

THE TARGUM OF JOB FROM QUMRAN CAVE ELEVEN

By A. S. VAN DER WOUDE

Translation by Mrs. B. Thiering, Sydney University.

(Our thanks are due to the publishers, Messrs. E. J. Brill, Leiden, for permission to reproduce an English translation of this article, originally appearing in German in "**Supplements to Vetus Testamentum**", vol. IX, pp. 322-331.)

The international congress of Old Testament scholars is hereby presented with a brief preliminary report, based on an initial study, of the Targum of Job which was discovered in 1956, together with other important manuscripts, in Cave XI, filled with large stones, a few kilometers north of Khirbet Qumran. The discovery was made by Bedouin¹. The finds² were acquired for a very considerable sum by the Palestine Archaeological Museum in the Jordanian section of Jerusalem. The planned purchase of the documents by foreign countries was prevented by the Jordanian Government edict of 8-5-'61, whereby all finds from the Dead Sea were declared the property of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The Trustees of the Museum, in order to be reimbursed for the capital which they had expended in order to ensure the best possible preservation of the manuscripts, could only offer to foreign institutions the exclusive rights of study and publication in return for the payment of the purchase price. After lengthy negotiations, the rights to study and publication of the Job Targum were acquired on 23-12-'61 by the Royal Netherlands Academy for Science in Amsterdam³, after the Netherlands Institute for Pure Science had underwritten a hundred per cent subsidy of the necessary moneys⁴. At the suggestion of its Qumran Commission, Professor Dr. J. van der Ploeg, O.P., and myself were invited to unroll and study the document. After a close collaboration of one and a half months, Professor van der Ploeg was able to lay the preliminary results of the work on the Targum before the Royal Academy on 14th May,

1962. The report has now been published in French⁵. The following exposition, the result of our joint work, corresponds on the whole to the information given by Professor van der Ploeg in Amsterdam. That I now give it here and in my own way corresponds to the wishes of my senior colleague, that our joint work should receive expression in the publication.

We reached the Holy City on 16-3-'62 and began our work the following day in the heavily guarded Scrollerly. The manuscript as we found it, consisted of 26 fragments and a small roll. To these could be added a partly petrified small fragment, so that we had altogether, apart from the small roll, 27 pieces, all of obovoid form and, apart from three fragments, averaging 4 to 6 cm wide and 6 cm high. The material of the roll is leather, from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 mm thick and dark brown. The MS has been damaged severely in the lower half through hydrolysis and oxidation⁶, whereas in almost all the fragments, including the large piece 109 cm in length, only one line is wholly or partly missing from the upper half, for the most part.

The largest piece, 109 cm long, contains more than half of the original Targum text of Job 37:10-42:11, while the 27 other fragments contain parts of the text of Job 17:14-36:33⁷. Altogether, some 15 per cent. of the original MS has been preserved, which gives us a fairly good insight into the problems posed by the Targum. Calculations can further demonstrate that the roll originally contained the whole text of Job in Targum form and comprised about 66 or 67 columns averaging 10 cm in width. The length of the MS was originally therefore about 7 m, while the height, including the upper and lower margins, must have been 12 to 13 cm⁸.

The form of the letters is not the same throughout: sometimes they are larger and better formed than is customary in the MS. But this fact does not suggest a second or third scribe because the irregularities in the script only appear occasionally and elsewhere the same hand is discernible from chapters 17 to 42. Because the middle of Job falls in ch.22, it can therefore be concluded that the whole Targum was written on one roll by one person.

The best preserved piece of 109cm long was originally placed inside the roll and the other 27 fragments from ch.36 backwards to ch.17 form the rest of the parts of the MS that were wound around this inside piece. The opening

columns have been completely lost. The pieces preserved therefore form a series of progressively, better preserved fragments. Corresponding to the loss of the lower half of the MS, there are approximately equal gaps between the preserved pieces. It is striking therefore that four fragments, which should have been present in these circumstances (around ch. 18:15, 20:20, end of 22 and 23) are not present and consequently must have been lost after the finding of the MS or else are still in the hands of the Bedouin.

Apart from carbon dating, which can scarcely be considered for this document⁹, palaeographical criteria are the only available means of dating the MS. The outstanding work of Albright, Avigad, Birnbaum and Cross¹⁰ (to name only these) has made it possible to date a Hebrew or Aramaic MS of this period with reasonable accuracy, on purely palaeographical grounds. We would use this method to assign the **manuscript** to the first half of the first Christian century. The **text** may, of course, originate in an earlier period. We will see that the **terminus ad quem** can be determined by a Jewish tradition to be quoted¹¹.

