, p. 53. It is quite common in Babylonian texts (mostly af.), and sporadically found in the PTg (see e.g. FragTg1 Exod. 20.5).
44 Which could be taken as another sign that originally the Elijah-tradition (B) existed apart from A and C.
45 See also TgNeof Deut. 1.6, 2.3 (ר יב לָבֵן; לְכָּל for Hebrew יב לָבֵן).
be struck. You said: *Enough for you* (Num. 16.7), and in the near future you shall hear: *Enough for you ...* (Deuteronomy 3.26).  

The targumist here pays full attention to the motif of לִלְבָּם / בְּרֹכַח in the Korah episode. A closer look at the passages quoted reveals that MS Paris differs from the other targumim in both instances:

**Num. 16.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>FragTgP Introd. Num. 16.1</th>
<th>TgNeoF</th>
<th>TgNeoF [M1]</th>
<th>TgNeoF [M2]</th>
<th>TgOnq // TgPsJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רַב לַבָּם בְּרֹכַח</td>
<td>אֶפְשָׁיִים לַבָּם בְּרֹכַח</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם בְּרֹכַח</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם בְּרֹכַח</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם בְּרֹכַח</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deuteronomy 3.26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>FragTgP Introd. Num. 16.1</th>
<th>TgNeoF</th>
<th>TgNeoF [M]</th>
<th>TgNeoF [1]</th>
<th>TgOnq // TgPsJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רַב לַבָּם אֱלֹהִים</td>
<td>אֱלֹהִים לַבָּם</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם</td>
<td>בַּיִת לַבָּם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS Paris starts by repeating the Hebrew words. In the case of Num. 16.7, it differs in this respect from the other Palestinian Targums and from Onqelos. Also the addition of לִלְבָּם / בְּרֹכַח is not found in the other targumim.

4.2. Elijah

As we have seen, the second scene (B) of the introduction to the Korah story differs from the foregoing (A) and the following (C), since no scriptural passage at all is quoted in the refutation (see above). The argument of Elijah is of interest, for in it an Aramaic targum of the Prophets is quoted on 1 Kgs 18.37 (‘Answer me, O Lord, answer me, so that this people may know that You are the Lord, God, and you have turned their hearts backward’) which differs from targum Jonathan. If


for the moment we leave out the additions, the targum quoted remains close to the Hebrew text, apart from some minor modifications:

MT

ענני יוה Answers to the Lord, answer me, so that all these people may know that You are their God... and (that You) have swayed their hearts backward'.

The text of targum Jonathan, is much more paraphrastic:

Receive my prayer, Lord, with the fire, receive my prayer, Lord, with rain; and may this people know by your doing for them the sign that You, Lord, are God, and by your loving them are asking for them by your Memra to bring them back to the fear of you. And they gave their divided heart.

The twofold 'ynn in the Hebrew text is translated by the words 'Adonai. The last part of the verse ('that you... have turned their hearts backward') is interpreted in two ways, first by 'by your loving them are asking for them... to bring them back to fear of you' and secondly by 'and they gave their divided heart'. The latter phrase

49Or 'turned'; see Sokoloff, Dictionary, pp. 372-73.

50See A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic (4 vols.; Leiden. Brill, 1959-1973) II, p. 260. Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments, II, p. 19 incorrectly leaves out 'י after the repetition of הבתרפש and reads 'יהל עליה instead of הבתרפש י bodyParser י bodyParser Y bodyParser 'Adonai. The last part of the verse ('that you... have turned their hearts backward') is interpreted in two ways, first by 'by your loving them are asking for them... to bring them back to fear of you' and secondly by 'and they gave their divided heart'. The latter phrase

51This expression is not uncommon in the targum on 1-2 Kgs, see 1 Kgs 8.28, 29, 30, 35, 45, 49, 52, 17.22; 2 Kgs 13.4, 22.19. In the targum on Psalms Hebrew is in most cases rendered as (TgPss 69.14, 17, 18 etc.) but in a few cases as (TgPs 4.2, 13.4, 60.7, cf. TgPs 27.7). Cf. Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments, II, p. 20 n. 5-6.

52Which either means 'that you have caused them to be backsliders' (negative) or 'that you have turned their heart back again' (positive). But the latter interpretation requires taking the verb as a future, and taking tynrja as meaning 'back again'. So the first interpretation seems the better one. See M. Cogan, I Kings (AB, 10; New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 443; J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1951), p. 305. The first interpretation, however, is found already in the Septuagint (see below) and is followed in many modern Bible-translations.
is a reply to Elijah’s reproving the people with being a divided nation: ‘How long are you to be divided into two divisions (Tg 1 Kgs 18.21)?’

This twofold rendering of targum Jonathan is remarkable, for it can only mean that God is asking for them to repent, and that as a result the people regretted their dissension. As M. Greenberg has shown, this interpretation of the Hebrew text, is close to that of the Septuagint, but it is not found in rabbinic sources. The addition ‘with the fire’ is in line with b. Ber. 6b, 9b (‘Answer me, that the fire may descend from heaven’), but there the twofold ‘answer me’ in the Hebrew text is not explained as ‘(answer me) with fire as well as with rain’ (so our targum), but ‘answer me that fire may descend’ is followed by ‘that they may not say it is the work of sorcery’. So here the targum only partly follows the bavli texts.

The additions in MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targum are connected rather loosely with the translation as such and could, in contrast with the additions in targum Jonathan, easily be left out. The first (‘first God and last God’) seems to be based on Isaiah 44.6 (‘I am the first and I am the last’), or 48.12 (‘I am the first, I am the last also’). As such it is a verbatim translation of the Hebrew text, differing from the more expansive rendering in Targum Jonathan. The second ‘and all the gods they worship in your presence are false gods’ echoes such scriptural passages as Psalm 96.5 and 1 Chronicles 16.26 (‘For all the gods of the nations are idols’).
Elijah’s argument is comparable to that of Moses and Micah. If such and such does not happen (‘if you do not answer me, and if you do not display the miracles of your might’ and send the fire from heaven), then it is no longer my responsibility as a prophet, then I am no longer the one who can unite this divided people, but then you are the one who ‘stiffened their necks, and turned their faces about and swayed their hearts backwards’. So in a way he threatens God. The refutation is not put forward by means of a scriptural passage but by the remark ‘Elijah, Elijah, why have you allowed the creditor to collect his debt?’, which in this context means: ‘Why have you incurred a sin by unnecessarily threatening Me? The prayer had already been accepted’.

4.3. Micah

The third of the harsh prophets is Micah. According to the Hebrew text of 1 Kings, he had told Ahab, the king of Israel, not to attack the Arameans in Ramoth-gilead and so brusquely contradicted all the other prophets of the kingdom, who had given Ahab a positive advice (1 Kgs 22.12 ‘all the prophets prophesied: ‘Attack Ramoth-gilead...’). The king had ordered the prophet to be thrown into prison and to be put on a diet of bread and water ‘until I come home in safety’. The prophet then declares: ‘If you do return in safety, the Lord has not spoken by me’. To which he adds: ‘Listen, all you peoples’. The targuminic text quoted differs not only from targum Jonathan on 1 Kgs 22.28, but also from its parallel Tg 2 Chron. 18.27. One may compare:

have no other gods (לא אחרים עלי אחר) beside me’ (Exod. 20.3, Deut. 5.7), associating with וקיים אחרי, paces Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments, II, p 20.

For the phrase ‘the signs (miracles) of your might’, see TgNeof Deut. 3.24, cf. FragTg/FragTg/TgNeof [M] Deut. 1.1 (‘How many miracles and mighty acts did the memra of the Lord perform for you’).

Can I say to the Creditor that He should not collect his debt?’; cf. Pes. K. 11.23 (ed. Mandelbaum, pp. 199-200).

So rightly Klein, Fragment-Targums, II, p. 70 n. 32.

Left out in REB, here as well as in the parallel 1 Chron. 18.27. It is omitted in Codex Vaticanus and in the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint, and often seen as a gloss from Mic. 1.2 demonstrating that Micah son of Imleh is identical with the prophet Micah. See J. Gray, 16/11 Kings (Old Testament Library; London: SCM Press, 19771, 1964), p. 447; Cogan, 1 Kings, p. 493.

See R. Le Déaut and J. Robert, Targum des Chroniques (2 vols; AnBib 51; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), II, p. 120.

The Hebrew ‘(then) the Lord has not spoken by me’ is rendered in targum Jonathan by ‘(then) there was no favour before the Lord in me’. The marginal notes in codex Reuchlinianus add to this: מַלִּים לֹא עָנַי נָעַמָּה בְּאָדָם. Targum Chronicles translates in the spirit of Jonathan: ‘(then) the favour of the Lord was not in me’, but offers an additional explanation: ‘and he has not spoken to me by the spirit of prophecy’. The Fragmentary Targum (MS P) also has two explanations, but they are expressed differently: ‘then I am not among the Lord’s prophets’ and ‘(then) the memra of the Lord has not spoken to me’. In addition, this targum differs from targum Jonathan and targum Chronicles by its use of רָצִי as against בְּנֵו.