The script of the document is on the whole easy to read. **Waw** and **Yod** are for the most part distinguished, except for some marked ligatures. **Beth** and **Kaph** are often similar. The MS is lined, as is for example, the Habbakuk commentary from Cave I, but the distance between the lines is not always the same.

The MS seems to us to be of the greatest importance in three respects:

a) Firstly, with regard to its philological significance. The language of the Targum shows in many respects a close relationship with Biblical Aramaic¹², and in many cases is closer to the Aramaic portions of Daniel than the Genesis Apocryphon (GA) found in Cave I¹³. In Daniel, **ד** as **nota relationis** is usual¹⁴, while in the Targum of Job it is never **ד**, but always **די**. On the other hand GA has the later **ד** instead of **די** in six out of about sixty cases¹⁵. In GA **ס** instead of **ה** is always found as the prefix of the causative conjugation in the Perfect, Imperative and Infinitive¹⁶. In the Job Targum it is always **ה**, as mostly in Biblical Aramaic¹⁷, while even in the reflexive-passive conjugations, in accordance with Biblical Aramaic¹⁸, the prefix **ה** predominates¹⁹. The

particle הן, 'if' appears in GA twice as הן and twice as אן²⁰ (as in Middle Aramaic). In the Job Targum, as in Biblical Aramaic, only the form הן is found. תנא 'here', that is met only in Official Aramaic and GA²¹, appears once in the Targum²². While GA has כמן as well as כמא 'as'²³, the Targum has only כמא²⁴. GA has תמן instead of the historically older תמא²⁵. The latter form is in the Targum²⁶. On the other hand, דן is found once in our MS as **pronomen demonstrativum** instead of the older דנא²⁷. In the verb, the 3rd pers. perf. plu. always has the ending ו- , never ון- (as in Palestinian Targum and Midrash²⁸). **Status absolutus** and **status emphaticus** are used **promiscue**, apparently without difference in meaning. Assimilation is occasionally found, mostly, however, there are dissimilated forms, like תנדע, מנדעא, אנפי, הנכא, etc. To denote the direct object 5 is sporadically used²⁹, both with nouns and pronouns, while ית is apparently not used in the Job Targum.

Although it is admittedly difficult to determine the date of origin of our document on the basis of these linguistic criteria, as local and generic differences must be reckoned with, the grammatical characteristics of the Job Targum indicate the origin of the work in the first century B.C., especially if we assign the Genesis Apocryphon, as E. Y. Kutscher would do, to the first century before our era. As far as we can now see and as the above-mentioned examples indicate, our Targum stands nearer to the Official Aramaic of the book of Daniel than does the Genesis Apocryphon.

In contrast to the book of Daniel, the Targum has relatively few Persian loan-words. Such are: פתנמא 'word, thing; and רת 'right'. Not previously exemplified in Aramaic is רחשת, an equivalent of Heb. ערבה 'desert, steppe' as the dwelling-place of the wild-ass (Job 39:6)³⁰. The word is found in Syriac as **dst**, while **dst** is still the usual word for 'desert' in Modern Syriac³¹. We also found the previously unknown verb תען, corresponding to the Assyrian **hasanu** (cover)³². The meaning of תשברא is still uncertain³³. The Hebrew original³⁴ has עני 'misery' in this spot. The similarly unknown נזך is certainly to be connected with Arab. **nzk**, 'penetrate with a spear'³⁵ and accordingly translated 'spear'.

Orthographically, there are relatively few **matres**

lectionis. But the peculiar form תבוּא, 'they return', instead of תבו is found, similar to יאמיניא in the Habakkuk commentary from Qumran Cave I (Col. II, 6). The **status emphaticus** is indicated by א and ה **promiscue.** In the case of the ה spelling, confusion with the 3rd pers. masc. possessive suffix ה.., and fem ה—, is quite possible. When this occurs, the original and the context decide the matter.

Whether we have in our document an exemplar of the often debated native speech of Jesus, is not so easily decided. Many years ago Gustav Dalman put forward the thesis, that we have in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan the traditions of a Targum that had arisen in Judaea and the primary source for our knowledge of the language of Jesus³⁶. Paul Kahle³⁷ and also Franz Rosenthal³⁸ have opposed this view emphatically and believe that these Targums cannot be used as for the Palestinian dialect form. On the other hand, E. Y. Kutscher³⁹ has recently put forward the view, that Dalman and Theodor Nöldeke were basically correct in asserting a Palestinian origin for the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. In these circumstances, I cannot at present venture a conclusion about the linguistic position of the Job Targum. It is still quite possible, that we are fairly close to the native language of Jesus in our Targum and even more in the Genesis Apocryphon. However that may be, the document is of extraordinary value for the study of Aramaic, because together with GA it fills in the almost total vacuum in Aramaic remains for the period surrounding the beginning of our era, which is extremely fortunate.

b) It is certain that we have in our roll the oldest Targum manuscript that has been preserved. I naturally, do not intend here to go into the whole problem of the history of Targums⁴⁰, but can at least mention that many scholars were not accustomed to date any Targum in written form before the second century of our era. Thus, George Foot Moore in his well-known book "Judaism"⁴¹, states that "the Targums of the Pentateuch and the Prophets are of Palestinian origin and probably date from the second century A.D. They show in many ways affinity to the exegesis of the Tannaim of the school of Aqiba". Further: "the Targums on the Hagiographa (are) all of too late a date to serve us as sources for the Judaism of the first centuries". On the other hand, Otto Eissfeldt, for instance, believes that there certainly were written Targums

in the time of Jesus⁴². This is shown by a tradition which is exceptionally interesting in the present connection, preserved in Bab. Talmud Sabbath Fol. 115a as follows:⁴³

Rabbi Joses related: Once, my father Halaphta came to Rabbi Gamliél Berabbi in Tiberias and found him sitting at the table of Johanan the Exile, reading out of a targumic book of Job which he held in his hand. Then he said to him: "I remember how your grandfather R. Gamliél used to stand on a step of the Temple mountain, and when a targumic book of Job was brought to him, he said to the architect: Hide it in a layer of the building. And he also ordered him to do it, and he hid it".

Whether Gamaliel I, the famous teacher of the apostle Paul⁴⁴, really had an exemplar of our Targum in his hands is admittedly not certain, because there may have been several Targums of Job at that period, yet it is the most probable view. This would give a happy confirmation of the **terminus ad quem** for the text in the first half of the first century of our era that has already been supported on palaeographical grounds.

We do not know exactly why the Job Targum was prohibited in the circles of Gamaliel I. For it cannot be proved that he had forbidden the use of this work because it originated from the Essene community at Qumran. As far as we can see, there is no express reference to either the customs or the special teachings of this community. At the most, the commentary-type translation of Job 35:10 might point in this direction, where the canonical text's "Where is God my Maker, who giveth songs in the night" is paraphrased as follows:

"Where is God, who has made and given us (.) for **our plantation** in the night"⁴⁵.

The concept of "plantation" is frequent in Jubilees⁴⁶, for instance, and may have been a current word in apocalyptic circles of the period, so in my judgement does not give grounds for assigning the Job Targum with confidence to the Essene community, even if it had a place in their library. I do not at present venture to decide whether the Targum had a function in the services of the Qumran community or was also used non-liturgically. The Targum by and large follows its Hebrew original fairly exactly, so that at times it appears to be a pure translation. At other points, however, there are fairly lengthy

excursi⁴⁷ or even abbreviations⁴⁸ as compared with the Hebrew text. There is also at least once a totally different reading⁴⁹. In contrast to its canonical model, the Aramaic text is easily understood. As well as the tradition, preserved in Bab. Talmud Baba bathra Fol. 14b, that Job was composed by Moses, the linguistic difficulties of the Hebrew book must have led to its early translation in targumic form⁵⁰.

Despite this, however, the Targum has practically nothing to do with the original of the LXX. As is well-known, this Greek translation of Job contains as an epilogue, inter alia, the words: οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς Βίβλου. We had at first hoped that our Targum might represent the original of the LXX. But this is not the case, although it is possible that in some places a tradition represented in the LXX has been deposited in our Targum. On this matter only a closer study of the text can afford a solution. Our work has just as little to do with the Job Targum which first gained currency in the Middle Ages and was published by De Lagarde⁵¹.

c) The translator has not only often tried to make the text of his original more comprehensible and on occasions more elegant, but he also shows a rationalising tendency vis-a-vis the mythological terminology of the Hebrew text. In this the demythologising activity of the author is clearly visible. A striking example of this is Job 38:7, where the canonical text reads:

When the morning stars **sang** together
And all the **sons** of God shouted for joy

The Targum paraphrases:

And all the **angels** of God shouted for joy.
When the morning stars **shone**,

Also the names Leviathan and Behemoth are not found in the Targum. Instead of these is found, as far as I can see always ג'נ'ג.