Again, the refutation is put into the mouth of a heavenly voice. The prophet Micah is told that there is no reason to question his prophetic mission, as his message had been proved true: Ahab, the king of Israel, did not return from the battlefield. Although he had gone into the battle in disguise, someone had drawn his bow at random and had hit the king of Israel (1 Kgs 22.34). Being severely wounded, he died the next day, and when he had been buried his chariot was swilled out and ‘the dogs licked up the blood’ (1 Kgs 22.38). But not only is justice done to Micah’s prophetic words—Ahab’s repentance is also accepted.
At the same time, Elijah’s prediction to Ahab that he will be punished for Naboth’s death has been fulfilled. For Elijah had said to him: ‘At the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, there dogs will lick your blood’ (1 Kgs 21.19), and these words have come true: ‘and dogs licked up the blood, in fulfilment of the word the Lord had spoken’ (1 Kgs 22.38). The prologue renders these words as follows: ‘Just as the dogs have eaten the blood of Naboth, so shall the dogs eat the blood of Ahab’, and adds ‘in the portion of Jezreel’. But in the biblical text the latter is only added to the predicted death of his wife Jezebel (1 Kgs 21.23, 2 Kgs 9.10, 36-37). There are additional reasons to suppose that we have here, in the prologue, a conflation of texts. We may compare the text and the targums of 1 Kgs 21.19:

| MT | יַעֲרֹב יִמְסָּכֹיו אַלְּלֶקָק הָעַלֶם אָזֹה דַּמִּים |
| TgJon | דַּמִּים יָבֹא זָא יִמְסָּכֹיו דַּמִּים אַלְּלֶקָק |
| FragTg Num. 16.1 | יָבֹא זָא יִמְסָּכֹיו דַּמִּים אַלְּלֶקָק |
| MT | יַעֲרֹב יִמְסָּכֹיו אָזֹה דַּמִּים |
| TgJon | דַּמִּים יָבֹא זָא יִמְסָּכֹיו דַּמִּים אַלְּלֶקָק |
| FragTg P Num. 16.1 | יָבֹא זָא יִמְסָּכֹיו דַּמִּים אַלְּלֶקָק |

The Fragmentary Targum’s rendering looks like a citation given by heart. The use of the verb בָּאָל indicates that the writer had in mind the Jezebel texts, for it is used in the Hebrew of 1 Kgs 21.23, 2 Kgs 9.10, 36-37 and in Targum Jonathan’s translation of these verses.

5. Concluding Remarks

1. The story of the three prophets is an elaboration of the extant targum on Num. 16.29. It was transferred from its original position to form a lengthy introduction to one of the weekly sabbath readings, acknowledged the truth of Elijah’s prophecy, for the dogs licked up his blood’ (Ant. 8.417).


70Cf. b. San. 39b: R. Eleazar said: This was in clear fulfilment of two visions, one of Micah, the other of Elijah. In the case of Micah it is written: If you do return in safety, the Lord has not spoken by me. In the case of Elijah it is written: At the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth’.

71In these texts the Hebrew נֹבֶט (in 1 Kgs 21.23 בָּאֲל הַיֶּשֶׁל נֹבֶט) is rendered in TgJon as רַמְמִים יֶשֶׁלָּא. In FragTgP as רַמְמִים יֶשֶׁלָּא. © The Continuum Publishing Group Ltd 2004.
parashat Korah. It consists of three scenes that are carefully structured, with an argument (a scriptural quotation) and a refutation of the argument (in each of the scenes introduced by the stereotyped formula ‘a heavenly voice came forth and said’; followed by a citation in two of the three scenes). We may probably assume that the Elijah-scene once formed an independent tradition that was combined with the Moses and Micah scenes at a later stage. Two of the three scenes are built on scriptural verses that have in common the pattern ‘If such and such happens..., then I am not...’ (thus in the case of Moses [A] and of Micah [C]); the third one (the Elijah-scene [B]) deviates from this with the formula ‘If you do not such and such, then it is you...’ (B).

2. What can we conclude from the foregoing analysis about the date and origin of this story? Only a few parallel sources are available. The yerushalmi text, attributed to rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, a teacher of the third century, consists of nothing but a concatenation of three verses introduced by the phrase ‘Three have denied their own prophecies because of the meanness (with which they were treated)’. As such, it seems to refer to a well-known tradition. Although that might be the story as we have it in the prologue of MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targum, this is not very likely. If we see the expression as a distortion of יִרְבּוּ בְּחַ תַּ הָא, it seems more justified to see our prologue as a later development and reworking of a simple tradition. The other parallels, Num. R. 18.12 and Tanchuma Buber. Additions to Parashat Korah (p. 96), are conflations of two passages in Yerushalmi, and in these sources the original order of the prophets has been changed. We have to assume that they are to be dated later. We might suggest, then, that the tosefta in the prologue of MS Paris on Num. 16.1ff. lies somewhere between these two sources. If the attribution of the yerushalmi passage to Resh Lakish is reliable, this tosefta originated in its elementary form.

72In my view, there is no direct influence of the haftara reading, 1 Sam. 11.14–12.10, on the formation of our tosefta. Generally speaking, the stories of Korah and of Samuel are related to each other in their descriptions of the prophets Moses and Samuel. Both have to defend themselves against fierce accusations. Moses’ words of self-defense ‘I have not taken from them so much as a single donkey’ (Num. 16.15) are echoed in Samuel’s words ‘Whose ox have I taken, whose donkey have I taken?’ (1 Sam. 12.3). See M. Fishbane, The JPS Bible Commentary. Haftarot (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002), pp. 233-38; cf. E. van Staaldruine-Sulman, The Targum of Samuel (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), p. 288.

73There are two reasons to think that this might be the case: as we have seen. Resh Lakish is well-known for his numerical sayings, and, secondly, he took much interest in the story of Korah, see Beer, ‘Korah’s Revolt’, pp. 31-33.

at the end of the third century, or even earlier. Its reworking into the carefully structured text that we have studied in this article took place at a (much?) later date, but it must have acquired its present form before the ninth century.  

3. The quotations of 1 Kgs 18.37, 1 Kgs 22.28 (= 2 Chron. 18.27) and of 1 Kgs 21.19 are of interest. The fact that the quotation of 1 Kgs 18.37 in MS Paris, which has all the features of a Palestinian targum, differs from targum Jonathan in being an (almost) verbatim rendering of the Hebrew text raises an important question. Does it mean that there existed a Palestinian targum or selections of Palestinian targums which offered a more literal interpretation than the ones we know today? But such a difference between a verbatim rendering and a more paraphrastic one is not visible in the case of the other quotations. Both the Palestinian targums (targum Chronicles and Fragmentary Targum, MS P) and the ‘Babylonian’ targum (Jonathan) on 1 Kgs 22.28 and 2 Chronicles 18.27 have a paraphrase of the Hebrew expression ‘the Lord has not spoken by me’. The interpretation of MS P can be seen as an adaptation of the Moses scene. In the case of 1 Kgs 21.19, Jonathan offers a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew text, whereas the rendering in MS P looks like a citation given by heart, in which several passages are combined. We need further studies on quotations of the prophetic books in the Palestinian Targums in order to see what differences there are between these citations and the official targum on the Prophets.

74 Its redactional form, of course, and its inclusion in the Korah-traditions in the Palestinian Talmud, are to be dated later. On the redaction of the Palestinian Talmud, see Goldberg, ‘Palestinian Talmud’, pp. 307-11. It is generally assumed that it originated in the fourth and fifth centuries, its final date being the extinction of the Patriarchate in 425 / 429 C.E. See also the survey of H.L. Strack and G. Stemberger, Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch (Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1982), pp. 368-87.

75 Chapters 15-23 of Num. R., which belong to the Tanhum-Yelammedenu type of midrashim, are often dated in the ninth century, although, as Stemberger states (Einleitung, p. 286), these chapters could be much earlier.

76 See Goshen-Gottstein, Fragments, 2:20.

In his commentary on Ben Sira, Rudolph Smend characterised the Syriac translation of Ben Sira as the worst piece of translation of the Syriac Bible. The text contains many additions, paraphrases, and free renderings, a number of times reflecting a misunderstanding of the Hebrew text. Some of the most striking features of the Syriac text are its omissions, which amount to 370 cola, one-ninth of the whole book.

The differences between the original book and its Syriac translation are not only quantitative. In many cases the translator gives not just a free rendering, but changes the purport of verses or whole passages. Some of these changes reflect adaptations to later socio-cultural circumstances. References to polygamy, for example, have been altered or omitted, and some of the notorious passages expressing Ben Sira’s
negative attitude towards women have been altered. Striking differences between the original Ben Sira and the Syriac translation occur also in the field of religious ideas and beliefs.

Because of the many traces that the translator left behind in the text, much more than in any other part of the Peshitta, one may think that the religious and cultural context in which he lived can be reconstructed without too much difficulty. But the debate about the origin of the Syriac text of Ben Sira shows that this is not the case. V. Ryssel thought that the translator was a Jew, although the present Syriac text also contains some later Christian interpolations. R. Smend argued that the translator was a Christian with an anti-Jewish attitude. A. Edersheim suggested that S was made by Jewish-Christians. M.M. Winter argued that the Jewish-Christian community in which S originated could be narrowed down to the Ebionites and that their translation was later revised by orthodox Christians in the aftermath of the Arian controversy.

3 An exception may be made for the book of Chronicles.
7 Cf. M.M. Winter, Ben Sira in Syriac (doctoral dissertation, Freiburg, 1974), pp. 110-11: ‘A large group of alterations can be explained satisfactorily on the hypothesis that Ben Sira was first translated into Syriac by the Ebionites, and later revised by strictly orthodox Christians after Arianism, for its insertion into the Peshitta; and that both parties inserted their distinctive theology into the text in the course of their operations’. See also idem, ‘Ben Sira in Syriac: An Ebionite Translation?’, in Elizabeth A. Livingstone (ed.), Studia Patristica, XVI. Papers Presented to the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1975 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975), pp. 121-23; idem, ‘The Origins of Ben Sira in Syriac’, VT 27 (1977), pp. 237-53 (Part I), 494-507 (Part II); idem,
2. Textual History of Ben Sira

For a proper appreciation of the Syriac translation of Ben Sira, it is necessary to give some basic information about the textual history of Ben Sira. The Hebrew witnesses are the following: one manuscript from Masada, containing portions of about five chapters; the tiny fragments of 2Q18, containing some words from Sir. 6.14-15, 20-31; the text of Sir. 51.13-30 in 11QPs; and six manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza from the eleventh and twelfth centuries (designated A to F). Altogether about two-thirds of the book of Ben Sira is now extant in Hebrew. Two Ancient Versions go back to a Hebrew original: the Greek and the Syriac (although it seems likely that the Syriac translator consulted also a Greek text). The Latin translation is based on the Greek.

The extant textual witnesses show a great number of additions. The Hebrew Geniza manuscripts show about 90 additions of the length of one bicolon or more. In 60 cases the text contains two alternative readings or formulations of the same text. In the case of the Greek text we can distinguish between a short, original Greek text (GrI) and an expanded text, which contains about 300 additional cola and a number of shorter additions (GrII), some of which are also found in the Geniza manuscripts. The Old Latin (which Jerome incorporated into the Vulgate) has many of the additions of GrII, but contains also 75 bicola particular to itself. The Syriac text shares with GrII about 70 of the 300 extra cola and a number of shorter additions. It contains a further 74 cola and other shorter variants of its own.

It is a debated issue how we should account for the many additions in the textual witnesses. It has been argued that at an early stage the Hebrew text was revised and that thus a secondary recension of the Hebrew text was created (HebII or SirII), which is reflected mainly in GrII (and the Latin translation) and partly in the Hebrew Geniza manuscripts and the Syriac translation. Others explain the additions in terms of an ongoing process of accretion.


8 The terminus ante quem is the end of the first century CE, because Lk. 1.17 cites Mal. 3.23 in a form that presupposes the GrII text of Sir. 48.10 and Didache 1.6 is
The textual history of Ben Sira and the place of the Syriac translation in it is a broad field of study, which will not further concern us here. For the moment it will suffice to note that any discussion of the Syriac translation of Ben Sira should take into account its complex relationship to the other textual witnesses and especially its parallels to the expanded text of Ben Sira.

3. Evidence for a Jewish Origin of the Syriac Text of Ben Sira

3.1. The Language of the Vorlage

A first argument in favour of a Jewish origin of the Syriac text of Ben Sira is that the translation was made from a Hebrew Vorlage. For the first three centuries of the Common Era there is hardly any evidence for knowledge or study of Hebrew outside Jewish (including Jewish-Christian) groups. The interest in Hebrew of Christian scholars like Jerome is exceptional and of a later date. Even Origen probably did not know Hebrew, even though Eusebius and Jerome claimed that he had made a thorough study of it. Nor did the presence of the Hebrew-based on the GrII reading of Sir. 12.1; see W.Th. van Peursen, The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, 41; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), pp. 15-19, p. 14 and the references given there. There is no other terminus post quem than the composition of the book of Ben Sira in the first quarter of the second century BCE.


10For the Syriac text of Ben Sira see my forthcoming monograph Language and Interpretation; for the other Ancient Versions see my Verbal System, pp. 11-26.


brew text in the second column of the Hexapla evoke much interest in Hebrew among Greek Christians.\textsuperscript{13} This attitude towards the Hebrew language is closely related to a similar lack of interest in the Hebrew text of the Bible.\textsuperscript{14}

3.2. \textit{Rabbinic Elements}

A second argument for a Jewish origin is the rabbinic flavour of the translation. This rabbinic colouring consists of the following.

1. Parallels with rabbinic literature as in 18.10.
   In 18.10 S reads ‘thousand years from this world, they are not like one day in the World of the Righteous’ instead of ‘so are these few years among the days of eternity’ (LXX). S is reminiscent of m. Abot 4.22 (Albeck 4.17) ‘better is one hour of blissfulness of spirit in the World to Come than the whole life of this world’.\textsuperscript{15}

2. The use of typical rabbinic idioms, such as ‘the place of your Shechina’ in 36.18.

3. Renderings that suggest acquaintance with halakhic traditions, like the double bride-price that is mentioned in 9.5.

The rabbinic elements are rather frequent in S and cannot be ignored when evaluating its background. The question is, however, how many of these elements are the work of the Syriac translator. From our short survey of the textual history of Ben Sira it appeared that the textual transmission was very free, characterised by paraphrases and additions. Accordingly, parallels between S and rabbinic literature led M.H. Segal to the conclusion ‘that Syr is based upon a Hebrew text which embodied popular paraphrases of certain verses originally current orally in Jewish circles of the Talmudic period’.\textsuperscript{16} In the model of a gradual

\textsuperscript{13}See Adam Kamesar, \textit{Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesis} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 38: ‘The presence of the Hebrew text in the \textit{Hexapla} does not seem to have stimulated the Greeks to come to terms with the original language of the Bible any more than the presence of the various translations.’

\textsuperscript{14}On this issue see e.g. Kamesar, \textit{Jerome}, 4-40.

\textsuperscript{15}The ‘World of the Righteous’ is also attested in some pseudepigraphical sources, see Conleth Kearns, \textit{The Expanded Text of Ecclesiasticus: Its Teaching on the Future Life as a Clue to its Origin} (doctoral dissertation, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Rome, 1951), p. 213.


accretion of the Hebrew text, in which the text was expanded more and more by, among others, rabbinic proverbs, it seems likely that at least some of the passages that suggest rabbinic influence were already present in the Syriac translator’s Vorlage. In this context it should be noted that parallels with rabbinic literature are not restricted to S. Also in the Hebrew text we find proverbs that have their parallels in the tractate Abot, readings that presuppose halakhic traditions and the like. It cannot be established whether or not the Syriac translator added to the rabbinic elements already present in his Vorlage. Because of this uncertainty the rabbinic elements in the Syriac version cannot be used as an argument for a Jewish background of the Syriac translator.

3.3. Targumic Elements

While parallels with rabbinic literature may derive from the Hebrew Vorlage of S, some typical characteristics of its translation technique cannot, which brings us to the targumic elements in S. In some respects S follows practices that are well-attested in Jewish Aramaic Bible translations, and these include the following.

1. The device to translate two different Hebrew words in adjacent lines with the same Syriac word, thus creating repetitive parallelism: e.g. 36.4 ‘as you have sanctified Yourself in us before their eyes, so before our eyes sanctify Yourself in them’.\(^\text{17}\)

2. The substitution of a metaphor by its signifié: e.g. 36.31 ‘(the man who has no) wife’ interprets ‘nest’, which is found in the Hebrew (MSS B,C) and the Greek.

3. The replacement of a common noun referring to God by the word ‘God’: e.g. 47.18 ‘the name of God’ corresponds to MS B ‘the name of the Honoured One’ (or: ‘the honoured name’).

4. The tendency to make explicit the referents of pronouns and the subjects of verbs: e.g. in 6.20 S has ‘wisdom’ instead of ‘she’ (MS A).

5. Shared lexicographical traditions: e.g. the interpretation of לָעֳב as ‘clouds’ in 40.13.\(^\text{18}\)

6. The avoidance of anthropomorphisms.

\(^\text{17}\) The Hebrew text (MS B) has ‘sanctify’ in v. 4a and ‘glorify’ in v. 4b.


With respect to the alleged anti-anthropomorphisms, we can distinguish a number of categories: the addition of prepositions before references to God (e.g. ‘from before the Lord’ instead of ‘from the Lord’);¹⁹ the replacement of direct references to God by references to the fear of God, the word of God etc.; the avoidance of references to God’s ears, eyes, face and to His anger and other human emotions; and the turning of active constructions in which God hears, sees, and the like, to passive constructions.

In 16.18 S has ‘at His revelation upon them (i.e. the mountains)’ instead of ‘when He descends upon them’ (MS A). In this respect S agrees with Targumim against other parts of the Peshitta. Compare Gen. 11.5; 11.7; 18.21 and others: MT ‘to descend’; TgOnq ‘to be revealed’; Pesh. ‘to descend’.²⁰

In other respects, too, S stands closer to the Targumim than to other parts of the Peshitta. The latter, for example, does not usually avoid bodily terms in relation to God.²¹

It is undeniable that the ‘translation technique’ or ‘translation strategy’ in S—in some respects even more than the other parts of the Peshitta—resembles that of the Jewish Aramaic translations in various ways. However, it is admissible to infer a Jewish origin from this evidence only if it can be demonstrated that some of the so-called targumic elements are exclusively Jewish and this is not the case. The evidence adduced here can assist us to locate S within the Aramaic-Syriac translation tradition, but it does not help us to answer the question whether it originated in a Jewish and/or a Christian context.

4. Evidence for a Christian Origin of the Syriac Text of Ben Sira
4.1. Eschatology
It has been argued that the eschatology of S betrays a Christian origin.²² Whereas in the original Ben Sira the end of all people is in Sheol


and people have nothing to hope for but to leave behind a good name, the Syriac text gives many references to eternal life in the World of the Righteous, the written record of bad deeds before God, and God’s judgment after the end of the world, while it omits verses like 17.27-28 ‘Who shall praise the Most High in the grave, instead of them which live and give thanks? Thanksgiving perishes from the dead, as from one that is not: the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord’ (LXX).

Although the eschatology of S fits a Christian context very well, it does not by any means indicate a Christian origin. We are dealing here with beliefs and ideas that entered Judaism already before the rise of Christianity. Moreover, it is this eschatology that is one of the typical characteristics of the so-called expanded text of Ben Sira. It is likely, therefore, that many of the references in question were already present in the Hebrew text used by the Syriac translator.23

4.2. Sacrifices, priesthood, temple
Tendencies in S that reflect ideas that were widespread in both Jewish and Christian circles in the first centuries of the Common Era, like those mentioned in § 4.1, do not help us to locate the origin of S within the Jewish-Christian spectrum. There are, however, some elements in S that are rather typically non-Jewish. One of these is the translator’s attitude towards sacrifices, priesthood and the temple. Many references to sacrifices have been shortened or omitted, and in some cases they have been replaced by remarks about prayer (35.8) or charity (35.10-11). Where the translator retains references to sacrifices, his renderings are often imprecise. Towards the priesthood, too, the translator was indifferent, if not hostile. In 45.8-14, for example, S omits a lengthy description of the liturgical vestments of Aaron. In several other places the translator omits references to the eternal degree of the priesthood.