REFERENCES

1. Cf. Palestine Exploration Quarterly 89 (1957), p.95, and 90 (1958), p.17.

2. There were found in addition: a scroll of Psalms, which, besides more than 30 known Psalms from the canonical book, contains 7 songs not previously known in Hebrew and a piece of prose with a description of the work of David as a poet. Two of these songs seem to represent the original of LXX Ps.151, while two others were already extant in a Syrian translation (cf. ZAW 48 (1930), p.1-23). Also a number of small fragments of Ezekiel; portions of a roll of Leviticus in archaic Hebrew script; fragments of Deuteronomy; a description of the New Jerusalem etc.
3. Two American institutions had previously acquired the Psalms scroll and the fragments of Ezekiel in this way.
4. The purchase price amounted to Jord. £10,000.
5. J. van der Ploeg, **Le targum de Job de la grotte 11 de Qumran** (11Q tg Job), Première communication, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen afd. Letterkunde (Nieuwe Reeks, deel 25, No.9) Amsterdam 1962.
6. From a personal communication from Dr. H. J. Plenderleith.
7. The completely or partially preserved portions of the text are: Col.1: Job XVII 14-XVIII 2; col.2: Job XIX 11-19; col.3: XIX 29-XX 6; col. 4: XXI 2-10; col. 5: XXI 20-27; col.6: XXII 3-9; col.7; XXII 16-22; col.8: XXIV 12-17; col. 9: XXIV 24-XXVI 2; col. 10: XXVI 10-XXVII 4; col. 11: XXVII 11-20; col. 12: XXVIII 4-13(?); col. 13: XXVIII 20-28; col. 14: XXIX 7-16; col. 15: XXIX 24-XXX 4; col. 16: XXX 13-20; col. 17: XXX 25-XXXI 1 (?); col. 18: XXXI 8-16; col. 19: XXXI 26-32; col. 20: XXXI 40-XXXII 3; col. 21: XXXII 10-17; col. 22: XXXIII 6-15, 17; col. 23: XXXIII 24-32; col. 24: XXXIV 6-17; col. 25 XXXIV 24-34; col. 26: XXXV 6-14; col. 27: XXXVI 7-16; col. 28: XXXVI 23-33; col. 29: XXXVII 10-19; col. 30: XXXVIII 3-13; col. 31: XXXVIII 23-32; col. 32: XXXIX 1-12; col. 33: XXXIX 20-29; col. 34: XL 5-14; col. 35: XL 23-31; col. 36: XLI 7-17; col. 37: XLI 25-XLII 6; col. 38 XLII 9-11.
8. The columns must have contained about 16 lines.
9. Cf. W. F. Libby, **Radiocarbon Dating**, Chicago 1952; E. Sutcliffe, **The Monks of Qumran**, London 1960, p.38f. Only the unused column at the end of the roll (after col. 38) would be available for such a test.
10. W. F. Albright, **A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus**, Journal of Biblical Literature LVI (1947) p.145ff; N. Avigad, **The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents**, Scripta Hierosolymitana IV (1957), p. 56-87; S. A. Birnbaum in a long series of works, including "**The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography**" (Bulletin of the American Schools of

Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies Nos. 13-14), New Haven 1952; **The Hebrew Scripts**, London 1954-57; **The Negeb Script**, *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956), p. 337-371; F. M. Cross, **The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran**, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955), p.147ff; **The Development of Jewish Scripts** in: *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, Essays in honor of W. F. Albright, ed. G. E. Wright, New York 1961, p.133-202.

11. If we are in fact dealing with a roll out of the Qumran library—and there is nothing to prevent this assumption—68 A.D. may be seen as the *terminus ad quem* for the manuscript, as in that year the Essene community had to leave their dwelling on account of the war with the Romans.
12. Cf. H. Bauer-P. Leander, **Grammar of Biblical-Aramaic**, Halle 1927; J. J. Koopmans, *Arameese grammatica*, Leiden 1957 and the previous literature therein mentioned (p.9); F. Rosenthal, **Grammar of Biblical Aramaic** (*Porta linguarum orientalium*, New Series, vol. V), Wiesbaden 1961. Cf. for the language of the Targums G. Dalman, **Grammatik des jüdisch-palastinischen Aramaisch**, Leipzig 1905 (Darmstadt 1960) and W. B. Stevenson, **Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic** (Oxford 1924) (deals also with *Bibl. Aram.*).
13. N. Avigad - Y. Yadin, **A Genesis Apocryphon**, Jerusalem 1956; on the language of the Genesis Apocryphon cf. E. Y. Kutscher, **The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon, A Preliminary Study**, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* IV, Jerusalem 1958, p.1-35. There is a 'Concordance to IQ Genesis Apocryphon' by H. Lignée in *Revue de Qumran*, tome 1, p.163-186.
14. ד is found only once in a variant of דִּי עֲבָרָה (Dan. 3:15) and also in the connection דְּהוּא Ezra 4.9 (for דְּרִי הוּא). The latter occurrence is a gloss.
15. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher op. cit. p.6 (GA XX 27; XXI 29; XXII 14, 21, 22 (twice).
16. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher op. cit. p.14.
17. The four exceptions are in Dan. 3:1, 4:11; and 5:12, 15.
18. According to W. Baumgartner, **The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel** (*ZAW* 45 (1927), p. 108 = **Zum Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt**, Leiden 1959, p. 95) הַת is found in Dan. 17 times, in Ezra 4 times. Against this are 6 cases of הָת in Dan. and 1 in Ezra. In the Elephantine writings, the form הָת, predominating elsewhere, is also found (cf. P. Leander, **Laut- und Formenlehre des ägyptisch-Aramaischen**, Göteborg 1928, p.48f.).
19. Not counting the Saphel form שִׁיזְבַת (col. 14, 6: Job XXIX 12) I have found so far four exceptions: אִיתַחַד