In 7.31 S has ‘bread of the offerings and the first-fruits of the hands’ instead of ‘the bread of the sacrifices, and the heave-offering of the hand, sacrifices which are due, and the heave-offering of holiness’ (MS A). The

22See especially the commentaries of Smend and Edersheim on passages mentioning eternal life, judgment, etc.
23Kearns, Expanded Text, p. 66. This observation does not take away the need to investigate the eschatological reworking of Ben Sira attested in some versions, but it makes this investigation part of the study of the textual transmission of this book in the first century BCE and the first century CE (see above, n. 10), rather than the study of the religious background of the Syriac translator.
Hebrew text contains a number of technical terms referring to sacrifices. S shortens the list of sacrifices but retains the  נָשָׂא נָשָׂא. This is interesting, because this idiom perfectly fits a Christian setting. In Syriac literature it is used for the bread of the eucharist.\(^{24}\)

One could contest the claim that the translator’s attitude towards the temple cult and related institutions is typically Christian by referring to passages in rabbinic literature that likewise declare charity or prayer superior to sacrifice.\(^{25}\) In those rabbinic sources, however, the hope for the restoration of the sacrificial cult was never abandoned.\(^{26}\)

In non-rabbinic circles there seems to have been a more explicit negative attitude to sacrifices and priesthood. Philo says of the Essenes that they are ‘not offering animal sacrifices, but taking care to keep their minds in a state worthy of consecrated priests’.\(^{27}\) Some Dead Sea Scrolls reflect strong sentiments against the priesthood in Jerusalem and the temple service,\(^{28}\) while the idea that praise offerings replace sacrifices is reflected in 1QS IX 5: ‘the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice, and the perfection of behaviour will be acceptable like a freewill offering’.

Even in these non-rabbinic sources, however, sacrifices and the temple service were not rejected as such. Thus in the Dead Sea Scrolls the ruling priesthood in Jerusalem is rejected and its sacrifices are considered illegitimate, but a restoration of the sacrificial service was part...


\(^{25}\) We find also parallels elsewhere in the Peshitta. Cf. Weitzman, *Peshitta*, 217-18: ‘A certain negligence [regarding sacrifices] can indeed be detected in P’s rendering of sacrificial laws. In fact, an indifferent or even hostile attitude to sacrifice—and to the priesthood and temple—can be traced right through the Peshitta of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha’. It is our impression, however, that S surpasses the other books of the Peshitta in its negative attitude towards sacrifices.


of the community’s hope for the future. This is completely different from the Syriac translator of Ben Sira. His negative attitude towards the priesthood concerns also the past (e.g. the descriptions of Aaron) and the future (e.g. the references to the ‘eternal decree’).

4.3. *Israel and the Nations*

Another feature that at first sight can be characterised as typically non-Jewish is the translator’s attitude towards Israel and the nations. Most striking is the omission of the verse mentioning the eternal existence of Israel/Jeshurun in 37.25, where the Hebrew (mss B, D) and the Greek have ‘the life of a man (lasts) a number of days, but the life of Jeshurun days without number’. Further, S adds positive references to the nations, like the addition of ‘and all the inhabitants of the earth will know’ in 23.27. Also the change of the singular ‘the community’ into the plural ‘communities’ in 31.11 may reflect a Christian origin.

Weitzman, who discusses similar tendencies throughout the Peshitta, thinks that they do not necessarily indicate a Christian origin: ‘The combination of high regard for the nations with disdain for those Jews of differing beliefs was not unknown among Jewish groups. Indeed, it is only to be expected in a non-rabbinic group that lacked any rapport with rabbinic Judaism, which now commanded majority allegiance’. He refers to Enoch 89-90, which reflects a negative attitude towards Jews outside the writer’s group. However, such an opposition of Jewish ‘insiders’ against Jewish ‘outsiders’—which is also attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls—does not imply a rejection of ‘Israel’ as such. It concerns rather the question who belongs to the legitimate ‘Israel’. If, therefore, the omission of 37.11 is intentional, it reflects anti-Jewish sentiments, which are not attested in other Jewish sources.

We cannot be completely sure that the omission of 37.11 was intentional; it could have been the result of inattentiveness of the translator, or the absence of this verse from his Vorlage. The references to the nations, which provide additional information about the translator’s attitude towards non-Jewish people, do not go beyond statements that

29Cf. Milgrom, ‘Sacrifice’.


we find already in Deutero-Isaiah. Accordingly, all this material should be treated with care, and no firm conclusions can be based on it.

4.4. The Law

Sometimes S suppresses references to the Law.\textsuperscript{32} We can distinguish the following categories.

1. For ‘the Law’ another word is substituted, like ‘the ways of the Lord’ (9.15), ‘his way’ (32.24), ‘the way’ (32.17),\textsuperscript{33} ‘the fear of God’ (19.20), ‘almsgiving and love’ (29.1) and ‘the words (of the Most High)’ (44.20).

2. The Hebrew and/or Greek text contain a reference to the law. S has a completely different reading (19.17; 28.6; 34.8; 37.12; 41.8).

3. The Hebrew and/or Greek text contain a reference to the law. S omits the verse (32.15; 33.2-4).

Although one may question the interpretation of some individual passages,\textsuperscript{34} the cumulative evidence of this list of instances (which is not exhaustive) shows that the Syriac translator was at least indifferent towards the Law.

Winter argued that the negative attitude to the Law was characteristic of a revision of S by orthodox Christians at the end of the fourth century. In his view the original translators had a high esteem of the Law, as appears from 35.4 ‘and he who gives alms keeps the Law’ instead of ‘he who gives alms makes a sacrifice of praise’ (LXX). However, this complimentary remark about the Law can easily be explained from a scribal error. While LXX reflects הַדְּבֵדָה, S reflects הַדוּרֶד. Probably this reading was already present in the translator’s Vorlage. And even if it is an intentional variant, it can be interpreted as a reinterpretation of the Law, rather than an approval of it. The Law is fulfilled by giving alms, rather than by sacrifices and the like. Accordingly, there is no need to ascribe the negative attitude to a later revision.


\textsuperscript{33}This reminds us of ‘the way’ in Acts 9.2 and 19.9 (see also Payne Smith, \textit{Thesaurus}, I, p. 375), but since this use of the idiom was common in Antiquity, we cannot consider it as an indication of a Christian origin of S.

\textsuperscript{34}In 28.6, for example, the reading in LXX rather than that in S is probably secondary.
4.5. **Parallels with the New Testament**

It has been claimed that the following passages display influence from the New Testament.\(^{35}\)

3.22 ‘And there is no confidence (אלאכיא) for you over (לא) what is hidden’ instead of ‘you should have no business in hidden things’ (mss A,C). S may have been influenced by 1 Tim. 6.17.

18.13 ‘And He leads them like a good shepherd who shepherds his flocks’. The epithet ‘good’ is a plus compared with LXX. Compare Jn 10.11.

35.11 ‘And with joy lend to the man who will not repay you’, instead of ‘and with joy sanctify your tithe’ (ms B). The reading in S is clearly reminiscent of Lk. 6.34.

38.24 ‘And who is not distracted (אַתָּמַר) with vanities (אֶחָטִים נֶאֱמָן)’ instead of ‘who is free from toil’ (LXX). S reflects influence from 1 Tim. 5.13.

40.15 ‘For the root of sins is like a spike that springs up on the tooth of a rock’ instead of ‘for the root of the godless is like a tooth on a rock’ (ms B; LXX). According to Edersheim the reading in S seems to indicate that the translator was thinking of the familiar parable in Matthew 13.\(^{36}\)

The examples in 3.22 and 40.15 are doubtful, but in 18.13, 35.11 and 38.24 influence from the New Testament is much more likely. Further, the most clear references to the New Testament occur in Sir. 48.10-11, which deals with the future return of Elijah. The Syriac text runs as follows:

> And he is prepared to come before the day of the Lord comes, to turn the sons to the fathers and to bring good tidings to the tribes of Jacob. Blessed is he who sees you and dies. Yet he will not die, but he will surely live (or: but giving life he will give life).

We can make the following comments.

1. ‘And he is prepared to come (אֲדֹנֵי הוּא צָא חֶסֶד)’ instead of ‘who is written as destined at the appointed time’ (ms B) or ‘who is written to be destined’ (LXX) may be due to the influence of Mt. 11.4 אֲדֹנֵי הוּא צָא חֶסֶד ‘Elijah, who is prepared to come’.

---

\(^{35}\) There is also a striking parallel between 25.8 ‘blessed is the husband of a good wife, who does not plough with bullock and ass combined’ (instead of LXX; ‘blessed is the husband of a prudent wife’) and 2 Cor. 6.14, but the exact relation between the two passages is hard to establish.

\(^{36}\) Edersheim, ‘Ecclesiasticus’, p. 195. See especially Mt. 13.5.

\(^{37}\) 7a1 has אֲדֹנֵי חֶסֶד.
2. ‘To bring good tidings (wrbsmlw)’ replaces ‘and to establish the tribes of Israel’ (MS B) or ‘and to establish the tribes of Jacob’ (LXX). S is reminiscent of Lk. 3.18 ‘with many other exhortations therefore he [John the Baptist] preached good tidings (towsm) unto the people’. This agrees with the early-Christian identification of John the Baptist with the Elijah of Mal. 3.23.38

3. The last two words of 48.11 (ajn ajm) can be translated with ‘he will surely live’ (infinitive and imperfect of the Peal) or as ‘giving life he will give life’ (participle and imperfect of the Aphel). Elsewhere we have argued that interpreting it as an Aphel is preferable and that the Syriac translator apparently understood ‘he who has seen you (Elijah) and died’ as a reference to Christ, who had seen Elijah at the Transfiguration. But even with the interpretation as a Peal it is perfectly possible that S reflects a christological understanding of this verse.39

4.6. Other Evidence for a Christian Background
Finally we should mention some other tendencies in S that have been put forward as evidence for a Christian origin.40 In 24.5 ‘alone I encompassed the circuit of heaven’ is translated with ‘I dwelt together with Him in heaven’. According to A. Edersheim the background of the reading in S may be the Christian identification of ‘Wisdom’ with Christ.41 Compare Jn 1.1, where it is said that the Logos was with God.42

38Note also that the reference to a function of the Servant of the Lord (which from a Christian perspective did not apply to Elijah/John, but to Jesus) has disappeared. 39See W.Th. van Peursen, ‘Le Vivificateur est vivant: le texte syriaque de Sirach 48:10-12’, in A. Schenker (ed.), L’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament : L’état de la question (Le monde de la Bible; Genève: Labor et fides, forthcoming).