- (col. 11, 10: Job XXVII 19) אַם (תהרת) (col. 13, 2: Job XXVIII 21) אַתְּכַפֶּפֶת (col. 16, 3: Job XXX 14) and אַתְּקַצֵּר (Col. 18, 5: Job XXXI 12).
20. GA II 5; XX, 19 and XXII, 21, 22.
 21. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.* p.7.
 22. Col. 30, 8.
 23. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, p.4 and 8.
 24. Col. 21, 6.
 25. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, p.4.
 26. Col. 26, 7.
 27. Col. 5, 5.
 28. Then ending *ūn* comes from the Imperfect and has entered the Perfect thence.
 29. Eg. ותמחה אחר לִי (col. 14, 6: Job XXIX 12); שיזבת לענא (Col. 4, 6, Job XXI 6).
 30. Cf. ZAW 62 (1949-1950), P. 205.
 31. Cf. A. J. MacLean, *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, Oxford 1901, p. 71 (dista or dasta, pers. Turk).
 32. Demonstrated by van der Ploeg.
 33. It is true that שבר is found as "break" in the Aramaic inscription of Sfiré 1A 38 (A. Dupont-Sommer-J. Starcky, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré in: Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et belles Lettres XV*, Paris 1958 (p. 197-351), and one could consider the meaning 'shattering, misery,' for תשברה on the basis of this. But there is a special problem concerning the relationship of the Sfiré-Stele with later Aramaic literary monuments. Eg. A33 צבי is found instead of טביא , A38 חציה instead of חטיא , A33 שעל ('fox') instead of העלא and 1B 8 יצרין instead of יטרן (on the text, cf. now also J. J. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, Leiden 1962, p.7 ff). Because in the later language 'break' is always תבר the derivation of תשברה from שבר 'break' is not likely.
 34. Job XXX 16.
 35. Col. 32, 3.
 36. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig 1905, p. 12f.
 37. *The Cairo Genizah*, Oxford 1959, p. 192ff.
 38. *Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen*, Leiden 1939, p. 108, 127.
 39. *op. cit.* p. 10.
 40. Literature on this subject will be found in O. Eissfeldt,

- Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Tübingen 1956, p. 850 f. (Translator's note: p. 696f. in the English translation, "The Old Testament: An Introduction".)
41. Vol. 1, p. 174 ff.
 42. *op. cit.*, p. 851 (Engl. version, p. 696 (translator). Similarly also E. Würthwein, *Der Text des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart 1952, p. 62.
 43. Quoted from the translation of Lazarus Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, Berlin 1929, Vol. 1, p. 787 f.
 44. Acts XXII, 3.
 45. Aram. $\text{בְּיָלִיָּא לְנַצְבְּנָא}$ 'plantation' (מִטְע) as a description of the community is often found in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the reference might therefore be to the Essene community. But the concept is too common to lead to this conclusion.
 46. XVI 26, XXI 24. 'Plantation' is used in this sense also in the O. T. (Isa. LX 21; LXI 3).
 47. In Job XXXI 29 and XXXIII 24.
 48. Job XXXIX 24 (except for one word) is missing completely.
 49. Instead of XLII 3, XL 5 is paraphrased.
 50. That the tradition of Bab. *Baba bathra* 14b was also known in Qumran circles would follow from the fact that at Qumran fragments in archaic Hebrew script were found of the Pentateuch and Job only.
 51. P. de Lagarde, *Hagiographa chaldaice*, Lipsiae 1873.