40We can also mention here 25.15, where S has ‘there is no head more bitter than the head of a serpent, and there is no enmity more bitter than that of a wife’ instead of ‘there is no head above the head of a serpent, and there is no wrath above the wrath of an enemy’ (LXX). According to Edersheim (‘Ecclesiasticus’, p. 134) the purpose of the reading in S ‘was intended to allude to the doctrine of the fall of man’. A discussion about the textual and exegetical problems of this verse would go beyond the scope of the present paper.

41Cf. Edersheim, ‘Ecclesiasticus’, p. 126: ‘remembering that the ancient Christian writers identified “Wisdom” in Ecclus. with Christ, it suggests a Christian hand . . . In any case, the expression “together with Him” goes much beyond the language of Prov. 8.30 in which Wisdom presents herself as “an artificer by His side”, where תִּזְאַג is certainly not “together with him”. In Prov. 8.30 the Peshitta has בְּכוֹל אוֹתִים.’

42But note that in Jn 1.1 both the Vetus Syra and the Peshitta use משלי ‘with’ rather than אַדּוֹחַ ‘together’.

Winter has argued that there are four passages where S avoids speaking about the creation of Wisdom (1.4, 9; 39.32; 42.21). He ascribes this phenomenon to orthodox Christians who revised S in the aftermath of the Arian controversy. But R. Owens has demonstrated that Winter’s argument is not convincing. In 1.9, for example, both S ‘he distributed her’ and LXX ‘The Lord created her’ may go back to a Hebrew text that had הֲלֹהֵם. In that case there is no question that the Syriac translator altered the text to avoid a reference to the creation of wisdom.

5. Other Tendencies

5.1. An Ebionite Translation?
In a number of studies M.M. Winter has argued that S was an Ebionite translation. In addition to the more general tendencies discussed above, which could indicate an origin in any Jewish or Jewish-Christian context, Winter has pointed out some tendencies that allow a more specific identification of the community in which S originated. These are an unwillingness to quote from the Prophets, an inclination towards vegetarianism and a stress on the moral goodness of poverty.

We need not repeat here the convincing arguments that R. Owens put forward against the Ebionite hypothesis. In fact we do not know what were the distinctive tenets of the Ebionites and whether it is true, for example, that they rejected the Prophets. It is very difficult to go beyond the general observation that the sources that provide us with information about Jewish-Christian groups like the Ebionites, the Elkaites, or the Nazoreans demonstrate that issues like vegetarianism, poverty, the attitude towards the Prophets and the like played a role in the identification of these groups.

The definition of Jewish Christians is problematic. The Christian element is that they accepted the messianic status of Jesus, which distinguished them from other Jews. The Jewish element, however, is more difficult to grasp. We follow here J. Carleton Paget, who favours a praxis-based definition (rather than an ethnic or an ideological and doctrinal one): a Jewish Christian is someone who accepts the messianic status of

Jesus but feels it necessary to keep, or perhaps adopt, practices associated with Judaism such as circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and the keeping of food laws.\textsuperscript{45}

Rather than trying to identify the community in which S originated with one of these groups known from ancient sources, we can make a profile of this community. Before doing so (§ 6), we have to discuss three issues that play an important role in Winter’s argument (§§ 5.2-5.4).

5.2. The Prophets
According to Winter the Syriac translator was unwilling to quote from the Prophets. The Syriac translator omitted the references to Mal. 4.6 in 48.10, to Jer. 1.10 in 49.07 and to Ezek. 14.4 in 49.9.\textsuperscript{46} In 48.10, however, S has ‘to turn the sons to the fathers’ instead of ‘to turn the fathers of the sons’, but the reading of S, too, comes from Mal. 4.6. Moreover, in the same verse S adds a reference to Mal. 3.23 ‘before the day of the Lord comes’.

It should also be noted that other references to the Prophets are retained in S. See, for example, 48.24 about Isaiah, who ‘comforted the mourners of Zion’ (cf. Isa. 40.1-2; 49.8-13), 49.8 on Ezekiel, who ‘made known a sort of chariot and saw a vision’ (cf. Ezek. 1-3) and the reference to the Twelve Prophets in 49.10. There are also cases were S introduces a reference to the Early or Late Prophets or the Writings not found in the Hebrew or the Greek.\textsuperscript{47}

If S really originated in a community that cherished the Pentateuch and rejected the Prophets, one would expect a much stronger favourable attitude towards ‘the Law’. S reflects neither such an adherence to ‘the Law’, nor a negative attitude to the Prophets.

5.3. Vegetarianism
According to Winter there is one verse that shows that the translator has a preference for vegetarianism.\textsuperscript{48} In 19.1 S has ‘and he who loves flesh (\textit{arsb}) will inherit poverty’ instead of ‘he who despises small

\textsuperscript{47}Note also the references to ‘prophecy’ in 19.20 and 47.17.
things will be destroyed’ (ms C; lxx). It is hard to establish, however, what the idiom ‘to love flesh’ means in this verse. Does it really refer to someone who likes to eat meat, or does refer to one’s own body or perhaps even to the Greek as it is used in the Pauline letters, with its markedly negative connotation. The parallelism with ‘a drunken labourer will not become rich’ could be taken to imply that in S the verse concerns wine and meat; but this parallelism could also suggest that the verse deals with excessiveness of consumption rather than drinking wine and eating meat as such. Because of these uncertainties about the purport and meaning of the verse, it is not justified to conclude that the translator had a preference for vegetarianism only on the basis of this verse. Moreover, in other cases the Syriac translator did not bother to modify a positive statement about meat (cf., e.g., 20.16 ‘a fat tail cannot be eaten without salt’).

5.4. Poverty
There are some passages in S that reflect a high esteem of the state of poverty and a negative attitude towards wealth. Thus in 37.14 S has ‘a man’s heart rejoices in his way more than riches of the world that do not profit’ instead of ‘. . . more than seven watchmen on a watchtower’ (mss B,D; lxx). That this tendency is present in S is undeniable, although it is not as pervasive as suggested by Winter. A number of his examples are open to alternative explanations, and references to charity (e.g. 29.28) do not necessarily indicate holding poverty in high esteem.

On the basis of the translator’s attitude towards poverty and wealth Winter argued that S originated in a community that had chosen to live in poverty. Was there any community to fit this picture better than the Ebionites, ‘the poor ones’? However, the devotion to poverty and even the designation ‘the poor ones’ is not exclusively Ebionite. A positive assessment of poverty is found in several New Testament passages and can be expected in other early Christian communities as well. And although rabbinic sources do not show any high esteem

49 Throughout the Syriac New Testament is translated with .
51 Moreover, there are also counter-examples, where ‘poverty’ is used with a negative connotation. Cf. 19.1 discussed above, § 5.3.
52 Cf. e.g. Lk. 6.20; Jas. 5.1-6.
for poverty,\textsuperscript{53} it did exist in some non-rabbinic circles, as appears, for example, from the Dead Sea Scrolls.\textsuperscript{54}

6. Towards a Profile of the Context in Which S Originated

The Syriac translation of Ben Sira reflects a number of tendencies that help us to build up a profile of the translator’s linguistic, cultural and religious background.

1. The translator knew Hebrew. In size and content his \textit{Vorlage} differed much from the original book of Ben Sira. It included a number of the alleged characteristics of SirII (e.g. references to eternal life) and reflected some rabbinic sapiential and halakhic traditions. There is no proof that the translator himself had affinity with rabbinic Judaism.

2. The freedom, negligence, and thoughtlessness with which the translation was made are a strong indication that the translator did not consider the book of Sirach canonical.\textsuperscript{55}

3. The translation stands in the Aramaic-Syriac translation tradition inasmuch as the translator uses techniques (like the avoidance of anthropomorphisms, or the poetic device to create repetitive parallelism) that are characteristic of this tradition.

4. The translator did not bother much about ‘the Law’. Perhaps it goes too far to say that he had a hostile attitude towards it, but his indifference suggests at least that he did not belong to a circle that was preoccupied with the Law. There is no evidence for Winter’s thesis that the Syriac translation was made by people who had a high esteem for the Law, and later revised by people with a negative attitude to it.

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. F. Hauck and E. Bammel, ‘\piωσε, \piωσεια, \piωσεω’, \textit{TWNT}, VI, pp. 885-915 (901).

\textsuperscript{54} Note also the references to the ‘the poor ones’ which we find in the Scrolls; cf. Igor R. Tantlevskij, ‘Ebionites’, in Schiffman and VanderKam, \textit{Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls}, I, pp. 225-26; see also Catherine M. Murphy, \textit{Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community} (STDJ, 40; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002).

\textsuperscript{55} We can see here a parallel with the book of Chronicles; cf. Weitzman, \textit{Peshitta}, 208.
5. The translator seems to have been familiar with all parts of the Hebrew Bible and was sometimes influenced by them in his translation.

6. The translator was indifferent, if not hostile, to sacrifices and priesthood. His negative attitude concerned not just the contemporary priests or sacrificial service (cf. Qumran) but the institutions as such.

7. The translator adds some positive references to the nations. He omits a statement about the eternity of Israel, but not much can be concluded from this. The omission may be unintentional and the references to the nations do not go beyond some passages in the Hebrew Bible.

8. The translator had a high esteem for poverty.


7. Jewish and/or Christian?

There is no consensus among scholars about the context in which the Syriac translation of Ben Sira originated. Some scholars argue that it originated in a Jewish context, others that it has a Christian background. Still others have suggested that it was made in a Jewish-Christian context. However, the question ‘Jewish or Christian?’ or even ‘Jewish and/or Christian?’ is a simplification of the problem. To consider Jews and Christians in the first centuries of the Common Era as two distinct groups, or even to make a tripartite division into Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians is anachronistic. Within the Jewish-Christian spectrum there was a plurality of movements and the borders between these movements were often not clearly marked. 56 This plurality existed both at the Jewish and at the Christian side of the spectrum. 57 H.J.W. Drijvers has argued that in Edessa and the Syriac-speaking regions of Northern Mesopotoamia it was not before 400 AD

56 It would be inaccurate to consider rabbinic Judaism and ‘orthodox’ Christianity as the extremes of this spectrum. Thus on the Christian side we also find forms of Christianity that were further removed from Judaism than what we can anachronistically call orthodox Christianity. An example is Marcionism, which played an important role in second- and third-century Syriac Christianity.

57 Cf. Weitzman, Peshitta, 207-208. ‘Previous generations, then, could not agree on the question of Jewish versus Christian origin. For them, Judaism was repre-
that the victory of Christian orthodoxy marked the final break between Jews and Christians.\textsuperscript{58}

We can try to locate the community in which S originated within the spectrum of JewishChristian types in the second or third century CE by comparing some segments in this spectrum with the profile we have established for the origin of S.

1. Rabbinic Judaism. We have seen that parallels with rabbinic halakhic and sapiential traditions do not demonstrate that S originated in a rabbinic Jewish context. The tendencies mentioned in § 6 under 4 (Law), 6 (sacrifices and priesthood), 7 (Israel and nations),\textsuperscript{59} 8 (poverty), and 9 (NT parallels) argue against such an origin.

2. Non-rabbinic Jewish groups. A non-rabbinic Jewish origin can account for 8 (poverty). At first sight it might also explain 6 (sacrifices and priesthood), but after a closer look at the material that explanation is not satisfying. Unlike Weitzman, we think that it cannot account for 7 (Israel and the nations). Moreover, the remaining objections against a rabbinic Jewish origin (4 and 9) argue against a non-rabbinic Jewish origin as well.

3. Jewish Christians (in a praxis-based definition).\textsuperscript{60} Two tendencies that argued against a non-rabbinic (and non-Christian) Jewish origin of S, namely 6 (sacrifices and priesthood) and 9 (NT parallels) do fit a Jewish-Christian group, but 4 (Law) does not.

Many authors have argued for a Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin of S and ascribed features that do not agree with this hypothesis to later


\textsuperscript{59}But note the uncertainties related to this topic; see § 4.3.

\textsuperscript{60}For the sake of clarity distinguished from the preceding group, but compare Carleton Paget, ‘Jewish Christianity’, pp. 732, 774-75.

revisions. In our view, however, there is no reason to stick to the ‘Jewishness’ of the translation. Once the parallels with rabbinic literature have lost their value as an argument in the discussion, the only remaining argument is the use of a Hebrew Vorlage. The combination of this argument with the Christian elements of the translation do not compel us to assume a Jewish-Christian context in the praxis-based definition given above. It suggests a Jewish-Christian origin in a genetic sense (i.e. the translator was a Jew converted to Christianity). Since, however, the Jews who became Christians represented a large variety of opinions, a genetic definition of Jewish-Christians does not define anything specific at all. Therefore the designation ‘Jewish-Christian’ is not very useful in a discussion about the origin of S.

Our conclusions agree much with what Smend wrote at the beginning of the twentieth century, namely that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew indicates that he was probably born as a Jew, but that his translation reflects an anti-Judaistic tendency. We can say more about the translator, especially concerning his attitude towards poverty, but that does not assist us in identifying the community in which S originated with any known religious group from the second or third century CE. The attempts that have been made to do so are unconvincing.

---

61 Thus Carleton Paget, ‘Jewish Christianity’, pp. 733-34.
62 Smend, Jesus Sirach, p. cxxxvii: ‘Zugleich tritt aber bei dem Verfasser, der nach seiner hebräischen Sprachkenntnis wahrscheinlich ein geborener Jude war, hier eine gewisse antijüdische Tendenz zu Tage’. Note, however, that even though we agree with Smend’s conclusion, we do not agree with many his arguments; cf. above, § 4.1.

This book is a brief study of how some important events in Genesis are connected with Passover in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (one of the Palestinian Targumim). The events discussed are the story of Cain and Abel in Gen. 4 (Chapter 2), the circumcision of Abraham in Gen. 17 (Chapter 3), the visit of the angels to Abraham in Gen. 18 (Chapter 4) and Isaac’s blessing in Gen. 27 (Chapter 5). In the Hebrew text of three of these stories one finds vague temporal expressions (Gen. 4.3 'at the end of days'; Gen. 17.26 'on the fourteenth of Nisan'; Gen. 18.14 'at the set time') which in Pseudo-Jonathan are rendered with a so-called 'translational doublet': 'at the end of days, on the fourteenth of Nisan' (Gen. 4.3); 'that very day, on the fourteenth of Nisan' (Gen. 17.26); 'at the time of the feast . . . at this time' (Gen. 18.14).

In the fourth text, Gen. 27, the connection with Passover is not established through a 'calendrical precision' (p. 15) but through the association of three elements in the Hebrew text with Passover. The most important of these three is the reference to the slaughtering of two kids in order to provide for a meal for Isaac (v. 9); according to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, one of these kids represents the Passover sacrifice and the other one the animal for the Passover meal (in accordance with the prescriptions in the Mishna). Translational doublets are found elsewhere in early Jewish exegetic literature as well. The month of Nisan was the holiest and most important month in ancient Judaism and dating important biblical events to Passover was a general tendency (p. 15). The binding of Isaac (Gen. 22) is not connected...
with Passover in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, while in some other ancient sources (e.g. Jubilees) it is. Accordingly, in their interpretation of Exod. 12.42 all other Palestinian Targumim to the Pentateuch connect the binding of Isaac with Passover. Unfortunately Bengtsson does not look for an explanation of this omission in Pseudo-Jonathan.

The introduction (Chapter 1) summarizes the scholarly debate on the origin of the Targumim. The author takes an intermediate position between the traditional view on the origin of the Targumim in the synagogue and more recent adjustments by a.o. Ph. Alexander. Bengtsson’s position with relation to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is clearly motivated by the connection of certain events in Genesis with Passover. According to Bengtsson this connection has its setting in the ancient synagogue, and more specifically, should be explained through the triennial Palestinian reading cycle of the Torah, which ‘at some point in time’ and ‘at least in some of the Palestinian synagogues’ was ‘aligned with the calendar, completed within three years’ (p. 10). Each triennial period started with the reading of Gen. 1, probably on the first of Nisan. As a result, every third year Gen. 4 would have been read in the week of Passover and this may explain the connection of Cain’s offering with Passover (with Friedlander). This interpretation, however, is somewhat at odds with Bengtsson’s view that Pseudo-Jonathan ‘was originally not intended for ordinary uneducated Jews in the Synagogue liturgy’ but rather was a ‘literary work addressed to intellectual readers of the academies’ (p. 12; cf. also p. 27). The more so if one considers that Pseudo-Jonathan is the only Palestinian Pentateuch Targum which makes the connection between the events described in Gen. 4 (and Gen. 17 and 18) and Passover. The introduction also gives an overview of the translational techniques which are characteristic of targumic literature. These techniques can be traced back to the threefold aim of early Biblical exegesis to ‘make the Biblical text intelligible, adjusted to tradition, and relevant to contemporary Jewry’ (p. 21). Finally the author briefly discusses the extant Targumim, both the Babylonian and the Palestinian, with the focus on Pseudo-Jonathan and its relation to both Targum Onqelos and other Palestinian Targumim.

The author is clearly not a linguist. Linguistic argumentations are virtually absent from his discussions and there are practically no references to grammatical works dealing with (parts) of the targumic literature (with the exception of G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 2nd edn, 1905]). Thus for instance the remark ‘When Hebrew had ceased to be the lin-
Reviews

Margaretha Folmer, Leiden


Three years after Geoffrey Khan’s impressive *A Grammar of Neo-Aramaic, The Dialect of the Jews of Arbel* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999) was published, he succeeded in bringing out another, equally impressive grammar of a Neo-Aramaic dialect. In *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh*, as this weighty volume is called, he describes in minute detail the language of the Christians of the small town of Qaraqosh, or Bağdedo (< Bet Kudaydad), as it is called by its inhabitants. This town, about eighteen miles east of Mosul, has a large community of Syrian Catholic and Syrian Orthodox Christians whose Neo-Aramaic dialect had not been studied until Khan’s publication. It seems that


2See *Bibliothea Orientalis* 58 (2001), pp. 440-43 for a review and a concise introduction into the field.

no written texts were ever produced in this language, although, remarkably enough, some of the liturgical poetry of the Alqosh region (originating in Church-of-the-East circles, but perhaps introduced via the (also Catholic) Chaldean Church) is used in Qaraqosh. Khan, therefore, based his study on texts he collected himself, either by eliciting them from native speakers (most of whom lived in London since the Gulf War of 1991) or by transcribing recordings of texts in a more fixed form, such as several modern poems by Talal ‘Acam, a theater play and a Gospel translation as used during mass. Most of these recordings were made in Qaraqosh.

Although the vocabulary of the Neo-Aramaic dialect of the Gdedaya, the Christian inhabitants of Qaraqosh, has been significantly influenced by Arabic and Kurdish, the dialect displays some interesting archaic traits in comparison to other dialects of the NENA (Northeastern Neo-Aramaic) group. Khan mentions the survival of the post-vocalic realizations of the consonants *t and *d (/t/and /d/), which in many other dialects shifted to /t/ and /d/ (Christian Zakho, Christian Urmi), in a few others to /s/ and /z/ (Jewish Aqra) or to /l/ (Jewish Arbel). The Qaraqosh dialect also preserved two different series of pronominal suffixes, one for singular and one for plural nouns (as in earlier Aramaic). In all other Neo-Aramaic dialects (including those of Tur ‘Abdin and Neo-Mandaic) only one form of the pronominal suffix survived. Another unique feature among the NENA dialects is the fact that Qaraqosh has preserved the imperative and infinitive verbal forms without an m-prefix in the second (formerly pa‘el) and third (formerly af‘el) stem pattern (e.g. in the third stem: ‘aqtel (imperative) // ‘aqtel (infinitive) // maqtel (present)). In other dialects the m-prefix either disappeared in all verbal forms (usually in the second stem pattern), or was analogically attached to the imperative and infinitive forms (in the third stem pattern). Whether these (and quite a few other) archaic traits are solely to be explained from the town’s location at the periphery of the Neo-Aramaic speaking region, or that perhaps, as Khan suggests, the migration of Christians from Takrit in the eleventh and twelfth century helped to preserve older forms of the language, is an interesting proposal. This would imply that the Christians of Takrit not only spoke Aramaic in the late eleventh century (not unlikely), but also that their language was more archaic (and closer to Classical Syriac?) than that of the inhabitants of Qaraqosh. Whether or not there has been influence from the Takriti dialect on the language of Qaraqosh, in general it is rather close to that of the nearby village.
of Bartilla (which probably had its share of Takriti immigrants). It is also relatively close to the dialect of Alqosh and thus belongs to the southern group of NENA dialects.

Khan's grammar of the Qaraqosh dialect closely follows the lines he set out for his grammar of the dialect of Arbil. In fact, up till chapter 19, the same subjects are found in the same chapters, from phonology (Chapters 1 to 6) and morphology (Chapters 7 to 13), to a detailed and informative treatment of syntax (Chapters 14 to 19). This thorough and methodical approach makes it easy to compare his work on Qaraqosh with the earlier work on Arbil, despite the fact that new subjects are introduced, usually as a result of particular characteristics of the Qaraqosh dialect. As in his book on Arbil, Khan uses a functional approach to syntax, which is very effective in explaining the variety of structures that he encountered in his texts. From the many interesting details that could be mentioned here, I note the fact that although the preposition \-\- in Qaraqosh (as in almost all NENA dialects) is not regularly used as an object marker with nouns, it is used as such in the (probably somewhat formalized) Gospel translation, in translating a parallel Classical Syriac structure with \-\- as definite object marker (p. 367). The same is found in the Literary Urmia dialect, where \-\- as object marker is also reserved for translations from Classical Syriac, suggesting either that the construction with \-\- had not completely disappeared from NENA, or, perhaps more likely, that loans from Classical Syriac are possible also in the grammatical domain.

In comparison to Khan's earlier work on Arbil, this grammar contains an additional chapter in which the lexicon is discussed. Khan here touches on a subject that so far received only limited attention in Neo-Aramaic studies. Especially his discussion of the semantics of a (small) number of words of Aramaic stock in comparison to earlier Aramaic (mainly Classical Syriac) is rather interesting, as is his presentation (apart from the regular alphabetic glossary) of the lexicon divided into semantic fields. Among other things this presents an interesting picture of the different amounts of loanwords in the different semantic fields, with for instance a relatively large numbers of loans in the fields of 'professions', 'women's clothes and jewelry' and 'cooked foods'.

As his earlier work on Arbil, also the grammar of the Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh constitutes a major contribution to the field of Neo-Aramaic linguistics, and the field of Aramaic and Semitic linguistics in general. Khan's two grammars, together with the wealth of studies from the late 1990s and a couple of important recent additions


Heleen Murre-van den Berg, Leiden


Ever since Abraham Geiger wrote his study *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?* (1833), scholars have endeavoured to trace the content of the Qurʾān back to its Jewish or Christian sources. Whereas the importance of specifically Syriac language and culture for the early history of Islam has long been known—Jeffery in his study of foreign words in the Qurʾān had already claimed that about 80% of all Qurʾānic loan words were Syriac³—the monograph under review takes the discussion one decisive step further. Luxenberg’s book is an interesting attempt to read the text of the Qurʾān with an eye to Syriac and produces some stunning results. It is presented as a preliminary pilot study of what will become a more comprehensive investigation, while in its present form it constitutes, in the author’s wording, ‘merely an attempt to clarify some problems of the language of the Qurʾān’ (p. viii).

Two important facts serve as L.’s point of departure. First, the fact that Syriac culture, including religious literature in Syriac, was conspicuous at the time of the rise of Islam, even on the Arab Peninsula.⁴ The second point is that during the first century of the textual trans-


⁴For a general overview, see e.g. S.P. Brock, ‘Syriac Culture in the Seventh Century’, *Aram* 1 (1989), pp. 268-80.
mission of the Qur'ān the Arabic script was defective, in the sense that it was written without the diacritical points which distinguish between the consonantal values of many basic letter-forms. Whereas in Hebrew or Syriac this is relevant only for the difference between šīn/šīn and reš/dālāt respectively, in the Arabic script the omission of the diacritical points is particularly troublesome: seven letter-forms are ambiguous, in that they represent two different phonemes (d/ḡ, ẓ/z, ẓ/ḍ, t/ẓ, ʾ/ḡ, ʾ/ḡ, ʾ/ḡ), one indicates three (ḡ/h/ḥ) and one can have as many as five different phonemic values (b/t/t/ḥ/y). Without the diacritical points, no less than twenty-two out of the twenty-eight letters of the Arabic alphabet are ambiguous.

An important feature in early Arabic orthography is that the ʾay without dots could serve as a mater lectionis for long ā not only in word-final position, as is well known, but also in the middle of a word. As this was later ‘forgotten’, such cases were subsequently interpreted as indicating either the vowel ā or the consonant y. This would explain ‘odd’ Arabic word-forms such as ʿabrāḥīm or ʿṣayfān, which originally must have been pronounced ʿabrahām and ʿṣāfān, with the same vowels as their equivalents in Syriac, from which they derive. According to L., hitherto enigmatic orthographic alternatives such as توراة and توراة must both be pronounced as tawrā, since the ʾay in the latter form should be dotless and hence represents ā. (The present reviewer might add that these forms were even more probably pronounced simply as tōrā, as in Hebrew, since already Nöldeke doubted the tripartite vowel system a-i-u for Classical Arabic.)

L.’s main point is that a fair number of problematic passages in the Qur'ān can in fact be understood if one assumes some words to have been misread (and hence ‘mis-pointed’) Syriac. It must be said that many of L.’s findings are stunning indeed. In some cases he even manages to reread entire sūrah, which, when read against their Syriac background, suddenly turn out to be coherent texts. A convincing example is L.’s treatment (pp. 269-276) of sūrat al-Kawtār (108): 1. ʾinnā ʾaṭṣamāka l-kawtār; 2. fa-ṣallī li-rabbika wa-nḥar; 3. ʾinnā šāniʿaka hawā l-ʾabtar. This enigmatic text is usually translated as follows: ‘1. Verily, We have given thee the abundance; 2. So pray to thy Lord, and sacrifice; 3. Verily, it is he who hateth thee who is the docked one.’ The expression كُتَر ‘is supposed to refer to one of the rivers of Paradise. L., however, identifies it with the Syriac noun ḏuḥas kutārā (or kuttārā) ‘persis-
tence’. Then the verb نَهَارُ نَهَارُ, which presents theological problems in view of Muhammad’s position towards pagan sacrifices, is apparently a misreading for Syriac نَگَرَ نَگَرَ ‘to continue, last’—that is, حَوَامُ حَوَامُ ‘to continue, last’—that is, حُوَامُ حُوَامُ should be repointed as أَثَارُ أَثَارُ ‘to continue, last’—that is, حَوَامُ حَوَامُ ‘to continue, last’—that is, حُوَامُ حُوَامُ should be repointed as أَثَارُ أَثَارُ ‘to be defeated’. This then yields an understandable text, which would fit perfectly within the context of an emerging religion: 1. Verily, We have given thee the (virtue of) persistence; 2. So pray to thy Lord, and persevere (i.e. in prayer). 3. Verily, it is thy enemy (i.e. Satan) who is the loser.’ Moreover, as L. points out, such a text is reminiscent of passages like 1 Peter 5.8-9. One may agree with L.’s new reading of this سُرَاح, even though doubts remain on some points, such as his claim that Arabic أَطْتُ أَطْتُ ‘to give’ should be derived from Syriac يَطْتُ يَطْتُ ‘to bring’. Not only is this particular proposal linguistically problematic, it also fails to lead to a better understanding of the Qur’anic text, since the meaning of this Arabic verb is fairly straightforward.

The same can be said for L.’s reinterpretation of سُرَاح 96 (الْعَلَاقْ، ‘the blood-clot’), another challenge to both traditional and modern exegetes. The word عِلَاقْ عِلَاقْ, according to L., does not refer to a blood-clot from which God is supposed to have created man. It should rather be connected with Syriac عِلَاقْ عِلَاقْ ‘sticky clay’. The fact that corroborating evidence for this idea is found in the Qur’ān itself simply clinches the matter: إنَّا خَلَقْنَاهُم مِّن طَيْنٍ لَّزِبًَِّ ‘We created them of sticky clay’ (Q 37.11). Even though L. is at his most convincing here, one is inclined to disagree with some of his conclusions, such as his interpretation of the last word of this سُرَاح, واَقَتَرُ واَقَتَرُ, which he translates as ‘and celebrate the Eucharist!’ But the verb أَقَتَرُ أَقَتَرُ ‘to draw near’ cannot simply be identified, as L. does, with the form تَقَارِرُ تَقَارِرُ, which is actually the Christian Arabic term for celebrating the Eucharist.

L.’s main conclusion is far-reaching: the influence of Syriac on the early text of the Qur’ān is much more pervasive than has hitherto been assumed. Many unclear expressions from the Qur’ān are actually understandable if read with Syriac in mind, sometimes by repointing the traditional Arabic text. This also implies that the supposed reliability of the oral reading tradition of the Qur’ān leaves much to be desired; the misunderstandings must have originated from misreading unpointed Arabic manuscripts. L. even goes as far as assuming an Aramaic عَرْكُوـْرَان and that the language of the inhabitants of Mecca must have spoken a Syriac-Arabic Mischsprache.
Some critical remarks might be made, which are not meant to detract from the overall value of this book. In a remarkable passage in the preface the author apologises for having omitted much secondary literature since it ‘hardly contributed anything to the new method presented here’ and begs for the reader’s indulgence in that shortcomings such as the lack of indexes will be made good in a revised edition of the book or in a second volume. In spite of the author’s humble request, a critical reader might be inclined to disagree. In some cases, mentioning secondary studies could have changed L.’s conclusions or claims. Thus, for instance, when stating somewhat naively that the Arabic script seems to be derived from Syriac cursive script, he contents himself to refer to Grohmann’s *Arabische Paläographie* (1967–71) and an Arabic-written handbook on calligraphy from 1968 (p. 15). Even though this view has indeed been put forward in scholarly literature, L.’s ‘representation’ of the state of affairs is incomplete. He makes no mention of the detailed study by Gruendler, who argued that the Arabic script was derived from Nabataean, nor of earlier articles by Healey, who suggested more specifically that the origin of Arabic script is to be found in the cursive variety of the Nabataean script. For a brief overview of the various views, see now John F. Healey, ‘The Early History of the Syriac Script’, *JSS* 45 (2000), pp. 55-67 (64-66).

Sometimes it seems that when L. has found a pair of cognates in Syriac and Arabic, he simply declares the Arabic word to be a loan from Syriac, even when from a historical-linguistic point of view this is not plausible. Such is the case, for instance, with the root ُتَمَّةَ and its Syriac cognate ُتَمَّةَ. In making such claims, however,

5*In dieser Arbeit konnte nicht auf die gesamte einschlägige Literatur eingegangen werden, da diese zu der hier neu vorgestellten Methode kaum etwas beiträgt. Der interessierte Leser wird darüber hinaus manches vermissen, was bei einer philologischen Untersuchung zum Standard gehört wie ein Index der behandelten Termini. Der Autor ist sich dieses Mangels wie auch der Unvollkommenheit dieser ersten Arbeit bewußt und bittet insoweit um Nachsicht, als ein solcher Anhang einer vorgeplanten erweiterten Auflage bzw. einem zweiten Band vorbehalten bleibt* (p. ix).

6Beatrice Gruendler, *The Development of the Arabic Scripts: From the Nabatean Era to the First Islamic Century according to Dated Texts* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 43; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993).


8*Außer dem sekundären تَمَّةَ hat diese Verbalwurzel nichts Arabisches an sich* (p. 283).

one implicitly takes issue with major themes in historical phonology of Semitic: L. presupposes that we do not have merger of ġ and ʿ in Aramaic, but rather split of these phonemes in Arabic. While L. is entitled to such a view, a critical reader is justified in expecting an exposition on the matter.

All in all, Luxenberg’s Syroaramäische Lesart des Koran contains a wealth of original ideas and interesting observations, which might indeed have major implications for our understanding of the emergence of Islam. In many instances he makes a convincing case for what he calls a ‘Syriac reading of the Qur’ān’. His proposals often do lead to a better understanding of impenetrable Qur’ānic passages, which in itself is a major achievement and a challenge for historians of early Islam. Whether one should go along with his more far-reaching statements, on the Syriac-Arabic mixed language of Mecca or an Aramaic Urkoran, is something that further research will make clear. Rumour has it that a second volume with Luxenberg’s findings is in the making. One can only hope that it will contain just as many original ideas as the first volume. Copies of this book may be ordered online at http://www.verlag-hans-schiler.de/. Finally, it is worth pointing out that an English translation of the work is about to appear.\textsuperscript{10}

Martin F.J. Baasten, Leiden


This book is a reprint of the monograph which was published in 1969 by Brill in the series Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia (vol. 8). The original text is now provided with an introduction

\textsuperscript{9}Cf. e.g. S. Moscati et al., An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Phonology and Morphology (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969) §§ 8.44-8.49. On merger and split of phonemes in general, see, e.g., Theodora Bynon, Historical Linguistics (rev. edn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 47-53.

\textsuperscript{10}A detailed philological discussion of some parts of L.’s book by the present reviewer will appear in the proceedings of the conference ‘Historische Sondierungen und methodische Reflexionen zur Korangenese – Wege zur Rekonstruktion des Vorkanonischen Koran’, which was held in Berlin, 21–24 January 2004.
(Prolegomenon) by colleague and friend B.A. Levine. In more than thirty pages Levine gives an excellent and very helpful overview of the methodological approach of Muffs’s classical study of legal terms and formulas of the Aramaic legal documents from Elephantine (Egypt) dating from the fifth c. BCE. On the basis of detailed diachronic and comparative investigations of some legal terms and formulas within legal papyri from Elephantine (especially [דַּבְלָה לָבְנָה] ‘my heart is satisfied’), Muffs was able to trace many principles of Aramaic law and much of its formulas back to Syrian-Mesopotamian cuneiform legal traditions (the so-called Assyriological approach), particularly the so-called ‘peripheral’ or ‘provincial’ legal traditions, that is, the traditions from the northern provinces and the fringe areas and not from central and southern Mesopotamia. Levine conclusively demonstrates that Muffs’ conclusions are still valid, even though many new Aramaic texts and other relevant source texts have been published and scrutinized, in addition to the monumental text edition by B. Porten and A. Yardeni and recent grammatical and lexical studies of the Aramaic language from the Achaemenid period and its direct predecessors. Levine demonstrates that some of Muffs’ assumptions are now confirmed by evidence from new sources, such as Emar (13th c.) or as Levine puts it ‘it has already happened that terms and formulas that Muffs expected to find, based on his analysis, have actually turned up in later sources’ (p. xix). Beyond any doubt, this important work once again will find its way in the scholarly world.

Margaretha Folmer, Leiden
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Abstracts


This investigation of the marginal notes in the Syro-Hexapla of Ecclesiastes delineates the role of the text history of the Old Greek in determining the text of the Three (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion), the relation of the Three and the Old Latin in the text history of the OG, and the role of the Three in determining the text of the OG. The implications for a new critical edition of the Three are elaborated as well as for the lexicography of the Three.

Gillian Greenberg, Indications of the Faith of the Translator in the Peshitta to the ‘Servant Songs’ of Deutero-Isaiah.

The Peshitta of Deutero-Isaiah includes several passages relevant to the question of the faith of the translator: Jewish or Christian? There are inconsistencies: some differences between MT and P suggest a Christian or messianic nuance; one blunts an anti-Jewish phrase; in another an opportunity to introduce a Christian theme is resisted. The cumulative weight of examples suggests Christian input. The inconsistency could be explained by postulating a Jewish-Christian translator who attempted to play fair by his Vorlage, putting his own convictions and religious literature to the back of his mind, but occasionally failed.

Dan Levene and Beno Rothenberg, Word-Smithing: Some Metallurgical Terms in Hebrew and Aramaic.

The collaboration between Dr Dan Levene and Prof. Beno Rothenberg on a project that aims to identify references to metals and metalworking techniques in what are primarily Judaic sources has been a bringing together of two different approaches to studying the past: philology and archaeometallurgy. This paper highlights the way in which the lexicography of certain terms must inevitably rely on knowledge of the relevant technology and its history. To illustrate this point two terms
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are examined: 1. the word \textit{s.rp} (ירַפ) and the shifting meanings of some of its cognates across time; and 2. the word \textit{\textquoteleft nk} (נן), that appears in Amos 7.7-8.

\textbf{Matthew Morgenstern}, Notes on a Recently Published Magic Bowl.

This article presents a new transcription and translation of the Aramaic magic bowl BM 135563, and suggests an interpretation that differs considerably from the previous editions. It is argued that the bowl presents a narrative is that more coherent than has been suggested, and that it is the product of carefully considered literary activity.

\textbf{Harry Sysling}, Three Harsh Prophets: A Targumic Tosefta to Parashat Korah.

In MS Paris of the Fragmentary Targums one finds lengthy introductions to the festival readings and also to the weekly sabbath readings. In one of these introductions (to Numbers 16.1ff.) a story is told about three prophets who denied their own prophecies, namely Moses, Elijah and Micah. This story is of special interest because of the quotations it contains of scriptural verses from the Prophets that are at variance with the official targum on the Prophets. The article offers a detailed analysis of the story and discusses its date and origin by comparing it to the extant parallels in rabbinic sources.

\textbf{Wido van Peursen}, The Peshitta of Ben Sira: Jewish and/or Christian?

The religious context in which the Syriac translation of the Bible originated is a much-debated issue. Some scholars argue that it originated in a Jewish context, others that it has a Christian background. Also various hypotheses about a Jewish-Christian origin have been put forward. This paper argues that the question ‘Jewish or Christian?’ and even the question ‘Jewish, Christian, or Jewish-Christian?’ is an oversimplification of the problem because of the broad Jewish-Christian spectrum that existed in the first centuries of the Common Era. The paper concentrates on the Syriac translation of Ben Sira, which has some undeniable traces of an origin somewhere on the Christian side of the spectrum.